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Grave markers are architectural artifacts that give witness to the state of the culture of their time. They reflect style and fashion tastes, both visually and textually, from the era in which they were created. The past few decades have seen an increase in academic interest in the topic of death. However, most of the research on death in western culture has avoided the eighteenth century and focused on either the transition between the Medieval and Early Modern eras or the Victorian era. Thus, there are gaps in the knowledge about the interplay of social movements on eighteenth-century practices and expressions surrounding death. In this study, changes to the messaging of eighteenth-century grave markers and monuments in England are connected with the Enlightenment and with the overall architectural styles of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries.
Special emphasis is given to key architects who were products of the Renaissance, Scientific Revolution, and the Enlightenment as well as conduits of architectural styles. In addition, the impact of the Agricultural and Industrial Revolutions, as well as the rise of the Dissenting church on the location and control of burial sites is explained.
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Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

For humans, expression is compulsive. Communicating artistically has been part of human history since the earliest records of human settlements. The desire to understand an artistic or written message is also a human element. Humans would not have advanced so far without a natural curiosity of their abilities and the world that surrounds them. For thousands of years humans have created funerary art and relatively elaborate burial sites with artistic messages understood by their creators and a mystery to those in the distant future. Those who merited such elaborate burial sites and messages of the distant past are believed to be of the highest ranks in society. This practice of honoring the special class in society continued throughout the centuries.

Samples of funerary art that have survived vary from the elaborate to the simple and speak of their time in history, but not always is the message clear. They and the eras in which they were created must be studied to be understood. Just as archaeological examinations of ancient burial sites give us insight into the cultures of their day, examinations of the burial practices of the late seventeenth and eighteenth centuries reveal much about social movements at work then. Fortunately, more is recorded of recent cultures than exists of ancient ones allowing researchers more insight and clues for deciphering the message of the era. Not only are there published records but there is first-
hand evidence of an increase in funerary monuments that represent all levels of society, not just the wealthy and socially important.

As Britain entered into the long eighteenth century, the ideals of the Renaissance had been introduced and embraced so heartily that British scientists embarked upon the Scientific Revolution which spread out across Europe. Though universally profound, the impact of both movements varied by country. For example, how England responded to these changes was significantly different from how France responded. Following and during these two societal movements, England experienced a time of great social upheaval both politically and religiously resulting in substantial adjustments with regard to the management of the dead. Not only were burial sites significantly changed, but so too were the expressions of death in funerary art and messaging. Deciphering the impact gives insight into the culture of the day. Doing so requires casting a wide net in terms of information sources.

LITERATURE REVIEW

The topic of death and burial is very broad and contains many aspects worthy of study. Considering that everyone is affected by this topic in one way or another, learning the historical path that burial commemoration took in England can give insight and understanding of local traditions for those living in the western world. The focus of this thesis is on England and its traditions over time with regard to burial sites and grave markers, and specifically on the eighteenth century, which has little representation in scholarly literature.

Many studies on the topic of burial monuments in England have focused on the transition from the medieval to the early modern eras. However, stating that they
included the early modern period does not communicate a consistent end-date as some chose 1600 and others chose 1700 to conclude their research period. Whichever end date they chose, it inadvertently stops short of the era that this paper is focused on, which is the long eighteenth century. In addition to the multiple resources available for the medieval and early modern period, there is a plethora of study given to the Victorian era. Understandably, these periods are rich with content of which to write about. The oversight could possibly be due to the fact that in comparison to these two periods mentioned, the eighteenth century may come across as a quieter period of transition in the world of burials and grave markers, or it might be due to the fact that the other two eras are just too tantalizing to ignore. Suffice it to say, there exists an overlooked segment of time with regard to burials and grave markers during the long eighteenth century. This study attempts to address that historical hole, specifically addressing how burial sites and grave markers were directly affected by the societal events of the late-seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. Being a subset of architecture, grave markers quietly reflect the ebb and flow of society’s mindset during the various societal movements. It is the intent of this paper to show how these quiet artifacts of time speak of the eighteenth-century society to any who take the time to consider their message.

The Awakening of Literature on the Subject of Death

One prominent author on the subject of death, Clare Gittings, stated the problem well: “The study of eighteenth-century English death is in general fairly sparse, with nothing comparable to McManners’s excellent study for France in this period.”

Aries’ 1981 book, *The Hour of Our Death*, initiated interest on the subject after a long dry spell.\(^2\) Aries’ book covers one-thousand years of the history of death in the western world and is a valuable resource in this field of interest. However, it mostly addresses the topic of death from the French point of view with only a small amount of the book devoted to English traditions. James Curl provided an English representation on the funerary customs over history in his book, *A Celebration of Death*.\(^3\) Curl’s specialty is more towards the Victorian era, but his historical recounting was very helpful.

Prior to Aries, there were authors who wrote about death, such as Bertram Puckle who wrote, *Funeral Customs: Their Origin and Development*.\(^4\) Puckle’s book covers a much broader area of discussion than the focus of this paper, in that he includes the traditions of handling the deceased from the time of death, announcements, the funeral, then burial and the grave marker over the years of recorded British history. However, he does give insight into the sociological effects made on eighteenth-century tombstones. Though Puckle preceded the next author in time, Katherine Esdaile is regarded as the pioneer twentieth-century author on the subject and stood alone in the field for some time. Her book, *English Church Monuments – 1510 to 1840*, appropriately focused on an important aspect for this study’s research on grave markers, as did her earlier two books

---


on the French sculptor, Roubiliac. Roubiliac lived for many years in England and produced exquisite funerary sepulcher work reflecting the changing style of the eighteenth century.

**Roman Britain**

Before entering into the long eighteenth century to discuss the effects societal events had on burial customs, the research first explored the path the Britons took from when the Romans ruled the land to the eighteenth century. This backward look gave insight into the tradition of why the British traditionally bury their dead instead of cremating them; how Christianity was introduced by the Romans and how persecution by the Romans led to the tradition of each church housing the relic of a saint in the altar; and how this practice introduced the practice of burial inside the church building which led to so many problems later on. Gaining an understanding about how Britain arrived to find itself immersed in the burial problems of the early modern era, which includes the eighteenth century for the purposes of this paper, required delving into books on Roman Britain. While many books covered the Roman empire, Barry Cunliffe’s *Iron Age Communities in Britain: An Account of England, Scotland and Wales from the Seventh Century BC Until the Roman Conquest* concentrated on the country chosen for this research, as did David Hume’s, *The History of England*. Especially helpful was Robert Philpott’s book, *Burial Practices in Roman Britain: A Survey of Grave Treatment and*
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Furnishing A.D. 43-410, because it tackled both the timeframe and the topic of interest.7 Catherine Arnold’s book, Necropolis: London and its Dead, looks specifically at London’s history spanning from the time when the Roman’s established the site as their main city following their conquest to the present day.8 She reveals how London is a city layered by centuries of burials. Over the centuries there has been the persistent problem of mismanagement of the dead leading to unhygienic living conditions which affected the whole country, which begs the question, how did England rise above this to progress so well in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries?

Eighteenth-Century England

Asa Briggs’ book, The Age of Improvement, addresses the many eighteenth-century changes that occurred in England.9 Society and culture were affected by new scientific and technological advancements coming from the seventeenth century which continued into the eighteenth and contributed to the Industrial Revolution. Dorothy George’s book, England in Transition: Life and Work in the Eighteenth Century, and Roy Porter’s book, English Society in the Eighteenth Century, both address the transitions of the century.10 George speaks of the humanitarianism that arose during the century as well


as the industrial changes. She discusses how the Scientific Revolution produced an Age of Reason mindset in the seventeenth/eighteenth century. An additional emphasis was placed on the emotional reaction against the religious enthusiasm of the Puritans which resulted in eighteenth-century tombstones containing restrained high praise – expression of sentiments sans enthusiasm. Porter explains how the Enlightenment ideals impacted religion, filtering down to grave markers exchanging their macabre skulls for the classical symbols of urns and laurels.

The Enlightenment indeed had a very strong impact on the century with one of the biggest outcomes being the promotion of individuality, which permeated all aspects of society. Considering that literature historically favors putting emphasis on the French version of the Enlightenment, Porter’s book, *The Creation of the Modern World: The Untold Story of the British Enlightenment*, was very helpful in explaining how the Enlightenment began in England and how its society was impacted by delving more deeply on the subject.\(^\text{11}\) Porter explains that, “In Britain, at least, the Enlightenment was thus not just a matter of pure epistemological breakthroughs; it was primarily the expression of new mental and moral values, new canons of taste, styles of sociability and views of human nature.”\(^\text{12}\) Both Ralph Houlbrooke and Julie Rugg contribute admirably to the discussion in *Death in England*.\(^\text{13}\) It is, however, Rugg’s chapter titled, ”From Reason to Regulation: 1760-1850,” which brings the attention to the fact that the


Enlightenment “offered many challenges to traditional views on death.” Rugg explains how the scientific progress in medicine neutralized death as did the “diminution of the traditional stress on eternal hellfire and damnation” which contributed to the move away from the inclusion of traditional symbolism for death. Death moved to being portrayed as a “restful and serene experience,” which fit in comfortably with the Neoclassical style pervasive during the last half of the eighteenth century.

Another major societal event focused on in this research is the Industrial Revolution. The migration of people due to job transition contributed to displacement confusion and an increased problem of public hygiene. Throughout the country the death rate increased, however, it was exacerbated in the crowded conditions of London. J. Landers’ article, Mortality and Metropolis: The Case of London 1675-1825, addresses the fact that in Europe, London was an important test case as it was the largest European city. While it housed ten percent of the country’s population, it consistently suffered annual burial surpluses. The hygiene problem covered in this research specifically addresses churchyard burials which were overcrowded and malodorous. This problem had been a complaint by the British people throughout the towns and cities for at least a century. The editors of Death in England, Peter Jupp and Clare Gittings, comment on how high population density led to more sickness and worse overcrowding of existing

---


burial sites which went against the ideal of decency cherished by those living in the eighteenth century. In addition to the unhygienic churchyards was the additional complaint by churchgoers about the intolerable practice of constantly burying people underneath the church floors. The stench people had to endure as they worshipped in church supported their concern and belief that the ‘miasma’ of the dead caused illness in the living. This argument was strongly worded in the 1726 book written by Thomas Lewis titled, *Churches no Charnel houses.* Lewis pushed for the preferred option of returning to the original Roman practice of cremation. *Albion’s People, English Society, 1714-1815,* written by John Rule, goes into great detail about the in-migration and population growth during the long eighteenth century. Where Rule connects the Industrial Revolution to the high mortality rates around the country, E. Anthony Wrigley in “A Simple Model of London’s Importance in Changing English Society and Economy 1650-1750” preferred to indirectly praise the Industrial Revolution by noting how the agricultural advances provided enough food to feed the additional people that the population growth created, even though farms had fewer laborers because of the call of industry to work in towns during the Industrial Revolution.

---


Architectural Impact of Societal Movements

The Renaissance entered England architecturally through Inigo Jones in the seventeenth century. Its impact on English society led to the embracing of the classical world ideals in art, and specifically architecture. All things classical came into fashion which expressed itself in the buildings and grave markers of the era. The architectural movement begun by Jones continued through Wren into the eighteenth century and on to Burlington and Robert Adam. These men promoted architectural styles that were based on either Greece and/or Rome because the British had embraced the Renaissance and all that came with it. Style changes often represented a change in the political leadership which is what occurred in the late seventeenth century. The chapter, “A Sense of Proportion,” by John Julius Norwich in *Spirit of the Age* shares about the return to Palladio in the eighteenth century, which bridged “mathematics and the natural sciences on the one hand, [and] classical heritage on the other.”21 During this century there was much architectural variety, however, all styles were based on the classical model. Architecture as small as grave markers were stylistically in tandem with the style of the day. Monuments moved from stiff effigies to graceful, Romantic era effigies as people desired to express their individuality. Nigel Llewellyn’s book, *Funeral Monuments in Post-Reformation England*, talks about how “monuments taught onlookers lessons about death, glossed by political and theological theory.”22 In Llewellyn’s other book on this topic, *The Art of Death: Visual Culture in the English Death Ritual, c. 1500-1800*, he
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points out how people would take the time to read an inscription on a grave marker because eighteenth century people were people of sensibility, a by-product of the Enlightenment. Appreciation for art spilled over into the sepulcher monument world with the wealthy commissioning talented sculptors to make a statement to the world about their life well lived. Margaret Whinney’s book, Sculpture in Britain: 1530-1830, writes in wonderful detail about the sculptors who created the monuments that represented each style. She explains how England was bereft of quality craftsmen for a century due to the revolt against images in the church, and how it took immigrants from Europe to awaken the English craftsmen to learn and accept the challenge to produce elegant, expressive tomb monuments.

The Move Towards Cemeteries

The creation of public cemeteries was an overdue solution, but one that did eventually come about where Parliament opened the way to solve both the overcrowding problem, the unhygienic problem, and the Dissenter’s need for burial space. They did this in the early nineteenth century, and because it is linked to the longtime burial space problem, it was included in this research. Julie Rugg provided two quality publications covering the development of the cemetery in her conference paper titled, "A New Burial Form and Its Meanings: Cemetery Establishment in the First Half of the 19th Century" and in her article, “Defining the Place of Burial: What Makes a Cemetery a Cemetery?"
In addition, A.J. Arnold and J.M. Bidmead explain the history leading up to this momentous decision and give their conclusions on the coming about of the original British cemeteries in their article, “Going 'to Paradise by Way of Kensal Green:’ A Most Unfit Subject for Trading Profit?” The two authors explain the challenges, successes, and failures of the for-profit, shareholder companies. Lastly, Harold Mytum’s article, “Public Health and Private Sentiment: The Development of Cemetery Architecture and Funerary Monuments from the Eighteenth Century Onwards,” addresses the original push for Parliament to quell the public hygiene issue, which Mytum feels that though it was a major factor in bringing about cemeteries, “changes in attitudes to life and death also played at least as important a role.”

**METHODODOLOGY**

This thesis makes connections between major societal movements and their impact on the messaging of grave markers and monuments as well as on the fundamental changes that occurred to burial practices in eighteenth-century England. To do so required an extensive survey of the literature on those societal movements, on grave marker designs and epitaphs, on burial practices, and on the architects, who were the
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conduits of architectural style that influenced the design language of grave markers. Access to several libraries as well as the inter-library loan system was required to acquire necessary research materials. Additionally, subscriptions and access to specialized web sites was needed to obtain certain documents. Finally, a personal trip to England in December 2019 was used to visit churchyards, churches, and cathedrals in order to seek eighteenth-century grave markers to provide further primary source material.

Recognizing that authentic research is a discovery process, developing connections between events, influential people, social movements and the burial practices and messages on grave markers and monuments was an iterative process. Links were suggested through initial broad-based research that were subsequently supported with targeted inquiry. Hypothesized connections were revised when the discoveries either contradicted the initial hypothesis or led in a more profitable direction. As an example, the importance of the topic of burial location changes both as a public health issue and a Church of England control issue was discovered during that initial exploration.

To discover and hypothesize connections, a wide variety of documents were gathered. Reports following the death rate numbers were compared with reports of the effects of migration caused by the Industrial Revolution. Numerous firsthand reports regarding the overcrowding burial sites in diaries, newspapers, and printed pamphlets by politicians and notables of the era condemning the burial practices of the day were acquired as one such report might indicate the existence of another source. Academic research available on the eighteenth century as a whole, academic works on architecture history, and academic works on grave marker appearance and history were foundational and many are described in more detail in the Literature Review.
Primary sources came from many eras: Roman, early modern and modern. For example, from the Roman empire came Vitruvius’ *De Architectura*; from Roman Britain, notes provided through the pen of Lactantius between Constantine and his co-emperor were found to confirm edicts made; and from more recent sources in the eighteenth century, the book by Thomas Lewis, *Churches no Charnel Houses*, who in it argued strongly against inhumation in churches. A challenge faced in this endeavor was in discovering a lack of eighteenth-century grave markers in the churchyards. Fortunately, many were found in the numerous churches and cathedrals visited. In addition, research was gained through a visit to Highgate Cemetery, one of the original ‘Magnificent Seven’ built by the London Cemetery Company in 1839. Lastly, Archive.org, the British Newspaper Archive, and newspapers.com were additional sites queried for books and clippings.

Another challenge to meeting the research goal of this thesis was finding publications that addressed the connection between the societal effects on grave markers. Most of the secondary sources, if they addressed the change in grave marker appearance, never connected that change to societal events of the eras. The purpose of this research was to bring together all the points, which seen as a whole, made possible the conclusions of this research.

This thesis weaves key ideas and facts from a wide variety of sources covering a diverse set of topics to support its two main ideas. In doing so, there is natural overlap of some of the people and of the social trends. It will be seen that Sir Christopher Wren had an impact on both the change of burial practices as well as the styles used on monuments. The Enlightenment likewise contributed to the impetus to change burial sites and control
over burial practices but was also responsible for changes in the messages on grave markers and monuments. A key contribution of this work is in pulling these disparate bits together to tell two important stories. In this thesis, the impact major social movements and key people had on the location and control of burial sites in England during the eighteenth century will be explained. Then changes to the messages, both textual and stylistically, of eighteenth-century grave markers and monuments in England will be connected with social movements, architects, and architecture.
Chapter 2

THE HISTORY OF ENGLISH BURIAL SITES

If one is interested in life, one might as well look at it from the proper perspective—which is its end, from where it comes fully into view at last.

-- Karl S. Guthke, Harvard Professor

Throughout the ages, a heterogeneous mix of practices reflect the influence of the varied cultures which have dominated the British Isles. From the mysterious passage tomb of Bryn Celli Ddu or the recently discovered, and not yet named, burial mounds of the Druids seen nearby or the ship burials of the Anglo-Saxons best illustrated by Sutton Hoo to the Roman practices of roadside burials, England has seen a plethora of social mores reflected in its diverse burial rituals. The concern of this thesis is with the practices that arose during the long 18th century and two key influences on those practices. The road to those practices, as is often said in other contexts, leads to Rome. There were earlier burial practices that occurred prior to the arrival of the Romans; however, they are beyond the scope of this paper. And so, the journey begins in Rome and in particular with Rome's conquest of Britain.

Roman Influences on Britain and Burial Practices

From the Druids to the Romans, the early history of England is relatively well documented. Credit for this gift of insight goes to the Greek and Latin writers such as Dio Cassius (Historia Romano) and Cornelius Tacitus (Annales, Historae, and Vita
Agricolae) who, by documenting the successes and failures of Roman officials, preserved the history of Britain for future generations.\(^1\) Without Rome’s interest and presence in the land they referred to as Britain, little would be known of how burial practices evolved during this early part of England’s history.

The island first caught the attention of Caesar in 55 B.C. as he was securing victories in Gaul, a region of Western Europe. With the run of success Caesar had enjoyed, the temptation to gain further territory was great. In addition, he understood the existing trade associations between Britain and a large section of Western Europe and how a threat to Gaul might instigate action by the Britons to come to their defense. Both the temptation and the threat were reason enough for Caesar to curtail the threat of a possible alliance against him by going on the offensive. He crossed the waters and victoriously conquered this new land but mistakenly left too soon to solidify the new arrangement and treaty.\(^2\) It took a return trip with a more solid show of force in 54 B.C. before Caesar had a semblance of control over the southern tribes. This second show of force left the island more solidly subjected to Rome and began the eventual spread of Roman influence over the British people.\(^3\)

Even though the tribes were officially loyal to Rome, some tribes were disproportionately enriched by their cooperation with the Romans while others chaffed
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under Roman control. Evidence shows that the Trinovantes/Catuvellauni British tribes benefitted based on “the quantity of trade goods and diplomatic gifts which poured into their territory.” Whereas, “the other coastal tribes – the Cantii, Atrebates and Durotriges – were far less favoured and may even have been hostile.” The hostility between the Cantii and the Romans is not surprising since the founder of the tribe was a “sworn enemy of Rome.” Additionally, the possible resentment over the preferred treatment by the Romans towards the Trinovantes/Catuvellauni tribes would only build over time. Casual Roman supervision allowed for minimal subservience to be expressed over the next century, a matter which did not seem very much to bother Rome. Once Rome had conquered a people-group, they would often set up a local authority to run the country on their behalf. As long as the puppet or ‘client’ king did as Rome directed, he kept his power. The fact that following the first invasion Rome reigned from afar is “an example of the long-established Roman custom of employing even kings to make others slaves.”

This disinterest eventually came to an end under the rule of Emperor Claudius as tensions among the tribes rose to such a level that by AD 42 the pro-Roman Atrebatic King, Verica, ran to Rome seeking help to retain control. In A.D. 43, Emperor Claudius sent his general Plautius to gain back control over Britain. The battle line was the Thames River.

---

4 Cunliffe, *Iron Age Communities in Britain*, 201.
5 Cunliffe, *Iron Age Communities in Britain*, 201.
6 Cunliffe, *Iron Age Communities in Britain*, 201.
7 Cunliffe, *Iron Age Communities in Britain*, 201.
over which the Roman superiority of arms eventually won resulting in the dissipation of opposition. This victory was followed by the founding of London, an act of establishing Rome’s solid claim of their colony. The location where London was built was strategic because of its port, the only place on the river Thames which “can be forded…and that with difficulty.”

That, along with the establishment of Roman Law, contributed to its success as Britain’s main city. While London and the southwest region became fully Roman, the north and Welsh areas continued to cause military challenges for the Roman leadership during the first thirty years of occupation. With the installation of Julius Agricora in AD 78, the resistance against Rome that had existed, especially in the northern tribes, turned slowly into an acceptance as the Roman troops won their battles up to Scotland. During the next century, Britain transitioned from a Druid state to a Roman state, which included the widespread adoption of Roman customs and traditions. As part of this transition, Roman burial practices in England were influenced by the preferences of Christianity, a religion introduced to the British by the Romans.

At the time of the Roman conquest, there existed throughout Britain a mix of burial styles varying between inhumation (burial) and cremation depending on the area of

---


12 Cunliffe, Iron Age Communities in Britain, 205.

the island.\textsuperscript{14} The conqueror’s army and administration, together with merchants and immigrants, settled down in newly established forts and towns throughout Britain, impacting local society. Part of that impact was the practice of cremation, which became the accepted practice for most of the island. It was not until the mid-second century that cremation started to be replaced with inhumation.\textsuperscript{15} One example of this transition is found in the Romano-British cemetery at Trenholme Drive in York. The earliest burials found were cremations from the early second century A.D. Through the mid- to the late second century A.D. the burials transitioned to inhumations being their dominant choice by the late third century.\textsuperscript{16} This was a Roman empire-wide shift, though the reason for the shift is poorly understood.\textsuperscript{17} Regardless of the availability of choice between cremation or inhumation in early Roman Britain, the tradition of burying the remains underground became the standard.

**Influence of Early Christians on Burial Practices**

Beginning in the Roman era, the accepted practice in England was the Roman method which was to bury the dead alongside the road or in the fields outside the city or town walls.\textsuperscript{18} It was important to those living at that time that the dead were buried far away because they harbored a fear of proximity to the dead believing that the dead would

\textsuperscript{14} Philpott, *Burial Practices in Roman Britain*, 8.

\textsuperscript{15} Philpott, *Burial Practices in Roman Britain*, 8.


\textsuperscript{17} Hope, “The Iron and Roman Ages: C. 600 BC to AD 400,” 55.

\textsuperscript{18} Puckle, *Funeral Customs*, 140.
return and bother or contaminate the living.\textsuperscript{19} The practice became so ingrained into the culture that the judicial code of the land, the Law of the Twelve Tables, “forbade the burial or burning of dead bodies within the city.”\textsuperscript{20} Though the Twelve Tables were not officially codified in writing until the late fifth century, such a practice had been customary for centuries. When the Twelve Tables were finally officially documented, the code “was, in general, a very conservative document that underlined existing rights and practices rather than creating new ones.”\textsuperscript{21} When Christianity entered Britain in the second century A.D., Christians fell in step with the Roman practice/law because they shared the same attitude towards the dead as the Romans.\textsuperscript{22} This shared attitude eventually diverged over time with respect to the practice of cremation. As Christianity spread in Britain the converts had to move away from cremation because the Christian Church forbade the practice.\textsuperscript{23} According to Bertram Puckle, it is unclear why the Christian faith originally forbade cremations. It may be that the connection Christianity has with Judaism, which forbids cremations, led the Christian Church to follow suit. It may be that it was seen as a pagan act, or because they wanted to follow the manner of how Jesus’ body was disposed, in a tomb. It is difficult to know for sure, “but the fact
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remains that neither Jews nor Christians can be cremated without violating the most ancient and sacred traditions of their respective beliefs.”\textsuperscript{24} Therefore, as the influence of the Christian Church grew, cremation dropped out of favor during the fourth and fifth centuries.\textsuperscript{25}

However, prior to being influential, in second century AD when Christianity was a new and unaccepted faith in Roman Britain, Christians were considered a threat to the Romans. Romans pushed back on the new religion through persecution. Persecution grew to the point that it became official with the Edict of A.D. 202 where the Roman Emperor Trajan gave permission to prosecute people who were suspected as being Christians.\textsuperscript{26} This was the first of many edicts issued and with each additional edict the level of persecution increased from harassment to murder.\textsuperscript{27} Identification as a Christian could lead to confiscation of property, exile, or slavery. Later, the murder of Christians created martyrs for the faith. It was therefore necessary for Christians to avoid attracting attention to themselves, making it hard for them to gather for worship. Fortunately, there was imbedded in Roman common law a high respect for places of burial as the Romans cherished the lasting memory of the deceased. This respect meant that Roman law protected every burial place “with divers safeguards, and punished its violation with the
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severest penalties." At the same time, Roman law, from the days of Julius Caesar, saw private gatherings of any sort as suspicious and potentially a threat to the government. However, there was one kind of club that could meet and that was the ‘burial club.’ Since the Romans had such a respect for the burial places, which needed to be maintained, the poorer classes were allowed to meet together once a month at the burial site to perform maintenance duties. Christians used this law for their purposes. Both Jews and Christians had taken advantage of the catacombs, also referred to as “large underground necropolis,” to bury their dead. Since the catacombs were subterranean, and the Romans were superstitious about being near the dead, the catacombs were an ideal location to meet as a ‘burial club’ for their church worship. Not only were they able to congregate, but doing so in the catacombs protected them from persecution at the same time.

An added attraction for worshiping in the catacombs was that the Christian martyrs were buried there. The graves of Christian martyrs became revered sites and focal points for the faithful. In England these graves were transformed into altars where early Christians “solemnized the rites of their faith.” The practices of meeting together in the catacombs coupled with the revered altars of the martyrs lent a church-like feel to
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the site. But how could the Christians gather together in such close proximity to the dead when they and the Romans shared a fear of the dead? What changed? It was simply a matter of necessity that they were forced to find and use the safest place to gather. Persecution gave them little choice and over time their fear dissipated as daily exposure to the dead removed their superstitions and fears. The Romans, on the other hand, continued to build chambers for their dead on land outside the city. The chamber would house an altar for the bones or ashes and benches with cushions for visitors who periodically visited to remember and memorialize the deceased.

The Rise of Churches and Church Burial Practices

As attitudes changed towards the dead and Christianity gained more acceptance in society, there arose a desire amongst the Christians to build above-ground churches. For a long time this was not possible because Christians did not share the same rights as a typical Roman citizen. But that changed when Emperor Gallienus made it legal in 260 A.D. for Christian churches to own property. By allowing this change, Gallienus was officially recognizing Christianity as one of the “lawful religions of the Roman Empire.”

Discussion of Gallienus’ decree of returning property to the Christians is included in the writings of the early Christian author, Lactantius, who quoted the Latin text of the letter sent out by co-emperor, Licinius, to all the governors, as agreed upon with co-emperor, Constantine. In Lactantius’ writings, he quotes Constantine declaring
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that all the property owned and taken from Christians “be given back without any
equivocation or dispute at all to these same Christians.”35 The right for Christians in the
Roman Empire to own property was a privilege that came and went based on the
emperor, which has been a source of confusion for many scholars.

For example, in 303 A.D. Diocletian withdrew this right/privilege and initiated
the “Great Persecution” which continued through the reign of Maximinus,36 Lactantius
mentions this edict in his writings explaining that the edict required Christians to return to
the “practices of the ancients” for if they did not, they “were subjected to danger, many
too were struck down.”37 The date when this privilege of property ownership was
restored and to which section of the Empire has caused much confusion. According to
Barnes and Boxwell, this privilege was restored to the West in 306 A.D. immediately
after Constantine was proclaimed Augustus in York, England, and not, as many claim, in
313 A.D.38 By the pen of Lactantius, a scholar and advisor to Constantine, an agreement
to return Christian-owned property taken in 303 A.D. in Asia Minor, the Levant and
Egypt, retracted by Maximinus in 303 A.D., was restored in 313 A.D. between
Constantine and Licinius, who was also Constantine’s brother-in-law.39 Following the
meeting of these two leaders in Milan in 313 A.D., Licinius sent correspondence listing
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39 Barnes, Constantine, 96–97; Lactantius, De Mortibus Persecutorum, trans. J.L.
and informing the Eastern areas of this agreement to ensure the restitution of property, which Lactantius mentioned in his writings, *De Mortibus Persecutorum*. This agreement came to be known as the “Edict of Milan.” It was, in fact, not an edict, nor made in Milan, nor a total reversal of the earlier edict by Diocletian to confiscate the property rights of Christians. The reversal for those under Constantine’s rule, as previously stated, had already occurred in 306 A.D. Church buildings were being built long before Constantine came to power and with their construction the practice continued of having some representation of a martyr in the church altar. Centuries of worshiping near the graves of the martyrs meant that moving their places of worship to the surface could not be done without bringing the martyrs’ bones with them. To meet the demand of the growing Christian movement and the building of multiple churches, the Church decided to exhume the martyrs and incorporate bone fragments, or relics, of their bodies into the above-ground church altars lending a “odour of sanctity” and authenticity to each place. Over the centuries, the value of relics to the church kept increasing reaching a climax in the Medieval period where they fueled the pilgrimage movement in France and Spain.
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Close proximity to martyrs’ graves in the church during one’s lifetime led to a natural desire to be close in death. Though it was still illegal to bury the dead within the town walls, by the fifth century Rome had a cemetery inside its walls highlighting how the law was no longer enforced.\(^4\) By the seventh and eighth century demand for change in this matter arose in England. Considering how the Christians no longer felt fear of proximity to the dead, it made sense to allow more freedom regarding where burials occurred. The response to this demand was to provide a site connected to the church that was designated as a burial space and kept separate from everything else via enclosure. To accommodate this objective, Pope Gregory I (590-604) authorized burials to occur in the immediate vicinity of the church.\(^5\) In Britain, Saint Cuthbert obtained papal permission to add burial sites to churches leading to the creation of the churchyard.\(^6\) These enclosures were to be walled, to ensure that no animals would have access, and consecrated to keep the evil influences away from disturbing the dead.\(^7\) Compared to the original arrangement of burial grounds located separately from the church, the new burial site not only allowed the Christian dead to be laid to rest near the revered martyrs, but it


additionally served as a reminder to those approaching the church to send prayers up for the souls of the dead.\textsuperscript{50}

Eventually, the move of burial sites from outside to inside town borders became the accepted practice throughout all of Britain. A contributing factor to widespread acceptance of this move was that graves inside the walls were better protected against grave violation or disturbance. When they were alongside the roads or in the fields, they were vulnerable. Within the confines of the church-owned land, they were better protected.\textsuperscript{51} This move put the responsibility of the dead onto the Church, thus making the Church the guardian of the dead as well as protector and manager of burial sites.\textsuperscript{52} Such a responsibility brought with it various challenges as well as great benefits.

