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ABSTRACT

Grave markers reflect a wealth of information and collectively epitomize society’s historic, social, and economic patterns over time. Despite an abundance of cemetery research in other parts of the country, little research has been undertaken to evaluate grave marker attributes in Florida. The purpose of this research was to determine how grave marker attributes have changed over time in north-central, central, and southeast Florida.

Data were collected from ten cemeteries in five counties in Florida, representing the grave markers of over 1,100 individuals. Data collection involved visiting each cemetery, photographing markers, and cataloging grave marker attributes. Attributes analyzed included marker type, marker material, epitaphs, iconographic images, memorial photographs, footstones, and kerbs. A number of important trends were noted. Marker material exhibited the clearest example of a temporal trend, shifting over time from 73% marble to 73% granite. Marker type varied greatly from upright and flat ground markers to a variety of customized markers and vaults. Cultural differences were also noted with in-ground vaults dominating traditionally black cemeteries. There were clear differences in marker style between affluent and less affluent cemeteries, with numerous hand-cast cement markers observed in less prosperous areas. Furthermore, beginning in the early 1980’s there is an increase in customized laser engraved markers. Overall, Florida’s cemeteries offer a rich history of the state’s mortuary practices and further research should be conducted to preserve this history.
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CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION TO CEMETERY RESEARCH

Richard E. Meyer, in his introduction to *Cemeteries & Gravemarkers: Voices of American Culture* likens cemeteries to museums in that both are “repositories of cultural artifacts” Meyer continues to define their cultural value by pointing out that cemeteries “exhibit patterns of change over temporal spans corresponding to their individual existences, and they can in many instances yield valuable cultural insight to a number of discrete time periods, including the present” (Meyer, 1995 p. 2).

Gravestone studies evolved sporadically over time. In 1927 Harriette Merrifield Forbes wrote one of the earliest books on the subject, *Gravestones of Early New England and the Men Who Made Them 1653-1800*. This book is reminiscent of many other books in the field, focusing on historically significant gravestones in the northeastern United States. Over time the importance of grave markers as reflectors of cultural beliefs and behaviors was recognized (Forbes, 1927; Meyer, 1995; Sloane, 1995), however, unlike other fields of inquiry, gravestone studies had no centralized body of peers reviewing and publishing research findings. As the interest in our historic burying grounds increased, the need for a more comprehensive and integrated view of our country’s cemeteries emerged. In 1977 The Association for Gravestone Studies was incorporated to further “the study and preservation of gravestones.” And yet, despite the recognized significance of cemetery research and their abundant collection of cultural data, very little research has been undertaken to evaluate characteristics exhibited by grave markers in central, north-central, and southeast Florida.
Lack of Research in Florida

Although many reference books have been written on cemetery and gravestone studies, there is a distinct focus on the northeastern United States, including areas such as New England (Eriquez, 2009; Rogak, 2004), Massachusetts (Bunnell, 1992), New York (Culbertson, 1987; Goerlich, 1987), New Jersey (Veir, 2008), Maryland (Holdcraft, 1985), Pennsylvania (Renkin, 2000; Xakellis, 2002), Ohio (Vigil, 2007), and Maine (Westfall, 2003). There are relatively few such books dedicated to the southeastern United States. Alabama Cemeteries: A Guide to their Stories in Stone (Booth, 1999), and Georgia Cemeteries (Westfall, 1999) offer some insight into southern mortuary practices, but are not indicative of Florida’s cultural practices. Fifteen Florida Cemeteries: Strange Tales Unearthed (Haskins, 2011) is currently the only book dedicated to the study of cemeteries in the state. While this book covers a broad geographic area, ranging from Pensacola in Florida’s panhandle south to Key West, it is limited in scope. In spite of providing a colorful character study of the people buried in select graves in cemeteries across the state, Fifteen Florida Cemeteries lacks a comprehensive survey of grave marker attributes. The memorialization of central, north-central, and southeast Florida’s residents, as reflected in their grave markers, deserves the same careful evaluation and respect shown in northern states.
**Research Purpose**

The goal of this two-year project was to determine how grave marker attributes have changed over time in Florida. Originally designed to evaluate grave markers in central and southeast Florida, the geographic area was expanded to include north-central Florida when original data collection revealed a preponderance of relatively late marker dates (ranging from the 1930's to the present) in the central and southeast areas. To resolve this poor representation of early headstones, the initial scope was extended to broaden the time range. Inclusion of north-central Florida incorporated a selection of pre-1900 and early 1900 era headstones, allowing evaluation of a wider time period.

**Thesis Objectives**

The objectives of this research included evaluating cemeteries in north-central, central, and southeast Florida to establish:

1. How grave marker attributes changed over time.
   a. What specific changes in grave marker attribute types and frequencies relate to different eras?
   b. Are regional differences expressed in grave markers in north-central, central and southeast Florida?
2. What are the attributes of folk style (hand cast) markers?
3. How do military markers change over time?
4. What is the state of preservation in small, mid-sized and larger cemeteries in the north-central, central, and southeast regions of Florida?
CHAPTER TWO: HISTORY

Friend, when you walk by
As you art now, so once was I
As I am now, soon you will be
Prepare to die, and follow me

~Epitaph, Donald Tecumseh Prose
Drawdy-Rouse Cemetery

History of The American Cemetery

Life is a temporary condition, while death is a permanent one. As of 9:00am on March 17, 2012 the current population of the United States included 313,198,145 individuals, as estimated by the government’s US POPClock (US & World Population Clock – US Census Bureau, 2012). In the three months between March 17th and June 17th 2012, the population increased by 562,322 to 313,760,467. This dynamic estimate changes continually, with numbers based on the 2010 Census and current population estimates. Calculations were based on the following criteria:

- One birth every 8 seconds
- One death every 14 seconds
- One international migrant (net) every 44 seconds
- Net gain of one person every 13 seconds

Even with a net gain of one person every 13 seconds, it is clear that the consequence of life is death and the cumulative effect of death in the time since this country was first colonized by Europeans results in a population of the dead which far exceeds that of the living. Yet, how we have housed and memorialized our dead has changed over time (Carmack, 2002; Greene, 2008; Sloane, 2008).

To differentiate the burial places of indigenous populations from those of the western peoples who colonized the Americas, Sloane (1995) uses the description “European-style” burial places. He states that there are one hundred thousand of
these European-style burial places dotting our countryside. This figure represents only those that have been identified. Many more have been lost to time. Carmack (2002), Greene (2008) and Sloane (1995) break the history of cemetery development into distinct categories: churchyards, frontier graves, homestead graves, potter’s fields, city graveyards, rural cemeteries, lawn-park cemeteries, memorial parks and veterans’ cemeteries.

**Churchyard Cemeteries**

Widely considered the earliest organized form of burial, European-style churchyards contain some of our country’s oldest grave markers (Carmack, 2002; Greene, 2008; Sloane, 2008). One of the oldest churchyard cemeteries is the Mission Bombre de Dios, which was established after the founding of St. Augustine in 1565 (Yalom, 2008). Churchyard cemeteries were modeled on European traditions. In speaking of 16th and 17th century European memorials, Mytum (2008) points to their simplicity in design. The typology of these early markers typically fell into two categories, upright headstones and flat slabs called ledgers. Europeans brought these mortuary traditions with them as they established new homes in North America.

The first northern settlement to boast a European-styled churchyard was Jamestown, Virginia (Yalom, 2008). Today the site contains the remains of a brick church and twenty-five tombstones. It is believed that there are actually several hundred unmarked burials on the property. One example of the popularity of early churchyard cemeteries is the seat of the Anglican Bishop of New York, Trinity Church, whose earliest internments date to the 1700’s (Greene, 2008; Sloane, 2008). Over crowding affects the dead as well as the living, and by the turn of the following
century there were estimated to be over one hundred thousand souls resting within its boundaries (Greene, 2008; Sloane, 2008). Another example of an early churchyard cemetery can be found at Old Steeple Church on Long Island, NY. Aquebough Cemetery at Old Steeple Church was established in 1755 (Chalmers, 1910). Here, early styled upright markers stand somberly in orderly rows (Figure 1).

![Churchyard Cemetery, Aquebogue, Long Island, NY est. 1755](image)

**Figure 1. Churchyard Cemetery, Aquebogue, Long Island, NY est. 1755 (collection of the author)**

*Frontier Graves*

Opening the western United States to settlers drew thousands in search of a new life (Carmack, 2002, Greene, 2008; Sloane, 2008). Inevitably death overtook some of these early pioneers. Cholera, tuberculosis, smallpox, and mumps were just a few of the diseases that killed them. It would have been both impractical and dangerous to transport the deceased to the new home, so they were hastily buried.
where they died (Carmack, 2002; Greene, 2008; Sloane, 2008). To protect the body from the possibility of disturbance by other travelers, many graves were left unmarked, although there are a small number of frontier graves still visible along the Oregon-California trails (Carmack, 2002).

**Homestead Graves**

As people established homesteads in remote locations there were often no formal churches or communities within which to bury their dead, thus a burial area was carved out of the homestead itself (Carmack, 2002; Greene, 2008; Sloane, 2008). Also called family burial plots, these were common in all areas, from early New England farms, to homesteads on the prairie, to southern plantations. They were often located on a high point, in an orchard or set among the flowers of a garden. (Carmack, 2002). The family maintained these burial grounds and as property possession shifted from familial hands to new owners, their sites were often overgrown and lost. As such, they pose a problem for contemporary researchers due to the lack of records pertaining to private burial places.

**Potter’s Fields**

Americans may pride themselves on their belief in equality, but in actuality ours is a class-conscious society. These class distinctions are evident in death as well as life. According to Greene (2008) Potter’s fields were dedicated to society’s castoffs, those who had no one and no resources with which to provide a proper burial. In such cases the county stepped in and provided for them. It is thought that the term “potter’s field” has a biblical root (Greene, 2008). The Gospel of Saint Matthew details how Judas, overcome by his betrayal, returned the money given to him for
this action. With these thirty pieces of silver, the priests purchased land where the
potters dug for clay and converted it to a place to bury strangers who died in their
town.

City Graveyards

Cities soon established their own burial grounds open to all the residents of
their community (Sloane, 1995; Yalom, 2008). However, issues of overcrowding and
concerns regarding the spread of disease created a push toward more remote
settings. In 1823 New York City’s Common Council passed a law “respecting the
interment of the dead” that prohibited the interment of the newly deceased or the
opening of previously interred graves within the confines of their district. This law
was in direct response to the city’s inability to control the spread of disease. City
dwellers felt “that graveyards exuded gases that aided the transmission of disease
within cities” (Sloane, 1995, p. 11). It was not uncommon for whole cemeteries to be
relocated to the outskirts of town. These urban cemeteries, whether in the center of
the city, or placed on the outskirts of town, are filled with rows of stone markers
arranged around straight paths with minimal landscaping or foliage (Carmack, 2002).

