

## Outside the Edict: The Chaotic Nature of Burial Culture in the United Kingdom

This paper considers the development of UK's burial culture, and reflects on the seemingly chaotic nature of new cemetery establishment in the first half of the nineteenth century. In the UK, unlike many other countries in Europe, there was little legislative interest in the issue of burials in the second half of the eighteenth century or the first half of the nineteenth: until the 1850s no legislation was passed that prohibited interment in densely populated urban areas. Despite this fact, by the middle of the century most large settlements had a new cemetery laid out on the outskirts of the main city. Some histories of cemeteries have reviewed the progress of burial reform through attempts to legislate on the issue. This paper takes an alternative approach, and is based on an extended series of local histories which reviewed and analysed new initiatives relating to burial in the country's largest towns and cities. The research demonstrated that a substantial shift in burial culture took place, led wholly by communities acting largely without prompting from any centralised or statutory authority. The principal agency used was the joint stock company, which financed the laying out of cemeteries through the sale of shares. The study reviewed the period from 1819 – the date of the first company – to 1852, when the first of a series of Burial Acts was passed.

This early history demonstrates that the meanings that could be attached to cemeteries changed over time. As will be seen, motivations for opening new sites for burial included fears relating to the security of the corpse; a desire for religious independence; a wish to make financial gain from what was evidently a profitable exercise; a growing civic ethos, particularly in the provinces; and public health concerns. This history indicates that *despite* the lack of any centralised direction, an extensive network of new cemeteries was created, and became well-used by the communities they intended to serve. A concluding section of the paper reviews the legislation that *did* emerge in the UK in the 1850s. Analysis of the legislation supports the contention that – as in many countries – laws relating to burial were frequently passed in the context of panic relating to the incidence of epidemic. This contention begs wider questions relating to chronology, and ways of understanding and mapping cemetery development. It is clear that the example of the UK, standing outside the Edict of St Cloud, provokes a series of questions that underlines the substantial gaps that remain in understanding the progress of European burial culture.

### Cemetery foundation and joint stock financing

Historiography in the UK, as it relates to cemeteries, has tended largely to take a “top down” approach, in reviewing attempts to pass national legislation aimed at tackling the evils associated with overcrowding in inner-city burial grounds and related fears attached to the incidence of “fever”.<sup>1</sup> An alternative method is to view burial reform, not as a national phenomenon, but as a highly localised concern. Communities can make distinctive and individual choices on the ways in which they deal with disposal of

their dead. Indeed, throughout Europe, the traditional settlement unit – a “parish” or congregation – has tended to have its own burial space, with usage largely dictated by the practices of a particular incumbent. The incursion of national legislation on this tradition was, in some places, resisted. For example, in France, attempts to impose the Royal Decree banning intramural interment in 1776 was simply ignored in some locations, with communities arguing that in their local churchyard the soil type was such that decomposition took place without threat to local health.<sup>2</sup> Thus national reviews of cemetery reform generally fail to take into account how local communities framed their response.

This paper is based on an extended series of local studies.<sup>3</sup> Research was completed in the largest towns and cities in the UK, to discover if any attempt was made to change burial provision in the first half of the nineteenth century. Beyond question the most significant agency of new cemetery establishment was the joint stock company. During the late eighteenth and for much of the first half of the nineteenth century, use of the joint stock company constituted a means of financing a bewildering range of civic improvements, amenities and industries. Railways, canals and mining companies were popular, but the format was also used to build town halls and market places, and to fund water and gas works. Ownership of certain types of shares was regarded in the vein of being a civic duty, if those shares raised finance for town improvement. In this context, the use of joint stock financing for cemetery development was unsurprising. A typical example would be an enterprise established with a capital of £10,000, and opening a cemetery of perhaps ten acres on the outskirts of a town. By the early 1850s, over a hundred such companies had been set up in England, Scotland and Wales. The institution was popular and widespread. Company formation was not restricted to a particular type of settlement. Enterprises were set up in old manufacturing and marketing towns such as Leeds, Halifax and Sheffield; in docks and ports such as Hull, Newcastle and Bristol; and in spas and resorts such as Brighton, Torquay and Ilfracombe. Some smaller towns also had settlements, for example, Hereford, Wisbech, Newport and Chippenham.

