

Final
COVER
64501196

National Register of Historic Places Multiple Property Documentation Form

This form is used for documenting property groups relating to one or several historic contexts. See instructions in National Register Bulletin *How to Complete the Multiple Property Documentation Form* (formerly 16B). Complete each item by entering the requested information. For additional space, use continuation sheets (Form 10-900-a). Use a typewriter, word processor, or computer to complete all items



New Submission Amended Submission

A. Name of Multiple Property Listing

The Early Community Mausoleum Movement in Indiana

B. Associated Historic Contexts

(Name each associated historic context, identifying theme, geographical area, and chronological period for each.)

Early community mausolea in the State of Indiana, 1907-1939.

C. Form Prepared by

name/title John Bry, Kurt West Garner
organization Partners in Preservation, Inc./Indiana Landmarks date October 18, 2012
street & number 12954 6th Road telephone 574-936-0613
city or town Plymouth state IN zip code 46563
e-mail kwgarner@kwgarner.com

D. Certification

As the designated authority under the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amended, I hereby certify that this documentation form meets the National Register documentation standards and sets forth requirements for the listing of related properties consistent with the National Register criteria. This submission meets the procedural and professional requirements set forth in 36 CFR 60 and the Secretary of the Interior's Standards and Guidelines for Archeology and Historic Preservation.
(See continuation sheet for additional comments.)

JKZ Signature and title of certifying official | 1-29-2014 Date
Indiana DNR - Division of Historic Preservation & Archaeology
State or Federal Agency or Tribal government

I hereby certify that this multiple property documentation form has been approved by the National Register as a basis for evaluating related properties for listing in the National Register.

Pattik Andrus Signature of the Keeper | 3/25/2014 Date of Action

Table of Contents for Written Narrative

Provide the following information on continuation sheets. Cite the letter and title before each section of the narrative. Assign page numbers according to the instructions for continuation sheets in National Register Bulletin *How to Complete the Multiple Property Documentation Form* (formerly 16B). Fill in page numbers for each section in the space below.

	Page Numbers
E. Statement of Historic Contexts (if more than one historic context is documented, present them in sequential order.)	1 -12
Burial Practices in America – 17 th – 20 th Century	1-4
Community Mausolea	4-12
F. Associated Property Types (Provide description, significance, and registration requirements.)	12-13
G. Geographical Data	14
H. Summary of Identification and Evaluation Methods (Discuss the methods used in developing the multiple property listing.)	14-15
I. Major Bibliographical References (List major written works and primary location of additional documentation: State Historic Preservation Office, other State agency, Federal agency, local government, university, or other, specifying repository.)	15-16

Paperwork Reduction Act Statement: This information is being collected for applications to the National Register of Historic Places to nominate properties for listing or determine eligibility for listing, to list properties, and to amend existing listings. Response to this request is required to obtain a benefit in accordance with the National Historic Preservation Act, as amended (16 U.S.C. 460 et seq.).

Estimated Burden Statement: Public reporting burden for this form is estimated to average 18 hours per response including time for reviewing instructions, gathering and maintaining data, and completing and reviewing the form. Direct comments regarding this burden estimate or any aspect of this form to the Chief, Administrative Services Division, National Park Service, PO Box 37127, Washington, DC 20013-7127; and the Office of Management and Budget, Paperwork Reductions Project (1024-0018), Washington, DC 20503.

**United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service**

**National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet**

Section number E

Page 1

The Early Community Mausoleum Movement in Indiana

E. Statement of Historic Context

Introduction

The early development of community mausolea in the State of Indiana was in response to a number of issues prominent at the beginning of the 20th century. Probably the most significant factor that allowed the development of community mausolea was the cultural acceptance of a burial practice that differed from traditional practices in America. Other factors that set the stage for the use of community mausolea were advances in engineering and construction materials, hygienic concerns, general neglect of cemeteries, and widespread new wealth in the first decades of the 20th century. These factors created a receptive audience that when coupled with the commercial promotion and marketing of community mausolea led to their appearance in several population centers across Indiana.

Mausolea, grounded in ancient precedents, merged the architecture of a culture fixed on Classical design with the projection of both social status and an idea of permanence for the living, together in an engineered structure. Their popularity and adaptation to popular architectural styles grew from the introduction of the first community mausoleum in 1907 through the 1930s. The community mausoleum movement typically left its mark on larger cities; however, community mausolea that were scaled to fit appropriate population sizes were developed even in small rural communities.

BURIAL PRACTICES IN AMERICA

To understand the significance of America's embrace of the community mausolea method of burial, a brief history of burial practices among Euro-Americans is important. Almost exclusively, the practice of burial in the United States by Americans of European descent is relegated to earthen burials in individual grave plots. This is probably most attributed to the Christian religious beliefs that have dominated American culture since the first Europeans settled in colonies in what would become the United States.

Differing from practices by many cultures considered pagan by most Euro-American Christians, earthen burial was considered the most acceptable practice. Native American Indian tribes and other cultures that practiced cremation or other methods of dealing with the deceased were considered unacceptable. The body was considered the "temple of the Holy Spirit" which is God's presence with an individual Christian; the destruction of the body was unacceptable because it was to be regenerated in heaven. Though certainly there were precedents for Christian burials in crypts throughout Europe and the area of early Christendom, Euro-Americans held to the tradition of grave burials that were most common with their English ancestors.