Guardianship of the dead raised the status of the churches. However, the challenge of providing protection from misuse was felt from the beginning. Misuse included usage of the space for purposes other than as a burial ground. Over time the churchyard attracted people to use the open space for their pleasure, such as a playground for the children, or a work yard for small businesses, or a field for animals to graze on. The clergy took the role seriously and endeavored to ensure that the burials were “conducted with reverence and decency, and that the bodies left in their charge were remained inviolate.”\textsuperscript{53} Part of the ritual of respect the Church gave to their dead was to acknowledge in their burial the hope of the resurrection of the body by placing their
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bodies in the ground in an east-west alignment (for the final summons to Judgment would come from the east) and surrounding them with gypsum and lime to help preserve their bodies for the Resurrection Day.  

**The Business of Death**

Throughout the following centuries, as guardians of the dead, the churches benefited from the receipt of burial fees and control over grave locations. From the eighth to the tenth century, the process was simple: fees would cover the cost of the burial space as well as the services of the clergy. In the seventeenth century an intramural interment (burial inside a church) cost around 6 shillings and 8 pennies, if one was buried in the church, and 10 shillings if buried in the chancel. A simple burial during the seventeenth century may involve a minister, clerk, and sexton of the parish. The minister would be paid a few shillings, the clerk one shilling for his attendance, and four pennies went to either the clerk or section for digging the grave. Cathedral burials were naturally more expensive. One man’s burial in 1632 at Canterbury Cathedral came to 3 pounds, 13 shillings, and 4 pennies.  

Announcing the death required a payment as well. The church bell tolled at the death cost 10 shillings with an additional 10 shillings for the burial. The ceremony of  

---

burying the dead varied over time, as did the cost. The more elaborate ceremonies exacted a higher fee. Funerals could be lavish affairs in the seventeenth century. Food and drink were the largest expenditures and were expected to be provided. One pauper’s funeral provided bread and beer costing seven shillings.\(^{59}\) All aspects of the event had to be paid for including invitations to the funeral, pall bearers, attendees, stone mason, and coffins, to name a few. Cost and status did not always match. Sometimes a very wealthy ‘yeoman’ would stage a more elaborate funeral than a gentleman, who was his superior in social status.\(^{60}\) Since it was important, and was the custom, to be buried in consecrated land, the Church had a monopoly over the business of death and the clergy came to depend on the income. The income that came directly into the church in connection to deaths and burials made it hard for the Church to avoid the temptation of allowing money to influence their practices.\(^{61}\) The more desirable burial locations within the church could demand a higher fee, which the wealthy and upper-class could afford, compensating for the meager income from the poor who could never afford inside the church locations.

The earlier mentioned ambition to be buried close to martyr’s bones continued to be great. However, the original intent of placing the burial site next to the church had not meant to include burying the dead within the church. Moving the burial site from outside the town walls to next to the church was an improvement, though for some it was not improvement enough. The elevated level of clergy in the early church (bishops) felt
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entitled to being buried even closer to the relics, that is, within the church building, than
the general public. Though this practice went against the intentions of the Early Church
as “the corpse was considered as an unclean thing” unless it was the body of a martyr, it
gained acceptance over time.\textsuperscript{62} Eventually, the bishops were followed by the priests, the
nobles, and then rich craftsmen in reserving their final resting place within the church.\textsuperscript{63}
Historically, they were simply following the example of the first Christian Roman
Emperor, Constantine the Great (A.D. 272-337), who himself was buried inside the
Church of the Holy Apostles in Constantinople. The popularity of intramural burial is
seen in a survey done of wills from the Diocese of Salisbury: “while 65 percent of
testators before 1399 anticipated burial in the churchyard, in the fifteenth century 61
percent asked for burial within the church.”\textsuperscript{64} Continuing into the eighteenth century, the
request for intramural burial was still being made as seen in the last will and testament of
the Right Honorable Edmund Burke. His will thoughtfully requests that his body, if he
“should die in any place very convenient for its transport thither (but not otherwise) to be
buried in the church at 

\textit{Beaconsfield}, near to the bodies of my dearest brother and my
dearest son, in all humility praying, that, as we have lived in perfect amity together, we
may together have a part in the resurrection of the just.”\textsuperscript{65} Such demand fueled the
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preferential treatment given to those with important status and money to get the best
locations. It became so much of a problem that attempts were made to curb this action in
the seventh century when the Council of Nantes expressly forbade burials inside the
church stating: “That in the Churches no one shall be allow’d to be buried, but in the
Porch, or Court, or the Out-Buildings of the Church,” for special cases.66 The flagstones
inside the churches were constantly being raised to accept new burials.67 Inevitably, the
practice got out of control leading to churches becoming more like cemeteries rather than
houses of worship. Author Philippe Aries called such churches, “veritable cities of the
dead.”68

The practice of burying the dead inside the church was controversial and became
even more so over the centuries. There were those like Bishop Quevil of Exeter, who in
1267 inadvertently encouraged intramural burials (burials within the church) through his
statement that “all churches...are holy (in themselves), and because they are made holy by
the relics of the Saints.”69 The attraction was too strong, both for those desiring to be
close to the holy Saints and for the clergy who received a higher fee. The medieval
church councils straddled the line by forbidding the practice of intramural burials, but
still allowing it for “members of the clergy and important lay people, such as monarchs,
founders, and patrons.”70 Churchmen in the seventeenth century opposed intramural
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burial as they saw it as profane or sacrilegious. “Sir Richard Browne (d. 1683) allegedly thought that ‘making Churches Charnelhouses’ was irreverent, insanitary, and structurally damaging.”

The concern for sanitation was connected to the lack of ventilation in the churches. Without good ventilation, the living had to absorb the smells rising from recent burials which were believed to be dangerous to their health. The structural concern was related to the constant lifting and moving of dirt and bones beneath the church floor tiles.

Considering how decomposing bodies emit unpleasant odors, it is understandable that church members would find it difficult and even unhygienic to have bodies constantly being buried beneath their feet. Even distinguished clergy such as Joseph Hall (1574-1656), Bishop of Norwich, and Archbishop Sancroft (1617-1693) of Canterbury Cathedral, expressed strong opposition. Bishop Hall argued that one should “not hold God's House a meet repository for the dead bodies of the greatest saints,” and Archbishop Sancroft stated that it was “improper that the House of God should be made the repository of sinful man.”

These protestations were only the beginning. It would be many more years before action was taken.

**Remembering the Dead**

Meanwhile, the winds of change regarding how one viewed the management of the deceased were blowing as both the Renaissance and the Reformation entered England. Both movements encouraged an mindset of individualism which replaced the
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long-held corporate identity.⁷⁴ Author Carolyn Gittings suggests that the importance of the individual has become “one of the basic tenets of western thought during the last five centuries.”⁷⁵ As society stresses the uniqueness of the individual, the loss of that individual is harder to contemplate because “one who is unique can, by definition, never truly be replaced.”⁷⁶ Individualism prioritized keeping the person’s memory alive. And to be remembered well one had to have a permanent burial plot with the assurance that the bones of the deceased would not be moved. The concept of permanent grave-ownership, or in-perpetuity, gained popularity which only added to the problem already felt by churchyard overcrowding and insignificant burial site options.

Prior to the Renaissance, it was not considered necessary to highlight where one was buried, with the exception of memorials inside the church. For most people, spreading the last bit of dirt over the grave completed the event. Outside of close relatives, most would walk away and not bother to remember where the actual burial was located for two reasons: 1) there was no grave marker to mark their grave, 2) The bones would be eventually moved anyway, so there was no need to take note of the burial location.⁷⁷ Efforts to keep the memory alive were uncommon for the general public. Gittings points out that: “The vast majority of people dying in England between 1558 and 1660 were buried in their local churchyard in unmarked graves, as had happened for


Though their graves were unmarked for centuries, people still grieved for their lost loved one. For those who could afford it, some commissioned a painting that showed their loved one on their deathbed surrounded by their family members. These paintings often included children who died prior to their parent as a memorial of their death. Another version of a memorial painting was a miniature portrait of the deceased one wore as a piece of jewelry. Later in the Victorian era, jewelry could contain a lock of the hair from the deceased as a remembrance of their life.

The rich, however, customarily erected some sort of permanent grave marker to remember their dead. Francis Bacon wrote in his *Observations on a Libel*: “There was never the like number of beautiful and costly tombs and monuments, which are erected in sundry churches in honourable memory of the dead.” Even when tombs or markers were requested, it was not important that the marker be placed precisely over the grave. It was enough that the marker was in the proximity of where the body was buried because at that time “the tomb was not synonymous with the container of the body.” This was in connection with the understanding that “the first resting-place for the body was temporary” as it was understood that the bones would eventually be transferred to the
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In connection to the Reformation and the rise of Protestantism, intramural burials and monuments saw an upswing in popularity, especially during the reign of William and Mary in the seventeenth century. This was not a coincidence. Churches in Holland had become public mausoleums and it was fashionable to follow their example.84

As the deceased lost their anonymity, the desire and need to erect a grave marker identifying the dead came in partnership with grave ownership. Rarely had church burials been marked prior to the fourteenth century but with the rise in individualism, especially among the wealthy, there was an increase in monumental brasses within the church displaying the person’s name.85 Permanent grave markers became prevalent by the sixteenth century. However, this was not the case with the poorer segment of the population as churchyards had few grave markers prior to the late seventeenth century. Even so, people found ways to keep in step with the new individualism mindset, so as the desire for earthly commemoration spread throughout society, grave markers slowly gained in popularity even amongst the general public from 1650 forward.86 Churchyards began to host simple markers and temporary memorials and the class distinction came to be evident in the grounds outside the church. Headstones identifying the “middling sort”
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graves were overshadowed by more substantial tombs of the clergy, gentry and men of wealth who could not afford intramural burials.  

The variation of grave markers, from simple to elaborate, reflected the status and wealth of the family. The wealthy had monuments built for them usually inside the church whereas the poor were usually identified with simple stones or wood crosses in the churchyard. Eventually, for reasons ranging from space shortage inside the church, the growing disapproval, or the higher cost of intramural burials, the rich joined the poor outside the church during the seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries. The silver lining benefit for the rich to choose the churchyard over the inside of the church was the additional amount of space made available for a substantial monument, if so desired. Gradually, societal pressures for memorials to the dead led the lower ranks of society to follow suit and purchase monuments of their own. In fact, in line with the growing focus on the individual, people began breaking from tradition, choosing instead to include instructions in their will on the type and cost of the memorial they would like purchased for their grave instead of leaving the choice of memorial to the survivor. An example is seen in the will of John Brooke of Ash in Kent in May 1, 1582. His will states: “And I will there a large marble stone to be laid over me with my arms engraved upon the same
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and under them this epitaph…”92 The epitaph he spells out mentions how he had no children and therefore no one to carry on his name. To ensure that his instructions are carried out, Brooke puts a condition in the will stating that unless his executrix follows through with his instruction within two years of his death, they will forfeit twenty pounds which would be given instead to the churchwardens of Ash.93

The permanent grave ownership movement took a toll on all existing churchyards resulting in churches purchasing additional burial sites not directly connected to the church. Though separate from the church, the ground was still consecrated by the clergy.94 Even with this additional space, the churches could not keep up with the number of deaths occurring, especially in the urban areas beginning in the sixteenth century.95

The migration from the rural to the urban areas in the mid to late eighteenth century highlighted how all burial sites were becoming unhygienic and dangerous for the living. Contributing to the problem was the rate of deaths in the eighteenth century which increased four times of what had been the normal rate in prior centuries.96 One can see this growth occurring between monarchs. When the Hanoverian dynasty began in 1714, there were over 5.25 million English subjects. A century later, under George III, the

---
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population had increased to 10.5 million. This problem was about to trigger great changes in the management of the dead.

**Conclusion**

British burial practices and sites have taken a path over the centuries few would have imagined in the first centuries. The initial decision for the Christian Church to take on the responsibility of the guardianship of the dead grew to something that got out of control, or at least beyond the Church’s ability to manage well. Money became a very influential factor in decision-making, as is the tendency. Creative solutions such as the charnel-houses were put to practice during a time when society was not bothered like it is today with the disturbance of the bones of the deceased. But then, the winds of change entered into Britain with the Reformation and the Renaissance. Each changed in their own way, one’s understanding of the relationship between man and God influencing how man approached death and burial. Now it was important to have a dedicated space for one’s body to rest and wait for the Resurrection Day – and to be remembered by the living. Overcrowding of burial sights became an overwhelming problem that did not find a solution for centuries, during which time the living suffered from illnesses and discomfort by being so close to the dead in everyday life. That was about to change.
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Chapter 3

CHANGES IN BURIAL LOCATION AND PRACTICES

The Dead are Killing the Living

-- Catharine Arnold, *Necropolis*

Prior to the start of the long eighteenth century, the church had near total control over burials, people worked the land informally, and local communities were mostly governed locally. During the long eighteenth century, significant agricultural, economic, political, religious, cultural, and social changes occurred which had a dramatic impact on the way people in England lived. Agriculturally, better farming methods both increased the need for food and decreased the need for agricultural laborers. Economically, factories were introduced which changed the labor structure. Politically, Parliament began to exercise greater control through laws like the Enclosure Act. Religiously, the growth of the Dissenters movement would create pressure on the Church of England's near monopoly of burial practices. Culturally, individualism was championed. Socially, the impact of many of these changes spurred a new concern for health and hygiene. As a consequence of better farming methods and the growth of factories, town populations swelled leading to increased population density centers without sufficient compensatory infrastructure improvements. This in turn led to decreases in health and increases in the number of deaths. The increase in the number of deaths exacerbated an already
overwhelmed burial location supply problem which, coupled with the larger social and religious changes, led to a breakdown of the Church's control over burials. Consequently, cemeteries began to appear and along with cemeteries, a rise in personal grave markers. This chapter will examine these changes in detail and, without minimizing the importance of political and religious changes, argue that the Industrial Revolution and the Enlightenment were the principal drivers behind all these changes and that, in consequence, they were the principal drivers behind the changes in burials in England.

**The Scientific Revolution’s Contribution to the Industrial Revolution**

The changes leading up to the Industrial Revolution were considerable and help explain how the Industrial Revolution merits comparable status to the Enlightenment in its effect on the burial traditions of England. Paired with the Europe-wide Scientific Revolution (sixteenth and seventeenth centuries) and the English Agricultural Revolution, which occurred between 1670-1750, the result was a complicated blend of advancement leading into, and through, the eighteenth century.\(^1\) In Britain a scientific culture was well established by the beginning of the eighteenth century.

The English scientific community anchored on Newtonian mechanics shared a common vocabulary used in various publications, including textbooks, that allowed any literate Englishman the ability to understand the concepts. In addition, by the 1720s the British school system had embedded this culture into its curriculum by “teaching basic mathematics, for example, algebra, geometry, surveying, mechanics, and astronomy,” which propelled a widespread interest and practical application of science and math in
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everyday life. This momentum of thorough education benefitted the English society and gave them the ability as early as the 1720s to do the advanced calculations that were required to invent, build or improve canals, and create pumps and steam engines which were specifically intended to enable “one man to do the work of a thousand and aimed at the marketplace of entrepreneurs.” The scientific culture was also helped along “by a relative freedom of press, the property rights and expectations of landed and commercial people, and the vibrancy of civil society in the form of voluntary associations for self-education and improvement.”

The scientific knowledge in England shines in comparison to the rest of Europe where the general public’s accessibility to science was restricted. England was ahead of the Continent in spreading Newtonian and applied scientific knowledge because access on the Continent was inhibited by various factors, one being the Catholic church. A major difference between the English and the Continentals, according to John Henry, is that “English natural philosophy was fundamentally empirical in a way that set it apart from other European countries.” And “although Continental natural philosophers experimented, only English natural philosophers can be said to have been

---


Thus, it is not surprising that the Industrial Revolution began in England as England had the advantage of being decades ahead of the Continent in applying science to technology.

**The Agricultural Revolution’s Contribution to the Industrial Revolution**

Secondly, the English Agricultural, or Agrarian, Revolution, contributed by increasing the food output and decreasing the labor need on the farms prior to the Industrial Revolution. Though there has been an ongoing debate on what dates to assign to the Agricultural Revolution, for the purposes of this paper the focus will be on the agricultural changes that occurred in England between the sixteenth and eighteenth centuries. Robert Allen states that, “most revisionists believe that output grew substantially between the sixteenth century and the first half of the eighteenth.”

During this time, there was both an increase in agricultural production as well as labor productivity leading up to the mid-eighteenth century.

Tracking the crop output of wheat and barley between the sixteenth century and the mid-eighteenth, Allen compares the counties of Oxfordshire, Norfolk, Suffolk, and Lincolnshire which support the claim of greater output. Allen states that in Oxfordshire both wheat and barley yields rose in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. While in “Norfolk and Suffolk, the yield of wheat rose 68 percent between 1584-99 and 1710-39,” he goes on to say that in “in Lincolnshire, the advance between 1550-76 and 1725-49 was
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76 percent.”

Similar increases in barley yields are seen in all these same counties. In fact, “in all counties, barley yields grew more in the eighteenth century than did wheat yields, a fact which tallies with the evidence of yield change during enclosure.” This food output increase was important because England was embarking on a population boom of substantial numbers.

Comparing England and Wales with Continental Europe, and considering the land and population size difference, there was a 109 percent increase in England and Wales and only a 50 percent increase in Europe between 1600-1800. In 1600, the total population was 4.4 million people. By 1750 it was at 6.5 million and by 1800 it had reached 9.2 million. Fifty years later, in 1850, population in England was at 17.9 million. Not only was the overall population increasing, but as Anthony Wrigley pointed out England was also growing in urban population considerably faster than the continent. Where the continent grew by 0.9 million in urban population between 1600-1800, England and Wales in the same period grew by 1.58 million. England’s urban population grew from 5.8 percent in 1600 to 20.3 percent in 1800. Incidental, and worthy of mention, is the surge of migration occurring between 1700 and 1800. Wrigley wrote that in 1700 the urban population in England and Wales was less than one million.
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but by 1800, it had increased to over two million (2.29) representing a 62 percent increase in one hundred years.\textsuperscript{12}

This impressive increase in population needed to be fed. Fortunately, as has been stated already, there was an increase in crop output. What is amazing is that during this same time period the agricultural labor force only increased by 20 percent. That is, between 1600-1800, food output doubled whereas agricultural labor barely rose in comparison. To be specific, Wrigley wrote: “Current estimates suggest that 62.9 percent of the male labor force was employed in agriculture in 1601 and 38.2 percent in 1801, implying that the male labor force at these two dates totaled 686,000 and 824,000, respectively—an increase of 20 percent over a period during which the population increased by 108 percent.”\textsuperscript{13} These numbers fully support that, “there was an agricultural revolution before the mid-eighteenth century, and it accounted for much of the output growth that occurred in England before the industrial revolution.”\textsuperscript{14}

A major factor contributing to the progress in the agricultural sector was the scientific advances and experimentation that led to improved output. The English farmers applied innovative farming techniques gleaned both from Dutch immigrants and from those who as English traders or soldiers visited the Continent. The new farming techniques included crop rotation, new crops, new farming implements and land

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{12} Wrigley, “Reconsidering the Industrial Revolution: England and Wales,” 15.
\item \textsuperscript{13} Wrigley, “Reconsidering the Industrial Revolution: England and Wales,” 22.
\item \textsuperscript{14} Allen, “Tracking the Agricultural Revolution in England,” 225.
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reclamation. These new approaches to traditional farming increased agricultural production throughout the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Then in the mid-eighteenth century, inspired by new scientific knowledge and methods, farmers started doing systematic experimentation. About the same time, the Royal Society of Arts stepped in to encourage the use of science in agriculture to improve crop output. Through advice, competitions, and their own controlled experimentation, the Royal Society was a great source of encouragement and communication between farmers. This spirit of improvement spread throughout the country and even King George III adopted it leading to his affectionately being nicknamed ‘Farmer George.’

**Enclosure Acts**

Another factor that contributed to the success of the Industrial Revolution, and invariably affected burial site locations, are the Enclosure Acts passed by Parliament throughout the long eighteenth century. Enclosures involved land distribution and usage. Prior to the sixteenth century each municipality was made up of a combination of individual strips of land and common land scattered around the village in large, unfenced fields. The process of enclosure began with a village agreeing to enclosure of land, and followed by farmers proving ownership of the land they farmed. An application was then forwarded to Parliament asking them to pass an Enclosure Act for the village. If passed, a new map of the village was drawn pulling all the land of one farmer together and

---


eliminating sections of land between strips that had been unused in the old system. This new system required farmers to then enclose their land with some form of barrier (hedges, fences, or walls) and to build access roads and buildings on their new land. This process began informally during the sixteenth century as a mutual agreement between landowners, then matured during the eighteenth century to a formally regulated system involving Parliament.

There were both negative and positive effects of this system. The biggest negative impact to a local farmer was when he could not prove his ownership of the land he had been claiming and farming for generations. The consequence was eviction. Similarly affected were villagers who did not personally own land but rather used the common areas to graze their animals. They too were evicted. This led to these two groups often reduced to seeking work in industrial cities which often resulted in low wages and poor living conditions. The positive effects included: less land wastage as all sections of land were used to their fullest potential; farmers were free to use their land as desired without concern that neighboring crops or animals would contaminate their own; and new farming techniques and machinery were better applied to larger plots of land. Lastly, there was a drop in labor cost since contained land was easier to manage.

There is much debate over how impactful these Acts were overall with some arguing that they did not make as much of a difference. The majority do feel that this system did allow for more experimentation to occur which then resulted in progress towards greater product output. A helpful insight comes from Joel Mokyr who explains

---

that Enclosure Acts “transformed the lands affected from collectively cultivated open fields to consolidated private lands.” The consequence of these Acts was an increase in off-farm labour (more than was needed to farm the land) which then became the industrial workforce. Seventeenth century commentators such as Samuel Fortrey (1663) supported this argument saying that “enclosure led to the conversion of arable to pasture ‘one hundred acres of which, will scarce maintain a shepherd and his dog, which now maintains many families, employed in tillage.’ The ‘people which lived in those towns they call depopulated’ were not destroyed, however. Instead, ‘they were onely (sic) removed to other places…and employed, in the manufacture of the wooll (sic) that may arise out of one hundred acres of pasture.’ Enclosure drove people from working the land to jobs in the textile industry.” They inadvertently drove people into the machinations of the Industrial Revolution which did offer opportunities to the man “who could borrow a little money and was prepared to work like a slave and to live like a slave master.”

**Results from the Industrial Revolution: Urban Migration**

Throughout the eighteenth century there was a great influx of people moving into towns due to the successes of the Agricultural Revolution and the Industrial Revolution. Because of the reduction of labor needs in the rural areas, there was an available labor
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force for the new factories. The draw of the factories or ‘manufactures,’ was very attractive especially at a time when there existed a surplus of farm laborers who needed an income. The attraction came from promised high wages. Notably, it was not only men who were able to benefit from higher wages, or wages at all, but also women and children. One example is found in the weaving industry of South Lancashire where traditionally the men would weave, and the women and children would spin. Prior to the Industrial Revolution the weaver enjoyed a higher status which was accompanied with a higher income. When the factories came along, they sought out the spinners to work for them, not the weavers. The result was that the weavers’ income stayed static, whereas that of the spinners increased. The spinners and the weavers invariably switched positions of status due to the well-paid employment spinners received from the factories.\textsuperscript{21} Incidentally, the draw of higher wages to do a historically menial job was attractive enough that people left other occupations to become spinners. A ‘Bolton witness’ to the Factory Commissioners stated in 1833 that he could “recollect shoemakers leaving their employ and learning to spin.”\textsuperscript{22} He goes on to recollect tailors and colliers (coal miner) and “a great many more husbandmen [who] left their employ to learn to spin.”\textsuperscript{23}

Families who moved to the towns and cities during the eighteenth century for employment opportunities were not aware of the long-term effects of their decision. The

\textsuperscript{21} Hammond and Hammond, \textit{The Town Labourer, 1760-1832: The New Civilisation}, 11.

\textsuperscript{22} Hammond and Hammond, \textit{The Town Labourer, 1760-1832: The New Civilisation}, 12.

\textsuperscript{23} Hammond and Hammond, \textit{The Town Labourer, 1760-1832: The New Civilisation}, 12.
sacrifice made by these families in exchanging the more hygienic and healthy countryside for an urban life and income was not known until it was too late. John Rule wrote in his book, *Albion’s People, English Society, 1714-1815*, that: “It was widely accepted that hard as was the lot of the country laborer, manufacturing workers fought a special struggle against ill health.”

Ill health for the working class resulted in a higher percentage of death in an already congested setting of the industrial towns.

**Consequences of Urban Migration**

Already well established towns such as Manchester, Leeds, Preston, Sheffield, and London were overwhelmed by the influx of people moving in to work in the factories and mills. Recruitment by the new industrialists seemed to ignore how and if the town would be able to absorb the requested masses of solicited workers because towns exerted little preparation in accommodating the influx of people. An 1825 advertisement in the Macclesfield paper expresses it well: “To the Overseers of the Poor and to families desirous of settling in Macclesfield. Wanted between 4000 and 5000 persons between the ages of 7 and 21 years.”

In 1821, the total population of Macclesfield was 17,746.

This advertisement was followed by another stating: “ Wanted to be built immediately one

---


thousand houses!”  

28 Such an influx would be hard on any town infrastructure and also on the people who replied to the advertisement. A writer for the 1791 *Annals of Agriculture* described the state the workers found themselves specifically in the town of Preston after responding to such advertisements as working “in air contaminated both by the exhalation and breathing of many people together, and also the effluvia of the material used, in confined places; and, though getting good wages at what they think easy work, yet…perhaps living but poorly in diet, these people are frequently visited, especially in autumn and beginning of winter, with low and nervous fevers; in short, putrid and gaol distempers, that often cuts off men, leaving families behind.”  

29 Though this was a national problem, it was not dealt with by Parliament. The responsibility rested on the local leadership of England’s villages, towns and cities, made up of the aristocracy and wealthy landowners, to independently deal with the consequences of large influxes of people to their municipality needing infrastructure support. The aristocracy and the wealthy held the strings of municipal government resulting in a closed clique of men ruling as they saw fit.  

30 Those with money did not have to live in such squalor and discomforts of poverty, and traditionally showed little concern in the challenges those in lower classes of society were experiencing. Through their disinterest in the welfare of the working class they allowed the mill owners to build housing for their workers as cheaply and with as little regard for sanitation as they
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wanted. A description of a street in Manchester emphasizes the lack of concern of where and how the houses were built: “In general the streets of these suburbs are unpaved, with a dungheap or ditch in the middle; the houses are built back to back, without ventilation or drainage, and whole families are limited to a corner of a cellar or a garret.”31 Since the working classes were regarded as “persons incapable of profiting by leisure, and fit only for the long discipline of factory hours,” they were incapable of benefitting from positive input into their lives, which included good housing.32 This pattern of poor treatment was common across the country. There were a few shining lights, however, represented by such mill owners as John Fielden, who fought hard for shorter working days and a more humane life for the factory worker in Lancashire; and John Wood, a woolen manufacturer from Bradford who fought against cruelties the workforce experienced in woolen factories; and essayist Rathbone Greg, the son of a mill owner, who joined Mr. Fielden in fighting for shorter work hours.33

Coal and Ease of Transport

England’s natural resources also contributed to the success it enjoyed during the Industrial Revolution. Where the rest of Europe depended heavily on wood for fueling their industry and heating their homes, England was able to tap into its rich supply of coal located in the north and the center of the country. And with the canals being built across

31 Hammond and Hammond, The Town Labourer, 1760-1832: The New Civilisation, 44.


the country, transport costs lowered to a level making coal a very accessible fuel source for both homes, cities, and factories. Glass manufacturers, for example, needed large quantities of heat energy which coal provided. Having easy access to this resource made glass windows a common sight around England. This contrasts with what the famous eighteenth century writer, Arthur Young, wrote about during his travels in France in the 1780s, that no windows in the towns and villages were filled with glass. England’s supply of coal literally fueled the Industrial Revolution. But it came at a deadly cost.

