
Introduction

The words ‘lunatic asylum’ conjure up images of imposing grey facades hiding white-washed corridors echoing with the torment of unwilling denizens. The popular association of these buildings with austerity and grimness has a long history. When an asylum was constructed outside the Irish town of Enniscorthy in Co. Wexford in the mid-nineteenth century, the surprisingly ornate architectural features of the institution gave rise to a local story. The story holds that the red-brick Italianate asylum building overlooking the picturesque Slaney Valley was originally planned as a palace, to be built in India rather than Ireland. In some (presumably) English colonial planning office, however, the plans for the ornate, Eastern palace were mixed up with those of an Irish asylum, the real building intended for Enniscorthy (National Inventory of Architectural Heritage 2019). The asylum, the story goes, was supposed to look like other, more austere and institutional-looking, asylums nearby without the elaborate architectural detail of the asylum as it was built.

Irish provincial asylums built in the 1820s and 1830s all shared a common architect and were built to similar (if not identical) plans. They were constructed from local stone, granite or limestone blocks, symmetrical and unadorned but for a cupola over the main administration block. The windows of an Irish provincial asylum were small and square and certainly did not boast flourishes like the Romanesque arches and carved stops which graced the Enniscorthy institution. The story of mixed-up plans at a busy London colonial office is not unique to Enniscorthy (or even to asylums), but that such local folklore should endure into the twenty-first century attests to the pervasiveness of popular expectations of these buildings, particularly those constructed in the nineteenth century. This story about the Enniscorthy Asylum makes a regular appearance in local media, and even in the Irish National Inventory of Architectural Heritage. The story has come to form part of the building’s history, even if its veracity is questionable at best. Given

the shadow cast by the legacy of two centuries of frequently experimental management practices in the treatment of the insane, the vague fiction of a more salubrious architectural heritage seems preferable to the idea that the asylum was only ever just that – an institution for confinement, however ornate its facade.

What stories like this one fail to acknowledge is that the form of lunatic asylum buildings, and buildings for confinement in general, was constantly reassessed, re-planned, and changed throughout the nineteenth century, according to the effectiveness of experimental new treatment methods and management practices, not to mention the vagaries of public works budgets. By the mid-nineteenth century, when the Enniscorthy Asylum was constructed, the architecture of the ideal public lunatic asylum had been a source of much debate for over half a century. Therefore, in order to trace the widely-held public opinion of asylums as austere, institutional, and utilitarian, it is necessary to go back to the early part of the nineteenth century, when a standard for large, public lunatic asylums at provincial level was still just a talking point in parliamentary committees. This book will explore the material structure and development of asylum buildings, examining the dichotomy between the progressive reform rhetoric inherent in their widespread construction in the early nineteenth century, and the practicalities of maintaining a large public institution in the face of massive overcrowding and increasing urban populations. In this manner, the book will trace the origins of the popular ideas of asylums as overcrowded, austere, and clinical, and propose an alternative view of these institutions as a public necessity, over-taxed by demand and lack of funds; as a workplace for the hundreds of people in areas of little industry; and, as much as was possible, a home for patients, for general staff, and for the individuals who ran them, the inheritance of whom is an active and living community of former staff and patients. What emerged from the early years of architectural and material experimentation was an imperfect but widespread and ordered system of provincial asylums across the British Isles, the basis for which lay in the trialling, successes, and failures of a few pioneering institutions.

Archaeology is a discipline concerned with the material legacy of social life. Archaeologists record the ways in which routine and ritual are carried out, changed, and abandoned over time, tracking the movement of people through landscapes using the things they leave behind. Archaeologists are thus well-placed to inform on changes in a busy land-and-task-scape like the historic lunatic asylum. Lunatic asylums are rich archaeological sites, encompassing both buildings and landscapes, and can inform on the social, political, and economic life of the period in which they were built. Changes to the arrangement and use of asylum

buildings are marked and (usually) leave visible traces in the material, if not always the documentary, record. Indeed, where the historical sources might only record a short building programme, or an increased number of patients, the impact of those changes in the material record can be as dramatic as a new wing to the building, or the reduction of outdoor space for patient recreation. Changes in the building's arrangement could have a significant impact on the ways in which the building was used and usurp the intentions of the architects and planners in ways that are rarely recorded explicitly.

So, what does an archaeology of lunacy look like? While lunacy in the past was not exclusively institutional, the study of historic asylums allows for a quantitative survey of the ways in which lunacy was conceived of and treated. This study of the subject of lunacy and asylums focuses, therefore, on the archaeology of those institutions where lunacy was managed within a framework: the asylums. Approaches to this subject in the United States and Australia have drawn heavily on historical documentation, as well as excavation data (where possible) and standing building survey. If archaeology is 'concerned with the physical and material aspects of past lives', as Sarah Tarlow has asserted (2007: 29), the archaeology of lunacy is a material and physical exploration of the lives of the builders, theorists, and inhabitants of the historic asylum. In addition to material culture, cartographic sources also inform on site how sites developed and the spatial relationship between different elements of the site, or the host population, allowing for a broader exploration of how the inhabitants and proprietors of asylums negotiated a relationship with the people and spaces outside the walls. An archaeology of lunacy is, by necessity, multidisciplinary, drawing on the large body of evidence. This includes archival evidence for asylum governance at local and national level, cartography and visual sources like photographs and drawings, and the sites themselves, analysis of which can draw on archaeological approaches to landscapes, buildings, and material culture. Employing a multidisciplinary approach, this book will explore the landscapes and building of lunatic asylums in England and Ireland in the early nineteenth century.

Public lunatic asylums were constructed in the first half of the nineteenth century in England and Ireland under the aegis of the British Government. Following a series of Acts and parliamentary enquiries, discussed in detail in this chapter, the British Government was concerned with the construction of asylums which would reflect increasingly popular ideas about the management of the insane. The history of madness and medicine does not exist in a vacuum; the construction of large-scale public institutions for the confinement of the insane coincided with the first sallies of the Industrial Revolution. In many ways, lunacy in its

modern form was a particular problem of the industrial age. People who could not work and contribute meaningfully to the increasingly industrial economy did not fit into a model for ideal behaviour. Added to this, a surge in the urban population meant that traditional frameworks for managing the insane at familial or community level broke down, and lunacy became a problem for the state. For this reason, many asylums constructed in the first decades of the nineteenth century were experimental in design or bore striking resemblance to other institutions for public confinement. With limited reference points for how an asylum, let alone a reformed asylum, should look, architects and reformers experimented. The result was a mix of different architectural styles, combining popular and effective designs for prisons and workhouses with the arrangement or setting of veteran's hospitals, factories, and country houses, among other institutions or large buildings. The resultant institution, the Georgian lunatic asylum, in turn informed its successors, the massive Victorian and Edwardian lunatic asylums which form the bulk of this kind of architectural heritage. Despite their myriad problems, which will be explored in this book, the public asylums built in the first half of the nineteenth century came to define the form, the management practice, and the architectural style of buildings for the confinement of the insane.

The lunatic asylum in historical context

Purpose-built lunatic asylums were a primarily urban phenomenon, and reasonably rare at the turn of the nineteenth century. The care of the insane prior to the construction of large public institutions fell to families or communities or small church-run institutions. Those who could not be cared for at home were managed by organised relief work or left in the charge of workhouses and prisons (Porter 2004: 125–7). If an individual or their family could afford to pay the (frequently steep) rates, a lunatic could be entrusted to the care of enterprising mad doctors who operated privately run madhouses. Private doctors began constructing private institutions in country house estates on an increasing scale from the mid-eighteenth century, responding to calls from the upper and middle classes for a more formal approach to the care of lunatics, particularly those who did not fall into the pauper class. Awareness of the plight of the lunatic was likely brought about when it became public knowledge that the king, George III, was himself so afflicted. Bethlem Hospital in London was a rare and famous example of a purpose-built public lunatic asylum in the early modern period and was not suitable for large numbers of fee-paying patients of the noble class, let alone a king.