Generally the development of early cemeteries in the United States followed the pattern found in Western Europe. Early cemeteries of Euro-Americans almost exclusively were associated with a church or churchyard. The churchyard cemetery of the 18th century could be considered a place of tranquility and contemplation, as in the English poet Thomas Gray's work *Elegy, Written in a Country Churchyard*.

**United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service**

**National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet**

Section number E

Page 2

The Early Community Mausoleum Movement in Indiana

Increasingly the churchyard cemeteries were filling, particularly as a result of plagues. They were often cramped, particularly as communities developed and the area for churches, located near urban centers, became difficult to expand into. Bodies were piled upon each other within the walls of the cemetery, at times to the point where earth had been filled to the tops of the walls in order to create graves.¹

Judeo-Christians brought their traditions with them when they came to North America. The practice of churchyard burials was continued by early settlers who were typically associated with a specific church or religious group. This was not unfamiliar with first and second generation Euro-Americans, who had experienced this in much of Europe. Most commonly headstone style gravestones marked the graves of individuals. Sometimes "bed graves", which consisted of a gravesite covered with stones or above ground crypts constructed from stones or bricks were located in churchyard cemeteries.

Keith Eggener argues in his book Cemeteries, that American cemeteries particularly represent a post-Reformation "sense of self" because of the almost exclusive use of individual graves and grave markers. "A well-carved monument outside (in the churchyard) (ideally on the building's sunny south side) was a sign of God's favor."² This idea was triumphed as many religious denominations, including the Puritans, felt that personal wealth was a reflection of God's favor and a shadow of eternal reward. Elaborate granite markers and later family mausolea of the 19th century seem to echo that sentiment.

As the need for additional burial space grew, and as a broader diversity of the population's religious beliefs grew, municipal cemeteries were established. These cemeteries were created on civic squares or by the set-aside of public lots in the plats of cities. They allowed burial of generally all persons, regardless of religious beliefs, but also followed the very dense arrangement of graves common in churchyards. Again, headstones, sometimes organized into family plots, and bed graves were the traditional method of marking grave sites.

As early westward expansion occurred in the United States, across the Alleghenies and into the Ohio River valley in the late 1700s and early 1800s, the need for cemeteries for a rural population outside of significant population centers often resulted in the establishment of family farm cemeteries. The cemeteries were typically established on a corner of the farm, possibly on a hill, and became the burial ground for the small farming neighborhood center. Differing from the churchyards of colonial America, these later cemeteries were often located on land set aside by the pioneer family for the use of burials, a church, and often a schoolhouse. The country cemeteries typically were enclosed in some manner in order to keep out livestock, and often had the most basic markers for graves. Wood and fieldstones, and later soft marble slabs, were used to memorialize the deceased.

These farm cemeteries were typically among the first cemeteries developed in Indiana. Their establishment dates continued well beyond the period of exploration and settlement, into the 1880s, and in many locations are still used for burials today. Communities also developed town burial grounds during their settlement periods, in similar fashion to the municipal cemeteries of the 1700s. While farm cemeteries, particularly those associated with churches, have been able to expand due to available land,

¹ Kerrigan, pg. 145

² Eggener, pg. 27

**United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service**

**National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet**

Section number E

Page 3

The Early Community Mausoleum Movement in Indiana

most early municipal cemeteries have been confined to their original lots by development. Both followed the practice of individual graves and grave markers, though the emergence of family plots identified by ornate fences, railings, or stone walls occurred during the second part of the 19th century.

Concern for the general health of the public after several contagious outbreaks in American cities during the early decades of the 19th century led to the establishment of cemeteries beyond the corporate boundaries of cities and towns. This is identified as the "Rural Cemetery Movement". The first rural cemetery developed after this model was created in 1831 and called "Mt. Auburn"; it was located just outside of Boston. This was the beginning of modern cemetery development in the United States. The creation of rural cemeteries was thought to alleviate health concerns associated with decaying bodies by removing graves from populated areas to the outskirts of towns. This also created a psychological removal of death from the general population.

The deceased were still to be memorialized but in a park-like setting that borrowed heavily from the Picturesque Movement in garden design. The available space found in the rural landscape provided ample room to plat appropriate drives, landscaping, and gravesites. The rural cemeteries began to fill a void found in American cities, that of a public park. The cemeteries became favorite places for afternoon strolls and picnics.

Rural cemeteries "were much larger, more hygienic, and more aesthetically pleasing than the older urban graveyards, but they were also intended to be socially and culturally uplifting....They were didactic landscapes, repositories for history and knowledge, showcases for fine art and horticulture, schools for the living. Cemetery visitors absorbed lessons on nature and its cycles, on mortality, humility, morality, and charity."³ The psychological result was that death became something to be visited, rather than ever-present in the comings and goings of in-town city life.

