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ABSTRACT

DEATH IN THE PORT CITY: A LOOK AT GRAVESTONES, RELIGION, AND STATUS IN MOBILE, ALABAMA’S CHURCH STREET GRAVEYARD

Stella Vasiliki Simpsiridis

Gravestones are a physical reminder left by the living to commemorate the life of the deceased. The markers that commemorate the dead can also be used to understand a society’s cultural ideas about death such as in regard to religion and social status. The Church Street Graveyard is Mobile, Alabama’s oldest existing cemetery, with burials first occurring in 1819 and ending in 1898. As a port city, Mobile was home to people of numerous religious affiliations. Many of the city’s wealthiest citizens and families were members of the Protestant faith. The Catholic Church in Mobile was associated with the poorer immigrants in the city and was therefore not favored by city elites. This research study examines if the association of wealth and religion during life is reflected in the gravestones found in the Church Street Graveyard. The size, decorative motifs, and text of the gravestones in both the Protestant and Catholic sections of the graveyard are compared and analyzed using chi-square tests. The results show that gravestones in the Catholic and Protestant sections of the Church Street Graveyard do not reflect a concern for exhibiting status, and instead they display a level of equality between the two religions.
CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

Cemeteries have become a popular research area among anthropologists. It is true that anthropologists have studied graves, grave goods, mortuary practices, and even human remains for some time, perhaps since the dawn of the discipline. However, with the publication of Edwin Dethlefsen and James Deetz’ initial work in the 1960s, historic cemeteries and gravestone monuments have become a more frequently tapped resource for understanding the culture of past societies. Cemeteries and gravestones offer researchers a unique opportunity to look at past societies at specific times and in chronological order as gravestones are, for the most part, dated by the people who erected them.

Gravestones are a physical reminder left by the living to commemorate the life of the deceased. But, it is not just of the dead that gravestones can “speak.” The choice of size, design, and motif can provide information not just about the person who died, but about the living as well as they are often the ones who choose the gravestone. The gravestones and monuments that commemorate the dead can be used to determine and understand personal relationships and family organization, group identities, individual identity, ethnicity, religious beliefs, ideas about death, social structure, and status (Gorman and DiBlasi 1981, Snyder 1989, Thompson 1988, Mytum 1989, Moore et al. 1991, Little et al. 1992, Rainville 1999, Buckham 2003,). Graveyard and cemetery landscapes are like microcosms that show the evolving cultural dynamics of the people who created them (Francavigilia 1971). However, cemeteries and their monuments are not always a straightforward interpretation. They can also show an idealized form of an individual or society as opposed to what actually existed (Parker Pearson 1982).
The Church Street Graveyard is Mobile, Alabama’s oldest extant cemetery. The remains of Spanish, French, and British officials, their families, and refugees from the different time periods of European rule as well as soldiers from the Revolutionary War, Mexican War, and the War of 1812 are all buried within Church Street Graveyard. It is the resting place for many of the people that played a part in the early history of the city, such as Don Miguel Eslava (1740-1823). Eslava was an official from Mobile’s period of Spanish rule (1780-1813) and a prominent land owner. Mary Josephine Hollinger (1766-1836) was the very accomplished daughter of a French refugee and most well-known for entertaining the Marquis de Lafayette during his two-day visit to Mobile in April of 1825. Col. Jerome J. Cluis (1789-1851) came to Mobile a Napoleonic refugee in order to escape persecution from the Bourbons. Dr. Richard Lee Fearn (1804-1868) and his wife Mary Jane Fearn (1810-1854) are located in the graveyard’s one mausoleum. Dr. Fearn was a well-known physician and wrote an essay about the diseases of Mobile, and Mary Fearn was a distinguished salon hostess (Nelson and Nelson 1963, Amos 1985, Sledge 2002).

Church Street is also home to a few contemporary gravestones. These stones mark the final resting place of some of Mobile’s more colorful natives and residents. Joseph Stillwell Cain (1832-1904), the Church Street Graveyard’s most famous resident and visited grave, is known for reviving Mardi Gras celebrations in Mobile following the Civil War. He is credited with starting the first people’s procession, which is celebrated each carnival season the Sunday before Fat Tuesday and is affectionately called Joe Cain Day. Buried immediately next to Joe Cain is Julian Lee Rayford (1908-1980). Rayford was a local historian and admirer of Joe Cain. Rayford petitioned the city to have Cain’s remains relocated to the Church Street Graveyard, and he helped establish Joe Cain Day. Not far from Cain and Rayford, is the marker for author Eugene Walter (1921-1998). Walter was a man of many talents, but he also became known for his
friendships with filmmaker Federico Felini, Truman Capote, and Princess Marguerite (Sledge 2002, Roberts 2015).

Though there are a few newer additions to the graveyard, this research will focus on gravestones dated from 1819-1898. Specifically, this thesis project will look at the size, motif, and amount of text on the gravestones in the Catholic and Protestant sections of the Church Street Graveyard. By examining those three elements and comparing the markers between the Catholic and Protestant sections, it may be possible to get a better understanding of how residents displayed status while commemorating their dead during that time period. Most of historic Mobile’s wealthiest families were Protestant, while many of the city’s poorer European immigrants were Catholic (Amos 1985). Thus, the major hypothesis for this thesis states that the markers located in the Protestant section are larger and more elaborate than the grave markers located in the Catholic section.

Displays of socioeconomic status during the 19th century went beyond the traditional items for the living, such as houses and household fineries (Baugher and Veit 2014). They can also be found in cemeteries by way of marker type, size, decoration, and even location (Baugher and Veit 2014). The study of gravestone design and how they change over time can give insight into a society’s cultural beliefs. What was society like in Mobile throughout the 19th century? What cultural beliefs did the people hold concerning the commemoration of the dead? Do the gravestones reflect the social and cultural concerns of the living? By looking at how status is reflected in gravestone design, it may be possible to see if the gravestones are reflecting the same cultural concerns as the living or if in death there is a shift away from concerns of religion or socioeconomic status.
The literature review revealed few writings specifically about the Church Street Graveyard. To current knowledge, very little scholarly work has ever been performed. This thesis project is the first of its kind done on the Church Street Graveyard. Any newly discovered information concerning the history of Mobile will add to the overall knowledge about the city, and it will give current residents a better understanding of the city’s past. It is hoped that this research will help to fill in some gaps concerning death, religion, and status in Mobile during the 19th century.

The research will also add to the body of academic research being conducted in Mobile as well as expand on the research ongoing statewide. Other cities along the Gulf Coast, such as Pensacola and New Orleans, have all had numerous studies conducted about their historic pasts, and the cemeteries located within them have been given special attention (Huber et al. 2004, Stringfield et al. 2008). Mobile, a city situated between New Orleans and Pensacola, is comparatively absent from the research. The information gained from this thesis project will help to bridge the geographical gap between New Orleans and Pensacola and give a better overall understanding of cemetery traditions along the Gulf Coast.

It is also apparent that the gravestones within the walls of the Church Street Graveyard have deteriorated over time due to natural aging and acid rain. The visual history of Mobile’s past is literally disappearing, and any research done on the graveyard will help to preserve that history for future generations of Mobilians. It is hoped that this project will, in some small way, bring public attention to the cemetery and garner public interest in the continuing care and protection of not just the Church Street Graveyard, but all of Mobile’s historic cemeteries.

Whether historic or contemporary, each headstone or monument represents a person who was born or came to the city of Mobile, lived, and died there. These gravestones add insight into
the lives and culture of the people who called Mobile home, however briefly, during the 19th century. Suzanne O. Mitoraj (2001) calls gravestones community artifacts. These artifacts help people in the present link together the events of the past by gaining insight into the mindset of the community that created them. Richard Meyer (1989:5) wrote that the reason for studying gravestones is that it allows us to gain, “a better understanding of ourselves—what we are, what we have been, and what we are in the process of becoming.”

The chapters that follow will present the details of this thesis project. Chapter two reviews the research that has been conducted involving cemeteries and their markers as well as a history of both the city of Mobile and the Church Street Graveyard. The methodology used to conduct this research is discussed in chapter three. Chapter four explains the analysis that was done; it looks at the initial data that was gathered, the statistical tests performed, and their results. Finally, chapter five concludes the thesis with a discussion of the results and possible future work.
CHAPTER II
LITERATURE REVIEW AND HISTORY

Since the 1960s, the study of cemeteries and gravestones in the United States has dramatically increased. There are now hundreds of research articles and books available to learn about the kinds of cultural information that can be found within cemeteries. Historians, art historians, and anthropologists alike have looked to historic cemeteries for information about the past.

Prior to the surge of interest in cemeteries that began in the late 1960s, there was only one major work that looked at gravestones in the U.S. Harriette Merrifield Forbes’ *Gravestones of Early New England and the Men Who Made Them, 1653-1800* was first published in 1927. Forbes created an extensive catalog of New England grave stones and their iconography or motifs. She looked at the religious and cultural influences that affected design choice over the course of the 17th and 18th centuries. As the title suggests, she also focused on the stone carvers of these markers and their influence on design choice. Forbes’ research on marker motif, stone carvers, and design choice continue to be examined by cemetery and gravestone researchers today.

Following Forbes, the next major works came over thirty years later. Allan I. Ludwig’s *Graven Images: New England Stonecarving and Its Symbols, 1650-1815* was published in 1966. This work again focused on gravestones in New England. Ludwig also looked at marker motifs, but he analyzed their change over time in relation to Puritan religious beliefs. By doing this, Ludwig helped to open up the possibility of grave stones as artifacts to interpret specific religious beliefs.
Perhaps the most well-known work among anthropologists regarding cemeteries was conducted by Edwin Dethlefsen and James Deetz. Their most significant work came with the publication of *Death’s Heads, Cherubs, and Willow Trees: Experimental Archaeology in Colonial Cemeteries* (1966). This work, too, looked at spatial and temporal trends over time. Specifically, it focused on the change of New England gravestone motifs across different time periods and how their change related to evolving religious views concerning death and the afterlife. After tracking the rise of a motif, its peak and popularity, and its fall from favor, Dethlefsen and Deetz noticed that the motif trends coincided with cultural events that were occurring among the living. For example, the fall of the death’s head motif and the rise of the cherub motif coincided with the “Great Awakening,” which was a religious movement that emphasized the joy of life after death. Dethlefsen and Deetz (1966) state that the fall of the death’s head motif, which was a graphic reminder of human mortality, shifted to the image of the angelic cherub when religious views of resurrection and the afterlife changed into something more uplifting.

After Dethlefsen and Deetz’s research in the 1960s, researchers continued to focus on the change of design and motif over time. However, more recent cemetery studies have considered a number of different variables, including cemetery landscape, ideology, socioeconomic status, ethnicity, gravestone inscription and epitaph language, demography, and even health.

Lynn Rainville (1999) examined numerous gravestone characteristics, including iconography, morphology, inscription, epitaph, and location to examine social, economic, and religious factors in gravestone design choice from 1770 to 1920 in Hanover, Connecticut. Marker type and size were just two variables among several examined to determine status. Her results showed that, unlike previous studies on cemeteries, religious affiliation and
socioeconomic status had little effect on design choices. In fact, recognizing true socioeconomic status was difficult, as the middle class and lower often copied the style choices of the upper class. She remarks on the importance of the cemetery’s context when defining displays of social status (Rainville 1999:580).

In a similar vein, Michael Parker Pearson (1982) researched mortuary practices in both Victorian and modern England. He examined status before and after death in order to understand the relationship over time between the living and the dead. He states that researchers into mortuary practices must look at the context of the living as status can be expressed in multiple ways. He concludes that what may be seen in cemeteries and their markers are not actual social relations, but an idealized form of those relations. The living can and do use death as a way to display and maintain both an actual and/or an idealized social dynamic.

Other cemetery studies have looked at groups that are often underrepresented. Ellen Marie Snyder (1989) examined the changing ideas and ideals surrounding gravestone monuments of children during the Victorian period in the United States. By examining how children are memorialized, it can offer insight into social and family structure. She emphasizes how Victorian children’s graves reiterate the notion that children are innocent and will remain forever young and pure based on the common use of certain motifs such as statues of young children, lambs, and markers shaped like a child’s bed. These design choices show that the child would always be remembered and would forever hold a place within the family group.

Ann and Dickran Tashjian are known for their work Memorials for Children of Change: The Art of Early New England Stonecarving (1974), which gives attention to grave marker art and its relationship to Puritanism. However, they have also investigated the representation of African-Americans in a colonial era cemetery in Newport, Rhode Island. They note that markers
for African-Americans from this time period in New England are mostly destroyed or were simply never erected. From the examples taken from Newport, Rhode Island, the Tashjians looked at social status, religious affiliation, and motif present on the markers from a historically African-American section in the cemetery. The stones generally have typical Puritan motifs of winged skull or cherubs. Status for the deceased was gathered from the inscription; the inclusion of surnames and/or an epitaph listing the qualities of the individual indicated their importance, usually as a servant to a white family. The Tashjians also researched the stone carver John Stevens III, who was responsible for many of the markers in their sample.

In one of the few cemetery studies outside of New England, Moore and colleagues (1991) researched changing patterns in mortuary practices which reflect status by examining the size, style, and material of gravestones dating from 1860 to 1980 in a cemetery in Manhattan, Kansas. Height was used to estimate status, but the results showed an abrupt change in marker height as opposed to a gradual one. For this study, it was suggested that the cause for this change was related to the Great Depression when both height and variation decreased. Markers became similar in size and style most likely due to a lack of funds across all status categories.

