



LUND UNIVERSITY

A Proper Place of Death?

Petersson, Anna

Published in:

Nordic Association of Architectural Research Annual Symposium 2006

2006

[Link to publication](#)

Citation for published version (APA):

Petersson, A. (2006). A Proper Place of Death? In K. Rivad (Ed.), *Nordic Association of Architectural Research Annual Symposium 2006* (pp. 110-117). The Royal Danish Academy of Fine Arts, School of Architecture Copenhagen.

Total number of authors:

1

General rights

Unless other specific re-use rights are stated the following general rights apply:

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the public portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the public portal

Read more about Creative commons licenses: <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/>

Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

LUND UNIVERSITY

PO Box 117
221 00 Lund
+46 46-222 00 00

A proper place of death?

Paper for the Annual symposium of the Nordic Association for Architectural Research 2006, ARCHITECTS - AGENTS OF CHANGE IN THE 21ST CENTURY?

Anna Petersson, department of Architecture and the Built Environment, LTH, Lund University

Abstract

The nineteenth century's long term planning and successive construction of new burial grounds and new ways of burial, with the help of among others scientific, technical and ideological strategies, have been quite successful in institutionalising a consciousness of what a proper place of death should be like. For the architect Augustus Welby Pugin the promotion of a revival of the Gothic style in ecclesiastical architecture and design was, for instance, not merely a matter of style, but rather of principle. The same can be said of the landscape architect John C. Loudon who in an 1843 treatise, *On the Laying Out, Planting, and Management of Cemeteries*, remarks that a cemetery, after having provided a decent place of burial, should function so as to improve 'the moral sentiments and tastes of all classes', with a focus on 'neatness, order, and high keeping'.

New ways of dealing with the deceased has continuously left traces in the space of death. From the churchyard, as the sacred heart of the city, to park-like burial blocks in extra-urban cemeteries, to the more recent practice of strewing the ashes outside the borders of the cemetery, in an environment that is specific to the deceased. Some researchers even speak of a shift: from an institutional to an individual notion of death. An important issue, which often collides with this individualisation of death, is the continual demand of efficiency and order on cemeteries of today pared with the latest requirement - to express spiritual character without religious codes. Hence the space of death can be said to reveal a tension between private and public as well as between sacred and secular interests.

As a further example of this tension we may regard the spontaneous sacralisation and personalisation of public space, at the sites of motor vehicle accidents, murders, terrorist acts or other catastrophes, which expresses a strong need somewhat opposite to the current demand for efficient public environments, free from religious and persona-oriented symbols. It also reflects society's religious structures and social orderings as well as changes in these matters over time. If we as architects and designers are to constructively support and reflect such tensions, needs, and changes I suggest it is important that we in the twenty-first century start employing an inclusive approach to design strategies. So as to provide more creative ways of defining a place as proper than by excluding that which is improper.

Introduction

Spaces of death, such as funeral monuments and cemeteries, as well as more spontaneous memorialisations, can be said to reveal the politics of space as in the tension between sacred versus secular and between private versus public

interests.¹ At the same time they also reflect a given society's religious structures, cultural differences and social orderings, as well as the changes in these matters over time.

As an example, the shift from a religiously ordered to a scientific world view is clearly visible in the way we care for our dead, from the churchyard, as the sacred heart of the city, to the eighteenth century's sanitary emplacement of death, excluding the cemetery from the city centre.

Background

Until the end of the eighteenth century the cemetery was closely tied to the church, which was situated in the centre of the city or village. The historian Philippe Ariés declares that 'if one wished to found a cemetery, one built a church'.² Due to industrialisation and urbanisation in the late eighteenth century the city churchyard soon grew overcrowded and unsanitary. Physicians and hygienists therefore suggested new burial patterns, with extra-urban cemeteries far away from the crowded city centres.