An evolution of the rural cemetery was the development of lawn-park cemeteries. These began to be developed during the 1850s and are the basis for what most Indiana cemeteries, not associated with a church or farm, were developed from. Lawn-park Cemeteries provided a less wild, more formal and cultivated space than rural cemeteries. In describing the shift, historian David Charles-Sloane stated that "the pastoral would replace the picturesque".⁴

Lawn-park cemeteries were well platted to achieve both density, but also maintain a rural and less crowded feel. They had drives that created linear separation of rows of graves, but also introduced winding drives and roundabouts that shaped formal spaces. These prominent spaces became locations for war dead, commemorative stones and monuments, flags, and later, mausoleums. The new cemetery form also brought with it the concept of perpetual care of the gravesites by a more communal or corporate entity. Previously, responsibility of care of grave sites was solely on family members. With a more systemized plan for burial sites, more uniform headstone location, and the invention of lawn mowing equipment, care for graves could also become uniform.

³ Eggener, pg. 24-25

⁴ Eggener, pg. 106

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet

Section number E

Page 4

The Early Community Mausoleum Movement in Indiana

The establishment of lawn-park cemeteries continued into the early part of the 1900s. The expansion of these cemeteries continues to occur today, often using the same design concepts that were used when the cemeteries were first established. It was into these cemeteries that the community mausoleum was first introduced. The cemetery plans allowed for the designation of large sections or places of prominence within the design for monumental architecture. Community mausolea, both large and small, were inserted into cemetery plans developed in the first decades of the 20th century.

ORIGINS OF MAUSOLEA

The origins of mausolea are ancient and cross-cultural. Generally a mausoleum is any building in which the remains of a human or humans are interred. The ancient Egyptians, Romans, Greeks, and other Mediterranean cultures practiced this form of entombment for their kings and families of nobility. Mausolea were often monuments to the dead and a reminder of the social and/or political status the deceased achieved while living. Mausolea were most often constructed with stone and where convenient, placed into the sides of hills. They appeared like fortresses and their solid construction provided protection against the desecration of the deceased's body.

The term "mausoleum" originated from the tomb of King Mausolus, located in Halicarnassus, in Asia Minor (modern-day Turkey). The building was constructed between 353 and 350 B.C. The building, which became a prototype for other building-tombs, was regarded as one of the seven wonders of the ancient world because of its scale and craftsmanship. Further development of Classical architecture in the Greek and Roman world included the creation of mausolea. As the Roman world became Christianized, catacombs and other forms of entombment within the structures of churches and other important buildings became common. The spread of private tombs and monuments versus a final expression of humility, such as mass graves, took hold during the Renaissance Period. It is identified as "the new cult of the individual" which led wealthy Christians to establish personal monuments for burial sites.⁵ The movement to individual burial sites increased as a wealthier middle and upper class increased.

Aside from burial crypts for nobility, frequently located in religious buildings, the traditional practice of interment in Christianized Europe was still earthen burial. That practice followed Euro-Americans when they colonized the North American continent. There were very few individual or family mausolea established in the United States prior to the late Victorian period. These early mausolea of the 18th and 19th centuries were constructed for only the noblest or wealthiest American families. Both Presidents Washington and Lincoln were interred in above ground tombs. In the case of Washington, it was a large brick building-tomb in which his body was placed. President Lincoln was placed into a hillside mausoleum in 1865, only to be reinterred in a larger, more elaborate monument in 1871 that was rebuilt in 1899.

⁵ Eggener, pg. 17

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet

Section number E

Page 5

The Early Community Mausoleum Movement in Indiana

In the late Victorian period when family fortunes had grown in the United States the emergence of the family mausoleum occurred. From the 1880s into the early 20th century, small family mausolea were constructed in cemeteries across the United States. Typically containing the crypts of two or four family members, the mausolea appeared like mini-temples, sometimes in rows, in planned cemetery developments of the late 19th and early 20th centuries. The mausolea were a way to mark the social status of the family as well as create a defined, protective enclosure for the deceased. Issues such as grave looting or the general unkempt condition of cemeteries could be minimized by the definition and protection of a family's burial space.

INTRODUCTION OF THE COMMUNITY MAUSOLEUM

The introduction of the community mausoleum occurred near the height of the family mausoleum movement. Offering the same benefits of the family mausoleum, the community mausoleum was affordable for a larger population and made use of technological advances in concrete and ventilation. It also played on the nearly century-old concern of hygiene, though still often well removed from urban population centers. Eggener called the community mausoleum a "mortuary apartment house" because they could house hundreds if not thousands of crypts.⁶

A mausoleum constructed in Ganges, Ohio in 1907 is considered the first community mausoleum in the United States. The building was constructed based on plans that were patented through the United States patent office the same year. The patent was issued to W. I. Hood and J. W. Chesrown for a "Sanitary Crypt". The building was constructed in a country churchyard cemetery and contained eighty crypts. The building had a parapet front wall and a formal entryway. The interior of the building was arranged with a center aisle with forty crypts on each side. The men who owned the patent established the first mausoleum corporation in the United States. Known as the National Mausoleum Company, the business was established at Shelby, Ohio but later moved to Chicago after it was reorganized under the name "International Mausoleum Corporation". That corporation absorbed other mausoleum companies and patents into the 1920s. Several of Indiana's mausoleums were developed by the National Mausoleum Company. The earliest extant mausoleum in Indiana is in Oxford (1908); it is most like the one constructed in Ganges, Ohio and is the only known example in Indiana constructed out of patent stone.