By no means the only dedicated lunatic asylum in the city of London, Bethlem was distinctive. It is distinguishable from other asylums built before 1800 for both its antiquity and its dedication to the lower classes. Bethlem was a public asylum serving the needs of the city of London, with medieval monastic origins and a historical reputation for the charitable reception of the insane – though better accommodation was also available for a fee. The hospital grew out of the Priory of St Mary Bethlehem which garnered a reputation in the later Middle Ages for taking in lunatics. The situation of the hospital, on the main highway leading north out of the city, meant that it was in an ideal position to solicit alms from passers-by (Andrews *et al.* 1997: 36). Though swiftly overtaken by the rapidly expanding city, Bethlem set an early precedent for the situation of future asylums: in removed – quieter – spaces outside, but close, to large population centres. As well as the insane, the hospital also took in the sick and the destitute, some of whom died while in the Priory. Excavations of the Priory burial ground undertaken by the Museum of London Archaeology on behalf of Crossrail in 2015 revealed over three thousand burials on the site, including a mass grave dating to a sixteenth- or early seventeenth-century plague outbreak (Crossrail 2017), likely in use when the Priory was still in operation. This shows that the site was a focal point for the destitute for all manner of ailments, and for the poor in times of crisis. It is not surprising, therefore, that the site became increasingly overcrowded.

When the Bethlem Hospital was relocated to a new site in Moorfields in 1676, it was rebuilt in a large, purpose-built institution, a ‘palace beautiful’ for the mad, far removed from the piecemeal architecture of the original Priory site (Arnold 2008: 87). The baroque architecture of the new Bethlem Hospital marked a shift in attitude towards the insane. Madness was no longer seen as a divine punishment or moral affliction, and the new hospital indicated a move towards the idea of a dedicated institutional framework to support the deserving mad – a purpose-built space that was visually and operationally separate from a prison or workhouse (Philo 2004: 432). Unfortunately, overcrowding soon marred the noble intentions of the Moorfields hospital. The word ‘bedlam’ – to mean uproar and confusion – comes from the popular rendering of the asylum name, Bedlam, and its introduction into common parlance goes some way towards communicating how the public felt about the hospital. To support growing demand and a rapidly expanding urban population, Bethlem was relocated again in 1815 to a site in St George’s Fields, this time to a classical-style building with a prominent portico and dedicated wings to promote patient classification. Patient classification according to severity and type of illness, as well as gender and status (fee-paying or not), was part of a wider trend in asylum

building in the British Isles, North America, and across the Empire; a refinement in thinking about madness which called for specialised care for the mad according to the specific needs of the patient. This change in outlook – an increased emphasis on reform and improvement – was not limited to lunatic asylums, but was reflected in social, economic, and political life in this period. Linked to the ideas of progress and secular principles of independence and order which emerged from seventeenth- and eighteenth-century European intellectual enlightenment, the reform of lunatic asylums must be seen as part of what historian Asa Briggs referred to as an ‘Age of Improvement’ (2000: 2). This period was characterised by an increasing intersection between the ideas of human progress and improvement, the landscape, wealth, and labour – epitomised in *The Wealth of Nations*, a foundational text on political economy by Scottish economist Adam Smith (1776; Tarlow 2007: 22). In his book, *Madness and Civilisation*, Michel Foucault goes further to situate the change in thinking about lunacy within a more general ‘Great Confinement’: the separation and institutionalisation of those who could not contribute to the new industrialising economy (2006: 43). The scale of the new state-sponsored institutions and their aesthetic gravitas and monumentality supports Foucault’s interpretation of these institutions as mechanisms of state power. This change was marked in management practices as well as aesthetics. The new Bethlem Asylum represented a visual and material shift away from the eighteenth-century urban madhouse. Located on a plantation on a site still on the fringes of the city, the Bethlem Asylum was a new type of institution, where fresh air was as important to the management of the insane as security. The new type of asylum that emerged at the end of the eighteenth century, as articulated in the new Bethlem Asylum, was built after the ideals of moral management.

The construction of large-scale public lunatic asylums in the early nineteenth century occurred within a shifting geographical framework of urban and rural consolidation and change and social development. A surge in population in the United Kingdom and Ireland during the eighteenth century drove urban development and the expansion of towns, while agricultural innovations and changes in farming practices in the countryside altered rural landscapes. As stated above, asylums were part of a much larger drive towards social and spatial improvement in this period, marked in the landscape and streetscape. In addition to increasing overcrowding and consequent health concerns in cities, fashion also played a part in changing how cities looked in this period. Continental trends towards wide streets and open amenity spaces in cities influenced massive changes to urban streetscapes in the British Isles from the late eighteenth century. The proliferation of a spirit of civic improvement

throughout the British Isles is clearly articulated in the adoption of ‘improving’ principles in the city of Dublin before and after joining the Union in 1801. While different social, political, and religious concerns meant that Ireland and the United Kingdom were different in many ways (Tarlow 2007: 28–9), in the aesthetics of monumental and state architecture they became increasingly similar. The late Georgian period saw the creation of open squares, architectural vistas, and promenade streets in both London and Dublin (Craig 1982: 243; Nord 1988: 165), as well as the construction of increasingly regular street patterns in new industrial cities like Manchester and Edinburgh. In the countryside, agricultural land was enclosed into ordered, manageable estates; fields were arranged in straight-edged land parcels bordered by fences and hedges which irrevocably altered movement through the landscape and consolidated and specialised agricultural practices. Unproductive borders and margins were ‘waste’, while productively farmed fields were likened to industry. In the language of improvement, as in the public institution – the asylum and the workhouse – the idle or wasteful were contrary to the productive and industrial (Porter 2001: 309). Though land was enclosed ostensibly for economic purposes, the status inherent in owning an improved estate marked landowners out as forward thinking (Williamson 2007: 6) and modern. Historian Asa Briggs terms this movement towards modernity as the ‘Age of Improvement’ (as stated above), arguing that the spirit of progress which began with the European Enlightenment inspired moral, economic, technological, civic, rural, and urban improvements (Briggs 2000: 2).

Alongside the spirit of social improvement was a broader cultural acceptance, from the early modern period, of the need for the ‘confinement’ of those elements of the population which were not conducive to maintaining the economic and urban peace or contributing meaningfully to the betterment of society. These elements included the unemployed, the poor, the criminal, and the insane (Foucault 2006: 43–50; Tarlow 2007: 136). Those who could not work and contribute meaningfully to the industrial economy were a problem to be solved, or at least managed (Foucault 2006: 43). In the case of the mad, this process of management involved the construction of more comprehensive and effective asylums, from around the middle of the eighteenth century, in which the mad could be confined. Building on the success or imperative of expanding eighteenth-century asylums, more were constructed. The early nineteenth century was a period of considerable social and political upheaval, necessitating the formalisation of a means of managing the non-industrious population. The Napoleonic Wars had a significant impact on the British economy – as both a driver of new markets and a barrier to others. This impact continued throughout the conflict, and

even after. In addition to a couple of bad harvests, Napoleon's blockades of British trade routes led to a period of economic crisis in 1811 and 1812. Thousands of people claimed poor relief during this period (Briggs 2000: 165), and there was significant strain on those institutions dedicated to the relief of the poor: on poorhouses, almshouses, and workhouses. After the war, the labour market was flooded with young men who had previously found employment in the army or the navy. As the population of able-bodied poor grew, institutions were strained. It is no coincidence that in the years in which many provincial asylums were planned, between 1808 and 1820, other, less specialised, institutions suffered significant overcrowding. Asylums relieved the burden of caring for the lunatic poor, a significant portion of the workhouse population.

Institutional confinement on a large scale was realised in (albeit elaborate and occasionally stylish) monolithic architecture, the buildings themselves expressions of public order represented in the monumental architecture of the day. One of the more explicit examples of this building type was Richmond Penitentiary in Dublin, nicknamed the 'Cease to do Evil Hotel' by locals and inmates for the inscription over the frontage which read 'Cease to do Evil, Learn to do Well' (O'Donnell 1972: 152–3). Though less austere or outwardly punitive, asylums built in this period were also constructed in a monumental style. The early nineteenth-century asylums were usually neo-classical, similar in form and scale to the rural dwelling-places of the upper classes. This style was popular in the architecture of hospitals for physical ailments too, such as the Dublin Lying-in Hospital, built in 1745, whose portico-adorned facade was comparable with the contemporaneously constructed palatial urban residence of James Fitzgerald, twentieth Earl of Kildare (Boyd 2006: 43–6). This was not a nineteenth-century phenomenon, but rather a large-scale realisation of a theme in hospital and asylum architecture from the early modern period from which asylum architects drew their inspiration. The architecture of public health in the early modern period was at times so impressive that it was mistaken for domestic architecture; for example, in an eighteenth-century guide to London, the hospital for invalids in Chelsea was described by author Edward Hatton as having the appearance of a palace, rather than a home for pensioners (1708: 737).