A single source listing all companies did not exist, and indeed was constructed during the course of the study. However, some useful government reports included *Reports by the Registrar of Joint-Stock Companies to the Committee of Privy Council for Trade*, which from 1846 made an annual record of new companies, and in its initial year listed some earlier enterprises. A total of 113 companies was found.

The research considered the organisational and management history of the cemeteries, and in doing so rested on a review of company documentation. Cemetery companies were often set up through the issuing of a prospectus; had minute books and annual reports; and frequently attracted comment in the local newspapers. Close analysis was completed of the rhetoric used to promote the company; prosopographical study was completed of company directors, to explore their religious and civic background; and information was collected on the company's capitalisation and general

legal foundation. Use of this material was vital to an understanding of the meaning and purposes ascribed to cemetery establishment. Furthermore, tracing the history of company foundation allowed the construction of a sound chronology. The research disclosed how many cemeteries were opened and when, but it was also possible to chart ways in which the rhetoric attached to company formation shifted over time. Indeed, analysis of the relevant company documentation led to the classification of companies according to the principal motivation of company directors. Three different types of company were established: those with a principal interest in promoting and protecting religious independence; companies with a primary interest in profit; and companies that had public health as a central concern. Additional motivations included the desire to protect corpses from disturbance; and the wish to add a cemetery to the "attractions" of a city, as a means of demonstrating the civility and good taste of its citizens. Each of these themes had a distinctive chronology, as will be seen.

### Dissent and dissection: early cemetery companies

In the UK, modern cemetery development had its origins in two largely unconnected threads: the desire of Nonconformists to have burial grounds separate from the Church of England; and increasing and often hysterical fears attached to the possible theft of bodies by and for anatomy students. The first cemetery company in Britain – the Rusholme Road Proprietary Cemetery Company – was founded in Manchester in 1820, and was established by Dissenters as a response to burial grievances. Clergymen could refuse churchyard burial to Nonconformists, and felt justified in denying interment to those who had not been baptised by a Church of England incumbent, and to those whose baptism did not invoke the Trinity. In a number of highly-publicised instances, Church of England clergy had refused burial particularly to Baptists or Unitarians. A further grievance was the fact that churchyards were consecrated. This was – in the view of many Nonconformists – a "Popish" ritual that, according to John Wesley, was "wrong in itself, not being authorised either by any law of God, or by any law of the land."<sup>4</sup> As a consequence and where possible, Nonconformist communities sought to use their own burial space, often using the land adjoining their chapels.

At the heart of the Dissenters' use of the joint-stock cemetery format was the desire to provide additional, independent, burial space. In many locations, space for interment outside churchyards tended to be restricted in size, and increases in Dissenting populations meant that the limited space became quickly taxed. In the majority of the fourteen towns in which Nonconformists established cemetery companies, more than fifty per cent of the population attended non-Church of England services.<sup>5</sup> Portsmouth was a typical example. Here, the Portsea Island General Cemetery Company laid out the Mile End Cemetery in 1831. There was little doubt that the Nonconformist community in Portsmouth was experiencing substantial growth. New chapels were opened in the town and surrounding area in 1800, 1807, 1808 and 1814. The Baptist Mile End Chapel had emerged as the city's leading chapel, and had a Sunday school of over 700 children.<sup>6</sup> Pressure on independent burial space in the city was heavy. The burial ground attached to the Mile End Chapel had had to close in 1827, probably because it had become full.<sup>7</sup> It was necessary to purchase new ground.