An article written about the community mausoleum movement in 1914 states that "a wave of sentiment in favor of Mausoleum Entombment has swept over part of several states during the past five years, and many persons are today engaged in the building of private and community homes for the dead".⁷ The article speculates that the community mausoleum movement could be the answer to many large urban areas' issues with creating burial grounds. The author of the article, W. C. Jenkins, believed that the movement may, in some part, offer some mitigation to the feeling of loss and mourning in death at the gravesite. Jenkins observed that the American people were awakening to the need for radical change from traditional burial practices, and that he believed the community mausoleum had been "perfected and built to stand the ravages of age" and could meet the need for change.

⁶ Eggener, pg. 253

⁷ Jenkins, pg. 638

**United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service**

**National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet**

Section number E

Page 6

The Early Community Mausoleum Movement in Indiana

The movement was energized by a few arguments that, while maybe exaggerated to increase demand by marketing campaigns, offered a stark contrast from traditional burial practices. One argument posed was the unsanitary conditions of cemeteries versus the improved hygiene of mausolea. This is an account of the condition of graveyards in London Jenkin's used as an argument for mausolea:

The graveyards of London are the plague spots of its population. The putrid drainage from them pollutes its wells, seethes beneath its dwellings and poisons its atmosphere; and some parts of the metropolis are still honeycombed with deposits of the putrescent remains of millions of its citizens, just as with cesspools and other abominations.⁸

Further arguments in favor of mausolea included the elimination of water and insects from the dead, and "absolute protection for the remains of the departed from every sort of despoilers, whether human or the lower forms of life that infest the earth".⁹ The mausoleum also offered the peace of mind that, if desired, where the "slightest doubt as to death having taken place, life-saving measures may be taken".¹⁰ It is assumed that to accommodate this peace of mind, some device could be placed in the crypt to allow the person to communicate outside of the vault. While this may seem odd, mistaken burials occurred at least frequently enough during the 19th century to cause the concern that a person may be entombed alive.

The community mausolea also offered something for the peace and comfort of the living. Jenkins affirms that the mausoleum "excels anything the world has ever known". The convenience for funeral services was a particularly important argument for the movement. Jenkins asks:

What can possibly be more depressing than to stand in the cold cemetery on a winter's day and see the remains of a loved one lowered into the yawning grave and hear the dull sounds of frozen earth thrown upon the coffin? How much better to realize that only a few inches away from a bright and sunlit corridor, in an apartment which can never feel the effects of winter storms, our dead may sleep until the final awakening.¹¹

Prior to the practice of placing caskets in concrete vaults, caskets were placed directly into the ground and dirt was shoveled over the top of the casket. Jenkins was asserting that mausolea offered a better approach to burial that would eliminate this. Many of the larger community mausolea included chapels in which funeral services could be conducted. This too was an advantage over open air services held graveside. A writer remarked "do away with the grave and the barbaric exposures at cemetery funerals; make it impossible to see the sinking casket, to hear the falling clod or witness the tragedy of losing the dead in the darkness of the earth".¹² It was thought that this new approach to burial would make death more acceptable philosophically and people could be more easily reconciled with their loss.

⁸ Jenkins, pg. 644

⁹ Jenkins, pg. 645

¹⁰ Jenkins, pg. 646

¹¹ Jenkins, pg. 645

¹² Jenkins, pg. 647

**United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service**

**National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet**

Section number E

Page 7

The Early Community Mausoleum Movement in Indiana

This idea was promoted in marketing literature of community mausolea companies. A brochure by the Keystone Mausoleum Company featured two images. One image depicted a group of mourners standing in the rain beside an open grave; it was labeled "The old barbaric way-Is this a civilized nation?" The other image depicted a service held inside a community mausoleum; it is labeled "The modern sanitary way-Can there be a question of preference?"¹³

Another hard and true fact of many cemeteries was the generally poor condition under which they were kept. Prior to great standardization of grave sites, grave markers, drives, and the supervised care of cemeteries, burial grounds often suffered from a lack of care. Generally it was the responsibility of family members to tend the graves of their departed. But in a cemetery where grave sites were close to each other and adjoining graves may no longer be cared for, regardless of the care extended by living family members, the general condition may be left wanting. Worse yet were cemeteries in the midst of farm fields where cattle may be permitted to graze and defecate across burial sites.

By the early 1900s many community cemeteries that had been established one hundred years prior at the time of the town's settlement had been filled and were falling into disrepair. As cemeteries filled and no longer had available sites, they no longer generated income. As survivors died off or relocated, the graves of their ancestors became less relevant to the generations that followed.¹⁴ Jenkins stated that "the country is filled with sad commentaries upon our civilization in the thousands of neglected or abandoned cemeteries".¹⁵ Also a reality of the day was instances of burial grounds being relocated due to development pressure. The community mausoleum model provided a true sense of permanence to the final resting place and kept any unsightly conditions in the cemetery itself away from the graves of loved ones.

The early development of community mausolea must have had its critics, particularly with regard to construction. In his article, Jenkins states "While mistakes may have been made in some of the earlier building, yet the underlying principles of mausoleum improvement are worthy of consideration".¹⁶ It goes on to cite faulty construction as a problem of early mausolea, but says that reason should not be an argument against the system of entombment. The article concludes that the "latest modern knowledge of building construction" would allow a building to stand for a thousand years.¹⁷

By 1914 mausoleum companies had been organized in several states and Canada, though the National Mausoleum Company was still the most prominent. Over one hundred and thirty community mausoleums had been constructed between the time the first mausoleum was built in 1907 and 1914. Several large mausolea constructed during this time include ones in Philadelphia and New York. The latter contained over two thousand crypts.