The neo-classical style and country-house architecture of public institutions correlated well with the growth in popularity of reformed and 'moral' styles of management. Moral management was not a single management practice, but rather a collection of doctrines, ideals, and practices which advocated for the management of the insane in a humane and caretaking manner. Management of the mad was a solution to the problem of confinement without an end. Moral management of the insane

was conceived of against an increasingly secular backdrop of reason and individuality, born out of the European intellectual Enlightenment (Porter 1995: 264; Williams 1999: 7), an increasing acknowledgement of the use of logic and reason to solve the problems of the world; the problem of long-term confinement addressed through the logical and reasonable methods of enlightened men. In prisons, the introduction of reform as the ultimate goal for prisoners, over punishment, is one such improving principle of enlightened institutional management. Architecturally, the creation of an environment which reflected the principles of sanity, reason, and domestic comfort could, logically, promote sane, rational, and civilised behaviour. As regards the management and treatment of the insane, the term 'moral management' referred to a variation on *traitement moral*, the introduction of intelligence and passion into the consideration of treatment for the insane as espoused by French asylum reformer Phillippe Pinel and defined by his student, Jean-Étienne Esquirol (Kelly 2008b: 20; Tucker 2007: 118). Moral management in practice was the treatment of the mind in a logical and calm manner, encouraging patients to develop self-control with the assistance and support of a doctor and a wider institutional framework (Yanni 2007: 24), with minimal use of physical restraint.

In the British Isles, the principles of moral management were championed by men like Samuel Tuke, the manager of a private asylum, the York Retreat. Tuke promoted moral management through the publication of instructional texts on the management and construction of an asylum based on his own experience and expertise. Tuke's book, *Description of the Retreat* (1813), was one of several didactic texts on asylum design and management in the nineteenth century. The earliest of these texts were descriptive in nature, offering examples of best practice rather than explicit guidance on how asylums should be run (as with later texts, such as W.A.F. Browne's *What Asylums Were, Are and Ought to Be* [1837] or John Conolly's *The Construction and Government of Lunatic Asylums and Hospitals for the Insane* [1847]) (Browne 1991; Conolly 1847; Piddock 2007: 29–30). Like Tuke, Lincoln Asylum's Edward Parker Charlesworth used his own asylum to promote the adoption of his system of non-restraint, that is the abolition of mechanical restraints like chains and manacles in favour of solitary confinement and other, less punitive measures. His book, *Remarks on the Treatment of the Insane*, like Tuke's book, included a detailed annotated plan of his own asylum (1828). The architecture of the asylum was as intrinsic to the treatment of the insane as any management method. In Ireland, moral management advocates like William Saunders Hallaran, physician to the Cork City Asylum, also penned observational texts; Hallaran's *Practical Observations on the Causes and Cure of Insanity* (1818) was a detailed

description of the application of moral management methods. Hallaran's book contained drawings of some of the instruments employed in his asylum, including a circulating swing and a leather brace. These instruments were to be alternatives to the manacles and chains of asylums of the past, and evidence the highly experimental nature of this period in the management of the insane.

Beginning in the early nineteenth century, a number of reform-inspired purpose-built lunatic asylums were constructed in Britain and Ireland. These asylums were administered at county level, and the various management practices implemented therein were drawn from the principles and ideals of moral management as preached by men like Tuke. A legislative framework for lunacy supported the construction of these asylums. A series of acts in the first half of the nineteenth century legislated for the construction of public lunatic asylums in England and Wales, and later established a centralised system of governance of asylums under a Commission. These acts were the County Asylums Act of 1808 (48. Geo.3, c.96), the County Asylums Act and Madhouses Act of 1828 (9. Geo.4, c.40; 9. Geo.4, c.41, respectively), and the Lunacy Act of 1845 (8 & 9 Vict. c.126). The 1808 Act, the first, made provision for the establishment of asylums at county level. The necessity of an asylum in a county was judged by local magistrates (Bewley 2008: 6; Smith 1999: 23). The 1828 Act went further, making the establishment of an asylum in each county compulsory, so that those counties which did not construct an asylum under the 1808 Act were compelled to do so. The 1845 Acts then formalised and centralised the new system of provincial and urban asylums under a single administering body, through the creation of the Commissioners of Lunacy.

Lunatic asylums in Ireland were legislated for under a different system, and the system of provincial asylums was administered centrally from the outset. Prior to the construction of purpose-built provincial asylums in the 1820s and 1830s, the insane were housed in a variety of institutions. Lunatic wards were established in houses of industry (workhouses) under the authority of the Inspector General of Prisons (Kelly 2014: 56). Even so, specialised institutional provision for the insane was largely urban in nature. In rural areas, the insane were cared for at home, or ended up in prisons or local infirmaries. Private asylums were relatively rare. The two largest urban institutions for the insane, St Patrick's Hospital and the Richmond Lunatic Asylum, were located in Dublin, Ireland's largest city. St Patrick's Hospital was established in 1747, paid for with a bequest from the Irish author Jonathan Swift (Figure 1.1). It was not a large asylum, and its plan by architect George Semple was based on the seventeenth-century Bethlem Hospital site at Moorfields (Reuber 1996: 1180). The original building was not large



Figure 1.1 Facade of St Patrick's Hospital, Dublin (c. 1890–1910).

enough to meet demand and further accommodation for the insane was added over the course of the eighteenth century. Francis Johnston, who would later design the Richmond Asylum and subsequent provincial asylums, worked as assistant to the architect Thomas Cooley on additions to the hospital in 1778. His experience with this asylum heavily informed his later institutional works. As such, St Patrick's early modern architecture had a significant influence on the form which the early nineteenth-century asylums took. The Richmond Lunatic Asylum was built as an addition to the Dublin House of Industry and opened in 1817. Overcrowding in both asylums indicated that provision for the insane was not sufficient in two large urban asylums, even with the support of various provincial houses of industry and prisons. The Irish Lunatic Asylums for the Poor Act of 1817 (59. Geo.3, c.127) supported the establishment of a dedicated district asylum to be constructed in each of Ireland's four provinces: Leinster (outside the city of Dublin), Munster, Connacht, and Ulster. By the 1820s, a more comprehensive system was devised to reflect the demographics of provincial Ireland, and nine provincial asylums were eventually built. The implementation of this organised system was overseen by a Board of General Control and, unlike the county-based system in England, was administered centrally from Dublin.

As asylums in England and Ireland were constructed regularly and

disparately from 1808, and without a centralised administration (until 1817 in Ireland, and 1845 in England), instructive publications on the design and correct management of a reformed moral asylum were widespread, penned primarily by physicians but also by architects and asylum managers. Different architectural styles were matched with management practices, each with their own variations and interpretations of moral management and non-restraint. The individual personalities and preferences of asylum managers and visiting physicians were reflected in how asylums were run. This early period of public asylum building, from the County Asylums Act in 1808 to the Lunacy Acts in 1845, was a period of significant experimentation.

The mid-1840s marked a shift in the administrative structure of asylums in the British Isles, with the establishment of the Commissioners of Lunacy to replace the local magistrates in English and Welsh asylums and the Board of General Control in Ireland. The 1845 Lunacy Acts initiated a surge of asylum building, which required regulated, centralised administration and a relative degree of uniformity in design. The ideas for these designs, however, were drawn from asylums constructed before 1845, during those years of experimentation in architecture and management. As such, these asylums occupy a place of significant influence in the built history of lunatic asylums. Despite the influence which these buildings had, however, much of the secondary literature on asylum construction has been focused on asylums built after 1845 (see, for examples: Rutherford 2005, 2008; Stevenson 2000; Taylor 1995; Thompson and Goldin 1975; Yanni 2007). Among others, the West Riding Asylum at Wakefield, the Richmond Asylum in Dublin, and the Middlesex County Asylum were strong architectural models on which the regulated system was built. Middlesex was particularly influential, as the asylum management reformer and didactic author John Conolly was based there when he penned his popular treatise on the ideal asylum building: *The Construction and Government of Lunatic Asylums and Hospitals for the Insane* (1847). The asylums constructed after the 1845 Acts, in the wake of Conolly's treatise and very much informed by it – the large Victorian lunatic asylums – have come to dominate the history of asylum architecture. Innocuous in the English and Irish landscape, these massive buildings have become the archetypical asylum building, eclipsing the institutions which came before.