Connections between Dissenting communities in the UK were strong, so it was not unusual for the Portsmouth Nonconformists to make reference in their company prospectus to an

earlier cemetery company – Proprietors of the Low Hill General Cemetery – that was established by Liverpool Dissenters in 1823. The Portsea Island Cemetery Company prospectus indicated that the Liverpool company had been able to secure a new cemetery for £7,000, funded largely by shares. Profits had been such that they were able to pay off an initial debt of £3,000 in only five years.<sup>8</sup> This information indicated why the Portsmouth Nonconformist had felt confident in adopting the joint stock format. The meaning that was attached to the cemetery was also made clear in its original prospectus:

"The plan now proposed to the public, is – to afford all classes the privilege of committing their dead to the tomb according to their own views of the rites of Sepulture, in the most decent and becoming manner... Those who bring their own Minister with them, will be at liberty to use what form they please; while others, who prefer it, may inter their dead without any service whatever."<sup>9</sup>

Thus, the cemetery would be able to counter one of the principal grievances felt by Nonconformists faced with the only option of Church of England burial provision: the prejudice of the clergy with regard to the burial of certain types of Dissenter. Furthermore, this and other companies were able to provide unconsecrated burial space. Thus, the Westgate Hill Cemetery Company in Newcastle declared: "We want no mitred dignity and state, to declare our spot of ground to be hallowed for the dead."<sup>10</sup> During the 1830s and 1840s, increased political pressure from Nonconformists seeking civil equality with Anglicans increased tensions between denominations, and created a situation in which either side could be easily tempted to extreme gestures. Cemetery company establishment was therefore, for some Nonconformist congregations, a religious political act. Indeed, in some instances there was a consciousness that the foundation of independent burial space went some way to undermining the financial viability of the Church of England, since it deprived clergy of burial fees that were in many instances a substantial part of their income. In terms of numbers, the Dissenting cemetery company was small: twenty-two such concerns were found. However, this type of company dominated cemetery foundation in the early period until the mid-1830s, and was vital in demonstrating the viability of the format to both speculators and local burial reformers.

A second and entirely unconnected theme was evident in the early history of cemetery company development, and through the course of the period up to the 1850s remained a distinctive thread running through much of the rhetoric attached to cemetery reform: the desire to offer protection to the corpse. In the first ten companies established between 1820 and 1832, fears relating to body-snatching activity were evident. Anxiety marked the rhetoric used in company literature, and the cemeteries themselves were laid out to offer maximum security against unlawful intrusion. Demand for cadavers for anatomical dissection was certainly increasing: in London alone, the number of anatomy courses had tripled between 1780 and 1814, and the number of registered students growing from 91 to 250 in the same period.<sup>11</sup> In 1815–30, the frequency of reports of bodies being taken from graves for use by anatomists, as reported in *The Times* was nearly triple that of the preceding fifteen years.<sup>12</sup> In 1832, the scandal attached to the issue led to the passage of Warburton's Anatomy Act, which ensured an alternative supply of bodies: unclaimed corpses from workhouses. Up until 1832, however – and even some years after – companies stressed the

security of their cemeteries. For example, Rusholme Road Cemetery in Manchester had a watchtower; the walls of New-castle's Westgate Hill Cemetery were fourteen feet high, and its interior lit with gas lamps; and at Portsea Island, the thirteen-foot high walls were surmounted with iron spiked rollers.

Fears for the "perfect security" of the corpse were also evident in the decades after the passage of the Anatomy Act. Over-crowding in inner-city churchyards had led to the frequent disturbance of bodies, in some cases only weeks or months after interment. Parliamentary reports had made evident the practice of sextons who were desperate to find space: breaking up coffins to make room and cutting bodies about, they often left fragments of decomposing corpses open to view by passers-by.<sup>13</sup> All cemetery companies offered the option of "perpetuity burial", that is, burial guaranteed to remain undisturbed "until the morning of resurrection".<sup>14</sup> This extreme response became integral to later legislation on burial. In the UK, it remains illegal to disturb human remains – for whatever purpose – without a specific licence from a government office.