A central force for the new hygienic and rational way of burial was the Enlightenment movement, evoking thoughts of clarity, common sense and empirical experience that questioned the religiously ordered world view.³ In the latter half of the eighteenth century, we consequently find two french 'revolutionary architects' promoting the new enlightened cemetery, Claude Nicolas Ledoux and Étienne-Louis Boullée.⁴

In Britain, a nation that joined the fight between the city and the cemetery rather late, the struggle came to coincide with the whole sanitary reform movement that had as its grounds the cholera epidemics of London in the beginning of the nineteenth century. Part of the crusade against unhealthy environments was directed towards the unsanitary conditions of London's churchyards, which were considered to spread diseases through 'fatal fumes'. The historian of architecture, Göran Lindahl, illustrates the situation in Sweden in a corresponding way by stating that the new burial grounds were mainly to be seen as a means by which to improve the health of the city.⁵

In the mid nineteenth century, a connection between taste and moral principles seems to go hand in hand with similar contemporary

thoughts on social engagement through good design.⁶ In his book *Gatherings from Grave Yards*, the surgeon George Alfred Walker went so far as to see the city cemeteries as the direct or indirect cause of ‘inhumanity, immorality, and irreligion’.⁷ And, for the architect Augustus Welby Pugin, the promotion of a revival of the Gothic style in ecclesiastical architecture and design was not merely a matter of style, but rather of principle.⁸ The same can be said of the landscape architect John C. Loudon who in an 1843 treatise remarks that a cemetery, after having provided a decent place of burial, should function so as to improve ‘the moral sentiments and tastes of all classes’, with a focus on ‘neatness, order, and high keeping’.⁹

With the introduction of cremation, in the end of the nineteenth century, further ideological motives and design strategies, regarding funerary architecture and memorials as well as the whole perception of death, was introduced.¹⁰ However, between the nineteenth and twentieth century a shift in ideology emerged: from the connection between taste and moral principles, in relation to the design of death, to the development of the widespread theory of death as invisible in modern Western society.

Sanitised in hospitals and professionally taken care of by funeral directors, the twentieth century is for Ariés the period when death became alienated and denied.¹¹ It is also in this framework that Zygmunt Bauman delivers his sociological analysis of mortality in modernity as being ‘deconstructed’ into a never-ending number of mortal illnesses, or causes of death, that can be ‘avoided’.¹² Similarly, Michel de Certeau sees death in the twentieth century as isolated by ‘technicians’ and rejected to ‘one of the technical and secret zones’ in society, namely the hospital.¹³

Cemeteries built during the second half of the twentieth century show influences from society’s emphasis on efficient, technical, and standardised large-scale production. This was a development that led to the destruction of old cemeteries with the loss of local, cultural and communal identity as a result, when the old stone slabs, hill shaped graves and wrought iron grave fences were eliminated to enhance efficient upkeep. Against this background the geographer J. B. Jackson pessimistically concludes: ‘The cemetery in consequence has lost its meaning

both to the individual and to the community, and what has taken its place it would be hard to say.’¹⁴

When looking at the last decades of the twentieth century researchers speak of another shift: from an institutional to an individual notion of death,¹⁵ in which our earthly remains and our handling of them seems to have grown ever more important.¹⁶ Whilst impersonalised ways of burial, like memorial groves or gardens of remembrance, were initially steadily increasing, in countries which now offer free possession of the cremated remains, such as Britain and Holland, a counter reaction is clearly noticeable, from an institutional to an individual placing of the ashes as private memorials.¹⁷

In their book on the anthropology of mortuary ritual, Peter Metcalf and Richard Huntington suggest that in the US the embalming, styling, and finally viewing of the dead during the funeral ceremony can be seen as a form of fulfilment of the deceased’s social person.¹⁸ The same kind of fulfilment, though interpreted in a British environment, is, according to the theologian Douglas J. Davies, to be found in the noticeable shift towards a personal placing of the cremated remains in a specific setting connected to the deceased’s private life.¹⁹ The individualisation of death is further clearly visible in what is commonly known as spontaneous memorialisations,²⁰ such as the placing of flowers, candles, photos and personal items at sites of motor vehicle accidents, murders, catastrophes, terrorist attacks, or the like.