**Urban Pollution**

In London the terrible living conditions created from the coal dust in the air were described by seventeenth-century diarist John Evelyn (1620-1706) in his famous pamphlet, *Fumifugium: Or the Inconvenience of the Aer and Smoake of London Dissipated*, which he presented to Charles II in 1661. Evelyn’s complaints about the ‘bad air’ are from the effects of switching from wood to coal as fuel across the country. He describes how the bad air over London causes its inhabitants to breath in “nothing but an impure and thick Mist, accompanied with a fuliginous and filthy vapour, which renders them obnoxious to a thousand inconveniences, corrupting the Lungs, and disordering the entire habit of their Bodies; so that Catharrs, Phthisicks, Coughs and Consumptions rage more in this one City, than in the whole Earth besides.” Bad air

---


36 Foster, “Introduction to John Evelyn’s Fumifugium,” 188.
from coal was prevalent throughout the country and only got worse due to contributions by industrial factories. This is confirmed by Josiah Wedgwood, a descendant of the famous Wedgwood family, in his book, *Staffordshire Pottery and its History*. By 1750, the famous Wedgwoods of Staffordshire had built “no fewer than sixty factories” which made “salt glaze in the Potteries, and every Saturday, for five hours at the time of firing up, the whole country was black with the smoke of the burning salt—so black, it is said, that people groped their way through the streets of Burslem.”\(^{37}\) In the north of England, as the city of Manchester was growing with the advancement of the Industrial Revolution there was a noticeable increase in air pollution and unhygienic surroundings. The working men found it “harder and harder to escape out of the wide web of smoke and squalor that enveloped their daily lives.”\(^{38}\)

Bad air was only one of the environmental problems of the time. As mentioned earlier, the influx of people into established, but unprepared towns and cities, created great challenges such as “sanitation, supply of drinking water, waste disposal, and burial of the dead [which] had to be tackled on a scale unknown since Roman times.”\(^{39}\) These slum-like, unhealthy conditions which existed primarily in the poorer neighborhoods of London and the new industrial towns “provided perfect breeding grounds for fevers and sustained the coming of cholera.”\(^{40}\) There were smaller-sized epidemics, such as


influenza, smallpox, and typhus, which occurred periodically and caused a higher number of deaths. Two cholera outbreaks occurred during the first half of the nineteenth century: Asiatic cholera in 1831, where 5,000 died, and a second outbreak in 1848, where 14,000 people died.\footnote{Arnold, \textit{Necropolis - London and Its Dead}, 111.} Aside from these outbreaks, the more common cause of death was due to malnutrition and exhaustion coupled with being surrounded by “cold, germ-ridden environments,” especially amongst the young.\footnote{Rugg, “From Reason to Regulation: 1760-1850,” 2000, 217.} Not surprisingly, considering the conditions that they lived in, the poor lost more children than the rich. Edwin Chadwick published a report in 1840 that stated that on the “average duration of life among the professional persons and gentry in the City of London, who live in better cleansed and ventilated houses, and better cleansed streets, is…about 43 years, and six percent of the deaths are deaths from epidemic disease; whilst among the labouring classes the proportion of deaths from epidemic disease is nineteen percent and the average age of all who die is only twenty-two years,” which Chadwick concludes, results in a death figure of twice as many lower class deaths than wealthy ones.\footnote{Edwin Chadwick, \textit{A Supplementary Report on the Results of a Special Inquiry into the Practice of Interment in Towns} (London: W. Clowes and Sons, 1843), 228.} The filthy environment was a factor in the rising mortality rates. Contributing to the crowded conditions was a rise in population which doubled from half a percent in the middle of the eighteenth century to over one percent from 1760-1800.\footnote{Rule, \textit{Albion’s People}, 1.}
Throughout the eighteenth century, as these very poor living conditions grew worse, there was a change occurring in the minds already affected by the doors opened by the Scientific and Agricultural Revolutions. Educated minds were taking note of the unacceptable environmental conditions England was living under and began to realize change was needed. Philip Goodchild portrayed the Enlightenment as “both a natural coming of age and a personal assumption of responsibility.”

The knowledge gained in the earlier revolutions coupled with the expansion of awareness challenged the English leadership to fight for social reform and to embrace the modern idea of human progress.

The Enlightenment

Many people do not realize that the Enlightenment first took hold in England and not, as is commonly thought, in Europe. European anglophiles “celebrated Britain’s constitutional monarchy and freedom under the law, its open society, its prosperity and religious toleration.” Voltaire (1694-1778) in his Lettres philosophiques ou Lettres anglaises (1733) “saluted England as a ‘nation of philosophers’ and the cradle of liberty, tolerance and sense.” He went on to give honor to those early English scientists, mathematicians or ‘natural philosophers,’ and philosophers such as the Englishmen, Francis Bacon (1561-1626), Isaac Newton (1642-1727), John Locke (1632-1704), stating
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that: “Francis Bacon was the prophet of modern science, Isaac Newton had revealed the laws of the universe, and John Locke had demolished Descartes and rebuilt philosophy on the bedrock of experience. Together, their teachings beat a path between dogmatism and skepticism, opening up new views of nature, morals and society.”

England, in the eyes of Voltaire and the other philosophes, was the birthplace of the modern.

From this strong foundation, Britain weathered significant transformations as it adjusted to the Enlightenment era of the long eighteenth century. Roy Porter lists the following significant transformations that occurred: “the overthrow of absolutism, accelerating population growth, urbanization, a commercial revolution marked by rising disposable income, [and] the origins of industrialization.”

Author Harry Redner describes the Enlightenment as a cultural revolution, calling it “the second and more decisive phase of the onset of Modernity,” following the first which came out of the Renaissance and the Reformation. His reference to the ‘Forces of Modernity’ includes capitalism, the state, and science and technology. As explained earlier, what led into the eighteenth century was Britain’s Scientific Revolution which paved a new path into the natural world via scientific explorations which brought about new knowledge and fueled the inventive minds of the eighteenth century.
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Enlightenment Ideals and Their Impact on Burial Practices

Unique to the eighteenth century was the sense of optimism and forward thinking that “instilled faith in progress and human perfectibility, and made people eager to try new methods, from infant care to crop rotations.”\(^{52}\) The Enlightenment era, which dominated this century, was a time where moral improvement and good hygiene, especially with respect to burial of the dead, were important causes. By the mid-eighteenth century medical professionals were beginning to till the ground for better hygiene practices. There were a few military doctors, such as Sir Gilbert Blane, physician of the Royal Navy fleet who applied the practice of good hygiene to St. Thomas’s hospital when he served there. And his friend, Sir John Pringle, a leading army physician and later President of the Royal Society, who authored, *Observations on the Diseases of the Army*, in 1752.\(^{53}\) Both men, and other famous military physicians during the latter half of the eighteenth century, shared their knowledge regarding the importance of good hygiene and preventative measures “over infectious and deficiency diseases to a wider context because the worst medical problems faced by the fighting services were exactly those of the urban poor.”\(^{54}\) However, the majority of doctors at this time still connected the dead with the cause of disease. They had yet to discover the causes of the plague and


cholera, therefore focus in the eighteenth century was still on the ‘miasma’ that exited dead bodies as being the source of disease.

The Enlightenment era was a time that championed individuality, with emphasis placed on the improvement of individuals. Improvement came through educating the mind, learning how to reason, gaining knowledge through the senses, and improving the world around the individual. Roy Porter highlighted John Locke (1632-1704), one of the most influential thinkers of the Enlightenment era, as a great teacher of the Enlightenment because he offered “a plausible account of the new science as valid knowledge, intertwined with a theory of rational control of the self, while bringing the two together under the ideal of rational self-responsibility.”

The promotion of the enlightened individual was expressed in various ways such as in the printed word and eventually through burial preferences during the Enlightenment era. Examples of how this ideal was promoted in print is seen through the works of men such as the German philosopher, Johann Gottfried Von Herder (1744-1803), who wrote a tract titled, "Another Philosophy of History for the Improvement of Mankind," where he refers to the happiness of individuals; and the French philosophe, Marie-Jean-Antoine-Nicolas de Condorcet, who wrote the treatise, Sketch for a Historical Picture of the Progress of the Human Mind, where he focuses on “the development of the faculties of the individual,” and pointed out that society is made up of “a large number of individuals joined together.”


How did this enhanced focus on the individual introduced by the Enlightenment affect burial traditions? The old burial tradition of being buried somewhere in the churchyard knowing that one day one’s bones would be moved to make space for the next corpse was being challenged by this new concept that every person was important and deserved a final resting place. Their unique plot of land would be where “the dead were to be buried where they would lie undisturbed and where they would not harm the living.”\(^{57}\) And along the lines of individuality, the desire that each grave have its own grave marker identifying the deceased became prevalent with the focus being “on particular individuals, and their existence in this world and the next one.”\(^{58}\) This was a new tradition but one that reinforced the allocation of ground in perpetuity. This new tradition, however, was in conflict with the reality that churchyards were overflowing and not capable of managing the level of dead requiring a burial.

**Mortality Increase, Disease, and the Overcrowding of Burial Sites**

Over time both churches and churchyards suffered from overcrowding and lack of space for burials. As the population grew across England, it became difficult to accommodate all the deaths within the walled boundaries. Churchyard overcrowding continued to get worse, especially in towns and cities, though country churchyards were not excluded from this chronic problem.\(^{59}\) The half-acre churchyard of St. Andrew’s, Widford, Hertfordshire received bodies for at least 900 years before it closed in 1903.

\(^{57}\) Curl, *A Celebration of Death*, 207.


\(^{59}\) Vanderstraeten, “Modes of Individualisation at Cemeteries,” 139.
Estimates are that at least 5,000 people were buried in this country churchyard.\textsuperscript{60} In the inner city, the process was to “pack the maximum possible number of corpses into the available ground…with several bodies being placed together.”\textsuperscript{61} It was becoming desperate enough that a change was needed to accommodate future burials.

For a few centuries, a solution was found which involved lifting the bones from the soil and relocating them to charnels or charnel-houses.\textsuperscript{62} Charnels were vaults underneath the church and charnel-houses were specially-built buildings; both were used to house the exhumed bones.\textsuperscript{63} In London, the number of bones accumulating became so great in the churchyard of St. Margaret’s, Westminster in 1616, that the churchwardens had to find an alternative to the charnel-house. The alternative was to clear out the bones and dig a bone-pit.\textsuperscript{64}

It may be surprising that the practice of relocating exhumed bones to allow for new burials did not cause discomfort to the living as it would today. Yet it apparently did not in the British Isles during that time as evidenced by the opinion stated in 1792 by an Irish citizen: “It would certainly be an improvement honourable to the decency and humanity of the country, were a charnel house to be erected in every great burial ground. It is not a little unseemly to behold the bones of ancestors and friends strewing the ground

\textsuperscript{60} Vanderstraeten, “Modes of Individualisation at Cemeteries,” 139–40.
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as they generally do, through the negligence of grave diggers.” A charnel-house became the normal method of handling the space issue and since society generally identified corporately rather than individually at the time, there was not a sense of ownership over the plot of land where their loved one was buried. And as charnel-houses were built on church property, it did not raise an alarm when the bones were relocated because they never left consecrated land. Besides, piling the bones in an organized manner seemed little different from the original burial site where bodies were often disturbed when another burial occurred. The author, John Aubrey (1626-1697), described the treatment of old bones well when he said: “Our Bones in consecrated ground never lie quiet, and in London once in ten years (or thereabout) the Earth is carried to the Dung-wharf.”

Author Ralph Houlbrooke added a note suggesting that the bones were used as “fertilizer in the country outside London.” Charnel-houses made their appearance in the fourteenth century and went on to become a mainstay solution. They started to fall out of favor in the seventeenth century, but it was not until the eighteenth century did the last charnel house get repurposed.

The London churchyards were well beyond capacity already in the seventeenth century. The tragedy of the Great Fire of 1666 in London was seen as an opportunity to
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rebuild the city by English diarist, John Evelyn (1620-1706), and English architect Christopher Wren (1632-1723), close friends and members of the Royal Society.⁷⁰ Both Evelyn and Wren had an interest in urban planning and enjoyed a friendship with King Charles II. At the encouragement of the King, Evelyn presented his Fumifugium paper to Parliament in 1661.⁷¹ In that work Evelyn lamented over the fact that the city was made of wood and expressed the wish that it “be rendred Brick, and (like another Rome) from Brick made Stone and Marble.”⁷² From May 1662 to November 1663, Evelyn had served with the King’s Surveyor John Denham on a commission “for the Repairing the High-Wayes and Sewers, and for Keeping Clean of the Streets, in, and about the City of London and Westminster.”⁷³ His time with the commission gave him great insight into preparing a city rebuilding plan which focused on an improved and regularized version of what had existed.”⁷⁴ Parliament subsequently incorporated his suggestion of wider streets and improved sewage drainage among other things into the 1666 Act For Rebuilding the City of London.⁷⁵ The King extended an invitation for plans to be submitted for
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rebuilding London after the Great Fire and specifically invited both Evelyn and Wren to participate, which they each did. Each man submitted plans to rebuild London with the goal of creating a city “sweeter for health,” which would improve hygienic conditions for the living by moving the burial sites outside of London and protecting public water features from pollution.

Parliament made the decision to not rebuild all eighty-seven churches that had burned down in the Great Fire, but to build fewer to force consolidation of congregations. Therefore, there was now an additional problem of meeting the need of space for burials. Both Evelyn and Wren agreed on a solution, but they were well ahead of their time. Their advice to the King was “that large cemeteries…be formed outside the City of London.” Evelyn envisioned a mile-long linear cemetery that was “to serve as a universal cemetery for all the London parishes.”

Wren also wanted cemeteries built outside the town limits and pushed for more involvement over design of monuments by architects to ensure “a harmonious whole.” Throughout his time as Surveyor for the King’s Works, Wren continued to promote
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moving burial sites to outside the city limits. In fact, James Elmes, in his book about Wren states it strongly saying: “One of his greatest desires was to prevent the burial of dead bodies within the walls and precincts of the City.”

In 1674, the parish of St. Clement Danes, rebuilt by Wren in 1680-82, requested allowance to build homes for the poor on the north section of their churchyard. The Privy Council checked with Wren, being the Surveyor-General, who then expressed his continued dismay at allowing interments within the city limits. “He suggested, however, two inconveniences as likely to result to the public, if it were granted. First, that the allowing of graveyards in the Metropolis, if made a precedent, would be, in other places, productive of evil consequences; for many parishes being ill provided with burying-places, if sickly times, such as the Metropolis had so recently and terrifically been visited with, should return, great indecencies would be committed, and fatal affects would occur from the dead bodies being crowded into such confinement, and improper places.”

Their burial suggestions found favor with the High Church Commissioner, George Hicks, who sent the commission his own suggestions. However, it was not until 1711 that it was “resolved that there should be no interments in the new buildings.”

Unfortunately, the Church of England objected to both men’s submissions leading to neither being carried out. The Church of England’s objection to both Evelyn and Wren’s
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cemetery suggestions came from the fact that the Church would have lost the total control over the care of the dead they had held since the Roman era and instead share the responsibility with Dissenter leaders and possibly the government. This would have resulted in the loss of income from burial fees which the Church felt an obligation to safeguard. \(^{84}\) Wren, through his appointment by the King as the Surveyor of the King’s Works in 1669, did still have a hand in London’s rebuild as he went on to design fifty-two new churches in London over the four decades he held this position. \(^{85}\)

The focus of rebuilding of the churches was logically the purview of the Church of England as they were the only official religion of the nation. The final number of churches built was wrangled over for years, with the end result being that fewer churchyards were going to be available for burying the dead. Furthermore, throughout the years of reconstruction, church congregations had to share existing church buildings for worship or at least share their churchyard by setting up a ‘tabernacle’ structure for the other congregation to use. \(^{86}\) In addition, there were new congregations beginning to form outside of the state church which did not have representation and struggled under the Anglican system. The Dissenters or Nonconformists, who did not agree theologically with the Church of England included the Methodists, Quakers, Baptists, and Presbyterians. At the end of the seventeenth century they numbered 300,000, which was
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\(^{84}\) Curl, *Death and Architecture*, 136.


five percent of the population.\textsuperscript{87} This earlier group were later given the title of the Old Dissent. The second half of the eighteenth century saw the advent of the New Dissent group, a group that was much more dynamic, enthusiastic and who preached for conversion.\textsuperscript{88} The New Dissent group, excepting the Quakers, grew significantly. A good example of this rapid growth can be seen within the Independent Baptist Churches. Between 1700-1749, the denomination increased by 95 churches; then in the same number of years between 1750-1799, a further 269 churches were added. After 1800, the pace of growth accelerated even more.\textsuperscript{89} Such a large number of Nonconformists/Dissenters created a high demand for burial site options because legally they were not allowed, not being a member of the Church of England, nor did they desire, to be buried in Church of England burial sites.\textsuperscript{90} They were barred from being buried in a Church of England churchyard or graveyard because of their theological differences, and even if they had been allowed, they did not desire to be buried in Church of England consecrated ground because of their theological view that burial grounds do not need to be made holy by the church leadership. The problem for the Nonconformists/Dissenters was that the Church of England controlled all the official places of burial.

Meanwhile, the first four years of the Industrial Revolution saw the number of deaths total around 885,000 in England at a time when the population of the country was
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around 8.6 million.\textsuperscript{91} Thereafter, for every five years the total reached well over one million deaths and kept increasing, reaching almost two million by 1845-49.\textsuperscript{92} This exasperated the ongoing problem felt by the established churchyard burial sites. Undertakers were said to resort to “temporarily storing the bodies of newborn infants in their own premises until there were enough dead babies to make it worthwhile giving them a decent burial.”\textsuperscript{93} This was not acceptable, especially to those educated in the Enlightenment ideals. Burial site overcrowding, which led to unhygienic conditions, had been a concern for over a century as witnessed by John Evelyn and Sir Christopher Wren’s recommendations following the Great Fire of London in 1666. Local populations had complained for years about the smell and poor hygiene directly connected to churchyard burial sites. These complaints were constant, but it was not until the late eighteenth century when there arose a loud din of protests within a compressed timeframe. Philipp Aries states it well: “Throughout the second half of the eighteenth century, there was a continuing preoccupation with the burial of the dead. The apparent motives of this interest varied, but the interest and its seriousness remained constant.”\textsuperscript{94}

Though Aries claims most of the protests occurred in the second half of the eighteenth century, there is evidence that protests were continuous from Evelyn and Wren’s time clear through the eighteenth century. For example, a strong protest was made by the London curate, Thomas Lewis, who in 1721 wrote the work titled,
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“Seasonable Considerations on the Indecent and Dangerous Custom of Burying in Churches and Churchyards.”\textsuperscript{95} Though he shared the medical opinion of the day that disease was transmitted via the dead, he added a different twist. The tract “Churches no Charnel Houses” printed in 1726 warned that “many dangerous and fatal Distempers may be received from the Effluvia of the Dead”\textsuperscript{96} The medical knowledge at the time believed that each body emitted an “effluvia.” It was believed that this “steam” coming from the dead spread “Contagious Distempers” such as, “Plague, Small-Pox, Bloody-Flux, Itch, Spotted Fever, and the like.”\textsuperscript{97} His theory was that the living can pass both health and disease between themselves via the Effluvia, or steams, from our bodies, but that the dead were more dangerous in transmission.\textsuperscript{98} Thus, churches and churchyards would not only be a source of this bad effluvia, they would expose large numbers of people to this tainted air because often graves are kept open for days. Lewis’ pamphlet preceded the more well-known book printed in 1745, by the Frenchman, Abbé Porée titled, \textit{Lettres sur la Sepulture Dans Les Eglises}. In his book, Porée spoke of ‘pestilential vapours’ and objected to burial in churches on the basis that “it is permissible to love health, and the cleanliness that is so important to preserving it.”\textsuperscript{99} Another voice of concern in this same vein was expressed by Sir Richard Mead’s \textit{Short Discourse Concerning Pestilential}
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Contagion written in 1720. In his publication he urged that the dead “be buried at as great a Distance from Dwellings Houses, as may be; put deep in the Earth; and covered with the exactest Care.” The College of Physicians had been suggesting this same practice in the previous century. Additionally, the topic was a main one in the 1721 publication, “Some Customs Consider’d Whether Prejudicial to the Health of this City,” which dedicated pages to the dangerous state of the capital’s churchyards. The anonymous author very strongly states:

IT is well known that several Out-Parishes of this City...are very much traiten'd for Room to bury their Dead; and that they dig in their Church-yards, or other annexed Burial-Places, large Holes or Pits, in which they put many of the Bodies of those, whose Friends are not able to pay for better Graves; and then those Pits or Holes (called the Poor's Holes) once opened, are not cover'd, till fill'd with such dead Bodies...NASTINESS is a great Source of Infection, and the Air being corrupted by noifome Smells, a Peftilential Venom may confequently receive additional Strength by such Means. The worst of Stenches are those that arise from dead Bodies; and of them, those from Human Bodies are the worst of all.

Some churchyards, such as St. Andrew Holborn in 1720, were officially closed by the Privy Council, “because it was so noxious and overcrowded.” Though strong as these objections were, they still did not result in the end of the practice of overusing churches and their churchyards. Even so, the concern did not dissipate. Near the end of
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the seventeenth century further objections were raised by the Archbishop Sancroft, who like Lewis, raised the point that the early church forbade such practices as did most ancient civilizations. The practice endured for many more years, still longer in the North of England than in the South. A newspaper article from 1850 describes how Manchester Cathedral churchwardens had sealed the flagstones closed with cement “in order to render the place endurable to the living by preventing the escape of noxious and disgusting effluvia from its vaults and graves for the dead.” The author was incredulous that the practice was still occurring thirty years after they closed the churchyard. He went on to say that “if the practice of interring bodies in the midst of a crowded town, but out of doors, was found dangerous, it is surprising that the storing of them up in the vaults of a close and confined building should so long have been tolerated.” He ended by saying that he was grateful that those in London had first acted against this practice which put public attention to attending to the problem in Manchester.

As the momentum of protests grew against the unhygienic practices of church and churchyard burials, so did hygienic campaigns promoting Enlightenment ideals about health and burial. Campaigns came to a climax in the mid-nineteenth century due to reformers such as Surgeon George Alfred Walker who had made an in-depth study on the impact burials in churchyards had on health and disease, leading to a publication titled,
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Gatherings from Graveyards, published in 1839. His purpose was to convince the government of the dangers of interment in the vicinity of the living. In his report he described in graphic detail the overcrowded and unhygienic conditions of forty-seven London churchyards. The shocking, melodramatic language he used was so forceful that it broke through the mindset of tolerance that had existed for so long. He was successful in gaining the attention of the government and the public as newspapers printed excerpts from his work. His success finally began the process of change. However, though there was now an established public concern regarding hygiene that began replacing old religious values, it still proved difficult to unhook the hold that traditional religious values held on burials. Long-held traditions such as intramural burials as well as extramural burials, though unhygienic, were valued as the deceased were buried in their own parish and close to loved ones.

Under New Management: The Transition of Oversight Over the Dead

The source of the overcrowding problem was primarily the mismanagement by the Church over centuries of burial oversight which led to the overcrowding disaster. The crisis came to a head in the eighteenth/early nineteenth century when the Enlightened public reached their level of tolerance regarding the hygiene issue, and when the growing Dissenting Church community from the Great Revival, whose needs required burial space

separate from the Church of England, rose up as one voice to demand religious equality.\textsuperscript{109}

The Dissenting Church suffered from second class status placed on them by the Anglican church and were kept from receiving typical rights of citizenship. This affected them in areas such as access to important local or national government positions, restricted admission to university, and holding a non-conformist burial service in a churchyard because they refused to adhere to laws that exist to support the Church of England and no other church.\textsuperscript{110} A significant additional barrier for Dissenters in using the parish churchyard for burials was over the issue of baptism. The Anglican Church clergy were guided by a law which stated: “anyone who had been baptized in the proper form was eligible for both the service and interment in consecrated ground.”\textsuperscript{111} The Anglican interpretation of this law was the problem as the Church of England felt that the only way a baptism could be in “the proper form” was with an Anglican clergyman officiating, whereas Dissenters believed anyone could perform the baptism ceremony.\textsuperscript{112} Since the parishioners of a Dissenting church refused to be under the teaching of the Church of England, they found it unacceptable to be forced to receive an Anglican burial service and be buried in consecrated land of a church they did not support. An interesting article in the \textit{Quarterly Review} from 1835, discusses the demands of the Dissenters. The
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author has taken the side of the Church of England and uses italics to suggest scorn over the Dissenters’ demand for “the right of interring their dead in the parochial burial-grounds by their own ministers.”\(^{113}\) The author appears offended by this demand and points out that the Dissenters do not pay the church-rate, which go towards the upkeep of the parish church, so therefore have no right to make demands on church property. He sees no reason why the Dissenters cannot purchase their own field to use as a burial site. His suggestion was not outlandish, but was difficult to fulfill.

**The Rise of the Cemetery**

It took turning to the City of London to help provide a burial ground where the Dissenters could finally have a place to bury their dead. The solution was provided through a precedent set by the 1665 plague. When the plague victims overwhelmed the space available for burials, the City of London turned a field of bones, called Bunhill Fields, into an extra-parochial cemetery. The cemetery derives its name from 1549 when the City chose it to house the bones from the demolished Charnel Chapel of St. Paul’s churchyard.\(^{114}\) So many bones were relocated from the Chapel that it took one-thousand cart-loads to transfer them all to the northside of the City creating a ‘bone-hill’ which eventually became Bunhill.\(^{115}\) Though the Dissenters were using it as their graveyard prior to 1665, according to Maitland’s *Survey*, the City did not make it an official


cemetery until 1665.\textsuperscript{116} The extra-parochial origin of the field attracted the
Nonconformists and it became the “Dissenters’ Westminster Abbey,” recognized as such
in Edmund Curll’s 1717 publication, \textit{Inscriptions on the Tombs in the Dissenters’ Burial-
Place, near Bunhill-Fields}.\textsuperscript{117} As of 1896, it was reported that 100,000 people had been
buried in Bunhill Fields, including author and Puritan preacher, John Bunyan and author
Daniel Defoe.\textsuperscript{118} It was not until 1819 before another Dissenter cemetery (Rosary
Cemetery) came to be.\textsuperscript{119} Other Dissenter burial grounds included one attached to the
Independent Chapel on the southside of the Thames, and Abney Park Cemetery, first
used in 1840.\textsuperscript{120} Slowly more emerged around the country but choice was very limited.

The Dissenters began in the early nineteenth century to supply alternative burial
sites for themselves using a new concept of cemetery companies. The first non-
denominational English cemetery was built in 1819 in Norwich. This privately owned
cemetery was followed quickly in 1820 by a joint-stock venture in Rusholm,
Manchester.\textsuperscript{121} During the 1820-1834 period, thirteen cemeteries were successfully
established by cemetery companies. Out of the thirteen, ten of them were successfully
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built by non-conformists as they were forced to find an alternative. All of these burial sites were open to those of any denomination. The Dissenters took this aspect quite seriously since they had suffered under burial restrictions for so long. In addition, they offered the option to use their provided minister, or a minister of the deceased family’s choice, or totally forego having a service. Lastly, not one of the cemeteries had consecrated land.

During the eighteenth century, England fell behind as other European countries started to build hygienic cemeteries. Sweden, for example, prohibited intramural burials in 1783, and encouraged cemeteries to be built outside of their town limits. In addition, “trees were planted in all churchyards in Sweden for reasons of hygiene.” It was France, however, that initiated a strong new trend towards hygienic cemeteries. The French doctors shared the same medical conclusion as the doctors in England that the air connected to a dead body was contaminated and carried infectious diseases. By 1763 most everyone, from doctors to shopkeepers, was convinced of the unhealthiness of cemeteries within the towns. The people started rebelling against their unhygienic burial sites demanding new options. The French Parliament responded by creating a decree on March 12, 1763, which attempted to close down existing cemeteries and replace them
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with eight large cemeteries located outside and around Paris. For the most part, the 1763 decree was not put into practice, however, “the campaign to move the cemeteries out of town continued.”

A new decree was made by Napoleon, then First Consul, in 1804 that not only banned burials within or next to churches but stipulated that “all cemeteries must be at least forty to fifty yards beyond urban limits.” That same year the French built a new cemetery, Père-Lachaise, outside of Paris which has been called “the first modern cemetery.” It was state owned and operated and became the model for the new, hygienic, public-owned burial site that would become a destination. It was a cemetery like no other – originally built as a garden with monuments, but where over time the monuments came to dominate. The French architects put their attention to designing a beautiful site with ‘avenues’ to walk along the burial plots with attractive grave markers and a planned garden-like landscape. The trees and shrubs would provide beauty and clean air and, if planted carefully, would not “interfere with the circulation of the air,” an important aspect in times when air was considered a main transmitter of disease.

People were drawn to this new place because it was designed to be attractive. What began as a burial site managed with decency and good hygiene and intended to be an “abode of
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the dead” developed “into a ‘cultural institution’ for the living, a place for people to come and meditate. It was then that the word cemetery came to replace churchyard and graveyard.”

What made this cemetery distinct was its design as “a rolling English Garden in which beautiful monuments were dominated by greenery.” This was a totally new model expressing a firm turn away from the traditional churchyard site where there was no room for any greenery since space was so valuable. Designing a burial site to be attractive was quite a different concept than had existed thus far. The Neoclassical architectural style was popular at this time and well fitted to funerary art. From the entrance gate, walking down the winding pathways, evidence of the Neoclassical style is all around in the Greek and Roman tombs and monuments built against a backdrop of foliage. It was a fortunate time for architects and sculptors who were given many commissions because priority was awarded to creating beauty and quality throughout the buildings and monuments in Père-Lachaise. These grand mausoleums and monuments were well complemented by the work of the landscape architect who surrounded them with a beautiful garden. Philippe Aries puts it well saying, “In short, this cemetery consists of a series of galleries full of monuments in a large garden.”

Beautiful as it was to be, and spacious as it was at the start, the public was a little slow in adopting this new burial site because it was so far from traditional sites and
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outside the city limits. However, after the government transferred the remains of French national treasurers, Jean de la Fontaine and Moliere, the people began to take an interest. A few years later in 1817, the government transferred the remains of French theologian and poet, Pierre Abélard, and his wife, Héloïse d'Argenteuil, to Père-Lachaise and the “people began clamoring to be buried among famous citizens.”\textsuperscript{136} The cemetery was a great accomplishment and received many accolades. This literal “breath of fresh air” model was a successful answer to the hygiene problem and became the model for many other countries. Scotland, Sweden, and India had joined France in establishing cemeteries based on hygienic principles ahead of England, but their efforts were not as grand or as beautiful as Père-Lachaise.\textsuperscript{137}

It represented a turning point in burial practices and one that would become an example for cemeteries in England and the United States. Père-Lachaise has been called the first modern cemetery because it discarded centuries-old traditions and approached the provision of a burial site in a new way. Though the English were making progress away from the old burial practices with the new Dissenters’ cemeteries, the building of Père-Lachaise gave new meaning to what a cemetery could be and presented a pattern for which they could base their own creations on.

Impatient over Parliament’s reluctance to officiate on the topic of cemetery reform, George Carden took matters into his own hands and called a meeting of
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prominent men to initiate the formation of the General Cemetery Company in London.\textsuperscript{138} This meeting occurred in 1830, and in 1832, following the latest cholera outbreak, Parliament “passed the private act allowing the creation of this company.”\textsuperscript{139} The following year the Company purchased fifty-four acres of rural landscape northwest of London in the area of Kensal Green for the future site of All Souls Cemetery, Kensal Green. They immediately started the creation of the cemetery by first planting 800 trees. They followed this act by announcing an architectural design contest for the various buildings with the plan that they be based on the Père-Lachaise model.