¹³ Eggener, pg. 255

¹⁴ Eggener, pg. 15

¹⁵ Jenkins, pg. 644

¹⁶ Jenkins, pg. 645-646

¹⁷ Jenkins, pg. 646

**United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service**

**National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet**

Section number E

Page 8

The Early Community Mausoleum Movement in Indiana

One factor that also provided a boost to the development of community mausolea was the consumerism that had entered the business of death. Funerals of the Victorian era became elaborate occasions and the expectations placed on the deceased's family to provide an appropriate burial based on their social status furthered consumerism. The community mausoleum offered a form of higher social standing for burials without the enormous cost of individual family mausolea. The community mausoleum companies understood this and marketed their products accordingly. The hygiene craze of the late 19th century also offered fertile ground for the companies to market their products as superior methods, which again reflected the desire to have only the best for the deceased.

Community mausolea were constructed based on subscription. A local association would be developed to own the buildings in fee simple forever. The crypts were sold to individuals or families, similar to the sale of grave sites in cemeteries. The purchase of a crypt included funds that would be set aside in the creation of a permanent endowment that was supposed to provide for the ongoing care of the building. Based on the condition of many community mausolea today and several that have been decommissioned and demolished, the ability to provide for perpetual care was not always reality.

DEVELOPMENT OF TECHNOLOGY

Jenkins wrote that while science had made great strides in the last decades of the 19th century to make living easier, little had been done up until the development of the community mausoleum to make the acceptance of death through the practice of burial easier. He stated that "the methods of burial in every land have undergone practically no change in twenty centuries" and that the custom of earthen burials were "brutal" because the departed were placed "in a bleak and often neglected cemetery, with the cold, wet ground for a bed."¹⁸

One of the key components of the development of the community mausoleum was the introduction of reinforced concrete. Unlike the family mausolea, which were almost exclusively constructed with stone, the community mausolea used a vault composed of reinforced concrete to maximize the number of available crypts in the building. The vaults were stacked in rows four to five crypts high, and then had the front of the vault's frame clad with marble. The exterior of the buildings were then covered with granite. The standardized vault design allowed the mausoleum companies to easily customize their product to the size of the community in which they promoted their product. Natural lighting allowed the buildings to be used during the day without electricity. The windows were often composed of art glass which provided an aesthetic commonly found in religious buildings of the period.

Ventilation and drainage systems were also important engineering components to the buildings that were often included in patents applied for by developers. Most systems installed in mausolea released formaldehyde gases to kill "all live germs which produce decay in the body" when it was placed into the crypt.¹⁹ Vents in the crypts allowed gas drainage to occur through formaldehyde tanks and lime conduits that disinfected escaping odors. Gases left the building by means of automatic valves and small metal

¹⁸ Jenkins, pg. 638

¹⁹ Jenkins, pg. 646

**United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service**

**National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet**

Section number E

Page 9

The Early Community Mausoleum Movement in Indiana

vents in the exterior walls, but not before being disinfected and deodorized. Formaldehyde tanks were located under the floors of corridors. To refill the tanks, a large valve and cap were located beneath a removable tile. This ventilation and treatment system was considered a new and superior method for mausolea because it allowed the body to "rapidly desiccate without any possibility of becoming a menace or endangering other human lives."²⁰ Interestingly enough, Cecil Bryan stated in his address to the 43rd convention of the AACS that Indiana had barred all systems by law.

ARCHITECTURE

Americans generally have clung to historical precedents in the creation of architecture related to death. "Functionalist modernism with its emphasis on light, health, transparency, and rationalism had little space for the shadow-world of melancholic memories and death."²¹ People engaged in the process of grief had no interest in things that were modern. This is logical since the future would be ventured without the deceased, leaving only memories of the past for the living. It is thought that radical modernism "is fine in the architecture of the living but in death the outlook seems to universally revert to the conservative."²²

Architecture based on historical, usually classical, precedents offered stability in a nation where change was continual. The other possible factor in the embrace of classical architecture for funerary purposes was the association of Victorian-era architecture with death, particularly the Gothic style. In his book The History of Death, Kerrigan writes "With medieval iconography went every trace of the gothic style, to be replaced by a sober yet un-scary neo-classicism."²³

Mausoleum architecture clearly embraced the architecture of the past. However, it was the architecture of the past that had become nationally popular during the early years of mausolea development. The Classical Revival style was a popular choice for the new building boom generated by the wealth at the close of the 19th century and the beginning of the 20th century. The reasons for using this style in public and some commercial architecture, particularly financial institutions, were the same reasons described for its use on mausolea. Classical architecture offered the values of permanence and stability because of its relationship to the ancient. It was enduring and tested. And furthermore, elements of Classical architecture implied wealth and high social status. Ornate porticos, stained glass windows, bronze metalwork, marble, and granite were all features of refinement found in mausolea construction.