By the end of the twentieth century, many of the large asylums – those constructed in the first wave of asylum building before 1845 and those constructed after – ceased operation as hospitals or facilities for the poor. Many were closed, others repurposed, and a few were demolished or left exposed to weather and vandalism. The result of this mass closure was that dozens of large institutional buildings in English

and Irish towns and cities stood empty and in need of reuse. Given the architectural merits of the buildings, many have been listed, preventing complete demolition. The buildings that remain present an ideal opportunity to study the architecture of the early management of the insane. Not all have been abandoned, however; some asylum buildings have been redeveloped, presenting interesting archaeological case studies in themselves. The ways in which asylum buildings have been redeveloped are telling of the stigma attached to mental health and twenty-first-century ideas about nineteenth-century madness. Repurposing has not been without its concerns, from a heritage perspective. These buildings pose significant challenges for developers, including the extent of the listing, the condition of the building and materials, the accessibility of the building from nearby locales, and the historic reputation of former asylums. The mitigation of this latter concern is clearly evidenced by the renaming of the buildings, redevelopment of the landscape and approaches, and in a few rare cases the use of the redeveloped buildings for the purposes of entertainment. This has included the use of former asylum buildings as filming locations or as ‘haunted’ attractions. The ‘dark’ heritage – associated with human suffering or death – of former lunatic asylum buildings and their frequent grouping with prisons and workhouses has impacted their study as built heritage, as well as their development. Indeed, the problematic legacy of the buildings has overshadowed their role as large-scale employers, suppliers, customers, venues for community building, and dwelling places, with the result that redevelopment rarely considers the impact of a modified landscape or rebranding on the historic communities which have grown up around these buildings.

Approaches to the historic asylum

In this book, the historic lunatic asylum will be approached as an archaeological, material landscape. Asylums extended beyond the physical boundaries of the buildings proper and were embedded into the semi-rural plantations in which they were situated, as well as the wider, increasingly urbanising landscapes of Britain and Ireland. A non-traditional approach to archaeology is required for the study of these sites, as formal excavation and material-culture study in situ is not always possible where buildings are still standing, sites are closed, or former asylum buildings have been put to alternative use (Newman 2016). The approach to the archaeological landscape and built heritage of the lunatic asylum outlined in this book builds on an existing base of scholarship on the archaeology of lunacy and lunatic asylums, as well as archaeological approaches to other institutions for confinement. The historic lunatic asylum was part of a wider drive towards social

improvement, which included the construction of many forms of institution for social control. As such, this study draws on archaeological approaches to other institutions constructed during this period. Rooting this study in the archaeology of historical institutions allows for cross comparison with other contemporaneous institutions, showing the wider context for the innovations and motivations of asylum builders and managers.

There have been several notable studies on the archaeology and built heritage of historic asylums which I have drawn on in this book. Susan Piddock's book on lunatic asylums in Australia and Britain firmly roots 'institutional archaeology' as an emerging field in historical archaeology, deriving from socially-focused feminist approaches to archaeology and material culture (2007: 8). Seeking to contribute to this emerging field of institutional archaeology, this study draws on Piddock's effective application of archaeological principles, methods, and theory to the study of asylum buildings, in which she establishes a clear method for the critical and comparative use of documentary evidence and historic built heritage. Given the breadth of published literature from the early nineteenth century on how asylums *should* look, it is necessary when studying these buildings to evaluate the material as well as documentary evidence in order to ascertain how the complex ideas of asylum builders and reformers were actually put into practice. Piddock demonstrates how the comparative use of documentary and material sources can ascertain the challenges posed by individual sites, building materials, or the constraints of local authorities in implementing written ideas on the ground (2007). Piddock's book has a broad remit, focusing primarily on those asylums constructed in the second half of the nineteenth century. This study therefore builds on Piddock's examination by taking in asylums constructed in the first wave of large-scale asylum building and exploring Irish, as well as British, examples.

In this book, the archaeology of lunacy will be addressed in the context of a public institution: the district lunatic asylum. The archaeology of lunacy in the nineteenth century is not confined to the public asylum, however, and this study will also draw on non-institutional archaeologies. Sunshine Psota's materially focused examination of mental illness in domestic assemblages, for example, explored the ways in which insanity can be identified through material culture, including medicine bottles (2011). In this book I will use similar types of material culture, notably cutlery and ceramics, to explore how individual asylums imposed authority on patients and staff alike. As with this study, Psota's approach was interdisciplinary, comparing the domestic material with the casual admission records of mental health institutions. Though public asylums housed patients on a long- and short-term basis, long-term patients were frequently the focus of contemporane-

ous didactic texts on asylums in the early nineteenth century and remain a central focus in histories of medicine. This is perhaps due to the point that casual or short-term patients were less likely to succumb to the mindset of institutionalisation, a social integration into the asylum due to habit and context while in long-term residence that makes leaving the institution a source of anxiety and fear, as theorised by anti-psychiatry sociologist Erving Goffman (1976: 69). Short-term patients are thus harder to identify in the material record. Short-term patients comprised a larger portion of the patient population in private asylums than in public asylums. As such, this study does take account of archaeological studies of lunacy in private institutions for comparative purposes. Private asylums were impacted as much by reformed ideas on the treatment and management of the insane as public asylums. In her examination of the private asylum Brooke House in Chiswick, London, Charlotte Newman (2015) identified decorative practice and interior arrangement as facets of treatment. Newman made effective use of a curated collection of interior decoration held by English Heritage, and in her comparative approach to both material culture and the documentary record demonstrated the potential of both to offer a broad view of how spaces for the treatment of lunacy developed over time. These archaeological studies on the material culture, architecture, and practical management of madness evidence the potential for a materially focused approach to inform on the daily life of an individual or an institution which is otherwise only represented in the official historical record.

Asylums in the British Isles, which are the focus of this study, are representative samples of how institutions could develop in an industrialising landscape. Despite their similarities, however, each individual asylum was constructed according to the constraints, limitations, and opportunities of the geographic and social contexts in which they were built. This book draws on approaches taken in archaeological studies of asylums in colonial contexts to draw out regionality, such as Peta Longhurst's critical comparison of ideology and the built environment in New South Wales, Australia (2015). Longhurst drew on existing scholarship on the archaeology of institutions to effectively apply theories of non-correspondence (the idea that the interplay between social action and the material world is not deterministic, as theorised by archaeologist Roland Fletcher) to asylums in New South Wales, populating the historic asylum with social actors who actively engaged with their environment. Identifying the ways in which individuals approached their material world is essential in an archaeological approach to institutions, as the relative homogeneity of architectural plans and a plethora of didactic texts on ideal asylum environments can suggest commonality where there is significant material difference.

Lunatic asylums were not constructed in isolation, but as part of a

wider drive of institutional reform and welfare, as previously discussed. Asylum buildings share much in common with prisons and workhouses, which were frequently constructed under the same governing bodies or by the same architect. While asylums had a different mission and remit than prisons or workhouses, they share many similar features in terms of management, in particular an attention towards the reform and self-governance of the inmate. In light of these commonalities, this study will draw heavily on other institutional archaeologies. From their construction, reformed public asylums in the nineteenth century practised the classification of patients, and space within the asylum was ordered according to patient diagnoses, gender, and class. This careful organisation of space according to use was one aspect of British social and domestic life which made its way into institutions. In her work on Magdalene asylums – institutions for the reform of ‘fallen women’ – in Philadelphia, archaeologist Lu Ann De Cunzo identified this spatial organisation as an aspect of ‘moral’ life outside the institution which was co-opted into its architecture (2001: 27). The moral life of the patient was key to the type of management that reformers like the York Retreat’s Samuel Tuke were aspiring to, and the influence of domestic space on asylum architecture and management will be addressed in this book.