### "Necessarily mercenary": death and dividends

A great deal of early historiography on cemeteries in the UK was written at a time when class relations were central to historical analysis. The cemetery company was – for some commentators – essentially a "bourgeois" phenomenon. Cemeteries were established as a physical expression of social rank, and excessive funerary trappings were an indicator of a society obsessed with conspicuous expenditure.<sup>15</sup> Analysis of cemetery company documentation demonstrates that, indeed, speculation in cemeteries for the purpose of profit was evident. Around a third of the cemetery companies fell into this category, although over half these did not open a cemetery. The profit-motivated cemetery company was not a development welcomed by local communities and succeeded only in few, and often exceptional, circumstances.

There were three types of speculative company. First, some companies were established purely to profit from "scrip", or partly paid-up shares. During the mid-1830s and mid-1840s, hysteria had attached to the foundation of joint stock enterprises of any description, with highly unrealistic reports in circulation as to the profits that could be made in investing in the right company at the right time. Charles Dickens parodied the trend in his invention of the United Improved Hot Muffin and Crumpet Baking and Punctual Delivery Company, in the novel *Nicholas Nickleby*. This company had a capital of £5m, sold in 5000 shares of £10 each, "the very name of which will get the shares up to a premium in ten days."<sup>16</sup> The success of the earlier Dissenting cemetery companies had demonstrated that investment in burial space could certainly pay its way: indeed, as has been seen, the Liverpool Necropolis was considered the epitome of success in this regard, with the frequent claim being made that its dividends had reached 20 per cent.<sup>17</sup> Evidently fake companies included the Great Eastern and Western Cemetery Company, capitalised at £1,600,000 and offering eager investors a site in which a "grand National Mausoleum" would be erected, on the principle of Westminster Abbey.<sup>18</sup> The majority of these companies were scams, and only one such enterprise actually opened a cemetery.

A second type of company, equally mercenary, was more successful. In Manchester, and in the larger cities of Scotland, "territorial" cemetery companies were founded in places where

a cemetery company was already flourishing. The new companies were again set up during the speculative boom periods of the mid-1830s and mid-1840s. In Manchester, for example, April 1836 saw the foundation of *five* cemetery companies all looking to ape the profitability of the earlier and respectable General Cemetery Company and the Ardwick Cemetery Association. An amazed editorial in the local newspaper wondered "Are we about to be visited by the plague?"<sup>19</sup> Around Manchester, this type of company did not succeed. However, this kind of enterprise proved to be more viable in Scotland. Both Edinburgh and Glasgow were ringed with company cemeteries that had little intent beyond the desire to tap into a lucrative market. Local response to these companies could be scathing. An attempt to set up a company in Greenock in 1845 provoked angry comment in the local newspapers. The town wanted a cemetery, but not one established by "those who have no interest in the matter other than the opportunity which it affords for *stock-jobbing* and *speculation*. A better approach would be to set up a company of a *strictly local nature*, to which the Provost and Magistrates ... and a portion of the clergy of all denominations should be parties."<sup>20</sup>

A third type of company, and one which has perhaps carried the longest legacy, was a style of speculative company that intended to draw greatest profit from tapping into a higher-end "luxury" market. These companies operated almost wholly in London, and opened cemeteries at Highgate, Nunhead, Brompton, and West Norwood. These companies again opened in the mid 1830s, and took their lead from the status – and profitability – of the slightly earlier All Saints Cemetery at Kensal Green. Stephen Geary, architect and progenitor of the London Cemetery Company which opened Highgate and Nunhead, aimed to establish cemeteries distinguished by high architectural merit. Highgate was laid out on a hill that had previously been a resort of tourists and picnickers, and indeed the "pleasure garden" atmosphere prevailed at the cemetery. Attractions at the cemetery included the still-famous Egyptian sunken catacombs. Norwood Cemetery, opened by the South Metropolitan Cemetery Company, was designed by William Tite, in the then-fashionable Gothic mode; the grounds were later criticised by cemetery reformer John Claudius Loudon as being too much "in the pleasure-ground style."<sup>21</sup> Reasons for the concentration of this type of cemetery company in London remains uncertain. The city certainly offered the greatest concentration of wealthier families able to pay the premium burial prices required for directors to make reasonable returns on a high initial investment in land and building. Both corporate investment in fine buildings and layout, and individual investment in funerary architecture at these sites, mean that they now secure disproportionate attention and funds in terms of conservation effort.