An important issue, which often collides with this individualisation of death, is the continual demand of efficiency and neatness on cemeteries of today. Furthermore, since cemeteries nowadays are to host different religious groups, as well as non-believers, the latest requirement on places of death is to express spiritual character without religious codes.²¹ Similarly, public environments often go by the same policy, i.e. to be free from religious, political, and persona-oriented symbols, something which somewhat runs counter to spontaneous memorialisations. Or, as an article on roadside memorialisation, in the magazine *American City & County*, declares: ‘In fact, in probably no other area of public life does public practice diverge so dramatically from official policy.’²²

Private vs. public

As a result, spontaneous memorials often trigger a process of formalisation, which is reminiscent of Certeau's discussion of how tactics in turn may produce strategies.²³ In this discussion, Certeau uses the terms *strategies* and *tactics* as opposites, since strategies are connected to the ruling forces in society, such as for instance economic, political, religious or scientific institutions, whereas tactics belong rather to the common people who do not have the means or status to produce what Certeau calls a *proper* place of their own. According to Certeau, a proper place emerges when a strategy circumscribes a place as proper, thereby excluding that which is improper. By means of tactics, on the other hand, you can only use, manipulate, or divert, the proper places produced by strategies. You can never own them.²⁴ In turn, the tactic use of proper places inspires new strategies for reordering and reorganising the tactics produced and so on.

If you think of spontaneous sites of grief and veneration created by the death of a well known person, or where the numbers of deceased is considered 'reasonably' high, you may probably all recognise the process I am referring to. Soon enough an official monument, arranged according to a given strategy, is constructed, turning the spontaneous memorial space into a proper public memorial place.

Another example of such a formalisation process is the US Department of Transportation's removal, in some states, of personal memorial objects on sites of motor vehicle accidents.²⁵ A similar process is just about to take place in Sweden, with a suggestion from the southern region of the Swedish Road Administrations to create an official policy for roadside memorials in Skåne.²⁶

Sacred vs. profane

As motives for these official policies we find diverse issues, such as safety and maintenance as well as religious freedom disputes.

In Sweden, safety reasons as well as road maintenance lay behind the suggestion to create a policy for roadside memorials.²⁷ Even though some sources claim that memorials by the road may actually increase road safety by stating as a bad example and warning.²⁸

In the US, the Oregon Department of Transportation's removal of roadside crosses was by some Oregonians interpreted as an antireligious act.²⁹ Although the Oregon Department of Transportation ensures they remove all kinds of unofficial signs since it, according to state highway regulations, is illegal to erect private signs on public roads. The debate sharpened when signs with the devils number, a black cross with a red slash through it, and a skull with crossbones, appeared anonymously along roads in Marion and Polk counties.³⁰ Without comment the signs were removed by the Oregon Department of Transportation. Marilyn Shannon, state senator of Oregon and supporter of roadside memorials, chooses to see the heated debate as a freedom of speech issue rather than a freedom of religion.³¹ 'The cross is a symbol of hope,' says Shannon, and, 'It's unfortunate that it's offensive to some.'³²

Interestingly enough, the opposite argument can also be found. Ellen Johnson, president of the American Atheists, sees roadside memorials as a growing problem across the country. 'We end up with these little Christian shrines everywhere,' says Johnson.³³ Recently the American Atheists went to federal court to stop the erection of a large metal cross on state property in Utah, honouring state troopers killed in duty.³⁴ The petition also aimed at the immediate removal of existing memorial crosses in six known locations in the same state.³⁵

Life vs. death

Apart from sparking disputes on private versus public space, and sacred versus secular interests, the unpredictable encounters with roadside memorials, or memorial decorations from the living world, like toys, photographs, or personal items, may function as catalysts in revealing the ever-present powers of death and turning the space of ordinary life upside down by exposing its temporariness and fragility.³⁶ For some people, roadside memorials make the daily drives to and from work 'almost like going to the cemetery every day'.³⁷

However, in the cemetery, standardised or even anonymous grave lots may function as redemptive tools with which to control the fear of death. And, while you can consciously avoid a visit to the cemetery, or at least prepare yourself for an expected encounter, the unpredicted sight

of a roadside memorial may suddenly bring about repressed feelings of pain and anger.³⁸ Hence, the borders of the cemetery, originally enclosing the churchyard to separate the consecrated earth from the unconsecrated, continues, in current secular and large-scale cemeteries, to keep death in order, inside well-trimmed hedges, straight grids of paths and proper grave lots.