Henry Kendall was the eventual winner of the Kensal Green contest with his Gothic style design; however, his style choice was overruled by the board which decided that they preferred the Classical style instead.\textsuperscript{140} Kensal Green was an ambitious project with 32 hectares (79 acres) of land made available for burials amongst beautiful pathways, greenery, and chapels. The cemeteries built in the north of England had been more conservative with the largest of them being no more than 5 hectares (12 acres) in size. London’s population size required considerably more land in a cemetery. To meet the need of both religious preferences, separate sections were created for the Dissenters and the Church of England. In 1833, the Board asked the Bishop of London to consecrate thirty-nine acres of the cemetery leaving the rest of the acreage reserved for Dissenters.\textsuperscript{141}
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Patronage of the new cemetery began with a steady income over the first few years with the value of the original shares doubling by 1839.\textsuperscript{142}

Society took notice of Kensal Green as a potential burial site when King George III’s children, Prince Augustus Frederick, the Duke of Sussex (d. 1843) and Princess Sophia (d. 1848) were buried in front of the Anglican Chapel.\textsuperscript{143} The Duke had requested this arrangement in the last moments before his death.\textsuperscript{144} A favorite amongst the British people having generally preferred their company over his royal family, this request was well received by the people but very much surprised his family. Perhaps it was his last rebellious act by a man least liked by his father, King George III, and who broke the rules throughout his life. The Duke, a favorite of Queen Victoria’s, got his wish though it marked the first time a royal was buried in a public cemetery.\textsuperscript{145}

Even without the graves of the royal family bringing in additional interest and income, Kensal Green did well financially because it addressed the problems with regard to burial sites of the day as did other for-profit public cemeteries that came soon after. By 1841, five more cemetery companies had been created setting up an additional six additional public cemeteries around London (the London Cemetery Company built both
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the Highgate and the Norwood cemeteries). In order of creation, the list includes: the South Metropolitan Cemetery in Norwood (1837), St. James Cemetery in Highgate (1839), All Saints’ Cemetery in Norwood (1840), Brompton Cemetery in Brompton (1840), Abney Park Cemetery in Abney Park (1840), and Tower Hamlets Cemetery in Tower Hamlets (1841). Though profitable, all of these cemetery companies had to adhere to the agreement made with the Church of England who had pushed back on allowing private ownership of cemeteries due to the potential loss of income from interments. The Act was passed by Parliament in July 1832, which allowed the “General Cemetery for the Interment of the Dead in the Neighbourhood of the Metropolis” to be created. According to the Act, the General Cemetery Company, the first of the for-profit cemetery companies, owed the church money for each corpse that came their way. According to James Curl, “fees were to be paid to the incumbents of parishes from which corpses derived, [which was] an important aspect of early burial reform.” This fee was in addition to the fee paid to the cemetery company. Churches fought the creation of private cemetery companies because they knew that the companies would then receive the burial fee and the Church would lose this substantial income source. Thus, an agreement was made where the parish church of the deceased would get ‘their due’ fee as if the burial had happened on their property. This was a significant amount of money to the parishes
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as “they averaged about £165 per annum in the period 1838–1840, although varying enormously (from £445 to just under £20) from parish to parish.”

Asking for this type of compensation went along with traditional British burial practices. The tradition had always been that when the deceased was not buried in his own parish but rather in another parish, a burial fee would have to be paid to both parishes.

The Church of England did not appropriately adjust with the changing times. They had tried to fix the problem by purchasing additional land for burials in an ad hoc fashion, however, it was not enough. The three forces which contributed to the Church of England’s loss of their monopoly over the dead in England were: Mismanagement, Enlightenment ideals of proper hygiene and individuality, and the Dissenting Church community needs. These forces progressed independently but eventually developed fully and contributed to the eventual weakening of the Church of England’s power over sepulchral matters making it impossible to resist change over the centuries-old traditions. Perhaps if they had been better at adapting along the way, they may have retained control over the responsibilities of the dead. The end result was the ‘cemetery phenomenon.’

The Rise of Personal Grave Markers

The trend of not only acquiring one’s own burial plot but to also place a personalized, informative grave marker/monument on that plot was new to the eighteenth century. Few grave markers can be found from the sixteenth century as commemoration either was not a priority for the wider community or markers were constructed of

---


permanent materials. It also stands that any older monuments that existed may have been cleared from the churchyard as space was needed during the medieval and early modern periods.\textsuperscript{151} Even so, as placing a grave marker slowly grew in popularity it remained a minority commemorative tradition through the seventeenth century and early eighteenth century. It was not until the later eighteenth and early nineteenth century that it expanded rapidly.\textsuperscript{152}

It is not coincidental that this trend occurred at the same time as the sense of individualism during the Enlightenment era was fostered. As Raf Vanderstraeten points out: “The increasing use of permanent individual grave markers corresponds with expanding notions of individuality.”\textsuperscript{153} At the same time, the Industrial Revolution made it possible to afford a memorial as there was a broader distribution of wealth across Britain contributing to the creation of a ‘middle class.’ Britain experienced an economic growth of “0.6% per annum in the period 1760-80, increasing to 1.4% in 1780–1800, and rising still further to 1.9% in the period 1801–31.”\textsuperscript{154} With an increase in resources came an increase of goods consumption. Probate inventories reveal that after consumers had satisfactorily completed making additions to their domestic setting, they then turned to a more public arena which included memorials for their lost loved ones.\textsuperscript{155} Grave markers
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and attention to their design became an important concern as the long eighteenth century progressed.

**Conclusion**

It has been made evident that changes driven in large part by the Industrial Revolution and the Enlightenment led to both a problem and a solution with respect to burial practices. The problem was from overcrowding caused by demand outstripping supply as the population grew and was condensed into townships without commensurate infrastructure changes. This restructuring of the population led to conditions that resulted in poor health and increased deaths. The Church of England had been gradually losing the battle through mismanagement of burial practices to deal with the increased number of deaths. Coupled with Enlightenment ideals about health and moral responsibility and humanism, and with a growing burial need by those outside the official church, the newly awakened national government stepped in to facilitate the situation. The consequence was that burials moved beyond the church and into cemeteries like Père-Lachaise and Kensal Green. The outcome of this major change introduced the idea of parks and breathing spaces within the large towns and cities leading to burial places becoming a desired and peaceful destination where one can contemplate. Additionally, as well as being indirectly a cause of the greater demand on burial sites, the Industrial Revolution created a larger class of sufficiently wealthy individuals who could afford burial in-perpetuity, and the Enlightenment created an individualistic desire to be commemorated through grave markers. In the following chapters, we will explore in greater detail exactly how the Enlightenment not only created the desire but was the dominant influence on the expression of individualism in grave markers.
Chapter 4

ARCHITECTS AND ARCHITECTURAL STYLES
OF THE LONG EIGHTEENTH CENTURY

Since ancient times, the architecture of the grave has mirrored society’s thoughts about the dwelling of the living.

– The Secret Cemetery

Focus thus far has been on how the Age of Enlightenment was a time of awakening across Europe where new ideas and philosophies were grappled with and explored. In addition, it has been highlighted how the Scientific, Industrial and Agricultural Revolutions were components of this age and how those major societal shifts impacted the locations and attitudes towards graves. To further aid in understanding, some of the most important and influential British participants in these movements have been surveyed. People like Francis Bacon, Robert Boyle, and Isaac Newton who led Britain forward into a leadership position on technological innovation. Those innovations had an impact on health, hygiene, and wealth distribution, all of which were tied to changes in the location and control of graves. This chapter will introduce the reader to the key men who either introduced new architectural styles or led the stylistic movements of their time. It will also provide an analysis of stylistic changes in architecture. The following chapter will show how societal events worked to create those architectural styles and how they are reflected in grave markers.
Styles and fashion are not created in a vacuum. They are the children of events and influential people. To understand them properly, one needs to study those events and people. Thus, as with the previous chapter, the focus will be on the key figures in Britain’s architectural heritage of the seventeenth and eighteenth century and key events that shaped the look of buildings, gardens, and grave markers throughout England and Scotland. Out of this, should come an understanding of the major influences on the visual elements that appear in architecture. In addition, a description of the elements will be made in some detail. This is preparation for explaining how the elements will show up again in grave markers in the next chapter. Lastly, this chapter will show how some of the same people that influenced the locations of grave markers also influenced the styles that would change their looks thus bridging the chapters preceding and following this chapter.

ARCHITECTS

Inigo Jones: Creator of the Anglo-Palladian Style

As the eighteenth century approached, the British enthusiasm for the Baroque architectural style that had dominated Europe throughout the seventeenth century was starting to wane. Though it took a few decades for the Baroque influence to fully disappear from British architecture and grave markers, the highly decorative and theatrical style had become too intense for a public which was steering away from passionate expression, preferring instead to align itself with the disciplined approach of the new Age of Reason. This, however, was after a period of a half century with a small level of Baroque flavoring bracketed by the influence of the man to whom credit is due for helping Britain move away from the Baroque. British architect, Inigo Jones (1573-1652), brought the Renaissance mindset into England at the beginning of the seventeenth
century with his passion for the Italian architect, Palladio. Jones’ start in life would not have foretold historical fame being the son of a clothworker, but fortunately he caught the attention of the Earl of Pembroke who financed a Grand Tour trip for Jones at the end of the sixteenth century.¹ During his four to five years studying art and culture in Venice and Rome, Jones was exposed to the ruins of Rome, to the famous first century Roman architect, Vitruvius, and also to the Venetian architect, Andrea Palladio, from which the Palladian architectural style got its name. Studying all three gave Jones a well-rounded education on the classical style of architecture, which was a blend of Greek and Roman architecture. Both Vitruvius and Palladio, had published books on architecture which were very popular amongst the Europeans going through the Renaissance and later, the Enlightenment. Vitruvius had published a handbook on architectural rules of proportion and symmetry called, *De Architectura*, which had been largely forgotten until the fifteenth century. Palladio had published, *I Quattro Libri dell’Architettura* (The Four Books of Architecture) in 1570, which had been translated and widely dispersed across Europe. When Inigo Jones returned to England from his Grand Tour in 1603, he introduced a version of Palladian’s classical language of Italian building design to England. Jones’ version was a blend of Palladianism with contemporary French practice and “elements from other Renaissance architects, including Sebastiano Serlio (1475-1554) and Vincenzo Scamozzi (1548-1616)” creating his own style called Anglo-

Palladianism. Examining the style Jones introduced to Britain gives the reader a path to follow in British history through the seventeenth and into the beginning of the eighteenth century.

Architectural styles build on or react against each other. Britain’s taste did not always follow that of Continental Europe. The Baroque style of the Continent leaned towards a more flamboyant expression, however, in France the style was a bit more subdued. This is probably why Inigo Jones, and later Sir Christopher Wren, allowed their styles to be influenced in a small way by the French look. Though the Baroque architecture style dominated Europe throughout the seventeenth century, Anglo-Palladianism contributed to the process of moving England away from the Baroque and towards the Neoclassical movement. During the eighteenth century, the English showed preference for the order and symmetry of Palladianism and Neoclassicalism over Europe’s choice of the playful Rococo style. Jones returned with the Renaissance ideals including the Renaissance focus on the culture and learning of Ancient Greece and Rome, which naturally aligned well with the Classical style. Though Jones lived and worked before the Age of Enlightenment, he prepared the way for the architectural style change that so wonderfully reflected its ideals.

The Palladian style introduced by Jones would have felt very familiar to the younger generation of men who themselves had gone on a Grand Tour to Italy. Before returning to England in 1603, Jones had made a detour, by invitation, to stay with the
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King of Denmark, Christian IV.\textsuperscript{3} Generations have debated whether he simply visited or made his first major venture into the world of architecture by contributing to castle designs while in Denmark. The English believe that Jones left his mark in Denmark and proudly claim that his style is very evident on the elegant gate tower of the Rosenborg Castle. Though still debatable, “English tradition, going back at least to the 18th century, insists on Inigo Jones’ role in famous complexes by King Christian IV such as Frederiksborg and Rosenborg Castles.”\textsuperscript{4} Jones did not stay long in Denmark, preferring to return to England to further his architectural opportunities and witness the coronation of King James I of England in 1603.

Following the death of Queen Elizabeth I, King James I and VI traveled from Scotland to London with the intent to legitimize his inheritance of the crown. To accomplish this, he followed the common tradition practiced by newly-adopted European monarchs of identifying themselves with legendary figures, and in this sense, connecting with the Romans and all the great kings of the Bible and England’s past.\textsuperscript{5} Using architecture to link London to the ancient cities of Troy, Rome, and Jerusalem would complete the desired intent. This provided a perfect scenario for the ambitious Inigo Jones to participate in upon his return to England. It seems that Anne, the new Queen of England, had heard of Jones, perhaps from her brother the King of Denmark. She hired

\textsuperscript{3} Peter Cunningham, \textit{Inigo Jones: A Life of the Architect} (London: The Shakespeare Society, 1848), 3.


him, not as an architect, but rather to design a Masque, which is a popular Court
entertainment. This masque, titled *Prince Henry’s Barriers* and performed in 1610,
brought together the desired mix of antiquity with the current royal family. It cast Prince
Henry, the Prince of Wales, “as Meliadus, a figure drawn from Arthurian romance, and
James was hailed as a second King Arthur, having restored the ancient unity of Britain
achieved by this legendary predecessor.” Jones went on to do many successful masques
which led him to acquiring the position as Surveyor for Prince Henry, whom he served
for two years. This ended at the death of the prince in 1612, which released Jones who
made a return trip to Italy. Soon after he began his trip, the King sent Jones a message
promising him the top architectural role of Britain once the job came open, which was
somewhat surprising considering that “though he had been Prince Henry’s Surveyor for
two years and was now almost forty, he had built very little and was still known less as
an architect than as the leading designer of court masques and ‘a great traveller.’”

The surveyor job became available in 1615, making Jones the King’s Surveyor of
the Works and putting him in charge of all building projects desired by the King. The
path which led Inigo Jones from his humble beginnings to serving the King in the highest
architectural position in Britain is quite unusual. It seemed, however, to be a well-made
match as the King’s desire and Jones’ architectural style preference fit extremely well
together. Jones served James I until the king’s death, continuing on through the extent of
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King Charles I’s reign, which ended in 1649. One would expect having served for thirty-four years as England’s Surveyor-General there would be more than a handful of impressive representations of his work. As it is, there is little to show in terms of architectural feats completed by Jones. Of the buildings that Jones designed, two are outstanding examples of his genius: the Queen’s House, Greenwich and the Banqueting House, Whitehall. His intent was always to finish rebuilding the palace at Whitehall, but events and restrictions got in the way. The blame must not be placed on Jones because it was later shown that he harbored ambitions. At his death in 1652, his portfolio was “full of noble designs for palaces and private houses.” The restrictions he had faced were having to work around the English Civil War during his last decade, which “diverted men's thoughts and means from the peaceful employments of architecture, and found for the King and his nobility other and sterner occupations than superintending squares, or rebuilding palaces.” These diversions came in conjunction with working under “a persistent shortage of cash,” that was “characteristic of the Stuarts.” Though proof of his architectural skills is scant, Jones was a man of many talents. Not only was he an architect, but “he was an author, a theorist, an antiquarian, a painter and, above all, the first man in the history of the arts in Britain to develop his talent as a draughtsman in
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order to express his ideas.”14 One must not forget the broader contribution Jones made to the world of British architecture through the introduction of the Anglo-Palladian style. Though his personal contribution was small in numbers, the impact permeating in the years to follow in both buildings and grave markers was vast. (Fig. 20) All the variations of architectural styles in Britain for the next two-hundred years were built on the foundation of Jones’ Anglo-Palladian style.

**Sir Christopher Wren: Promoter of the English Baroque Style**

Circumstances for Jones’ famous successor, Sir Christopher Wren, were different as Wren worked under a very different monarchy. Though the two King Charles’ were of the same family, they ruled in completely different times. The Civil War (1640-1650) and the subsequent English Interregnum era (1649-1660) changed forever the reach of monarchical power in England, which consequently affected the world of the architect. A considerable difference was that “Divine Kingship had gone, to be replaced by Divine Landordism- the rich man in his castle, the poor man at his gate. The King might have a place in this, but he had to know his place.”15 The newly empowered rich men of the day desired grand houses built by the genius architects of their day. Some of these architects (Nicholas Hawksmoor, John Vanbrugh) worked alongside Wren in his many architectural projects.

To understand Wren, the architect, one first has to understand Wren, the scientist. Sir Christopher Wren, with his remarkably broad interests, was a great representation of
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the essence of the Renaissance. In the world of architecture, the Renaissance focused on how harmony in structures is achieved by proportion, in that “the ratios in a building are simple arithmetical functions and that ratios of all parts of the building are either those same ratios or related to them in a direct way.” It is the belief that harmony resides in “the buildings of antiquity and to be to a great extent ‘built in’ to the principle antique elements – especially to the five ‘orders’.” (Fig. 1) Such was the connection between the Renaissance’s emphasis on math to achieve harmony and Wren’s natural talents. Wren was considered a mathematical prodigy. Sir Isaac Newton honored him with the title of “one of the three greatest practitioners of geometry of his time.” One biographer stated that he was known “as a young man possessing altogether exceptional powers of acquisition, interested in anything intellectual, but especially addicted, not to the fine arts at all, but to the higher branches of science.”

Born in 1632, he was the son of Christopher Wren, the Dean of Windsor (1635-1659), and nephew of Matthew Wren, a future bishop and Dean of the Chapel Royal. Wren showed his many talents at a young age. Following private tutoring for his early school years, he attended the Westminster Abbey School for a year (1645-6) during the time his father was jailed by the


Parliamentary Forces. Wren graduated in 1646 from Westminster Abbey School at the age of fourteen, having distinguished himself while there “inventing an astronomical instrument, of which no description remains, and dedicating it to his father in a short Latin poem, which has been often praised for the flow and smoothness of its lines.” Wren’s cleverness and broad interests opened doors for him at Oxford. He joined a prestigious group of professors at their weekly experimental philosophy discussions on “such as related thereunto: as physick, anatomy, geometry, astronomy, navigation, staticks, magneticks, chymicks, mechanicks, and natural experiments.” The Oxford mathematician and Civil War cryptologist, Dr. Wallis, was instrumental in bringing together this group of young men to “take on the new philosophy of the observation and testing of nature as distinguished from theory alone. To enquire. To experiment. To interrogate Nature.” These meetings must have spurred Wren’s creativity because many inventions of his date from this time. His connections with Dr. Wallis led to his being asked in 1652 to assist a famous mathematician, Rev. William Oughtred, in translating into Latin his work on sundials which was included in his famous book, Clavis


22 Phillimore, Sir Christopher Wren, 77.

Mathematicae (The Key to Mathematics). This was quite the honor as Rev. William Oughtred was a renowned self-taught mathematician and Anglican clergyman who had “introduced new algebraic symbols as well as the symbol × for multiplication. He also invented the earliest form of slide rule.” Rev. Oughtred expressed his great satisfaction in Wren and his contribution to his book by writing in the 1652 book’s preface, “Mr. Christopher Wren, Gentleman Commoner of Wadham College, a youth generally admired for his talents, who, when not yet sixteen years old, enriched astronomy, gnomonics, statics and mechanics, by brilliant inventions, and from that time has continued to enrich them, and in truth is one from whom I can, not vainly, look for great things.”

Wren was clearly at the right place at the right time. His connections with the men of the weekly philosophical discussions and his intellect, inventiveness, and grasp of mathematics, would in 1660 lead to his joining them in founding the Royal Society of London for Improving Natural Knowledge. What was key to the Society was the “notion of sharing ideas and of working as a group and of looking at and commenting on and examining each other's ideas.” Wren continued experimenting in the natural sciences throughout his life. This creative exploratory mindset was deeply supported as the Age of


26 Phillimore, Sir Christopher Wren, 79.

Enlightenment was gaining ground as evidenced by the Isaac Newton’s publication, *Principia Mathematica*, in 1687. The work of the Royal Society’s members and the groundbreaking contribution made by Isaac Newton represent the transition England was going through from the Scientific Revolution of the seventeenth century to the Age of Enlightenment of the eighteenth century. Christopher Wren was a man whose natural talents bridged the transition through science and mathematics, and later through architecture.

Wren’s brilliance, now well established, allows for one’s attention to be directed to what he is best known for, which is architecture. Wren was never called an ‘architect’ during his lifetime as it was not a term yet used. Rather he was considered “one of that succession of ‘Surveyors to the Crown’ – Inigo Jones, Christopher Wren, John Vanbrugh and Nicholas Hawksmoor…who dominated the architectural scene for over a century.”

More likely, Wren had been known for being an expert in astronomy. His professional academic career began at the young age of twenty-one when he was elected a fellow of All Souls College, Oxford. Just three years later, he added the role of Gresham College Professor of Astronomy in London which he chaired from 1657 until his ascension to the Savilian Chair position in 1661. Gresham College was the foremost institution of the time for the study of the mathematical sciences. This season when Wren served as “Gresham Professor was perhaps the most active and fruitful of his professional career”

---


29 Davies, “The Youth and Education of Christopher Wren,” 321.

in science.\textsuperscript{31} His lectures, which were the fruit of his own research, generated considerable interest and were attended by the famous mathematicians/scientists of the day, such as William Brouncker, Robert Boyle, William Ball, and many others, who all were members of the philosophical group.\textsuperscript{32} His academic career was full of astronomical explorations specializing on the study of Saturn, to which he gave himself fully from 1654-1659.\textsuperscript{33} To effectively research the stars required good instruments. While working closely with Sir Paul Neile and William Ball and their telescopes, it was made clear that “Wren’s mind moved easily from pure theoretical astronomy to practical applications and improvements in telescopes and other instruments.”\textsuperscript{34} At the age of twenty-nine he was appointed to the prestigious position of Savilian Professor of Astronomy at Oxford University (1661-1673). Though an astronomer, Wren was considered a philosopher and in that day a philosopher was “a master of all wisdom, and a man who could make a model of a solar system could certainly make a model of a cathedral.”\textsuperscript{35} If he had died in his thirties he would have been known for his contributions to astronomy and his part in founding the Royal Society, both impressive aspects for any resume. He continued
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throughout his life making “important contributions to astronomy, physics and physiology and was increasingly involved with building.”

Though Wren surpassed Jones in the area of brilliance, his professional path was to mimic Inigo’s starting with, in 1669, filling the same position Jones did as Surveyor-General of the King’s Works, or architect for the king. Both men took on the role with little practical architectural experience and both men were promised the top job a few years before being appointed. Wren moved into the role more gradually as it would be close to ten years before Wren shared the same title with Jones. Upon the restoration of the monarchy in 1660, Charles re-appointed John Denham, who had first been assigned the job of Surveyor of the King’s Works by Charles I, “who much valued him for his ingenuity.” Considering that Denham was “a man whose name is now rather associated with poetry in words than with poetry in stone,” and in whom the diarist, John Evelyn, thought little of as an architect, it was prudent of the King to, at the same time, appoint Christopher Wren as Denham’s Assistant Surveyor-General. With Denham’s lack of architectural talent and Wren’s position at Oxford, it was fortunate that both men had the assistance of Mr. John Webb, Inigo Jones’ son-in-law and deputy surveyor who had worked for Jones when he was the Surveyor. Though Wren was part of the Surveyor office from around 1661, he kept very busy with his other positions/interests in Oxford.
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and with the Royal Society. Fortunately for the Royal Society, the King was an enthusiastic supporter of their purpose resulting in his granting them a royal charter in 1662, and later, declaring himself a founding member in the second royal charter in 1663. While it is not a stated fact, it seems highly probable that the Royal Society was truly where Wren’s heart lay based on his long-term commitment to the group. It was a reciprocal relationship of appreciation evidenced by the fact that Wren would have the honor later on to serve as vice-president from 1674-76, and president from 1680-1682.

Upon the return of the monarchy in 1660, Wren’s life employment started to take a turn away from science towards architecture, though he never stopped exploring science. It was a gradual switch and somewhat surprising since Wren was known for his love of science and geometry. But geometry plays an important role in the world of architecture and a genius such as Wren was able to participate with ease in this new role as ‘architect’ when called upon to do so. The first endeavor into this new world came from his famous uncle, Matthew Wren, the Bishop of Ely, who had been held for eighteen years in the Tower of London for his connection during the reign of King Charles I with Archbishop Laud, who was later executed. Upon Bishop Wren’s release, in conjunction with the return of King Charles II, he immediately put to action his vow that, if released, he would call upon his talented nephew to build a chapel at the Bishop’s alma mater, Pembroke College, Cambridge as a thank-offering to God. The foundation
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stone was placed in May 1663, and its completion was two years later. Christopher Wren designed the chapel in the new Classical style of architecture introduced by Inigo Jones. He would continue using this style of architecture on all of his projects.\footnote{Phillimore, \textit{Sir Christopher Wren}, 134.}

Amazingly, at the same time that he was working on the Pembroke Chapel, his first architectural venture, he got involved in two other significant projects, while still holding the Professorship at Oxford. The first was in 1663, when Charles II tapped Wren to be part of a commission to renovate St. Paul’s Cathedral. Charles II was very concerned about the poor state that St. Paul’s Cathedral was in, so made the Cathedral’s restoration a high priority. Following the destructive years of Puritan purposeful neglect, St. Paul’s “became a vast useless pile…exposed at least to neglect…the portico was let for mean shops…the body of the Church became a calvary barrack.”\footnote{William Longman, \textit{A History of St. Paul’s Cathedral} (London: Spottiswoode and Co., 1873), 78.} The commission was asked “to consider what should be done to further the restoration, or rebuilding of St. Paul’s” and immediately went into action.\footnote{Longman, \textit{A History of St. Paul’s Cathedral}, 77–78.} Monies were raised, buildings removed, and the existing stone was examined in preparation for the renovation, but for all the money spent, little was shown for it by 1666.\footnote{Longman, \textit{A History of St. Paul’s Cathedral}, 78.} While Wren was busy designing and building the Pembroke College Chapel at Cambridge and participating in the St. Paul commission, he was called upon by his alma mater, Oxford, to design a building for them. In 1664, Wren was asked by the Archbishop of Sheldon to design a ceremonial hall in Oxford, later
called the Sheldonian after its donor. Though it resembles, as planned, the Theatre of Marcellus in Rome, it differs in that it has a roof.\(^{47}\) Not one to shy away from a challenge of keeping the resemblance of the open-air feeling even with a roof above, Wren successfully designed the building sans any load-bearing columns. The final result, completed in 1669, was acknowledged as a “technical achievement which gained him great credit in scientific and architectural circles and made the roof of the Sheldonian a landmark in roof construction.”\(^{48}\) This impressive building “still stands as a marvel of construction” even though Wren designed this with little architectural experience.\(^{49}\) Surprisingly, Wren’s preparation for this job was built on his interest in ancient Roman theatre drawings (and perhaps his familiarity to Palladio’s work). It seems that these gave him sufficient information for his design purposes, as it was not until after designing the Sheldonian that Wren read the works of Vitruvius and Vignola.\(^{50}\) Vitruvius is known as the first century Roman ‘father of architecture’ and Vignola was one of three architects who helped spread the Italian Renaissance style – the other two being Serlio and Palladio. Wren was probably familiar with Vitruvius prior to his interest in him as an architect, because, as J.A. Bennet claims, “both astronomy and architecture were based, as were all the Vitruvian subjects, on the fundamental sciences of arithmetic and geometry.”\(^{51}\)


\(^{48}\) Sir Howard Colvin, https://www.sheldonian.ox.ac.uk/building-history.
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While all three building projects were progressing, Wren partially switched back to his scientific role by taking a break from the building projects and his Professorship job and making a lengthy visit to Paris in 1665 to explore their scientific endeavors and to avoid the plague in London. Though he was officially in Paris to meet with scientists and discuss science, he made time to “observe contemporary buildings in the classical style, an essential supplement to the main sources for his first designs—architectural treatises and built works of Inigo Jones.”\footnote{Soo, “Reconstructing Antiquity,” 253.} Wren even got an appointment with Bernini, the Italian sculptor and architect, to discuss the plans Bernini was preparing for Louis XIV who had invited him to submit designs for a new east façade for the Louvre. Though none of Bernini’s plans pleased the king, the short peek Wren was given on one of them produced the exclamation: “Bernini’s design of the Louvre I would have given my skin for, but the old reserv’d Italian gave me but a few minutes view.”\footnote{Stratton, The Life, Work, and Influence of Sir Christopher Wren: An Essay, 6.} Even with so little time to observe, Wren went on to recreate the plans from memory.\footnote{Elmes, Sir Christopher Wren and His Times, 216.} Was this the beginning of a move away from a scientific profession to one in architecture? If Wren was making a transition, the progression was slow and with some reluctance to totally commit resulting in some conflict. While managing these three projects, he still held the chair at Oxford, but discontent was rising over the lack of time spent at his professorship role. Wren’s friend and colleague, Thomas Sprat, wrote a letter in 1662 informing Wren about the Vice-Chancellor’s inquiry into his long absence and Sprat’s defense that Wren was on the
king’s business.\textsuperscript{55} Wren kept up this two-fold profession for many years, only resigning from his chair at Oxford in 1673.\textsuperscript{56} This incredible ability to simultaneously manage what seems like two distinct vocations did not represent two sides of his personality. He bridged the two roles by bringing “to architecture a collection of intellectual and practical skills that were the common property of those working within the tradition of the mathematical sciences of his era.”\textsuperscript{57}

Wren’s trip to France made quite an impact on him, turning out to be his only trip outside of Britain. While there, he used his time well making a copious number of sketches of the city and its buildings.\textsuperscript{58} His exposure to the style of Louis XIV no doubt made an impression that blended some aspects of the Continental Baroque style with the Palladian style Wren had adopted. Some have looked to this trip as the turning point in Wren’s life where he chose to switch his focus from science to architecture.\textsuperscript{59} His experience designing the Sheldonian probably heightened his interest in the architectural developments being made by Louis XIV who had unleashed his architects to transform Paris into one of the glories of the world.\textsuperscript{60} Upon his return to London, the newly inspired Wren submitted a report to the St. Paul Cathedral renovation commission on May 7,
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1666, suggesting that the “Gothic tower be replaced by ‘a spacious Dome or rotunda with a Cupolo or Hemispherical Roof.’” Unfortunately, his report was submitted in vain because although accepted in August, the report became null and void due to the Great Fire that broke out in London a week later lasting three days and four nights and causing irreparable damage to the City and specifically, the Cathedral. Wren, in an official position three years later, was able to draw up new plans for St. Paul’s followed by the razing and rebuild of the damaged building.