Rural or Garden Cemeteries

Used interchangeably (Greene, 2008; Meyer, 1995; Sloane, 1995) the terms
rural or garden cemetery describe a new style of American cemetery. By the mid
1800’s the rural cemetery movement reflected a change in burial patterns from small
churchyard or domestic burial grounds to large cemeteries with winding paths and
roadways. The first American “Garden Cemetery” Mount Auburn, was built in
Cambridge, Massachusetts (Greene, 2008; Sloane, 2008). Mount Auburn Cemetery
borrowed stylistic features from Europe. In a somewhat ostentatious fashion visitors entered through an Egyptian styled gate and once inside the cemetery grounds gazed upon a Norman tower (Cooper, 2009). A list of rural cemeteries and their origination dates is readily available, however a short selection is sufficient to represent four decades of growth (Table 1).

Table 1. Origination dates of four rural cemeteries based on Sloane, 1995.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cemetery</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mount Auburn</td>
<td>Cambridge, MA</td>
<td>1831</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harmony Grove</td>
<td>Salem, MA</td>
<td>1840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York Bay</td>
<td>Jersey City, NJ</td>
<td>1850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graceland</td>
<td>Chicago, IL</td>
<td>1860</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These cemeteries were seen differently than their earlier counterparts, and it is during this period that the term “cemetry” became standardized. Of Greek origin, the word cemetery was derived from “Koimeterium,” which translates to “a place to sleep” (Yalom, 2008). The concept of a sleeping chamber appealed to the early Victorians who envisioned placing their loved ones in an environment where the transition from this realm to one of eternal life could occur in tranquility (Sloane, 1995). Such cemeteries existed in a time before widespread development of community parks and became the place to go to enjoy a Sunday picnic among the elaborate monuments. In keeping with its garden theme, the rural cemetery’s park-like atmosphere was designed so visitors could wander through the trees and around ponds while paying their respects to loved ones (Carmack, 2002; Greene, 2008; Sloane, 2008). Orlando’s Greenwood cemetery, situated in a pastoral setting is considered a garden cemetery. The Orlando Cemetery Company was established in 1880 and bodies from the city’s four other operating cemeteries were thereafter
reinterred in Greenwood (Murphy, 2007). While Greenwood’s landscaping is an excellent example of the garden cemetery plan, consolidation of Orlando’s four city cemeteries into Greenwood Cemetery’s grounds reflects practices begun by city cemeteries in the past. In this way Greenwood Cemetery serves to illustrate an observation Carmack (2002, p. 87) made at Evergreen Cemetery in Colorado Springs, CO. Evergreen is not easily definable, ranging from urban to garden in character. In cemetery studies, as with many areas of analysis, the lines of demarcation can blur when attempting to classify groups by specifically defined characteristics.

**Lawn-park Cemeteries**

In 1855 Cincinnati’s Adolph Strauch adapted the cemetery at Spring Grove to a “landscape lawn plan” (Greene, 2008; Sloane, 2008). Strauch sought to reduce ostentation and replace it with simplicity in design by thinning trees and shrubs and limiting marker size. He is quoted as saying “Gaudiness is often mistaken for splendor” (Sloane, 1995, p. 104). After initial resistance by lot owners who did not want to give up their rights to memorialization choices, his designs found sure footing. By 1900 Strauch was seen as the father of the modern cemetery movement, a movement that was the cornerstone of the commercialization of the cemetery industry. Over time lawn area was expanded and cemeteries became even more park like with monuments that conformed to a more standardized pattern (Greene, 2008; Sloane, 2008).

**Memorial Parks**

What Adolph Strauch was to the lawn cemetery movement, Hubert Eaton was to the memorial park (Greene, 2008; Sloane, 2008). He created an interconnected
network of services under the umbrella of the memorial park. The funeral director, memorial dealer, and cemetery agent could now be found in one location to serve all their client’s needs. By 1917 Eaton was offering incentives to plot owners to encourage them to purchase flat ground markers. First seen as a Californian cultural phenomenon, the memorial park spread throughout the country and numbered over six hundred by 1935 (Sloane, 1995). The flat ground markers promoted by Eaton are designed to lie flush with the ground to allow easier maintenance. They contain little information about the deceased, typically no more than the name and birth and death dates. Even the most elaborate engravings offered no more than a simple family relation such as “mother, sister, or aunt” (Carmack, 2002).

**Veterans’ Cemeteries**

Prior to the Civil War, there was no centralized plan for the burial of veterans (Carmack, 2002; Greene, 2008; Sloane, 2008; United States Department of Veterans Affairs, 2012). They were often buried where they fell. Luckier ones may be buried on the post or fort to which they were stationed. Embalming, a process lacking widespread appeal until after the Civil War, was rarely practiced, making a hasty burial a desired event (Sloane, 1995). It wasn’t until July 17, 1862 that Congress authorized the purchase of land to establish the first national burial ground for Veterans (United States Department of Veterans Affairs, 2012). With that authorization they formed 14 national cemeteries (Table 2).
Today the remains of more than two million American, representing all branches of
the military are interred in one hundred and nineteen national cemeteries. (Carmack,
2002; Greene, 2008; Sloane, 2008; United States Department of Veterans Affairs,
2012).
Cemetery Development and Societal Attitudes Regarding Death

The history and development of the American cemetery parallels the history and development of our nation’s attitude toward death and mortality (Carmack, 2002; Greene, 2008; Sloane, 2008; Yalom, 2008). From America’s puritan beginnings death was seen as a personal and religious experience. Family members undertook the preparation of the dead for burial, and when possible buried them within the confines of the churchyard. When this practice was made impractical by the circumstances or location of death, burials were extended to frontier graves and homestead locations. However, even in these circumstances religious rituals were frequently observed (Sloane, 1995).

Burial practices evolved through stages from simple churchyard burials open to any member of the church, to city cemeteries accommodating a variety of religious denominations, to privatized cemetery associations who sold cemetery plots as real estate, simply another commodity on the consumer market (Greene, 2008; Sloane, 2008; Yalom, 2008). Walking through the evolution of the American cemetery provided an overview of societal burial patterns. Examining one specific cemetery deed can illuminate the past, personalizing the freedoms and restrictions placed on one family’s burial practices in a given place and time.

On August 10, 1881, Henry Reetz purchased a lot for the sum of $30, in Concordia Cemetery located in Chicago, IL. Concordia is an example of a private city graveyard, which limited internments to lot owners. This deed gave Henry’s “heirs and assigns, forever” burial privileges (Figure 2). Under the deed’s “Rules and Regulations of Concordia Cemetery” rule #8 (Figure 3), outlines acceptable
Figure 2. 1881 Deed to Concordia Cemetery - Front (collection of the author)
Figure 3. 1881 Deed to Concordia Cemetery - Back (collection of the author)
monuments and restricts grave marker material stating, “No monument and no portion of vaults above-ground shall be of other materials than cut stone, granite or marble, without the consent of the Company.” In a time when garden cemeteries were gaining popularity and inviting people to come enjoy the outdoors, Concordia’s “Rules Concerning Visitors” rule #6 (Figure 3) declares, “Pic-Nic Parties will Not be admitted to the Grounds; neither will Children be admitted unless in care of Parents or Adults, who will be held responsible for them.” Concordia’s deed paints a picture of a restrictive institution, one which is not reflective of the general atmosphere described by Greene (2008), Sloane (2008) and Yalom (2008) for the period.

Another way to explore a culture’s attitude toward a subject is to examine how it is integrated into daily life, including the way people spend their leisure time. During the Victorian era public sentiment shifted from the devoutly religious attitudes of the puritan settlers and embraced a new ritualization of the mourning process (Sloane, 2008; Yalom, 2008). Parlors became living rooms, flowers were combined with black crepe as symbols of devotion to the departed, undertakers were called funeral directors and the use of the word deceased came into vogue (Sloane, 2008).

Popular culture reflected this change. Images of death were often intertwined with images of life and could be both satirical and cautionary. Initially designed to provide an affordable alternative to more expensive forms of photography, carte de visites (CDV’s) were photography cards approximately 2.25” x 3.5” that were typically portraits designed to be exchanged between friends. The CDV format, which was substantially less expensive than daguerreotypes and tintypes, made
photography more accessible to the middle class. According to the American
Museum of Photography, in 1863 Dr. Oliver Wendell Holmes wrote, "Card portraits,
as everybody knows, have become the social currency, the 'green-backs' of
civilization" (A Brief History of the Carte de Visite, 2012). However, once their status
was assured, CDV's filled a variety of roles. According to Wichard (1999, p. 73) “As
the popularity of ‘art’ cartes increased, painting and engravings were commissioned
especially for the carte de visite format.” At their peak in the 1860’s it is estimated
that up to four hundred million CDV’s were sold annually.

A unique example of an “art carte”
depicts a bridge under which two
youths relax. Entitled “Blossom and
Decay” (Figure 4) the image reflects
either two bucolic youths or a grinning
skull (Wichard, 1999, p. 73).

Images such as “Blossom and
Decay” were not limited to small CDV’s.
In 1892 Charles Gilbert drew a woman
sitting at her vanity table gazing into
the mirror. Entitled “All is Vanity,” as
with “Blossom and Decay” the image is an illusion (All is Vanity, 2012). From one
vantage point you see a beautiful woman admiring her reflection, from another a
grinning skull. The image enjoyed mass appeal after being sold to Life Magazine in
1902, and is considered one of the most reproduced illusions of all time.
Death was an accepted element of life in the Victorian world, and as the illusions “Blossom” and “Vanity” illustrate, perception was purely a function of perspective.

Introduced to the public in 1851, stereoscopes (Figure 5) were the Victorian version of today’s computers, televisions, and iPads. They were a way to experience the world in three dimensions and were a popular form of entertainment (Waldsmith, 1991). Examples of the public’s fascination with cemeteries and mortuary practices can be seen in the many stereo views of cemeteries around the country and around the world. When placed in a stereoscope these dual images merge together to become one three dimensional picture. Places documented through the stereoscope include famous sites such as Arlington National Cemetery (Figure 6.a) and New York’s Greenwood Cemetery (Figure 6.b). Greenwood’s stereo view contains information on the back, which boasts, “This widely known cemetery is situated in Gowanus Heights, and covers an area of 474 acres. The number of bodies interred up to July, 1896, was 290,000 or an average of about 5,000 per annum since it was opened” (collection of the author). Even quiet country cemeteries like Kalamazoo,
Figure 6. Stereoviews illustrate the popularity of cemetery images (collection of the author)
Michigan’s Mountain Home Cemetery (Figure 6.c) enjoyed wide appeal, once again suggesting a society embracing death as an expected and natural stage of life, allowing a transition into the next realm.