The theme of classification and segregation into dedicated spaces runs throughout the primary source material for asylums. The plans and descriptions of asylums by their financiers and architects are useful tools in identifying how the buildings were intended to function. Archaeology, as a discipline concerned with uncovering the material traces of human behaviour, offers an approach to the material remains that allows for the identification of resistance in these spaces, too. Resistance, on the part of the staff or the inmate to the intentions of the asylum authorities and their rules, is the action of an individual. As such, the material and historical traces of resistance, where they can be found, indicate human agency. The assertions of Michel Foucault regarding resistance, power, and domination in an institutional context (1991; 2006), and the impact of institutionalisation articulated by sociologist Erving Goffman (1976), have been applied in this study and guide critical analysis of the historical record. The ideas of Foucault, and to a lesser extent of Goffman, have been influential in the history and archaeology of madness, informing interpretations of the architecture and management of lunatic asylums from the late eighteenth century to the twentieth century. In his 1961 book, *Folie et déraison: Histoire de la folie à l’âge classique* – published in 1964 in English translation as *Madness and Civilisation*, as discussed above – Foucault asserted that the institutional confinement of the mad in the nineteenth century was a feature of industrialisation. Those who could not meaningfully engage

with the 'imperative of labour' were necessarily confined in out-of-the-way places – asylums (2006: 43). Throughout his interpretation of asylums as repositories for inconvenient and unproductive people, he criticised men like Samuel Tuke and Philippe Pinel of Paris, both didactic authors on the subject of asylums. Foucault's criticising approach to their writing and the mission of asylum reformers informs critical reading in this study. However, Foucault's approach is itself flawed in that his reading of nineteenth-century institutions was coloured by his own intellectual context. Foucault, like Erving Goffman, was a key figure in the anti-psychiatry movement, an intellectual movement involving social commentators and academics, as well as psychiatrists and doctors, which challenged the use of physical methods and involuntary treatment, as well as the institutional confinement of the mentally ill, in the second half of the twentieth century. Goffman's primary focus was mental hospitals in the mid-twentieth century, but his ideas about institutionalisation have been influential in the history of medicine, and historians of medicine like Roy Porter have engaged with his work critically. As such, his work will be taken into account in this study, particularly with regards to the idea of the 'total institution'.

In his 1961 work, *Asylums*, Goffman posited that the key principle in the operation of a total institution, that is an institution catering to all aspects of an inmate's life (in this case, the mid-twentieth century mental hospital), is the institutionalisation of the inmate. In acculturation to the inner workings of an institutional life, an inmate becomes dependent on that culture and consequently suffers when faced with leaving it for the outside world (1976: 70–3). Porter has queried the application of Goffman's ideas to the Georgian lunatic asylum, suggesting that the units in question were, in that period, too small to be considered effective as total institutions (2004: 162). While agreeing with Porter that Goffman's principles of the total institution are too general to be applied wholesale to a system as inconsistent and small scale as the Georgian lunatic asylums, Goffman's assessment of the patient and staff experience of institutionalisation as key to the maintenance of order stands up to scrutiny. In this book, I will engage with this idea as it relates to discipline and resistance (see Chapter 3). This book seeks to challenge one common aspect of Foucault's interpretation and Goffman's critique: that the material environment of historic asylums is primarily punitive. In this study, I will argue that the interior layout of some of the earliest asylums evidences a caretaking attitude towards lunacy that can be seen in the architecture and material arrangement of asylums. This is not to suggest that resistance was not also a facet of everyday life in the asylum. For this reason, archaeological approaches to the theme of resistance in other institutions will be drawn on for comparative purposes.

The theme of resistance runs through several historical archaeologies

of institutions for confinement, providing a rich body of research on which this study can draw. Eleanor Casella's work on prisons and penal colonies, in particular, demonstrates the potential of excavated material in showing that inmates operate beyond their proscribed roles. Casella's work on the Ross Female Factory in Tasmania, Australia accounts for the materiality of resistance uncovered through archaeological excavation. Excavated contraband artefacts, such as alcohol bottle glass and clay tobacco pipes in patient cells and in the prison grounds, suggest that clandestine behaviour and resistance to established hierarchies was common (2002, 2007). This approach to domination and resistance as articulated in the archaeological record has been applied in other institutional contexts such as internment and prisoner of war camps (Mytum and Carr 2013) and can be applied to lunatic asylums in excavated material and in the study of the built environment. Through excavated material and spatial analysis of built remains, the actions and behaviour of prisoners on a daily basis, largely absent from the official records of these institutions, is made visible. Spatial analysis and built heritage study will form the core methods of this book, rather than excavation. Despite this, resistance will still be addressed through the material remains.

Most nineteenth-century lunatic asylums in the British Isles are still standing in some form, and access to the sites is limited, if possible at all. A non-destructive means of studying the buildings and sites necessarily excludes any form of excavation. Archival sources such as cartography and building plans form a rich vein for studying these buildings archaeologically (as per Piddock 2007), while standing building survey techniques such as photographic survey and built-fabric analysis have been used to good effect in other institutional settings, such as Charlotte Newman's study of the Madeley Union Workhouse which explored the ways in which the institution of the mid-nineteenth-century workhouse responded to increasing industrialisation in a rural landscape (2013). However, standing building surveys on institutional sites are sometimes hampered by changes to the building fabric as a result of development. Lunatic asylum sites in the British Isles have been transformed into apartment buildings, markets, university buildings, and hotels. In consequence, original plasterwork is moved, and sometimes whole sections of the buildings are demolished, while sites are re-landscaped according to the needs of the new development. This kind of development is destructive to the original sites but also offers new opportunities for study not normally open to researchers. Archaeological site reports generated during development are key resources in these cases. Development-led archaeology on sites can answer questions about the past uses of the site. For example, excavations at the Lincoln Lunatic Asylum site after

the closure of hospital in the 1980s uncovered the remains of a late-medieval church and high-medieval hospital on the site (Vince 2003: 307), indicating that the area where the asylum was constructed had a long history of institutional infrastructure. Records from these archaeological events, like site reports and desk-based assessments, are useful in assessing the long-term histories of individual sites. These records are easily accessible, if underused in academic research on these sites. Since 1990, archaeological remains are protected by law in the United Kingdom (Planning Act 1990, c.9). This covers scheduled monuments and listed buildings, and thus includes lunatic asylums. Developers and planners are bound to evaluate sites before development and adhere to guidance on the preservation of archaeological landscapes. Resulting reports from surveys of lunatic asylum sites are valuable resources in institutional archaeology. As a signatory to the 1992 European Convention on the Protection of the Archaeological Heritage (known as the Malta Convention or the Valetta Treaty) (Council of Europe Treaty Series no. 143), archaeological heritage is also a central planning concern in Ireland, where it is reinforced by national legislation (Number 30 of 2000). Large development-led excavations, like those undertaken at the Kilkenny Union Workhouse site in Ireland in 2006, offer valuable data on life in institutions. The 2006 excavation unearthed a graveyard associated with the workhouse which allowed for examination of diet and disease in the institution and offered valuable insights into privations at the workhouse during the Irish Famine of 1845–49 (Geber 2015). Peripheral aspects of institutional life, such as burial grounds, represent aspects of institutional life which are not always clear in the historical record. Grey literature – reports resulting from development-led archaeology on these sites – are invaluable resources for studying the long histories and changes on institutional sites.