Unfortunate as it was, the Great Fire opened up great opportunities for Wren, of which Inigo Jones never had, marking the beginning of the era during which Wren’s architectural fame came into being. After the Great Fire, of which “13,200 houses, 87 churches and 52 livery company halls were destroyed, as were courts, gaols and civil administration buildings, obliterating the city infrastructure,” Wren presented a plan to the King for rebuilding London. Wren’s plan included fine boulevards, piazzas, a spacious riverside quay and “marvelously sited churches.” No doubt visions of Paris and the Park at Versailles played in his mind as he drew up his plan. Noting that many churches had been burned to the ground and seeing an opportunity to restructure traditional burial ways, Wren suggested in his plan that all burials inside the church be banned “because it was 'unwholesome' and because it ruined the smoothness of the
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61 Soo, “Reconstructing Antiquity,” 255.
He further urged that “interments should not be in the churchyard either, but in ‘cemeteries seated in the outskirts of town.”’

Though the King accepted Wren’s plan, it was not practical enough to implement with all the interests involved because it would require, for one thing, the straightening of all the crooked streets making them uniform in width and parallel with each other. Wren’s plans were too expensive and would have taken too long to suit the Parliament which did, however, strive to make a compromise. With the passing of the Act for the Rebuilding of the City of London in February 1667, Parliament made the requirement that all new buildings be constructed with brick or stone as a fire prevention. In the end, the limitations of time and expense led to a satisfactory, though not ideal, rebuild plan with the result in which “the new London was better built than the old; and innumerable improvements in the width and gradients of streets, in paving and drainage, in the removal of markets from the broad streets to proper market-places, showed that the city authorities had achieved all that experience could advise and their means allowed.”

Seemingly as compensation for his plan being rejected, King Charles appointed Wren in October 1666, to serve as a Commissioner for Rebuilding London. Though
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Wren’s grand city rebuild plan was not accepted, he still had the honor of making London livable again. Wren did not have it easy working with his fellow commissioners because the six men all “had conflicting views and conflicting interests.” Fortunately, an Order of Council was issued on January 15, 1667, that focused solely on action towards St. Paul’s Cathedral. It commissioned a committee to appoint an architect “to execute the reparation of the damaged cathedral, which were finally abandoned, and a new building determined on,” basically giving in to the fact that saving what was left of the Cathedral was a futile notion and that a total rebuild was necessary. Who did they turn to but Christopher Wren to take on this massive assignment? This was the opportunity of a lifetime for Wren and one it seems he had been preparing for over many years. Wren had “strenuously opposed all patching-up of the Cathedral,” being convinced that a total rebuild was necessary. He made his point to Dean Sancroft (of St. Paul’s) in the spring of 1667, but there was a strong desire to try and save the original building, resulting in Wren’s preference being ignored. It was not until a year later that the Dean acknowledged the truth of Wren’s stance with the statement: “Our work at the west-end of St. Paul’s has fallen about our ears.” It took two attempts by the Dean to get Wren to return from Oxford to address the problem personally. When Wren did respond to the second plea, he gained some ground towards his ultimate goal of a total rebuild by convincing the committee to stop attempting a repair. At the same time, he also acquired
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a warrant from the king in July 1668 to have the ground cleared of the east end, the old choir and the tower as part of the project “of a possible new Cathedral." Patience and diplomacy was needed in order to obtain his goal of a new St. Paul’s Cathedral.

Additionally in 1670, Wren was asked to fill the role of ‘Chief Surveyor to the Commission’ that was created after Parliament passed *An additional act for the rebuilding of the City of London, uniting of Parishes, and rebuilding of the Cathedral and Parochial Churches within the said City.* In this position, the already busy Wren was given oversight of the rebuilding of numerous churches that had been damaged or ruined in the Great Fire. This role meant that Wren not only had his hand in designing and repairing the great St. Paul’s Cathedral but also churches throughout the City thus leaving a substantial mark on the new London. In addition, throughout the many years he worked on the Cathedral, he was involved in building, repairing, and renovating many more structures. Releasing his professorship and placing his full focus on the city of London shows his sacrifice for the good of his country because throughout his architectural profession he had to deal with “endless difficulties and petty quarrels,” but Wren felt that “in truth, the pressure of business was enormous. Not a moment could be spared while the population of the City had neither churches, places of traffic, nor houses to dwell in.” He felt the call to give of his energies to the fullest and he answered well. Arthur
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Stratton dedicates a comprehensive list in his book showing all of Wren’s projects with beginning and end dates, a separate list of mostly undated miscellaneous projects, and lastly a list of designs presented, but never executed, surveys and treatises Wren produced. Concurrent significant projects over the years from 1663-1706, include the following in chronological order: repairing Salisbury Cathedral, converting the Royal Palace in Greenwich into a Seaman’s hospital (later the Royal Naval College), renovating the Chelsea Military Hospital, building the Custom House, the Royal Exchange, Temple Bar, the Great Fire Monument, the Royal Conservatory, Greenwich, and lastly, renovating Kensington Palace and Wolsey’s Palace, Hampton Court. Wren could not have achieved all that he did alone. He was fortunate to have exceptionally good assistants including his main assistant, Nicholas Hawksmore, his once pupil and later “a clerk to Wren, and employed by him at all his great works.” Other assistants include architects Robert Hooke, Professor of Geometry, Gresham College, and Edward Woodroffe, Surveyor of Westminster Abbey. For master craftsmen, Wren was fortunate to employ two master masons, Edward Strong and Thomas Cartwright, as well as the celebrated wood carver and sometimes stone sculptor, Grinling Gibbons, whose beautiful artwork greatly enhanced many churches as well as aristocratic stately homes (e.g. Petworth House).

Though these other projects took place in tandem, Wren’s attention was greatly demanded upon by the St. Paul’s rebuilding project. By 1673, it was obvious to all that
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no part of the damaged building could be spared from being razed to the ground. Wren’s inspection brought to light that though beautiful, Jones “had not laid as sufficient foundations, especially under the pillars, as he should have done, considering the marshy nature of the soil, the frequent inundations, the great weight that the pillars had to bear, and that they themselves were too slight, particularly those under the spire.” The point is not to stain the great architect’s reputation, because as has been stated earlier, he had restrictions on his projects due to the persistent shortage of cash under the Stuart monarchy. One must remember also that Wren had the benefit of a culture of experimentation on the proper scientific method approach to architecture. His methods, based on science, for working around these challenges of the soil type have stood the test of time, as proven when inspected 200 years later.

In November 1673, King Charles granted Wren a knighthood at Whitehall. That same month the king issued a new commission declaring that he had asked of Christopher Wren to submit many designs for the new Cathedral, one of which the King accepted, and requested a large-scale model made for display. This model was made to scale of 1:25 and intended to be ‘walked through’ at eye-level and serve as “a permanent record in case of accident to the architect, and to show, more clearly than sets of drawings could do, how everything fitted together.” Additionally, the King replaced the original
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members of the original commission who had been told to repair the Cathedral with a new group of members given the mandate to help facilitate the creation of a totally new St. Paul’s Cathedral. Finally, the King gave the Bishop of London and the Dean of St. Paul’s “full power and authority to ask, demand, receive, and take the free and Voluntary Contributions of all such our Nobility, Bishops, Judges, and others of Quality and Ability, and of all such our subjects as shall willingly contribute to the said work.”

Given this freedom to raise funds, the Bishop did not stay within the boundaries of London in asking for contributions. Even amongst objections raised, the Bishop reached out to the whole nation asking everyone to give to the cause whilst defending this action by stating that the inhabitants of London were not only victims of the Great Fire, but were additionally being taxed to fund the rebuilding of the whole city. His argument went on to include the fact that St. Paul’s was a “standing monument of the public affection and zeal of this Protestant kingdom to piety and good works.”

Though the King had approved the modeled plan, the Chapter and others of the clergy did not like the plan because it was “not enough of a Cathedral fashion,” possibly because it was so different from what existed in England. Wren’s favored plan incorporated a circular quire but did not have aisles or naves. What the clergy truly desired was the footprint of a Gothic cathedral with its long nave and choir, big chancel.

and processional aisles, but in a Classic dress. In response to their criticism, Wren sat down two years afterwards in 1675 and drew up new plans that included a copula, a lofty spire, and large porticoes. The king approved of this new design, issued a royal warrant for work to begin and at the same time gave Wren the freedom to make variations to the design as needed. It seems that Wren used this authority to its fullest as he did not produce a model or publicly expose his drawings throughout the project thereafter having found that doing so “did but lose time, and subjected his Business many Times, to incompetent Judges.” The end result was a totally different building from the set of plans the king had approved, and obviously more to Wren’s liking.

The last section of the Cathedral to be completed was the dome. The inventive design of Wren’s dome for the Cathedral brings to the mind of this author Brunelleschi’s dome for the Duomo in Florence in that both designs used scientific methods forgotten or unknown prior to that time. Brunelleschi conquered the problem of building the dome without scaffolding “which revolutionized everything that was known about erecting such structures.” To the point, Brunelleschi successfully engineered and built the largest dome in Europe in the fifteenth century when no one knew how to accomplish this feat.

---

When designing St. Paul’s dome, Wren stated that he was inspired by the Hagia Sophia mosque in Istanbul. Though he had never seen it with his own eyes, he gained an understanding from the 1683 publication of *A Late Voyage to Constantinople* by the Frenchman Guillaume-Joseph Grelot, who had drawn “accurate perspectives and plans of…Hagia Sophia, for prolonged periods on site by disguising himself as a Turk. He compared his observations to what he had been told and read in order to establish accurate information.”93 Wren’s dome was inventive genius in itself. To support the dome, he counteracted “the outward thrust by the suspension…of an inward falling weight.”94 The outcome produced a very elegant effect. The great artist, J.M.W. Turner (1775-1851), once said “of Wren’s Cathedral that ‘the dome of St. Paul’s makes London.’”95 St. Paul’s is a symbol representing a renewal: of an old church made new, of a city rebuilt and an emerging empire. It will always remind those who visit of the resilience of the British people during extreme calamity because Wren placed the words, *RESURGAM* (I will rise again), under the image of a large phoenix above the south transept symbolizing how London had risen out the ashes of the Great Fire.96

The rebuilding of St. Paul’s Cathedral progressed over a period of forty years. In 1708, the seventy-eight year old Wren watched as his son had the honor of laying the

93 Soo, “Reconstructing Antiquity,” 100.


“highest stone of the lantern on the copula.” This officially marked the end of
construction leaving only the necessary decorations “required to embellish and finish this
magnificent church.”

97 Earlier in 1708, Wren’s preference of a mosaic for the inside of
the dome had been overruled. The new dean, Henry Godolphin, wanted a painting on the
inside of the dome and put up such a battle that Wren stopped attending the commission
meetings. This allowed the commission members to go forward with Godolphin’s choice
and paint the inside of the dome with eight scenes depicting St. Paul’s life.  

98 Though he
had lost control over the final touches to his cathedral and his influence was growing
weaker, Wren stayed in the role of Surveyor-General until 1718. He retired to his home
in Hampton Court having worked under five monarchies over the course of forty-nine
years: Charles II, James II, William and Mary, Anne, and George I. Amazingly, Wren
saw his Cathedral completed during his lifetime, a feat that was remarkable as “St Paul’s
is the only great cathedral of the early modern era to have been designed and completed
by a single architect.”

99 Architecturally, Wren’s masterpiece stands alone being the first
English cathedral to be built “in the English classical and baroque style and the only
English cathedral to have a dome.”

100


100 “The Rebuilding of St. Paul’s Cathedral after the Great Fire of London,” The
History of London, n.d., https://www.thehistoryoflondon.co.uk/the-rebuilding-of-st-
pauls-cathedral-after-the-great-fire-of-london/.
In the end, Wren not only accomplished this Herculean task, he gave London a skyline of beauty with St. Paul’s dome claiming the center piece and an armada of white steeples peppering the city and creating a panorama that together were his greatest achievement. *(Fig. 12)* Following the completion of St. Paul’s, Wren made periodic visits to London to sit under his dome and enjoy his masterpiece. Unfortunately, on one of these visits Wren caught a cold and died on February 25, 1723.\(^{101}\) Ironically, Wren who was against interment within churches, was buried inside his great St. Paul’s Cathedral. There is a plaque near his grave that reads, “’Reader, if you seek a monument, look around you.’ It is the perfect epitaph.”\(^{102}\)

**Wren’s Churches**

As alluded to earlier, throughout the forty-nine years Wren served as the Surveyor of the King’s Works, he did not have the luxury of focusing solely on building St. Paul’s Cathedral. He was involved in many building projects before he was honored with the Cathedral project. The number of churches originally expected to be replaced from the Great Fire was eighty-seven. However, Parliament mandated in the second Act passed, the Additional Rebuilding Act of 1670, that no fewer than fifty-one churches were to be rebuilt, an increase from the first Act of 1667, which stated that only thirty-nine would be rebuilt.\(^{103}\) The choice to build fewer churches and not replace all the damaged/destroyed

\(^{101}\) Phillimore, *Sir Christopher Wren*, 333.


\(^{103}\) Guildhall Records Office MS. PD. 163.2, "Charles II, 1670: An Additionall, Act for the rebuilding of the City of London, uniteing of Parishes and rebuilding of the Cathedrall and Parochiall Churches within the said City.,” in Statutes of the Realm (22 Car.2.c.11), https://www.british-history.ac.uk/.
churches was made by the king and Parliament who wanted to consolidate some of the parishes. This created a lobbying frenzy among the churches trying to convince the government that their church was worthy of being rebuilt.\textsuperscript{104} The first round of churches chosen were the fortunate ones because there was plenty of money available to properly build these churches thanks to the coal tax. The coal tax was part of the first Rebuilding Act of 1667, which stipulated that a new tax “of 12 pence for every ton of coal brought into the city ports” would be collected for ten years by the city government for the use towards rebuilding London.\textsuperscript{105} In 1670, the tax was extended to raise funds to specifically rebuild London’s churches.\textsuperscript{106} This seemed a fair way of raising funds because all levels of society were equally responsible based on their ability to afford coal. Of the fifty-six churches Wren is credited with building, five were outside the city limits, so are not officially counted.\textsuperscript{107} But of the churches inside the city limits, one stands out and is claimed to be “the Master-piece of the celebrated Sir Christopher Wren.”\textsuperscript{108} If St. Paul’s did not exist as a monument to Wren’s great architectural abilities, St. Stephens, Walbrook would have sufficed. It has often been “connected with the development of Wren’s ideas on St. Paul’s Cathedral.\textsuperscript{109} The great eighteenth-century sculptor, Anthony Canova, visited England and when asked if he would return, he answered he would so
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\textsuperscript{108} Tinniswood, \textit{His Invention so Fertile: A Life of Christopher Wren}, 223.

that he could again “see S. Paul’s Cathedral, Somerset House, and S. Stephens, Walbrook.”

Near the end of Wren’s career, he was again asked to build churches. In 1708, an Act was passed under Queen Anne for fifty new churches to be built to the east and west of the City. In the end, only eleven were built before funding disappeared following King George I’s ascension to the throne. Though Wren was the official supervisor over the Commission created by Queen Anne in 1708, he delegated most of the work “to certain of his brother architects, which he endeavoured to give them such advice with regard to church planning and arrangement as his exceptional experience enabled him to do with all discretion.” His attention was demanded at this point in designing additions and renovations to Westminster Abbey, as he was now the Surveyor of Westminster Abbey. This role came by Wren in 1698, when he replaced his friend, professional colleague and scientist, Dr. Robert Hooke, who had followed a similar path as Wren from science to architecture.

---
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Wren’s Style of Architecture: English Baroque

Wren’s architectural style was uniquely his own though it fits under the category of English Baroque. It reflected aspects of the Renaissance, Baroque and Gothic, but his background reveals the source of its guiding principles of mathematical sciences: proportion, balance, and economy. Like Jones, his predecessor, Wren favored the Palladian influence of architecture style, but his style was closer to the European Baroque than was Jones’ as he allowed modern baroque architects such as Bernini and Borromini to stir his imagination. He blended together styles and quality workmanship of his day to produce exquisite results. He brought together the ancient with the modern, as his mathematical gifting naturally agreed with the perfect proportion of Vitruvian architecture which was in keeping with the new Renaissance ideals. The transition he made from astronomy to architecture has much to do with the application of geometry which he expressed in his church designs. To Wren, the beauty of geometry naturally produced visually balanced and pleasing proportions. It was fortunate that Wren lived during a time when mathematics was integrated throughout society because the culture of the day allowed Wren to ingeniously create “a unique expression of a distinctive English tradition in the mathematical sciences.” His love of light is evident throughout his works. He once said to Seth Ward, fellow astronomer and friend, that “nothing can add beauty to light,” and followed this up with always placing clear, hand-blown glass in his


churches. Wren was in his element with the numerous churches he was asked to design because it allowed him to experiment in the interior design. England profited greatly from John Evelyn’s discovery, and Wren’s hiring, of Grinling Gibbons, the master wood carver. Gibbons’ handiwork graces many of Wren’s churches.

Wren’s other main interest was in designing the steeples. Looking at his churches, one notices that the exterior is usually plain, that is, until the eye rises to the steeple. The plain exterior can be attributed to the fact that in the seventeenth century it was more of a priority to place emphasis on the interior over the exterior. In addition, Wren faced limitations because “the medieval churches which they replaced had often been almost completely surrounded by houses, and these houses had already been rebuilt.” The steeples, however, “are his crowning glory and can be seen all across London – at least at the time.” Each steeple is uniquely designed, with some made of stone and others in lead. Being the last section of the building project, they tended to be constructed much later than the rest of the church. Most of Wren’s churches were completed by 1685, but the steeples, built last, added some fifteen or twenty years to the project. Fortunately, “by then London was again prosperous, and money was forthcoming, so that the churches could be ‘beautified.’ They therefore show Wren’s style at its most mature. A few, indeed, were not completed until Wren was over eighty.”

---
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The path to completion of any of Wren’s projects often required compromise. Throughout his career, Wren wrestled between designing buildings in his preferred architectural style of Roman antiquity with the English clergy’s preference for their churches of the popular Gothic style. As it stands, he succeeded in pleasing the client while still incorporating his preference because the clergy also desired their buildings to have a sense of grandeur and beauty, a goal which Wren shared and achieved in all his buildings. Wren’s most impressive project, St. Paul’s Cathedral, represents “the apogee of English Baroque, because it is the finest English expression of what Mr. Geoffrey Scott calls the Architecture of Humanism.”121 During the latter half of the seventeenth century, the finest minds were brought together, led by one of the best, who pulled the English from the world of the Medieval, produced a Protestant cathedral, while blending the Gothic with the Baroque in the Palladian architectural style introduced by Inigo Jones. Lawrence Weaver states it so well when he wrote, “St. Paul’s is a no less perfect emblem of what England could make of humanistic ideals in art joined with robust English Churchmanship expressed through so sincere an Anglican as was Sir Christopher Wren.”122

One would be justified in labeling Wren a ‘Renaissance Man.’ Over his lifetime the number of roles held by Wren at the same time was impressive and would most likely overwhelm the typical person. However, as busy as Wren was in his two-fold professional roles, there was “scarcely a meeting of the Royal Society recorded in which papers and experiments in astronomy, anatomy, physics, etc. by him and applications to
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him from the Council, are not recorded.” Wren the architect was a product of Wren the scientist. And Wren the scientist was a product of the Renaissance and the Scientific Revolution.

**Vanbrugh and Hawksmoor: The Transition to Neo-Palladianism**

Though his legacy lives on in his churches, cathedral, and contribution to science, Wren’s reputation suffered at the end of his life. With the demise of his reputation went the popularity of his style of architecture. Both Jones and Wren promoted the inspirations of the Renaissance and the Scientific Revolution, which in turn naturally flowed into the Age of Enlightenment. These movements overlapped for a short time as did the architectural styles. The men who worked beside Wren and who continued the Baroque style in their own way after his retirement and death included his faithful assistant, Nicholas Hawksmoor, and his flashy successor of the Surveyorship, John Vanbrugh. Hawksmoor could possibly have stood on his own talents, if he was not always “content to be a loyal assistant” to Wren, “and making Vanbrugh’s fantasies possible.”

Vanbrugh contrasted Wren’s ‘equable, serene mind” and the “typical English gentleman,” with his “son of a Dutch refugee…soldier of fortune, playwright, and man-about-town” personality. Vanbrugh made his name by designing one of the greatest country houses in England: Castle Howard. In North Yorkshire, Vanbrugh “established himself overnight as a master of true Baroque,” which refers to the European as opposed
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to the English Baroque. Vanbrugh followed this great endeavor with a commission to design Blenheim Palace, an even grander house. In both houses he was assisted by Hawksmoor. These two commissions were accompanied with conflict, which some blame may be attributed to Vanbrugh’s flamboyant personality. Though Castle Howard’s construction began first in 1701, its progress was slow due to the commission Vanbrugh got in 1705 to build Blenheim Palace. At the time of Vanbrugh’s death in 1726, only the latter of the two was completed. All along hindering Blenheim’s progress was “the rise and fall of Whig and Tory fortunes which paralleled, of course, the fortunes of the Duke and Duchess of Marlborough.” Similarly to Wren’s full schedule, Vanbrugh squeezed a multitude of other job opportunities while building the most important building of his career. However, unlike Wren, Vanbrugh did not manage his many projects well. In addition, throughout much of the construction period of Blenheim Palace, Vanbrugh quarreled with the Duchess resulting in Vanbrugh being banned from the property for the latter years of its construction. Castle Howard, on the other hand was lacking only one segment before Vanbrugh’s death — the west wing. Surprisingly, it was not until 1811 (over one hundred years from start to finish) before Castle Howard was completed. Because of this delay, Vanbrugh’s design was not followed and instead the 3rd Earl’s son-

---


in-law, Sir Thomas Robinson, an amateur architect, was allowed to build the west wing in the Palladian style that had come back in vogue in the early nineteenth century.\textsuperscript{129}

In 1714, an impending governmental power shift gained momentum with the ascension of George I, who had more in common with the Whig party and thus indirectly helped them gain power in the 1715 election. The new regime resented Wren’s long-lasting power and desired a new national architectural style that was freed of any connection with the Stuart monarchy. They saw Wren’s buildings as tainted by “associations with the absolutist tyrannies of the past.”\textsuperscript{130} His buildings, once criticized for not being traditional, were now not classically severe enough. The Neoclassical Young Turks rejected “Wren’s experimentation in baroque…of liberating architecture from the classical orders,” preferring instead the “restrictive confines of ancient tradition” represented by Inigo Jones.\textsuperscript{131} They felt that “the works of ‘the renowned Palladio’ and his English disciple ‘the famous Inigo Jones’ showed the way ahead.”\textsuperscript{132}

Wren’s architectural style was influenced by the Italian baroque architects who, in turn, influenced the French. Wren’s exposure to both Bernini and the latest French architecture while on his trip to Paris was evident in his designs. Some who disdained his architectural style argued that Britain should have its own unique style and not follow the
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fashion of the Continent and its connection to the Catholic church. In his *Letter Concerning Design*, the 3rd Earl of Shaftesbury expressed his criticism of both Wren and the French influence which he claimed imposed grave injustices of bad taste on the British public. He states that these injustices made to the many London churches had exasperated the patience of the people. Lord Shaftesbury, however, saw hope that as this patience waned, a large sector of public buildings would benefit from a turning in architectural taste. He claimed that: “Our *State*, in this respect, may prove perhaps more fortunate than our *Church*, in having waiting till a national *Taste* was form’d, before these edifices were undertaken.”

Lord Shaftesbury’s letter was in tune with the attitudes of his day. Most likely, the excesses of Blenheim Palace’s style, built at great public expense, was the final straw in the pressure mounting against the old regime’s architecture style. The new political power of the 1720s, the Whigs, “wanted an architectural style that expressed moderation rather than ‘fancy’ and ‘enthusiasm,’ combining the practical and the attractive.”

Just like when James I and VI came down from Scotland wanting to associate himself with antiquity to justify his claim to the British throne, so also did the new political regime of the Whigs want to reach back to the Roman times to “image themselves as virtuous Romans in the century following the
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Revolution settlement of 1688-9.”\footnote{Ayres, Classical Culture and the Idea of Rome in Eighteenth Century England, xiii.} Those rising in power were seeking to dignify and vindicate themselves “with an idealized image of republican Rome.”\footnote{Ayres, Classical Culture and the Idea of Rome in Eighteenth Century England, xiii.}

**Lord Burlington and Kent: Promoters of the English Palladian Revival/Neo-Palladian**

It is unknown whether the 3rd Earl of Burlington (1694-1753) was a friend of Lord Shaftesbury (1671-1713) or had been under his influence before Burlington left for his first Grand Tour. Credited by historians as the influence behind Lord Burlington’s interest in architecture, it is hard to match the proof that he was so. When Lord Shaftesbury left England due to poor health in 1711 to eventually die in Italy in 1713, Burlington was only seventeen. Burlington’s interest in architecture did not show itself until after his first Grand Tour in 1714-1715. Was Burlington privy to Lord Shaftesbury’s personal letter sent prior to his death in 1713? If he was, perhaps the letter sharpened Burlington’s awareness of the architecture he saw while in Italy. If he was influenced by Lord Shaftesbury, it had to have been through a private connection as Lord Shaftesbury’s letter, though eventually published posthumously titled *Letter Concerning Design*, was not included until the fifth edition of the *Characteristicks of Men, Manners, Opinions, Times*, published in 1732.\footnote{Echlin and Kelley, “A ‘Shaftesburian Agenda’? Lord Burlington, Lord Shaftesbury and the Intellectual Origins of English Palladianism,” Architectural History 59 (2016), 225.} More likely, Shaftesbury’s letter had little influence on Burlington because the direction Burlington took towards a preference for the Roman
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style was quite different from the preference Shaftesbury had for the Greek style in architecture as well as feeling that Greece was an exemplary example of a society “where liberty had been allowed to flourish.”

The connection between Lord Shaftesbury and Lord Burlington has been made by historians for many decades, however, there is no proof other than the fact that Burlington leaned in a similar direction, which could have been because he was a product of his times, so ripe for change as they were.

The atmosphere in England early in the eighteenth century was ready for the rise of a national taste and Shaftesbury’s *Letter Concerning Design* expresses it well, no matter if Burlington was aware of it or not. In Shaftesbury’s letter he advocated not only breaking with the French domination, but “he also emphasized the obligation of the oligarchy to promote the arts,” something very near and dear to Lord Burlington’s heart.

Prior to embarking on his initial Grand Tour trip (1714-1715), the twenty-year-old Burlington’s reputation as a collector of paintings preceded him. And he lived up to it. While touring Italy and France, he collected many paintings and some sculpture, repeating this pattern on subsequent trips to the Continent in 1717, 1719, and 1726.

According to the long-time legal and financial advisor for the Earl’s family, Richard Graham, Burlington was “a master of the arts of painting, sculpture, and architecture…[who] saved his countrymen the effort of travel to Paris and Rome to study
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the arts, for they could find them ‘in their utmost Perfection at Burlington House.’”

Rounding out Burlington’s appreciation of the arts was his shared love with his mother for Italian opera. A lifelong passion which led to his becoming one of the founding members of the Royal Academy of Music. To complete the Enlightenment Era picture of the man, the 3rd Earl’s family “had a long-standing commitment to scientific inquiry” being related to the renowned chemist, Robert Boyle (1627-1691), who was his great uncle and a contemporary of Sir Christopher Wren. Burlington and Wren shared a love of Palladio-based architecture but they differed in the application of the style introduced to England by Inigo Jones. Burlington leaned more strongly towards Palladio than did Wren and looked upon Inigo Jones as an exemplar of the classical tradition in England. Though Burlington eventually became known as the ‘Architect Earl,’ his talent in this field was not strongly evident until the 1720s when he produced his first design for the remodeling of Tottenham Park.

To understand the architecture Burlington helped usher in during the eighteenth century, one must compare Burlington with his predecessor, Jones. Where Jones approached architecture as an artist, allowing his senses to guide him, Burlington’s approach was more intellectual and erudite in nature. Jones, like Wren, liked to blend “a variety of classical sources for his architecture,” while Burlington turned solely to
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Palladio, who represented pure Roman classical architecture, for his inspiration.\textsuperscript{147} Instead of blending European interpretations, Burlington preferred to look directly to Rome through Palladio’s eyes. As a result, his architecture style was absent of “all extraneous, unnecessary complexity or decorative extravagance.”\textsuperscript{148} His approach incorporated the Age of Reason he was living in by employing logic and rationality.

Although the entrance of Lord Burlington onto the English architectural scene seems to imply this, the English Palladian Revival (Neo-Palladian) did not begin with Lord Burlington or Lord Shaftesbury, but rather from the publication of two literary pieces: Giacomo (James) Leoni’s English translation of The Architecture of A. Palladio (1715) and Colen Campbell’s Vitruvius Britannicus (1715). Their publications coincided with Burlington’s return from his first Grand Tour. Exposure to the architecture of Palladio followed by reading these publications espousing Palladianism peaked Burlington’s interest in architecture. With Burlington’s return from his second Grand Tour in 1717, he was accompanied “by a struggling young Yorkshire artist, William Kent, with whom he was to form one of the happiest and most fruitful partnerships in the history of architecture.”\textsuperscript{149} The two men were opposites in personality and approach to the Palladian style. Burlington, being the one in charge was more “formula-loving and compartmented” in his thinking, whereas Kent was “a man of happy
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temperament…whimsical, impulsive, unintellectual and…he was in many ways the antithesis of his patron.” Fortunately, the partnership worked well both because Kent would dutifully submit to the Earl’s direction and because Burlington would often let Kent unleash his various talents of expression on the interior decoration and landscape garden design for their commissions. An example of Kent’s talents as both an architect and an interior designer is seen at the entrance hall at Holkham Hall he designed. The visitor’s first impression upon entering the Hall is of a Palladian room “exploited in an imaginative and theatrical manner” using Egyptian and Roman aspects that together create a very dramatic affect. It is perhaps his masterpiece. But, Kent’s greatest contribution was in gardens and landscape, such as at Chiswick, Claremont, Rousham and Stowe. He was the first to break away from the formal French garden planting style to create a landscape that looked as nature intended it to look. This style was most successfully championed by Lancelot ‘Capability’ Brown, who learned under and worked with Kent at Stowe. After nine years at Stowe, Brown began his independent career as a garden designer where his name is famously connected with the Neoclassical era houses such as Harewood House, Belvoir Castle, Blenheim Castle, Warwick Castle, and Highclere Castle.
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As eluded to earlier, the shift to the Neo-Palladian style was occurring prior to Burlington’s leadership and promotion of the style. But it was the happy marriage of this strong movement which was looking both backwards to Jones’ time and forwards to a new version in which Burlington entered the scene. Proof of the introduction of a strong Palladian force leading into the eighteenth century is found in the earliest commissions of Nicholas Hawksmoor (1661-1736), who has been referred to as a “pioneer Neo-Palladian.”