The late 1800’s also saw the rise of the funeral industry. While many families still prepared the body by washing and dressing the deceased prior to a period of mourning in the home (Yalom, 2008) more elaborate funerals were coming into vogue, replete with postmortem photographs such as that taken of Henry Reetz Phillipson (Figure 7), the young grandson of Henry Reetz. As was often the case during this time, Henry died so young that no other photograph had been taken of him and this represents the only visual reminder the family had of a beloved child.

Figure 7. Postmortem. Henry Reetz Phillipson, 2yrs 2mos, April 4, 1888 (collection of the author)

Postmortem photographs were often staged to appear as if the deceased were simply sleeping and served to reinforce the belief in eternal rest.
Following this interval, burial preparation experienced a period of depersonalization as funeral homes and pre-need contracts allowed families to distance themselves, removing the deceased from the home environment and allowing the family to mourn from a distance. It is at this junction that the business

![Promotional material reflecting commercialization (collection of the author)](image)

Figure 8. Promotional material reflecting commercialization (collection of the author)

of death became truly commercialized (Sloane, 2008, Yalom, 2008). Funeral homes began marketing to the public using all the same advertising tools businessmen employed to promote sales. Monument makers offered free tours of their factories
and handed out promotional items such as needle books (Figure 8) and color
catalogs.

According to Sloane (2008, p. 135) “By 1900 the supply of burial lots exceeded the demand.” As commercialization grew, a shift in public consciousness can be seen in the spread of lawn-park cemeteries, which foreshadowed today’s highly commercialized memorial parks (Sloane, 1995). With increased regulation, disagreements between deed holders and cemetery management became more complicated (Greene, 2008). In 1887 the Association of American Cemetery Superintendents (AACS) was formed through the combined efforts of eighteen cemeteries to provide cemetery management guidelines. The AACS continues today under the auspices of The International Cemetery, Cremation, and Funeral Association ICCFA (ICCFA, 2012).

A Historical Perspective of Variation in Grave Marker Material

As expressed by Gaylord Cooper, grave markers “were carefully chosen, usually in an attempt to commemorate and reflect the thinking of the deceased” (Cooper, 2009, p. 9). Examples of the popularity of the memorial marker abound. In promotional material produced by marker companies (Figure 8), stereoscopic views of the Victorian era (Figure 6) and Norman Rockwell images (Figure 9), the memorialization of death endures and adjusts as the political, social, and economic climate changes. As is evidenced by this inclusion in our popular culture, cemeteries and memorial markers hold a noteworthy place in our collective history.
Figure 9. Norman Rockwell advertisement circa 1955 (collection of the author)
As cemeteries evolved, grave markers evolved alongside them (Carmack, 2002; Greene, 2008; Sloane, 2008). The types of marker materials used to memorialize the dead range from wood, to durable stone and metal, encompassing fieldstone, slate, soapstone, sandstone, marble, and granite as well as metals such as bronze and zinc. The following section will contain a description of such materials based on general categories provided by Carmack, (2002), Greene (2008) and Sloane (2008).

**Wooden Markers**

Wooden markers (Figure 10a) represent the earliest form of grave markers. They may take the shape of a post, cross, or “headboard” designed to resemble the headboard of a bed. However, it is rare to find a wooden grave marker in legible condition (Mytum, 2008; Strangstad, 1995). The post imprints of grave rails may be all that is seen in some early settlement graveyards. Grave rails consisted of a long wooden rail that was suspended by two wooden posts and traversed the length of the grave.

![Figure 10. Variation in grave marker material](image)

a. Wooden Marker  
Drawdy-Rouse Cemetery  
b. Marble Marker  
Palms Cemetery  
c. Bronze Marker  
St. Lucie Village Cemetery
**Stone Markers**

The types of stones used for grave markers include everything from fieldstones to highly polished granite (Carmack, 2002; Greene, 2008; Mytum, 2008; Strangstad, 1995; Sloane, 2008; Yalom, 2008). Such sedimentary rocks as sandstone, limestone, and slate are subject to the effects of weathering. Marble’s popularity began to rise between 1830-1880, but its durability was subject to the ill effects of acid-rain pollution (Figure 10.b). After 1880 gray granite began to replace the softer marble markers in popularity. The turn of the century brought with it the advent of sandblasting as a method of stone carving, along with the ability to polish granite faces to a high gloss further improving their durability (Boutwell, n.d.; Carmack, 2002).

**Metal Markers**

Bronze (Figure 10.c) was introduced as a primary marker material in conjunction with the growth of memorial parks. Sloan points out that “The only markers that Forest Lawn had allowed were bronze; this was part of its attempt to separate itself from past practices” (Sloane, 1995, p. 183). While bronze was a cemetery staple in the centuries prior to this modernization, its use was restricted to statuary. Until this aesthetic shift, metal monuments were banned from the cemetery landscape. In 1919, touting the appeal of the bronze monument, the *Monument Dealer’s Manual* printed notes from The Gorham Co. which read “By many architects and artist this verdigris coloring is regarded as one of the beautiful and interesting effects which bronze takes on with age” and the American Art Bronze Foundry stated, “In regard to verdigris on bronze . . . there are many other influences that give
character to bronze” (Sample, 1919). In addition to embracing modernization, many twentieth-century Americans saw the flat bronze grave markers as a way to preserve privacy, as their low profile prevented identification until you reached the grave site (Sloan, 1995).

One of the most interesting materials used for grave markers was called “white bronze” (Figure 11). Manufactured exclusively by the Monumental Bronze Company, white bronze was made from zinc (Meyer, 1992) and was touted as the “perfect” solution, offering an inexpensive, attractive, durable alternative to traditional materials. These monuments exhibited a unique beauty brought about by its physical properties. When exposed to air, zinc develops a protective coating of zinc carbonate from which its distinctive blue-gray color arises. These monuments were touted as nearly indestructible and were sold from the mid 1870’s until roughly 1918. Outside of vandalism, and the tendency for heavier monuments to put pressure on their bases creating a phenomenon called “creep” as the baseline moves out of alignment, the monuments have held up surprisingly well, somewhat less affected by the elements than their stone counterparts. Many reasons have been suggested for the relatively short manufacturing period of these attractive and durable monuments. Meyer (1992)
points to a loss of faith in the “perfectibility” of life. After a commercial life of less than 50 years, people began to doubt the claims of a “perfect” monument. Thus, a shift in societal beliefs and attitudes led to the demise of the Monumental Bronze Company.

**Military Markers**

As noted in the cemetery history section, there was no centralized burial plan for military personnel prior to the Civil War. General Orders number 75 were issued on September 11, 1861 following the first battle of Manassas. They “Made commanders of national forces responsible for burials and marking graves.” (United States Department of Veterans Affairs, 2012). Not only was there no organization for the burial of veterans prior to the Civil War, there was no standardized method to mark such burials. General Orders 75 were issued to regulate military burials by marking the grave with plain white wooden markers. However, by 1872 the high maintenance cost of wooden markers was recognized. Stone markers were introduced in 1873 and went through several iterations in design (Figure 12 & Table 3). In 2001, The VA was allowed to furnish “an appropriate government marker for the grave of a veteran buried in a private cemetery regardless of whether the grave is already marked with a private marker” (United States Department of Veterans Affairs). The tendency to double mark burial sites is frequently seen in the regional cemeteries sampled for this research project.
a. Civil War type  
Carleton Cemetery  
b. Spanish-American War type  
Drawdy-Rouse Cemetery  
c. General type  
Washington Memorial Cemetery  
d. Flat marble marker  
Drawdy-Rouse Cemetery  
e. Flat granite marker  
Drawdy-Rouse Cemetery  
f. Flat bronze marker  
Drawdy-Rouse Cemetery  

Figure 12. Variation in military marker type
Table 3. Chronology of marker types, (United States Department of Veterans Affairs, 2012)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Designed For Veterans of:</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1861-1872</td>
<td>Union soldiers</td>
<td>Wooden headboards painted white and inscribed with the veteran's name and information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1873</td>
<td>Union soldiers</td>
<td>“Civil War” Type (Fig. 9.a) A slab of marble or durable stone, 4 inches thick, 10 inches wide and 12 inches in height above the ground. The face was polished and the top curved. On the face was a sunken shield with a bas-relief inscription.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1899</td>
<td>Spanish-American War soldiers</td>
<td>The same as Civil War type with Spanish-American War noted (Fig. 9.b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1903</td>
<td>Union soldiers</td>
<td>The width was changed to 12 inches and the height was changed to 39 inches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1906</td>
<td>Confederate soldiers</td>
<td>Similar to Union markers, but the top was pointed instead of curved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1918</td>
<td>All soldiers except veterans of the Civil and Spanish-American War</td>
<td>“General” Type (Fig. 9.c) White American marble 4 inches thick, 13 inches wide and 42 inches in height above the ground with a curved top. For the first time the Latin cross, or Star of David was authorized for use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1930</td>
<td>Confederate soldiers</td>
<td>The Confederate Cross was added in a small circle above the standard inscription.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1936</td>
<td>All eligible members of the armed forces and veterans</td>
<td>Flat marble markers (Fig. 9.d) 24 inches in length, 12 inches wide, 4 inches deep</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1939</td>
<td>All eligible members of the armed forces and veterans</td>
<td>Flat granite markers (Fig. 9.e) 24 inches in length, 12 inches wide, 4 inches deep</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1940</td>
<td>All eligible members of the armed forces and veterans</td>
<td>Flat bronze markers (Fig. 9.f) 24 inches in length, 12 inches wide, 3/16 of an inch deep</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1941-1947</td>
<td>All soldiers</td>
<td>Granite was authorized for use in established upright designs, but was discontinued in 1947 due to cost.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1944</td>
<td>All soldiers</td>
<td>The date of birth was added</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>All soldiers</td>
<td>Upright granite headstones were reintroduced.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER THREE: METHODOLOGY AND CEMETERY SAMPLE

Research and data collection was initiated in 2010 as part of the University of Central Florida’s Research and Mentoring Program (RAMP). The research design included identifying grave marker attributes as an overlooked area of grave marker study. Once a focus was selected, a cemetery sample was defined. It was determined that moderately sized cemeteries (ranging from 5 grave markers to no more than 750 grave markers) would be necessary to ensure manageable data collection, thereby excluding large commercial cemeteries. However, within the moderate classification, a mixture of small to larger sized cemeteries in two or more counties was desired to offer a measure of variety to the sample. Counties with proximity to the university and researcher’s residence were selected to allow ease of access in data collection. Viking Cemetery and St. Lucie Village Cemetery in St. Lucie County, were selected to represent small cemeteries, while Palms Cemetery in St. Lucie County was identified as a small to mid-sized cemetery for inclusion. Washington Memorial Cemetery in Martin County, FL represented a mid-sized cemetery, while Drawdy-Rouse Cemetery on Rouse Road in Orlando, FL was identified as an appropriate large cemetery, logistically well placed for data collection.