Seth Mallios and David M. Caterino have also conducted cemetery research outside of the New England area; their focus has been southern California. Their 2007 study looked at nearly 300,000 marked graves dating from 1886 to 1961 in San Diego County. These grave markers were examined to pinpoint patterns in commemoration choice over time and space. Changes in gravestones were found to reduce in height and decoration over time and were associated with major social and economic changes such as the first world war.

Cemetery patterns in the United States also reflect influences from Europe. Cemetery researcher Harold Mytum (1989) looked at how cemetery architecture in Europe has evolved
since the 18th century, particularly in response to public sentiment over health conditions. He looks at the shift from in-ground burials in churchyards to the placement of the dead in mausoleum vaults, loculi, and large, park-like cemeteries located outside city limits. The shift was caused by health concerns due to over burial in city graveyards. In response, new British cemeteries were laid out as garden spaces during the 19th century. This eventually lead to the change from churchyard type burial grounds in the United States to those that are more park-like.

While many cemetery studies have focused on marker size, type, and motif to identify cultural ideas about status and religious affiliation, there are other variables that can give insight into these areas. Looking at a cemetery’s landscape can give an indication of an individual’s status. Francaviglia (1971) offers an interesting perspective on cemeteries, looking at them geographically as well as observing how the cemetery has changed spatially and architecturally within the landscape occupied by the living. Francaviglia (1971) examined cemeteries in Oregon, Utah, Minnesota, Wisconsin, and New York dating from 1870 to 1970. As cities and towns developed, cemeteries began to change in shape and layout too. Different parts of town were given designations as “good” neighborhoods and “bad” neighborhoods. These same distinctions can be seen in cemeteries. A single cemetery may have subareas within it that are more desirable than others for burial. Increased desirability for burial in a specific subarea within a cemetery also made those plots more expensive.

As a literature teacher, Suzanne O. Mitoraj (2001) brings an interesting perspective to the subject of cemeteries and gravestones that proves useful for both anthropological and historical research. Mitoraj showed how the study of language used in gravestone epitaphs can be used as a source for examining the changing religious beliefs and social structure that occurred in New England during the 18th and 19th century. The inscription can give clues to the deceased’s place
in the social order and the status they held in their community based on the inclusion of titles and epitaphs. The inclusion of titles such as “Elder” or “Wife of” and epitaph descriptors such as “affectionate mother” or “steadfast Christian” are just a few examples. She also showed how outreach to school students and the public can bring about awareness to historical cemeteries and reinvigorate local interest and preservation.

**Cemetery Research in the South**

The early and seminal work on cemeteries by Forbes, Ludwig, and Dethlefsen and Deetz focused on gravestones in New England, and many of the cemetery studies that followed them did the same. Hijiya (1983), Moore and colleagues (1991), Meyer (1992), and Mytum (2004) all note that the number of cemetery studies outside of the region of New England has been lacking in comparison. Today, the overall number of cemetery studies outside of New England is increasing, but the number of studies in the South, specifically in Alabama, is still low.

Perhaps one of the most interesting studies done has been by Barbara J. Little, Kim M. Lanphear, and Douglas W. Owsley (1992). This study looked at mortuary style, in particular coffin hardware, in a family cemetery in Virginia. They were also able to perform skeletal analysis. Little and her colleagues examined elaboration of burial and coffin hardware to examine how status was displayed by the family. They found the least amount of elaboration at the height of the family’s wealth (Little et al. 1992:411-414). The most heavily decorated artifacts and coffin hardware were found to be from a period in which the family had lost much of its monetary wealth. Despite not having any actual wealth, the family chose elaborate displays; it is thought this was the family’s way of affirming their status in the community (Little et al. 1992:413).
There have been a number of studies that have looked at cemeteries in both Georgia and South Carolina. These two states were part of the colonial United States, and their cemeteries show a number of similarities to their New England counterparts. Frederick J. E. Gorman and Michael DiBlasi (1981) examined patterns of 18th and 19th century mortuary ideology and iconography in South Carolina and Georgia. They looked at how the marker motifs related to religious, social, and economic factors as well as how they compared to markers found in New England. When they looked at these factors, Gorman and DiBlasi (1981:83-88) note that the motifs from New England were used to indicate status, but that the level of status the motifs represented may differ by the religious denomination of the cemetery. In other words, a motif may represent a great level of status in one cemetery, for example a Protestant cemetery, but may not represent the same level of status in a Catholic cemetery. Gorman and DiBlasi also looked at the changes over time for the common New England motifs (death’s head, cherubs, willow, and urn) found in Georgia and South Carolina. The order in which the motifs appeared and were replaced matches what is seen in New England.

Diana Williams Combs (1986) also explored the colonial gravestones in both Georgia and South Carolina and showed how the gravestones in these southernmost colonial states were influenced in design and motif by stone carvers from New England. Combs also discusses the differences in time in which certain motifs, such as the death’s head, first appeared in New England compared with its first appearances in Georgia and South Carolina. She also voices her doubts concerning the connection between these well know motifs to that of Puritanism. The choice of grave marker motif appears to be related more to the carver than the religion as far as examples in Georgia and South Carolina are concerned.
James M. Davidson (2004) studied grave articles, or in his case charm use, at an African-American cemetery from 1869 to 1907 in Dallas, Texas. These charms can help to explain the religious beliefs and customs among the African-American community. By studying such grave articles, it can give insight into its origin, how its use changed over time, and the meaning it held to that social group.

**Cemetery Research along the Gulf Coast**

Among cities that border the Gulf Coast, New Orleans is one where numerous research studies have taken place. Located to the west of Mobile, New Orleans is unique due to its proximity to water and high water tables, which makes in ground burials difficult. Because of this, residents have adapted by using above ground burial in vaults and mausolea. Huber and colleagues (1974) detail the architectural design of these types of burials in *New Orleans Architecture Volume III: The Cemeteries*. This book gives an overview of the cemeteries in New Orleans, discussing their layout as well as the utility, style, size, and materials of burial markers. It also discusses the people that were buried in these vaults and mausolea and the men who designed them.

Leonard V. Huber (1982) published a book about motifs. He cataloged the various motifs that are found on the markers in New Orleans’ cemeteries. He discusses over thirty motifs, such as different flower types, weeping willow, clasped hands, urns, angels, etc. He also provides pictures of the variations that can be found.

East of Mobile, in Pensacola, Florida, much research is being conducted on the city’s historic cemeteries, in particular St. Michael’s Cemetery. An important research project conducted at Pensacola’s St. Michael’s Cemetery is the *Search for the Hidden People of St. Michael’s Cemetery*. This research project was conducted by Margo S. Stringfield, Stuart
Hamilton, Johan Liebens, Jay K. Johnson, Bryan S. Haley, Aaron Fogle, Kendra Kennedy, Siska Williams, and Elizabeth D. Benchley. The focus of this endeavor was to locate and/or identify possible unmarked graves using remote sensing methods. Through the use of remote sensing, nearly 4,000 anomalies were found at various depths throughout the cemetery. This project has helped to bring attention to an unseen and almost forgot portion of the cemetery’s landscape.

Johan Liebens (2003) of the University of West Florida, shows the value of mapping an historic cemetery and linking it to a database. Liebens recorded 3,200 markers in St. Michael’s Cemetery. The map and database created a base from which further research of the cemetery could easily be done. He detailed how the map and database were created and the applications in which they could be used for both understanding the past and preserving it for the future.

Following the creation of the St. Michael’s Cemetery map and database, further research in the cemetery has been conducted by several graduate students. Two examples are the master’s theses of Nicole Marie Bonomo Lipson (2012) from the University of West Florida and Amy Larner Giroux (2009) from the University of Central Florida. Lipson’s research focused on identifying and locating victims of the yellow fever epidemic that affected Pensacola in 1882. Using the cemetery map and database and other primary sources, she was able to analyze whether burial practices changed as a result of the disease. With the help of the database, Giroux was able to examine 1,447 grave markers from St. Michael’s Cemetery for several different attributes in looking for evidence of ethnicity and acculturation. These works show the importance of database creation. Not only can it help with preservation, but it can also allow for future research on numerous topics. Similarly, the creation of a database was a key component for this thesis project and allowed for an easy analysis of the research variables.
When it comes to the cemetery research in Alabama, there is a small amount of published work. However, archaeologists Ian W. Brown of the University of Alabama in Tuscaloosa and Ann Marshall of Huntsville are involved in ongoing cemetery projects in their respective locales. There are also books that give an overview of the history of certain cemeteries in the state. Kimberly R. Jacobson and the Greene County Historical Society (2007) wrote about the Mesopotamia Cemetery in Greene County, Alabama. The book discusses the beginnings of the cemetery with its establishment through the Mesopotamia Presbyterian Church, the people of note buried in the cemetery, and examples of the motif symbolism found on the grave markers. It also details the carvers found in the cemetery, including McDonald, March, and Company, a Mobile stone carving firm, who have examples in the Church Street Graveyard.

In regard to Mobile County, John Sledge’s *Cities of Silence* (2202) is an important work. Sledge details the history of several historic cemeteries in Mobile, including the Church Street Graveyard. He explains how the cemeteries were established and includes excellent images, both historic and modern, of the cemeteries and their grave stones. There is but one work found that focuses solely on the Church Street Graveyard: *A History of Church Street Graveyard* by Col. and Mrs. Soren Nelson (1963). This small, yet informative book, provides a short history of the graveyard and offers details about some of the notable people buried there. The most remarkable part of this book is that it includes the inscriptions for each of the markers present in the graveyard. It also includes a simple row and lot map. These were invaluable tools in the recording of the cemetery for this thesis.

It is known that in 1993 the city of Mobile consulted with cemetery researcher Sharyn Thompson on how to approach preservation concerning the Church Street Graveyard. Sharyn Thompson has worked often with the city of Pensacola, specifically in regard to St. Michael’s
Cemetery. There, she created a survey and evaluation of the historic resources in St. Michael’s cemetery (1988). For the city of Mobile, she suggested putting together a master preservation plan. According to the Mobile Parks and Recreation website, an Historic Ironworks Survey is to be the first in a series of surveys to be conducted in the graveyard. It is not currently known when this will take place.

Many of the works mentioned above focus on the same features that were examined for this thesis: status, religion, and motifs (Gorman and DiBlasi 1981, Little and colleagues 1992, Rainville 1999, Mallios and Caterino 2007). One aspect of this thesis that was not often found in the reviewed literature concerns the marker text. While text has been looked at to help identify status and social roles, it has not really been examined or used to establish wealth. That is something that this thesis will try to do.

**History of Mobile**

Mobile was founded in 1702 along the Mobile River by French brothers Pierre le Moyne d’lberville and Jean-Baptiste Le Moyne de Bienville (Waselkov 1999). It was originally established a few miles north of its present location in an area known today as Twenty-seven Mile Bluff. The French named the settlement after the Mobilian Indians, whose villages were located along the river bank (Waselkov 1999). In 1711, the town was moved to its current location by Mobile Bay. The French then referred to the original site as Old Mobile, which is how it is still referred to today (Waselkov 1999).

Mobile would shift between French, British, and Spanish rule before finally coming under the control of the United States in 1813. By 1819, Mobile was incorporated into the newly established state of Alabama. Mobile during this time was not very developed as far as buildings and society were concerned; compared to older port cities, Mobile was far behind (Amos 1985).
For a city well over one hundred years old by that time, it had little to show for its age. However, Mobile was well situated and as a port city held great promise. With the city’s focus turned to commerce and trade, the population began to grow rapidly, from around 300 at the end of the 18th century to over 2500 by 1822 (Amos 1985, Delaney 1968, Sledge 2002).

Wealth was what native Mobilians and the people that came to the city most pursued, and in Mobile the cotton trade led the way (Amos 1985, Delaney 1968, Roberts 2015). The commercial trade of cotton at the port of Mobile drew merchants and agents from other parts of the country and the world to the city (Delaney 1981, Taylor 1951). Whites from the Atlantic coast up to New England, foreign immigrants from Europe and around the globe, black slaves, free blacks, creoles, and others of mixed heritage called Mobile home (Amos 1985, Sledge 2002). The city offered numerous business opportunities, which attracted people of different professions; merchants set up their businesses, and this attracted workers. This influx of both northern born Americans and foreign immigrants added to the expanding diversity of ethnicities and religions in Mobile.

In the 1830s, Mobile was almost unrecognizable from how it looked at the beginning of the century. Buildings were being erected, and there were three city newspapers, an efficient mail service, numerous doctors and lawyers, and a well-supplied market place (Delaney 1968). By the 1850s, Mobile became the second largest port by volume for the export of cotton after New Orleans (Delaney 1981). Newspaper articles at the time show advertisements from agents interested in buying cotton. For example, a May issue in 1843 of the *Mobile Daily Advertiser* listed 18 different advertisements from agents willing to give advancements for cotton in order to ship the product to cities such as New York, Boston, Philadelphia, Liverpool, and Glasgow.
The residents of Mobile during this time, in an effort to make it similar to other established cities and more socially appealing, set up volunteer organizations including the Female Benevolent Society, the Auxiliary Tract Society, and the Temperance Society; residents also joined social organizations such as Masonic lodges and Mardi Gras mystic societies (Amos 1985, Delaney 1968, Roberts 2015). Membership in such organizations afforded Mobile residents social status.

The first Christian church to serve residents of Mobile was the Roman Catholic church. When the city of Mobile was founded, the French brought with them a Catholic priest to serve. Both French and Spanish residents and their descendants were members of the Catholic Faith. The Catholic church was the only organized religious organization present in the city until around the 1820s (Amos 1976, Historic Churches of Mobile 1971). By this time, Protestant sects were beginning to form. The first Protestant church was Christ Church (an Episcopal congregation), with the first church structure built in the mid-1820s (Historic Churches of Mobile 1971).