### Civic ethos and cemetery endeavour

Although heavy investment in cemetery architecture was characteristic of many of the speculative London cemetery companies, a heightened interest in cemetery aesthetics was also evident in many cemeteries established in the provinces. The motivation differed, however, and rested on the desire to lay out a cemetery that would reflect well on its local community. None of the companies that were studied had "civic ethos" as a central reason for establishment, but for many the desire to lay out land commensurate with the "self-image" of a particular town or city was a key element in deciding expenditure on building and lay out. Cer-

tainly from the 1830s onwards, earlier disparaging comments on the excesses of Père Lachaise had begun to be replaced by more definite admiration. It was becoming clear that any settlement aiming for a degree of sophistication would require a burial ground of apposite magnificence: the cemetery became one of the required facilities in a city's portfolio of improvements.

All civic enhancement undertaken before 1850 carried a common element: philosophical ideas about the function of cities as agents of civilisation. The cemetery was both an indicator and inculcator of sophistication. At its most straightforward, the cemetery stood for a cultured revulsion against existing burial practices, which not only threatened public health but which were increasingly defined as barbaric and an offence to moral, sentimental and aesthetic sensibilities. Furthermore, the garden cemetery aesthetic was attuned to several Romantic themes. This dominant cultural genre stressed the uniqueness of the individual. The cemetery – in its provision of a single, permanent, burial spot for each person – was able to preserve individuality, ostensibly for all time. The ability to erect a memorial on the grave gave the opportunity for the bereaved to give physical expression to their deepest feelings of loss. The cemetery, adorned with these individual expressions, became a landscape of feeling and moral refinement. Company literature often stressed the moral improvements that would be brought by a new cemetery. Thus, according to George Milner, director of the Hull General Cemetery:

“Many a prodigal son might be reclaimed by visiting the grave of a departed and neglected parent provided such resting-places were suitably situated, away from the busy haunts of man, and so arranged to invite, and not forbid, meditation.”<sup>22</sup>

As a consequence, attention paid to landscaping and planting became particularly evident from the 1830s, and in many locations local town guides recommended the cemetery as a place of resort. Inter-town rivalry played no small part in pushing company directors to perhaps greater architectural investment than was strictly necessary. A letter to a Bradford newspaper in 1824 summarised this feeling: “Institutions of this kind are an honour to the towns in which they are supported. Bradford is the only manufacturing town hereabouts in which such a one does not exist; and shall Wakefield, Huddersfield and Halifax excel us? Our pride says nay.”<sup>23</sup>

### Cemeteries and sanitary reform

Cemetery companies founded on the desire to improve burial facilities for public health purposes dominated the 1830s and 1840s. Thirty-seven such companies were established, laying out cemeteries in such locations as Hull, York, Glasgow, Cambridge and Brighton. These companies can be distinguished by their strong connection with local civic administration – directors often included local aldermen and clergy – and their desire to operate “general” cemeteries that could accommodate both Anglicans and Dissenters alike. These companies, and more importantly the *timing* of these companies are crucial to an understanding of poor burial conditions as a causal factor in new cemetery establishment.

First, it is necessary to stress that certainly by the 1820s, existing burial provision in churchyards, private grounds and Non-conformist burial grounds were wholly inadequate considering

massive growth in urban population. For even large settlements, this space rarely totalled more than five acres, and had in many cases been used and reused over a period of decades if not centuries. Substantial growth in demand for burial space overtook the ability of the ground to absorb new bodies, and the consequences were grisly. For example, in 1849 it was reported that in Falkirk passers-by were subject to “the revolting sight of half-decayed human limbs and the ghastly countenances that show the work of death but half complete”.<sup>24</sup> However, it was clear that tolerance for appalling conditions could be high, as a local doctor in Norwich commented in 1845: the “regular and more fixed” population of the town was “disregardful” of the “obnoxious and deleterious sights presented daily to its view.”<sup>25</sup> This tolerance was very clearly subject to challenge in the 1840s. A total of twenty-eight companies with a primary interest in public health were established in the period 1840–53. The decade saw the re-formulation of the issue of burial crisis as an immediate and national scandal.