Following the first year of data collection, it was recognized that was a lack of early grave markers, and that it would be necessary to expand the geographic range to include more early and pre-1900 era grave markers. At this time five additional cemeteries were added to the sample including: Carlton Cemetery in St. Lucie County, FL, Carleton Cemetery in Putnam County, FL and Carlton Cemetery, Caraway
Cemetery, and Jones Cemetery in Alachua County. This resulted in a sample of 10 cemeteries in five counties, providing a broad geographical distribution (Table 4).

Table 4. Grave marker distribution by cemetery

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County and Cemetery</th>
<th>Date Range</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alachua County</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carlton</td>
<td>1866 - 1906</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caraway</td>
<td>1915 - 1951</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jones</td>
<td>1900 - 1991</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Putnam County</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carleton</td>
<td>1910 - 1919</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orange County</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drawdy-Rouse</td>
<td>1871 - 2011</td>
<td>704</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Lucie County</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Lucie Village</td>
<td>1882 - 1895</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viking</td>
<td>1905 - 2010</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carlton</td>
<td>1882 - 2011</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palms</td>
<td>1903 - 2008</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin County</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington Memorial</td>
<td>1841 - 2009</td>
<td>219</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Grave Markers Sampled** 1267
North-Central Florida

The cemeteries analyzed in north-central Florida are identified on the following GIS map (Figure 13) and included Carlton Cemetery, Caraway Cemetery, and Jones Cemetery in Alachua county and Carleton Cemetery in Putnam County.

Figure 13. North-central Florida, GIS map created by Chelsea Nicole Stewart
Central Florida

The central Florida area was represented by Drawdy-Rouse Cemetery in Orange County, which is identified on the following GIS map (Figure 14). The choice to incorporate only one cemetery in central Florida was due to the large size of this cemetery, which consisted of 806 grave markers (704 containing death dates).

Figure 14. Central Florida, GIS map created by Chelsea Nicole Stewart
Southeast Florida

The cemeteries analyzed in southeast Florida are identified on the following GIS map (Figure 15) and included St. Lucie Village Cemetery, Carleton Cemetery, and Palms Cemetery in St. Lucie County and Washington Memorial Cemetery in Martin County.

Figure 15. Southeast Florida, GIS map created by Chelsea Nicole Stewart
**Data Collection**

A preliminary field visit resulted in the development of a list of relevant grave marker attributes. Data collection sheets (Figure 16) were designed to record attributes for each grave marker. These forms documented decedent name, birth and death dates, age at death (in years only), marker type, marker material and size, epitaphs, iconographic images, what broad categories were represented, memorial photographs, footstones, kerbs, base and shoulder types, as well as marker/individual representation (individual, couples, or families on one marker or multiple markers for one individual) in addition it was noted whether or not the marker was manufactured or folk style (hand made). From these data six categories were selected for analysis. These categories included: grave marker type, grave marker material, epitaphs, iconographic images, memorial photographs, footstones, and kerbs. Collected data were then compiled to evaluate the frequency of these attributes. In addition, a photograph of the individual grave marker, along with a grid position assigned to facilitate location for future study, was included in each completed data sheet.
Figure 16. Completed data collection sheet, including grave marker image
Time Periods and Data Collection Guidelines

Grave markers were categorized into seven time ranges based on death dates, (pre-1900, 1890-1920, 1919-1940, 1939-1960, 1959-1980, 1979-2000, 1999-2011). Excluding the earliest, and the latest time range, all ranges represent twenty-year periods. Grave markers from the earliest period (pre-1900) were categorized into one time range due to the limited quantity of early grave markers. The latest time period (1999-2011) represents a span of 12 years. Although data were collected on grave markers that did not contain death dates, this data was excluded from analysis based on the inability to accurately place the marker in an appropriate time range.

Guidelines were established in data collection to determine the total number of grave markers evaluated and how they related to the total number of burials represented. In all, data were collected on 1,454 grave markers. Of these, 187 did not contain death years, and were therefore excluded, leaving a remainder of 1,267 grave markers for analysis. In the case where one marker represented the burial of more than one individual (most often in the case of a husband and wife) the marker was counted twice, once for each burial. This avoided arbitrary assignment of gender related attributes to one burial or the other. In this data set, 124 individual burials contained a secondary grave marker. To ensure the analysis of all grave markers, secondary grave markers were analyzed individually. Subtracting the secondary markers from total grave markers analyzed results in the analysis of 1,267 grave markers representing 1,143 individuals. A description of the grave marker attributes utilized in the analysis of this data set follows.
Grave Marker Attributes

Marker Type

The marker type reflects the overall design of the marker (Figure 17 & Figure 18). These types vary greatly, from vaults (Figure 17.a & Figure 17.b) to beveled (Figure 17.d) and common flat ground markers (Figure 17.f) to rare varieties represented by Woodman of the World (Figure 18.b) and custom laser designs (Figure 18.i). Types of markers were denoted on data collection sheets as they were encountered, resulting in a compilation of marker types in the areas evaluated. In addition, memorial parks (which allow only ground markers) were excluded to avoid an artificially constructed bias.

Material

As discussed in detail earlier, marker material changed over time ranging from wood to more durable materials such as stone and metal. Each marker material was identified on data collection sheets as it was encountered, resulting in a compilation of material types in the areas evaluated.

Epitaph

Grave markers typically include the name of the individual along with the dates of birth and death. Epitaphs elaborate on this information and may offer a window into the deceased’s character (Carmack, 2002; Giguere, 2007; Yalom, 2008). Donald Tecumseh Prose’s epitaph as quoted in chapter two’s opening phrase, is based on a religious view common in colonial America “ (Yalom, 2008). The original cautions “As I am now so shall you be; prepare for death and follow me.” Epitaphs can take many forms, but generally “anything added to the basic biographical data is
Figure 17. Representative vault, ground, temporary, and cube marker types
Figure 18. Representative upright, cross, and miscellaneous custom marker types
known as an epitaph” (Yalom, 2008:13). Epitaphs were cataloged as they were encountered, noted on data collection sheets, and compiled into broad categories.

**Iconographic Images**

Gaylord Cooper has described iconography as “image writing” (Cooper, 2009). Iconographic imagery (Figure 19) is comprised of commonly recognized symbols (Cooper, 2009; Keister, 2004). A cross represents Christianity, the Star of David, Judaism. These are fairly static symbols with consistent meaning across time. However, not all symbols are as constant. Early Puritans engraved skull-and-crossbones images to caution and prepare the living for death. By the early 1800’s this image had evolved into a winged death’s head skull, and by the late 1700’s the skulls gave way to angels watching over those slumbering below (Cooper, 2009).

Iconographic imagery was cataloged as encountered, noted on data collection sheets and compiled into broad categories.

![Representative samples of iconographic imagery](image)

*Figure 19. Representative samples of iconographic imagery*
Memorial Photographs

“The earliest known carved portrait was cut in 1744” (Carmack, 2002, p. 102).

On August 19, 1839, at the French Academy of Sciences meeting, Louis Daguerre introduced photography to the public (Library of Congress, 20120). Naming the processes after himself, his images were called daguerreotypes. A new industry was formed and photographers soon found a lucrative market in the bereaved. In addition to postmortem photographs (Figure 7) daguerreotypes of the deceased could be mounted to the grave marker. On March 11, 1851, Solon Jenkins, Jr. received the first recorded memorial tombstone photograph patent (Carmack, 2002; US Patent Office, 2012). U.S. Patent Number 7,974, (Appendix A, Figure 38 & Figure 39) titled “Securing Daguerreotypes In Monumental Stones” was issued (Taylor, 2012; US Patent Office, 2012). In 1893 the J.A. Dedouch Company in Chicago produced their first memorial portrait for grave markers. The company continues to produce up to 15,000 “Dedo” memorial photographs per year (Yalom, 2008, p. 20). By the

![Figure 20. Representative memorial photography](image)

a. Mary Elizabeth Carlton
   Carlton Cemetery – Fort Pierce
b. Thomas Allen Seagraves
   Drawdy-Rouse Cemetery
c. Clemmons Family
   Drawdy-Rouse Cemetery

twentieth century porcelain and ceramic photographs became popular grave marker adornments. These photographs may reflect not only the physical characteristics of
the deceased, but also what their interests and passions were (Figure 20). Twenty
year old Thomas Allen Seagraves’ unusual photograph (Figure 20.b) is enhanced
with the haunting epitaph:

“To Tommy, you have gone the way you wanted, our Lord chose the time. You are missed in many ways, by the ones left behind. Tho’ the light you gave has gone out, and is no longer here, in our minds we know you are away, but in our hearts so very near.”

More recent memorial photographs are laser etched onto the face of the
marker itself (Figure 20.c).

Footstone

Footstones were traditionally place at the foot of the grave and contained the
deceased initials (Figure 21, Figure 22.a, & Figure 37). Shaped as small oblong
markers, they could also represent a miniature of the headstone. Mytum
reflects that the combination of a headstone and footstone produced a
potent image of “a bed below which the deceased lies in eternal rest” (Mytum,
2008, p. 7). In this data set footstones were evaluated as observed or absent.
Kerb

Kerbs form boundaries delineating the outline of a single grave (Figure 22.b) or several conjoined graves (Figure 22.c) in a family plot (Mytum, 2008). In this data set kerbs were evaluated as either observed or absent.

Base

Grave markers are made-up of one or more parts (Mytum, 2008). Markers may be set in the ground with no base at all (Figure 17.i), or may contain both a die (the upright portion) and a base (Figure 18.d). Bases can be multilayered and elaborate (Figure 18.b) or simple single supports for the die to rest on (Figure 18.c). In this data set bases were evaluated in relation to the number of levels observed, none, single, double or triple. Although data were collected on base types, it was not utilized in the overall analysis of markers in this data set.

Shoulder

Mytum describes a variety of headstone shapes that “can extend up from the top of the stone, or the shoulder can be cut away in a variety of shapes” (Mytum,
2008). His comprehensive book has been used as a reference, and shoulder types were identified on data collection sheets as they were encountered, resulting in a compilation of shoulder shapes in the areas evaluated. Examples of shoulder diversity include serpentine (Figure 18.d), rounded (Figure 18.c), and straight (Figure 17.i). Although data were collected on shoulder types, it was not utilized in the overall analysis of markers in this data set.
CHAPTER FOUR: INDIVIDUAL CEMETERY RESULTS

Each cemetery was analyzed individually for the frequency of each identified grave marker attribute (marker type, marker material, epitaphs, iconographic images, memorial photographs, footstones and kerbs). Results for each cemetery will be grouped by county and presented geographically from north to south. Additional observations, including any known history for the cemetery, dates of the earliest and latest dated burials, and whether a cemetery is active or non-active will also be noted.