A large number of the American transplants to Mobile in the 19th century came from the areas around New England, bringing with them their Protestant traditions. Many of the city’s leaders and wealthiest families were members of the Protestant faith. According to Amos, many of Mobile’s Protestant elites showed a preference for joining not just Episcopal congregations, but also the oldest established congregations, which was usually made up of the upper-class, rather than other Protestant churches (1976, 1985).

Long term French and Spanish residents remained faithful to the Catholic church, but by the 1840s they became minority nationalities within the religion as large numbers of Irish immigrants began to arrive in the city (Amos 1976). The Catholic Church in Mobile soon
became associated with the poorer immigrants in the city, such as the Irish or Germans, and was therefore not looked on favorably by the wealthiest residents (Amos 1985). While the city’s wealthy leaders attended Protestant congregations, the majority of Mobile County’s residents still attended Catholic churches, thus creating a distinction between the two groups (Amos 1985). Blacks, both slaves and free, were admitted into both predominately white Catholic and Presbyterian congregations, while Episcopalian, Methodist, and Baptist churches formed separate congregations for black church members (Amos 1976, 1985, Taylor 1951).

The Church Street Graveyard

As Mobile grew, it soon became clear that a new cemetery was needed to replace the Spanish cemetery, known as Campo Santo, as it was too close to businesses and residences (Sledge 2002). Mobile’s Church Street Graveyard was quickly established. The city officially acquired the land from William E. Kennedy, one of the city’s largest landowners, in April of 1820 for the sum of twenty dollars. However, burials occurred before the sale was formally finalized with the city due to a Yellow Fever outbreak that caused the deaths of 274 people in only a few months (Nelson and Nelson 1963, Sledge 2002). By the time the land changed ownership to the city, the graveyard was already over a quarter filled, an unknown number of which were victims of Yellow Fever outbreaks (Sledge 2002). A handful of headstones present in the graveyard today actually list the cause of death as Yellow Fever, though the exact number of victims of the disease buried in the Church Street Graveyard is not known.

Yellow Fever was a scourge along the Gulf Coast. Mobile in fact suffered numerous outbreaks throughout the 19th century, but several years were particularly bad: 1819, 1825, 1837, 1839, 1843, 1853, 1878 (Amos 1985, Sledge 2002). The Mobile Daily Advertiser in 1843, a year of a severe Yellow Fever outbreak, posted updates from the Board of Health on recent cases of
Yellow Fever and asked physicians to report all possible cases of the disease. Newspapers regularly updated residents on conditions within their own city as well as in neighboring ones. For example, posts about the conditions in New Orleans and the number of reported cases of Yellow Fever can be found in the *Mobile Daily Advertiser* (September 1843). A weekly internments section was even found in a Mobile newspaper reporting the deaths caused by Yellow fever (*Mobile Daily Advertiser* 1844). Advertisements of the port city would also note the health of the city in an effort to attract businesses and workers. One such advertisement made the claim of “no Yellow Fever there during the summer…” in looking for workers for the port and along the rivers (*Mobile Daily Advertiser* 1843).

The Church Street Graveyard was active starting in the year 1819 (although it officially opened in 1820) and closed for burials in 1898. The graveyard was divided into three primary sections: a Catholic section, a Protestant section, and a section designated “For Strangers” that included individuals of unknown religious denomination, Masons and Odd Fellows, veterans, and a potter’s field area (Nelson and Nelson 1963, Sledge 2002). This division offers an opportunity to understand the role religion played in the lives of Mobile’s citizens.

Catholicism and Protestantism were the two most prevalent religions in Mobile in the early part of the 19th century, and each religion had their own burial customs. Catholic Canon Law concerning funerary customs (Canon 1176-1185) details the steps that are to be taken for proper burial. The Church is to have its own burial grounds or portion in a public cemetery, and it is to be blessed by a priest before receiving the deceased. The Church Street Graveyard was the only burial ground at the time of Mobile’s economic boom. As such, it was necessary that the graveyard serve residents of multiple religious denominations and was therefore not associated
with a particular church or denomination. It is believed this is why the Church Street Graveyard was equally divided between the Catholic and Protestant religions.

Mobile was a city of diverse ethnicities, but it could not be determined if the Church Street Graveyard was further divided beyond religious association. It is currently believed that the Church Street Graveyard did not have any racial segregation and was mainly divided according to religion only. Examples are Constance Hugon (1773-1845) and the Batre and Chaudron families. Constance Hugon is interred at Church Street Graveyard and her marker indicates that she was originally from New Orleans. Mobile census records for 1830 show that she was a Creole woman. Her grave marker is located in the Catholic section, as creoles in Mobile were Catholic and most non-creoles were not (Amos 1976, Mannhard 1982).

Census records for 1866 list Adolphe Batre (birth and death year unknown), head of the Batre family, and his children as colored. Three of the children from his second marriage are buried in the Church Street Graveyard along with his first wife. Coincidently, his first wife, Sylvania Chaudron (1803-1825), is possibly of mixed ethnicity as her father, Simon Chaudron (1758-1846) was originally from France and her mother Melanie Jeanne G. Chaudron (1774-1859) was from St. Domingo according to state census records for 1830 and federal census records for 1850. Both Simon Chaudron and his wife Melanie are buried in the Church Street Graveyard as well.

It is known, however, that racially segregated burial sections did occur with the establishment of Magnolia Cemetery in 1836. There are also no known records during the time of the 19th century of black only burial grounds. There is the possibility of simple, family burials taking place outside of the existing cemeteries, but this could not be confirmed. It is believed that blacks were buried in the Church Street Graveyard and later in Magnolia Cemetery.
While the city of Mobile expanded and Protestantism became more prevalent, relations between Protestants and Catholics were mostly amicable. Both contributed to the betterment of the city, for example in donating to the construction of the Cathedral of the Immaculate Conception. It was not until the mid-part of the 19th century that any type of animosity formed (Amos 1976). The American Party, or the Know Nothings, brought bigotry toward Catholics and Protestant preachers openly attacked and opposed Catholicism in their church sermons (Amos 1976). It was also towards the mid-part of the 19th century that the Church Street Graveyard was over half filled and two new cemeteries were established: Magnolia Cemetery in 1836 and the Catholic Cemetery in 1848. Undoubtedly, these two new cemeteries helped to better serve each religion on a separate basis, but also served to reinforce socio-religious divisions in Mobilian society.

When the Church Street Graveyard was established, it lay about half a mile outside the city. The graveyard originally measured 417 ½ feet on all sides and was roughly four acres in size; it is surrounded by a brick wall, which was constructed during the 1830s (Nelson and Nelson 1963, Sledge 2002). The original entrance was located to the south towards present day Monroe Street and changed location two more times with the final location being to the north, facing Government Street. The layout was similar in appearance to old New England churchyards, as much of Mobile’s elite during that time were from the New England area (Sledge 2002, Amos 1985). Today, the Church Street Graveyard is located between the main road of Government Street to the north and Monroe Street to the south in downtown Mobile.

According to Nelson and Nelson (1963) and John Sledge (2002), the original surveyor used magnetic north and did not plot out the graveyard using “true North” (or grid north), which
was used to lay out the city streets. Therefore, city maps of the era show the graveyard’s layout as being offset relative to the surrounding streets (Figure 1a and 1b). Figure 1a shows how the graveyard was divided into three sections: Catholic, Protestant, and For Strangers. The Catholic and Protestant sections were divided into equal parts and took up two thirds of the grounds (Nelson and Nelson 1963). The Catholic section is located in the northeastern half while the Protestant section is to the southeast. The remaining western third of the graveyard is designated “For Strangers”.

Today, the graveyard is no longer square, but “L” shaped. Several burials were removed from the graveyard during the early 1900s and relocated to nearby Magnolia Cemetery (Nelson and Nelson 1963). The burial relocation was believed to coincide with the partial removal of the west wall in order to open Bayou Street to Church Street. Current aerial images of the graveyard show its modern era “L” shape and its layout as still being offset to the surrounding streets (Figure 1c).

Each of the two religious sections contain 10 rows with 14 and one-half lots in each row. The rows are numbered 1 to 20 and run north to south across both sections, with the start of Row 1 located in the northeast corner and the start of Row 20 in the southeast corner. The lots are numbered 1 to 10 in each religious section, and moving east to west, the lots increase by tens. For example, Row 1 contains Lots 10, 20, 30, etc. followed by Row 2 and Lots 9, 19, 29, and on; this pattern continues all the way through to Row 10. Beginning with Row 11, the lot numbers start over again with Lots 10, 20, 30, and on, and end with Row 20 and Lots 1, 11, 21, etc.
Figure 1a. Close-up of the La Tourrette Map showing the graveyard's layout. Shows the three sections found in the graveyard and surrounding streets. (Courtesy of the city of Mobile, Municipal Archives.)
Figure 1b. La Tourette Map 1838 showing the location of the graveyard. The red circle denotes the location of the graveyard. (Courtesy of the city of Mobile, Municipal Archives)
When the Church Street Graveyard opened, a number of recent graves from the site of the previous cemetery, Campo Santo, were moved to Church Street. It is believed that the oldest burial in the graveyard belonged to a five-year-old girl named Anson Newbald who died in 1817, and whose remains were relocated to the Church Street Graveyard (Nelson and Nelson 1963,
Sledge 2002). However, her grave, if present, is no longer marked. The last recorded burial is that of Virginia Gaines Mitchell, a three-year-old child who died in the summer of 1898 (Nelson and Nelson 1963). The exact number of burials in the graveyard does not appear to be currently known. Further disturbances and damage occurred to the graveyard when the city attempted to repair graves that had been damaged or fallen in, though it is uncertain when this took place. Many of the stones and monuments were completely covered by concrete and are today considered “unknown” (Nelson and Nelson 1963).

During the early 1960s, Col. and Soren Nelson and members of the Historic Mobile Preservation Society recorded all the information that was legible at the time for most of the existing headstones and monuments. This information has been of great use to this thesis project as much of the information found on the stones existing today is difficult to read due to years of neglect and monument degradation. It is currently not known how many stones and monuments exist in the Church Street Graveyard today, but it is estimated to have well over 500.

The headstones, monuments, and markers located in the Church Street Graveyard are the artifacts that were studied. The markers were analyzed to determine whether concepts of religion and socioeconomic status are reflected in the gravestones. Because Church Street is divided into sections according to religion, comparisons can be made of the gravestone types and motifs used. The non-Catholics represented a kind of “nouveau riche” in Mobile. This thesis ultimately tests the assumption that wealthy Protestants were representing their wealth in the gravestones of their deceased members.

The basis for this thesis hypothesis is wealth. The costs associated with grave markers could vary depending on size, material, ornamentation, and lettering. No historical documents could be found concerning the cost of any markers in the Church Street Graveyard. However,
stone carvers during the time were known to advertise and list costs for certain grave stone items. Unfortunately, no Mobile newspapers could be found with advertisements of cost from local carvers. However, advertisements for costs were found for nearby Pensacola; two advertisements in 1849 and 1853 were found in the Pensacola Gazette for local carver Elihu Purvis. In each of these, Purvis listed costs for different types of marble, headpieces, and lettering (Pensacola Gazette 1849). Purvis also advertised that he could accommodate a range of prices, from as low as $8 to as high as $5,000 (Pensacola Gazette 1853). The costs that Purvis listed in the newspaper are considered comparable to costs in Mobile.

In order to consider the stones as proxy for wealth, criteria for wealth were established. Size is one of the major criteria for wealth, given the additional expenses associated with greater material costs. The largest stones are assumed to represent the wealthiest citizens. Measurements and style forms or the architectural type of stone were used to determine size. Examples of forms or types include, but are not limited to, tablets, headstones, ledger stones, obelisks, box tombs, and above-ground tombs. Also, the components that compose a gravestone can indicate wealth, such as evidence of brick masonry or multiple pieces (die, base, cap, or other cut stones) that required assemblage. The more components, the more the marker is presumed to have cost. Elaboration in the carving or presence of a motif are also criteria for establishing wealth. The more decorated and heavily carved the gravestone, the wealthier the individual or family.

Finally, text, or more specifically the amount of text found on a marker, was used as criteria for wealth. Since stone carvers charged by the character, the more text present on a marker, the more expensive the stone. According to a newspaper advertisement, Elihu Purvis charged four to five cents per letter (Pensacola Gazette 1849). Religion, of course, was
determined on the location of the gravestone in the Protestant section or the Catholic section of the graveyard and corroborated by their respective religious iconography.

The major hypothesis for this thesis is that larger, more elaborate, and more heavily inscribed graves will be located in the Protestant section of the graveyard. The size of the memorial, according to Kephart (1950) was used as a class distinction. Kephart states, “Historically the rich man's grave was marked by a large memorial or mausoleum, the poor man's by a small head or footstone, or perhaps by the absence of a stone” (1950:642). However, it is important to keep in mind that social factors concerning death can also play a role in marker choice, and that size does not always equal status (Parker Pearson 1982, Rainville 1999, Buckham 2003).

By looking at the design as well as the information provided on the gravestone itself, it may be possible to determine if and or which of Mobile’s main religions chose to display their socioeconomic status in death. Were displays of status after death important to Catholic and Protestant Mobilians? Do the memorials display a level of equality? Or, do they display idealized relations? Ultimately, what does that say about Mobile’s society during the 19th century?