The means of this re-formulation was the publication in 1839 of a text entitled *Gatherings from Graveyards*, by a previously unknown London doctor, George Alfred Walker. In the decades prior to the publication of his book, little attention had been paid to the public health aspects of intramural interment – burial in the city. Even in the *Lancet* – the country's leading medical journal – the first detailed discussion of intramural interment was a review of Walker's book. According to the review, Walker had “awaken[ed] an unusual degree of public attention to the subject.”<sup>26</sup> The doctor worked in London, in Drury Lane. His work combined a scientific treatise on the deleterious effects of miasmas emanating from decomposing bodies with graphic description of conditions in the capital's graveyards and burial grounds. Anecdotal evidence supported the two themes. For example, the fatal nature of graveyard gases was “proven” through the discovery of Thomas Oakes. This gravedigger was discovered apparently dead at the bottom of a common grave in Aldgate Churchyard. A young labourer attempted to recover the body. He descended into the grave and died instantaneously. Walker's narratives were striking, but more importantly his language was highly emotive and even gothic in tone:

“In making a grave in a burying-ground in Southwark, a body partly decomposed was dug up and placed on the surface, at the side slightly covered with earth; a mourner stepped upon it, the loosened skin peeled off, he slipped forward, and had nearly fallen into the grave. At another place, amongst a heap of rubbish, a young woman recognised the finger of her mother, who had been buried there a short time previously.”<sup>27</sup>

Walker's influence was extensive. During the 1830s, his text was reviewed by leading periodicals: few commentators doubted the scientific basis of the work, and all accepted the need for burial reform. Many of his stories were reproduced verbatim. The majority of cemetery companies established in the 1840s and early 1850s made reference to Walker's work, often adopting Walker's tone. For example, the City of Canterbury Cemetery Company referred to “the feelings of the living” being “continually harrowed” by “the conviction that their dead can find a resting place only among the mouldering heaps of mortality which are amalgamated with, and in fact form, the soil.”<sup>28</sup> In some locations, enthusiasm for reform was so marked that more than one company was formed, although in almost all cases these generally became amalgamated into one successful enterprise.

Many of the "public health" cemetery companies conformed to what was at the time considered good sanitary practice. A national review of burial provision in 1850 sent General Board of Health inspectors to many towns and cities. One such inspector, James Smith, visited Hull in 1850. A company had been established in 1845, with the cemetery opened soon after. Smith found that the company was prepared "to adopt any arrangements which I, as representative of the General Board of Health, may require", although he found the cemetery to be in excellent condition; "ample accommodation, with every necessary precaution as to public health, and at moderate charges, for the interment of the dead in the town of Hull."<sup>29</sup> Thus, the cemetery company had become a viable agency for burial reform, and by the early 1850s was providing a common alternative to intramural interment.

### Some conclusions

There are a number of conclusions that can be drawn from the rise of the cemetery company in the UK. The first is the understanding that a desire for burial reform *per se* was rarely a sufficient causal factor in provoking the foundation of a new cemetery. Even during the 1840s, when the movement in favour of new cemetery establishment was pushed from a number of different angles, it was possible for communities to remain apathetic. For example, in Rochdale in 1847, an editorial in the local newspaper pressed the case for a new cemetery, describing the local churchyards as "loathsome" and "nearly full with graves".<sup>30</sup> But the call was met with indifference, and it took eight years for a new cemetery to be opened. A similar lack of action was evident in other towns with high population growth and evidently poor conditions, such as Bolton, Wigan and Stoke-on-Trent.