For others, the cemetery's standardised and formal place of death may actually hinder the process of grief.³⁹ Or, as the ethnologist Lynn Åkesson describes it, personalised memorials may serve as a positive and graspable link between the symbolic reality, signifying feelings of unity and meaning of life, and the diabolic reality, signifying feelings of disruption and disillusion.⁴⁰

In the same fashion, the construction, maintenance, and ritual visits to a roadside memorial may for some serve as a way to feel closure on a tragic event.⁴¹ Additionally, the place where death occurred continues for some to have importance long after the initial mourning period has passed, where after it often serves as a place to memorialise the dead on the death day.⁴²

Places of death in the twenty-first century

As we have seen, the process of formalisation, eliminating personal and religious spaces of death, may actually benefit some while it for others hinders the process of grief. And even though centuries of long term planning and successive construction of new burial grounds and new ways of burial, with the help of among others scientific, technical and ideological strategies, have been quite successful in institutionalising a consciousness of what a proper place of death should be like, informal ritual activities, such as spontaneous memorialisations, also have the power of producing places of ritual as well as reinforcing social or cultural identity. The question is how we as architects and designers are to respond to this politics of space or, in other words, how we are to constructively deal with the complexity of the space of death in the twenty-first century.

In the following I will suggest that we need to start employing an inclusive approach to design strategies. So as to provide more creative ways of

defining a place as proper than by excluding that which is improper.

Conclusion

One suggestion is that we should further work with symbols that signify the use of the space of death, although without referring to specific religious ideals. This could involve constructing a significant place that visually diverges from the surrounding everyday space without using well known religious props. The same suggestion may be applied to memorials placed outside the given context of a cemetery, since even though a public memorial should function as a proper ground for veneration and grief, the profane and everyday setting of an accident or murder site often contradicts this message.

Hence, in both these examples the challenge is to provide a place with heightened meaning without using well established symbols of belief and grief. The meaning of the place is therefore left to be designed with the immediate surroundings at hand. This can obviously be seen as quite a challenge but, as landscape architect Catherine Howett says:

We cannot assume that our increased mobility and our secularized, urbanized culture have robbed us of all sense of place and that we cannot, therefore, invest landscapes with heightened meaning or symbolic resonance.⁴³

A recent Swedish example of a place with heightened meaning, but without a specific religious setting, is the new ceremonial hall for burials in Helsingborg called *Ceremoniplatsen*.⁴⁴ By working with spatiality, materiality and lighting architects Dan Rahmqvist and Uffe Nilsson, together with lighting designers Jim Andersson and Jan Ebbesson, have strived to provide the ceremonial hall with symbolic resonance by more general means than with specific religious props. The shape of the ceremonial hall is to remind of an open hand through which daylight sifts via carefully planed openings in the building, which at night time serve as lanterns projected outwards.⁴⁵ All this to create a welcoming atmosphere symbolising that this is a building open for all, both atheists and people with various religious backgrounds.

Another suggestion is that we could use changes in our cultural and historical values as a creative approach in design strategies concerning the space of death.⁴⁶ Hence, it is important to acknowledge that we do have an option when approaching cemeteries of today. They can either be handled in a routine fashion, with an emphasis on functionality, or one can focus on the spatial, artistic and architectural freedom that these cemeteries actually can offer.⁴⁷

An example of such a creatively planned cemetery is the Swedish cemetery at Berthåga, close to Uppsala, designed by the landscape architects Monica Sandberg and Nils Odén.⁴⁸ The cemetery at Berthåga offers several different places of death for specific religious beliefs as well as alternative ideologies. An example of the latter is the 'urn forest' [my translation], where trees are planted according to the signs of the Zodiac and urns buried in the surrounding meadows. A Christian feature is the outdoor 'tree church' [my translation], made of trees planted so as to form the outline of the Uppsala Cathedral.⁴⁹ In this tree church burial ceremonies as well as weddings and baptisms are enacted.