Hawksmoor used Palladian elements such as “Serlian and Diocletian windows, pediments with broken bases, rustication and arcading, and pavilion towers.”

One could say that England never really strayed away from Palladianism because there was always an underlying Italian Renaissance influence introduced by Jones that never went away. Baroque architecture was inspired by Bernini, who also inspired Wren during his trip to France. Jones’ version, as outlined earlier, was a concoction of his own making resulting in what came to be known as Anglo-Palladianism. Wren took the style and made it his own, leaning towards the Baroque. Keeping the Palladian fire going as the eighteenth century approached, was the Dean of Christ Church, Oxford, Henry Aldrich, who was introducing his students to the great man, Palladio, a man Aldrich “acknowledged as his master in architecture.” Such promotion thus produced a new wave of disciples which included Sir Andrew Fountaine and Lord Herbert, the 9th Earl of Pembroke, great architects on their own and close friends of Burlington. These two men entered the eighteenth century fully discipled in the Palladian style, extending Aldrich’s
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influential reach one step further through their close friendship with Burlington. The pull in the eighteenth century to return to the purer Palladianism really was jumping back past Jones to Palladio and ultimately back to the Roman Vitruvius, who so influenced Palladio.

The Palladian Revival gained momentum in the 1720s. All across Britain architects of all levels were taking their cue from Lord Burlington and building in the Palladian style. However, top-level architect, James Gibbs, continued the Queen Anne era of church building with his masterpiece, St. Martin-in-the-fields, London (1722-26). The look of the church may seem familiar to those of the Anglican faith around the world because “Gibbs's unconventional combination of classical temple front with spire served as the prototype for many places of Anglican worship.” As the British empire expanded, so did Gibb’s influence due to his very popular publication, *A Book of Architecture* (1728), which became the equivalent of a best-seller throughout the British Empire being “the first architectural publication by a British-born architect to comprise exclusively his own designs.”

**John Woods (Elder and Younger): Pure Neo-Palladianism and Bath**

Although much focus has been given thus far on the impact Neo-Palladianism had on London, one cannot overlook the city of Bath, which has been referred to as the only real Palladian town. Bath is a combination of how “fine building and inspired town
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planning go hand in hand,” which together created “an atmosphere of Palladian elegance and civilized refinement without equal anywhere.”¹⁶⁰ This beautiful description is largely due to two related architects, the two John Woods, father and son. They were followed by other architects, but these two men started the process of taking an unassuming small town, only remotely known for its hot springs, and raising it up by building in the classical spirit and creating a monument to elegance which led to the city becoming a destination for the aristocracy. The transformation of Bath was helped by the nearby quarry filled with the soft colored Bath stone, and by future self-made men such as Richard ‘Beau’ Nash, the city’s Master of Ceremonies, who for half a century created an air of sophistication and social rules which all visitors were required to adhere to during their visit.¹⁶¹ John Woods, the Elder (1704-1754), never actually saw the famous Roman Baths in his lifetime as they had not yet been excavated, but being a good Palladian, he knew that the connection with Rome supported the Palladian architecture ambiance he created. His architectural triumphs began in the heart of Bath, where Woods created Queens Square (1728-1736), and went on to design and build other impressive buildings of which all had Roman names connecting them back to Rome. Woods, the Elder, designed a Forum, a Circus, a Royal Crescent, and an ‘Imperial Gymnasium,’ however, only the Circus and Royal Crescent were completed in his lifetime. His son, John, the Younger (1728-1782), completed the Circus after his father’s death and then went on to “an even grander concept – the Royal Crescent, the first crescent in English


architecture.”¹⁶² Bath became, and still is, a beautiful city. Its beauty is shared with always bearing a sense of civility. According to John Julius Norwich, the Palladian was “never pompous or grandiose” like its predecessor, the Baroque, nor was it “over-delicate or effete,” like its successor, Neoclassicism.¹⁶³ It lasted so well because it was a bridge between these styles, always being “elegant and graceful, yet always firm, masculine, and four-square.”¹⁶⁴ In addition, it was a cultural bridge. Norwich wrote it so well when he explained how Palladianism bridged mathematics and the natural sciences with classical heritage. He wrote, Palladianism “carried nothing to excess, for it recognized that man was the measure of all things and it sought to place him in the most perfect setting that the laws of nature could devise.”¹⁶⁵ With their background of classical education which included reading Locke and Newton, and having lived in the Age of Reason, the English Palladians of the eighteenth century responded well to a style made up of harmony and natural laws.¹⁶⁶

**Publications of Palladian Architecture**

The printing press truly had been the force that spread the Palladian movement throughout England. More publications came out adding to the initial publications by Leoni and Campbell that were “weighty architectural tomes and engraved folios” by Kent and Burlington among others. They were read by a small but influential audience that


pushed the movement outside of London to the rest of the country, Scotland, and even to America where Thomas Jefferson became an admirer.\textsuperscript{167} However, the spread of Palladianism stopped at the English southern border and did not cross the channel, as the rest of Europe continued with French classicism as the predominate style. It was only in England that there was an obsession for the Vitruvius-Palladio-Jones equation.\textsuperscript{168} In Scotland, the foremost architect of the time and patriarch of a family of famous architect sons, William Adam, adapted the style for the more rugged land up north, but at the same time kept to the true spirit of Palladio more so than some of Lord Burlington’s inner circle.\textsuperscript{169} This supports the notion that a national style truly developed in Britain in the early eighteenth century, though it was not the national style hoped for by Lord Shaftesbury.\textsuperscript{170} That national style of the early eighteenth century was soon to evolve into something new, the Neoclassical style.

\textbf{Robert Adam: Neoclassical and the “Adam Style”}

There was a new wave of architects that rose up following the death of the leaders of the Neo-Palladian movement (William Kent, Giacomo Leoni, Colen Campbell, and Lord Burlington). With the passing of the ‘old guard,’ the Palladian formula was losing its authority with the new generation who saw recent construction in the style as

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{168} John Summerson, \textit{The Architecture of the Eighteenth Century} (Singapore: Thames & Hudson, Ltd., 2003), 13.
\item \textsuperscript{169} Fleming, \textit{The Early Georgian Period: 1714-1760}, 26.
\item \textsuperscript{170} “Palladian Design: The Good, the Bad and the Unexpected,” \textit{Targeted News Service}, July 23, 2015.
\end{itemize}
representing “mere ‘correctness,’” a lapse of the “purity of style into coldness and monotony.”  

In addition, there arose the conviction that to truly grasp a full understanding of traditional classical architecture, one must go further back in time beyond the work of the fifteenth and sixteenth century Italian architects to the buildings of Ancient Rome. As in the buildup of the Neo-Palladian era, publications in the 1750s by Robert Wood on buildings in the Roman empire contributed early on to the rise of the Neoclassical movement. The next decade saw the 1764 folio production by a future star of this movement, Robert Adam, which documented his visit to Dalmatia several years earlier. Upon his return to England in which he was ready to make his mark, Adam entered into a competitive architectural field where men such as James Paine (1716-1789) and Sir Robert Taylor (1714-1788) “nearly divided the practice of the profession between them, for they had little opposition till Robert Adam entered the lists.” Both these men, and John Carr of York (1723-1807), were Palladian traditionalists and produced beautiful work in the north of England. One of Carr’s earliest commissions was at Harewood House, Yorkshire, where more of his work survives in the village than at the House due to major alterations made by Adam and later Charles Barry.

Robert Adam was born in Scotland into an architect family of four boys, of which Robert proved to be the star. He received his earliest architectural training under his

---


father, William Adam, Sr., who is considered the “first strictly classical architect that Scotland produced.” William Sr.’s publication of an extensive portfolio of houses throughout Scotland, *Vitruvius Scoticus*, was posthumously published in 1810, and contained a collection of his architectural plans. Some say it was an imitation of Colen Campbell’s, *Vitruvius Britannicus* (1717-1725). Embarking on his Grand Tour at the age of twenty-six, Robert Adam spent four years in Italy, returning to England in 1758. When he returned he came upon the scene at a time of “the ebb and flow between the lapsing classic and the rising romantic movements.” Having been educated under the classic style of his father, his studies in Italy allowed him to expand his view on the classic resulting in an eclectic new style sourced from “Roman and Greek buildings of the classical period, the Roman architecture of the Renaissance, the painted ‘grotesque’ decorations imitated by Raphael and his pupils from classical originals in the loggias of the Vatican and the Villa Madama, and the arabesque decorations of Herculaneum and Pompeii.” Adam’s return to England in 1758 was at a time ripe for his architectural and stylistic contribution. His style was fresh, new and more expansive than the current trend. It was also flexible and allowed for compromise. Reaching back to the first half of the century, Adam had a connection with Burlington with regards to spatial disposition,

---


which had been lost in the intermediary years between the two men. Adam’s work had a sense of movement, a freedom denied by precise theorists “which he applied to the profiles of a building and to its interiors.”\textsuperscript{180} Robert Adam and his brother James participated in the broad diffusion of their style through the publication of the \textit{Works in Architecture} in 1773. This book ensured that their “distinctive style throughout the land became irresistible and limitless.”\textsuperscript{181} The Greek emphasis was a priority to Robert Adam, being “among the first British architects to incorporate Greek moldings and other Grecian details in his designs.”\textsuperscript{182} Robert made this preference clear in his publication where he stated his “partiality for Greek moldings.”\textsuperscript{183} Their style could be applied to both the grand, aristocratic houses as well as to the smaller houses due to the less expensive décor over the “heavier or more complicated rococo plaster ornament of the Palladian fashion.”\textsuperscript{184}

Another noteworthy architect, Robert Adam’s “greatest rival and critic,” was William Chambers, Surveyor-General (1782), who built Somerset House (1776).\textsuperscript{185} Upon the ascent of George III, the king appointed both Adam and Chambers to serve as “Joint Architect of His Majesty’s Works,” which must have been difficult since the two were
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very different in their approach to architecture.\textsuperscript{186} Chambers’ very popular treatise, \textit{The Decorative Part of Civil Architecture} (1759), “became the standard authority upon classical design” and was probably the needed corrective influence that contributed to the sound and satisfying manner in which the succeeding period developed.\textsuperscript{187} Often the Palladian style is interchangeably referred to as the Neoclassical style. This is easily understood because they did share similarities and because the Neoclassical style came out of the Neo-Palladian style. Though there were other architects designing in the Neoclassical style, the Neoclassical style during the second half of the eighteenth century is strongly connected with Robert Adam. In fact, “Adam is the only British architect for whom a style is named: the ‘Adam Style.’”\textsuperscript{188}

Adam could not have become the great “leader and vigorous exponent of a classical revival in England in architecture and decoration” without the help of skilled men and women who applied their talent to his designs.\textsuperscript{189} Famous contemporaries who benefitted as partners with Adam include Joseph Rose, Jr., the plasterer who put in place Adam’s beautiful and graceful ceilings and other designs, and who was one of the greatest artists in stucco of any country or age.\textsuperscript{190} Other contributors to the great buildings
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created and decorated by Adam were the famous painter, Angelica Kaufman (1741-1807) and her husband Antonio Zucchi (1726-1796), as well as the celebrated Thomas Chippendale (1718-1779) of Yorkshire, who filled the houses of the aristocracy with his beautiful furniture and cabinetry. As successful architects do, Adams chose only the best craftsmen to work with, who after gaining a spot on Adam’s trusted craftsmen list, never lacked in commissions.191

One house, already mentioned, which can claim commissions from many of the names listed above is Harewood House in Yorkshire. John Carr’s un-altered work can be seen in the stable block he built; Adam is given credit for building and decorating the house, which includes providing matching bespoke carpets to his ceiling designs; Angelica Kaufman’s work is seen in the Music Room ceiling roundels; Antonio Zucchi’s paintings grace the walls of the Music Room; and lastly, Chippendale furniture fills the house.192 Nearby Nostell Priory was designed by Thomas Paine who began work in 1735, but had not completed his commission before the 4th Baronet, Sir Rowland Winn, died in 1765. The 5th Baronet, after choosing to part ways with Paine turned to Adam “to fashion the interiors in a Neoclassical style and the Yorkshire-born Chippendale was commissioned to create more than 100 items of furniture, wallpaper and textiles.”193 As pointed out with regard to Harewood House, Adam applied his talents to exterior design as well as interior. At Nostell Priory, he was commissioned to design four more wings.

191 Beard, Georgian Craftsmen and Their Work, 69.


Though he submitted his design plans, he was only able to complete one wing before the 5th Baronet died, which ended further construction leaving the house with an asymmetrical façade.\textsuperscript{194}

**ARCHITECTURE**

**Elements of Architectural Styles**

Having looked at the people who shaped and influenced the architecture during this period, it is time to look at the historical architectural elements that influenced them as well as the architectural elements they popularized. Modern European architecture is founded on the works of Vitruvius, a Roman practitioner from 40 BC who wrote a treatise titled, *De Architectura*, which was broken down into ten books or chapters. Vitruvius was the original ‘architect’ in the western world and over the millennia, all who followed in the practice of western architecture looked to him for guidance on the basics of this artform. In his treatise, Vitruvius describes the make-up of an ‘architect’ – what one must be and do in order to claim this title. To be an architect, according to Vitruvius, meant being a well-rounded person because one could not simply practice but had to apply theory as well.\textsuperscript{195} Those seeking to fit Vitruvius’ description of this well-rounded person had to be one who “ought to have a knowledge of letters, be expert in drawing, learned in geometry, not ignorant of optics, instructed in arithmetic, well read in history, to have diligently attended to philosophy, to have a knowledge of music, not a stranger to physic, understanding in the law, and be conversant in astronomy and the aspects of the


heavens.” This description sets a very high standard which many may have trouble filling, however, it is very applicable to one specific architect described earlier in this chapter – that of Sir Christopher Wren. Vitruvius’ focus on math (specifically geometry) and sciences ties in well with the same focus highlighted in all the cultural movements discussed in this paper: the Renaissance, the Scientific Revolution, and the Enlightenment, which all built on each other.

**Foundations: Greek Classical**

Though the Greek civilization is not the first to build buildings and organize their society, they are the ones of which western history has recorded and from which comes the ‘orders’ of architecture. Vitruvius identified these orders in connection to the Greek temple in which “the Greeks developed a highly stylized treatment for columns, capitals, and the supported members, the entablature.”\(^{196}\) Each order’s name represents a geographical region and “is the creation of a single ethnic group whose name it bears.”\(^{197}\)

There are three Greek orders of architecture: Doric, Ionic, and Corinthian. *(Fig. 1)* They are most readily recognized in the capitals of the columns. The Doric is the earliest and plainest of the three orders. While the Doric column lacks a base or ornamentation on the capital, the Ionic and Corinthian both have bases and some decoration. The decoration softens the appearance of the Ionic and Corinthian orders, especially with the Corinthian capital, which has the most delicate style in contrast to the serious appearance of the Doric. The decorated capitals represent “natural forms, as in the rams’ horns of the Ionic


or the stylized acanthus leaves of the Corinthian.”\textsuperscript{198} The Greeks used the Corinthian order in the most sparing way, preferring the other orders for general use. Other common ornamentations include: dentil, egg and dart/leaf and dart pattern, fruit garland/swag, rosette, braided band, palmette, olive wreath, lion, bead and reel pattern, urn, triglyph, volute, statuary, and the key pattern. (\textit{Fig. 2, Fig. 17, Fig. 18}) The Greeks put much thought into the proportions of their temples as they represented “the Greek ideal of beauty in simplicity” and “a sense of order.”\textsuperscript{199} As an aside, the Tuscan order is often connected with the Greek Orders, however, it was “not employed by the Greeks.”\textsuperscript{200} The style evolved from the Etruscans, a society which traded with the Greeks. Vitruvius mentioned it in his treatise because he knew of its existence, thus the confusion of why many charts list it alongside the original three Greek orders. Vitruvius, however, did not include it in the original explanation of the Greek orders. In his discussion of temples in Book IV, he referred to the Tuscan style as “outside the accepted methods” of designing temples.”\textsuperscript{201} The Etruscans borrowed elements of the Greek orders “with originality, if not with understanding.”\textsuperscript{202} When the Romans conquered the Etruscans they adopted their Tuscan column, which is a simplified version of the Doric. The Romans, originally
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lacking in artistic culture, incorporated many Etruscan cultural and architectural features into their society.203

**Foundations: Roman Classical**

Understanding the background of the orders and the distinction of the columns is key to understanding how future eras added to this base set of orders. The Romans had the habit of blending the culture of conquered societies into their own. They took the architectural orders the Greeks had identified and expanded their use to their liking. For example, they added their own version of the Doric Order. The Roman Doric differs from the Greek Doric in that it has a base, and both the base and the capital are slightly embellished. In addition, the Romans created a Composite order by seemingly blending the Ionic and Corinthian orders. They used the Composite order where they thought the Corinthian “seemed too restrained.”204 Where the Greeks used the Corinthian order sparingly, the Romans preferred this order over the others. It suited their aim of glorifying empire or emperors because it is the most ornate of the orders.205 The area where the Romans most excelled was in the use of the arch. In total, the Romans “erected about a hundred commemorative arches throughout their empire.”206 Future eras copied the Romans in building victory monuments such as the Marble Arch in London and the Arc de Triomphe in Paris.


An additional variation made by the Romans was in creating the pilaster, which is a flat or half column that forms part of a wall and used as a decoration.\textsuperscript{207} (Fig. 5) This is an example of how the Romans transformed the Greek Orders into something purely ornamental. Often the columns and pilasters were simply decoration (superimposed) and not structurally necessary in Roman buildings.\textsuperscript{208} One example is seen in the Coliseum in Rome where part of the outside decoration of columns and entablatures is missing thus exposing the main wall – still standing, though rough in appearance.\textsuperscript{209} Another feature the Romans made their own was the use of the arch. (Fig. 9) Though the arch was already commonly used in Greek society, the Romans included the arch in as many places as they could. In truth, the Romans “were the first people really to understand the arch, and since they understood it thoroughly, they used it in a variety of ways.”\textsuperscript{210} Engineering is where the Romans excelled. The Roman architecture was practical yet impressive in comparison to the Greek focus on beauty. To best understand the difference, one can compare the Roman Pantheon (impressive, but lacks grace) with the Greek Parthenon (impressive and graceful). In general, the Roman engineering feats “stretch far beyond those of the earlier Greek civilization with its elegance and grace.”\textsuperscript{211} On the topic of ornamentation, one feature unique to the Romans was the inclusion of the bucrane (skull of an ox/bull)
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representing the animal sacrifices in which they participated. (*Fig. 5*) Additions made to the adopted Greek ornamentation include the winged angel, low relief sculpture, and arranging the column variations in such a way to give the eye a sense of order across different levels of a building. The Romans used the Doric on the bottom story because of its appearance of strength followed by the Ionic in the middle, and the Corinthian at the top. The integration of the classical style throughout the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries was not only evident in the structures but very popular in the grave markers, which incorporated the use of columns and Greek ornamentation such as winged angels, dentil, egg and dart/leaf and dart pattern, fruit garland/swag, etc. and Roman arches into their design.

**Renaissance**

Math was important to architecture, as stated earlier, but it was not until the time of the Renaissance that this was again highlighted. Leon Baptista Alberti wrote the first architectural treatise after a large gap from when Vitruvius wrote his. Alberti’s book, *De Re Aedificatoria* (1452), was enlightening and influential as it was published at a receptive time in history. Once again someone was writing out in detail the principal elements of architecture – square, cube, circle, and sphere – and the ideal proportions of a building that should follow on from them.”

Arriving during the Renaissance, it is not surprising that these proportions were partnered with music and nature. They were also in line with the idealized human body, which naturally represented God – “as man was created in the image of God, so a building could represent the very image of the divine

---

creator, if architects followed the logic of mathematical proportions.”

Some common features, such as the coffered ornamentation often used in ceilings by the Greeks and Romans experienced a usage hiatus until the Renaissance when the fashion was revived. Coffered ceilings were commonly used by Sir Christopher Wren in his church construction. *(Fig. 18)*

**Palladian**

As time went on, men such as contemporary sixteenth-century architects, Vignola and Palladio, took the Classical style and incorporated their own preferences, referred to by Professor Talbot Hamlin as the ‘classifying tendency.’ Both men added to the Greek and Roman orders to suit their era. In Palladio’s case, his design of a Gothic Basilica in Venice led to the creation of a hallmark of his style. What is now known as the ‘Palladian arch’ or ‘Palladian window’ is “an arched opening supported on columns and flanked by two narrow square-headed openings of the same height as the columns.” *(Fig. 6)* Palladio, like Alberti, based his architecture on “symmetry, proportion and his own codification of the Classical Orders.” In addition to the Palladian window (sometimes referred to as a Serliana or Venetian window), other Classical aspects used in Palladian architecture include symmetrical windows and doors, extensive use of columns and pilasters, triangular pediments, square lintels, arches, domes, and niches with

---


sculptures.\textsuperscript{216} (Fig. 3, Fig. 4, Fig. 7, Fig. 9, Fig. 10, Fig. 11) Out of all the different styles of Renaissance architecture, “Andrea Palladio's architecture from the 1500s still stands as some of the finest examples of Renaissance design and construction.”\textsuperscript{217}

**Anglo-Palladian**

*Examples: Queen’s House (London), Banqueting House (London), Holkham House (Norfolk)*

A true disciple of Palladio is found in Inigo Jones who continued the classicizing tendency by introducing his own personality into what became known as the Anglo-Palladian style. Fundamentally, Palladian buildings are square or rectangular, symmetrical and well-proportioned. Hallmarks of Jones’ interpretation of Palladio’s style include Venetian windows and the temple fronts.\textsuperscript{218} Further characteristics include the use of columns (Doric and Corinthian), heavy pediments over doors and windows, moldings with super-imposed blocked quoins framing both doors and windows, and porticoes. (Fig. 8) Jones’ Palladian country houses were typified by “the clear, balanced and wide-spaced alternations between a plain wall and openings and by the adoption of the Italian piano-nobile at first-floor level with rusticated base below and a small attic storey above.”\textsuperscript{219} Throughout the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries the English, and those in the Royal Society especially, enjoyed a love of all things Egyptian, which can
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also be seen in the grave markers of the time.\textsuperscript{220} This led to the introduction of pyramids and obelisks in architectural decoration, as it was believed that Egypt “was the birthplace of architecture.”\textsuperscript{221} (Fig. 34, Fig. 44) Jones had a preference for Roman architecture but did not like ‘composed ornaments’ introduced by Michelangelo, which included “intricately profiled cornices [ornamental molding just below ceiling], and architraves [main beam laying across tops of columns], broken pediments, swagged tablets and enriched panels exhibited by most of the modern buildings in the Rome he saw in 1614.”\textsuperscript{222} It is not that Jones totally avoided such ornamentation in his designs; he simply gave preference to what he stated as “sollid, proporsionable according to the rulles, masculine and unaffected” characteristics.\textsuperscript{223} He did, however, like to use the Vitruvian scroll pattern in his designs. (Fig. 18) In short, Jones did not adopt the ‘Mannerism’ style that had been introduced in Rome because he felt a strong pull to the authentic antique and the fundamentally disciplined architecture of Vitruvius and Alberti and Palladio – architecturally influential men of the past. In England, a typical Palladian building is recognizable by the unadorned outside and the severe and relentless commitment to geometric shapes, as seen in Holkham Hall. His interpretation “brought a revolutionary discipline and decorum to English architecture.”\textsuperscript{224} As the eighteenth century advanced,

\textsuperscript{220} Soo, “Reconstructing Antiquity,” 165.

\textsuperscript{221} Soo, “Reconstructing Antiquity,” 301.

\textsuperscript{222} Summerson, \textit{Inigo Jones}, 43.

\textsuperscript{223} Summerson, \textit{Inigo Jones}, 43.

\textsuperscript{224} Waters, “Palladianism: A Classical Style Named after the Influential Architect Andrea Palladio.”
however, what had been of utmost importance - consistency and rules – started to become a burden. Therefore, the architects of the second half of the eighteenth century began to look upon the Roman buildings as models to guide them rather than demand their imitation.225

**English Baroque**

*Examples: Chatsworth House (Derbyshire), Blenheim Palace (Oxfordshire), St. Paul’s Cathedral (London)*

In between Anglo-Palladianism and the later, Neo-Palladianism, was English Baroque –the style championed by Sir Christopher Wren and his associates. Baroque in England leaned more toward Classicism than did the Baroque style of Continental Europe. As Nikolaus Pevsner stated, “English Baroque is Baroque asserting itself against an inborn leaning towards the static and the sober.”226 This was partly due to its connection to the Catholic Church, England being a Protestant country, and its appeal to the senses was “alien to the British temperament.”227 Baroque was uniquely expressed based on location and architect, however, there was always the continuity of “illusion and drama seen as its principal characteristics.”228 It was considered an architecture of power and was often used in religious buildings, as witnessed in Wren’s work. Though Baroque

---


in general is very expressive, the more subdued English Baroque tended to “eschew ornament, and instead relied on the manipulation of light and shade for architectural effect...some facades reduced to the basic geometrical repetition of arched or circular windows.”\textsuperscript{229} The more expressive Continental version of Baroque used color in the form of paint or stucco in contrast to English Baroque which limited itself to the color of the materials used in construction. Other characteristics include classical figures, columns, shells, and pilasters. \textit{(Fig. 4, Fig. 9)} Symmetry was also important, particularly for civic and religious constructions. The design of a central building with symmetrical wings on either side was a popular English Baroque feature often seen throughout England. A good example is found in Seaton Delaval in Northumberland.

English stately homes, or country houses, during this era commonly show a rusticated semi-underground basement, a main floor that sometimes claimed two floors in the center building, exaggerated keystones over the windows, and a roof that was often hidden from eye level. Baroque churches tended to be laid out in a Latin cross footprint with a central dome emphasizing the intersection of the four points of the cross.\textsuperscript{230} The outside of both country houses and churches included the use of columns, moldings, and framing for the windows and arches. The interiors, on the other hand, were much more decorative supporting the idea that overly decorated rooms exuded a sense of wealth and power. When left to his imagination, William Kent produced elaborately carved chimney-pieces and used “a profusion of swags and garlands…gilded and painted beams
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and gambolling cherubs.”²³¹ (Fig. 17) Often used was trompe-l’oeil painting to trick the eye to believe that “flat surfaces are in relief or broken by solid objects, or that flat ceilings are vaulted.”²³² Ceilings were painted with elaborate scenes of allegorical and historical figures. (Fig. 14) Wren’s Sheldonian ceiling allowed the viewer to feel transported into the heavens with its night sky illusion.

**Neo-Palladian**

*Examples: Chiswick House (London), St. Martin-in-the-Fields (London), Queen’s Square (Bath)*

Having had enough of the experiment of a conservative version of Baroque, the revival of Palladianism emerges in the eighteenth century bringing back the elegance and civilized refinement for which the style is known. An emphasis on the palatial was introduced by Campbell and Burlington and most wholly affected British country houses. For the purist version of a Palladian country house, one must look to Houghton House in Bedfordshire. Houghton is considered one of the finest Palladian houses in England. Though the desire was to be true to Palladio’s work, the Palladian country house design made an adjustment in the eighteenth century to suit the new tastes of society. Where Palladio designed for a flat country, British architects designed country home sites to be on a gentle sloping hill which showed off the grandeur of the house. Pevsner felt that, “Palladian country houses in Britain were designed to stand in English parks.”²³³ Compared with Palladian country villas in Italy, British derivations played with room
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shapes and staircase designs. Furthermore, wing buildings were no longer detached from the main building. As seen at Prior Park, the wing buildings went from being detached and low in size to attached and raised in height. In addition, the wings gained the ornamentation of porticos and pediments usually reserved for the main section. Holkham Hall is a wonderful example of this change with its triple-pedimented roof on each wing.

Neo-Palladian buildings usually incorporated Venetian windows, “or the heavy pediments over doors and windows, or the doors and windows framed by mouldings with super-imposed blocked quoins, or the ubiquitous classical temple front – columns carrying a large pediment – a motif which Palladio introduced as a prominent feature into domestic architecture.” Other outside variations include the introduction of ball-finials on crenelated walls, and on the interior, the reintroduction of coffered ceilings in domes – a type of ceiling decoration popular with both the Greeks and the Romans. (Fig. 41)

When approaching interior planning, the Neo-Palladians excelled in the use of classical forms. New space compositions were explored through the use of “curved forms (elliptical halls, bow-windows, apses in dining-rooms, etc.) in place of monotonous rectangular room shapes of an earlier period.” This legacy contributed greatly to the upcoming style of the Neoclassical.

Neoclassical

Examples: Harewood House (Yorkshire), Syon Park Interiors (London); Kedleston Hall (Derbyshire)

---


A change occurred around the middle of the eighteenth century which instigated a new architectural movement. This movement, according to Nikolaus Pevsner, was called the ‘Classical Revival’ in which Robert Adam played a significant part leading to his winning international fame.\textsuperscript{237} The Adam brothers’ style differed from the Palladian style by the fact that it was an eclectic style acquired in Rome, “compounded from various sources, from Roman and Greek buildings of the classical period, the Roman architecture of the Renaissance, the painted ‘grotesque’ decorations imitated by Raphael and his pupils from classical originals in the loggias of the Vatican and the Villa Madama, and the arabesque decorations of Herculaneum and Pompeii.”\textsuperscript{238} (Fig. 19) The Adam brothers used the same ornamentation as their contemporary architects which included “the festoons of husks, the swags, the garlands, the vases, urns, tripods and gryphons, the arabesques and scrolls,” but took a different direction in the handling of the ornamentation.\textsuperscript{239} (Fig. 15) Their style showed a highly personal refinement and delicacy, giving the “lighter proportion of the elements of design to the space containing them” a contrast “with the heavier treatment of earlier times.”\textsuperscript{240} Robert was very free in his treatment of capitals, moldings, and other architectural details. The Adam plaster ceilings included very slight projections and small detail which excelled in “the delicate mouldings, slender scrolls, rinceau, wreaths, and festoons” which suggested a Pompeian

\textsuperscript{237} Pevsner, \textit{An Outline of European Architecture}, 187.

\textsuperscript{238} Edwards and Ramsey, \textit{The Late Georgian Period: 1760-1810}, 17.
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and Roman stucco-relief. Adam enjoyed including “painted panels, roundels and medallions depicting somewhat primly elegant scenes from an idealized world of classical mythology.” (Fig. 13) Venetian windows were common in all Adam’s commissions. His love of the delicate turned him away from the harsh lines of squares and rectangles as he preferred an octagonal or circular room over a square one; and if he had an oblong room, he added apses and recesses to break up the lines. Adam’s paint colors of choice leaned toward the pastels but he was not shy in using bold colors when called for. Kenwood House, London houses “one of his masterpieces” in the design of the Great Library. Its domed ceiling painted in pastel blue and pink is bookended with apses which create a cozy reading area where one is surrounded by books and set back from the main section by impressive Corinthian columns.