The history of the study of cemeteries and gravestones has often focused on religion and socioeconomic factors. By learning if or how these are reflected in grave stones, it is possible to understand the cultural practices and ideology of the society that chose them. The Church Street Graveyard is Mobile, Alabama’s oldest extant cemetery. It was established during a time in which the city was finally experiencing an urban and economic revitalization. The population boomed, and with that came distinct religious and class affiliations. The establishment of separate religious sections within the graveyard demonstrates that these distinctions mattered to
Mobilians during the 19th century. The following chapter discusses the methods used to study if religious and socioeconomic differences are found in the grave markers used by each group.
CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

The intention of this project is to explore the association of wealth and religion during life as reflected in the gravestones found in the Church Street Graveyard. The major hypothesis to be tested is that the markers located in the Protestant section will be larger, more decorative, and have more text than the grave markers located in the Catholic section, reflecting the greater wealth and higher socioeconomic status of the Protestant community. To test this hypothesis, a suite of attributes from a sample of headstones were recorded. Subsequent comparisons focused on three main variables between the two religious sections.

Recording

Records indicate that the Church Street Graveyard is divided into equal parts for both the Protestant and Catholic sections with each section containing 10 rows with 14 and a half lots in each row (Nelson and Nelson 1963). Each recorded lot contains between 1 and 13 grave markers. When Nelson and Nelson (1963) published their work for the Historic Mobile Preservation Society, they included a reference “map” to indicate the location of a grave (by name only) according to row and lot numbers. Figures 2a and 2b show an updated map created by the city of Mobile that is based off the map by Nelson and Nelson (1963). This map shows the boundaries and graves in both the Protestant and Catholic sections; these names and religious affiliations were used to construct a database for recording the headstones.

Each gravestone was recorded using two forms. The first form is the Historic Cemetery Object Form created by the Alabama Historical Commission (AHC) (Appendix A). This form is a pre-made form for surveying and recording historic cemeteries in the state of Alabama.
Figure 2a. Row and Lot layout for the Catholic section. (Courtesy City of Mobile Parks and Recreation Department)
Figure 2b. Row and Lot layout for the Protestant section. (Courtesy City of Mobile Parks and Recreation Department)
The Alabama Historical Commission’s website provides a number of resources for how to record cemeteries in the state as well as how to fill out their forms. These resources were consulted before fieldwork took place, and the instructions, terms, and definitions provided by the AHC were used to fill out both forms.

The AHC form allowed for recording object information for each maker like object head (tablet, headstone, obelisk, etc.), object body (box tomb, above-ground tomb, ledger stone, etc.), foot/base of object (base, footstone, statuary, etc.), and transcribing all marker text. This form also includes sections for marker material, condition, repairs, text condition, and grave articles. The AHC also allows for recording groups of markers on a separate form. This form is the Historic Cemetery Group Form (Appendix B). This form was used to record clusters of above-ground tombs that were unmarked and unknown. For such markers, the AHC does not require measurements and due to the inability to distinguish individual tombs in these cases, these markers were excluded from the analysis. Completed forms will be submitted to the AHC after this project is complete.

The second form was created specifically to suit the needs of this project at the Church Street Graveyard (Appendix C). This form did include some information found on the AHC forms as well as additional information. It was mainly used to record data such as marker measurements, marker motif/design, and sculpted motifs. This form also noted coping and curbing, fencing, carver signatures, lettering type, and cardinal direction. Space is available for sketching the marker. While some of the data collected were not utilized during this project, they were retained for the purposes of potential future work and preservation.

University of West Florida Anthropology graduate student volunteers helped record the cemetery over the course of several months. The Catholic section was recorded first, followed by
the Protestant section. Sampled markers meeting project requirements were fully recorded; however, a number of markers were ultimately excluded from the research project. Excluded markers include modern-day monuments, military stones that are not of the time period, and Jewish markers. There were also markers that were found to be face down in the ground. These markers were left unmoved per city request, but as much data that could be was collected. Data such as marker type, marker material, and when possible, marker measurements were recorded. Data such as marker text and motif were not included.

The entirety of the Catholic section was recorded. The final number of markers recorded in the Catholic section totaled 309. When the recording for the Protestant section began, it became clear that completion of this section could not be done in the remaining field time. In order to record as much as possible and have a representative sample, the remainder of the Protestant section was recorded using a random sampling. One lot from each of the remaining rows was randomly chosen and then recorded. In the end, the number of Protestant markers recorded totaled 215. Although this leaves a difference of 94 markers between the Catholic and Protestant sections, the sample size is adequately large and is presumably representative of the entire population.

**Database and Variables**

A database for this project was created using Microsoft Access. The database organized the data as well as allowed for different search queries based on any of the variables entered. A total of fifteen datum were used in the database. This included additional marker information such as carver signature and foot stone text and measurements. The kinds of data placed into the database were chosen with the three main variables in mind: size, decorative motifs, and text.
**Size.** For the first variable of size, marker measurements and marker type were examined. To do this, search queries for marker measurements were done in the database. The measurements for each marker were taken using a measuring tape in inches for H x W x D. The AHC form allows for three different measurements to be taken. These measurements are termed the head of the object (headstone, tablet, obelisk, etc.), the body of the object (above-ground tomb, box tomb, ledger stone, etc.), and the foot/base of object (base, foot stone, statuary, etc.) (Appendix A). When applicable, each of these measurements were taken while in the field. A majority of markers, however, only required a single measurement. Figure 3 shows how the measurements were taken.

With the measurements for the shortest, tallest, and widest markers, parameters could be established to place each into a more simplified grouping of small, medium, and large sizes. In order to determine the parameters of the three sizes, the distribution of the markers across height and width were examined. Figure 4 and Figure 5 show the distribution of the markers based on height and width.

Both height and width displayed similar breaks in marker measurements. These natural shifts in measurement serve as the delineation for the three sizes. The sizes for height/length were divided as follows: (9”– 59””) for small, (60”– 109””) for medium, and (110”– 159””) for large. Parameters for width were also made, (9”– 29””) for small, (30”– 49””) for medium, and (50”– 89””) for large. In cases in which a marker’s measurements did not fit into the same size grouping for both height and width, the marker size was designated based one which was bigger. For example, a marker with a height that was medium (60”– 109””), but a width that was small (9”– 29””) would ultimately be categorized as medium.
Figure 3. Diagram of how measurements were taken. (free clipart courtesy of http://hddfhm.com/)

Figure 4. Distribution of markers based on height.
In addition to marker size, marker types were also examined. Each marker recorded was designated a marker type. Types were assigned based on the Alabama Historical Commission’s list of marker types and definitions. For example, the AHC defines a ledger stone as, “a large (usually 3’x6’) rectangular grave marker of stone laid flat over a grave or set on top of a box or table tomb.” Ten of the marker types listed by the AHC are found in the sample. These include common markers such as tablet, headstone, ledger stone, box tomb, above-ground tomb, obelisk, and cradle. For additional information, the AHC website provides a cemetery glossary for common Alabama grave markers. An additional four marker types are not listed by the AHC. A new type was designated specifically for this project if multiple examples of the type were identified and/or did not fit into any existing AHC marker type definitions. These markers were often a combination of marker types, such as the Headstone on top of a Ledger. Otherwise, single examples were labeled “miscellaneous.” A full list of marker types can be seen in Table 1.

**Decorative Motifs.** The second variable examined was decorative motifs. Decorative elements for this project were defined as any additional carved or sculptural decoration to the
marker beyond the general shape of the stone. The shape of the marker alone was not counted as a decorative motif for this project.

Table 1. Identified Marker Types

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marker Types</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tablet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Headstone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ledger Stone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Box Tomb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above-Ground Tomb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obelisk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Headstone on top of a Ledger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cradle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Tablet with Dome Body Stone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monument</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table Tomb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Above-Ground with Tablet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Above-Ground with Headstone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mausoleum Loculus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* denotes marker type not listed with AHC

Most markers in the sample were found to have no decorative motifs. For the stones found with decorative motifs, each individual motif was counted. Individual motifs were defined as any image or decorative element, carved or sculptural, that is present and is independent of any other decorative element. For example, if a marker has a willow and an urn image the willow was counted as one motif and the urn as a second motif. Though the willow and urn are often found together, they are also found independently on markers. Therefore, for this project, they were counted separately even if found together. Markers were then placed into one of three categories based on the number of motifs present. The categories were simply labeled: 1 motif, 2
motifs, or 3+ motifs. Several stones were also found to be face down in the ground or destroyed to the point that no decorative motifs could be identified. These markers were placed into a category of “not applicable” (N/A).

Along with counting the number of decorative motifs on each marker, the individual decorative motifs were also identified. This made it possible to determine what the most common motifs are as well as how many different motifs are present overall and in each of the religious sections.

Text. The final variable examined was text, specifically the amount of text present. As part of the graveyard recording, all text was carefully transcribed exactly as written on the marker. All names, inscriptions, punctuation, dates, and abbreviations were copied as found. This allowed for an accurate count of every individual word and each character present on the marker.

As each marker inscription was entered into the database, word and character counts were noted. In order to compare the amount of text found on the markers between each religious section, their averages were determined. Not every marker contained text, however. Numerous markers were completely unmarked, and several were face down or completely illegible. These markers were, of course, excluded from the count. There were also markers that were only partially legible. For these stones, as much text that could be recognized was counted and the remaining illegible portions were excluded from the word and character counts.

The average number of words and the average number of characters were found for each religious section as well as overall for the graveyard. From here, it was possible to determine how many markers met the average, were below the average, or were above the average for word and character counts. It was also possible to determine which markers had the most and least amount of text in each religious section.
Statistical Analysis

For this project, a simple chi-square test of independence was employed to test the project hypothesis: grave markers in the Protestant section of the graveyard are larger, more decorative, and have more text than those found in the Catholic section. This statistical model was employed because it allows for a comparison of data to determine if there is a relationship between variables. For this project, the chi-square model will statistically test if there is a connection between the two religious sections and the size, number of decorative motifs, and the amount of text found on the grave markers.

The chi-square model was applied to each of the three main variables using the base numbers found during their initial analysis. For size, a chi-square model was created using the classifications of small, medium, and large for both the Catholic and Protestant sections. To analyze motif, a chi-square was created using the categories of 1 motif, 2 motifs, and 3+ motifs for each religious section. Lastly, for text, a chi-square model was created using the categories of below average, at average, and above average for both the word count and the character count of each marker in both the Catholic and Protestant sections.

The next chapter will detail the analysis that was conducted on the Church Street Graveyard. The recorded markers in both the Catholic and Protestant sections are examined in relation to each of the three variables mentioned in this chapter: size, decorative motif, and text. Finally, the results of the chi-square tests are presented.
CHAPTER IV

ANALYSIS AND RESULTS

The sections in this chapter detail the initial analysis of each of the three variables followed by a statistical analysis. The data collected were inputted into a database that allowed for a simple analysis of the three main variables: size, motif, and text. For the statistical analysis, the data for the three variables were evaluated using a chi-square statistical test.

Size

Analysis. For the analysis of size, the tallest, shortest, and widest markers in the sample were identified first. The tallest marker measures 154 inches in height and the smallest marker in the sample measures 9.5 inches in height. The widest marker measures 85 inches. Both the tallest and widest markers in the sample are found in the Catholic section. The shortest marker in the sample is in the Protestant section. These initial measurements serve as the parameters for the size categories used for the statistical analysis.

Once the overall measurements were found, the tallest, shortest, and widest markers for both religious sections were noted (Table 2). For the Catholic section, the tallest marker is also the tallest overall marker in the sample at 154 inches. This marker is an obelisk. The shortest marker in the Catholic section is a tablet and is 11.75 inches tall. An above-ground tomb is the widest marker in the Catholic section at 85 inches. In the Protestant section, the tallest marker is also an obelisk at 138 inches in height. The shortest stone is a tablet at 9.5 inches. The widest marker recorded in the Protestant section is that of a box tomb with a width of 62.5 inches.
The markers were then placed into size categories of small, medium, and large. Of the 524 markers recorded, 488 were analyzed for size. There were 36 markers that were not used in this study. These stones mostly consisted of above-ground tombs and ledger stones clustered together to the point that accurately measuring individual markers was impossible. In the field, these markers were recorded as a group and measurements were not taken, therefore they were excluded from the size analysis.

The analysis sample consisted of a total of 297 small markers, 177 medium markers, and 14 large markers. Of these, 273 markers were from the Catholic section and 215 were from the Protestant. Table 3 displays how the markers were divided by size among the two religious sections. In the Catholic section, small markers make up 56% of the total of 273, followed by 41% for medium markers, and 2.9% for large markers. In the Protestant section, small markers make up the majority of the total of 215 with 66.9%, followed by medium with 30.2% and large markers with 2.7%.