Much scholarship on the spatial and material world of the historic lunatic asylum has been focused on the architecture of the buildings themselves, though the deliberate situation of these buildings in carefully chosen, curated parks and managed landscapes must be borne in mind when analysing them. Descriptive accounts of the buildings inform on how the architecture of mental health developed over time. These accounts, such as Jeremy Taylor's detailed overview of hospital architecture, asylum gardens, and landscaping (1991), are useful in creating a typology of the buildings and are used in this study to situate individual asylums within their wider stylistic context. More in-depth approaches to how the spaces were managed and the buildings functioned as lived places have been published since the early 1990s, and these more detailed spatial studies will be drawn from here. Asylum buildings were dynamic spaces, in which individual agents acted and reacted according

to the ideology inherent in the institutions. Thomas Markus's studies of the spatial syntax of asylum spaces – that is the network of access routes, hierarchies of movement, and the use of space in the buildings (1993) – form a basis for the analysis of access and movement in this book. Markus's work is part of the body of asylum scholarship influenced by Foucault's ideas of power and confinement in the asylum (outlined above). This scholarship includes the edited volume on the built environment of mental healthcare, *Madness, Architecture, and the Built Environment* (Topp *et al.* 2007), which showcases approaches to lunatic asylums and mental health from geographical, social, and spatial perspectives. One aspect of asylum architecture which is featured in this collection, and numbers among the concerns of Markus in his work, is the idea of the panoptic gaze. This is the architecture of surveillance, and specifically of unseen, all-seeing vigilance on the part of the management of the asylum. The architectural panopticon, as proposed by Jeremy Bentham (1791), is referred to widely as a primary influence in the planning and design of asylums (see also, Franklin 2002b; Kennihan 2003; Markus 1993; Reuber 1996; and Richardson 1998). While Bentham's influence on the architecture of public institutions is undoubted given the frequency with which panoptic-style designs are referred to in didactic texts, government legislation, and articulated in asylum buildings themselves, the extent to which this design was put into practice is in question and will be addressed in this book.

The active management and movement of people through the lunatic asylum forms a core tenet of this study. As such, the interior make-up and furniture of the building will be addressed as inhibitive or reinforcing features of the lived asylum. This materially focused study builds on recent material approaches to the lunatic asylum, which have moved beyond the shell of the buildings and into the rooms themselves. Rather than cold or clinical spaces, nineteenth-century asylums were designed with ideas of domesticity and comfort in mind, and each asylum addressed this concern in its own way. Recent studies of institutional interiors from a historical perspective are drawn on here to explore this facet of asylum study. Jane Hamlett's work on institutional interiors moves away from presentations of institutions for confinement as homogenous or impersonal, and accounts for the adoption and use of domestic furnishings (2015). In her collaboration with Lesley Hoskins, they take this idea further to focus specifically on the aesthetic interior, on decoration in the public and private asylums as a feature of management and care in the later nineteenth century (2012). Similarly, in an archaeological approach to the therapeutic aesthetic of the private asylum, Charlotte Newman has posited that the use of unusual and expensive wallpapers con-

tributed to the domestic environment (Newman 2016). These studies show the potential of a materially focused study in informing on how asylums were dynamically managed. Rather than timeless or static, asylums changed rapidly both inside and outside, according not only to pressures from overcrowding or wider changes in management practice, but also to fashion, taste, and social concerns. Focusing primarily on the early part of the nineteenth century, this book will bear both the local and wider context of asylums in mind when addressing the ways in which they changed over time. In terms of how these buildings developed over the two hundred years between their construction and their closure, the earliest phases of interior decoration are the least likely to survive into the present day.

Where original early nineteenth-century lunatic asylum buildings have survived into the present day, they are frequently part of larger hospital complexes, municipal buildings, commercial or residential buildings, or hotels. In consequence, while the buildings themselves survive, they are much altered and their wider landscape context is frequently changed beyond recognition. Despite the mass closure and repurposing of asylum buildings in Britain and Ireland in the second half of the twentieth century (see the Mental Health Acts (UK) 7 & 8. Eliz.2, c.72, and the 2001 Mental Health Act in Ireland, alongside a series of reports and proposals for change), a large number remain unoccupied or in a state of transition. How the buildings have been adapted for reuse has been contingent upon the inheriting body. From an archaeological perspective, redevelopment has had a significant impact on the heritage management of the material remains and reflects the social legacy of the institutions in general. Asylum buildings are divisive sites. On the one hand, major historic employers and institutions for community welfare within locales. On the other hand, asylums are frequently seen as sites of social control and hardship, where the worst of state and institutional neglect and privation was played out throughout the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. This reputation is not undeserved in many cases, though it is by no means universal. Alongside historic prisons and closed workhouses, asylum sites can be considered as sites of dark or difficult heritage. Asylums, as closed-door sites of mystery, have become a kind of cultural short-hand for suffering, and are frequently used in video games, in film, and in television as venues for horror and fear. Enduring public discomfort with mental illness into the modern period has, in many ways, been transferred to the material sites in which mental illness was treated. In their study of the phenomenon of dark tourism, John Lennon and Malcolm Foley cite film and television media as vehicles for popularising scenes of dark or difficult

history, such as the sinking of the RMS *Titanic* and its portrayal in cinema throughout the twentieth century (2000: 17–18). Asylums are a particularly frequent reference point in fiction. The Danvers State Hospital, an 1870s state asylum in Massachusetts, for example, was an inspiration for horror writer H.P. Lovecraft's Arkham Sanitarium, the scene of a grisly patient murder in his short story, *The Thing on the Doorstep* (2018). In all of his writing, Lovecraft uses the buildings and landscapes of New England to create atmosphere (Evans 2004: 189). Lovecraft mentioned Danvers itself in his works, for example as the suspected final destination for ill-fated visitors to mysterious towns (see *The Shadow Over Innsmouth*; Lovecraft 2011: 274). Even in retirement (Danvers no longer operates as an asylum and has been partially demolished), this asylum has been unable to shake its reputation; in his essays on haunted buildings in the United States, Harry Skrdla references Danvers's influence on Lovecraft in the same context as he refers to the earlier history of the site as part of early modern Salem of witch-trial infamy (2006). These kinds of associations have a direct influence on how the built heritage of historic asylum buildings is treated once they cease operating as hospitals.

The cultural reference point of asylums as venues of horror both draws on and reinforces public discomfort with the built heritage of the historic lunatic asylum. Indeed, some have even become tourist attractions in themselves. As such, the dark legacy of both the sadly real and fantastically fictional needs to be considered when looking at the future of asylum buildings as built heritage, and even when arranging fieldwork for archaeological assessment of the sites. Laura McAtackney's work on the Maze/Long Kesh Prison in Northern Ireland (2014) is a good example of how archaeologists can approach buildings with difficult and conflicting histories. Her book is an archaeologically focused examination of the issues surrounding a problematic and politically volatile site of dark heritage. Her work is a model from which to study the dark and difficult legacy of institutions from an archaeological perspective. This book will contribute to the established, multidisciplinary literature on dark heritage and dark tourism, exploring the built environment of the nineteenth-century asylum throughout and offering a holistic approach to the material world of the historic lunatic asylum in its earliest period of large-scale development – the first half of the nineteenth century. The built heritage of the buildings will be revisited in the conclusion, with a short discussion on how a broader view of asylums, beyond the buildings themselves, may inform repurposing and preservation of this building type. In this way, this book will problematise the selective and inconsistent preservation of asylum buildings and difficult institutional built heritage in England and Ireland.

Methodology

The largely still-standing remains of the early nineteenth-century lunatic asylum system represent a unique opportunity, from an archaeological perspective, to study a building in active transition – materially and ideologically. It also makes their study, from an archaeological perspective, problematic. The conversion of asylum sites into apartment buildings, hotels, universities, and office blocks means that the grounds have already undergone intensive redevelopment in many cases. Commercial archaeology is a valuable source of excavation data on these sites, but the focus of commercial watching briefs, standing building surveys, and evaluations varies from site to site, dictated by the level of disruption to the built heritage. Where buildings have continued in use as psychiatric facilities, the privacy of patients limits what on-site work can be done (Pidcock 2007: 29). As such, building survey was not always possible. This book employs methods drawn from archaeological landscape analysis, material culture study, and historical research.

The historic lunatic asylum was comprised of more than just a building for accommodation or a set of structures. Established on landscaped estates, often surrounded by planned gardens and plantations, the asylum was a complex made up, variously, of accommodation blocks, administration buildings, gate lodges, out-buildings, and utilities such as a laundry, a bake house, and a kitchen – and sometimes a farm. The asylum was both a landscape in the material sense that it was a complex physical space through which people move and relationships were established, and a taskscape in that each space was dedicated to an activity or interaction (as per Ingold 1993: 158). The successful operation of the asylum was dependent upon the maintenance of a social and spatial hierarchy, defined not just by the position of the individual – patient, keeper, doctor – but also their material signifiers; keepers, for example, carried keys. The social and spatial hierarchy of the asylum was also defined by privilege of movement and access. The maps and plans of historic lunatic asylums form the core primary and material source in this archaeology of lunacy, as they are informative of both the approved plan and original form of the historic asylum, as well as its redevelopment over time and the intention behind spatial division (if not always an accurate reflection of how people moved through the space in practice). Lines of sight, access points, and pathways for movement and sight were central to the management and operation of the asylum and were recreated using historical records and built heritage study. Asylum plans and maps of the local areas were cross-referenced with other sources, such as historic photographs and twentieth-century plans, as well as historical accounts and, where possible, standing building survey.