Greek Revival

The emphasis on the Greek building style only intensified as the eighteenth century came to a close culminating with the ‘Greek Revival,’ which was “a movement towards the use of Greek rather than Roman elements in an already developed architectural system.” Greek fashion became vogue as well, spurred on by the immensely rich man-of-the-world, Thomas Hope. Hope built a house near Cavendish


Square in London which was Greek in all aspects, both inside and out. The architecture was Greek, the furniture and silverware was Greek, it is even said that the women who attended his parties wore Greek costumes.\textsuperscript{246} What added momentum to this Greek craze was the 1803 arrival of authentic Greek sculptures from the Parthenon and the Erectheum imported into England by Lord Elgin. The removal of the “Elgin Marbles,” as they came to be known, was very controversial but helped establish architectural Greek styles as established convention. In 1809, the new Covent Garden theatre design included a “colossal Athenian portico,” which was imitated in Newcastle and Glasgow.\textsuperscript{247} Greek columns by 1815 were seen on all public buildings, spreading to churches, which switched from their prior allegiance to Sir Christopher Wren’s style to the ‘new’ Athenian. Dedication to the Greek soared so much in Edinburgh that it came to be called the Modern Athens.\textsuperscript{248} This became so through the efforts of architects, “William Henry Playfair (1789–1857) and his competitor Thomas Hamilton (1784–1858), two men who in the next decade [1830-1840s] endowed Edinburgh with buildings to match its aim, then manifest, of becoming the Athens of the North.”\textsuperscript{249}

**Conclusion**

Examining the styles of architecture during the long eighteenth century reveals a rebirth of ancient classical taste begun in the Italian Renaissance. The rise of the

\textsuperscript{246} Summerson, “Landscape with Buildings,” 143.
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‘architect’ during this period was fostered by social trends such as the Age of Enlightenment. When coupled with Grand Tours where ancient Greek and Roman styles were closely observed, these architects brought back the ancient world design elements they had seen and incorporated them into their modern world through the construction of churches, buildings, monuments, grave markers and even gardens. In summary, the social trends produced architects and specific styles of architecture that reflected the social trend. For example, out of the Renaissance came Inigo Jones and his Anglo-Palladian style of architecture; out of the Scientific Revolution came Sir Christopher Wren and his English Baroque style; out of the Enlightenment came Robert Adam with his Neoclassical style. Each man was a product of his time and produced architecture embraced by those who lived during that specific era. The social trends and the architectural styles both influenced burial site locations as well as grave marker design. In the next chapter, the expression of these visual styles on grave markers will be explored in detail thus connecting grave marker design elements with societal movements.
Chapter 5

GRAVE MARKERS AND EPITAPHS

Why study . . . grave markers . . . ? For the same reasons, in essence, that we value and study all artifacts which embody lasting cultural truths: to achieve a better understanding of ourselves—what we are, what we have been, and, perhaps what we are in the process of becoming.

-- Richard E. Meyer, Cultural Historian

When antiquary Ralph Bigland (d. 1784) recorded Gloucestershire inscriptions and headstones from the 1750s forward, he found that it was not until the later seventeenth century that “more durable or substantial churchyard monuments first began to be erected in relatively large numbers.”¹ Protection of their loved one’s bodies coupled with the desire to “preserve their memories in stone” contributed to the attention to detail placed in grave markers, both in design and inscription.² Nevertheless, records exist, not all markers have deteriorated, and markers and monuments protected inside of churches act as proxies for those that have been lost due to weathering. Grave marker messaging is conveyed in two ways: by the design motifs and by the inscription or epitaph. This

---


chapter will use both methods to show how grave markers, being a subset of architectural expression, reflected the major societal trends of eighteenth-century England.

**Design Motifs**

When the Renaissance was introduced to Britain, it brought with it a renewed focus and appreciation of all things ancient. Though Britain was exposed later than the rest of Europe to this new mindset, adoption of the concept established a solid hold creating a response that affected many aspects of the English culture. The second chapter showed that it was during the Scientific Revolution where England raced forward with inventions and incorporated science and mathematics into societal foundations such as education of their future generations. The third chapter demonstrated the influence of societal movements on fashion, architecture, and general style. The natural evolution following on the heels of the Scientific Revolution was the Age of Enlightenment. As noted earlier in chapter two, in England the Age of Enlightenment took a different route than in France which allowed for a unique application to develop. But how did these changes affect the symbolism and imagery used on grave markers, monument and tombs?

During the seventeenth century England experienced extraordinary amounts of upheaval with two civil wars and a revolution. In the midst of this civil unrest, the monarchial system came and went via death or rejection, a commonwealth was born, which after the restoration of the monarchy, evolved into a constitutional monarchy. The greatest benefactors from this ‘death’ and ‘rebirth’ episode in British history were the aristocracy and gentry who “formed a new oligarchy and created a new political discourse of which the pivotal terms were ‘civic virtue’ and ‘liberty’ as modelled on
Cicero, Brutus, Cato—the heroes of the late Roman Republic.”\(^3\) The aristocracy and gentry promoted a self-image of ‘virtuous Romans’ and thus actively embraced the already circulating popular Greek and Roman ideals from the Renaissance which partnered well with this new image. As the British empire expanded, the correlation with the expansive Roman empire further fueled the obsession with the culture of antiquity since the British “regarded themselves as the undisputed heirs of Rome.”\(^4\) This new national identity required “a sense of national taste and a national heritage.”\(^5\) The association with antiquity satisfied this requirement and now only needed to be visually represented through accurate classical architecture to give validation.

Classical architecture is frequently defined only in terms of buildings. There is, however, much more to architecture than four walls and a roof. England’s fixation on all things Roman began with its influence on art and in particular, on busts, statues, and eventually monuments. In the architecture of the Ancients, statues depicting important men of their time were commonly included as decoration for both the interior and exterior. Inigo Jones popularized Roman costume through the masques he designed. Following the Revolution in 1688-89, it became acceptable for non-regal depictions of important men in Roman dress to be made in stone and brass. This led to important, wealthy men commissioning Roman busts, statues, and monuments “to suggest their


qualifications for authority and privileges they enjoyed, in particular their adherence to high moral and civic standards.”

This spilled over into sepulchral monuments where Roman military garb, as well as civil garb, represented not a ‘masquerade costume’ but rather gave the subject the image of maintaining “the values of the classical past in the English present.”

Examples of both military and civic costumed monuments found in Westminster Abbey include: Roubiliac’s monument to John Campbell, 2nd Duke of Argyll and Greenwich; the monument to Rear-Admiral Charles Holmes, by Joseph Wilton; and the monument to Lt. Col. Roger Townshend, by Benjamin and Thomas Carter and John Eckstein. Other examples include the bust of Richard Temple, Viscount Cobham, by Peter Scheemakers (Victoria and Albert Museum); and the statue of Christopher Codrington, by Henry Cheere (All Souls Library, Oxford). These busts and statues depicted the English ruling class “as they now saw themselves – spiritual Romans of the republican period.”

Monuments or grave markers are commentaries on a society’s view of death. Following the Reformation monuments underwent a reformation of their own. What had been a traditional function of intercession and prayer under the Roman Catholic Church domination transformed into a more secular representation of English society. Through
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subtle use of design and text, “post-Reformation monuments manifested the ideological concerns of their patrons and exemplified an increasingly wide range of virtues and achievements.”

Visually, monuments can often be broken down into containing four components: “architectural members; sculpted forms; painted and carved heraldry; and the inscribed word.” Each monument puts its own unique combination of these four components together, whether it be a large table and canopy monument dominated by architectural members and sculpted forms, or a wall monument which is dominated by the architectural members and the inscribed word. If a monument is on the large scale, most likely the monument’s imagery will communicate more strongly than the inscribed text. This is sometimes due to the usage of Latin text over English; however, it also may be due to the size of text. If the text is too small to be read from a distance and the viewer is unwilling or unable to gain a closer view, then the sole message acquired is the importance of the deceased and their family seen in the heraldry and elaborate sculpture work.

Not only are grave markers heralds of society’s religious and aesthetic preferences, monuments can give an understanding of the “people involved and how they have and have not changed over the years. The memorialization of individuals reflects society’s attempts to deal with death.” The monument both perpetuates a person’s existence beyond death, and continues the social life connection with the living. Lastly,
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“individual memorialization builds a record of the history of the community represented
in the graveyard.”\textsuperscript{12} Research on the monument’s message, both verbal and inscribed,
lends “comparative insight into cultural trends in the past and the present.”\textsuperscript{13} Both
cultural trends and the need for individualism, as discussed in earlier chapters, is reflected
through the choice of decoration and inscription on grave markers.

Changes in culture are not easily explained in simplified ways because societal
movements are made up of shifts of thinking; shifts in thinking affect how one views the
world which lead to changes in lifestyle reflecting the adopted view of the world. The
sixteenth century saw the germination of “a small classical seed” which flowered “in the
early eighteenth century with Burlington and the Neo-Palladians.”\textsuperscript{14} The growth of this
seed occurred in spurts but eventually established itself as the foundation for architecture
in Britain. The Greek/Roman architectural wave initiated by Inigo Jones included both
architecture and décor and continued throughout the eighteenth and into the nineteenth
century. London, where many grave markers were lost or destroyed during the Great Fire,
is sparse on the number of older grave markers. However, one can still look to the south-
eastern counties of England, and specifically to Kent, for examples of older grave
markers as these areas were dense in monuments.\textsuperscript{15}

\textsuperscript{12} Collier, “Tradition, Modernity, and Postmodernity in Symbolism of Death,”
728.
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729.
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From the Reformation forward changes in religious beliefs and societal mores led to a steady transformation in attitudes towards death leading to death being represented in a variety of symbols on grave markers. Though inadvertently done through his rejection of Catholicism and the Pope’s control, King Henry VIII smoothed the way for those in Britain to move towards the new theology and church structure promoted by the Reformation. Over time a new theology of death emerged which turned the focus towards the continuation of life “rather than the physical death stressed in pre-Reformation thought.”\textsuperscript{16} In addition, prior to the Reformation the Renaissance had introduced an awakening of “all the arts and graces of the classical age” and brought about ‘active’ versus the ‘static’ posed effigies of the medieval times.\textsuperscript{17} Examples of static posed effigies can be seen in most churches that date to the Medieval times. The effigies are usually lying on their backs with their hands in a prayerful position. Examples of the new, evolving active posed effigies began with the awkward and stiff effigy propped up on their elbow as if doing a version of a side plank position. Over time, poses altered from recumbent (lying down) position to a semi-cumbent position of sitting or standing; from no movement expressed, to an animated one where it seems like the viewer is capturing a scene in a play.

One example of a monument showing the awkward transition the effigy made from a static to an active position can be found in Ely Cathedral. Edmund Esdaile’s book, \textit{The Monuments in Ely Cathedral}, mentions this 1604 monument made for Sir Robert Steward in the south chancel aisle. It is often pointed out for its comical, awkward pose

\begin{footnotesize}

\textsuperscript{17} Llewellyn, \textit{Funeral Monuments in Post-Reformation England}, 24–25.
\end{footnotesize}
as he is propped up by his helmet. *(Fig. 20)* Sir Robert Steward was the first Dean of Ely Cathedral, whose family claimed a false heritage connected to royal house of Stuart. This false claim, which did not come to light for some time, tried to elevate the family reputation similarly to how the craftsman of his monument attempted to imitate the classical style, but failed. The monument to Sir Robert Steward is positioned awkwardly and comes up short in producing a classical-styled monument during a time when country craftsmen did not have easy access to the publications that were available to craftsmen in London.18 Edmund Esdaile described the tomb’s classical frame as approximately correct, except for a column in the middle where none should exist, and noted that the posture of the effigy is far from fluent and natural. Esdaile went on to succinctly describe it by saying: “To view this tomb is to see at a glance how urgently needed was an Inigo Jones.”19

Throughout the sixteenth century monuments were designed to “include an altar and from c. 1600 prayer desks become ubiquitous.”20 In the later seventeenth century and into the eighteenth century, the prayer desks went away and “funeral sculpture grew ever more ambitious, with portrait medallions, pictorial reliefs, and dramatic figural groupings,” in keeping with the influence of the Renaissance and the Enlightenment.21


Additionally, grave marker designs began to branch out from the traditional expressions of heraldic and Christian symbology to include a mix of symbols and styles brought about by the influx of classical thinking that had once again become popular. What led to this stylistic change was an adjustment in society’s theology of death. Purgatory was a Catholic belief, as was praying for the souls after their death. The Anglican Church denounced Purgatory, therefore, there was no longer a need to pray for the souls. In addition, the Enlightenment placed a focus more on mankind and his/her place in the world God created.

Monuments from the post-Reformation era tended to be “unabashedly decorated and coloured and have busy surfaces.”22 With the seventeenth century and the introduction by Inigo Jones of the Classical style of art, specifically in architecture, there came a more “cautious decoration, ‘plainness’ and monochromy.”23 Specifically, throughout the century in Kent there was an increased interest amongst both ordinary people as well as their superiors to establish grave markers over their dead.24 Few wooden markers of this time called ‘bed-heads’ or ‘leap-boards,’ have survived. Those made of stone and brass (inside the church) still survive.25 It is only from the later seventeenth century that one sees headstones used as grave markers.”26


Following the Reformation and the slow weakening of the Church’s authority over many centuries, artists started to push past the traditional boundaries in an effort of introducing new ways of expressing themselves. This was evident in the design and message of grave markers. During the long eighteenth century, there were two factors challenging the Church’s authority: scientific and spiritual exploration. The Enlightenment was a time where people were encouraged to explore their world and practice creative thinking. In addition, it was a time when challenges to the Church came from those wanting to believe in God differently than what the established church dictated. According to Julie Rugg, “the God of the Enlightenment was a rational being, distant, benevolent, tolerant and unmysterious.”27 This image of God did not sit well beside the traditional hellfire and eternal damnation God of the established church, leading to a minimizing of this aspect.28 As it was, the Great Revival during the first half of the eighteenth century was adding fuel to the already existing break from the Church which began with the Dissenters.

Evidence of the move away from traditional Christian symbolic representation on grave markers is seen in the anonymous grave marker catalog which provides the reader a peek into gravestone designs of the last two decades of the eighteenth century. The catalog shows that the dominant design aspect of the day was the Palladian geometric


structure with a temple look and the Neoclassical décor. Urns, pitchers, Grecian busts, obelisks, eternal flames, swags, and piles of books claim most of the real estate of each grave marker, but periodically one can find a cross offered as a choice. This catalog is one item supporting the claim that grave marker expression evolved to allow inclusion of everything important to society at the time of death and at the same time, represent a neutral and fashionable look. The English society was distancing itself from the formal representations of death where the goal of the marker was solely to promote the deceased in all their glory and goodness to the audience. Instead, through the influence of the highlighted societal events, people tended towards a graveside experience that placed an emphasis on one or all points of time – a reflection of the past, a snapshot of the present (time of death) and/or the future – all of which had the goal of drawing the audience in.

Many grave markers prior to the eighteenth century made sure that the reader learned all about their pedigree through prominently placed heraldic symbols and about all the good deeds they did while they were alive through their inscription. Hints of heaven came through the symbology in the frame, if any were included. An example of a monument that shows both present and future is found at Wythyham, Sussex, in the monument honoring the teenager Thomas Sackville’s death in 1678. (Fig. 46) His monument shows him on an altar tomb leaning on one elbow with a parent on either side gazing at him with grief stricken eyes. Thomas, holding a skull signifying mortality, is looking heavenwards “with rapt expression, as if wholly absorbed in the prospect of

coming glory.”

Created almost one hundred years later, an example of a non-sepulchral secular sculpture, which well represents the age, is found at Holkham Hall, *Death of Germanicus* (1774), by Thomas Banks. *(Fig. 47) Death of Germanicus* “has been considered to be the first truly neoclassical sculpture.”

It shows the death of Germanicus Julius Caesar, who died a mysterious death, some say by poison, in AD 19. On the memorial, Germanicus is “surrounded by mourning figures, carved in high relief against a plain background. His pose in death is elongated and languid and his body is represented as perfect and unmarked. Death by poisoning has left no signs of agony on the hero’s serene features.”

There is action and emotion expressed in this scene, and it is very poetic. There is nothing static about it. Near the end of the eighteenth century, the entrance of the Romantic era re-emphasized the importance of the individual.

Sentimentalism between parents and children started to be expressed in monuments as evidenced in the 1793 Thomas Banks sculpture to Penelope Boothby, the child of Sir Brooke Boothby. *(Fig. 45) Banks’ memorial shows the dead Penelope peacefully sleeping. According to some historians, “this was the first significant monument to a child in eighteenth century England, and perhaps the first truly Romantic sculpture.”* It captures a sweet, innocent picture as a lasting memory of their child.

---


The innocence and peaceful nature of the Boothby monument represents the new ideology regarding death in the Age of Enlightenment vs. the very different look of monuments and grave markers in general that were made prior to the eighteenth century. In these earlier markers the symbolism and message inscribed on them commonly included skulls and skeletons as reminders of physical decomposition and as a warning about the shortness of life. This negative focus on the effects of death altered after the mid-eighteenth century with the change of theology. Leading up to England’s Great Revival of the 1730s people held a “dread of death and damnation.”

This anxiety regarding death was reflected in grave markers. At the same time, the Anglican church seemed remote, both spiritually and physically, and did not seem to be providing an assurance that was needed, especially in the pockets around the country (north and west) which responded well to the Methodist teachings. Michael Crawford’s study identified how those who responded strongly to the Methodists during the Great Revival tended to be from the working classes connected to commerce and manufacturing, who had been redistributed to areas where the traditional English authority structure, such as the manorial system, did not operate. In addition, this people group was not adequately served by the Church of England because in the northern and western industrial areas the churches were few and far between lending a sense of vulnerability.

---


teachings provided what the Church of England did not at the time: "a vital, experiential religion, for the assurance of sins personally forgiven, and of salvation presently granted." Embracing the Methodist teaching led to a relief from the disturbing feelings of dreading death and guilt for sin, replacing them with the “more comforting feelings of forgiveness, belonging, and joy.”

Death no longer represented a negative but rather a positive. Death gave the promise of the end of hardships and of heaven. This allowed people who believed in the Methodist way to begin to look forward to death, rather than dread death, a change reflected on their grave markers in the removal of death with his scythe. An additional example is seen in how the winged skull gave way to “the far softer image of flying souls or cherubs.” Accompanying this softer image of death was a rapidly growing unease over the process of physical decay. When the traditional and common images of death represented by skeletons and skulls people had so long lived beside were no longer there, they lost their sensibilities about the physical decay of death. Today, as in the late eighteenth century, such images arouse “shock, disgust, and fear, the stock reactions to ‘horror.’”

As the classical style took hold, the expectations of the quality of sculpture rose to a higher level. Prior to the seventeenth century, architecture was becoming increasingly codified in terms of formal rules.” This allowed skilled craftsmen to consistently
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produce monuments of the caliber of a high-quality piece of classical architecture.

Similar to how the role of an architect became distinguished from the role of a general contractor, so too was there a new distinction between the master tomb-maker from the general mason. As the architect role was usually filled by educated men, the same applied to the master tomb-makers. Seventeenth-century author and artificer, Thomas Stirrup, observed that the common craftsman did not have the arithmetical skills needed to produce quality work, nor did they know how to read or write.44 Master tomb-makers and sculptors during the seventeenth century include Nicholas Stone, who was the best of his trade in England and who produced beautifully detailed monuments. A colleague of his was Maximilian Colt, a Flemish sculptor who moved to England and rose to the position of the King’s Master Carver in 1608. During the eighteenth century the very talented French artist, Louis-François Roubiliac, produced outstanding monuments as did John Michael Rysbrack, a Flemish sculptor. Both Roubiliac and Rysbrack made England their home during the eighteenth century. Near the end of the century, at the height of the Neoclassical era, John Flaxman, another celebrated sculptor, sculpted a monument to Agnes Cromwell named, ‘Come, Thou Blessed,’ which “demonstrates the unthreatening nature of Enlightenment death: passage to Heaven was assured by the ministration of tending angels.”45 (Fig. 49) The composition of this sculpture is perfectly balanced and fluid. Other than the symbol of angels, there is no other Christian symbology, though it is assumed the angels are bearing her up to heaven. It evokes an emotion in the observer unlike that of earlier styles of sculpture.


Imagery and Heraldic Elements

Imagery is a powerful communication tool. However, creating a monument that states a powerful message simply through imagery was expensive. To include imagery meant commissioning a sculptor of some level of expertise, which was more expensive than simply ordering a wall monument that had little imagery. As more people representing the working class became grave marker customers, and as those who were wealthy chose not to spend as much on a monument, fewer elaborate monuments were produced. More often what was ordered was a wall monument, or a headstone, with the architectural elements minimally represented, some décor, and a dominance of English text. Heraldic signs, however, rarely were left out as they were not seen to have “any contradiction between classicism and heraldry” and “were understood jointly as components [with the classical orders] in the antique revival.”

In England, the purpose of heraldry was at first to distinguish specific individuals especially when at war, but it then gained popularity for its representation of the bearer’s honor and dignity. Heraldry entered into England in the twelfth century having come from the Continent (Germany and France), and gained a solid foothold in English society by the thirteenth century. To obtain a coat of arms, one must be deemed worthy of, and granted, this honor by the monarch. The average person was not awarded a coat-of-arms as it was originally restricted to the aristocracy. This made obtaining them even more special. Since the arms used symbols rather than words, they could be ‘read’ from a distance, such as on a battlefield, and by the illiterate. Their original battlefield purpose
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eventually expanded into civil and legal life as arms were found to be useful as proof of
authorship of a document, similar to the wax seal.

As the design rules gained complexity over time and the number increased,
structure was necessary to ensure each design was unique as well as to ensure proper use.
Misuse of arms was equal to forgery or counterfeit. The complex pictorial language
needed strong guidance over time which led to the creation of a regulatory body to
manage the science of heraldry. Since the position of herald involved the announcement
at jousting tournaments of the combatants by family, it naturally was the herald who was
given the management of the arms system. The heralds later formed a hierarchy where
the “principal heralds, called kings-of-arms, came to control all heraldic matters under the
marshals who derived their authority from the crown.”

Heraldry generated a necessary sense of order in society. Originally, only the
noble and knightly classes could bear arms, for obvious connections to warfare, and with
this honor came responsibilities to the monarch. In return, the monarch used the coat-of-
arms to publicly show favor, give a reward, or recognition to the nobleman. Each time
additional recognition was granted, the coat-of-arms design was modified. This, of
course, further encouraged prominent exhibition of their coat-of-arms to show off their
status with the monarch. Death was not excluded in this proud display of the family coat-
of-arms. In truth, funeral monuments “were regarded as little more than vehicles for the
display of arms.”

47 Helicon, ed., “Heraldry,” in The Hutchinson Unabridged Encyclopedia with
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reason funeral monuments always displayed the family coat-of-arms. They acted as a genealogical tool. Sir Robert Steward’s monument not only shows him wearing his coat-of-arms, but it displays his shield-of-arms above. *(Fig. 20)* Not to be outdone, the 4th Earl of Rutland’s monument displays three variations of his family shields-of-arms. *(Fig. 21)* In the case of Sir Vincent Fulnetby’s family monument located in St. Oswald, Rand, Lincolnshire, pride in his lineage was the dominant factor. Fulnetby’s wall monument displays twenty-two shields-of-arms (arms on shields), an inscription, and little else.

Heraldry in early modern England was a very disciplined practice that reflected a small group of people who adhered to a semblance of order and loyalty to their monarch. Heraldry not only communicated one’s family history, but as Nigel Llewellyn explains it, “heraldry fixed the subject’s place within the community of honour and signaled the physical occupation of land and power within the early modern English state.”49 In Tudor England, “any assault on heraldry was taken as an assault on order.” Such a commitment to orderly society added to the attraction that those in the long eighteenth century felt towards the classical style of architecture with its connection to the laws of natural order found in science and math. British society was beginning to expand its intellectual borders and in doing so, the lasting impact of the Renaissance made deep inroads into all areas of society, not excluding death and the grave marker.

**Illustrating History in Tombstones, Grave Markers, and Monuments**

In order to understand the changes brought about in the eighteenth century, the state of funerary décor must be understood to put those changes into proper context. Though the official inauguration of the Classical architectural style in England occurred

in the seventeenth century when Inigo Jones returned from his Grand Tour trip, there are incremental inclusions of basic classical aspects that made it into sixteenth century memorials suggesting that some in England had been given an early preview of Europe’s new look. Though there were many travelers from England to Italy over centuries—from the time that Claudius incorporated Britain into the realms of the Rome empire continuing into the sixteenth century with its connection to the Catholic Church—nobody in England had published a book about Italy. It took until 1549 for the first English book on the history of Italy to be published by the on/off civil servant, William Thomas (ca. 1507-1554). As a result, English enthusiasm for Italy was awakened resulting in an increased number of visits to Italy. This interest was a surprise considering the severing of religious ties with Rome. The increase of the British visiting Italy was so significant that Sir Thomas Chaloner was prompted to write to the Earl of Essex in 1596-7 commenting that, “such a rabble of English roam now in Italy.”

The book, in addition to increasing visits, helped explain why sixteenth-century sepulchral monuments began showing stylistic aspects of the newly popularized Classical style prior to the introduction made by Inigo Jones.

Technically speaking, English monuments already had an unofficial connection with the Classical style in the English version of the sarcophagus. What the Renaissance introduced was “the sweetness and light of revived humanism [which] caused men to
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think of death in its aspects of release and repose.”

As a result, the stiffness exhibited in the Medieval monuments gave way to a more natural pose. In addition, the dominance once owned by the tomb as the universal type of memorial in England, began to yield in the sixteenth century to options that by the eighteenth century allowed for the more affordable wall memorial. The popularity of the wall memorial aligned the English with what was typically used in Italy. Furthermore, over time the monuments of substantial size were scaled down as they went from recumbent effigies to kneeling or standing effigies.

The transition from the Medieval altar style to the Classical, and eventual Anglo-Palladian style, can be seen in the tomb of 4th Earl of Rutland (1591). (Fig. 21) In this monument, the Medieval style of recumbent effigies and kneeling children beneath them, all with prayerful hands, is still the dominant style, however, the classical style has been introduced through the two Greek columns, the dentil design in the cornice, and the Roman arches. Another example of style transition is seen in the monument for Thomas Owen (d. 1598). (Fig. 22) The altar-tomb has the same three classical aspects as the Earl of Rutland’s monument (Ionic columns, dentil design, Roman arch), however, what stands out to the historian is the change in the effigy’s position. The effigy is seen stiffly lying on his side propped on one elbow with open eyes, similar to Sir Robert Steward’s earlier monument, but with less awkwardness. Both the positional change and the fact that the eyes are now open is a significant change as recumbent effigies had traditionally been positioned in a state of prayer with hands in proper prayerful position, or asleep.
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awaiting resurrection. Well into the late 1550s, it was considered “improper for an effigial figure to be shown ‘awake.’”

If it were the choice of the British, the recumbent effigy position would have continued much longer. However, exposure to new Renaissance-influenced ideas came with the influx of immigrant craftsmen refugees from the Wars of Religion of Holland during the last years of the sixteenth century, and later immigrants from France. The British reluctance to change is comically portrayed in John Webster’s tragic play, *The Duchess of Malfi*, written in 1612-1613, where changes to the tomb style is considered ‘fantastical:’

Duchess: *Why, do we grow fantastical on our deathbed? Do we affect fashion in the grave?*

Bosola: *Most ambitiously. Princes’ images on their tombs do not lie, as they were wont, seeming to pray up to heaven; but with their hands under their cheeks, as if they died of the tooth-ache. They are not carved with their eyes fix’d upon the stars, but as their minds were wholly bent upon the world, the selfsame way they seem to turn their faces.*

As the seventeenth century dawned, “English architecture was to undergo a transformation, perhaps the most striking in its whole history.” The creativity that for so long lay dormant within the English sculpture was given its freedom with the introduction of Renaissance designs and ideals brought to England by Continental European craftsmen. The new requisites for design included “invention, expression, a
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perception of the ideal, and a facility of grouping in composition…rather than a mere adaptation of architectural detail.”57 Slowly throughout the seventeenth century the sculpting of recumbent effigies on tombs ceased, making room for the creation of monuments decorated in the style of the Enlightenment with urns, “pyramidal compositions, bas-reliefs, mythological conceits, and groups of statuary allegorically designed, with figures clad in draperies artfully disposed.”58 One of the earliest Dutch sculptors to set up a workshop was William Cure, the principal craftsman at Somerset House.59 Though the monument was never built, William Cure had the honor of designing the tomb for King Edward VI. (Fig. 23) The design was unique because it “establishes the pattern of setting an effigy under richly coffered arches.”60 A later monument built by the Cure workshop for Sir William Pickering (d. 1574), was the first monument to use the four or six poster design. William’s son, Cornelius, used the same design for the tomb of the 1st Baron Burghley (d. 1598). (Fig. 24)

The sculptor, Nicholas Stone, rose to become the leading mason-sculptor by around 1625.61 An example of his work showing the dramatic change in the effigy expression, though still recumbent, is seen in the tomb for Lady Carey (1617/18),

58 Bloxam, A Glimpse at the Monumental Architecture and Sculpture of Great Britain, 277.
60 Whinney, Sculpture in Britain: 1530-1830, 52.
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sculpted during her lifetime. (*Fig. 25, Fig. 26*) The carving of Lady Carey’s effigy is richly detailed and positioned in such a way that expresses emotion, unlike the stiff effigy tradition of the sixteenth century. Not only is her effigy more naturally positioned with her hand casually lying on her breast, but Stone gave her face a look of tranquility as if she were in a deep sleep. She lies on top of a table-tomb with no canopy - another design change introduced in the seventeenth century.

Though it was going out of fashion, the altar-tomb style was still popular but sometimes included a classical twist. A very impressive and strong monument built by Nicholas Stone for Sir Dudley Carleton (d. 1632) is located in Westminster Abbey. (*Fig. 27*) This tomb exhibits strong Classical style aspects with a temple-like feel. It has fluted Ionic columns, strong geometric shapes, and a broken pediment coupled with the effigy comfortably gazing at the visitor. The prominent display of the family coat-of-arms in noteworthy above and below the effigy.