Alachua County

Carlton Cemetery

Carlton Cemetery is an active cemetery run by the Putnam Land Conservancy with burials dated between 1866 and 1906. With an 8.3 million dollar grant from the Florida Communities Trust, the Putnam Land Conservancy was able to purchase over 2,400 acres of land including the Carlton Cemetery (Figure 23). They are currently in the process of restoration and preservation and plan to utilize the property for public education in the near future (Mike Stallings, personal communication, 2012).

In addition to the Carlton Cemetery, the Putnam Land Conservancy’s property includes the original pioneer settlement established at Morrison’s Mill, the foundation of which can still be seen just beyond the cemetery gates. This settlement represents the origins of the current town of Hawthorne and is the final resting place of McKeen Carlton and Anna Morrison Carlton who represent one of Hawthorne’s founding families.

As part of the Conservancy’s future plan, Carlton cemetery has been converted to a green cemetery, a type of burial practice that prohibits grave markers
and requires all materials used in the burial be natural and decomposable. The first
green burial occurred this year.

Figure 23. Overview of Carlton Cemetery, Alachua County

Marker Type

Carlton Cemetery contained 15 dated graves. While a number of marker types
were represented, upright markers were the predominant marker type (Table 5).

Table 5. Summary of marker types, Carlton Cemetery, Alachua County

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beveled</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cube</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upright</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oblisk</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Marker Material

Marker material was predominantly gray or white marble, reflecting this cemetery’s early burials (Table 6).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gray Granite</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gray Marble</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Marble</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Concrete</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6. Summary of marker material, Carlton Cemetery, Alachua County

Epitaphs

Carlton Cemetery contained 13 grave markers exhibiting an epitaph. Of these, 10 were genealogical, one was familial and two were religious in nature.

Iconographic Images

Carlton Cemetery contained seven grave markers exhibiting iconographic imagery. Of these seven, four were religious in nature, with one animal, one floral and one stylistic in design.

Memorial Photographs

This cemetery contained no markers with photographs.

Footstones and Kerbs

Carlton Cemetery contained eight grave markers exhibiting footstones and one grave marker bordered by a kerb.

Caraway Cemetery

Caraway Cemetery is a non-active, overgrown, and neglected cemetery with burials dated between 1915 and 1951. There is very little historical information available regarding Caraway Cemetery (Figure 24). According to Mike Stallings, this
collection of grave markers represents a small family cemetery. This is likely as every marker in the cemetery belongs to the Caraway surname. The cemetery is located in a highly wooded area of Alachua County, which required a guide and a four-wheel-drive vehicle to access. Mike Stallings from the Putnam Land Conservancy guided my research and identified the location of this cemetery.

**Marker Type**

Caraway Cemetery contained six dated graves. These were overwhelmingly (five of the six) hand cast upright markers, the sixth is a temporary funeral home marker.

Figure 24. Overview of Caraway Cemetery, Alachua County
Marker Material
Of Caraway Cemetery's six dated graves, five are hand cast concrete with hand etched names and dates. The sixth marker is a metal temporary funeral home marker.

Epitaphs
This cemetery contained no markers with epitaphs.

Iconographic Images
This cemetery contained no markers with iconographic imagery.

Memorial Photographs
This cemetery contained no markers with photographs.

Footstones and Kerbs
This cemetery contained no markers with footstones or kerbs.
Jones Cemetery

Jones Cemetery (Figure 25) is a non-active, overgrown, and neglected cemetery with burials dated between 1900 and 1991. Mike Stallings again provided transportation and offered the limited information that he had based on funeral home markers and the collective memory of the Hawthorne community. This is considered a traditionally black cemetery, a fact made plausible by funeral home markers listing Hughes & Chestnut Funeral Home.

Figure 25. Overview of Jones Cemetery, Alachua County

Hughes and Chestnut was founded in 1914 by Charles Chestnut, Sr. Charles was the grandson of Johnson Chestnut, a man brought to Alachua County as a slave by Thomas Evans Haile to help establish his cotton plantation, Kanapaha. (Hail
Homestead, 2012). Hughes & Chestnut Funeral Home has been the choice of black residents of Alachua County for nearly 100 years. Jones cemetery is difficult to locate and Mike Stallings provided navigation and transportation service to this cemetery.

**Marker Type**

Jones Cemetery contained 19 dated graves. Flat ground markers were the most frequently observed marker type. In-ground vaults and ledgers are represented by three markers apiece while the remaining categories contain no more than one or two markers each (Table 7).

**Table 7. Summary of marker types, Jones Cemetery, Alachua County**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Above Gr Vault</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flat Ground</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Gr Vault</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ledger</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military Ground</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military Upright</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upright</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Marker Material**

Only four marker materials were observed in Jones Cemetery. White marble is the predominant material, while gray marble, metal, and white concrete markers are represented on a limited basis (Table 8).

**Table 8. Summary of marker material, Jones Cemetery, Alachua County**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gray Marble</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metal</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Marble</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Concrete</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Epitaphs

Jones Cemetery contained eight markers exhibiting epitaphs, of which four were familial, one was memorial, two were military, and one was genealogical in nature.

Iconographic Images

Jones Cemetery contained three markers exhibiting iconographic imagery, of these one was stylistic in design and two were religious.

Memorial Photographs

This cemetery contained no markers with photographs.

Footstones and Kerbs

This cemetery contained no markers with footstones or kerbs.
Putnam County

Carleton Cemetery

Carleton Cemetery (Figure 26) is a moderately well maintained, non-active cemetery with burials dated between 1910 and 1919. It is located north of the area known as Carleton settlement, which was established in 1888 by Granville C. Smith. He purchased 20 acres for $200.00 (Putnam County Historical Society, 2012; Personal Communication, Sue Sinclair, 2012).

Figure 26. Overview of Carleton Cemetery, Putnam County

Interestingly Col. Smith was the only white man, and the only Yankee in an area populated with southern blacks, and remained such until 1900. Why the name Carleton was taken is not known, however, Granville did print a circular letter in
which he stated the settlement was intended for “the benefit of the many veteran of
the Civil War, and pensioned widows of such veterans, who are seeking a mild,
equable and salubrious climate; whose advanced age, declining years, and in many
cases, afflictions, being such as to no longer be able to endure the rigors of a northern
latitude.” Carleton cemetery is comprised of military markers that are all that
remains of the Carleton settlement (Putnam County Historical Society, 2012;

Marker Type
Carleton Cemetery contains 10 dated graves, all of which are military upright
markers.

Marker Material
Marker material in this cemetery was ambiguous. While most markers appear
to be marble and were categorized as such, some markers show possible
characteristics of sandstone, and require further evaluation.

Epitaphs
All markers in this cemetery contained military epitaphs

Iconographic Images
All markers in this cemetery contained military styled iconographic imagery.

Memorial Photographs
This cemetery contained no markers with photographs.

Footstones and Kerbs
This cemetery contained no markers with footstones, although one marker
was bordered by a kerb.
Drawdy-Rouse Cemetery

Drawdy-Rouse Cemetery (Figure 27) is a well-maintained, active cemetery with burials dated between 1871 and 2011. The cemetery was established in 1871 to provide a final resting place for the Drawdy and Rouse families. It is still maintained by the family cemetery association. According to the Polk County News, Mary Ann Drawdy (1833-1897) planted the first grapefruit tree in Florida. Mary Ann received the seed as a gift from a friend who lived in Cuba (Polk County News, 2012).
Marker Type

Drawdy-Rouse Cemetery contained 704 dated graves. While a number of marker types were represented, upright markers and ground markers were the predominant marker type. Drawdy-Rouse Cemetery has the distinction of being the only cemetery in this study to contain original wooden markers (Table 9).

Table 9. Summary of marker types, Drawdy-Rouse Cemetery, Orange County

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beveled</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Custion</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cube</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flat Ground</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ledger</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military Ground</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military Upright</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obelisk</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scroll Top Desk</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slant Upright</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temporary</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upright</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>704</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Marker Material

Grave markers in Drawdy-Rouse Cemetery were overwhelmingly made up of gray granite, which represented 544 grave markers. The nearest category was white marble, which contained only 74 grave markers (Table 10).
Table 10. Summary of marker material, Drawdy-Rouse Cemetery, Orange County

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Black Granite</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bronze</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gray Granite</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>544</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gray Marble</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metal</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pink Granite</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tan Granite</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Concrete</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Marble</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>704</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Epitaphs**

Drawdy-Rouse Cemetery contained 239 grave markers exhibiting epitaphs, in six categories.

**Iconographic Images**

Drawdy-Rouse Cemetery contained 338 grave markers exhibiting iconographic imagery in 16 categories.

**Memorial Photographs**

Drawdy-Rouse Cemetery contained 33 grave markers exhibiting memorial photographs.

**Footstones and Kerbs**

Drawdy-Rouse Cemetery contained 27 grave markers containing footstones and 24 bordered by kerbs.
St. Lucie County

St. Lucie Village Cemetery

St. Lucie Village Cemetery (Figure 28) is a well maintained cemetery. With burials dated between 1882 and 1895 it might be assumed that it is non-active, however there are several modern, undated granite grave markers, placed prior to death and burial.

Figure 28. Overview of St. Lucie Village Cemetery, St. Lucie County

In the 1870’s St. Lucie was the capital of Brevard County (Byrn et al., 2007). Following his pre-Civil War service at Fort Capron, Major James Pain built a homestead, including this family cemetery, in the area known as St. Lucie Village. In the early 20th century, St. Lucie Village played a role in the presidential elections.
when several influential members of the Republican party met at the St. Lucie Club to decide the GOP nominee for president (Byrn et al., 2007, p. 131). In addition to the Pain family, St. Lucie Village Cemetery is the final resting place of another founding family, the Summerlins. While the Summerlin family moved to Florida in 1770, it wasn’t until 1888 that Edward and Pollyanna Summerlin claimed ten acres under Florida’s homestead act and moved to the area near St. Lucie Village (TCPalm, December 21, 2008, VanLandingham, 2007). While it is likely that both Summerlin children buried in this cemetery belonged to Edward and Pollyanna, it is difficult to confirm as both were born and died between census periods.

**Marker Type**

St. Lucie Village Cemetery contains four dated graves. Of these, two are marked with a mounted plaque, and two are upright markers. All dates fall into the pre-1900 era.

**Marker Material**

St. Lucie Village Cemetery contains two graves marked with a bronze plaque mounted in white concrete, and two white marble grave markers.

**Epitaphs**

St. Lucie Village Cemetery contained two grave markers exhibiting epitaphs, in only two categories. One was personal in nature while one was genealogical in nature.

**Iconographic Images**

St. Lucie Village Cemetery contained two grave markers exhibiting iconographic imagery.
Memorial Photographs
This cemetery contained no markers with photographs.