In order to study access and egress from the asylums as a stage in

power relationships, relational graphs showing lines of movement and points of access were compiled for selected asylums. These graphs are a modified and simplified version of the spatial relationship graphs called *gamma maps*. Bill Hillier and Julienne Hanson theorised gamma maps and relational graphs in their 1984 book, *The Social Logic of Space*, as an articulation of three related principles present in almost all cases of spatial designs. These are that space should be hierarchically arranged, with a well-marked series of public-to-private zones. That the object of spatial layout is a physical expression of single-group identity and the exclusion of others; and that separate identity group spaces should be segregated from each other (Hillier and Hanson 1984: 130). The object of a gamma map is to demonstrate the control of space and access through the mapping of alpha (single entrance) and gamma (multiple entrances) spaces on a relational graph. While Hillier and Hanson's work can be criticised for being formulaic and presumptive of adherence to a social norm (and therefore discounting individual agency), their second summation – that spatial design in architecture demonstrates an articulation of identity and exclusion – can be used to discern intention in the design of buildings, if not in day-to-day practice. This method has been employed with success by Markus in his consideration of asylum architecture, in order to determine access and power in nineteenth-century institutions, specifically asylums in Scotland (1993). This book draws heavily on Markus's work. Markus's gamma maps illustrated the interior spatial structure and divisions within an institution, and demonstrated access and in some cases visual links, as in his spatial plan of the Edinburgh Bridewell (1989: 95). Markus's use of the maps to demonstrate visual links mirrors the work of James Delle (1998) and Terrance Epperson (2000), who used intervisibility, viewpoints, and viewsheds to illustrate panopticism, hierarchy, and power in archaeological landscapes. Intervisibility, viewpoints, and viewsheds, as well as movement, access, and spatial hierarchies were intrinsic to the success of moral management, as will be outlined in this book.

Spatial division and complex classification were essential features of the moral asylums, as will be outlined. The careful control of space was key to the maintenance of classifications and security. Historic asylums have frequently been seen as marginal spaces, not least by politician Enoch Powell in his speech to justify mass mental hospital closure in Britain in 1961. This idea of asylums as marginal, transitional, and in some cases 'sacred' or rarefied spaces will be revisited in this book. In his 1901 book, *Le rites de passage*, published in English as *The Rites of Passage* (1960), French ethnographer Arnold Van Gennep explored the practice of religion and social ritual through the organisation of space, specifically the spatial transition between profane and sacred, that is lim-

inal space (1960). In this book, the lunatic asylum will be examined as a dedicated and protected (sacred) space, for which admission involved a complex series of bureaucratic and cleansing rituals. The dichotomy between 'profane' and 'sacred' may be identified in the classification and designation of internal and external, private and public space within the asylum. The hierarchy that dictated the privilege of access and movement through the site was supported by the maintenance of liminal spaces and stages: the admission office, the gate lodge, the front garden, and the visitors' rooms, to name a few. In this book, those liminal spaces will be explored, referred to as threshold spaces through which an actor must qualify to move. This means of reading spaces and spatial sources draws heavily on Van Gennep's concept of the threshold as a magico-religious space – a liminal space over which one must cross to alter identity. These ideas about liminality and identity will be applied to asylum architecture, historic plans and maps, and compared with historical sources for administration practice. The aim of this means of analysis is to identify the expectations and material environments necessary to carry out the rituals of everyday practice, namely movement, surveillance, admission, and discharge. Far from linear, these practices were heavily dependent on the creation and maintenance of a dedicated asylum environment and hierarchy.

Architectural histories of asylums have, in the past, focused on the visual and aesthetic features of the lunatic asylum. The carefully planned built environment on which both the success and failure of moral management depended, however, was more than just visual and decorative. This book will examine the physical environment of the asylum from a visual, sonic, and environmental perspective. Australian historian of medicine, Dolly MacKinnon, has suggested that the study of madness has been silent; the aural or sonic is overtaken in histories of the subject by the visual (Hilmes 2005: 249; MacKinnon 2003: 73). Study of the careful use and control of sound and acoustics as an aspect of place-making in the asylum contributes to the understanding of supervision and control of movement and space. Noise and its management in the nineteenth century have been considered an important feature of living in an increasingly urban environment. In his essay 'On noise', Hillel Schwartz illustrated the primary position of concern that background noise held in the nineteenth-century urban mindset, enough to see the introduction of Quiet Zones (2004: 51–3). Sonic features of the urban environment such as the church bell were key to the creation of industrialised mindsets and personal geographies; the church bell was both a timekeeper and a symbol of territorial identity (Corbin 2004: 184). Mackinnon pointed out that staff in historic asylums used bells and whistles in the early twentieth century in Australia in order to create

a sense of time and regulation (2003: 76). The prominence of the whistle and the bell in museum collections for madness support the central role of these objects in the daily life of the asylum. However, it is difficult to assess the acoustic experience of the interior of an historical asylum. Mackinnon has utilised case notes and asylum histories in order to build an understanding of the interior soundscapes of these buildings. This book draws on these historical approaches to sound and contributes to the methodological framework for this study by examining unintentional noise, such as unlocking doors, footfalls, and rustling, as contributors to the creation of an institutional sonic environment.

There is an established archaeological and anthropological scholarship in the field of archaeoacoustics, the study of past sounds – the examination of the sonic understanding of the environment. Many of these studies are concerned primarily with deliberate sound creation through the manipulation of material culture, rather than the effect of sound itself (see collected essays in Scarre and Lawson 2006; Watson and Keating 1999). There are a few exceptions which examine the presence and effect of sound on the environment (King and Santiago 2011), and the soundscapes of sites as part of the experience of the space (Cocroft and Wilson 2006: 20–1). Sound recording has proved an effective means of accessing historical soundscapes. Notably, research on Stonehenge has examined the acoustic properties of the monument and its capacity to manipulate sound (Till 2011). Study of sound in this book draws on Steve Feld's conception of the idea of acoustemology, that is everyday sounds and how they affected one's experience of 'being in the world' (Feld and Brenneis 2004: 462). Analysis of the everyday sounds of the asylum can contribute to the broader picture of internal environment experience.

The historic sonic environment can be accessed through the material indicators and historical documentary evidence supporting the use and consideration of sound in the construction of lunatic asylums. Changes in the buildings over time, not to mention the difficulties in recreating a full-to-capacity lunatic asylum, make accurate recording of the sonic environment on the ground impossible, while it is not possible either to determine levels of past appreciation (Corbin 1995: 184). The material wealth of sound indicators and their presence in the historical record, however, make historical sound and its impact an accessible avenue of sensory study. Collaborative use of archaeological phenomenological approaches with more established methods (Hamilton *et al.* 2006: 31), such as historical sources, has proved a richer and less problematic avenue of research for lunatic asylums. This research will compare the historical documentary evidence with the material culture, in an attempt to determine the sensory concerns and safeguards of the architects and authors of reform literature.

Portable material culture from Irish and English asylums in the early nineteenth century has not been commonly retained by the institutions or by local heritage bodies, and apart from the buildings themselves, material remains are scarce. Some museum collections retain material from this period, such as small privately run mental health museums in Wakefield and Dublin. The survival of material remains varies from collection to collection, however, reliant on private donations and the discretion of the health services and developers. Portable material culture from the period is rare, but sometimes makes its way into local museum collections. The Stephen Beaumont Museum of Mental Health at Wakefield in England holds a significant amount of debris and material recovered from the Stanley Royd Mental Hospital (formerly the West Riding District Asylum) before demolition and development on the site. While heritage frameworks in England and Ireland are increasingly cognisant of the importance of retaining post-medieval and later historical materials from development-led excavations, the sheer volume of innocuous building material in these institutions means that the material is rarely retained. Buildings are extensively recorded by commercial archaeology units before demolition or redevelopment; examples of such include heritage assessments at the former Crooked Acres Hospital (a twentieth-century mental hospital) by ARCUS in 2008 (Cooper 2008), and the Victorian asylum, Bexley Hospital, by English Heritage in 1992 (Richardson 1992). For the purposes of this research, standing built heritage was photographed extensively, as access and permissions would permit, and the photographic record was supplemented with archaeological site reports, aerial photography, cartographic sources, and material culture where available.