The number of marker types was also noted for all 524 recorded markers. Table 4 shows how many of each marker type were recorded and how many are present in each of the two religious sections. It also shows what percentage of each marker type makes up the total number found in each religious section. Apart from the marker type labeled Tablet with Dome Body

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Overall Sample</th>
<th>Catholic Section</th>
<th>Protestant Section</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Shortest</strong></td>
<td>9.5&quot;</td>
<td>11.75&quot;</td>
<td>9.5&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tallest</strong></td>
<td>154&quot;</td>
<td>154&quot;</td>
<td>138&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Widest</strong></td>
<td>85&quot;</td>
<td>85&quot;</td>
<td>62.5&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Stone and the miscellaneous markers, each of the recorded marker types are found in the Catholic section. Four of the marker types listed in Table 4 were not recorded in the Protestant section. This suggests that the Catholic section contains a larger variety of marker types compared to the Protestant.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marker Type</th>
<th>Number of Markers</th>
<th>Catholic Section</th>
<th>Protestant Section</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tablet</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>101 (32.6%)</td>
<td>108 (50.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Headstone</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>40 (12.9%)</td>
<td>37 (17.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ledger Stone</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>47 (15.2%)</td>
<td>18 (8.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Box Tomb</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>33 (10.6%)</td>
<td>15 (6.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above-Ground Tomb</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>43 (13.9%)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obelisk</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>10 (3.2%)</td>
<td>12 (5.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Headstone on top of Ledger</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8 (2.5%)</td>
<td>4 (1.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cradle</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3 (0.9%)</td>
<td>5 (2.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tablet with Dome Body Stone</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8 (3.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monument</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4 (1.2%)</td>
<td>1 (0.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table Tomb</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2 (0.6%)</td>
<td>2 (0.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above-Ground with Tablet</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4 (1.2%)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above-Ground with Headstone</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3 (0.9%)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mausoleum Loculus</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3 (0.9%)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8 (2.5%)</td>
<td>5 (2.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>524</strong></td>
<td><strong>309</strong></td>
<td><strong>215</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
During the initial analysis, it was found that the most common marker type in the graveyard is the tablet. It is also the most common marker in both religious sections, and more tablets were recorded in the Protestant section than the Catholic. The tablet varies in size between small and medium, with the smallest recorded tablet measuring 9.5” x 9” x 1.75” and the biggest at 65” x 30” x 2.” Both tablets are in the Protestant section. Tablets make up 50.2% of the makers found in the Protestant section, but only 32.6% of the total number of markers in the Catholic section.

Several marker types are composed of multiple pieces and require assemblage. Often markers that have a base (obelisks, headstones, monuments) are placed on a secondary base made of brick. Box tombs and above-ground tombs also require masonry work. The extra material and the labor used to erect these markers is assumed in this study to be an indication of wealth.

A total of 22 obelisks were recorded in the sample. Of all the marker types found in the sample, obelisks are the tallest. The tallest obelisk is in the Catholic section and measures 154” x 22” x 22.” However, more obelisks were recorded in the Protestant section. Obelisks vary in size from small to large. The shortest obelisk is in the Protestant section and measures 57” x 22.5” x 22.5” and the tallest measures 138” x 28” x 28.” Obelisks make up only 3.2% of the total of makers found in the Catholic section. In comparison, obelisks compose 5.5% of the total in the Protestant section.

The Protestant section is just three markers short of the Catholic section for the number of headstone markers. Headstones are the second most common marker type found in the sample. Headstones, by AHC’s definition have a base, can be multi-tiered, and require assembling (Figure 6). Headstones make up just 12.9% of the total for markers in the Catholic
section, while in comparison to the Protestant section, they make up 17.2% of the total. Figure 7 is an example of the brick masonry work that markers such as headstones can have.

The marker type labeled Headstone on top of Ledger can also be found in both religious sections. This particular maker type consists of multiple pieces, just like a typical headstone, but with the addition of a ledger (Figure 8). Although this marker type is not specifically listed by the AHC, it was found numerous times throughout the graveyard to warrant a separate name type. Twelve such markers were found throughout the graveyard, with eight in the Catholic section and four in the Protestant. The eight such markers in the Catholic section make up 2.5% of the total. The four in the Protestant section only account for 1.8% of the total number of Protestant markers.

Figure 6. Example of a headstone with a base in the Catholic section. Marker for Stephen D. Lopez (1848-1859).
Figure 7. Example of a base and brick masonry in the Protestant section. Marker for James Innis Adams, undated.

Figure 8. Example of a headstone on top of ledger. This example also contains an additional sculptural piece. Marker for Edward F. Cooper (1836-1875) and Mattie Cooper (1845-1874).
Box tombs and above-ground tombs are the fourth and fifth most common marker types found in the sample respectively (Figure 9a, Figure 9b, and Figure 10). The AHC defines an above-ground tomb as a structure that entombs human remains entirely above ground while a box tomb is composed of a ledger stone and brick or other stone, is rectangular in shape, and is placed over an in-ground burial. In the Church Street Graveyard, 48 box tombs and 43 above-ground tombs were identified. There are 33 box tombs in the Catholic section and 15 in the Protestant section. Box tombs compose 10.6% of the total for Catholic markers and above-ground tombs account for 13.9%. Comparatively, box tombs make up just 6.9% of the total number of markers found in the Protestant section. All of the above-ground tombs recorded are in the Catholic section. It is not clear why above-ground tombs only appear in the Catholic Section, and unfortunately, all but five of these markers are considered “unknown.” They appear to be the ones associated with the attempts mentioned in Chapter II to repair damaged markers in the graveyard. No further information beyond religion could be garnered from these markers, and specifics can only be speculated.

In addition to box tombs and above-ground tombs, there are also the marker types labeled Above-Ground with Tablet and Above-Ground with Headstone. These marker types are not listed by the AHC, but were found numerous times during the recording and were given a separate label. During the recording, these two marker types were found only in the Catholic section. Combined, their percentage makes up 2.1% of the total for markers in the Catholic section.
Figure 9a. Example of a box tomb with brick box. Marker for William James Magee (1834-1835).

Figure 9b. Example of a box tomb with marble box. Marker for Hannah Townley (1805-1839).
The cradle marker type is also a marker that contains multiple pieces that require assemblage (Figure 11). According to the AHC, a cradle marker consists of a tablet or headstone that has decorative curbing that outlines a single grave, is made of the same material as the main stone and is part of the overall marker design. There were eight such markers recorded in the Church Street Graveyard. Three are in the Catholic section and five are in the Protestant. Cradle markers comprise 2.3% of the total markers recorded in the Protestant section, but only 0.9% of the markers recorded in the Catholic.

**Statistical Analysis Results.** The first part of the hypothesis for this thesis states that the markers in the Protestant section will be larger in size than those in the Catholic section. Having larger sizes of markers in general and a greater number of large sized markers present would indicate that members of the Protestant faith are wealthier and have more status. Chi-square is a statistical test that is used to determine if observed frequencies differ significantly from expected frequencies (Madrigal 2012:166).
In the chi-square test of independence, the difference is determined by two variables which allows for two possible outcomes: either there is a relationship between the variables or they are independent of each other (Madrigal 2012:172). For this statistical analysis, the data are tested to see if the results would produce a p-value of less than 0.05. A p-value of 0.05 or 5% means that there is a 95% chance or certainty that the results are significant. In this section, the chi-square test of independence was used to identify if there is any relationship between the religious sections and the size of the markers.

Contingency tables (3x2) were constructed showing both the observed and expected values (Tables 5 and 6). The chi-square results for size did show a statistical significance:
\( \chi^2 (df=2, N=488) = 6.233, p = .0443 \). The resulting p-value of .0443 means that there is only a 4.43% chance that the results are completely random and not related. In other words, there is a 95.57% chance that there is an association between the size of a marker and religion.

Table 5. Contingency Table Showing Expected Values for Sizes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Size</th>
<th>Catholic</th>
<th>Protestant</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Small</td>
<td>166.1</td>
<td>130.85</td>
<td>297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>99.0</td>
<td>77.98</td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large</td>
<td>7.83</td>
<td>6.17</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>488</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6. Contingency Table Showing Observed Values for Sizes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Size</th>
<th>Catholic</th>
<th>Protestant</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Small</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>488</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A contribution chart (Figure 12) was then created to see which religious section and what marker size contributed the most to the statistical significance. Surprisingly, the Catholic section contained fewer small sized markers than expected, and the Protestant section contained a greater number of small stones than expected. The Catholic section also contained a greater number of
medium sized markers than expected, while the Protestant section had fewer. Both the medium and small sizes contribute a significantly greater number compared to large. The size large contribution is quite miniscule. The chi-square results from this statistical analysis are significant. However, they show the opposite of what was expected to be found. Instead of medium- and large-size markers in the Protestant section being more numerous, it was the Catholic section that actually had larger stones on average.

![Chart of Contribution to the Chi-Square Value by Size](image)

Figure 12. Chi-square contribution chart by size.

**Decorative Motifs**

**Analysis.** Some researchers observe that motif choice was often influenced by an individual’s or family’s religious affiliation, and in some contemporary cemeteries motif choice has been found to correlate with religious affiliation (Rainville 1999, Buckham 2003). While no one motif was found to be exclusive to either religious section in the Church Street Graveyard, each religion showed a preference for particular motifs. The most obvious difference between the two religions when it comes to motif preference is that Catholics often chose motifs related to
their religion, like the “cross,” while Protestants often chose floral motifs which are not as overtly religious in nature.

There were a total of 28 different motifs identified in the sample with the “cross” being the most commonly found motif. Of the 37 cross motifs recorded, 35 were on markers located in the Catholic section, making the “cross” the most commonly found motif in the Catholic portion of the sample. Flowers of various types and flower buds were the most commonly found motifs on markers in the Protestant section. Examples of these motifs can be seen in Figures 13 and 14.

In the Church Street Graveyard, most of the motif types identified were found in both religious sections. However, when the religious sections are looked at individually for motifs, the Catholic section does contain a slightly greater variety than the Protestant section. A list of overall marker motifs can be seen in Table 7 and a list of the symbolic meanings behind those motifs can be found in Appendix D. It is also interesting to note that two motifs predominately associated with markers in the Catholic section were found on markers in the Protestant; these motifs are the cross, found on two stones, and the Christogram I H S, found on one. Single motif examples were placed into a “miscellaneous” group.

According to Harriet Amos, residents of Mobile during the 19th century became involved in social activities and organizations to establish Mobile as a city of culture and manners, and residents that joined these social organizations became city leaders (1985). Membership in such groups afforded residents social status. Masonic lodges and Mardi Gras mystic societies are examples of such organizations.
Figure 13. Example of a marker with a cross motif in the Catholic section. Marker for Hannah Sughi (d. 1861).

Figure 14. Example of marker with flower motif in Protestant section. Marker for Sarah S. Bowen (d. 1849).
Symbols from these social groups were found in both religious sections. In the recorded sample, three markers in the Catholic section and two in the Protestant section had the Freemasons’ symbol of the square and compass. There was also a motif identified as a possible Knights Templar symbol found on a marker in the Protestant section (Figure 15). One mystic society
symbol was also found on a marker in the Protestant section (Figure 16); the Striker’s Goat is a symbol associated with Mobile’s Strikers Independent Society, which is not only the oldest Carnival society in the United States, but the nation’s third-oldest active social organization (Roberts 2015).

**Statistical Analysis Results.** During the database creation, the number of motifs for each marker was counted and placed into a category of 1 motif, 2 motifs, or 3+ motifs based on the number of individual motifs present (Figures 17-20). It became very evident that a majority (n=378) of markers did not have any decorative motifs. There were also nine markers that were not applicable to the analysis. This was due to the marker being faced down in the ground or destroyed. In total, 137 markers were analyzed for motifs. Table 8 shows how the markers were divided between the two religious sections in the sample.

Figure 15. Example of Freemason and Knights Templar motifs. Marker for James Moore (1792-1829) and William Barnes Moore (1826-1860).
Figure 16. Marker with a mystic society motif and image close-up. Image of the Striker’s Goat from Mobile’s Strikers Independent Society. Marker for Edward W. Moore (1826-1856).
Figure 17. Example of a marker with 1 motif.
Marker for Lucy (d. 1838) and Emma Woolsey (d. 1844).

Figure 18. Example of a marker with 2 motifs.
Marker for Margaret Haney (d. 1829).
Figure 19. Example of a marker with 3+ motifs.
Marker for John McCartney (d. 1835).

Figure 20. Example of markers with 3+ motifs.
Markers for Abby Ann Whiting (1820-1866) and James Whiting (1828-1870).
A corollary of the thesis hypothesis states that the markers in the Protestant section will have a greater number of decorative motifs than those in the Catholic section. Marker elaboration is an indication of wealth because of the added time and expense to carve these additional decorations. For the statistical analysis, the chi-square test of independence was again used to identify if there is any relationship between the religious sections and the number of motifs found on the stones. Contingency tables (3x2) were constructed showing both the observed and expected values (Tables 9 and 10).

The chi-square results for motif were: $\chi^2$ (df=2, N=137) = .268, p = .8745. The resulting p-value is greater than the set significance level of .05, which means that the chi-square test did not show any statistical significance. In other words, the test was unable to identify a relationship between the religious sections and the number of marker motifs.
Table 9. Contingency Table Showing the Expected Values for Motifs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Motifs</th>
<th>Catholic</th>
<th>Protestant</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>48.72</td>
<td>26.28</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>27.28</td>
<td>14.72</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3+</td>
<td>12.99</td>
<td>7.01</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 10. Contingency Table Showing the Observed Values for Motifs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Motifs</th>
<th>Catholic</th>
<th>Protestant</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3+</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Text

Analysis. Each marker inscription was carefully recorded while in the field and great lengths were taken to accurately transcribe each word and character. Once the data were entered into the database, markers were analyzed for text. Specifically, the number of words and the number of characters for each marker were examined. Markers with the least and most words and characters were found first. The shortest inscriptions overall included one word with six characters; the longest inscription included 150 words with 684 characters. The shortest and longest inscriptions for both the Catholic and Protestant sections were also identified.
Marker inscriptions in the sample were found to have various amounts of text. Most of the markers recorded had the same standard information or combination of: name, birth date, and death date. Phrases such as “In memory of” or “Sacred to the memory of” were the most common inscription introductions in the sample. Titles such as “wife of” or “son of” or “daughter of” were also common and found on markers in both religious sections. These types of titles are most often found on stones for women and children, and can be an indication of the individual’s status, usually in relation to their husband or father (Rainville 1999, Mitoraj 2001). Of the eight longest inscriptions recorded, three are for individual women and one is for a mother and son. Two of these longer inscriptions detail the social roles of the deceased; one stone is from the Catholic section and the other the Protestant. Text on markers that represented more than one person were counted in full and not divided between the number of individuals, as the analysis focused only on the marker and not the number of people.