Thus, dissatisfaction with existing burial conditions was widespread, but it was possible for communities to be apathetic *unless* an immediate, additional factor created a "crisis" situation in which action was deemed imperative. For some cemetery companies, local action was provoked by small scandals: for example, in Kidderminster, Dissenters set up a company following the refusal of an Anglican clergyman to admit burial to a leading Nonconformist minister, despite that minister having family members buried in the churchyard. In Newcastle, the Westgate Hill Cemetery Company was set up as a direct consequence of the collapse of the wall of the existing Dissenting burial ground. A principal conclusion to draw from this trend is the fact that burial culture tends to be conservative in nature. There tends to be a strong attachment to existing burial provision unless extreme circumstances provoke change.

The need for a "crisis" event to provoke action was underlined most succinctly in the UK by the progress of burial legislation in the 1850s. Britain saw its worst cholera epidemic in 1848–9: deaths totalled 62,000. Parliament was panicked into the passage of legislation in 1850 that introduced a new system of cemeteries that would be owned and managed centrally, by the General Board of Health. This measure had been recommended as early as 1843 by the sanitary reformer Edwin Chadwick, but its centralising tendencies ran counter to the broader *laissez-faire* principles of the time. As the epidemic abated, a re-consideration of the legislation took place, and the measure was repealed. In 1852, a new piece of legislation was passed permitting local communities to establish burial boards that could lay out new cemeteries with finances drawn from the rates. The legislation also set out procedures for closure of overcrowded inner-city churchyards. Essentially, the new law followed the

principles that had been established by the company cemetery: continued control of burial space by the local community.

A further conclusion relates to the study of cemeteries in a broader sense. The development of burial culture comprises many "histories", and a not exhaustive list includes the existence of scientific or "elite" movements in favour of burial reform; the progress and passage of legislation on burial matters; the chronology of cemetery establishment; the ideals expressed through cemetery and monument design; and finally the ways in which communities and sub-communities took up and adapted this new burial form. So far, studies of burial culture have tended to focus on aspects of cemetery design, but other histories provoke themes and questions that have tended to remain unexplored. For example, further work needs to examine popular resistance to enforced use of cemeteries; the ways communities dealt with the secularising tendency of burial reform; strategies to ensure that, despite being outside the control of the Church, cemeteries remained "sacred"; and what general cultural trends proved to be the most telling, in provoking actual cemetery establishment. Research on the UK's chaotic burial history has indicated that these perhaps more prosaic aspects of cemetery development constitute valuable and valid fields of study. Without these, our understanding of burial culture will be less than complete.

### Bibliography

- Annual Report of the York Public Cemetery, 1850, York Archive Office.
- Chris BROOKS, *Mortal Remains: The History and Present State of the Victorian and Edwardian Cemetery*, Exeter 1989.
- B. COLEMAN, *The Church of England in the Mid-Nineteenth Century*, London 1980.
- George COLLISON, *Cemetery Interment*, London 1840.
- Charles DICKENS, *Nicholas Nickleby*, 1839.
- J. FENWICK, Substance of a Speech Given at the General Meeting of the Various Denominations of Protestant Dissenters, of Newcastle upon Tyne, to take into Consideration the Propriety of Obtaining a New Place of Sepulture, 1825. Local History Library, Newcastle-upon-Tyne.
- Samuel FINER, *The Life and Times of Sir Edwin Chadwick*, London 1952.
- Susan LAWRENCE, *Entrepreneurs and private enterprise: the development of medical lecturing in London, 1775–1820*, *Bulletin of the History of Medicine*, vol. 62, 1988.
- John Claudius LOUDON, *On the Laying Out, Planting and Management of Cemeteries, and on the Improvement of Churchyards*, 1843.
- John MCMANNERS, *Death and the Enlightenment: Changing Attitudes to Death in Eighteenth-Century France*, Oxford 1981.
- George MILNER, *On Cemetery Burial: Or, Sepulture Ancient and Modern*, Hull, 1846.
- John MORLEY, *Death, Heaven and the Victorians*, London 1971.
- Palmer's Index to the Times Newspaper, Shepperton on Thames 1965.
- R. PHILLIPS, *Burial Administration in Portsmouth and Portsea, 1820–1900*, Dissertation for Diploma for English Local History, Portsmouth Polytechnic 1979.
- Prospectus of the Portsea Island Cemetery Company, 1830. Sanderson Collection, Local History Library, Portsmouth Central Library.
- Report from the Select Committee on Improvement of the Health of Towns: Effect of Interment of Bodies in Towns (1842).
- F. RIDOUTT, *Early Baptist History in Portsmouth*, Portsmouth 1888.
- Julie RUGG, *The Rise of Cemetery Companies in Britain 1819–1853*, unpublished PhD thesis, University of Stirling 1992.
- Scrapbook of John Green Crosse (1829–46). Norfolk Record Office, Norwich.
- James SMITH, Report to the General Board of Health on a Preliminary Inquiry into the Sewerage, Drainage and Supply of Water, and the Sanitary Condition of the Town and Borough of Kingston upon Hull 1850.
- George Alfred WALKER, *Gatherings from Graveyards*, 1839.
- Anthony WÖHL, *Endangered Lives: Public Health in Victorian Britain*, London 1983.