Historical documentary sources form the core primary source material in this book. Historical records provide documentary evidence for management and practice in asylums, but they are also the most abundant material sources available for the study of historic lunatic asylums. The documentary record is a rich source of artefacts from the historical context in question (Wilkie 2006: 14). Like a platter or a ceramic bed pan, a ledger from an asylum office is an artefact as well as a useful documentary source. Documentary sources are employed as written texts and artefacts in this book. Extensive comparative analysis of material culture with historical documentary sources is necessary to gain a holistic picture of asylum life. The use of historical records in historical archaeologies is well established in the discipline. Though oft-misinterpreted as a disparaging comment on the inferiority of our discipline, Ivor Noël Hume's statement about archaeology as the 'handmaiden to history' (1964) referred to the potential for archaeologists, with our unique perspective on the material environment, to populate written

records with real people, providing a voice to non-literate peoples through material remains. Rather than filling in gaps, archaeological and material approaches can uncover that which lies outside of the written record, such as human agency or subaltern voices. The discipline of historical archaeology has since been well established, with archaeologists employing the historical record to good effect in informing interpretation of material remains. This is particularly evident in later historical archaeologies where the extensive historical record of bureaucracy makes up a considerable portion of material remains. In many multidisciplinary assessments of the material culture of nineteenth-century asylums, however, historical records have been used extensively to inform research, yet without reference to the potential of these sources as artefacts in themselves. In order to maintain their basic bureaucratic processes, institutions used large ledgers, accounts, and letters, and these records represent the material record of administration and bureaucracy in the text they bear, their physicality, and the imperative of storage implied by their very survival into the present day.

The idea of the book or text as a physical artefact from which cultural processes and attitudes can be inferred is well established in literature studies and codicology (the study of books as material). Book history scholar D.F. McKenzie, in an assessment of the designation of a 'text', recalled the origins of the word in the Latin, *textere*, 'to weave' (2002: 29) as referring to material, as well as words. Archaeological approaches to graffiti address the consideration of text as material culture in an explicit way. John Schofield and Paul Graves-Brown have examined graffiti as both a textual and material source in their study of 6 Denmark Street in London, interpreting the graffiti therein as an expression of the volatile interpersonal relationships between members of punk culture in London in the 1970s (2011). Similarly, Katherine Giles and Melanie Giles's study of twentieth-century graffiti in rural farmhouses in the Yorkshire Wolds looked at graffiti as the material, as well as textual, indicator of routines and accounts of life experiences (2010). In the context of an historical institution, Eleanor Casella's examination of prisoner graffiti in Ireland relating to penal transportation emphasises the act of the inmate in creating graffiti. Casella paints a vivid picture of graffiti 'painstakingly carved, scratched or pecked into the fabric of the cell interior', emphasising the emotion involved in the creation of these artefacts, as well as the physical exertion (2005: 457–8). While patient graffiti is difficult to identify on redeveloped asylum walls, the written records compiled by clerks and doctors are not written without feeling. The compilation of text is part of the active (and emotional) taskscape of the asylum, through which human agents operate.

Beyond historical archaeology, the study of texts as artefacts is

common. For example, medieval illuminated manuscripts are studied as both material and visual culture and given the well-known subject of most illuminated manuscripts (biblical transcriptions), they are arguably more useful as material and visual sources informing on the period in which they were composed than the text itself. Relevant for this study, as Chapter 3 will examine in more detail, is the study of illuminated manuscripts as physical, portable objects. A study of the Irish manuscript, the Book of Kells, looked at how the sourcing of extensive materials and exotic goods (200 calf skins for the vellum, and lapis lazuli for blue illuminations) evidence the importance of the book from its earliest days as an item of luxury (Rose 2011: 5). Historian Bernard Meehan has examined the vellum itself, suggesting that the monks responsible for the compilation and illumination of the book favoured a thick piece of vellum for pages of high illumination, demonstrating an active engagement with the physical arrangement of the book on the part of the illustrators (2009: 86). George Greenia has further argued that the creation of large volumes on which to transcribe and illuminate biblical texts in the Middle Ages attested to their status as totemic objects of power. A large book announced itself as a stage marker, signifying the status of the holder, binding them to their user groups (2005: 727). Large or expensively compiled books were carefully planned in their making and in their storage. In this book, the accounts ledger will be examined as an object of status and power, as well as a historical source.

Historical documentary research was carried out in archives and libraries, museums, hospitals, and using digitised online source material. The mass digitisation of rare books on the management of the insane and their publication online has aided comparative examination of these sources. Sources consulted included: plans and maps of lunatic asylum buildings and local areas; the minute books, accounts, and audits of individual asylums; government papers regarding lunatic asylum construction and administration; instructive texts on the construction and governance of the insane; and news media. Research on Irish asylums was occasionally hindered by a lack of surviving records; this is a problem commonly encountered by researchers in modern Irish history. In 1922, the Irish Public Records Office was destroyed. The office was housed at the Four Courts in Dublin and suffered heavy bombardment during the Irish Civil War by the forces of the Provisional Government while occupied by Irregular insurgents. Towards the end of the engagement, the Public Records Office was blown up from the inside by the occupiers. As a result, many public records – including the census data for almost every Irish county – suffered significant damage or were destroyed (Jackson 1999: 265–6). As such, there are many gaps in the documentary record. Demographic data and the content of government

and census reports have been pieced together from parliamentary papers containing report summaries of commissions and committees. This material mainly comprises an overview of destroyed, yet detailed, accounts and records. As such, research in Ireland was heavily reliant on parliamentary reports and the preservation of asylum records or commissioner's reports onsite in the asylums themselves, as well as relevant correspondence from the Chief Secretary's Office, architectural plans, and government audits.

Management, space, administration, and the built environment

When they were constructed, asylums represented the physical manifestation of reform ideals, architectural principles, and innovative design approaches. The buildings underwent significant change during their tenure as public institutions and now present major challenges to local authorities and private developers as listed structures with problematic histories, linked in the popular imagination to narratives of abuse and confinement. Employing archaeological approaches to the built and material environment, as well as the historic documentary record, this book will address the built heritage of the historic lunatic asylum. Approaching the asylum and the built environment of insanity as archaeological artefacts and landscapes, this book will draw together archival source material, material culture, built heritage, and cartographic information to present a broad view of public lunatic asylums from the late-Georgian legislative frameworks which provided for their mass construction, to the Acts and changes in management and architectural practice which preceded the more widespread construction of the Victorian asylum system under the Commissioners for Lunacy. The legacy of these early decades of public *asylumdom* are key to understanding the built heritage and legacy of historic asylum buildings as they face massive redevelopment in the twenty-first century.

This book is organised into three thematic sections: asylum management, asylum administration, and movement through the asylum. The application of management and design practices outlined by lunacy reformers will be assessed in Chapter 2. In order to determine the extent to which reform principals were adopted and practised, spatial layout and design will be explored through the analysis of building plans and annual audits. Examination of management practice will highlight how the rhetoric of lunacy reform was applied at ground level, in the architecture and in management structures, taking into account the ongoing process of refining asylum management throughout the early nineteenth century. Chapter 3 will address the running of the institutions and the

material culture of asylum administration. The spaces and processes of administration, as well as the materials implicated in bureaucratic process, inform on staff and patient hierarchies and the ways in which asylum spaces – interior and exterior – were actively employed in the running of the institutions. Internal staff and patient hierarchies are a central theme of Chapter 4, which will examine the spatial boundaries and pathways which determined the development of the asylum over time and led ultimately to a major design overhaul of the building type in the 1840s. The use of interior and exterior space informs on the extent to which reforms were incorporated into asylum architecture and management at ground level. Concluding with an overview of the archaeology of lunacy, the final Chapter 5 will address the ongoing issues surrounding the redevelopment and reuse of these still controversial sites, examining the historic communities which have grown around these institutions. This chapter will address the stigma associated with asylum buildings, in light of their (sometimes misunderstood) pasts.