The longest inscriptions recorded have over one hundred words and characters. Eight such stones are in the sample, with six from the Catholic section and two from the Protestant section. Half of these inscriptions are on stones representing multiple people. Of the six markers from the Catholic section, three represent more than one person. The remaining three Catholic markers are for individuals. For the Protestant section, there is one each for an individual and multiple people. The marker with the most words and characters in the entire sample is in the Protestant section and is for an individual female (Figure 21). This marker contains a total of 150 words with 684 characters. It has a detailed epitaph regarding the deceased’s family and social roles.
The shortest inscriptions in the sample are simply a name and are markers for individuals. The shortest inscriptions recorded were of a single word with six characters. There were three such markers recorded in the sample, one located in the Catholic section and two in the Protestant section. The marker in the Catholic section simply had the word ‘father’ inscribed on it. The two markers in the Protestant section each had first names inscribed, Sallie and Eugene respectively.

After the markers with least and most number of words and characters were identified, the average number of words and the average number of characters for the sample were
calculated. In the sample, 440 stones contained text and the average number of words is 32. The average number of characters is 134. Word and character averages were also found for each religious section. Table 11 shows the averages found overall in the sample as well as in the Catholic and Protestant sections. The table shows that markers in the Protestant section have a higher average number of words and characters than markers in the Catholic section.

The lettering costs found in the 1849 issue of the *Pensacola Gazette* were also applied in order to provide a sense for the cost of text. When applied to the overall average for number of characters (134), total lettering costs range from $5.36 to $6.36 for four and five cents per letter respectively. An inflation calculator was used to determine what these costs would equal to today. Accounting for inflation, this would equal out to be $1.24 to $1.55 per letter for a total cost of $166.02 to $207.52 on average for lettering on a marker in the Church Street Graveyard.

When these costs are applied to the markers with the least and most characters in the Catholic and Protestant sections, it provides a better understanding of the amount of cost of the stone. The least expensive text for both the Catholic and Protestant sections are for markers with just six characters, which would have cost .24 to .30 cents. In today’s value, that would be $7.43 to $9.29. The Catholic marker with the most text had a character count of 518. When the lettering costs are applied, it ranges from $27.36 to $34.20, which would equate to $641.77 to $802.22 in 2018. The marker with the most text in the Protestant section has a character count of 684, which would have had a cost range of $27.36 to $34.20 if the lettering costs of four and five cents were applied. In 2018, this would equal to $847.44 to $1,059.30 just for lettering.
Table 11. Word and Character Averages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Catholic</th>
<th>Protestant</th>
<th>Overall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average Number of Words</strong></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average Number of Characters</strong></td>
<td>128</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 12. Number of Markers with Text

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Catholic</th>
<th>Protestant</th>
<th>Overall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of Markers with Text</strong></td>
<td>240</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>No Text</em></td>
<td>60</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>(N/A)</em></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Statistical Analysis Results.** Of the 524 markers in the sample, 440 contained text. There are 64 markers that had no text. These markers are completely unmarked, and it is unknown who they once represented. There are also 20 markers that were designated not applicable (N/A). These markers are either face down in the ground or illegible to the point no text could be identified. Only the 440 markers with text were used in the analysis. Table 12 shows how the 440 stones in the sample were divided between the two religious sections. Markers were divided into three different categories based on the average number of words and the average number of characters found overall in the graveyard. Stones were placed into groups labeled below average, at average, or above average.

The third part of the thesis hypothesis suggests that the markers in the Protestant section will have more words and more characters than those in the Catholic section. The amount of text carved on a marker is an indication of wealth because of the increased time and labor required to
carve the text; the more text on the marker, the more expensive. For the statistical analysis, the chi-square test of independence was used to identify if there is any relationship between the religious sections and the amount of text found on the stones. Separate contingency tables (3x2) were constructed to test both words and characters. Tables 13 and 14 show the observed and expected values for word averages.

The chi-square results for words were: \( \chi^2 \) (df=2, N=440) = 2.784, p = .2485. The chi-square test did not show any statistical significance as the p-value is greater than .05. No association was identified between the religious sections and the amount of words inscribed.

Table 13. Contingency Table Showing the Expected Values for Words.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Averages</th>
<th>Catholic</th>
<th>Protestant</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Below Average</td>
<td>143.45</td>
<td>119.55</td>
<td>263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At Average</td>
<td>8.73</td>
<td>7.27</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above Average</td>
<td>87.82</td>
<td>73.18</td>
<td>161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td>240</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>440</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 14. Contingency Table Showing the Observed Values for Words

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Averages</th>
<th>Catholic</th>
<th>Protestant</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Below Average</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At Average</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above Average</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td>240</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>440</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The average number of characters was examined next. Table 15 and 16 show the observed and expected values. The chi-square result for characters were: \( \chi^2 (df=2, N=440) = 5.277, p = .0714 \). The chi-square test showed that the results were not statistically significant. Though the results were close to being significant, the current data did not show an association between the religious sections and the amount of characters inscribed.

Table 15. Contingency Table Showing Expected Values for Characters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Averages</th>
<th>Catholic</th>
<th>Protestant</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Below Average</td>
<td>142.36</td>
<td>118.64</td>
<td>261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At Average</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below Average</td>
<td>94.91</td>
<td>79.09</td>
<td>174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>440</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 16. Contingency Table Showing Observed Values for Characters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Averages</th>
<th>Catholic</th>
<th>Protestant</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Below Average</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At Average</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above Average</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>440</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Stone Carvers

It is also important to mention the carvers that were identified during the recording. Carvers can play a significant role in what motifs are found on grave stones and can give an indication of cost (Forbes 1927, Combs 1986, Veit 2009). Of the 524 recorded stones, 47 were signed. However, only 41 had legible signatures and ten were designated not applicable (N/A) due to them being faced down in the ground. A chart listing all the carvers found in the Church Street Graveyard, their location, and years of activity can be found in Appendix E. Researching carvers can be difficult and determining their location and years of activity is not always possible (Thompson 1988), therefore the list in Appendix E shows what could be found during research. Images of markers with carver signatures can be referenced in Appendix F.

The most commonly found carver signature is that of Jarvis Turner, a stone carver based in Mobile, with a total of 18 signed stones; 12 are in the Catholic section and 6 are in the Protestant. Jarvis Turner was born in Birmingham, England in 1814 and came to Mobile in 1834. His work began in 1836 and ended in 1871 when he sold his stone carving business to one of his employees, Thomas McDonald. Examples of Turner’s work can be found in cemeteries throughout Mobile and the Gulf Coast, such as Pensacola’s St. Michael’s Cemetery (Thompson 1988). Turner’s markers are found throughout both religious sections in the Church Street Graveyard, and represent individuals from different locations, from native Mobilians and Southerners to northern born Americans and European transplants.

When Turner sold his business to Thomas McDonald, McDonald teamed up with marble yard owner Richard March to form McDonald, March, & Co. This company also has examples present in the Church Street Graveyard as well as St. Michael’s Cemetery in Pensacola (Jacobson 2007, Thompson 1988). Aside from local carvers Jarvis Turner and McDonald,
March, & Co., fifteen additional carvers were identified. Table 17 shows the names of the other carvers and the number of signed stones found in the graveyard.

Table 17. Carvers and Signed Markers in the Church Street Graveyard

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Carver</th>
<th>Number of Signed Markers</th>
<th>Catholic Section</th>
<th>Protestant Section</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jarvis Turner Mobile</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trinchard Mobile</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neale &amp; Davis</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isnard N. O.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Struthers</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin &amp; Russell</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stackhouse</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crowe &amp; Treat</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eagleson &amp; Trinchard</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. B. T.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jas. Bain</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walker &amp; Sons Gravestones</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davis Mobile</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McDonald, March, &amp; Co.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Ritter, N. Haven, Ct</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fisher &amp; Bird, N.Y.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total: 41  28  13

Researchers also state that carvers would often sign markers that showed off their skills and abilities, usually on the more elaborate and larger sized stones (Combs 1984, Veit 2009). Among the markers that are signed, four are size large. Three are in the Protestant section and
one in the Catholic. The large stone in the Catholic section is signed by Isnard, a carver based out of New Orleans and was active there from 1818-1846 (Thompson 1988). Examples of Isnard’s stone carving can be found in New Orleans’ St. Louis Cemetery I. Not surprisingly, the two stones in the Church Street Graveyard signed by Isnard are both located in the Catholic section and are written in French. The large marker was for a native of New Orleans and the second marker was for a native of Jamaica. The large marker is an example of a marker being chosen for the deceased from a carver from their native city. By looking at the carvers and the place of origin for the deceased, it is possible to get a better understanding of grave marker trade patterns and the stone carving industry along the Gulf Coast (Thompson 1988).

A fascinating example are the markers by Struthers. According to the website Philadelphia Architects and Buildings, John Struthers was born in Scotland and came to Philadelphia in 1816, where he worked as a skillful architect and stone mason (2018). Two Struthers markers were found in the Church Street Graveyard and both are located in the Catholic section. What makes these markers unusual is not only are they in the Catholic section, but they are markers for seven-year-old Henry Batre (1828-1835) and four-year-old Ernest Chaudron (1821-1825). The Batre and Chaudron families, as mentioned in Chapter II, were related by marriage. Simon Chaudron was the patriarch of the Chaudron family and according to U.S. census records for 1800 was a resident of Philadelphia, Pennsylvania before moving to Mobile. It appears that Simon Chaudron had an influence on the choice of marker for his family members and selected a carver from his former home in Philadelphia.

In the Protestant section, two of the large signed stones are the works of Jarvis Turner. The remaining marker is signed Fisher & Bird N. Y. This latter marker is the same marker that contains the most text and characters in the sample (Figure 21). Fisher and Bird was a well-
established marble firm based in New York and was active from 1832-1885 (Voorsanger 2000). They were known for their elaborate stone monuments and fireplace mantels (Voorsanger 2000). Clearly, the marker in Church Street Graveyard represents significant expense, not just in the cost of the marker itself, but also for the cost of insurance and shipping it from New York to Mobile.

The Walker and Sons Gravestones marker is also noteworthy. Walker and Sons was founded in Charleston, South Carolina by Scottish immigrant Thomas Walker (Combs 1986). Walker came to the United States in the 1790s and quickly made a name for himself with his headstone carvings; eventually he involved his sons in the business and they continued it after his death in 1838 (Combs 1986, Karpiel 2013). The Walker and Sons marker in the Church Street Graveyard is a ledger stone and has no decorative motifs. The marker is for George Haupt and his wife and son. The marker notes the location of birth for both the husband and wife, St. Augustine, Florida and Savannah, Georgia respectively. According to the ledger stone, Savannah was their home before relocating to Mobile. This marker is another example of how transplants to Mobile chose not to purchase a grave marker from a local carver, but from one that would have been familiar to them back home as Walker and Sons had a reputation throughout South Carolina and Georgia (Combs 1986, Karpiel 2013).
CHAPTER V

CONCLUSION

Mobile is a city rich with history. As a port city during the 19th century, it was a melting pot of people from different parts of the then forming United States as well as from multiple countries around the globe. This diversity of people and cultures helped to form Mobile into the city it is today. During the early part of the 19th century, when the Church Street Graveyard opened, Mobile was just beginning to expand despite having been established over a hundred years prior. People came to Mobile to find their fortunes (Amos 1985). Wealth was the driving force behind the men and families that helped establish Mobile as a successful port city. Many of these founding city leaders and their families attended Protestant congregations; Catholic congregations in contrast were attended by many of the poorer immigrants who came to the city (Amos 1976, 1985). This religious association separated elites from most of the church goers in Mobile (Amos 1985). The purpose of this research project was to determine whether Protestant markers in the Church Street Graveyard display greater wealth and status than Catholic markers.

The results found during this thesis project were surprising. Research indicated a very strong Protestant influence on the wealthy residents of Mobile, despite the city’s founding and history with the Catholic church. By all accounts, Protestant markers were expected to show this association with socioeconomic status. But, the findings in the Church Street Graveyard showed something different.

Interpreting grave markers is not always a straightforward endeavor. Marker size and motif can have more than one meaning (Hiijya 1983, Moore et al. 1991), funerary monumentality does not always correlate with social status, and the social relations portrayed in cemetery landscapes can be idealized, rather than actual (Parker Pearson 1982). Indeed, the
percentages of each marker size (small, medium, large) found in the Catholic and Protestant sections of the Church Street Graveyard indicate that the Catholic section contains more of the larger monuments in the graveyard. Small-size markers make up the majority of the monuments in the sample, and they compose over half the recorded markers in the Protestant section. The Protestant section also contains a lower percentage of medium-size markers compared to the Catholic section, while large size markers are almost equal in percentage for both religious sections. Chi-squared tests confirm that the between-group differences in marker size were significant. However, the results showed that it was the Catholic section that contained the larger markers and not the Protestant section as was expected.