When constructing the cemetery at Berthåga, Odén and Sandberg further strived to reconstruct the countryside of the Uppland area as it once was and with it the lost wildlife of old meadows and farmlands. The burial grounds are also constructed as ecologically as possible. They even have their own entomologist, Nils Ryrholm, placing out endangered or extinct species of insects in the growing fields of herbs, flowers and grasses.⁵⁰

Both these examples, completed in the beginning of the twenty-first century, show an inclusive approach to design strategies. Which strategy that will be the most successful remains yet to be seen but both places of death can at least be held to reflect the cultural and social realities of today. And, as Howett states, only when our spaces of death reflect the economic, ecological, and social realities of our time 'Only then will our burial places be reinvested with significance within the landscape of the living.'⁵¹

¹ Lily Kong, 'Cemeteries and Columbaria, Memorials and Mausoleums: Narrative and Interpretation in the Study of Deathscapes in Geography', *Australian Geographical Studies*, 37/1 (1999), 1-10. Lily Kong, 'Geography and religion: trends and prospects', *Progress in Human Geography*, 14/3 (1990), 355-71.

² Philippe Ariès, *The Hour of Death*, translated by Helen Weaver (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1983), 51.

³ John McManners, *Death and the Enlightenment. Changing Attitudes to Death among Christians and Unbelievers in Eighteenth-century France* (Oxford, New York: Oxford University Press, 1985), 309. Kjell Lundquist, 'Från beteshage till trädgård – kyrkogårdens historia', *Kyrkogårdens gröna kulturarv*, Stad och land, 103 (Alnarp: Movium, 1992), 27.

⁴ Étienne-Louis Boullée, 'Architecture, essay on art', *Boullée and visionary architecture*, ed. Helene Rosenau (London, 1976). Michel Ragon, *The Space of Death: a study of funerary architecture, decoration, and urbanism*, translated by Alan Sheridan (Charlottesville: Univ. Press of Virginia, 1983), 237-60.

⁵ Göran Lindahl, *Grav och Rum: svenskt gravskick från medeltiden till 1800-talets slut* (Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell, 1969), 208.

⁶ This is perhaps not so surprising since a relationship between aesthetic judgement and causal as well as moral judgement is already noticeable in the works of philosophers active in the Age of Reason, such as for instance David Hume. Great Britain has a strong foundation of later reformers, such as Pugin and John Ruskin, followed by William Morris and the Arts & Crafts movement as well as the British Guild of Handicrafts, combining design strategies and moral issues in publications as well as design programmes. In Sweden we find Ellen Key as well as the Swedish Handicrafts union with their propaganda publications formulated by the theoretician Gregor Paulsson. Publications promoting social reform through good design were followed by other propaganda publications, written by Paulsson, Erik Gunnar Asplund, and many other functionalist architects.

⁷ George Alfred Walker, *Gatherings from Grave Yards*, facsimile edition of the first edition published in 1839 (Kila, MT, USA: Kessinger Publishing, 2003), III.

⁸ Augustus Welby Northmore Pugin, *The present state of ecclesiastical architecture in England*, facsimile edition of the first edition published in 1843 (Oxford, 1969), 44.

⁹ John C. Loudon, *On the Laying Out, Planting, and Management of Cemeteries* (London, 1843), cited in Catherine Howett, 'Living Landscapes for the Dead', *Landscape*, 21 (1977), 12.

¹⁰ The Cremation Society's aesthetic programme even included newly invented words to make death, disposal and dying more appealing. Bengt Enström, *Kyrkan och Eldbegängelserörelsen i Sverige 1882-1962*, akademisk avhandling, Teologiska fakulteten, Uppsala universitet (Lund: Berlingska Boktryckeriet, 1964), 303-20. Eva Åhrén Snickare, *Döden, kroppen och moderniteten*, Linköping Studies in Arts and Science, 249 (Stockholm: Carlsson, 2002), 205-6.