Footstones and Kerbs
St. Lucie Village Cemetery contained two grave markers containing footstones.

None of the grave markers were bordered by kerbs.
**Viking Cemetery**

Viking Cemetery (Figure 29) is a well-maintained, active cemetery with burials dated between 1905 and 2010. Like Carleton Cemetery in Putnam County, the only trace of Viking Village is Viking Cemetery (Byrn et al., 2007). Established in 1905 on land donated by Jens Helseth, an early pineapple farmer, Viking Cemetery is still in use today.

![Viking Cemetery](image)

**Figure 29. Overview of Viking Cemetery, St. Lucie County**

Viking Village takes its name from the Viking settlement begun in 1892 by a large contingent of Scandinavian immigrants (Byrn et al., 2007, p. 140, VanLandingham, 2007, p. 28). Today the area is split between the Indrio section of
Fort Pierce and the large Indrio Savannahs nature preserve to the north (Viking Ghost Town, 2012).

**Marker Type**

Viking Cemetery contained 53 dated graves. While a number of marker types were represented, flat ground markers were the most frequently observed marker type (Table 11).

**Table 11. Summary of marker types, Viking Cemetery, St. Lucie County**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cube</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flat Ground</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military Ground</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mounted Plaque</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military Upright</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slant Upright</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temporary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upright</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Marker Material**

Gray granite was the most frequently observed marker material, followed by pink granite and gray marble. Other marker materials were less frequently observed (Table 12).

**Table 12. Summary of marker material, Viking Cemetery, St. Lucie County**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gray Granite</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gray Marble</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pink Granite</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paper</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Concrete</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Marble</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Epitaphs**

Viking Cemetery contained 10 grave markers exhibiting epitaphs, representing four categories. Of these, two were familial, one was genealogical, three were military and four were religious in nature.

**Iconographic Images**

Viking Cemetery contained 20 grave markers exhibiting iconographic imagery. Of these, two were banner symbols, six were floral, and eleven were religious in nature.

**Memorial Photographs**

This cemetery contained no markers with photographs.

**Footstones and Kerbs**

This cemetery contained no markers with footstones or kerbs.
Carlton Cemetery

Carlton Cemetery in Fort Pierce (Figure 30) is a well-maintained, active cemetery with burials dated between 1882 and 2011. It is a private family cemetery maintained by one of Florida’s pioneer ranching families. The earliest marked death date belongs to Ruben Carlton who died on July 23, 1913 at the age of 37, however there is a small footstone with the initials AKC attributed to Ruben’s baby brother Albert K Carlton who died in 1882, and which may be the earliest marker.

Figure 30. Overview of Carlton Cemetery, St. Lucie County

There are as many stories as there are graves in a Cemetery. One resident of note is Thad H. Carlton (1906-1965). Thad made the development of Port St. Lucie possible when he sold ten thousand acres of land to the Mackle Brother’s development company. A distinguished lawyer, Thad also served as a judge, a state’s
attorney and represented his county in 1943 in the State Legislature (Byrn et al., 2007, p. 289).

While collecting data at this cemetery I was invited to attend a family gathering designed to teach the younger Carltons about their past, and instill a sense of responsibility to the cemetery’s future care. Although my research centered on the markers themselves, this was a wonderful opportunity to experience first hand the impact grave markers have on future generations (Rebecca Eaves, personal communication, 2011).

Marker Type

Carlton Cemetery contained ninety-seven dated grave markers. While a number of marker types were represented, above ground vaults were the predominant marker type. This cemetery was unique in the number of graves marked by two markers (Table 13).

Table 13. Summary of marker types, Carlton Cemetery, St. Lucie County

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beveled</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Custion</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cube</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flat Ground</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ledger</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military Ground</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>52</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military Upright</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obelisk</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scroll Top Desk</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slant Upright</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>96</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temporary</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upright</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>704</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Marker Material

Due to the heavy concentration of above-ground vaults marked with a secondary grave marker, both white concrete and gray granite were prominent.

Table 14. Summary of marker material, Carlton Cemetery, St. Lucie County

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Above Gr Vault</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beveled</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curved Ground</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Custion</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cube</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flat Ground</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military Ground</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military Upright</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obelisk</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slant Upright</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upright</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Marker materials in this cemetery (Table 14).

Epitaphs

Carlton Cemetery contained 19 grave markers exhibiting epitaphs in five categories.

Iconographic Images

Carlton Cemetery contained 21 grave markers exhibiting iconographic imagery in seven categories.

Memorial Photographs

Carlton Cemetery contained one grave marker exhibiting a memorial photograph.

Footstones and Kerbs

This cemetery contained no markers with footstones or kerbs.
**Palms Cemetery**

Palms Cemetery (Figure 31) is a well-maintained, active cemetery with burials dated between 1903 and 2008. The cemetery is located seven miles south of Fort Pierce on Indian River Drive. One of the first areas settled in southeast Florida, due to its proximity to the Indian River, (Hutchinson, 1998; Thurlow, 2004), the road meanders along the river for twenty miles between Fort Pierce and Jensen Beach. Designated by the Florida Department of Transportation as part of “Florida’s Scenic Highway” it is home to

![Figure 31. Overview of Palms Cemetery, St. Lucie County](image)

Palms Cemetery and the remains of many early St. Lucie and Martin County residents. However, the most famous grave is that of Governor Daniel T. McCarty.
Elected in 1952 Governor McCarty was one of only 44 governors native to the Treasure Coast. Tragically, he had a heart attack less than two months after being sworn in, and died within weeks at the early age of 41 (Byrn et al., 2007, pp. 299-300; Fort Pierce Magazine, 2012).

Marker Type

This cemetery contained 140 dated graves. While a number of marker types were represented, flat ground markers were the most frequently observed marker type (Table 15).

Table 15. Summary of marker types, Palms Cemetery, St. Lucie County

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beveled</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curved Ground</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Custom</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cube</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flat Ground</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ledger</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military Ground</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scroll Top Desk</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slant Cube</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slant Upright</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temporary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upright</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodmen</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Marker Material

Grave markers in Palms Cemetery were overwhelmingly made up of gray granite, which represented 113 grave markers. The marker material nearest in number was white marble, which contained only 17 grave markers (Table 16).
Table 16. Summary of marker material, Palms Cemetery, St. Lucie County

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bronze</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gray Granite</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metal</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gray Marble</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Marble</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Epitaphs

Palms Cemetery contained 24 grave markers exhibiting epitaphs in five categories.

Iconographic Images

Palms Cemetery contained 40 grave markers exhibiting iconographic imagery in four categories.

Memorial Photographs

This cemetery contained no markers with memorial photographs.

Footstones and Kerbs

Palms Cemetery contained one grave marker containing a footstone and three grave markers bordered by kerbs.
**Martin County**

**Washington Memorial Cemetery**

Washington Memorial Cemetery (Figure 32) is a sporadically maintained, active cemetery with burials dated between 1841 and 2009. The cemetery is located on North Savannah Road in Jensen Beach, Florida. Originally known as Mount Washington Cemetery (Hutchinson, 1998, p. 325), the name is still in use by locals and was likely taken from what is considered the highest sand hill on the east coast of Florida (Hutchinson, 1998, p. 227).

![Figure 32. Overview of Washington Memorial Cemetery, Martin County](image)

exceeds that which exists for the other cemeteries surveyed, perhaps because it is considered one of the oldest cemeteries in Martin County. This has enriched and personalized the research experience and offers an understanding of the processes which work to build, and in some unfortunate cases destroy, this rich cultural heritage.

The northeastern corner of Martin County was built through the development of pineapple plantations. The first man to bring pineapple slips (from which pineapple plants are grown) to the southeast coast of Florida was Captain Thomas Richards (Hutchinson, 1998, p. 242). After homesteading alone with his son for a year, his daughter Lucy joined him and managed his growing plantation and small hotel. It was hard, lonely work. In 1880 there were only 1,619 white residents listed on the census. However that was a booming population compared to 64 black residents. Lucy longed for more blacks to move to the area to help with the work and expressed her feelings in a letter, "The colored people will not come so far from their own kind. Oh, well, maybe someday we will build a place for them to sleep and have a family of colored folks" (Thurlow, 2004, p. 109).

Established as a burial place for Eden’s (now Jensen Beach’s) black community, the land Washington Memorial Cemetery occupies was donated for this use between 1887 and 1889 by Captain Richards (Thurlow, 2004). At the time Mount Washington was the only burying place for black Floridians between Sebastian in the north and West Palm Beach in the south (Hutchinson, 1998). Original burials were arranged alphabetically, and the cemetery reached capacity around 1920, at which time C.W. Maynard purchased additional land from the Captain Richards’ sisters.
Hutchinson also notes that there were approximately twenty pre-1900 burials, however, the current survey identified only one pre-1900 grave, that of Nettie Goodbread Langston in 1841. This hand-cast concrete marker predates the establishment of the cemetery and leads to the conclusion that it is in memorial to an ancestor, not reflective of an actual burial. Hutchinson (p. 325) lists a marker with the name Smith as the oldest in existence at the time she wrote *The History of Martin County*. This marker has also been lost to time. The only internment with the name Smith at the time of this writing contained a death date of February, 1968, and the earliest marker now readable (other than that of Nettie Langston) is that of Josephine Lewis, with a death date of October 1, 1924. Thurlow (p. 110) lists a marker for Samuel Goodbread with a death date of January 10, 1914 as the oldest in existence at the time she wrote *Historic Jensen and Eden on Florida’s Indian River*. His is another marker lost to time, reinforcing the importance of capturing this information through cemetery research.

Today Washington Memorial Cemetery is separated into two sections. The original section is located in the back of the cemetery and is maintained under the care of the Jensen Colored Cemetery Association, formed in 1920 (Hutchinson, 1998), and is the section included in this study. The Ukrainian Orthodox Church owns the front section of the cemetery (Holy Theotokos Orthodox Shrine, 2012) and was unable to provide access at the time necessary for this research.

Jensen Beach is situated on the southeast coast of Florida where the soil is principally a sandy mix. The soil in this cemetery is predominantly sugar sand, which has created problem in maintenance and protection of the graves. In 2008 tropical
storm Fay flooded the area, unearthing a recently buried casket (TCPalm, Fay, 2008). This type of event is rare, however many markers are disturbed and out of place. In addition to natural forces, Washington Memorial Cemetery has suffered from neglect and vandalism. Hutchinson (p. 326) points to motorcyclists who have utilized the rolling nature of the landscape to ride through the cemetery, destroying grave markers in the process.

**Marker Type**

Washington Memorial Cemetery contained 219 dated graves (Table 17). While a number of marker types were represented, in-ground vaults were the predominant marker type. Similar to Carlton Cemetery in St. Lucie County, Washington Memorial Cemetery was unique in the number of graves marked by two markers. In-ground vaults frequently contained either a flat ground marker or an upright marker.