The Protestant section does contain a greater number of obelisks, which are the tallest marker types. Marker height is often used to determine social rank and status (Francaviglia 1971, Moore et al. 1991). Essentially, taller stones often represent wealthy individuals. This would suggest that the Protestant section, with its greater number of obelisks, has and displays a higher-level of status when compared to the Catholic section. However, Moore and colleagues (1991) suggests that status is not always reflected in the tallest markers, as children and infant markers during the mid to late 19th century can be of equal size to those of adults (1991:75). To determine if the tallest markers in the Church Street Graveyard are those of adults with [assumed] status, a comparison would need to be made between the size of the markers and age of the deceased, which is out of the scope of this study.

The statistically significant relationship between the religious sections and marker size is not immediately apparent when visiting the Church Street Graveyard. The graveyard has but one mausoleum example and only fourteen large-sized markers out of a total of 488 analyzed stones. Hiijya (1983), Mallios and Caterino (2007, 2011), Baugher and Veit (2014) note that such large-
scale memorialization did not occur until the mid to later part of the 19th century. Baugher and Veit (2014) go even further to say that the most obvious distinctions of wealth are found in cemeteries that have large-scale monuments like mausolea. The Church Street Graveyard does not have these types of markers.

Susan Buckham (2003), in her examination of Victorian era markers in a cemetery in York, England, noted that markers representing the wealthiest individuals tend to be of modest size. Also, the middle class often copied the markers of elites (Rainville 1999), which can make distinguishing markers based on socioeconomic status difficult. Parker Pearson (1982) notes that social ideas about death and how the dead are commemorated can change over time, so what may be considered a display of status during one decade may not be viewed as such in a later decade. Buckham (2003) also states that variation in marker design helped to maintain the distinction between the classes, and they would rotate between style preferences. Research into the change of marker style and motif over the graveyard’s time span may help to illuminate further whether Mobile’s wealthiest chose to display their socioeconomic status in regard to marker motif or elaboration.

Of the markers that are present, tablets are the most commonly found marker type in both religious sections of the Church Street Graveyard. In the Protestant section, tablets make up half the total number of recorded markers. Tablets are also one of the simplest marker types in terms of structure recorded. The AHC defines a tablet as a single piece of upright stone that does not have a base. Many of the other marker types found in the sample all require some degree of assemblage or masonry work as they are made up of multiple pieces. The necessary components and work these marker types require is assumed to indicate wealth. Headstones, box tombs, above-ground tombs, and obelisks are all such marker types and comprise a significant
percentage of the marker totals in both religious sections. Interestingly, the only above-ground tombs recorded at the Church Street Graveyard were found in the Catholic section. It is unfortunate that no additional information beyond religion could be gathered from most of these markers as they no longer possess any inscriptions and are “unknown.”

Motif is another variable that cemetery researchers inevitably examine. While many examine temporal and spatial trends for motifs and their symbolism, this project looked at the number of motifs present on the grave stones. Elaboration of a marker can indicate status. It is expected that those with greater socioeconomic status would have more highly decorated markers, and Protestant markers were expected to be more decorative compared to Catholic ones. However, chi-square tests identified no statistically significant associations between religion and number of motifs present. Over two-thirds of the markers in the sample were found to be plain with no decorative motifs. The “cross” was the most common motif found in the sample and was observed almost exclusively in the Catholic section. This, coupled with that fact that the Catholic section was found to have a slightly greater variety of motifs, suggests that the Catholic section actually has more markers with decorative motifs. In this sample, it does not appear that either the Catholics or the Protestants buried in the Church Street Graveyard were concerned with displaying wealth or status through decorative motifs. Rather, motifs may have represented an opportunity to portray religious/cultural identity, as indicated by the prevalence of the “cross” on Catholic graves.

Finally, there is the variable of text. This project approached this variable in a unique way. Grave stone inscriptions are often looked at for their use of language to indicate cultural and social traditions. This project, instead, looked at how much text is actually present on the stone. The time and labor spent inscribing a marker factored into the cost of the stone. Markers
with a considerable amount of text were more expensive than those with less. Protestant markers were expected to be more heavily inscribed than those in the Catholic section.

The analysis of the amount of text is my own contribution to cemetery studies. Marker inscriptions are a wealth of information and have often been used to determine status and social roles. Looking at averages for word and character counts seemed an easy and straightforward approach for examining the text. The results were not found to be statistically significant, though Protestant markers seemed to bear slightly more text. An association between religion and text in another cemetery in Mobile that has more variation in the amount of text used on a headstone may be found.

Markers with carver signatures were also found the Church Street Graveyard. The most common signature found was that of Mobile carver Jarvis Turner. Turner was the carver of grave stones for both native and non-native Mobilians. The graveyard also contained a number of marker examples from other carvers both near and far, such as Jean. J. Isnard of New Orleans, J. Ritter of New Haven, Connecticut, and Walker and Sons from Charleston, South Carolina. The markers with carver signatures can give insight into marker choice, trade distances, and artisanship (Thompson 1988).

The differences between the Catholic and Protestant sections is not visually obvious. Most varieties of marker type are found in both religious sections, with the exception of above-ground tombs, which were recorded exclusively in the Catholic section. Both sections lack prominent monumental displays, meaning that the significant relationship between Catholicism and slightly larger marker size is not visually apparent at the graveyard. Most stones fall into categories of small and medium, and Protestant stone sizes proved to be unexpectedly small,
rejecting the hypothesis that their greater wealth would be reflected in more elaborate funerary monumentality.

Motif varieties were also modest. Most stones had no decoration, and no significant associations were found between motif complexity and religion. However, although most motif varieties were found in both religious sections, crosses were inscribed almost exclusively on Catholic markers, indicating the importance of this symbol to this religious group.

Overall, the study’s results do not support the hypothesis that Protestant graves at the Church Street Graveyard would reflect the greater wealth and social status of that population. The markers in the graveyard tell a different story. As mentioned at the beginning of this thesis, gravestones can also tell researchers about the living, as they are making the funerary choices. A society’s views and ideas about death can affect the way grave stones are chosen and displayed (Parker Pearson 1982). By looking at the living in 19th century Mobile, a better understanding can be gained of the choices made for funerary displays, such as grave stones.

When the graveyard was established in the early part of the 19th century, Mobile was a growing city and relations between Catholics and Protestants were amicable. At the time of the Church Street Graveyard’s establishment, the city suffered from a terrible Yellow Fever epidemic and the disease would continue to cause numerous deaths throughout the century. At this point in time, excessive funerary displays may have been viewed as unnecessary and carried little social value as both religious groups were constantly being confronted with death due to disease and class differences between the religions were not yet fully formed. Wealthy residents during this time may have simply chosen not to display their status in the graveyard or the markers in the graveyard are reflecting society’s preference during that time for simple and
modestly sized grave markers. Also, the wealthy may have chosen to display their status in other ways, such as through clothing, a large home, and ornate furnishings.

As the century reached the mid-point, social dynamics between the Catholics and Protestants changed and animosity between them grew (Amos 1976). Class distinctions were also becoming more apparent (Amos 1985). With the opening of Magnolia Cemetery in 1836, burials in Church Street Graveyard began to slow in favor of burial in the new cemetery (Sledge 2002). Magnolia Cemetery has a vastly greater number of burials due to its significant size, which allowed for greater spatial separation from other denominations. The variation in marker types, specifically large-scale monuments, surpasses what is found in the Church Street Graveyard (Myers 1993). Also, in the late 1840s, a third cemetery known today as the Old Catholic Cemetery opened, and members of that faith began to be buried there (Sledge 2002).

The views or attitudes society held towards the graveyard and Magnolia Cemetery (and later the Old Catholic Cemetery) may have affected not just the choice of the marker placed at the grave, but the choice of burial ground in which to be buried. Protestant markers in the Church Street Graveyard dated after the establishment of Magnolia cemetery possibly represent a less wealthy class of Protestants. Residents finally had a choice of where to be buried, and the elite may have viewed the graveyard as the less fashionable burial ground compared to Magnolia Cemetery. The role of the graveyard and what it represented to the living had changed. The Church Street Graveyard went from being the only choice for burial to the less desirable choice.

With their increasing wealth, Protestants may have felt a desire to distinguish and present themselves (the dead as well as the living) in a certain way, and Magnolia Cemetery afforded them a place in which to do this. This may explain why Catholic markers in the Church Street Graveyard were found to be larger and have a greater variety of marker types than the Protestant
section, as well as why the graveyard lacks large-scale monuments. By the mid-part of the 19th century, wealthy Protestants were simply choosing not to be buried in the Church Street Graveyard.

Religious association appears to play a more prominent role in choice of motif in the Church Street Graveyard than wealth. This is evident by the predominance of the ‘cross’ motif among Catholics. In contrast, religion does not seem to play a role in motif choice for Protestants, whose markers essentially lack religious motifs. Motifs with more symbolic meanings, such as different types of flowers, were chosen instead. The meaning behind a specific type of flower would provide information regarding the character of the deceased. For example, the rose symbolized love, hope, beauty, and the Virgin Mary, while the lily symbolized things such as purity, innocence, chastity, and resurrection (Huber 1982). Flower motifs were found often on the markers of women and children.

The markers with carver signatures gave a better understanding for marker choice and may indicate cultural preferences. These markers show that a number of Mobile’s transplants were actually choosing markers from their home states or by carvers familiar to them, as opposed to choosing a marker from a local carver. For example, there is the marker by Jean J. Isnard for a Catholic, New Orleans native and the Walker and Sons Gravestone chosen by a Protestant couple originally from Savannah, Georgia. Interestingly, the examples of local Mobile carver Jarvis Turner show that he was the carver of choice for many native and non-native Mobilians. A deeper look into the markers with carver signatures and the family of the deceased they represent may give a clearer understanding of marker choice by carver.

The presence of above-ground tombs in the Catholic section also indicates that something culturally may be occurring among this religious group. It may simply be that above-ground
tombs as a marker type were chosen simply due to the high occurrence rate of flooding in that area of Mobile. The marker style may have been a hold-over from the previous Spanish cemetery Campo Santo, as it was closer to the Mobile Bay and river. It is also possible that because these markers are in the Catholic section a French or New Orleans influence had taken place and guided marker choice since above-ground burial is the only option in predominately French-Catholic New Orleans. Marker inscriptions would be helpful in confirming or refuting these possibilities, but no inscriptions exist on many of these markers. It is difficult to say why Catholics chose above-ground tombs.

In the Church Street Graveyard, Mobile’s Protestants were choosing simple, small sized tablet stones, often with no decoration, to memorialize their dead. Lavish funerary displays were not found in the Graveyard, although it did become the trend eventually, as an 1875 Mobile Daily Tribune article comments:

The New York Star, protesting against the custom of extravagant display that now obtains at funerals, says: This sort of thing should be stopped. Poor people make geese of themselves in rivalling each other at these ceremonials, and the rich—well, the rich are simply absurd. The extravagance of funeral ceremonials has increased to such a degree in this country as to become a serious burden to the living, and to lead to the formation of funeral reform societies…

The results found during this thesis project show how fascinating the cultural differences are during life and then in death by the commemoration of the dead during the 19th century. The held ideas about funerary culture and memorialization in a historic cemetery are not always what are discovered. While the living may show an interest in displaying wealth, it is not always the case with death. This thesis project supports the accounts put forth by Mike Parker Pearson.
(1982), Moore and colleagues (1991), Lynn Rainville (1999), and Susan Buckham (2003), that size does not equate to status. This is also similar to the findings of Little and colleagues (1992), who discovered during their research that funerary displays for the wealthiest are the most plain. There is more involved in the choice of marker than simply displaying wealth. Social structure and relations of the living are a factor to be considered.

This thesis project shows that 19th century Catholic and Protestant Mobilians memorialized their dead in similar ways in the Church Street Graveyard. In order to see clear displays of status among Mobile’s Catholic and Protestant residents, it may be necessary to look at the other historic burial grounds in Mobile, such as the Old Catholic Cemetery and Magnolia Cemetery. These cemeteries were established later in the century and do contain large, scale memorials. Burials within the Church Street Graveyard had slowed by the publication date of the above newspaper article. Such spectacles may have been present within Magnolia Cemetery or the Old Catholic Cemetery. A study on the change of marker style over time within the Church Street Graveyard and a comparison of it with other Mobile cemeteries would help to better understand how 19th century Mobilians were choosing to memorialize their dead.

**Future Work**

Before the possible research studies mentioned above can take place, the first step that needs to be taken is recording the remaining stones in the Protestant section. Once this is accomplished, the data can be entered into the database created for this project. This will create a completed database of every stone currently present in the graveyard. The work started by Col. and Mrs. Nelson in the 1960s will be supplemented by a new trove of information. Like Liebens’ (2003) work in Pensacola’s St. Michael’s Cemetery, the Church Street Graveyard would benefit from the creation of a map that uses global positioning points to mark the layout of each
headstone on the grounds. This map, coupled with the database started for this project, would make for a solid jumping off point for continued research. Also, with a map and database, the Church Street Graveyard will be in a good position for preservation work.

The scholarly research possibilities in the Church Street Graveyard are almost limitless. It would be simple to examine the temporal and spatial trends for marker types and motifs in the graveyard. These trends could be compared between the Catholic and Protestant sections within the graveyard or they could be compared to the other historic cemeteries in Mobile or along the Gulf Coast. Demographic research such as mortality rates could also be explored.

