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Chapter 1:
Introduction

Gravestones provide a wealth of information not only on the individual memorialized, but also on the society that produced it. Investigating graveyards, burial markers, and burial plots reveal an insight into past death practices which may not be uncovered through written documents, and help fill gaps within the historical record. Baugher and Veit believe grave markers to be “the ultimate artifact”, as their purpose is to literally convey information to future generations, while most other objects were disposed and forgotten once their usefulness ended (2014: 2). The markers are partially documents and partly material culture; American gravestones are described as documents in stone (Baugher and Veit 2014: 2).

They not only mark the location of the deceased and provide a space for the living to visit and mourn, but also allow insight into popular societal practices and beliefs of the time period they were created. Memorial stones aid in uncovering information on particular communities, as, “they are complex, symbolic bundles of social, cultural, and individual meanings fused onto something we can touch, see, and own,” (Martin 1993: 141). The gravestones are commonly dated, associated with a known individual, generally remain in their original locations, and can help examine issues concerning socioeconomic status, trade networks, gender, race, religion, ethnicity, regional culture, and consumer behavior (Baugher and Veit 2014: 79).

Various factors are involved when deciding a manner in which to commemorate the deceased. Gravestone designs, including their form, size, decoration, inscriptions, epitaphs, and locations have shown to be a helpful indicator of social change, status, consumerism, gender, and ethnicity (Baugher and Veit 2014: 2). Influential elements contributing to gravestone styles include religious beliefs about the nature of the afterlife and the ontology of being, which affect the scripture and iconography of burials (Baugher and Veit 2014: xv). Of equal importance are
the availability of certain materials, such as raw building materials, as well as access to resources, racial hierarchy, time and place of death, and manner of death, such as military-related deaths.

Because of these elements, there is great variability in death practices and commemoration. Therefore, gravestone memorials and their diversity must be studied in the broader context of death, commemoration, and burial, “so that the elements of surviving material culture can be seen as active in different parts of this set of cultural meanings and activities,” (Mytum 2004: 13). While headstones display numerous characteristics, stone carvers provided little to no written record describing the impetus for their stylistic choices (Hijia 1983: 340). Hence, it is essential to observe the characteristics of gravestones in order to gain insight into the society that created them.

The following study investigates grave markers in Philadelphia and its surrounding suburbs, placed between 1800 and 1930. The major economic movement occurring during this era was the North American Industrial Revolution, beginning in the late 1700s up to approximately 1870, partially inspired by the preceding British Industrial Revolution. This period focused on shifting away from an agricultural economy and hand-producing goods within the home, towards the growth of an industrialized economy, mass-producing goods outside of the home within factories. With this major economic change came social ones. The middle class emerged due to an increase in available jobs, salaries grew allowing additional monies for non-essential items, once prized objects reserved for the wealthy were mass produced, allowing lower classes to purchase them at a lessened cost, and the ideal of consumerism was introduced.

Consumerism is an economic strategy which stabilizes the economy by encouraging the purchase of certain goods and services created by manufacturers. The act of acquiring these
goods and services is known as consumption. Consumption not only alters spending habits, but social ones as well: how individuals equate their place in society in terms of their acquisition of goods, their relationship with material objects, and how their consumption habits alter their sense of self.

Through studying gravestones in a period when consumption was at its peak, the potential to understand how the act of exorbitant acquisition impacted how individuals and their survivors, who may have chosen their stones, viewed their place in society, the manner in which the ideal impacted their sense of self, and how they wanted to be remembered for these beliefs after death, can be uncovered. Doing so also helps understand if consumption impacted the smaller “forgotten” artifacts, such as memorial stones, in addition to the more obvious material objects, such as grand homes and household goods. Grave markers were also chosen for analysis because of the finality they represent. They epitomize what was important to the individuals during their life and how one chose to be remembered to the living, as well as the culmination of ideals at the forefront of society at the time they were placed.

Seven cemeteries were investigated in the Philadelphia area, five within the city proper and two in the surrounding New Jersey suburbs. Different types of burial grounds were chosen to understand if location, size, and spiritual affiliations were impacted differently. The grounds within Philadelphia were three small church-adjacent burial yards and two large secular grounds, part of the growing garden cemetery movement that emerged in early 1800s. One church-adjacent cemetery and one large garden cemetery were investigated in New Jersey to provide a set of data to compare and contrast to results found within the city, and uncover if practices present within the burgeoning city flowed outward towards the surrounding areas, or vice versa.
A total of 398 memorials were observed, studying stone size, shape, and iconography. Results were listed for each cemetery and placed chronologically based on the year of death. Organizing findings in this manner allowed detection of any changes emerging within particular time frames and if it could be contributed to the societal impacts occurring during the same period, particularly consumerism. The results of all seven cemeteries were also combined and organized sequentially, to understand if any similar changes were apparent not only within each individual burial ground but across all of them.

This study aims to add an anthropological view to a period of American cultural history that historian scholarship has dominated. I argue understanding the impact the of the consumerist ideology on 18th and 19th century North American residents will show how overarching changes within societies trickle down and impact the smaller, oft overlooked aspects. Studying these material objects is of equal importance to understand a society, culture, and its peoples.
Chapter 2: Historical Context

The American Industrial Revolution began in the last quarter of the 18th century, which changed not only economic but social practices of the developing country. Concurrently, some of the earliest American burials were performed and gravestones placed. The following details the histories of each event, describing the societal impacts of the former and the practices of the latter during the same period of time.

The North American Industrial Revolution

The North American Industrial Revolution began in the last quarter of the 18th century, drastically evolving the American lifestyle in numerous aspects. Brady exclaims the Industrial Revolution, “transformed society and its institutions, given birth to new social and economic orders, and set the stage for the great ideological confrontations of the 20th century,” (2004: 22). The revolution shifted the economy from agrarian-based toward manufacturing, as well as the production of goods from handmade within the home to machine-made in factories. The introduction of efficient machinery allowed for goods to be produced in large quantities, therefore reducing their price and making them attainable to the majority of the population (Brady 1981: 22).

The start of the revolution actually has roots in the United Kingdom. England attempted to keep the growth of manufacturing practices within their boundaries; therefore, their colonies, including the United States, would be self-sustaining in terms of food production but remain economically dependent on their mother country for goods (Brady 1981: 22). This practice also eliminated any potential for economic competition between England and its colonies.
Though the New World was not formally industrialized until the late 18th century, the pattern of manufacturing dates back to the earliest colonists. They began creating products locally that were needed frequently and swiftly, such as tar, glass, and soap (Gibb 1946: 106). In addition, as more skilled laborers immigrated to America, the amount and skill level of local manufacturers began increasing, producing more homegrown goods within the colonies (Gibb 1946: 106).

A combination of factors brought on the official start of industrialization in America. The growth of the factory systems, introducing methods of business administration, and political action were each crucial to the development of the Industrial Revolution (Gibb 1946: 105). The early manufactures of goods were handcrafted by skilled laborers, which were produced in workshops and homes. Merchants worked on a small scale, often partnering in business within their own families, amongst family friends, or long-term business associates (Tucker 1981: 300).

However, the evolution towards the use of power-fueled manufacturing began in the 1790’s. During this time, wind, water, and horse-powered machines were slowly introduced to local mills, often working alongside handicraft stores (Gibb 1946: 109). This decade was the period between the Pre-Industrial Revolution and the Industrial Revolution, when the two eras were less individually identifiable and they began to mesh (Gibb 1946: 113).

Each major American east coast city experienced the shift from homegrown to factory manufactured goods at different times, but three major factors contributed to the growth of industrialization: Samuel Slater, the Embargo Act of 1807, and the War of 1812. Englishman Samuel Slater brought established manufacturing methods to America in the late 17th century (Gibb 1946: 105). Dubbed “Father of the American Industrial Revolution”, Slater was
knowledgeable in methods of the textile trade through working with a dynamic British manufacturer (Tucker 1981: 298).

Emigrating to the United States in 1789, Slater began working with popular mercantile families in New England, introducing business models from England and forming partnerships with them to grow their manufacturing practices (Tucker 1981: 299). The skilled laborers of handmade goods already possessed needed experience and knowledge in order to manage power-based machinery; therefore, the introduction of new manufacturing techniques combined with pre-existing skilled workers allowed for the introduction and flourishing of industrialization in America (Gibb 1946: 115).

Eventually, manufacturers used Slater’s business models and began establishing industrial mills throughout New England and the mid-Atlantic (Tucker 2005: 23). For example, by 1850 Philadelphia became the epicenter for textiles and handloom weaving, where, “the sound of these looms may be heard at all hours in garrets, cellars, and outhouses, as well as in the weavers’ apartments,” (Tucker 2005: 23). The diverse immigrant population also helped Philadelphia become one of the first major industrialized cities, as labor was never in short supply. The growing numbers of skilled newcomers aided in filling roles within factories, such as handloom weavers and water-powered machine attendants (Shelton 1984: 366).

The additional circumstance contributing to large-scale manufacturing outside the home was the Embargo of 1807. Enacted by Thomas Jefferson in 1807, its purpose was end France and Great Britain’s practice of seizing neutral American ships, but also restricted trade with all foreign countries (Frankel 1982: 291). This devastated the American economy, which was not stable enough to support itself without foreign aid, and in order to obtain needed goods, citizens were forced to produce the goods themselves (Frankel 1982: 291-292). The expansion of
manufacturing also contributed to the War of 1812, which occurred because Great Britain attempted to block trade between America and France, reducing the import of foreign goods.

Therefore, mills and factories began appearing both locally and nationally to meet demands (Conrad 1995: 13).

All of these sizable events occurred concurrently with the introduction and expansion of various modes of transportation, helping expand production and trade across the country. Canal companies, turnpike trusts which collected tolls, and growing railroad companies provided the transportation framework for a growing economy (More 2000: 31). More explains, “...throughout the whole of the Industrial Revolution period one type of transport mode or another was being actively developed…” (2000: 31).

The great amount of jobs created by industrialization changed the social class structure from only the wealthy elite and lower class, by the addition of the middle class. In addition, to an emerging social class and the increase in tangible objects, the beginnings of a consumerist culture were being formed. Pollard describes a major societal effect caused by industrialization as, “the pressure on consumption and material standards of living of the mass of the population, at a time when it is forced for adapt itself to major social changes,” (1958: 220). As more efficient production practices allowed for goods to be sold at lower prices and the emerging middle class individuals acquired larger incomes, additional funds could be spent on non-essential items, disseminating the ability to consume from the upper to the middle and lower classes (Pendergast 1998: 27). Therefore, the Industrial Revolution created a society that was encouraged to consume, and because of extraneous funds, the lower classes had the ability to purchase goods once reserved for the wealthiest members of society.
**History of Early American Burials**

While early American economic strategies were being placed and their societal impacts coming to fruition, the earliest burials were being placed simultaneously. Following the Reformation, in which the first immigrants left Europe for other lands, including North America, in search of religious freedom, several thousand foreigners fled and settled in New England. Their presence is noted by the few burial stones predating the 1660s in the Massachusetts Bay colony (Duval and Rigby 1978: vii). While many European memorials of the historic period are underground burials with scant burial markers surviving, surface markers, such as gravestones, are the majority of the remaining record in the northeastern coast of North America (Mytum 2004: 13). Few colonial settlements in the American southwest and California were established; therefore, the majority of colonial-era studies were performed in the eastern United States.