¹¹ Philippe Ariès, *Western Attitudes Toward Death: From the Middle Ages to the Present*, translated by Patricia M. Ranum (London and New York: Marion Boyars, 1976), 85-107.

¹² Zygmunt Bauman, *Mortality, Immortality and other Life Strategies* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 1992), 138-9.

¹³ Michel de Certeau, *The Practice of Everyday Life*, new edition, translated by Steven Rendall (Berkeley and Los Angeles, California: University of California Press, 2002), 194.

¹⁴ J. B. Jackson, 'From Monument to Place', *Landscape*, 17 (1967-68), 26.

¹⁵ Douglas J. Davies, *Death, Ritual and Belief: The Rhetoric of Funerary Rites*, second edition (London, New York: Continuum, 2002). Curt Dahlgren, *När döden skiljer oss åt... Anonymitet och individualisering i dödsannonser: 1945-1999* (Stockholm: Databokförlaget AB, 2000). Göran Gustavsson, *När det sociala kapitalet växlas in: om begravingar och deltagandet i begravingar*, Lund studies in Sociology of Religion, 4 (Centrum för Teologi och Religionsvetenskap, Lund University: Arken bokhandel, 2003). Curt Dahlgren and Jan Hermanson, 'Kremation och spridning av aska: förändrade begravnings seder i Sverige under sent 1990-tal?', *RIT religionsvetenskaplig Internet-tidskrift*, 6 [online PDF], (published online 27 Nov. 2003), <<http://www.teol.lu.se/rit/pdf/6/jh1.pdf>>, accessed 13 Mar. 2006.