Community mausolea were particularly adapted to portray this idea of permanence and austere elegance. The architectural styles of community mausolea generally were some subcategory or form of the Classical Revival style. This is most evident in the porticos found on most of these buildings. The porticos typically have specific elements of Classical architecture with pairs of columns, pediments, and building cornices. Many of the buildings themselves adopted the classical arrangement of base,

²⁰ Jenkins 646-647

²¹ Eggener, pg. 30

²² Eggener, pg. 30

²³ Kerrigan, pg. 149

**United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service**

**National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet**

Section number E

Page 10

The Early Community Mausoleum Movement in Indiana

chamber, architrave, frieze, and cornice. Mausolea often resemble Greek temples and early Christian/Roman basilicas. These generally appeared like monolithic cubes with formal classical entries.

Community mausolea architecture also adapted more modern styles that were becoming popular during the 1920s, but continued to hold to historical precedents. This was most true with the design response to the Art Deco style. Community mausolea lent themselves to some of the sleek, simple wall surface design and forms of the style, but typically with a nod to ancient Egyptian architecture. That influence is also most profound in the design of mausolea entries where stylistic columns and tall entryways straddled both modern architecture and ancient precedents of Egyptian mausolea.

Styles of architecture used in community mausolea design include the Classical Revival/Neo-classical style. Though often stripped down to an austere form of the style, it was the most commonly used style. One of the most impressive Classical Revival examples is Resurrection Mausoleum in Catholic Cemetery, Fort Wayne, Indiana. It is the oldest Catholic community mausoleum in the United States. Other styles include, in far fewer numbers, Early Medieval, Romanesque Revival, Spanish Revival, and Late Gothic Revival styles. Peru has a Spanish Revival style example; its walls and roofs are covered with stucco and it has a simple front gable with a shaped window. Other styles include Egyptian Revival and Art Deco, and most typically a combination of both. These latter styles became popular during the 1920s through the 1930s for community mausolea design. Huntington, Indiana has an excellent example of the Egyptian Revival style. The community mausoleum constructed at East Hill Cemetery in Rushville, Indiana is an excellent example of the Art Deco style, with very little connection to ancient precedents.

The entryway and portico was typically the most elaborate part of the mausolea. While this is not uncommon on types of architecture from homes to churches and commercial buildings to grand public buildings, it may serve a more profound role in mausolea architecture. The threshold of the entry symbolizes a departure of the world of the living to the realm of the dead. Elaborate to even simple cemetery gates also carry this spiritual separation between two worlds. During the 19th century American artists, writers, and intellectuals pondered this idea of transitional spaces between the two worlds. Cemeteries, and particularly mausolea, were specific realms where living and dead convened. These thresholds, most physically tangible in community mausolea, "mark a clear division between the realms of the living and the dead, between past and future, chronology and eternity, the mundane and the mysterious."²⁴ Entries to mausolea often are sealed with large, thick bronze doors that require physical exertion beyond the ordinary to open. The space inside the buildings has an acute change in both temperature and sound transmission because of the finishes on the surfaces of the walls, floor, and ceiling. This also enhances that threshold experience between the outside world and the inside chamber, or main hall of the mausoleum.

The community mausoleum may have its architectural roots in historical precedents and cover itself in Classical architectural elements, but it also is a product of form following function, which is a modern 20th century approach to architecture. Advances in the technology of concrete construction were the primary basis for the design of community mausolea. Precast and reinforced concrete was used to create a form for individual crypts. The form was then covered, or shrouded, in marble and granite. The function of

²⁴ Eggener, pg. 143

**United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service**

**National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet**

Section number E

Page 11

The Early Community Mausoleum Movement in Indiana

rows, both vertically and horizontally, of concrete vaults that became the crypts for the deceased gave the community mausoleum its shape. The shape, usually some cube or rectangular form was simple to adorn with granite, marble, austere entries, porticos, clerestory windows, and flat roofs.

While there certainly was a surge of community mausolea constructed throughout the United States during the 1910s-1920s, Indiana has relatively few examples of community mausolea from this early period. Examples of early community mausolea in Indiana are primarily found in larger cities like Fort Wayne, Kokomo, and Bloomington. These cities offered enough of a concentration of their population interested in breaking from the traditional practice of burial to make the mausoleum a profitable venture. Very few small Hoosier towns or cities have community mausolea. An unusual situation exists in DeKalb County, Indiana where every community of any size constructed community mausolea between 1914 and 1922. Auburn, Butler, Garrett, and Waterloo each have appropriately scaled mausolea in their community cemeteries. This may have been partially due to the proximity of DeKalb County to Ohio, where the movement was started. But it also was because of a local man named Frank Emerick who was a sales representative for the Ohio Mausoleum Company and promoted the new method of interment in his home county.

KEY DESIGNERS AND MAUSOLEUM COMPANIES

From the time the first community mausoleum patent was issued in 1907, there was a wave of new patents and designs for community mausolea. This led to several small companies that over time merged into a few large corporations by the late 1920s, bringing their patents and architectural designs with them. The patents, designers, builders, and promoters were very much intertwined which leads to some confusion. Two identical mausolea, located in separate cities, may have been constructed by two different companies depending on who the patent holder was during the period they were constructed. The patent would have been based on a design by a single individual.

There were two men who were at the heart of mausoleum design during the 1910s through the 1930s. Cecil Bryan and Henry Sievert, both natives of Ohio, appeared to cross paths and competed in community mausolea design. They were often the driving forces and promoters of mausoleum companies.