**Early American Burial Grounds**

Death rates during the 16th, 17th, and 18th centuries were exceedingly high; urban locations, rural areas, and colonial communities all experienced similarly large mortality rates (Mytum 2004: 13). In early America, most colonists would have lost a family member in their earliest years (Mays 2004: 100). Death was not glossed over or hidden from view; it was a common occurrence that was dealt with swiftly. Even children witnessed deaths “because the experience was believed to be important for their understanding that death could strike at any time,” (Mays 2004: 100).

Formal burials in colonial North America occurred mainly in community grounds, family property such as individual farmland, and in or around or in parish churchyards or synagogue burial grounds (Mytum 2004: 15; Baugher and Veit 2014: 127). Around the early 17th century,
the earliest period of colonial burials, communal interments were common practice. Community burials were mainly under the control of religious jurisdiction; the few burials found outside the designated religious burial grounds belonged to criminals and those excommunicated from the Church (Mytum 2004: 15-17). Community burial grounds in 17th century New England may have been as far as a kilometer away from meeting houses, which acted as community centers (Mytum 2004: 18).

Religion was a major foundation for early colonial burial practices. These practices varied by region, with southern Anglicans, northern Puritans, and small scattered groups of Quakers determining how death was treated in their communities (Mytum 2004: 13; Mays 2004: 102). The earliest funeral rites for the first colonists were rooted in Puritan practices. During these burial rites, attendees were not permitted to kneel, chant prayers, or sing; Puritan beliefs claim each soul’s fate was predetermined and lavish commemorations were not advantageous to the deceased (Duval and Rigby 1978: vii). However, as congregations grew independent of one another, they no longer closely adhered to these customs (Duval and Rigby 1978: vii). Burial rites became a much more secular practice than spiritual and by the mid-18th century; laws were placed to restrict excessive funeral displays (Duval and Rigby 1978: vii).

Funerals of the early 17th century did not have overtly religious aspects; the processions went from the home of the deceased to the burial ground where a civil ceremony was performed (Mytum 2004: 18). As communities began spreading into more disbanded settlement patterns away from town centers in the late 17th century, meeting places and burial grounds were placed beside one another. Funerals became centrally located and now contained religious components such as a sermon and prayers in the meetinghouse (Mytum 2004: 18). This period of alteration of burial location gave interments greater prominence and easier access in the community.
Permanent stone burial markers coincided with the changes in burial location; therefore, this shift may have been a component in the widespread use of the markers (Mytum 2004: 18).

**Early American Grave Markers**

The earliest external markers placed on early colonial graves were believed to be constructed of lumber. Wooden grave markers rarely survived the elements and eventually disintegrated (Mytum 2004: 25). A popular style using lumber was a post and rail; one wooden post sat at the head of the grave, the other the foot, and rails or boards ran along the length of the grave (Mytum 2004: 26). Iconography or text could be carved, painted, or inscribed on the posts, including symbols of morality (Mytum 2004: 26).

By the mid-17th century, a limited number of headstones began being placed in the English-speaking world, with a slow increase in use thereafter (Mytum 2004: 27). Soon, stones surpassed wooden markers in popularity during the late 17th century. The growing use of stone markers may have stemmed from, “a combination of improving the unshaped fieldstone placed at the head (and perhaps the foot) of graves to mark them, and the placing in an upright plane the designs and texts from the ledger type memorials,” (Mytum 2004: 26). Mytum also suggests the stones evolved as certain graves were surrounded by a fence that could imitate elements of the bed; this occurred when the idea of death as sleep is highlighted in society (2004: 26). In addition to headstones, footstones were also placed to mark the end of a grave and occasionally a protective stone was placed over the grave, shaped either flat, rounded to reflect the mound of soil underneath, or carved in the shape of the body wrapped in a shroud (Mytum 2004: 29).

The earliest remaining legible engraved headstone in North America is found in the Dorchester region of Boston, Massachusetts, belonging to Bernard and Joan Capen, who died in
1638 and 1658, respectively (Mytum 2004: 27). The debut of subsequently produced memorial stones varied from region to region along the eastern coast. Most memorial stones in major colonial settlements began to be created and placed at the end of the 18th century, even in territories which had been settled for a lengthy amount of time (Mytum 2004: 28). For example, New Yorkers imported stones from New England and did not begin to produce their own grave markers until about 1750, while during the same period the majority of markers from Virginia continued to be imported already carved from Britain (Mytum 2004: 28).

The earliest gravestone carvers also performed other stonework, such as masonry or bricklaying, and created stones for recreation. The first gravestone carvings were simplistic and unpolished. However, as stones grew in popularity, carvers devoted their talents only to burial stones, with each having their own unique style (Duval and Rigby 1978: viii). In order to meet the growing demand for burial stones, families established workshops that produced stylistically similar stones over generations (Duval and Rigby 1978: viii).

The first American grave markers were originally reserved for the most prestigious members of the community, such as famous clergyman, mayors, and governors (Mays 2004: 103). Slowly, families began placing crude stone markers in remembrance of the deceased until the 1730s. The earliest of these stones were not carved and bore minimal inscriptions. These engravings stated the initials, age, and year of death of the deceased; eventually small ornamentation and the day and month of death were included (Duval and Rigby 1978: viii).

Burial memorials evolved from these crude stones into thick vertical headstones, which were surrounded by a border and a smaller stone was placed at the foot of the grave. Placement of the stones and border were meant to symbolize a bed, as the “deceased awaited the reward of resurrection,” (Duval and Rigby 1978: viii). The shape of most 17th and 18th century vertical
headstones had a central arch top with two small arches on both sides or simply on arched top (Veit and Nonestied 2008: 20).

Additional styles of memorial stones were also placed in the late 18th century. Flat stones placed on top of the graves, called ledgers, were used during this period by those who could afford the slabs of material (Mytum 2004: 29). The stones were most commonly rectangular in shape, though hexagonal outlines were also produced. In most cases, the stones helped prevent gravediggers from encroaching on their burial space when placing future interments (Mytum 2004: 29). The ledgers helped prevent the grave being disturbed by animals, therefore were sometimes referred to as “wolf stones” in New England (Mytum 2004: 29). Tombs were also placed during this period, as either a slab placed on pillars or as a solid or hollow box, allowing the sides to be engraved. However, this style was rare during this period in North America and the stones rather plain, with highly decorated tombs being imported from England (Mytum 2004: 31).

Generally, epitaphs of the early period of colonial burial were exclusively for men. Early epitaphs focused on judgment, brevity of life, and worldly vanity; by the end of the 18th century information such as family relations and the deceased moral qualities began to appear on grave markers (Mays 2004: 103). Inscriptions in Latin were also used often, including “Frugit hora”
(The hour is fleeting), “Memento te esse mortalem” (Remember that you are mortal), and “Memento mori” (Remember that you must die) (Duval and Rigby 1978: viii). However, by the 18th century women were slowly starting to be memorialized with inscriptions (Mays 2004: 103). The gradual appearance of epitaphs on women’s gravestones may have signaled the growing respect for motherhood in the formation of a new nation (Mays 2004: 103).

Iconography began to appear on memorial stones in the mid-1670s. Mortality-based symbols such as winged death’s-heads, skeletons, skulls, and crossbones, darts of death, coffins, and pallbearers were common in the Massachusetts Bay Colony (Duval and Rigby 1978: viii). Carvings also represented the passing of time, illustrated through the hourglass, candle and snuffer, scythe, and Father Time (Duval and Rigby 1978: viii). Imagery grew common amongst colonial-era grave markers because churches and meetinghouses did not allow iconography due to their sacred purpose and the secular life could not impose on their functions (Duval and Rigby 1978: viii). Therefore, the burial grounds were considered to be of this world and imagery on stones intended to educate the living on the moral beliefs of the Puritans (Duval and Rigby 1978: viii).

Symbolism varied from locations. A number of factors contributed to this, such as local customs, regional carvers, religious beliefs, and cultural diversity. New England, for example, saw early popularity in death’s heads symbolism, which later moved towards cherubs and then to urn and willow tree iconography (Dethlefsen and Deetz 1966: 503). However, the iconography in New Jersey reflected the cultural diversity of the area: winged cherubs, hourglass, axes, crossbones, and skulls (Baugher and Veit 2014: 104).

As religious attitudes eased, the imagery reflected in gravestones was less powerful during the 19th century. Grave markers were starting to be composed of white marble with
carvings of cinerary-urns, willows, and pilaster carvings; so much so burial grounds were beginning to look monotonous (Duval and Rigby 1978: ix). Monument manufacturers were established due to the industrial age, creating similar, tedious memorial styles unlike the unique patterns of local carvers (Duval and Rigby 1978: ix).

Changes in 19th Century Burials

The American Revolution impacted culture, economics, and politics of 18th century North America. Regardless of the unsteady political system, American commerce flourished since mercantilism was lifted (Baugher and Veit 2014: 126). A wide variety of jobs emerged as the growing industrial sector overtook the agrarian lifestyle. As transportation improved with the creations of the Erie Canal and similar aqueducts, factory-produced affordable goods were more accessible to American consumers, allowing them to obtain greater material items, including gravestones (Baugher and Veit 2014: 127).

Approaching the late 18th and early 19th century, the cultural shift from an agrarian-based society to an industrialized one impacted burial practices. Though a slow process, disorganized burials were transformed into arranged cemeteries, monuments replaced markers, and regional carving culture was replaced with national and international memorial trends. Cremation and embalming practices were also introduced as advanced procedures for body preservation (Baugher and Veit 2014: 125).

By the early 19th century, church graveyards in urban areas were full; yellow fever and cholera epidemics between the 1790s through the 1820 caused high death rate in urban populations, leading to the overpopulation of graveyards (Baugher and Veit 2014: 127). This sparked health concerns as burial grounds were starting to be associated with disease outbreaks
(Baugher and Veit 2014: 127). New York was one of the earliest cities to address these concerns. New York City invested in underground burial vaults that held a great number of bodies, establishing the New York Marble Cemetery in 1823 and the New York City Marble Cemetery in 1830. These cemeteries were small, located too close to developing city centers, available only to the wealthy and people were reluctant to be interred in an alternative burial space (Baugher and Veit 2014: 129).

Community members of other major east coast American cities sought alternative clean burial grounds that would be available to individuals outside of the upper class. They “worked to solve the problems of overcrowded, unsightly, and unsanitary burials places by designing new burial places, organized and incorporated and business and managed by a board of trustees,” (Baugher and Veit 2014: 127). McDannell argues in addition to wanting to create sanitary and orderly burial grounds, founders of rural cemeteries wanted to ease the pain of death by providing moral instruction and comfort to those suffering (1987: 278). The scenic landscape “purified the sentiments of visitors, while monuments to the dead evoked a sense of history, continuity, and patriotism,” (McDannell 1987: 278).