- ¹⁶ Davies, *Death, Ritual and Belief*, 229-30. Jan-Olof Aggedal, *Griftetalet mellan trostolkning och livstydning: en pastorateologisk studie*, Bibliotheca theologiae practicae, 71 (Lund: Arcus, 2003), 93.
- ¹⁷ Davies, *Death, Ritual and Belief*, 30.
- ¹⁸ Peter Metcalf and Richard Huntington, *Celebrations of Death: the anthropology of mortuary ritual*, second edition (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991), 210.
- ¹⁹ Davies, *Death, Ritual and Belief*, 31.
- ²⁰ C. Allen Haney, Christina Leimer, and Juliann Lowery, 'Spontaneous memorialisation: Violent death and emerging mourning ritual', *Omega – Journal of Death and Dying*, 35 (1997), 159-171. Jennifer Clark and Ashley Cheshire, 'RIP by the roadside: A comparative study of roadside memorials in New South Wales, Australia, and Texas, United States', *Omega – Journal of Death and Dying*, 48/3 (2003/2004), 206. Sylvia Grider, 'Spontaneous Shrines and Public Memorialization', *Death and Religion in a Changing World*, ed. Kathleen Garces-Foley (Armonk, NY: M. E. Sharpe, 2005).
- ²¹ Bruno Wall, *Grauskick i förändring, tradition och visioner* (Stockholm: Svenska kyrkans Församlingsförbund, 2000), 9. Jan-Olof Aggedal, 'Den mångkulturella kyrkogården – ett principiellt perspektiv med utgångspunkt i Sverige', NFKK Kongress (Reykjavik, 24-27 Aug. 2005), 9-10.
- ²² Chriss Ross, 'Roadside Memorials: Public policy vs. private expression', *American City & County* (1 May 1998), section: Streets & Highways.
- ²³ Certeau, *The Practice of Everyday Life*, 29-42.
- ²⁴ Certeau, *The Practice of Everyday Life*, 36-7.
- ²⁵ Ross, 'Roadside Memorials: Public policy vs. private expression'.
- ²⁶ Personal communication, from an unpublished study on people's conceptions of roadside memorials in Sweden, conducted by Anna Petersson in 2005.
- ²⁷ Personal communication, Petersson, 2005.
- ²⁸ Kate V. Hartig and Kevin M. Dunn, 'Roadside Memorials: Interpreting New Deathscapes in Newcastle, New South Wales', *Australian Geographical Studies*, 36/1 (March, 1998), 11-3. Personal communication, Petersson, 2005.
- ²⁹ Karen Schmidt, 'Roadside Memorials spark religious freedom dispute', *Christianity Today* (3 Apr. 2000), section: North American report. 'The (unconstitutional) cross by the side of the road – Atheists in court to remove Christian highway memorials', *Atheists* [webpage], (published online 5 Dec. 2005), <<http://www.atheists.org/flash.line/utah12.htm>>, accessed 31 Jan. 2006.
- ³⁰ Schmidt, 'Roadside Memorials spark religious freedom dispute'.
- ³¹ Schmidt, 'Roadside Memorials spark religious freedom dispute'.
- ³² Schmidt, 'Roadside Memorials spark religious freedom dispute'.
- ³³ 'The (unconstitutional) cross by the side of the road', <<http://www.atheists.org/flash.line/utah12.htm>>.
- ³⁴ 'The (unconstitutional) cross by the side of the road', <<http://www.atheists.org/flash.line/utah12.htm>>.
- ³⁵ 'The (unconstitutional) cross by the side of the road', <<http://www.atheists.org/flash.line/utah12.htm>>.
- ³⁶ Julia Kristeva, *Powers of Horror: An Essay on Abjection*, translated by Leon S. Roudiez (New York: Columbia University Press, 1982), 3-4. Certeau, *The Practice of Everyday Life*, 87-8.
- ³⁷ Ross, 'Roadside Memorials: Public policy vs. private expression'. Personal communication, Petersson, 2005.
- ³⁸ Personal communication, Petersson, 2005.
- ³⁹ Personal communication, Petersson, 2005.
- ⁴⁰ Lynn Åkesson, *Mellan levande och döda: föreställningar om kropp och ritual* (Stockholm: Natur och Kultur: Forskningsrådsnämnden, 1997), 112-13, 149-50.
- ⁴¹ *The Aftermath of Road Accidents: Psychological, social and legal consequences of an everyday trauma*, ed. Margaret Mitchell (London, New York: Routledge, 1997), 194-5. Ross, 'Roadside Memorials: Public policy vs. private expression'. Personal communication, Petersson, 2005.
- ⁴² Personal communication, Petersson, 2005.
- ⁴³ Personal communication, Petersson, 2005.
- ⁴⁴ Catherine Howett, 'Living Landscapes for the Dead', *Landscape*, 21 (1977), 17.
- ⁴⁵ Ceremoniplatsen won first price in the Swedish Lighting Price competition in 2005. 'Presstext Svenska Ljuspriset 2005', *Ljuskultur* [online PDF], (published online 14 Feb. 2006), <<http://www.ljuskultur.se/ljk2/nav/Presstext%20Svenska%20Ljuspriset%202005%20webben.pdf>>, accessed 21 Mar. 2006.
- ⁴⁶ 'Presstext Svenska Ljuspriset 2005', <<http://www.ljuskultur.se/ljk2/nav/Presstext%20Svenska%20Ljuspriset%202005%20webben.pdf>>.
- ⁴⁷ In line with cultural geographer Lily Kong, who emphasises that changes in our cultural and historical values might be fruitfully employed as a creative approach in design strategies concerning cemetery construction. Kong, 'Geography and religion: trends and prospects', 363.
- ⁴⁸ Wall, *Grauskick i förändring*, 8-9.
- ⁴⁹ Marianne Silén, 'Berthåga – hela tillvarons trädgård', *Byggindustrin*, 25 (2002): 13-5.
- ⁵⁰ [Originary in Swedish: *Urmskogen* and *Trädkyrkan*.] Silén, 'Berthåga – hela tillvarons trädgård', 13-5.
- ⁵¹ Silén, 'Berthåga – hela tillvarons trädgård', 14.
- ⁵² Howett, 'Living Landscapes for the Dead', 9-10.