**Table 17. Summary of marker types, Washington Memorial, Martin County**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beveled</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cube</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flat Ground</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Gr Vault</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>108</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ledger</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military Ground</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military Upright</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slant Upright</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T-bar</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temporary</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upright</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>219</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Marker Material

Grave markers in Washington Memorial Cemetery were overwhelmingly made up of white concrete, which represented 138 grave markers. The marker material nearest in number was gray granite, which contained only 53 grave markers (Table 18).

Table 18. Summary of marker material, Washington Memorial Cemetery, Martin County

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Black Granite</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bronze</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gray Granite</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metal</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Concrete</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Marble</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>219</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Epitaphs

Washington Memorial Cemetery contained 24 grave markers exhibiting epitaphs in five categories.

Iconographic Images

Washington Memorial Cemetery contained 61 grave markers exhibiting iconographic imagery in five categories.

Memorial Photographs

This cemetery contained no markers with photographs.

Footstones and Kerbs

Washington Memorial Cemetery contained no grave markers containing a footstone and four grave markers bordered by kerbs.
CHAPTER FIVE: AGGREGATE RESULTS

To identify temporal trends in grave marker attributes, data collected from all cemeteries were aggregated. This information was then analyzed for frequency based on individual attributes and time periods. Grave marker attributes analyzed included: marker type, marker material, epitaphs, iconographic images, memorial photography, and footstones. The occurrence of folk style markers was considered in the aggregate sample. Folk style markers were defined as markers created by hand in a non-commercial manner. In addition, epitaphs, iconographic images, and memorial photography were analyzed for frequency rates based on gender. This chapter will present the results of this analysis categorized by marker attribute.

*Marker Type*

When analyzing temporal trends, upright markers represent the most frequently observed grave marker type in all time periods excluding 1940-1959 (Figure 33). The frequency of upright markers peaks at 58% Pre-1900 and decreases to 13% between 1940-1959. While upright markers remain prevalent over time, from 1900 forward an increase in a variety of marker types is seen.

When grave marker type is analyzed as a percentage of the aggregate (Table 19), upright markers emerge as the dominant type, representing 27% of all markers sampled. Ground markers (Figure 17.e & Figure 17.f) represented the second largest concentration (19%) of all markers sampled. Slant upright markers (Figure 18.d &) and vaults (Figure 17.a & Figure 17.b) represented 12% of the aggregate each, and were followed by military markers representing 9% of the aggregate. Cube (Figure 17.h & Figure 17.i), ledger (Figure 17.c), beveled (Figure 17.d), and miscellaneous
custom markers (Figure 18a, Figure 18.b, Figure 18.e, Figure 18.f, Figure 18.g & Figure 18.i) were less frequent, while cross shaped markers (Figure 18.h) represented only 1% of all markers observed.

Table 19. Grave marker type by overall percentage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Upright</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>338</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ground</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slant</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vaults</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cube</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ledger</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beveled</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misc</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>502</td>
<td>447</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>1267</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 33. Chart of marker type by time period, illustrating the prevalence of upright markers.
**Marker Material**

When grave marker material is analyzed by individual time period, marble emerges as the material of choice (Figure 34) by an overwhelming percentage (73%) in the earliest time period (Pre-1900). This industry dominance fell to a mere 4% between 2000-2011. Conversely, granite increased from 10% Pre-1900 to 73% between 1960-1979, completely inverting the positions held by marble and granite in the last century. Granite remains the predominant material in use today.

![Figure 34. Percentage of grave marker material by time period](image)

When grave marker material is analyzed as a percentage of the aggregate, granite is the predominant material, representing 62% of all grave markers observed (Table 20). Concrete markers make up 19% of the total and marble represents 13%. Only 4% of all markers are made of bronze, while other metals, sandstone, and miscellaneous materials represent 1% each.
Table 20. Grave marker material by overall percentage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Granite</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>786</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concrete</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marble</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bronze</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metal (other)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandstone</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misc</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>359</td>
<td>660</td>
<td>569</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>1267</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Epitaphs**

When aggregated, epitaphs were placed in broad categories for analysis (Table 21). Only 35% of all grave markers contained epitaphs. Familial epitaphs represented 8% of all epitaphs and indicated family relationships such as wife, mother, husband, and son. Military epitaphs represented 8% of the all epitaphs and provided information regarding military service. Memorial epitaphs represented 6% of all epitaphs and included such phrases as beloved, in loving memory, and rest in peace. Religious epitaphs represented 6% of all epitaphs sampled. Genealogical epitaphs represented 4% of all epitaphs and provided more detailed family relations than basic familial epitaphs, including phrases such as “husband of, wife of” or generational information, including children’s names, and the names of parents or grandparents. Personal epitaphs represented 1% of all epitaphs and included...
reference to the deceased’s personal interests such as “where have all the cowboys gone?” or “water conservationist” or a personal status such as doctor, judge, etc.

After identifying the overall percentage of markers containing epitaphs, the distribution of these markers over time was analyzed (Figure 35). The earliest three periods, (Pre-1900, 1900-1919, 1920-1939), reflected a fairly small percentage of epitaphs, between 5-6%. The frequency doubled to 13% between 1940-1959, then doubled again between 1960-1979 to 26%. The percentage of epitaphs increased to 30% between 1980-1999, then decreases sharply to 15% in the final period between 2000-2011.

![Figure 35. Distribution of epitaphs over time](image)

When aggregated and evaluated for gender, the grave markers of women represented 29.7% of all markers containing epitaphs, while the grave markers of men represented 39.5% of all markers containing epitaphs.
Iconographic Images

When aggregated, iconographic images were placed in broad categories for analysis (Table 22). Only 43% of all grave markers contained iconographic imagery.

Table 22. Iconographic imagery by overall percentage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Religious</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>42.81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Floral</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>30.24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Book</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>8.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2.91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fraternal</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2.55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Banner</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2.55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animal</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2.55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sun Burst</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sport or Hobby</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.09%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patriotic</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.09%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heart</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.09%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scroll</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscape</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matrimonial</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design (Misc)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Musical</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baby</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.18%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sub Total         | 14         | 17        | 28        | 50        | 170       | 184       | 86        | 549            | 43.33%          |
No Iconography     | 34         | 42        | 77        | 157       | 197       | 141       | 70        | 718            | 56.67%          |
Total              | 48         | 59        | 105       | 207       | 367       | 325       | 156       | 1267           | 100%            |

After identifying the overall percentage of markers containing iconographic imagery, the distribution of these markers over time was analyzed (Figure 36). The first three periods, (Pre-1900, 1900-1919, 1920-1939), reflected a fairly small percentage of iconographic imagery, ranging from 3-5%. The frequency increases between 1940-1959 to 9%, then more than triples between 1960-1979 and 1980-1999 to 31% and 33% respectively. During the final period (2000-2011), there is a sharp decline to 16%.
Figure 36. Distribution of iconographic imagery over time

Grave markers were also examined to determine if iconographic imagery was more or less likely to adorn the grave markers of men or women. When names were ambiguous, grave markers were assigned to an “undetermined” category (Table 23). Five time periods (1900-1919, 1920-1939, 1940-1959, 1960-1979 & 1980-1999) reflected a bias toward iconographic imagery on the grave markers of men. Two time periods, (Pre-1900 & 2000-2011), reflected a bias toward iconographic imagery on the grave markers of women. Overall the grave markers of men represented 46.8% of all grave markers with iconographic imagery, while the grave markers of women represented 39.6% of all grave markers with iconographic imagery.

When analyzed based on category, iconographic imagery was overwhelmingly religious in nature, while a floral motif was the second most frequently observed category of iconographic imagery.
Table 23. Iconographic imagery by category* and gender (U=undetermined, M=Male, F=Female)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AN</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BB</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BN</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DT</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FL</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LS</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ML</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MT</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MU</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OB</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PR</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PT</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RL</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SH</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Category: AN=Animal, BB=Baby, BN=Banner, SD=Design, FL=Floral, FR=Fraternal, LS=Landscape, GN=Genealogical, HT=Heart, MT=Matrimonial, MU=Musical, OB=Open Book, PR=Professional, PT=Patriotic, RL=Religious, SC=Scroll, SB=Sun Burst, SH=Sports or Hobby*
Memorial Photographs

A total of 30 grave markers, located in two cemeteries, contained memorial photographs (Figure 17.a). Twenty-nine of these grave markers were located in Drawdy-Rouse Cemetery, while one was located in Carlton Cemetery in St. Lucie County. Percentages based on gender reflect 2.1% of memorial photographs on the grave markers of men, and 2.8% of memorial photographs on the grave markers of women. Seven of the memorial photographs were of married couples photographed together, all of which were located in Drawdy-Rouse Cemetery.

Footstones and Kerbs

Thirty-nine grave markers contained both a headstone and a footstone (Figure 21, Figure 22 & Figure 37), and 30 grave markers were bordered by kerbs. While kerbs were well represented in all time periods, 72% of all footstones were found in the earliest two time periods (Pre-1900, 1900-1919).

Figure 37. Headstones and footstones, Drawdy-Rouse Cemetery
CHAPTER SIX: DISCUSSION, CONCLUSIONS AND FUTURE RESEARCH

Variation in Grave Marker Attributes Over Time

Early grave markers are “archaeological artifacts” and “unlike most such artifacts, they are readily available and in the same location as they were originally placed” (Strangstad, 1995, p.1). Preservation is the most pressing concern facing cemeteries today (Carmack, 2002; Greene, 2008; Meyer, 1992; Mytum, 2000; Sloane, 1995; Stangstad, 1995; Yalom). More comprehensive documentation of grave marker attributes is warranted as many of Florida’s cemeteries face destruction from vandalism, development, and neglect. Particularly troubling for small community and family cemeteries is abandonment (Carmack, 2002). When this occurs, nature inevitably reclaims the terrain. As grave markers become lost in the overgrowth, valuable information about the people who settled here disappears forever.

Two of the cemeteries in this study, Jones Cemetery and Caraway Cemetery, are dangerously overgrown and uncared for. One cemetery, Washington Memorial Cemetery, while receiving a moderate level of care, is vulnerable to unique environmental effects (sugar sand erosion) and vandalism. Vandalism has been documented in the past (Hutchinson, 1998) and over the course of this two year project, damage to several markers was observed. As the history of Washington Memorial Cemetery clearly illustrates, overgrown and uncared for grave markers are in constant danger disappearing, resulting in the loss of cultural data and an increase in unmarked burials (Hutchinson, 1998; Thurlow, 2004). Fortunately, the other cemeteries visited are receiving good to excellent levels of care, and while all
cemeteries face unavoidable deterioration due to time and environment, the prognosis for their continued preservation is good.