Prior to 1831, large-scale modern graveyards did not exist in North America. As a response to the increasing land values in city centers and the growing urban populations in major east coast cities, secular burials in large cemeteries outside of densely populated areas were becoming increasingly popular (Baugher and Veit 2014: 125). The term “cemetery” grew in popularity in the 19th century as death was believed to be a progression from life to eternal life instead of transitioning into decay (Baugher and Veit 2014: 127). The term stems from the belief of death as sleep; it is derived from the Greek word for “sleeping chamber” (Baugher and Veit 2014: 127).
The idea of garden cemeteries was not unique to the colonies. England experienced comparable overcrowding in burial yards; the cemetery reform movement arose from this burial crisis and with it came the first modern cemeteries in Britain (Baugher and Veit 2014: 127). The lack of adequate space for burials was alleviated with the introduction of rural cemeteries, large secular burial grounds. The nonsectarian cemeteries were generally established just outside of cities in less expensive suburban areas. The term “rural cemeteries” is not always an accurate description of the grounds; some were found just on the edge of cities and many are found completely within today’s city limits (Baugher and Veit 2014: 130). Occasionally designed by landscape architects, rural cemeteries, sometimes described as “garden”, or “romantic” cemeteries, predated large urban parks. They were viewed as outdoor museums and viewed as a merger of nature and art (Baugher and Veit 2014: 125).

The first rural cemetery is considered the Père Lachaise Cemetery in Paris, France, established in 1804. McDannell explains Père Lachaise ingrained the new principle for burial grounds separated from religious authority (1987: 176). The blooming vegetation, winding paths, and grand trees inspired visitors to meditate on “the glories of heaven”, and many of the tombs motifs were widely intimidated in other rural cemeteries (Baugher and Veit 2014: 128 and McDannell 1987: 277). In North America, New Haven, Connecticut was the earliest city to call for burial reform. A combination of overused city burial grounds, the growing population, and high death rate due to disease, was the catalyst for the construction of New Haven Burying Ground 1796. The cemetery was formed in a grid pattern with family plots, greenery, and a central road at the entryway (Baugher and Veit 2014: 129).

Britain and North America during the 1820s and 1830s followed the French concerns for “privately-controlled cemeteries situation in a natural environment free from urban blight, and
filled with gravestones that promoted civic and domestic virtues,” (McDannell 1987: 277). The first rural cemetery constructed in North America was in Mount Auburn, Massachusetts in 1831. Established by the Massachusetts Horticultural Society, it is considered the next evolution in burial practices after New Haven Burying Ground; it was designed as a beautiful and pleasant landscape, a style fashionable in England (Baugher and Veit 2014: 129).

The layout of the cemetery itself was orderly and precise, a model later rural cemeteries would replicate. Families would purchase expensive acreage and erect cast iron fences around the property, where they would place family monuments (Baugher and Veit 2014: 130). Some monuments were extravagant, displaying the family’s wealth and investment in their family lots (Baugher and Veit 2014: 130-131). Single plots were available for individuals who could not afford large lots but they were restricted on the type of monuments they could place (Baugher and Veit 2014: 130).

The next two rural cemeteries erected in North America were Laurel Hill Cemetery in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania in 1836 and Green-Wood Cemetery in Brooklyn, New York in 1838. Both cemeteries emulated the neat layout of Mount Auburn and were also major attractions that received large numbers of visitors (French 1974: 53). The rural cemetery style dominated popular tastes in the 1800s and spread throughout the Northeast United States, with such grounds being established in New York, Maryland, and Massachusetts (French 1974: 53).

Rural cemeteries became so commonplace by the end of the 1850’s that most towns or cities of any size contained one, becoming an American institution (French 1974: 53). During this period, external monuments were omnipresent and prominent. By the late 19th century more than half of the population received permanent gravestones, compared to the handful of individuals in the late 18th century (Mytum 2004: 58).
Headstone style also evolved during the 19th century, influenced by the revival of Gothic and Egyptian architecture. Gothic style was reflected in stone shape, while the Egyptian revival was seen through decor and stone shape such as mausoleums and obelisks (Mytum 2004: 65). In addition, marble round-topped tablets, scroll-shaped stones, mausoleums, and cross-shaped monuments grew popular in this period (Mytum 2004: 65-66). During this era, there was a general trend toward larger height and therefore visibility for memorials.

Decor and symbolism also transitioned during this period. While early grave markers were generally plain, they began moving toward displaying symbolism. Floral decor dominated the iconography of 19th and early 20th stones, which may be attributed to Victorian-era taste (Mytum 2004: 80). Cherubs were a popular choice, often displayed holding shrouds or with symbols of mortality like the hourglass (Mytum 2004: 76). Urns were part of the growing Neo-Classical style of the period, while Gothic revival led to using the cross and monograms (Mytum 2004: 77). Concerning epitaphs, they “tended to shift from warnings to the living from the deceased in the grave to explicit statements by the living,” and biblical quotations grew popular (Mytum 2004: 80).

Rural cemeteries remained popular up to 1870, which then gave way to lawn-park cemeteries. Lawn-park cemeteries aimed to “emphasize open spaces, dispersed trees and plantings, small grave markers close to the ground, and a limited number of monuments in a narrower range of sizes and styles,” (Baughner and Veit 2014: 144). This style of burial grounds grew in popularity by the end of the 19th century, as it allowed the wealthy to display their wealth through large monuments and mausoleums on uncluttered grounds (Baughner and Veit 2014: 145-146). While housing the elaborate markers of the wealthy, park-lawn cemeteries were monotonous and lacked the diversity typically seen in rural cemeteries.
History of Philadelphia Cemeteries

The city of Philadelphia was laid in 1682 and by 1700, the city’s population increased from a few hundred settlers to over two thousand; thus, the need for more burial sites was evident (Keels 2003: 9). The earliest emerging burial yards in the area reflected the variation of religions, income levels, and races, including Quaker, Episcopalian, Protestant sects, Catholic, Jewish, enslaved and free African Americans, the poor, prisoners, and unknowns (Keels 2003: 9). Historians estimate approximately one hundred and twenty colonial graveyards existed at the city’s peak, but less than twenty have survived to present day (Keels 2003: 9).

Before secular cemeteries grew popular in the mid-19th century, most Philadelphia residents were buried in churchyards in earthen graves (Cotter et al. 1992: 199). The most esteemed community members were interred within crypts in the church’s walls, floors, transept, nave, or chancel (Cotter et al. 1992: 199). Families with enough space in the city or their country estates created private burial lots for their household (Keels 2003: 9). Such grounds remained present into the early 20th century until expanding neighborhoods forced their elimination.

The lower classes were placed in public burial grounds named “potter’s fields” where their bodies were placed, often on top of one another, with little expense (Cotter et al. 1992: 199). Potter’s fields were not only used for the impoverished; they also were used during epidemics, which resulted in mass deaths. When plagues of yellow fever, typhus, and smallpox broke out in Philadelphia, burial needed to be performed quickly for sanitary reasons. Therefore, unless the victim’s family could afford a quiet church burial, the body was placed in a swiftly dug grave in a public burial ground (Cotter et al. 1992: 199).

Commemoration practices are generally not stagnant; this has proven true for Philadelphia burials. By the mid-18th century, burials had become simple affairs, with the
deceased buried in plain coffins and few markers; the style eventually reverted back to more elaborate events in the early 19th century (Cotter et al. 1992: 199). The reasoning behind the change “coincides with a transition from the Quaker and Puritan view that death is the end of an earthly journey, upon which the body should be unceremoniously abandoned, to an idea that the body is a precious entity, whose remains should be treated accordingly,” part of the Victorian-era manner in approaching death (Cotter et al. 1992: 199-200).

With this changing attitude towards death came the recognition on how poorly burial grounds were maintained. Rural burial grounds fell into great disrepair; the article, “Burial of the Dead”, published in the November 1841 issue of The Christian Examiner stated, in regards to rural graveyards, “the state in which they have fallen shows little reverence or regard for those who sleep beneath their sods,” (Brazer 1841: 146). Urban burial grounds for the lower classes faced similar, if not worse, conditions. Graves in potter’s field were often over thirty feet deep, holding coffins stacked one on top of the other until a few feet below the surface (Cotter et al. 1992: 201). Examples throughout Philadelphia include the First African Baptist Church cemetery, active from 1823 through 1842, with up to five bodies placed in a single grave, and in a mid-19th century potter’s field in West Philadelphia, on what is today the University of Pennsylvania’s Franklin Field, bodies were unearthed up to twenty feet deep (Cotter et al. 1992: 201).

The need for more burial space in Philadelphia was indisputable before the end of the 18th century. Small church burial yards were over capacity by 1794, thus the municipal government started purchasing land outside the city for burials (Cotter et al. 1992: 201). Eventually, privately owned cemeteries appeared: Ronaldson’s Cemetery opened in 1828,
followed by the rural cemeteries Laurel Hill in 1836 and Woodlands in 1849, signaling the start of the “cemetery beautiful” movement in Philadelphia (Cotter et al. 1992: 201).

James Ronaldson established the first non-sectarian burial ground, Ronaldson’s Cemetery, in 1827. The city’s first independent burial ground was a semi-rural landscaped plot open to all white Protestants, complete with gravel paths allowing visitors to leisurely stroll through the yard (Keels 2003: 9). Local churches were adamantly opposed to Ronaldson’s Cemetery, as they would lose their burial fees if secular cemeteries grew popular (Keels 2003: 9). Until rural cemeteries grew popular years later, Ronaldson’s was the Philadelphia area’s leading burial ground.

Soon after the establishment of Ronaldson Cemetery, the rural cemetery movement began to appear in Philadelphia. Laurel Hill Cemetery was founded by laymen Benjamin Richards, Frederick Brown, Nathan Dunn, and John Jay Smith (McDannell 1987: 275). During autumn 1835, Smith, director of the Library Company and member of the Arch Street Meeting House, searched for his five-year old daughter’s grave in the Quaker cemetery at Arch and Fourth Streets in Philadelphia (McDannell 1987: 275). For economic reasons, graves at this burial yard were placed on top of the other, or superimposed (Cotter et al. 1992: 200). Therefore, he was unsure whether he had actually visited the grave of his daughter as the number of burials had quickly increased. Smith accused the Quakers of neglecting a final burial place and eventually felt motivated to find an alternative solution (McDannell 1987: 275 - 276).

While The Society of Friends did not support lavish mourning, such as grand grave markers and funeral processions, Smith felt the poor manner in which residents of Philadelphia cared for the deceased was becoming a moral issue (McDannell 1987: 276). Smith and fellow aforementioned laymen formed the “Laurel Hill Cemetery Company” and purchased thirty-two
acres of land that has previously served as a country estate (McDannell 1987: 276). The lot, which was functioning as a burial space by the 1840s, sat high on a hill, which ran three miles along the Schuylkill River (McDannell 1987: 276).

One of the most distinguished architects during this period, John Notman, was hired to design the grounds of Laurel Hill (Cotter et al. 1992: 202). The Woodlands was an additional rural burial ground within the Philadelphia area, established in 1840. The two cemeteries displayed a diverse variety of markers, such as simple crosses, elegant mausoleums, and massive obelisks (Cotter et al. 1992: 201). The cost of being buried at these cemeteries was considerable due to the upkeep of maintaining thoroughly landscaped greenery (Cotter et al. 1992: 201). Both Laurel Hill cemetery and the Woodlands cemetery were resting places of choice for the Philadelphia elite (Keels 2003: 35).