- <sup>1</sup> See, for example WOHL, *Endangered Lives*, 1983; FINER, Chadwick, 1952.
- <sup>2</sup> MCMANNERS, *Death*, p. 313.
- <sup>3</sup> Much of this paper is based on RUGG, unpublished PhD thesis, University of Stirling (1992).
- <sup>4</sup> Wesley, quoted by COLLISON, *Cemetery Interment*, 1840, p. 192.
- <sup>5</sup> COLEMAN, *The Church of England*, 1980, pp. 40–41.
- <sup>6</sup> RIDOUTT, *Early Baptist History*, 1888, p. 100.
- <sup>7</sup> PHILLIPS, *Burial administration*, 1979, p. 51.
- <sup>8</sup> *Prospectus of the Portsea Island Cemetery Company*, 1830.
- <sup>9</sup> *Ibid.*
- <sup>10</sup> FENWICK, *Substance of a Speech*, 1825, appendix d.
- <sup>11</sup> LAWRENCE, *Entrepreneurs*, 1988, pp. 171–2.
- <sup>12</sup> Statistic based on own analysis of Palmer's Index to the Times Newspaper.
- <sup>13</sup> See, for example, Report from the Select Committee, 1842.
- <sup>14</sup> For example, *Annual Report of the York Public Cemetery Company* (1850). York Archive Office.
- <sup>15</sup> See, for example, BROOKS, *Mortal Remains*, 1989; MORLEY, *Death*, 1971.
- <sup>16</sup> DICKENS, *Nicholas Nickleby*, 1839, p. 69.
- <sup>17</sup> COLLISON, *Cemetery Interment*, 1840, p. 183.
- <sup>18</sup> Newspaper clipping, undated (but probably 1845) and without source, pasted into the Scrapbook of John Green Crosse (1829–46).
- <sup>19</sup> *Manchester Guardian*, 30<sup>th</sup> April 1836.
- <sup>20</sup> *Glasgow Herald*, 17<sup>th</sup> February 1845. Original italics.
- <sup>21</sup> LOUDON, *Laying out*, 1843, p. 69.
- <sup>22</sup> MILNER, *On Cemetery Burial*, 1846, p. 46.
- <sup>23</sup> *Leeds Intelligencer*, 14 October 1824.
- <sup>24</sup> *Falkirk Herald*, 8 November 1849.
- <sup>25</sup> *Norwich Mercury*, 15 October 1845.
- <sup>26</sup> *Lancet*, I (1839), p. 366.
- <sup>27</sup> WALKER, *Gatherings*, 1839, p. 212.
- <sup>28</sup> *Kentish Gazette*, 9 September 1845.
- <sup>29</sup> SMITH, *Report*, 1850, p. 60.
- <sup>30</sup> *Pilot and Rochdale Reporter*, 14 June 1847.