The city of Mobile and the Church Street Graveyard are open and waiting for further research and analysis. The cultural significance, influence, and choice of design of gravestone markers and monuments have never really been explored. It is my hope that the research performed for this thesis project will shine some light on the Church Street Graveyard, its gravestones and monuments, and through them the society and culture of the residents that lived, worked, played, and died in Mobile during the 19th century.
REFERENCES


Davidson, James M. Rituals Captures in Context and Time: Charm Use in North Dallas Freedmans’ Town (1869-1907), Dallas, Texas. Historical Archaeology 38, no. 2 (2004): 22-54.


Mobile Daily Advertiser (Mobile, AL).


Mobile Daily Tribune (Mobile, AL).


Myers, Harry E. *Lest We Forget*. Self-Published, Friends of Magnolia Cemetery, 1993.


Pensacola Gazette (Pensacola, FL).


---. ”The Search for the Hidden People of St. Michael’s’s Cemetery.” Volume 1. Florida: University of West Florida Archaeology Institute, 2008

---. ”The Search for the Hidden People of St. Michael’s’s Cemetery.” Volume 2. Florida: University of West Florida Archaeology Institute, 2008


United States Census Records


APPENDIX A

ALABAMA HISTORICAL COMMISSION OBJECT FORM
4. Historic Cemetery Object Form

Fill out one object form for each burial in the cemetery OR fill out a few forms for significant grave markers.

Name of Cemetery: ______________________  Object Number: __________
Date: ______________________

Head of Object:
1. Type of object at head:
   - [ ] column
   - [ ] headstone
   - [ ] obelisk
   - [ ] statue
   - [ ] tablet stone
   - [ ] none
   - [ ] other: ______________________

2. Materials:
   - [ ] brick
   - [ ] concrete
   - [ ] field stone
   - [ ] granite
   - [ ] limestone
   - [ ] marble
   - [ ] pottery
   - [ ] white bronze (zinc)
   - [ ] wood
   - [ ] wrought/cast iron
   - [ ] other: ______________________

3. Condition:
   - [ ] sound
   - [ ] chipped
   - [ ] cracked/broken
   - [ ] crumbled/eroded
   - [ ] tilted
   - [ ] fallen
   - [ ] plant growth
   - [ ] other: ______________________

4. Measurements:
   - Height: ________________
   - Width: ________________
   - Depth: ________________

5. Previous Repairs to Object:
   - [ ] repairs made with cement
   - [ ] exterior iron bars added
   - [ ] none
   - [ ] other: ______________________

Body of Object:
7. Type of object at body:
   - [ ] above-ground tomb
   - [ ] box tomb
   - [ ] comb grave
   - [ ] cradle
   - [ ] ledger stone
   - [ ] none
   - [ ] other: ______________________

8. Materials:
   - [ ] brick
   - [ ] concrete
   - [ ] field stone
   - [ ] granite
   - [ ] limestone
   - [ ] marble
   - [ ] pottery
   - [ ] white bronze (zinc)
   - [ ] wood
   - [ ] wrought/cast iron
   - [ ] other: ______________________

9. Condition:
   - [ ] sound
   - [ ] chipped
   - [ ] cracked/broken
   - [ ] crumbled/eroded
   - [ ] tilted
   - [ ] fallen
   - [ ] plant growth
   - [ ] other: ______________________

10. Measurement:
    - Height: ________________
    - Width: ________________
    - Depth: ________________

11. Previous Repairs to Object:
    - [ ] repairs made with cement
    - [ ] exterior iron bars added
    - [ ] none
    - [ ] other: ______________________

Foot/Base of Object:
13. Type of object at foot/base:
    - [ ] base
    - [ ] column
    - [ ] foot stone
    - [ ] obelisk
    - [ ] statue
    - [ ] none
    - [ ] other: ______________________

14. Materials:
    - [ ] brick
    - [ ] concrete
    - [ ] field stone
    - [ ] granite
    - [ ] limestone
    - [ ] marble
    - [ ] pottery
    - [ ] white bronze (zinc)
    - [ ] wood
    - [ ] wrought/cast iron
    - [ ] other: ______________________

15. Condition:
    - [ ] sound
    - [ ] chipped
    - [ ] cracked/broken
    - [ ] crumbled/eroded
    - [ ] tilted
    - [ ] fallen
    - [ ] plant growth
    - [ ] other: ______________________

16. Measurement:
    - Height: ________________
    - Width: ________________
    - Depth: ________________

17. Previous Repairs to Object:
    - [ ] repairs made with cement
    - [ ] exterior iron bars added
    - [ ] none
    - [ ] other: ______________________

For Official Use Only
AHC Cemetery Number: ____________
Not for Publication
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**Head of Object:**
6. **Inscription:**
   Condition of text:
   - □ mint
   - □ clear, but worn
   - □ mostly legible
   - □ traces only
   - □ illegible/destroyed
   - □ underground

   **Transcribe all Text:**
   (Exactly as it appears on marker)

**Body of Object:**
12. **Inscription:**
   Condition of text:
   - □ mint
   - □ clear, but worn
   - □ mostly legible
   - □ traces only
   - □ illegible/destroyed
   - □ underground

   **Transcribe all Text:**
   (Exactly as it appears on marker)

**Foot of Object:**
18. **Inscription:**
   Condition of text:
   - □ mint
   - □ clear, but worn
   - □ mostly legible
   - □ traces only
   - □ illegible/destroyed
   - □ underground

   **Transcribe all Text:**
   (Exactly as it appears on marker)

---

**Additional Description**

19. **Signature of Stone Carvers/Marker Manufacturer (Specify name, town if available):**

---

**Marker Designs**

- □ All-seeing Eye
- □ Cross
- □ Heart
- □ Sleeping Child
- □ Other:
  □ Anchor
  □ Draped Urn
  □ Lamb
  □ Star / Star of David
  □ Angel
  □ Hand reaching down
  □ Masonic
  □ Weeping Willow
  □ Bible
  □ Hand with finger point up
  □ Menorah

---

21. **Grave Articles:**

- □ bedsteads
- □ dolls/toys
- □ lamps
- □ pinwheels
- □ none
  □ bottles
  □ flowers/plastic flowers
  □ light bulbs
  □ plastic bottles
  □ ceramic objects
  □ flower pots/vases
  □ marbles
  □ plates
  □ clocks
  □ jars
  □ medicine bottles
  □ sea shells

---

22. **Placement of Articles:**

---

23. **Additional Information/Description:**
APPENDIX B

ALABAMA HISTORICAL COMMISSION GROUP FORM
5. Historic Cemetery Group Form

Fill out a group form for every visually distinct grouping of graves in the cemetery (i.e. family plot, military/religious/ethnic section)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Cemetery:</th>
<th>Group Number:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name of Person filing out form:</td>
<td>Date:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PHYSICAL DESCRIPTION**

1. Burials Grouped by:
   - [ ] Race  [ ] Religion  [ ] Family  [ ] Military  [ ] Occupation  [ ] Fraternal Organization  [ ] Socio-economics  [ ] Other:

2. Grouping Indicated by:
   - [ ] Curbing  [ ] Fence  [ ] Distinctive Markers  [ ] Other:

3. Enclosure Description:

4. Marker Types
   - [ ] above-ground tomb  [ ] box tomb  [ ] column  [ ] comb grave
   - [ ] coping/curbing/craddles  [ ] foot stone  [ ] headstone  [ ] ledger stone
   - [ ] obelisk  [ ] rock cairn  [ ] statuary  [ ] tablet stone
   - [ ] other:

5. Marker Materials:
   - [ ] brick  [ ] concrete  [ ] field stone  [ ] granite
   - [ ] limestone  [ ] marble  [ ] pottery  [ ] sandstone
   - [ ] slate  [ ] white bronze (zinc)  [ ] wood  [ ] wrought/cast iron
   - [ ] other:

6. Marker Designs:
   - [ ] All-seeing eye  [ ] Anchor  [ ] Angel  [ ] Bible
   - [ ] Cross  [ ] Draped Urn  [ ] Hand reaching down  [ ] Masonic
   - [ ] Hand w/finger pointed up  [ ] Heart  [ ] Lamb  [ ] Weeping Willow
   - [ ] Menorah  [ ] Sleeping Child  [ ] Star/Star of David  [ ] Other:

7. Grave Articles:
   - [ ] bedsheets  [ ] bottles  [ ] ceramic objects  [ ] clocks
   - [ ] dolls/toys  [ ] flowers/plastic flowers  [ ] flower pots/vases  [ ] jars
   - [ ] lams  [ ] light bulbs  [ ] marbles  [ ] medicine bottles
   - [ ] pinwheels  [ ] milk jugs/plastic bottles  [ ] plates  [ ] sea shells
   - [ ] none  [ ] other:

8. Placement of Articles:

9. Ornamental Planting/Historic Vegetation:

Additional Description:
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Sketch a map of the visually distinct grouping of burials. Label roads and other features. Draw an arrow indicating north. See back of Map Form for the most popular symbols.
APPENDIX C

CHURCH STREET GRAVEYARD FORM
Church Street Graveyard
Mobile, Alabama

Name(s) on marker

Year(s) of internment

Coping/Curbing:  a. No  b. Yes, individual  c. Yes, group

Fencing:  a. No  b. Yes

Footstone:  a. No  b. Yes

Carver signature:  a. No  b. Yes

I. Marker Type
   a. box tomb  b. tablet  c. table tomb  d. flush marker  e. ledger stone
   f. mausoleum  g. simple obelisk  h. cross-vault obelisk  i. obelisk other
   j. simple cross  k. cross other  l. headstone  m. other

II. Marker Measurements
   Height  
   Width  
   Depth  

III. Lettering
   a. raised  b. incised  c. both

IV. Marker Material
   a. don’t know  b. marble  c. granite  d. slate  e. sandstone
   f. other
IV. Marker Orientation
   a. N/A    b. North    c. East    d. South    e. West

V. Marker Motif(s)
   a. weeping willow  b. urn  c. all-seeing eye  d. cross  e. broken column
   f. anchor  g. draped urn  h. lamb  i. angel  j. hand reaching down
   k. hand with finger pointing up  l. clasped hands  m. broken chain  n. bible  o. Masonic
   p. Star of David  q. sleeping child  r. flower(s)  s. other

sketch

VI. Sculpted Motif(s) description


sketch

VII. Marker Text

Relationship

Birth Date(s)

Death Date(s)

Age(s) at Death

Place(s) of Birth

Epitaph/Additional Info:
APPENDIX D

LIST OF MOTIFS AND SYMBOLISM
Symbol definitions by Leonard V. Huber (1982).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symbolic Motif</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cross</td>
<td>Christianity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urn (draped, flamed)</td>
<td>Death, eternal life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flower Bud (unopened, broken)</td>
<td>A life not yet fully lived, young life cut short</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flower(s)</td>
<td>Multiple meanings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weeping Willow</td>
<td>Sadness, mourning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IHS (Christogram)</td>
<td>Jesus Christ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scroll</td>
<td>Life, time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wreath/Garland</td>
<td>Mourning and respect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ivy/Vines</td>
<td>Friendship, immortality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masonic Symbol</td>
<td>Fraternal Society, Free Masons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column(s) (broken, draped)</td>
<td>End of life, life cut short, mourning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filigree</td>
<td>Strength</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shield Shape</td>
<td>Messenger of God</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angel</td>
<td>Loss, grief</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mourner</td>
<td>Jesus Christ, child innocence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lamb</td>
<td>Mourning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Headstones</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenery</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hands (clasped, pointing)</td>
<td>Union, friendship, blessing from God</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ribbon/Banner</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Book</td>
<td>Bible, word of God</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bouquet</td>
<td>Plenty, abundant life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Torches (inverted)</td>
<td>End of life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finial</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child</td>
<td>Innocence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wings</td>
<td>Flight, to heaven</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clock</td>
<td>Time, shortness of life, end of life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fleur de Lise</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX E

LIST OF CARVERS
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Carvers</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Years Active</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jarvis Turner</td>
<td>Mobile, AL</td>
<td>1836-1871</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trinchard Mobile</td>
<td>Mobile, AL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neale &amp; Davis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isnard, N.O.</td>
<td>New Orleans, LA</td>
<td>1818-1846</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Struthers</td>
<td>Philadelphia, PA</td>
<td>1816-1851</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin &amp; Russell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stackhouse</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crowe &amp; Treat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eagleson &amp; Trinchard</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. B. T.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jas. Bain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walker &amp; Sons Gravestones</td>
<td>Charleston, SC</td>
<td>1830s-1870s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davis Mobile</td>
<td>Mobile, AL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McDonald, March, &amp; Co.</td>
<td>Mobile, AL</td>
<td>1870s-?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Ritter, N. Haven, Ct</td>
<td>New Haven, CT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fisher &amp; Bird, N.Y.</td>
<td>New York, NY</td>
<td>1832-1885</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX F

IMAGES OF MARKERS WITH CARVER SIGNATURES
Jarvis Turner Mobile, AL

Marker for Col. William D. Stone (1794-1855)
Jean J. Isnard, New Orleans, LA

Marker for J. C. Lioni (1777-1825)
Walker and Sons Gravestones, Charleston, SC

Marker for George Haupt (1782-1831), Jestine Barnard Haupt (1781-1819), and George Washington Haupt (1817-1834)
J. Struthers, Philadelphia, PA

Marker for Ernest Chaudron (d. 1825)
Fisher and Bird, New York, NY

Marker for Elizabeth B. Clinch (1801-1835)
J. Ritter, New Haven, CT

Marker for Julia Ann Knapp (d. 1839)
Marker for A. Knapp (1799-1875)
Neale & Davis

Marker for John McCartney (d. 1835)
Trinchard, Mobile, AL

Marker for Constance Hugon (1773-1845)