The popularity and economic success of these two cemeteries triggered the creation of other larger, secular cemeteries between 1845 and 1860 in Philadelphia (Keels 2003: 49). As the Woodlands and Laurel Hill cemeteries appealed to an elite clientele, these subsequent cemeteries focused on the middle class. The burial grounds competed with one another for business, constructing elaborate gatehouses in popular architecture styles of the time, including Egyptian or Classical (Keels 2003: 49). Over twenty rural cemeteries were formed in Philadelphia by 1876, each appealing to the many religious, racial, social, economic, and ethnic groups within the city (Keels 2003: 49). As Philadelphia grew in size and population, and thrived industrially, more residents wanted a tranquil and lush resting place for their family members (Keels 2003: 49).
Chapter 3:
Literature Review

Studying Gravestones as Material Culture

Archaeologist James Deetz’s belief in studying modest artifacts, the objects which quickly escape one’s mind and interest, was the basis for studying Philadelphia-area gravestones of the colonial era. Deetz elaborated this idea in his 1977 publication *In Small Things Forgotten: An Archaeology of Early American Life*. He explains that material objects left behind by past peoples provide information on how their societies and cultures functioned; it is a different way of looking at the past outside of the written record (Deetz 1977: 4-5).

Deetz proposes that studying burial markers specifically is crucial in understanding the thought process behind memorial practices of early American settlers. He elaborates, “The mortuary art of colonial Anglo-America is unique in providing us with a tightly controlled body of material in which to observe stylistic changes in material culture and to relate this change to change in the society which produced it,” (Deetz 1977: 89). The stones are ideal for archaeological study as they allow control of the three archaeological dimensions: space, time, and form (Deetz 1977: 89). Space as it was assumed they would not be moved far from their original location, time as they were engraved with dates, and form as their variation in decor can be easily identifiable (Deetz 1977: 90-92).

American historians and genealogists have long been interested in early North American grave markers. Publications concerning colonial burials and grave markers began emerging during the early 19th century. One of the earliest publications was a selection of epitaphs entitled, *A Collection of American Epitaphs and Inscriptions, with Occasional Notes*, composed by Timothy Alden in 1814 (Baugher and Veit 2014: 79). The authors of a series of mid-19th
century state histories, William Howe and John Barber, often used grave markers to exhibit discussions of historical figures (Baugher and Veit 2014: 79). Many colonial churches observed significant anniversaries between the late 19th century and early 20th centuries, which included publishing photographs and epitaphs of notable markers (Baugher and Veit 2014: 79). The first substantial academic publication on early colonial grave markers was authored by Harriette Merrifield Forbes in 1927, entitled, *Gravestones of Early New England and the Men Who Made Them, 1653-1800*. Her publication approached grave markers as an art form to be studied and catalogued (Baugher and Veit 2014: 79). Forbes identified individual carvers, described their variation in style, and catalogued their work.

However, it was not until archaeologists James Deetz and Edwin Dethlefsen published their pioneering studies of colonial gravestones that the markers became a focus of archaeological study. The pair published a series of articles in the 1960’s and 1970’s exploring the changes in gravestone iconography and their reflection on cultural ideals. In their second article, “Death's Heads, Cherubs, and Willow Trees: Experimental Archaeology in Colonial Cemeteries”, published in *American Antiquity* in 1966, they argued studying colonial gravestones were ideal for studying archaeological methods. The stones are dated so they provide chronological records of change and were created by educated people whose history is known; therefore, design changes can be compared with historical data and events, showing the relationship between changes in material objects and the changes within a society (Dethfelsen and Deetz 1966: 502).

The United States Bicentennial also brought upon a new interest in the arts and industries of colonial America. During this time, folklorists, art historians, and artists became interested in grave markers. They viewed the stones as, “objects made or modified by man reflect,
consciously or unconsciously, directly or indirectly, the beliefs of individuals who made, commissioned, or purchased them and by extension, the beliefs of the larger society to which they belonged,” (Baugher and Veit 2014: 79).

An example of this belief can be seen evidenced through the publication, *Memorials for Children of Change* by Dickran Tashjian and Ann Tashjian. The authors present the idea of Puritan burial as civil rather than religious; therefore, regardless of how society felt of religious art, gravestones were excluded from artistic restriction (Ludwig 1999: xxix). Ludwig explains, “this does not make them less significant or symbolic, but it does make them more understandable in the culture that gave rise to them,” (1999: xxix). Studying the dissemination of symbolism in gravestones as well as other commonly found cultural objects, such as embroidery and metal work, help show the how ideals and beliefs change within a culture (1999: xxix).

**Seriation Theory and The Doppler Effect**

Hoping to gain a greater understanding into colonial culture, Deetz and Dethlefsen aimed to discover the reason religious iconography began changing on headstones in Massachusetts cemeteries. In the pair’s 1965 article, “The Doppler Effect and Archaeology: A Consideration of the Spatial Aspects of Seriation”, they set out to test the theory of seriation on the iconography of colonial grave markers in eastern Massachusetts, carved by Jonathan Worcester. The pair used the seriation theory to organize their results. Popularized by archaeologist James Ford in his landmark 1936 study, “Analysis of Indian Village Site Collections from Louisiana and Mississippi”, seriation theory states certain artifacts, such as a pottery and jewelry, increase in popularity, peak, and then recede (O’Brien, et al. 2000: 46).
The cycle of popularity can be graphed, which usually forms a battleship-shaped curve, with the peak of popularity composing the middle, widest section, by plotting the results against time, Dethfelsen and Deetz concluded the prominence of death’s head aligned with the popularity of Puritanism and the shift towards cherubs could reflect the changing religious ideals and beliefs brought about by the Great Awakening (Dethfelsen and Deetz 1966: 507).

Figure 3.1 Examples of the Seriation Method (Dethlefson and Deetz 1966: 505; Deetz 1967).
The theoretical framework for this study is based in part on their research of applying the archaeological seriation method on colonial-era gravestones. Employing the seriation method in this study, by plotting stone shape, size, and iconography chronologically, aided in showing developing trends, or lack thereof, in Philadelphia during the period of flourishing industrialization. Understanding changes in burial practices in a specific time frame allowed the results to be aligned with the ongoing economic and societal changes of the same period, thus providing insight if the latter impacted the former in the major city.

Additionally, the pair made two supplementary assumptions on stylistic changes based on their results. They first concluded that, “any type used in seriation originated at a single locus and subsequently spread outward from that point,” and secondly, that “sites further removed from the locus of origin of any type will show the occurrence of that type, at a given frequency, later in time,” (Deetz and Dethlefsen 1965: 196-197). Deetz and Dethlefsen arrived at this conclusion using the Doppler Effect concept, which states if a certain artifact was first produced at one location and distributed to others, it would appear later at the area to which it was distributed rather than where it was formed. Implementing the Doppler Effect on the results uncovered through this study helped discern if burial marker characteristics placed on stones in Philadelphia cemeteries were then seen on stones the cemeteries outside of the city in the following years. Hence, aiming to understand if emerging and popular societal ideals disperse in a particular manner away from their epicenter.

Alternative Findings

Dethlefsen and Deetz’s formative investigation spurred similar studies on grave markers, though sometimes with differing and challenging results. David Hall’s 1976 article, “The
Gravestone Image as a Puritan Cultural Code”, argues the earliest colonial gravestones were not related to Puritanism but rather the “momento mori” concept. The Latin phrase translates to, “Remember that you must die”, and did not aim to memorialize the deceased but rather to educate the living by emphasizing the inevitability of death (Baugher and Veit 2014: 88).

Sherene Baughner and Frederick A. Winter’s 1983 publication, “Early American Gravestones: Archaeological Perspectives on Three Cemeteries of Old New York”, investigated the changing gravestone iconography in a major American east coast city. While their investigation provided data similar to Deetz and Dethlefsen’s studies, the location and its residents differed greatly. While New England was ethnically homogenous, New York housed an ethnically diverse population, which was reflected in burial grounds (Baughner and Winter 1983: 48). Baughner and Winter concluded gravestone iconography is not a reflection of ethnicity or religious affiliation, explaining one should not assume the changing motifs could be credited to religious beliefs (1983: 53).

Patrick Gorman and Michael DiBlasi’s study of mortuary ideology in the American Southeast uncovered different reasons for the diffusion rates of stone iconography and shapes. In their 1981 publication, “Gravestone Iconography and Mortuary Ideology”, the pair used Deetz and Dethfelsen’s “Doppler Effect” method to evaluate grave markers in the Georgia and South Carolina to uncover if motif patterns spread at a similar rate to New England gravestones. Gorman and DiBlasi discovered, “the distance of a southeastern cemetery from a motif’s point of origin elsewhere is not meaningfully related to the chronology of the motif’s point of origin,” (1981: 93). This lack of spatial patterning may be attributed more so to various economic and social occurrences: importation of New England-carved grave markers, remote rural
communities out of touch with popular trends, local craftsman and the inability to transport their products outside their community, and diversity in local styles (Gorman and DiBlasi 1981: 94).

Identifying these additional studies and challenges to Deetz and Dethfelsen’s seminal studies allowed for comprehending these results through different lenses. This investigation focused on a large growing northeastern American city; therefore, it is important to note results may differ from those of investigating smaller, more rural areas of New England. Changing iconography should not naturally be attributed to ethnicity or changing religious beliefs; they should be interpreted through multiple lenses. Additionally, the results of Gorman and DiBlasi’s study prove gravestone iconography take different routes of dissemination according to the area. This was important to note as comparing urban and suburban cemeteries of different faith traditions in Philadelphia may have experienced the spread of iconography at varying paces.

**Industrialization and Growing Consumption Practices**

Consumption is the act of acquiring goods and services, and is part of the larger economic practice of consumerism. The encouragement of consumption of particular goods organizes and stabilizes an economy by encouraging the desire and purchase of the products and services products supplied by manufacturers (Stearns 2001: 16). Consumerism “describes a society in which many people formulate their goals in life partly through acquiring goods that they clearly do not need for subsistence or for traditional display,” and not only impacts economic practices but social ones as well (Stearns 2001: ix). This encouragement is seen through a combination of factors: multiplying the amount of available goods, culture encouraging consumption as a lifestyle, higher incomes allowing for purchase outside of essential goods, and, most importantly, advertising (Pendergast 1998: 29).
The main theories posed by scholars focus on whether a changing economy and society influences consumption habits, if consumption habits are a separate phenomenon from industrialization, and how changing consumption habits in the cultural landscape impact how individuals view themselves. Each set of theories has their own respective set of literature, some of which builds upon as well as contrasts prior theories and assumptions. Comparing, contrasting, and filtering the collected data to these ideologies provided the framework for interpreting the changes observed in gravestones.

One of the earliest critiques of cultural impacts due to economic changes is “The Theory of the Leisure Class” by Thorstein Veblen. Published in 1899, Veblen described how the growing act of consumption impacts social relations and cultural norms within a society. He describes the practice of conspicuous consumption, which is, “a pattern of conduct that is intended to realize the goal of maintaining of enhancing an individual’s social position,” (Campbell 1995: 38). Veblen’s theory suggests individuals in a society, which is thriving economically, want to display their success and thus differentiate their status from individuals of lower class. He explains they, “desire to excel in pecuniary standing and so gain the esteem and envy of one’s fellow-men,” (Veblen 1899: 16).

The following decades experienced an absence of literature on the systematic study of consumption. Pendergast explains historians and economists failed to focus on consumption habits as, “they believed that materialism has contributed to the degradation of cultural life and social customs that existed in an imprecise prelapsarian past,” (1998: 24). While some scholarly work was being produced on consumption, such as Veblen’s theory, this work had little impact on historical writings. Historians preferred to explain modern society in terms of production and
supply, viewing economic growth as a response to increased supply, which in itself is a reaction of increased production (Pedergast 1998: 24).