Cecil Bryan was called the "dean of mausoleum builders" by the *Los Angeles Times* upon his death in 1951. Bryan designed about eighty mausolea in the United States, including large ones in Morris, Illinois and Rockford, Illinois. Cecil Bryan was a key figure with the National Mausoleum Company which started in Ohio and was later reorganized as the International Mausoleum Company of Chicago. Cecil Bryan designed the community mausoleum in New Castle, Indiana and Resurrection Mausoleum at Catholic Cemetery of Fort Wayne is attributed to him, in conjunction with Charles Weatherhogg, who added finer details. Bryan used the phrase "Build a Better Way" in his promotional literature. This phrase was used to promote a community mausoleum in Rose Hill Cemetery in Eaton Rapids, Michigan. This is important to note because it is identical to the community mausoleum in Auburn, Indiana.

**United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service**

**National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet**

Section number E.F Page 12

The Early Community Mausoleum Movement in Indiana

The other man at the heart of mausoleum design was Henry Sievert of Toledo, Ohio. In his obituary Sievert was credited with building hundreds of mausolea across the country including some of the largest, best-known ones at Arlington Cemetery, Washington D. C., and others in Philadelphia, New York, Chicago, Cleveland, and Harrisburg, Pennsylvania. Sievert had a copyright infringement battle with the International Mausoleum Company, formerly the National Mausoleum Company of Ohio. Sievert had patented several of the internal construction methods of the community mausoleum including venting and drainage. During the early 1920s a company by the name of Sweitzer and Fifer of Toledo, Ohio constructed mausolea designed by Sievert. This includes the community mausoleum in Garrett, Indiana.

A dentist turned mausolea designer was responsible for the community mausoleum in Greenville, Ohio. His name was Dr. J. P. Collett. The same design was repeated in both Chattanooga, Ohio and under the auspices of the Ohio Mausoleum Company, in Butler, Indiana. The building relies less on the Classical style and more on Early Christian or Roman basilica precedents. The Ohio Mausoleum Company, whose major promoter and designer was Cecil Bryan, became the National and later the International Mausoleum Company. Latchaw Brothers was a contractor often connected to the Ohio Mausoleum Company's projects.

Conclusion

Community mausolea that were constructed during the industry's early movement are important features in our cemetery landscapes. They meet National Register of Historic Places qualifying criteria A and C. Under criterion A, the early examples of community mausolea are important markers in the social history of the United States because they symbolize a break from the accepted cultural, traditional burial practices of Christian Euro-Americans that was centuries old. The mausolea are the product of how society began to view death differently and its reaction to issues surrounding burials during the early 20th century.

Community mausolea of this period also qualify under criterion C for architecture. Mausolea use architecture symbolically to portray the idea of permanence and social status. The austere and refined stylistic elements associated with early precedents make the buildings unique examples of architecture. The additional importance of engineered systems of drainage and venting, and the use of advanced construction materials which allowed for the development of the buildings are also important architectural achievements.

F. Associated Property Types

GENERAL PARAMETERS

Community mausolea considered eligible for the National Register of Historic Places under "The Early Community Mausoleum Movement in Indiana" shall meet the following general criteria. The community mausoleum shall have been constructed for the benefit of the general public. The mausolea shall not include family or private mausolea intended for the exclusive use of a family group, or other limited

**United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service**

**National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet**

Section number E Page 13 The Early Community Mausoleum Movement in Indiana

population. The community mausolea may be owned by mausoleum associations, as was common practice when first established, or by cemetery associations, municipalities, townships, or other public governing bodies.

PERIOD OF TIME

It is difficult to know when the first community mausoleum was constructed in Indiana. The state has several examples of community mausolea that were constructed between the mid 1910s and the 1920s. Fewer examples were constructed during the 1930s. Because the community mausoleum constructed at Ganges, Ohio in 1907 is considered the first community mausoleum, the qualifying period for community mausolea in Indiana for purposes of this document begins in 1907. Generally, community mausolea of this early movement were not constructed in Indiana until the mid 1910s. The construction of community mausolea continued in relatively large numbers through the 1920s, but probably due to the Great Depression, drastically slowed during the 1930s. A few later examples were constructed at the end of the 1930s and have similar qualifying attributes to those of the earlier period and are considered to qualify under this document.

The qualifying period of time for community mausolea to be considered eligible for the National Register under "The Early Community Mausoleum Movement in Indiana" is 1907-1939. Community mausolea constructed after that period may be reviewed independently for eligibility.

GENERAL INTEGRITY

Community mausolea that qualify under this document shall meet certain levels of general physical integrity to be considered eligible. As much as possible, the original design and historic features of the building shall be extant to be considered eligible. Significant alterations or additions to the building shall make the building ineligible.

The entry and portico is a prominent feature in all community mausoleum design. The entry shall retain its historic features (porticos, columns, etc.). The removal of historic doors shall not exclude the mausoleum from eligibility. In many cases windows with art glass have been broken by vandals and communities have secured the building by filling in the window openings with masonry or wood. So long as other important features remain extant, the building is still considered eligible. Minor loose marble cladding shall also not make the building ineligible. A significant amount of removed marble cladding or other demolitions shall make the building ineligible.