The overlap of styles continued to persist well into the seventeenth century. The Robert Aldsworth monument appears to portray a reluctant nudge away from the staid Medieval style to the adaptation of the new Classical style. (*Fig. 28*) The effigies are no longer recumbent or semi-recumbent but rather positioned in a new version (for the adults) of the prayerful position, that of kneeling and facing each other, and surrounded by a Jacobean structure with multiple Greek columns and a dentil cornice.

Because of the political chaos of the mid-seventeenth century in England, the aristocratic commissions for monuments dwindled leaving little to show from the mid-century. The British middle-class had tombs built but they were conservative in
character. In addition, wall monuments were exceedingly popular and though often more on the minimalist side, they still used Classical decoration. Two examples of this can be seen in the wall monuments made by Nicholas Stone in 1638 and 1640, respectively. (Fig. 29, Fig. 30)

The restoration of the monarchy in 1660 brought Charles II back to England after having spent ten or so years in France and the low countries where he was exposed to the architectural styles of the Continent. The 1665 plague and 1666 fire in London created a whirlwind of building. During this time, the Baroque style was commonly used alongside the popular Palladian style. Twisted columns, curved pediments, and swags of naturalistic flowers can be seen in many architectural designs. The dual wall monument of Thomas Mansell and William Morgan displays the blending of the two architectural styles of Palladian and Baroque with its twisted Corinthian columns and curved pediment. (Fig. 31) Some of these aspects are also apparent in the 1st Duke of Beaufort’s (1700) tomb with its patterned Corinthian columns and swags of naturalistic flowers. (Fig. 32) Interestingly, the majority of the upcoming examples include a sarcophagus; there is even a miniature version in one of the wall monuments.

In contrast to the Baroque in the Duke of Beaufort’s monument is the sixteenth-century large monument for Viscount Campden (1686), which makes a strong statement towards the Neo-Palladian style that was soon to take over in England. (Fig. 33) This is a magnificent monument incorporating many Classical design aspects including the broken pediment, urns, wreaths, obelisk-like pillars, and bas-reliefs seen in the medallions as well as the front two face panels. The strong lines are softened by the wreaths circling the
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bas-reliefs, as well as by the hanging swags of flowers. As noted earlier, England’s architectural styles differed from the rest of Europe, and additionally, each used color differently. England preferred to use the natural marble colors of white, black, grey, red, and green, except for periodic highlighted spots, and also for the coat-of-arms. The Italian Baroque monuments tended to be much richer in color.63

During the eighteenth century, the Age of Enlightenment began to influence the design elements of monuments towards the arts and sciences. The monument for John Cecil, Earl of Exeter, dated 1707, was sculpted in France by Pierre Monnot and sent to England.64 (Fig. 34) It lacks any obvious Christian symbolism. The influence of the Enlightenment can be seen in the two female figures representing Wisdom and Science, and in the use of the pyramid representing immortality. This example is not the first of its kind in England, however, it is a good depiction of the cultural shift of highlighting the arts and sciences throughout all walks of life and death.

Another example of a strong Enlightenment-influenced monument can be seen in Sir Isaac Newton’s monument sculpted in 1727. (Fig. 35) As was the custom of the era, Newton is wearing classical-style clothing. The monument communicates Newton’s great contributions to science with the inclusion of the books Newton is leaning on. Tailored for Newton, the putti boys are holding instruments related to Newton’s mathematical and optical work. Though Newton did believe in God, the imagery lacks any Christian symbolism. The weeping figure on top of the globe is not an angel but Urania, the muse of Astronomy. Note that though the monument looks colorful, the color is from the choir
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screen that surrounds it. The actual monument is colored using only natural marble colors, except for the highlighted globe.

The Baroque style continued to be popular into the eighteenth century, especially in wall monuments, however, it always stayed in the minority next to the more preferred Anglo- and Neo-Palladian style in England. The lingering Baroque interest may be due to the book of architectural designs Daniel Marot published in 1680, which enjoyed a wide circulation in England inspiring many native sculptors.\footnote{Weaver, Memorials & Monuments Old and New, 100.} To compare the two styles, four examples are highlighted. They include: George Stepney (1707), Matthew Prior (1722), Mrs. Judith Cary (1715), and Elizabeth Corbett (1724-6). (Fig. 36, Fig. 37, Fig. 38, Fig. 39) The examples show how the Palladian style is the more dominant, but also that the Baroque comes through in both the Stepney and the Corbett monuments through the use of drapery, swags, putti/cherubs, and curved pediment. The swags never truly disappear from use; they reappear during the Neoclassical era in a more simplified version. The Carey monument displays the most Neo-Palladian style with its more restrained manner.

Between 1715-20, a distinguished group of Flemish sculptors arrived in England seeking work. Among them were Peter Scheemakers and John Michael Rysbrack. Though Scheemakers was very good and became known for his Shakespeare monument of 1740, he trailed behind Rysbrack and a Frenchman named Louis-François Roubiliac who became the leading sculptors between 1720 and 1760.\footnote{Whinney, Sculpture in Britain: 1530-1830, 147–49.} During this time, busts became very popular and were often used as grave markers. The monument to Sir George Fettiplace (d. 1743) is an example. (Fig. 40)
As the century progressed, there developed a move away from the rationalism of the early eighteenth century. Some see this move as the beginning of the Romantic era which welcomed the Neoclassical style Robert Adam championed so thoroughly. Adam did not usually participate in the world of grave markers, but he did provide a backdrop for one particular monument by Dutch sculptor, Peter Matthias Vangelder (1739-1809), whose finest work was his monument to Mary, Duchess of Montagu (1775). (Fig. 41) The Montagu monument is set in an elegant niche Adam designed in the chancel of the church of St. Edmund, Warkton. Vangelder’s Neoclassical monument depicts Mary “as a dignified Roman matron, accompanied by the god of death wearing a wreath of poppy heads signifying eternal sleep.” During the Neoclassical era, death was represented by sleep.

Two artists that stood out during the Neoclassical era were Thomas Banks (1735-1805) and John Flaxman (1755-1826). They were referred to as two of the “most sincerest artists of the century” both contributing to a “new and noteworthy development in the design of English monuments.” During their tenure, allegories for the most part go out of fashion, except in the largest of monuments, and what came in fashion is “a more direct and simpler treatment of the theme of grief…often with a more personal reference to the interests of the deceased.” In addition, an increase of small monuments
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develop, many with the repetitive theme of a woman mourning over an urn as seen in the Montagu monument, replacing the common former theme of mourning boys. As the Montagu monument depicts, Neoclassicism combines “sentiment with the love of clean contour.”\footnote{Whinney, \textit{Sculpture in Britain: 1530-1830}, 286.} Examples of works by Banks and Flaxman show both aspects well. Mary Lushington’s memorial displays both the Neoclassical aspects: the mourning woman and clean contour. \textit{(Fig. 42)} The monument to Mrs. Hand shares the similar aspects of a mourning woman. The design “has a simplicity and a directness which is very moving.”\footnote{Whinney, \textit{Sculpture in Britain: 1530-1830}, 328.} \textit{(Fig. 43)} An unusual monument displaying strong Neoclassical aspects is the Bates Memorial (1785), with its geometric appearance softened by the urns, fan at the bottom, and Etruscan-style decoration on both sides of the inscription. \textit{(Fig. 44)} It lacks any kind of human representation, making it distinctive beside the majority of memorials. The last example is the complete view of a Thomas Banks monument for Penelope Boothby, already referred to in this chapter, which highlights the new epoch of sentimentality that society was beginning to express in the late eighteenth century.\footnote{Whinney, \textit{Sculpture in Britain: 1530-1830}, 328.}

As powerful as imagery is, words convey a broader message and if one has to choose between the two because of cost, an inscription is the more affordable option. Epitaphs can also be printed in the newspaper making them more versatile as well. Just as the style of monument and the imagery changed in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, so did the content of the epitaphs.
Epitaphs

The epitaph or inscription on a grave marker is useful for both informing the reader of the deceased and “to mark the final resting place of the dead.” To Joseph Barlow Robinson, an epitaph “is strictly a publication.” He goes on to say that, “an epitaph publishes itself in open sunshine to all the world; and, indeed, has a far better chance of being read, than one book out of every five hundred.” Often epitaphs are considered the most important feature on a grave marker – at least they are to the deceased and their family. However, the observer must always be cautious when reading them because “no one is under oath when inscriptions are written.” This quote, though applicable throughout the early modern period, mostly applies to the eighteenth century. Epitaphs migrated from the Tudor era where the deceased is “described in genealogical terms, listing any offices they held,” to the seventeenth century where a more personal tone appeared, to the hard-to-believe epitaphs of the eighteenth century which had “become so fulsome in their praise of the deceased’s personal virtues that they severely strain credibility.”
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Epitaphs following post-Reformation era often were still written in Latin, though the practice was beginning to wane because of the hint that there may be popish sympathies hidden in the inscription. The practice did continue through the eighteenth century but was in the minority and sometimes the inscription was a mix of Latin and English. The following is an example, with the English and grammar representative of the time.

From Christ Church, Oxford:
Pray for the Soule of Mafter John Hibden, which hath fitablyfyed and founded a perpetual Exhibition for eight Students of this College.79

During the seventeenth century the practice of Latin inscriptions also included Old Testament imagery in their text. One example is found in the grave marker to Jane Shipsea who died in childbirth in 1626. The inscription on her monument states: “Sic mortua est Rachel et sepulta,” which translates to, “So Rachel died and was buried.”80 The Old Testament scripture used comes from Genesis 35:16-20. Later epitaphs for women usually praised them for performing well throughout their life as per the requirements of the gender. Most were written from the viewpoint of their husbands and therefore reflect their role towards their husband. The epitaph for Elizabeth Hamilton of Streatham, Surrey, who died in 1746, is a good example: “Elizabeth / Wife of Major General Hamilton / Who was married 47 years / And never did ONE thing to disoblige
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her husband.”  

As evident in the examples, following the Reformation it was not considered necessary to request prayers for the soul of the deceased.

Post-Reformation, the purpose of the inscription was “not intercession but commemoration, mixed with moral instruction.” Grave markers highlighted the virtues of the dead as an example to the living and focused on the promise of a joyful resurrection. Though the deceased left a message telling of their hopeful entrance into heaven, their desire for posthumous fame was just as important. Their motives were, therefore, mixed. The motto inscribed on the Cambridge college chapel grave marker of Dr. John Caius states it well: *Vivit post funera virtus* (‘virtue survives the grave’).

Near the end of the seventeenth and into the eighteenth century, “a huge volume of human energy and material resources was devoted to this task of commemoration.” Everyone sought to be remembered and ensured this to be the central message of their monument. The rise of self and individualism was growing stronger. Robert Burton, the ‘anatomist of melancholy’ stated that “tombs and monuments . . . epitaphs, elegies, inscriptions, pyramids, obelisks, statues, images, pictures, histories, poems, annals, feasts, anniversaries . . . they will . . . omit no good office that may tend to the preservation of
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their names, honours, and eternal memory.”85 The family members of the deceased, even as late as 1791, faithfully listed the virtues of the deceased in creative ways to ensure that visitors would stay to read and remember them. But it was not only to honor the deceased that they were so highly touted; it was also for the sake of the parents, spouses, and children of the living that the deceased were commemorated.86 The shift from solely focusing on the deceased to also focusing on the living was becoming in fashion. By the eighteenth century families were wont to show a display of grief both in the sepulchral monuments and through their actions following their loss. The survivor’s grief became “the most authentic testimony to the enduring importance of the dead.”87 However, this display of grief took the focus away from the deceased and onto the here-and-now. As the Enlightenment era proceeded forward, this attitude of focusing on the world rather than heaven gained momentum. Here is an example of a father mourning the loss of his daughter:

Mira Hodgkins, died Oct. 3, 1803, aged 9
Dearer than daughter, paralleled by few
In sweetness, patience, suffering – adieu!
Adieu, my Mira, till that day more blest,
When, if deserving, I with thee shall rest.
Come, then thy sire will cry in joyful strain—
Oh come to my paternal arms again!88
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Naturally, there was always a choice on how elaborate a tomb/wall monument/grave marker one would choose for themselves or their loved one. Even though there are the memorable monuments regularly written about, many grave markers in the eighteenth century did not mention the virtues of the deceased. They “simply provided the basic facts of age at, and date of, death together with place of residence and names of closest relations.”89 (Fig. 48) The Colby inscription with its additional genealogy of the family which includes the point that the son rose in status to become a baronet is one example:

Here lyeth,  
in a vault under this pew,  
The bodies of  
Philip Colby, Esq.  
and Elizabeth his wife.  
Also of Thomas Colby, Esq. his brother,  
and several others of the family.  
This monument was erected in memory of  
them, by Sir Thomas Colby, Bart. Son of the  
abovesaid Philip and Elizabeth,  
Anno 1727,  
The abovesaid Sir Thomas Colby, Bart. Died  
Sept. 23, 1729, and is here interred.90

However long the inscription, it seems that text alone was the preferred legacy for the majority entering into the eighteenth century. At the same time, there was a resurgence in including the traditional Christian message of reminding the reader to look to the next world and not the earthly one to find fulfillment. This, however, was sometimes contrary to how they themselves lived. “In practice, most of the population
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implicitly took a more secular view: they cherished life for its own sake, not merely as a preliminary to some future state."\(^{91}\) This new secular lifestyle mindset represents the general outlook that the English society was adopting in the eighteenth century with the Age of Enlightenment. The inscription on William Shenstone’s grave marker represents this mindset well:

*Hales-Owen Churchyard, Shropshire*

**ON WILLIAM SHENSTONE, Esq.**

Died Feb. 11, 1763

Whoe’er thou art, with rev’rence tread
The sacred mansions of the dead.—
Not that the monumental bust,
Or sumptuous tomb, here guards the dust
Of rich or great: (let wealth, rank, birth,
Sleep undistinguish’d in the earth!)
This simple urn records a name,
That shines with more exalted fame.
Reader! if genius, taste refin’d,
A native elegance of mind;
If virtue, science, manly sense;
If wit that never gave offence;
The clearest head, the tenderest heart,
In thy esteem e’er claim’d a part,
Ah! smite they breast, and drop a tear,
For, know, they *Shenstone’s* dust lies here!\(^{92}\)

There was the belief that inscriptions on tombstones were expected to be read. The diary of Lieutenant Hammond of the Military Company of Norwich supports the notion that the public took opportunities to visit the graves of the dead. He wrote, “I must not part until I had seen the Monuments…”\(^{93}\) Often the inscription would reach out to the
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reader by imploring them to pause by saying, “Stay Passenger / And know who lies beneath this stone,” followed by a history lesson in order to encourage some sort of moral improvement.\textsuperscript{94} In a churchyard in Bolton, Lancashire, John Oakly left all future visitors with a substantial history lesson. His grave marker states the following:

\begin{center}
TO THE MEMORY OF \\
JOHN OAKLY, \\
THE SERVANT OF GOD.
\end{center}

Was born in London, 1608; came into this town, 1629; married Mary the daughter of James Crompton, of Breightmet, 1635, with whom he lived comfortably 20 years, and begat four sons and six daughters; since then he lived solely till the day of his death. In his time there were many great changes and terrible altercations: eighteen years civil wars in England; besides many dreadful sea fights; the crown or command of England changed eight times; Episcopacy laid aside fourteen years; London burnt by the Papists, and more stately built again; Germany wasted 300 miles; 200,000 Protestants murdered; this town thrice stormed, and once taken and plundered. He went through many troubles and divers conditions; found rest, joy, and happiness, only in holiness, the faith, fear, and love of God in Jesus Christ.

He died the 29\textsuperscript{th} of April, 1684.

Come, Lord! Jesus, come quickly!\textsuperscript{95}

The Reformers, however, were more determined than most in using their inscriptions for the utmost good of the public by including a wholesome message. Their inscriptions not only listed all the virtues of the deceased, they also chose to continue “the work of the medieval \textit{memento mori} in reminding the onlooker of what awaited sinners in


\textsuperscript{95} Thomas Kinnersley, \textit{A Selection of Sepulchral Curiosities, with a Biographical Sketch on Human Longevity, Containing the Most Sublime, Singular, and Authentic Epitaphs That Were Ever Before Collected. Taken from Monuments and Gravestones in the United Kingdoms of England, Ireland, & Scotland; and in the United States of America} (New York: T. Kinnersley, 1823), 13.
or beyond the grave.”96 Having one last chance to do the right thing by encouraging the contemplative audience to take their spiritual exercises to heart, they ended with the words like, “So thou shalt gaine by looking on ys tombe / A better life than from thy mother’s womb.”97 The number of people able to read these inscriptions grew in the eighteenth century as the literacy rate increased, thus rewarding those who took the time to reach out to the reader in their inscriptions. Eventually, “the growth of literacy brought longer inscriptions. New wording began to be used and accepted. Ornament, too, came largely from the wider world, and included rococo and Adam-style motifs.”98 In conjunction with the rise in literacy was a European-wide cultural tendency to cope with “relativity and variety by focusing on the subject, particularly the viewer’s experience, rather than the object.”99 The viewer was encouraged and reproached in William Hogarth’s inscription:

Here lies the body of William Hogarth, Esq. who died Oct. 26, 1764, aged 67 years
Farewell, great Painter of Mankind
Who reach’d the noblest point of Art
Whose pictur’d Morals charm the Mind
And through the Eye correct the Heart.
If Genius fire thee, Reader, stay,
If Nature touch thee, drop a tear;
If neither move thee, turn away,
For Hogarth’s honoured dust lies here.


The approach assumed a commitment to ‘sensibility,’ which those who left soul-searching inscriptions counted on in their readers. This expectation was a reasonable one to hold since the eighteenth century is often now regarded as both ‘an age of reason’ as well as ‘an age of sensibility.’

**Conclusion**

Grave markers inadvertently are used as a societal tool to reflect the era’s cultural state of mind. In the long eighteenth-century of England, design elements and inscriptions changed from darker religious elements and messages to lighter and more secular ones. Greek and Roman symbols replaced Christian ones, and all of these were driven by the dominant social forces at work: the Scientific Revolution, the Industrial Revolution, and the Enlightenment. As Karl S. Guthke stated so well, “funerary markers are among the cultural features defining civilized humanity.” The design, the symbols, and the inscriptions communicate to the observer the history and life of those that lived during an earlier time. Throughout the age of reason, Enlightenment thinkers were “championing liberty and individuality.” It was the beginning of the mindset of society’s right to happiness, which became the theme of moral essayists. The rejection of gloom and solemnity was a social duty with some taking this duty so far as to leave a humorous inscription on their grave marker. Samuel Foote, a one-legged comedian, actor, and
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playwright, is noted for his joke on himself. He requested the following for his grave marker:

Here lies one Foote, whose death may thousands save,
For death has now one foot within the grave.  

He is buried within Westminster Abbey, however, the Abbey states that there is no marker for his grave. A pity since people would probably enjoy reading his last message to society.

---


Chapter 6

CONCLUSION

In researching the various societal movements that led up to and through the long eighteenth century, it has been demonstrated there was a connection between the movements, the grave markers, and burial sites in England. Fully understanding the connection required reaching back in history to the time of the Romans on British soil. Their impact as a culture is far-reaching. Through the Romans came the introduction to Christianity. Starting from a minority position, Christianity grew to dominate oversight of the dead throughout the land. This brought about a long-term change of practice from cremation to inhumation. The oversight of the dead led to the reversal of the Roman-introduced practice of burying outside the city walls to burying next to places of worship. The Renaissance, Reformation, and Enlightenment movements each brought about a change of viewpoint with regard to one’s world, one’s theology, or one’s identity. All three wore away at the traditional practices of burial.

Within each movement, major events occurred adding complexity to the effect of the movement. The eighteenth century experienced an Agricultural and an Industrial Revolution, as well as the effects of the Enclosure Act passed by Parliament. Migration, food production, and efficient work production changed old community traditions as well as created societal problems. Urbanization, city density increases, and Industrial Revolution coal pollution contributed to public health problems and an increase in death
rates. With these challenges came an increase of population at the same time people were demanding their own permanent burial sites, which led to a serious overcrowding problem at the existing burial sites. The question was then raised about why the burial site overcrowding problem was tolerated for so long at the expense of the living. The answer was found through the evaluation of the Church of England’s supervision of the dead, who out of tradition and profit were reluctant to release their control over the dead. Fortunately, the Enlightenment sensitized the English people to the need to stop ignoring the unhygienic burial sites which were causing so much distress to the living. In addition, the rise of the Dissenter population who were without adequate burial site options demanded representational change.

Change was inevitable due to the fact that during the Enlightenment society was moving from a community mindset to one of individuality. Individuality put a stop to the old system of charnel houses, which had for centuries partially staved off the overcrowding issue. The demand, however, for in-perpetuity burial plots exasperated the overcrowding issue. After centuries of health and space problems created by the overcrowded burial site issue, Parliament separated the Church from oversight of the dead and allowed the creation of independent cemeteries in the early nineteenth century. This overdue action was the solution which settled both the overcrowding issue as well as the Dissenter’s burial.

In the meantime, the funerary art world responded to the enthusiastic ancient Greek and Roman interest as well as the individuality mindset. Interest in antiquity ignited the British world of architecture with Inigo Jones’ spread of Renaissance ideals and the introduction of the Anglo-Palladian style. Sir Christopher Wren made his English
Baroque architectural impact on London with the opportunity given by the Great Fire of 1666. Lord Burlington led the Neo-Palladian style movement for the first half of the eighteenth century, and Robert Adam completed the century with his Neoclassical style. The popularity of the antiquity theme spilled into the nineteenth century with the Greek Revival style of architecture. The rise in interest and belief in the powers of science and mathematics created a demand for these architectural styles showing how the art world was reflecting the societal movements of the Scientific Revolution and the Enlightenment.

Throughout the long eighteenth century, the influence of these architectural movements trickled down to the smallest version of architecture, the grave marker. Grave markers became important to each individual who could afford one. Affording one was made easier after the Industrial Revolution brought about a wider spread of wealth. During this time all class levels began participating in their own commemoration by leaving instructions in wills regarding a marker of their choosing. The Renaissance and the Enlightenment made the greatest impact on grave markers by bringing a change to both the design motifs and the epitaphs. Both aspects turned away from exclusively displaying the traditional Christian symbols and messages warning against death to favoring the Grecian/Roman/Egyptian symbology and secular messages.

Though grave markers and monuments are the miniature cousins to traditional architectural structures, they have plenty to say. They share with buildings the role of revealing societal tastes and various stylistic waves of fashion. They compactly tell stories about cultural values of independence or conformity, of focus on this life or the next, of other-centeredness or self-centeredness, and in the raw data contained in the
dates and ages of death which connect with the public health of the day. One fundamental characteristic in contrast with buildings is the density of information they convey. Dates buildings were built connecting their architectural style with a time period may not be easily accessible. Grave markers and monuments, on the other hand, have their dates as an explicit feature thus allowing ease in correlating styles with time periods. Likewise, mortality records can be directly obtained from the markers thus allowing identification of periods of excessive death correlating with important events like wars, plagues, or poor health policies. Finally, with the return of cemeteries placed outside of cities, the dates on the markers can help establish the pattern of urban growth as the cemeteries became engulfed in the expansion of cities.

Ironically, grave markers of today continue the individuality mindset at the same time as representing a loss of individuality. Each burial is marked by a uniquely designed grave marker, however, each marker can only be individualized to a point. Individualized is the message and the visual motif which usually focus on the deceased and can include photographs and personalized inscriptions. However, gravestones of today must conform to what is allowed in size, choice of symbols, and length of text per cemetery. Mostly gone is the variety enjoyed during the eighteenth century that makes a stroll through an old cemetery so interesting and enlightening. In contrast, today’s message speaks of society’s utilitarianism and disinterest in death. Future historians will have fewer grave markers in which to decipher considering the popular and financially affordable return to cremation and the spreading of the deceased ashes in a number of locations. How does this practice speak of today’s social mores? How long will it be before the inscription becomes so condensed that is will only contain a hashtag? All of today’s idiosyncrasies
do speak of the culture of the day, and like present day historians who sometimes must learn to read Latin or old English, future historians will have to learn the ‘language’ of the day in order to understand the message.
Appendix

Architectural Examples

Left:
A. Classical Orders
   1. Doric
   2. Ionic
   3. Corinthian
B. Derived Orders
   4. Tuscan
   7. Doric Roman
   6. Composite

Right:
A. The Doric Order
   1. Mutule
   2. Triglyph
   3. Guttae
   4. Necking
   5. Hypotrehelion
   6. Astragal
B. The Ionic Order
   6. Flat frieze
   7. Convex frieze
   8. Volutes
C. The Corinthian Order
   9. Modillion
   10. Dentils
   11. Acanthus foliage

Fig. 1: Greek and Roman Orders, *Architecture & Ornament*
Fig. 2: The Greek Key, “Illustrated Glossary of Classically-Inspired Architectural Terms,” https://columnsdirect.com/pages/glossary

Fig. 3: The Basic Pediment Design, www.houseappeal.wordpress.com/2013/09/10/pediments-classical-elements-of-ancient-architecture/
Fig. 4: Banqueting Hall, Whitehall, London,
Inigo Jones and Wren; or, The Rise and Decline of Modern Architecture in England
Fig. 5: Design for a Palace, Andrea Palladio
Fig. 6: Venetian Window,  
*The City and Country Builder's and Workman's Treasury of Designs*
Fig. 7: Ionic and Corinthian Window Examples,
*The City and Country Builder's and Workman's Treasury of Designs*
Fig. 8: Palazzo Antonini in Udine, *Andrea Palladio*, by Cornelius Gurlitt
Fig. 9: Palladian Niche at Belton House (1685-1688),
https://www.pinterest.de/pin/399272323198457840/
Fig. 10: Variations of Pediment Design,  
*Designs of Buildings and Ornaments*
Fig. 11: Pediment Examples,
*The City and Country Builder's and Workman's Treasury of Designs*
Fig. 12: A Tribute to the Memory of Sir Christopher Wren, by Charles Robert Cockerell, www.britishmuseum.org
Fig. 13: Home House, London (1775),
*The Elements of Style: a Practical Encyclopedia of Interior Architectural Details, from 1485 to the Present*
Fig. 14: Adelphi Ceiling by Robert Adam (1771), Victoria and Albert Museum, London
Fig. 15: Festoons, Plastic Ornaments Catalog IV

Fig. 16: Wreaths, Plastics Ornaments Catalog IV
Fig. 17: Various Ornamentation,  
*A Manual of Historic Ornament*
Fig. 18: Ornamentation,
*The Styles of English Architecture*
Fig. 19: Painted filigree "grotesque" work made famous by Robert Adam, *The Elements of Style: a Practical Encyclopedia of Interior Architectural Details, from 1485 to the Present*
Grave Markers of Varying Styles

Fig. 20: Sir Robert Steward (1570), Cambridgeshire, City of Ely, http://www.churchmonumentsgazetteer.co.uk/Cambridgeshire-%20Ely.html.
Fig. 21: 4th Earl of Rutland (1591),
*Sculpture in Britain*
Fig. 22: Thomas Owen (1598),
Courtesy of the Dean and Chapter of Westminster
Fig. 23: King Edward VI (1573? Never built),
_Sculpture in Britain_
Fig. 24: Baron Burghley (1598), *Sculpture in Britain*
Fig. 25: Lady Carey (1617/18), *Sculpture in Britain*
Fig. 26: Lady Carey (1617/18), *Sculpture in Britain*
Fig. 27: Sir Dudley Carleton (1632),
Courtesy of the Dean and Chapter of Westminster
Fig. 28: Robert Aldsworth (1635),
*Sculpture in Britain*
Fig. 29: Dame Jane Boys, *Sculpture in Britain*

Fig. 30: Thomas Randolph, *Sculpture in Britain*
Fig. 31: Thomas Mansell and William Morgan (1681), Memorials & Monuments
Fig. 32: 1st Duke of Beaufort (1700), *Sculpture in Britain*
Fig. 33: Viscount Campden (1686), by Tedster007,
www.commons.wikimedia.org/w/index.php?curid=71922205
Fig. 34: John Cecil, Earl of Exeter (1707), Find-a-Grave, www.findagrave.com/memorial/73384361/john-cecil
Fig. 35: Sir Isaac Newton (1727),
Courtesy of the Dean and Chapter of Westminster
Fig. 36: George Stepney (1707),
Courtesy of the Dean and Chapter of Westminster
Fig. 37: Matthew Prior (1722),
*Sculpture in Britain*
Fig. 38: Mrs. Judith Cary (1715), Memorials & Monuments

Fig. 39: Elizabeth Corbett (1724-6), Memorials & Monuments
Fig. 40: Sir George Fettiplace (d. 1743),
Fig. 41: Mary, Duchess of Montagu (1775),
*Sculpture in Britain*
Fig. 42: Mary Lushington (1799),
_Sculpture in Britain_
Fig. 43: Mrs. Hand (1785),
*Sculpture in Britain*
Fig. 44: Bates Memorial (1785),
*English Mural Monuments and Tombstones*
Fig. 45: Penelope Boothby (1793),
_Sculpture in Britain_
Fig. 46: Thomas Sackville (1678),
Art and Architecture, Courtauld Institute of Art,
www.artandarchitecture.org.uk/images/conway/a0dbece7.html
Fig. 47: *Death of Germanicus* (1774),
History of Art: Architecture and Sculpture,
www.all-art.org/Architecture/21-1.htm
Fig. 48: Lucy Weller (1786),
*English Mural Monuments and Tombstones*
Fig. 49: Agnes Sarah Harriet (1798),
*Death in England*
Bibliography


Calendar of the Manuscripts of the Most Honourable the Marquess of Salisbury ... Preserved at Hatfield House, Hertfordshire. Vol. VII. London: H.M.S.O., 1883.


Cunliffe, Barry W. Iron Age Communities in Britain: An Account of England, Scotland and Wales from the Seventh Century BC Until the Roman Conquest. EBSCO Publishing: eBook Collection (EBSCOhost), n.d.


“Dublin Evening Post.” August 11, 1792.


Ramsey, Stanley C. Inigo Jones. New York: Charles Scribner’s Sons, 1924.


Shaftesbury, Anthony Ashley Cooper, Earl of. Characteristicks of Men, Manners, Opinions, Times: In Three Volumes. London: John Darby, 1732.


Some Customs Consider’d Whether Prejudicial to the Health of This City. London: E. Matthews, 1721.


The Inscriptions Upon the Tombs, Grave-Stones, Etc. in the Dissenters Burial-Place near Bunhill-Fields. London: E.Curll, 1717.


The Globe, April 24, 1843.

Bell’s New Weekly Messenger, April 30, 1843.