However, a shift in occurred in the 1970’s and 80’s, where sociologists and historians started focusing on consumption to understand queries that have arisen within their respective disciplines. They focused on two major periods of change in America’s short history: the arrival and advancement of 18th century market economies and the movement from proprietary to corporate capitalism around the start of the 20th century (Pendergast 1998: 26). The particular focus during these periods was the “proliferation of goods in the 18th century ‘consumer boom’ and the influence of advertising and corporate retailing on consumption patterns in the early 20th century,” (Pendergast 1998: 26).

During this period of growing interest in the history of consumption, the idea that a consumer boom and the Industrial Revolution were autonomous was presented. Neil McKendrick, John Brewer, and J.H. Plumb were among the first historians to show how economic and social changes of the 18th century was the catalyst for consumption practices in their 1982 book, The Birth of a Consumer Society: The Commercialization of 18th-century England. The authors argue consumption was not a byproduct of the Industrial Revolution but part of a separate consumer boom, which was of equal importance to transforming society (Pendergast 1998: 26). Historian Cary Carson and his colleagues agreed with this belief, presenting the idea of a “consumer revolution” in which everyday household items were essential not only to individual’s social status but how they defined themselves (Veit 2009: 117). Carson believed the revolution was brought on by mass production and advertising, and it actually preceded and contributed to the Industrial Revolution (Veit 2009: 118).
Studies soon followed negating McKendrick, Brewer, and Plumb’s assertions, as well as Veblen’s theory. Lorna Weatherhill also challenged their views through studying probate inventories, illustrations, and diaries to understand if material lives reflected social status. She explains lower classes did not attempt to emulate the upper class; rather, she links consumption patterns to class, which she considers strictly defined by income (Weatherhill 1988: 189). Therefore, she links the increase of available goods to changes in consumption habits, but only in proportion to individual’s income.

Consumption’s Impact on Social Behavior

Moving away from viewing the practice through an economic lens, scholars began analyzing consumption behaviors from a cultural and social viewpoint. Consumer culture theory (CCT) identifies the interdisciplinary nature of the study of consumerism, and refers to the group of theoretical perspectives which interpret the links between consumer actions and cultural meanings (Arnould and Thompson 2005: 868). Instead of looking at culture as a shared way of life, CCT encapsulates the belief that, “consumer culture denotes a social arrangement in which the relations between lived culture and social resources, and between meaningful ways of life and symbolic and material resources on which they depend, are mediated through markets,” (Arnould and Thompson 2005: 868-869).

An aspect of CCT is investigating the manner in which individuals impacted by industrialization and consumerism viewed themselves. Pendergast explains the rise of consumer culture had the tendency to alter acceptable behavior and expectations by those affected (1998: 30). Sociologist David Riesman investigated the changing consumer culture in his 1950 publication, The Lonely Crowd. Riesman argued that American character was once “inner-
directed,” motivated by traditional practices learned in childhood focused on a specific set of ideas and values, but moved towards “other-directed,” being shaped by current technological and cultural changes (Wrong 1992: 382). The “other-directed” character is, “more sensitive to the immediate social setting than to the echoes in his or her head of parental injunctions long ago,” as well as more aware of the expectations, wishes, and feelings of fellow members of society (Wrong 1992: 382).

Bringing a social science perspective to consumption are Mary Douglas and Baron Isherwood. Their 1978 publication *The World of Goods: Towards an Anthropology of Consumption* tried to interpret the relationship between individuals and the goods they consume. They present the ideology of consumption being a form of social communication, where individuals who consume particular commodities are showing their status of being part of a distinct culture (Douglas and Isherwood 1978: 37). Douglas and Isherwood stress not to view goods in terms of their actual use, such as providing sustenance or shelter, but, “try instead to the idea that commodities are good for thinking; treat them as a nonverbal medium for the human creative faculty” (Douglas and Isherwood 1978: 41).

Mihalyi Czikszentmihalyi and Eugene Rochberg-Halton explain identities are “cultivated” through the individual's relationship with inanimate material objects for consumption. They explain self-development is impacted by objects, and understanding their relationship provides insight that American culture is addicted to materialism (Czikszentmihalyi and Rochberg-Halton 1981: 164). The pair studied 315 individuals at various income levels to uncover their relationship with material objects. They discovered an individual’s relationship with goods help illustrate their social relations, purpose within the world, and essentially their sense of self (Czikszentmihalyi and Rochberg-Halton 1981: 196).
Chapter 4:  
Methodology

In order to accurately investigate burial practices of the 18th and 19th centuries, seven Philadelphia-area burial sites and memorials, actively used between 1800 and 1930, were selected. This included modest, large, suburban, city, secular, and religious burial grounds; each was important to understanding the changes occurring within the city’s memorial practices. All burial grounds were erected either before the start of the Industrial Revolution or during the height of industrialization.

Focus was paid on both religious and secular burial sites. Doing so helped detect if both types of burial grounds and the individuals buried there were impacted in any manner by growing industrialization. Attention was also paid to the year each cemetery was established; grounds placed both before and after 1800 were selected. Cemeteries constructed before the start of the 19th century provided examples of burials placed prior to the Industrial Revolution arriving in Philadelphia and how pre-existing cemeteries were impacted due to consumerist ideals beginning to appear as societal standards. Studying burial grounds placed after 1800 gave insight into burial practice methods after the start of industrialization.

The cemeteries were carefully chosen to provide insight into the aforementioned variety of burial landscapes throughout the region. Laurel Hill Cemetery and The Woodlands are nonsectarian grounds within the area of East Falls and University City within Philadelphia, respectively. These cemeteries served to represent the growing rural cemetery movement which started in the early 19th century, as well as secular burial grounds within the city proper. Laurel Hill Cemetery was constructed in 1836 and The Woodlands Cemetery in 1840, while the Industrial Revolution in the Philadelphia-area was in its zenith.
Figure 4.1 Locations of Philadelphia Cemeteries (Google Maps 2017).
Three church-adjacent burial grounds within Philadelphia were also selected to provide insight into religiously affiliated burials. These cemeteries comprise some of the oldest burial grounds in the city; all were constructed sometime in the 18th century. Established in 1758, St. Peter’s Church is an Episcopal church within the Society Hill neighborhood, near the city center of Philadelphia. Next to this ground is Old Pine Street Church, a Presbyterian church, established in 1768. Built between 1698 and 1700, Gloria Dei (Old Swedes) Church, an Episcopal church, was also investigated.

Figure 4.2 Locations of New Jersey Cemeteries (Google Maps 2017).
Studying suburban burial grounds provided information on if and how the changing ideals which infiltrated cemeteries in the city trickled to the outlying area. Established in 1702, St. Mary’s Episcopal Church in Burlington, New Jersey allowed for information to be gathered concerning religious-based burial practices within the suburbs of Philadelphia. Riverview Cemetery in Trenton, New Jersey, a rural cemetery, was formally incorporated by an act of the State Legislature in 1858, although Quaker burials have been placed on the grounds since the late 1600’s (New Jersey Department of Transportation n.d. 3, 7). This burial ground provided information concerning a suburban, nonsectarian garden cemetery.

After the burial grounds were chosen, the first task upon commencing research at each site was selecting the sample size. While the date range of stones remained consistent amongst all burial grounds, identifying stones placed between the late 1700s and early 1900s, the amount of stones surveyed from each burial ground varied based on its size. For example, within the smaller church-adjacent lots, St. Peter’s Church, Old Pine Street Church, and Gloria Dei Church, all legible stone’s which fell between the aforementioned death date range were noted, disregarding those which were highly degraded and illegible. These burial grounds were investigated in their entirety as their sizes allowed for a manageable sampling. The same criteria applied to the suburban grounds of St. Mary’s in Burlington, NJ and Riverview Cemetery in Trenton, New Jersey. This typically amounted to capturing between thirty and sixty burials for these cemeteries.

However, the rural/garden cemeteries studied, Laurel Hill and The Woodlands, were exceedingly large and provided a great selection of gravestones compared to the church-adjacent grounds. Therefore, between 50 and 100 burials were identified from various locations within the grounds, except for Riverview Cemetery, which did contain many burials that adhered to the date
range. Degradation of the markers was also an issue for the rural grounds; however, due to the immense amount of stones from which to choose, illegibility proved less of a problem.

The theory on which I based my data collection and analysis was the aforementioned seriation method popularized by James Ford (see Chapter 3: Literature Review). Similar to Deetz and Dethlefsen’s landmark study of New England stones, grave markers were organized chronologically, which helped identify any evident patterns within size, shape, or symbolism over time. Characteristics were noted from each cemetery, as well as combining findings from all grounds, in order to show trends in each individual cemetery as well as potential patterns across all burial grounds.

Data collection began with photographing each legible stone that fell into the decided date of death range, approximately 1800-1930, resulting in a sample of 398 memorials. Focus was paid only on the year of death listed on the stone; markers without month and/or day listed for either birth or death dates were still included in the sample. While possible for stones to be placed at a different time than the year of death, for purposes of this study it was assumed the date of death listed on the stone was the year in which it was erected.

Numerous elements were noted for analysis: year of death, age, sex, stone size, stone shape, and symbolism/iconography. A preliminary study of grave markers in the Philadelphia area aided in creating categories for the most commonly seen iconography, such as religious decor, monograms, inscriptions, etc., as well as stone shapes. Each characteristic was recorded in a spreadsheet for each individual cemetery.

An unexpected characteristic presented itself when investigating individual stones: multiple burials listed on one stone. For this situation, each deceased was listed individually in the cemetery spreadsheets. Individuals were noted instead of each stone because each person was
considered as choosing that particular stone style, shape, and symbolism for their marker. Analysis was meant to uncover individual’s choices for their burial stones and marking each person individually aided in this discovery.

It is also important to note stone carvers most likely created stones, and family members possibly chose the memorial stone for their recently departed loved ones. However, for purposes of this study, it is assumed the deceased chose the characteristics of their stone, representing their beliefs and how cultural ideals of the period impacted them.

During analysis, three main characteristics, stone size, shape, and iconography, were organized chronologically based on the year of death. Formulating results in this manner followed the seriation method employed by Deetz and Dethfofelsen in their study of New England gravestones. Doing so allowed seeing if any attribute increased in popular, hit a peak, then receded thereafter, particularly between the start of industrialization around 1800 and its zenith around the mid-century. The headstone data was then compared against the rise and advancement of industrialization to uncover any potential correlation. Sex, age, and year of death were also noted to understand if these characteristics were of any impact on gravestones or particularly impacted by the changing societal patterns.
Chapter 5:
Results

Results from each cemetery were organized into six categories: stone shape, size, and symbolism, as well as the age, sex, and year of death of the deceased listed on each marker. The following details the results in each category, organizing the findings chronologically. Formulating the characteristics by date ranges allowed to see particular patterns within the findings, helping uncover if burial practices were impacted in any aspect by the growing consumerist culture of 19th century Philadelphia.

Stone Shape

The shape of gravestones varied greatly amongst each cemetery in both religious and secular burial sites. The most commonly found shapes within all cemeteries were oval, obelisk, square, and rectangular. The next most popular shapes were cross, ledger, aboveground tombs, tri-pointed, and followed by circular, column, pillar, and pyramid with the lowest number of stones. However, shape was not highly impacted by a changing culture in comparison to the other factors studied, unlike size and iconography.