The building must also continue in its historic function as a community mausoleum. A building that has had the majority of its interments removed and reinterred elsewhere, or has been vacated entirely shall not be considered eligible.

**United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service**

**National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet**

Section number G, H Page 14

The Early Community Mausoleum Movement in Indiana

G. Geographical Data

The geographical location identified is the State of Indiana. While community mausolea were constructed throughout the country, and a large number were constructed in the Midwest due to their Ohio origins, the document uses the state boundaries of Indiana for its geographic parameters.

H. Summary of Identification & Evaluation Methods

The community mausolea in DeKalb County were used as a springboard for research by Mr. John Bry of the early movement toward community mausolea in the United States. Research of those four mausolea led to information about the mausoleum regarded as the first community mausoleum in the United States²⁵, the movement's chief promoters and patents, and the general construction of community mausolea in the United States.

An informal list of community mausolea in Indiana, including identical buildings in other Midwestern cities, was developed in order to understand how the movement spread from its Ohio origins. Historic Sites and Structures Inventories for sixty-four Indiana counties were searched for their inclusion of community mausolea in their resource listings. Indiana Landmarks regional and field offices in the state were also contacted in an attempt to compile a more complete list of early community mausolea in Indiana. The Indiana Division of Historic Preservation & Archaeology's SHAARD site for cemetery registry and Jeannie Reagan-Dinius were also consulted.

While not a complete list, the following are communities in which mausolea that were part of the early community mausoleum movement have been identified in the State of Indiana:

Alexandria, Parkview Cemetery, Madison County, c. 1920. Classical Revival. Attributed to Henry Seivert

Auburn, Roselawn Cemetery, DeKalb County, 1917. Neo-classical. Attributed to Cecil E. Bryan

Bloomington, Rose Hill Cemetery, Monroe County, c. 1925. Neo-classical

Butler, Butler Cemetery, DeKalb County, 1914. Early Medieval

Connersville, Shrine of Memories Mausoleum, Fayette County, c. 1938. Art Deco

Crown Point, Lake County, 1912. Early Medieval (concrete block). Razed, c. 1955

Danville, Danville South Cemetery, Hendricks County, 1927. Neo-classical

Elwood Cemetery, Madison County, c. 1920. Classical Revival. Attributed to Henry Seivert

²⁵ Jenkins, pg. 644/647

**United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service**

**National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet**

Section number H, I

Page 15

The Early Community Mausoleum Movement in Indiana

Evansville, Denton Mausoleum at Oak Hill Cemetery, Vanderburgh County, 1931. Classical Revival

Fort Wayne, Catholic Cemetery, Resurrection Mausoleum, Allen County, 1918. Neo-classical
Standard Mausoleum Company of Findley, Ohio

Frankfort, Greenlawn Memorial Park, Clinton County, c. 1920. Neo-classical

Garrett, Calvary Cemetery, DeKalb County, 1922. Classical Revival. Attributed to Henry Seivert

Greencastle, Forest Hill Cemetery "The Abbey", Putman County, 1930-31. Art Deco

Huntington, Mt. Hope Cemetery, Huntington County, c. 1920. Egyptian Revival

Kokomo, Crown Point Cemetery, Howard County, c. 1920. Classical Revival. Attributed to Henry Seivert

Logansport, Catholic Cemetery Mausoleum, Cass County, 1912-1913. Early Medieval

Martinsville, Greenlawn Cemetery, Morgan County, c. 1920. Neo-classical

New Castle, South Mound Cemetery, Henry County, c. 1915. Neo-classical. Cecil E. Bryan, architect.

Oxford, Oxford West Cemetery, Benton County, 1908. Early Medieval (concrete block)

Peru, Mt. Hope Cemetery, Miami County, 1912. Spanish Revival

Rushville, East Hill Cemetery, East Hill Shrine Mausoleum, Rush County, 1938. Art Deco

Shelbyville, Temple Hill Mausoleum, Shelby County, c. 1927. Neo-classical

Tipton, Tipton Cemetery, Tipton County, c. 1925. Classical Revival. Attributed to Henry Seivert

Waterloo, Waterloo Cemetery, DeKalb County, 1916. Neo-classical

I. Major Bibliographical References

Resources are very limited with regard to the development of community mausolea. This document relied heavily on one period source in particular, an article written in 1914 by W. C. Jenkins, a writer for the *National Magazine*.

DeKalb County Historian, John Bry, conducted research in several of the Ohio counties in which community mausoleum companies were established. Mr. Bry also conducted telephone interviews with descendents of two of the leading promoters of community mausoleum design. Additional internet searches of images and information was also conducted by John Bry and the author.

**United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service**

**National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet**

Section number 1

Page 16

The Early Community Mausoleum Movement in Indiana

REFERENCES

Bry, John: telephone interviews with Cheryl Bryan, wife of the grandson of Cecil Bryan

Bryan, Cecil E., *Address to the 43rd Annual Convention of the AACCS*, September 3-6, 1929

Eggner, Keith, Cemeteries. W. W. Norton & Company: New York, 2010.

Indiana Historic Sites and Structures Inventories (inventories for 64 counties)

Jenkins, W. C. "Post Cineres Gloriam Venit." *National Magazine* Volume XL April 1914-September 1914: pages 637-647.

Kerrigan, Michael, The History of Death. The Lyons Press: Guilford, CT, 2007.