The clearest distinctions emerged not between the three regions studied (north-central, central, and southeast Florida), but between individual cemeteries. These differences may even be considered to reflect a cemetery’s specific personality or culture. Carlton Cemetery in Alachua County reflected its heritage as the resting place of the community’s founders, with more elaborate markers designating the burial of the family patriarch and his wife. Carlton Cemetery in Putnam County, commissioned by a retired Civil War veteran, is military in nature, containing government issued military upright markers. Due to its small size and family based nature, St. Lucie Village Cemetery reflects the early period of grave markers with typically thin upright marble stones (Carmack, 2002; Mytum, 2000).

Three cemeteries: Caraway, Jones, and Washington Memorial, represented a population with less economic stability (Hutchinson, 1998; Thurlow, 2004; Mike Stallings, personal communication, 2012). As such, there was a strong bias toward folk style grave markers of a type (hand-cast) not found in other areas of the country (Carmack, 2002; Meyer, 1992). Caraway Cemetery contained nearly identical folk style markers for each burial except the newest, which was marked only by a funeral home’s temporary marker. While geographically the most distant from one another, Jones Cemetery and Washington Memorial Cemetery are both traditionally black cemeteries (Hutchinson, 1998; Thurlow, 2004; Mike Stallings, personal communication, 2012) and shared several characteristics. Both contained in-ground vaults, folk style markers, and markers in the shape of a cross.
Drawdy-Rouse Cemetery was the largest cemetery sampled and contains the widest variety of marker types. Specific to this cemetery was the use of memorial photographs on grave markers. Such photographs help personalize the grave marker and allow the visitor to gain a closer association to the deceased. Grave markers in both Palms Cemetery and Viking Cemetery are predominantly gray granite, although in Viking cemetery there is some variation in color, with six of the stones carved from pink granite. Carlton Cemetery in St. Lucie County had a very distinct personality dominated as it is by above-ground vaults. Overall, each cemetery maintains a certain consistency within itself relative to theme and style.

Yalom writes that when aggregated and studied as a unit, gravestones become the “constellations of ideas and attitudes held by specific groups at a certain time and place” (2008, p. 17). When aggregated, this cemetery sample revealed general trends in grave marker attributes in Florida. Most noticeable were trends in grave marker type and material. Trends related to epitaphs and iconographic images suggested that gender may play a role in determining the use of such embellishments. Memorial photographs were observed almost exclusively in one cemetery and may represent the mortuary practices of that specific group. While rarely encountered, when noted, the time period relevant to footstones and kerbs exist in inverse proportions, with the majority of footstones found in the earliest three periods (Pre-1900, 1900-1919, and 1920-1939), and the least number of kerbs are found in these same periods. Each of these grave marker attributes represent a carefully constructed choice in memorialization (Cooper, 2009). To consider the implications of these choices, a more detailed discussion of each grave marker attribute follows.
While not all grave markers contained all attributes, two attributes are integral components of every grave marker; type (shape) and material. None of the cemeteries sampled during this research placed restrictions on the type of grave marker allowed, thus avoiding an artificially constructed bias toward a specific marker type. The type, or shape of a grave marker is one of the most noted features in cemetery literature (Carmack, 2002; Greene, 2008; Mytum, 2000; Sloane, 2008; Strangstad, 1995). In this study, upright markers were both the earliest, and the most common marker type noted. Ground markers were the second most common, followed by slant markers and vaults.

The dichotomy between the types of grave markers selected for use in black and white cemeteries was noted. While in-ground vaults represent only 11% of all marker types in this sample, 100% of these in-ground vaults were located in the two traditionally black cemeteries, Jones and Washington Memorial. Cross-shaped markers represented only 1% of all markers evaluated; yet 75% of these markers were found in the same traditionally black cemeteries. All cross-shaped markers in these two cemeteries were hand-cast folk markers. Drawdy-Rouse Cemetery contained the only commercially produced cross-shaped marker.

Grave marker material is the second of two integral grave marker components, and was the attribute illustrating the clearest example of a temporal trend (Figure 34). During the Pre-1900 period, marble represented 73% of all grave markers, by the 1960-1979 time period, an industry shift occurred and granite represent 73% of the market. This shift occurred later in Florida (1920-1939) than the 1880-1910 transition experienced in northern areas (Carmack, 2002). Granite is
much more durable than marble and remains the most prevalent grave marker material today (Carmack, 2002; Greene, 2008; Sloane, 2008).

Additional materials of note include bronze, which is a staple of the flat ground marker preferred by memorial parks, and was introduced for use in military markers by 1940 (Carmack, 2002). In this sample 66% of all bronze markers were military in nature and were less frequently observed for use in non-military markers. In addition, although bronze was utilized for grave markers as early as 1917, (Sloane, 1995) in this sample, bronze use is most prevalent in the latest three time periods (1960-1979, 1980-1999 and 2000-2011). Concrete was the second most common marker material overall, representing 19% of the aggregate. This reflects the inordinately high number of both in-ground and above-ground vaults sampled in Jones Cemetery, Washington Memorial Cemetery, and Carlton Cemetery in Fort Pierce. Sandstone was the least represented grave marker material, appearing in only one time period (1900-1919) when it is utilized exclusively for military markers in Carleton Cemetery in Putnam County.

Folk style markers are encountered across the country (Carmack, 2002; Meyer, 1992). According to Chip Letter, concrete grave marker molds were sold through the magazine Popular Mechanics in the 1940s and 1950’s (Chip Letter, personal communication, 2010). Although this research did not produce any advertisements for grave marker molds, the strong prevalence of hand-cast concrete marker encourages further inquiry. Overall 48 folk markers were observed, 36 of which had death dates, and all of which were hand-cast concrete. The largest concentration of hand-cast concrete markers was found in the least maintained, and
less economically stable cemeteries, Caraway Cemetery, Jones Cemetery, and Washington Memorial Cemetery, totaling 85% of all folk markers observed. Markers in Viking Cemetery, Carlton Cemetery in St. Lucie County, and Drawdy-Rouse Cemetery accounted for the remaining 15%.

Two grave marker attributes, epitaphs and iconographic imagery, offer the greatest insight into the deceased’s character (Carmack, 2002; Meyer, 1992; Yalom, 2008). Giguere (2007) points out that epitaphs were meant to both describe the dead and guide the living, suggesting that they reflect the social and moral codes of contemporary society. While the language, along with their reflection of contemporary moral codes, may change over time, broad categories (familial, military, memorial, religious, genealogical, and personal) endured across time periods. Gender differences should be considered when analyzing epitaphs. The language of the epitaphs in this study was not evaluated for gender reflective content, however the frequency of epitaphs on the grave markers of men relative to their frequency on the grave markers of women was. The grave markers of men were more likely to contain an epitaph (39.5%) than were the grave markers of women (29.7%). This may be related to social status. According to Giguere (2007), epitaphs reflect the way in which a woman’s social status is tied to her husband or father while a man’s social status, when tied to another individual, is tied to renowned male figures such as his father or grandfather, perpetuating the higher status of men. If epitaphs are meant to codify social and moral norms, then finding a higher concentration of them on the grave markers of men may reflect male social standing.
According to Carmack (2002), the number of documented religious, secular, and fraternal symbols used in iconographic imagery exceeds 8,000. While epitaphs in this sample could be organized into six broad categories, the number of categories necessary to catalog iconographic images was triple that amount. In addition to representing a wider range of subject matter, the meaning of these symbols has changed over time (Cooper, 2008). In the Victorian era each flower, whether open or closed, and how it was draped had a detailed meaning (Carmack, 2002; Cooper, 2008; Keister, 2004). These specific meanings were not evaluated for this study, however, certain trends were observed. Religious imagery was the most enduring symbol overall, followed by floral imagery. As with epitaphs, this sample revealed a slight gender bias toward iconographic imagery on the graves of men, which represented 46.8% of all grave markers containing such imagery.

Overall, the significance of cemetery research, as demonstrated through this project, revolves around the importance of documenting previously unrecorded trends reflecting the manner in which we memorialize our dead before this valuable information is lost to time. The expression of our mortality through burial practices is deeply personal. Marilyn Yalom captures it best when describing the early 20th century practice of Mississippians to ask “Where do you bury?” She recounts that: “That simple question had meaning far beyond the literal. It meant: where do you come from? Who are your kin? What place do you call home? In short: Who are you?” (Yalom, 2008:9). Damage to our remaining cemeteries is occurring at an alarming rate (Strangstad, 1995). Similar research should be conducted around the country before centuries worth of cultural data is lost forever.
APPENDIX A: US PATENT 70974
Figure 38. US Patent 7974, S. Jenkins Monument, pg.1, US Patent Office Copy
To all whom it may concern:

Be it known that I, SOLON JENKINS, Jr., of West Cambridge, in the county of Middlesex and State of Massachusetts, have invented a new and useful Improvement in Monumental Gravestones; and I do hereby declare that the following is a full and exact description thereof, reference being had to the annexed drawings, made part of this specification.

The nature of my invention consists in a peculiar mode of attaching, permanently and durably, a daguerreotype or photographic portrait to an ordinary monumental stone.

In the annexed drawing Figure (1) represents a front view of a stone with a portrait secured therein; and Fig. (2) is a vertical transverse section showing the several plates employed in securing the portrait in its combination with the stone.

The daguerreotype plate B with the portrait thereon being prepared in the usual manner, the face of the picture is overlaid with cupel or other varnish; and to the front of this plate is cemented with shellac a thin metallic border C, C, and to the front of this border is cemented a plate of glass D; and this combination of metal and glass plates is placed within the rabbet of a frame or case E E (of metal or molded plaster).

Another plate of glass F is placed within the rabbet of a metallic case or shield G G, and cemented thereto with shellac or other resiny matter; and upon this plate F is placed the case E with its contents and over this is poured plaster cement, thus filling up the space I; and over this plaster is placed a plate of copper H, the border of which is soldered to the rear edge of the flange of the shield G. A cavity (A) is made in the front of the stone, of convenient depth and size to receive the flange of the shield G G with the back plate H; and a small quantity of dilute mixed plaster being poured into the cavity (the stone being in a horizontal position) the flange with its contents are inserted therein and pressed down till the front plate of the shield rests upon the face of the stone.

What I claim as my invention, and desire to secure by Letters Patent, is—

The mode herein described of securing the portrait plate against injury (from moisture or otherwise) by means of the two glass plates D and F, the plaster I and back plate H, the whole being arranged and combined substantially as herein set forth.

WITNESSES:

A. Bradford,
H. S. Bush.

SOLON JENKINS, Jr.
APPENDIX B: CEMETERY PRESERVATION PHOTOGRAPHY
Figure 40. Before and after preservation, Carlton Cemetery, St. Lucie County

Figure 41. Before and after preservation, Carlton Cemetery, Alachua County
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