Although each cemetery had a fair amount of stone shape variation, as at least four different shapes were found at each cemetery, oval remained the most populous stone shape in five out of seven burial yards. These cemeteries were Gloria Dei Church, Old Pine Street Church, St. Peter’s Church, St. Mary’s Church, and Laurel Hill Cemetery. The popularity of oval shaped stones did not falter, as their appearance spans the entirety of the time period studied, first placed before 1800 and appearing in every decade until the 1930’s.

In the two remaining cemeteries, the most popular stone shape differed from the traditional oval shape most prevalent in the other five cemeteries. In the Woodlands Cemetery,
the most placed stone shape was rectangular, with the height of its placement in the second half of the 19th century, first placed in 1855 and appearing until 1913. Square dominated the stone shape in Riverview Cemetery, which first appears from 1848 and appearing in every decade up to the early 1900’s. In comparison to the other five burial grounds, oval shaped stones was the third most popular stone in The Woodlands Cemetery, first appearing in 1860 and placed over the next three decades, to the 1890s. Riverview Cemetery had the least number of oval stones, with the sole stone placed in 1881. Based on this evidence, I feel these two burial grounds were most impacted by the changing societal ideals and style, as different burial stone shapes outnumbered traditional oval and tri-pointed stones.

While the traditional oval stone remained the most common shape used within five of the burial grounds, these cemeteries were also impacted by popular trends of the time. Both secular and religious burial yards were not immune to the changing stone shapes that appear by 1850 and onward; the most commonly being obelisk, square, and rectangular. All of these shapes were also being placed as memorial stones within these burial grounds. Within these five cemeteries, obelisk shaped stones began appearing between the early and mid-1800s, square shaped placed in the first and last quarter of the century, while rectangular stones were generally placed closer to mid-to-late 1800s.

A focus was paid to obelisks, aboveground tombs, and columns, as they were some of the largest stones placed. While not the most popular marker shapes, obelisks were present in every burial ground, with the earliest being placed in 1812. It was the second most popular stone shape after oval, with 62 stones total, with the highest amount placed in the 1860s and 1870s. The great placement in these two decades coincided with growing preference for Egyptian architecture
during this period; therefore, all cemeteries felt the influence of changing gravestone tastes to varying degrees.

Aboveground tombs were one of the least placed stones; only 16 stones out of 398 total classified as this shape. However, three of the four cemeteries containing aboveground tombs were placed after 1867; only in St. Peter’s Church were tombs placed in late 18th century, with death dates between 1776 and 1791. While exceeding large, only nine column-shaped markers were noted, with the highest amount was placed in the 1870’s. The placement of these larger memorials in the latter half of the 18th century, after the height of the Industrial Revolution, may suggest the desire for larger and differing shapes influenced by conspicuous consumerism of the time.

The results also pointed to a notable finding concerning cross-shaped stones. While relevant literature and studies do not note this shape as notable of the time, the results proved it to be an emerging trend within the Philadelphia metro area. Cross-shaped burial markers were seen in five out of the seven cemeteries investigated: Gloria Dei Church, St. Peter’s Church, St. Mary’s Church, The Woodlands Cemetery and Laurel Hill Cemetery.

Unsurprisingly, three of the five burial grounds that contained cross-shaped stones were religiously affiliated, but two garden cemeteries also contained the religious markers. In total, all
but two of the 23 cross-shaped stones were placed in the decades from 1870 and 1910. This shape did not follow the seriation model of growth; it appeared suddenly with little build up to their popularity, with their placement slowly receding in the following decades.

Overall, the classic oval shape remained a popular burial marker throughout the entire time period, but all cemeteries saw the placement of differing stone shapes during the 18th century. However, their placements were not high enough to overcome the classic oval shape, which was the most popular at 114 stones total. The majority of stones with death dates closer to the start of the 19th century tended to be the traditional oval and tri-shaped. Nearing the mid-19th century saw the emergence of ledgers, obelisks, and small numbers of rectangular shaped stones placed, and in the last quarter of the century, square, rectangular, aboveground tombs, and cross-shaped stones began to be erected. Over the time period studied, religiously affiliated burial grounds maintained more traditional markers, adhering towards oval and tri-shaped stones, while secular grounds saw greater variation in shape. However, both saw changes in shape around the mid-18th century, to varying degrees.

**Stone Size**

Concerning stone size, large was the most popular stone size, with a total of 143 stones. The next most popular sizes were medium with 132, small with 85, and extra-large with 38. The second most popular stone size, medium, had placement numbers rivaling the first. In fact, all cemeteries with large as the most popular stone size were closely followed by medium sized stones.

Large was the majority stone size found in five out of the seven cemeteries investigated. Large stones were relatively the most popular stone size in the decades 1840, 1860, 1870, and
1900, dominating the stone size placement of the time, while small sized stones were amongst 
the least popular of these decades. This shows a gradual increase in popularity of larger sized 
stone markers, while small gravestones were becoming placed less often. This shows a pattern of 
seriation amongst large stones coinciding with the introduction and height of the Industrial 
Revolution.

The time period which large stone sizes first appeared at the five burial grounds slightly 
varied. Old Pine Street Church, St. Peter’s Church, and Riverview Cemetery all saw the first 
appearance of larger sized stones closer to the start of the 19th century while larger stones at 
Laurel Hill Cemetery and The Woodlands Cemetery were present around the mid-19th century. 
The church-adjacent cemeteries were all established before 1800, while Laurel Hill Cemetery, 
The Woodlands Cemetery, and Riverview Cemetery were created around 1840. Therefore, one 
can conclude these burial grounds began placing larger shaped stones relative to the date they 
were established, with all impacted by the societal impacts of industrialization.

Extra-large was never a dominant stone size, with only 38 of the 398 markers falling 
within this classification. However, both rural cemeteries, Laurel Hill and The Woodlands, had 
the greatest number of extra-large stones, at 10 and 11, respectively. Church-adjacent burial 
grounds had at most two extra-large stones, marking a stark difference in the placement of grand 
stones.

In the two remaining burial grounds, the most common gravestone size at St. Mary’s 
Church is small, first appearing in 1706, and the most popular at Gloria Dei Church is medium, 
first placed in 1721. While the most dominant stone size in the additional five cemeteries, large 
gravestones was the third most popular stone size in both Gloria Dei Church and St. Mary’s 
Church, first appearing around 1829 and 1866, respectively. Based on these results, it can be
concluded gravestone sizes was a characteristic impacted by changing societal and cultural ideals, regardless of location within the Philadelphia area or religious or secular affiliation of the grounds.

**Iconography**

Across all seven cemeteries, symbolism and iconography were diverse regardless of the type of burial ground. The most popular iconography was various types of inscriptions, religiously affiliated engravings, floral decor, and urn statues. However, the distribution of the most commonly found symbolism varied within each burial ground.

The majority of burial grounds had a larger percentage of decorated gravestones than undecorated stones. St. Peter’s Church, St. Mary’s Church, The Woodlands, Laurel Hill Cemetery, and Riverview Cemetery all contained a larger number of decorated stones, while Gloria Dei Church and Old Pine Street Church had a greater amount of undecorated stones. Undecorated markers appeared earlier than decorated ones, as most stones placed throughout the 1700s lacked carvings or decor. Decorated and undecorated stones were placed consistently throughout the time period studied with no discernable pattern identified.

However, there were patterns of the appearances of specific symbolism, and the appearance and number of each type of symbolism was unique to each cemetery. Every burial ground had stones containing religious iconography or scripture. The placement of such symbolism first appeared by 1810’s and after the initial placement of religious symbolism on gravestones, their use can be seen consistently throughout the remaining decades. The appearance of religious decor overlaps with the appearance of cross-shaped gravestones discussed in the “Stone Shape” subsection.
Inscriptions, floral iconography, and urn statues were the next most commonly placed symbolism. These three characteristics follow the seriation model at the same time; all three experienced a slow increase in popularity, peaked between 1860 and 1890, and decreased in popularity. Urn statues appeared on 39 memorials and in five out of seven burial grounds: Old Pine Street Church, St. Peter’s Church, The Woodlands Cemetery, Laurel Hill Church, and Riverview Church. All but one was placed post-1845. Urns and draped urns, last placed in my sample in 1918, represent mourning and were an incredibly popular stylistic choice of the period.

Inscriptions appeared on stones in every cemetery, first appearing before 1800 and seen in every decade up to the 1920s, placed on 210 total memorials. The most popular inscriptions were religious and biblical quotations and stating relations of deceased, such as “Wife/Husband of…” or “Daughter/Son of…”. Floral decoration was placed on 71 memorials and also appeared in each cemetery, first appearing near the mid-18th century in 1830 and placed consistently throughout the remaining decades studied. Floral engravings represent the shortness of life, often placed on headstones for individuals who died at a young age (Sarapin 1994: 32).

An additional burial style that was noted in this research was the cradle grave memorial, popular during the Victorian era. This particular type of burial marker contained a headstone,
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footstone, and side rails, representing the parts of a bed. Cradle graves represented the aspect of death as sleep, likening a passing to an eternal sleep, helping to ease sadness felt by mourners. While the cradle grave style appeared in five of the seven cemeteries, Gloria Dei Church, Old Pine Street Church, The Woodlands Cemetery, Laurel Hill Cemetery, and Riverview Cemetery, the total number is low, with only 21 stones taking this shape and symbolic meaning. This particular style began being placed close to the mid-19th century in 1836, coinciding with the popular Victorian tastes of the period (Cotter et al. 1992: 199-200). Cradle stones did indeed follow the seriation model, and peaked between 1870 and 1890. While I do attribute their appearance to a combination of the Victorian-era influence on American taste and growing mentality of consumption, it appears it was not a commonly chosen style and did not have a large impact on burial trends of the Philadelphia metro area.

The type of gravestone symbolism chosen to investigate was partly based on relevant literature and what appeared to be frequently appearing iconography observed during my preliminary investigation. Of this popular iconography, the least noted of the time in the Philadelphia area proved to be books, wreath, angel/cherub, and monograms. Academic and book iconography symbolizes focus on either education and religious text, wreaths represent victory in death, angel/cherub symbolize a guide to heaven and protection, and monograms often represented family names (Sarapin 1994: 28).

However, concerning this particular set of symbolism, besides religious symbolism, it was sparsely seen in the church-adjacent burial grounds, but was more popular in the two secular rural cemeteries. While consumption impacted religiously-minded individuals to emphasize their spiritual beliefs via stone size and shape, I conclude individuals buried in secular grounds were
impacted by other changing societal beliefs which this set of iconography represent, including an emphasis on education, family connections, and a sense of victory in death.

In addition, each cemetery contained other types of symbolism that appeared sparingly. Carvings of anchors, harps, unique floral engravings, wood logs, stone designs, scrolls, handshakes, columns, hourglasses, and shields were scattered throughout the seven cemeteries. These symbolisms were seen in low numbers and with no patterns for each type identified. Some of the aforementioned iconography are representative of particular beliefs, such as anchors representing hope and hourglasses signifying the passage of time, and their appearances are not discredited as being meaningful to the deceased for which they represent, but they were not prevalent enough to contribute their appearances to emerging societal beliefs of the 19th century (Sarapin 1994: 32).

However, various other types of iconography also followed the seriation model, peaking between 1860 and 1880. As the symbolism is the “Other” category did not represent any one particular belief but rather shows an increase in overall various types of iconography. It can be suggested the larger increase of any iconography, regardless of meaning, shows the social status, association with certain groups, as well as allowing them the means to express their beliefs.

*Year of Death, Age, and Sex*

Almost every cemetery had the largest amount of burials between the 1860s and 1890s, sans Old Pine Street Church, where the greatest number of burials was placed between the 1810s and 1870s. As the years with largest number of burials coincided with the height and proceeding years of industrialization, these burials aided in understanding if the appearance of various stone size, stone shape, and symbolism could be credited to consumerism.
The 61 to 80-year-old age bracket had the highest amount of burials in each of the seven burial grounds. Four of the seven cemeteries (The Woodlands Cemetery, Riverview Cemetery, Gloria Dei, and Laurel Hill) began burying deceased within the age bracket around the mid-19th century, while the remaining three burial grounds began closer to first quarter of the century. Based on this discovery, older individuals had a longer time to be influenced by the industrialization and its impacts, and many were buried in the zenith of the movement. Therefore, because of the longevity of their lives, it allowed greater amounts of time to be influenced by societal changes concerning gravestone styles, which is reflected in their stone size, shape, and symbolism choices.

Sex did not have a noticeable impact or influence on burial stones. All cemeteries had almost equal amounts of male and female burials, though there were slightly more female burials in five of the seven cemeteries, with only a larger number of males in Old Pine Street Church and Gloria Dei Church. Both sexes had a wide variety of stone sizes, shapes, and symbolism; no clear patterns existed on burial type based on sex. However, more female burials were often noted with inscriptions noting their relation to other individuals, such as stating them as the wife, mother, daughter, or sister of a family member. This sense of females being viewed as a supporting role to others did not decrease until closer to the turn of the 20th century. Therefore, results do not attribute women's growing independence to consumption ideals; rather, coincide with growing women's suffragette movements beginning in the late 19th century.

**Total Findings**

To understand the trends within all cemeteries, results were combined from each grave site, providing insight into the overall choices for burial markers between 1800-1930. The most
common stone shape amongst all cemeteries was oval, coming in at 29% of all grave markers investigated, appearing in each decade studied. Next most popular shapes were the obelisk and square shaped stones, both comprising 16% of the total. Obelisks were placed in each decade spanning from 1810’s through 1920, and most square shaped stones were placed between the 1860s to 1930s.

The next commonly most placed stone shapes were ledgers, cross, tri-pointed, and aboveground. Ledgers composed 8% of stones, placed consistently throughout the decades with a slight peak in the 1860’s. Cross-shaped accounted for 6% of stones, most which were placed in each decade between 1870 and 1910, while 5% of were tri-pointed, many which were placed around 1800. Aboveground tombs were 4% of markers, erected in each decade from 1860 to 1910. Column, pyramid, circular, and pillar shaped were the least placed stones, accounting for 0-2%, with little placement pattern except a small cluster of column-shaped stones erected in the 1870’s and 1880’s.

The most popular stone size placed in all seven sites were sized large, comprising 36% of stones. Medium stones followed this at 33%, and lastly 21% of all markers investigated were sized small. The highest amounts of these sizes were placed between 1860 and 1900. All three of these sizes appeared in each decade, sans size small, which was absent from 1800-1810. The least common stone size was extra-large stones at 38 markers, accounting for 10% of markers, the majority appearing in each decade between 1850 and 1920. The decades where larger stones were more popular while the small sized stones were least popular were 1840, 1860, 1870, and 1900, showing a popularity and dominance of placing large stones over small and medium sized markers.
Concerning symbolism, 46% of all stones studied were decorated in some fashion, with the remaining 54% lacking decor. Inscriptions were a popular stylistic choice, with 43% of stones displaying inscriptions of any type. Religious symbolism accounted for 29% of engravings, and other rare types of iconography, such as shields and anchors, were found on 23% of the total stones. Floral decor and statues of urns composed around 18% and 10% of total gravestone iconography, respectively. Cradle graves accounted for 5% of markers, and the remaining symbolism studied, monograms, wreaths, angel/cherubs, and academia, each accounted for around 2-3% of all stone iconography observed.

Regarding patterns of symbolism across all cemeteries, the vast majority of decor appeared post-1840. The gravestones of the late 1700’s and early 1800’s, typically undecorated sans for the occasional sole decor of brief inscriptions, quickly gave way to a myriad of iconography. It is important to note each cemetery saw an influx of decor appear all about the same time; symbolism did not slowly trickle onto markers one by one. Rather, a flood of iconography occurred on burial stones in the Philadelphia metro area.

Of the remaining characteristics analyzed, the majority of deceased individuals buried in the seven cemeteries were women at 53%. Men accounted for 45% of burials, and around 2% of the populations in these cemeteries were of unknown or undetermined sex. Concerning age, the highest number of deceased individuals lies in the interval of 61 through 80 years of age, accounting for 32%. The second greatest of deceased individuals belong to the age group 41-60 age bracket (15%), and the next number of deceased individuals belongs to the age group 21 through 40 and the unknown age group, both at 14% of burials. The lowest percentage of burials were found in the intervals for 81-100 years old (12%), 1 through 20 years of age (10%), and lastly, the under one year of age interval at 4%.
Finally, the largest number of deceased individuals was buried in the interval of death between the years of 1851-1900 at 239 individuals, which comprises 60% of all burials. Of these 60% of burials, the age of deceased falls within the 41-60 (15%), 61-80 (32%), and 81-100 (12%) age brackets. The second highest number of deceased individuals fell between the years 1901-1930 at 20%, followed by 1801-1850 at 16%, undetermined date of death or none listed at 3%. The least amount of burials was placed in the 1700-1750 and 1750-1800 year brackets, at 1% of all burials.
Chapter 6: Discussion and Conclusion

The results of this study show a correlation between the start and height of 19th century industrialization in Philadelphia, and changes observed in grave markers placed in the growing and thriving American east coast city. The sample’s results show stone size and various types of gravestone symbolism were most impacted. Stone shape also experienced the introduction of differing shapes that also peaked; however, it was not enough to overcome the classic oval shape, which remained the most popular throughout the period. Stone size and the symbolism adorning the stones grew larger and more elaborate within all seven cemeteries, particularly between the years 1850 and 1900.

Seriation Method

Employing the seriation method illustrated what factors slowly grew in popularity, peaked, and eventually went out of style during the period studied. The iconography that slowly appeared then peaked between 1860 and 1900 were religious symbols, urns, floral decor, cradle graves, inscriptions, and other types of symbolism. Small, medium, and large stone sizes all experienced a greater number of markers placed between 1860 and 1890; however, the decades 1840, 1860, 1870, and 1900 all saw large stone sizes as the most popular choice while smaller sized stones were among the least popular choice. Concerning stone shape, obelisk, ledgers, rectangle, and square all slowly grew in popularity and reached a peak sometime between 1860 and 1890.

In addition, organizing results chronologically displayed which characteristics maintained a constant presence throughout the period studied. Oval, for example, appeared as a stone shape before 1800 and was placed consistently up to the 1930’s. Tri-pointed stones were also placed
prior to 1800, and erected throughout the following decades, albeit sporadically. Inscriptions, stones lacking any decor, and other types of symbols were placed throughout almost each decade.

However, the majority of the characteristics constant throughout the entire period also experienced peaks in placement. Long-used oval-shaped stones saw the greatest use between 1850 and 1890. Stones that were undecorated as well as ones that displayed inscriptions and other iconography also experienced a peak within the middle 1850 and 1910. Medium and large stones, placed in each decade, peaked between 1860 and 1910. Therefore, I conclude different types of individuals with varying beliefs were impacted by consumerism. Some felt the need to alter their beliefs to changing times, while other maintained their beliefs but were presented with different ways in which to express themselves through material objects.

Seriation shows a clear increase in popularity in certain characteristics, particularly in the latter half of the 19th century. The “consumer boom” theory being a separate phenomenon to industrialization and perhaps preceding the Industrial Revolution does not appear to apply to Philadelphia gravestones (McKendrick et al. 1982: 9). The increase in stone size, shape, and symbolism hit a peak in 1860-1890, while industrialization in Philadelphia was at its height. The changing society allowed for purchase and display of larger and elaborate stones; consumption was a result of industrialization and can be viewed through gravestone choices during the latter half of the 19th century.

The changes in gravestone characteristics during this period coincide with the changing economy and industrial practice as well as the social impacts attached to it which occurred during the same time. The following further details how the changes are related to social implications brought on by industrialization.
Stone Size and Social Status

The findings show all residents in the Philadelphia area were in some way impacted by the fledgling societal idea of consumerism introduced by industrialization and the act of consumption. During this period of economic change, consumption practices disseminated from the upper classes, who could typically afford goods outside of their basic needs, to the middle and lower classes, who now had the means and opportunity to purchase such goods, now at lower costs. Weatherhill posed the notion that lower social classes did not try to emulate the spending habits of the upper classes; rather, they themselves were impacted by the growing cultural ideal to also consume, but to a lesser degree (Weatherhill 1988: 189). Pendergast claims patterns of consumption were correlated to income, and “being poor and being a consumer...were not mutually exclusive conditions in early modern Europe and in colonial British America,” (1988: 27).

Weatherhill and Pendergast’s claims support this result, which can be concluded through evidence that all seven cemeteries experienced changes regardless of their location, size, religious affiliation, or secularity. Although the type and number of memorial changes in each burial ground differed, all experienced some type of changes in gravestone characteristics throughout the 19th century. The abrupt appearance of change amongst all burial yards leads to the conclusion all individuals, regardless of status, wealth, age, or location within the Philadelphia area were somehow influenced by cultural ideals brought on by the major change impacting multiple facets of life, industrialization, and expressed that consumption through burial marker changes.

While Weatherhill’s theory applies for the appearance of overall changes in all seven cemeteries, Veblen’s ideology of conspicuous consumption linked to social status falls in line
with flourishing stone size. The growing importance of displaying social status through the acquisition and exhibition of goods is reflected in the increasing size of markers. Large was the most popular stone size in five of the seven burial grounds, found in both secular and religious grounds in and outside Philadelphia, and began being placed in greater numbers starting in the 1830’s. While not the most popular stone size in the remaining two cemeteries, Gloria Dei Church and St. Mary’s Church, also experienced large grave markers, such as obelisks, being placed in their cemeteries starting in 1820’s and 1860’s, respectively.

As large stones became the most commonly placed in five cemeteries, as well as a presence of bigger stones at the remaining two cemeteries, it can be concluded individuals in or around the major city, regardless of location or religious beliefs, aimed to convey their social status via headstone size. Moving towards placing large-sized stones implies wealth and social status, also aiming to invoke the “envy of one’s fellow-men,” (Veblen 1899: 16). The placement of larger stones was likely placed to forever cement the deceased’s position within society, as the grand size conveys a message of greater wealth and higher status to onlookers for as long as the stone remains erected.

**Symbolism and the Inner and Outer Directive**

Symbolism and iconography on early American grave markers were one of the few forms of publicly accessible art. The designs reflected the changing attitude in death from a preindustrial agricultural society to a capitalistic and post-industrial one (Baugher and Veit 2014: 2). When viewed today, the iconography seen on early grave markers, such as skulls, empty hourglasses, and bones, may seem grim, but reflect cultural and social trends as well as religious beliefs (Nonestied and Veit 2008: 43).
Iconography on Philadelphia grave markers were mainly undecorated in the late 1700s and early 1800s. Based on the seriation model of all cemeteries combined, there appears to be a sudden appearance and increase in iconography of varying types beginning in the 1840s. The most commonly seen symbolism on Philadelphia-area gravestones were floral decor, urn statues, religious decor, various types of inscriptions, and other iconography. Floral engravings, including thistle, buds, and flowers, “symbolize the brevity of life, the contract of life and death in nature,” (Sarapin 1994: 32). They also represent respect, sorrow and beauty, as well as the life of a young person ended too soon (Sarapin 1994: 28).

Urns were a popular symbol during the 19th century, representing mourning. The statue is often draped, symbolizing the veil between heaven and earth (Keister 2009: 135). Other décor displays symbolism seen sparingly throughout all the cemeteries, such as anchors, small statues of animals or children, swords, etc.

As explained by Cotter, Philadelphia resident’s attitudes towards death were a changing cultural ideal, shifting away from Quaker and Puritan beliefs and towards Victorian attitudes towards death, with respect and adoration for the body (Cotter et al. 1992: 199-200). These changes can be seen within changing headstone iconography, such as floral and urns. However, I
hypothesize industrialization made the expression of these ideals possible, providing the vehicle by which to display their beliefs towards death and the afterlife, and possibly differentiate between groups which held other beliefs. Through the materials being available to the masses and the act of consumption linked to status encouraged individuals to display their status and possibly their beliefs, we see an influx in specific symbolism, floral, urn, and inscriptions, on memorial markers.

Religious iconography in Philadelphia differed from the traditional death’s heads and cherubs studied in Deetz and Dethlefsen’s study of New England cemeteries. Overall, there wasn’t a shift to a particular set of religious iconography, rather, there was a lack of any religious symbolism prior to 1810. Even within the four cemeteries which were religiously-affiliated, a surprising lack of religious iconography was placed prior to the early-to-mid 1800’s in these burial yards. Thereafter, religious iconography experienced a great influx, following the pattern of seriation, peaking between 1860 and 1910. In addition, cross-shaped stones began appearing in the last quarter of the 19th century as well. Cross-shaped stones did not hit a peak; rather, the style appeared suddenly in the 1870s (sans one stone placed in the 1830’s) and was placed until the 1910’s.

Secular cemeteries experienced changes in various types of iconography throughout the time period studied. Church-adjacent cemeteries, on the other hand, maintained mainly religious symbolism on memorial stones. Approaching the middle 1800’s, church burial yards, regardless of the branch of Christianity such as Episcopalian or Presbyterian, saw an increase in the amount of religious iconography displayed, such as crosses and religious inscriptions. Three of the four religious burial grounds religious burial grounds experienced this increase in the 1840s, with only St. Mary’s starting in 1814.
While secular burial grounds also saw the introduction of religious iconography placed between 1830 and 1895, the changes in symbolism in church-adjacent lots is noted because of the lack of additional types of decor. This result ties in with the with Riesman’s ideal of the character evolving from “inner-directed,” motivated by traditional practices learned in childhood focused on a specific set of ideas and values, towards “other-directed,” being shaped by current technological and cultural changes (Wrong 1992: 382). I argue in this result the inner-directed represents long-held religious beliefs, and the outer-directed is the practice of expressing popular beliefs via material objects, an ideal of consumerism. Religious-minded individuals held onto their beliefs but used the available products and societal ideals to greater express their “inner directed” ideals, unlike others who altered their beliefs to changing attitudes towards death and displaying social status.

**Doppler Effect**

Lastly, the Doppler Effect was investigated by comparing results between the cemeteries within Philadelphia and surrounding suburban burial grounds. Doing so helped uncover if changes occurring within the city proper were also experienced in suburban grounds, if they appeared concurrently, or appeared after they hit their peak in Philadelphia. Riverview Cemetery in Trenton, New Jersey experienced an increase in floral decor, undecorated stones, inscriptions, and other iconography between 1870 and 1900. Small and large-sized stone placements were most popular between 1860 and 1890. Aboveground tombs, rectangles, and squares also appeared in a short time period, between 1870 and 1890.

St. Mary’s Church experienced an influx in religious symbolism, inscriptions, other iconography, and undecorated stones between 1850 and 1910. All stone sizes experienced an
increase in placement between 1860 and 1890. Similar to Philadelphia area cemeteries, oval shaped remained the most popular in St. Mary’s; however, obelisks, aboveground tombs, and square shaped stones were placed between 1860 and 1900.

Based on these results, it's concluded the Doppler Effect, which states an artifact first produced at one location and distributed to others would appear later at the area to which it was distributed rather than where it was formed, was not applicable for grounds in the suburbs of Philadelphia. These two cemeteries experienced an increase in specific characteristics while Philadelphia was experiencing the same changes. Therefore, suburban areas were simultaneously impacted by societal changes present during the height of the Industrial Revolution.

**Conclusion**

Gravestones located in Philadelphia and its surrounding regions all experienced changes during the 19th century. As the city became highly industrialized, social norms were greatly impacted by the changing practices in production, distribution, and acquisition of goods, particularly the introduction of an emphasis on consuming material objects. The changes in markers coincide with the height of the Industrial Revolution; therefore, it is concluded changes in social standards, cultural practices, and personal beliefs set off by industrialization are reflected in diverse gravestone characteristics.

Social class and distinctions were viewed through the increase in stone size, signaling a greater wealth and a higher-class status. Changing iconography reflects the changing views on death, moving towards the Victorian beliefs, and the greater availability of goods allowed these beliefs to be expressed. Religious attitudes were impacted as well but not by changing beliefs on death. Rather, the growing ideal to express one's beliefs via goods allowed religiously-minded
individuals to express their spirituality on a grander scale, allowing their “inner-directive” to be expressed outwardly. The altered societal ideals were not confined only within Philadelphia; its suburban cemeteries experience similar changes within the same decades as the grounds within the city.

The results of this study provide an insight into a crucial facet of American history that impacted the manner in which the deceased were memorialized. Changes in gravestones in numerous burial grounds in the Philadelphia area present a sliver of how the introduction of consumerist ideals impact remembrance beliefs and memorial stones in a flourishing city within a developing nation. This investigation aimed to illustrate how aspects of life not at the forefront of early American culture, such as memorial practices and gravestones, were impacted by society's economic growth and its residual transforming social ideals.
## Appendix

### Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Eras</th>
<th>Small</th>
<th>Medium</th>
<th>Large</th>
<th>Extra-Large</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-1800</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1800's</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1810's</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1820's</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1830's</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1840's</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1850's</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1860's</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1870's</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1880's</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1890's</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1900's</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1910's</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1920's</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1930's</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>85</strong></td>
<td><strong>132</strong></td>
<td><strong>143</strong></td>
<td><strong>38</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>132</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Combined Results: Kinography Section
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Column</th>
<th>1840's</th>
<th>1850's</th>
<th>1860's</th>
<th>1870's</th>
<th>1880's</th>
<th>1890's</th>
<th>1890's</th>
<th>1900's</th>
<th>1910's</th>
<th>1920's</th>
<th>1930's</th>
<th>1940's</th>
<th>Pre-1900s</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Combined Results: Stone Shape Percentage
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Gloria Dei Church</th>
<th>Laurel Hill Cemetery</th>
<th>Old Pine Street Cemetery</th>
<th>Riverview Church</th>
<th>St. Peter's Church</th>
<th>St. Mary's Cemetery</th>
<th>Combined Results: Stone Size Percentage</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td># %</td>
<td># %</td>
<td># %</td>
<td># %</td>
<td># %</td>
<td># %</td>
<td># %</td>
<td># %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>72 100%</td>
<td>115 100%</td>
<td>41 100%</td>
<td>24 100%</td>
<td>34 100%</td>
<td>53 100%</td>
<td>398 100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large</td>
<td>2 2%</td>
<td>10 9%</td>
<td>2 5%</td>
<td>1 4%</td>
<td>3 9%</td>
<td>8 15%</td>
<td>11 19%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>22 31%</td>
<td>10 9%</td>
<td>9 22%</td>
<td>10 42%</td>
<td>2 6%</td>
<td>21 40%</td>
<td>85 19%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small</td>
<td>33 46%</td>
<td>36 31%</td>
<td>11 27%</td>
<td>2 8%</td>
<td>15 44%</td>
<td>17 32%</td>
<td>132 33%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extra</td>
<td>15 21%</td>
<td>59 51%</td>
<td>19 46%</td>
<td>2 8%</td>
<td>14 41%</td>
<td>7 13%</td>
<td>43 30%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>%</th>
<th>VHHH</th>
<th>VHHH</th>
<th>VHHH</th>
<th>VHHH</th>
<th>VHHH</th>
<th>VHHH</th>
<th>VHHH</th>
<th>VHHH</th>
<th>VHHH</th>
<th>VHHH</th>
<th>VHHH</th>
<th>VHHH</th>
<th>VHHH</th>
<th>VHHH</th>
<th>VHHH</th>
<th>VHHH</th>
<th>VHHH</th>
<th>VHHH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>97.99%</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.25%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97.74%</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96.73%</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94.72%</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90.20%</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89.16%</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76.88%</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70.89%</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56.28%</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45.73%</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Combined Results: Environment Percentage
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>100%</th>
<th>115</th>
<th>100%</th>
<th>72</th>
<th>100%</th>
<th>39</th>
<th>100%</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>100%</th>
<th>39</th>
<th>100%</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>100%</th>
<th>39</th>
<th>100%</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>100%</th>
<th>39</th>
<th>100%</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>100%</th>
<th>39</th>
<th>100%</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Table 7</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sex</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Race</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Marital Status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Occupation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Professional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Combined Results: Sex, Percentage
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>1800-1820</th>
<th>1821-1840</th>
<th>1841-1860</th>
<th>1861-1880</th>
<th>1881-1900</th>
<th>1901-1920</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1800-1820</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1821-1840</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1841-1860</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1861-1880</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1881-1900</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1901-1920</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 8**

Combined Results: Date of Death Interims Percentage
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>0-1</th>
<th>1-4</th>
<th>5-14</th>
<th>15-29</th>
<th>30-59</th>
<th>60-74</th>
<th>75-84</th>
<th>85+</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under One Year</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One Year Through Twenty-One</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twenty-One Through Forty</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forty-One Through Sixty-Five</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sixty-Five Through Eighty-Five</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eighty-Five Through One Hundred One</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One Hundred Through One Hundred Fifty</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One Hundred Fifty Through Two Hundred One</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two Hundred One Through Three Hundred One</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three Hundred One Through Four Hundred</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four Hundred Through Five Hundred</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five Hundred Through Six Hundred</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Six Hundred Through Seven Hundred</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seven Hundred Through Eight Hundred</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eight Hundred Through Nine Hundred</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nine Hundred Through One Thousand</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One Thousand Through One Thousand Two Hundred</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One Thousand Two Hundred Through One Thousand Five Hundred</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One Thousand Five Hundred Through Two Thousand</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two Thousand Through Three Thousand</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three Thousand Through Four Thousand</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four Thousand Through Five Thousand</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five Thousand Through Six Thousand</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Six Thousand Through Seven Thousand</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seven Thousand Through Eight Thousand</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eight Thousand Through Nine Thousand</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nine Thousand Through Ten Thousand</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ten Thousand Through Fifty Thousand</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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