This article was downloaded by: [Stockholm University Library (Stockholms Universitet)]

On: 12 May 2011

Access details: Access Details: [subscription number 926347096]

Publisher Routledge

Informa Ltd Registered in England and Wales Registered Number: 1072954 Registered office: Mortimer House, 37-41 Mortimer Street, London W1T 3JH, UK

Mortality

Publication details, including instructions for authors and subscription information:

<http://www.informaworld.com/smpp/title~content=t713437993>

Presenting the past: On archaeologists and their influence on modern burial practices

Ing-Marie Back Danielsson^a

^a Department of Archaeology and Classical Studies, Stockholm University, Stockholm, Sweden

Online publication date: 12 April 2011

To cite this Article Back Danielsson, Ing-Marie(2011) 'Presenting the past: On archaeologists and their influence on modern burial practices', *Mortality*, 16: 2, 98 — 112

To link to this Article: DOI: 10.1080/13576275.2011.560452

URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/13576275.2011.560452>

PLEASE SCROLL DOWN FOR ARTICLE

Full terms and conditions of use: <http://www.informaworld.com/terms-and-conditions-of-access.pdf>

This article may be used for research, teaching and private study purposes. Any substantial or systematic reproduction, re-distribution, re-selling, loan or sub-licensing, systematic supply or distribution in any form to anyone is expressly forbidden.

The publisher does not give any warranty express or implied or make any representation that the contents will be complete or accurate or up to date. The accuracy of any instructions, formulae and drug doses should be independently verified with primary sources. The publisher shall not be liable for any loss, actions, claims, proceedings, demand or costs or damages whatsoever or howsoever caused arising directly or indirectly in connection with or arising out of the use of this material.

Presenting the past: On archaeologists and their influence on modern burial practices

ING-MARIE BACK DANIELSSON

Department of Archaeology and Classical Studies, Stockholm University, Stockholm, Sweden

ABSTRACT *This paper demonstrates how antiquarians and archaeologists have influenced the burial practices of their times. They have encouraged the re-invention of prehistoric monuments in contemporary burial practices and also been involved in introducing the practice of modern cremation. Whereas antiquarians encouraged the upper-class stratum of society to reuse prehistoric material culture, their nineteenth century successors, archaeologists, turned to another audience. By focussing in greater detail on the earliest archaeologists and their endeavours to make archaeology a subject of public interest, it is revealed how they facilitated the re-invention of prehistoric material culture. For instance, bautas (a prehistoric memory stone for a deceased) became popular in the late nineteenth century, and it was also a category of sepulchral objects that the wealthier working class could afford. Hereby it is further shown how archaeology is an integral part of society, and not, as commonly argued within the history of archaeology, a discipline which in its interpretation of prehistory is influenced from a societal 'outside'.*

KEYWORDS: archaeology; death; cremation; material culture; burials; Sweden; bautas; Montelius; Hildebrand

Introduction

Archaeologists study remnants of human beings and their material culture. They are therefore in a unique position to see how burial practices change over centuries, or even millennia. From an archaeological point of view, one trait that seems to be essential in human burial practices is the recurring use of the past in the present. For example, already during the Viking Age (800–1050 AD), people in Scandinavia made references to, and even reused, older burial monuments for their own funerals. It is well known that the Vikings were especially fond of making connections to what we call Bronze Age monuments (e.g. Thäte, 2007). Later, in the Middle Ages, the Christian church used the sarcophagus from classical antiquity as a burial model, although more rarely in the Scandinavian countries than in Continental Europe (Ambrosiani, 1919). These monuments were reserved for the landed nobles, and were during the eleventh and twelfth centuries followed by other similar material expressions such as stone slabs with and without gables, the so-called Eskilstuna cists (e.g. Lindqvist, 1915; Wienberg, 1997), Lily stones

Correspondence: E-mail: im.back@ark.su.se

and Staff cross slabs (e.g. Nitenberg, 2009), placed outside the churches. From the thirteenth century and onwards élite burials were interred inside churches until such interments were forbidden in 1815 (Ambrosiani, 1919). From the late Middle Ages to the eighteenth century ordinary people were commonly laid to rest in churchyards, with low mounds covering the graves. At times, the tombs could be marked with humble decorations or monuments made of wood (Andréasson, 2009). Throughout this period, ancient and prehistoric references were restricted to an upper-class stratum of Swedish society.

Whereas archaeologists have been able to unravel how ancient burial practices have been influenced by even older funeral traditions, little attention has been paid to the possible influences in society of archaeologists themselves when it comes to contemporary burial practices. In fact, the history of archaeology is predominantly preoccupied with externalist thoughts and explanations, that is, recognising how social, economic, and political conditions affect interpretations of material culture and prehistory, but not the other way around (Abadía, 2010). This externalist focus disregards archaeology as an integral part of society. This paper will demonstrate how archaeologists from the start in the late nineteenth century were actively involved in, and affecting, a number of contemporary societal and political issues, where those connected to the interment and treatment of the dead body are of primary interest here.

Antiquarian research in Sweden goes as far back as to the seventeenth century, when the first regulation was passed to protect ancient monuments. Archaeology on the other hand was founded as an academic discipline in the late nineteenth century. Two Swedish scholars, Hans Hildebrand (1842–1913) and Oscar Montelius (1843–1921), are considered forefathers of the discipline. Given the sustained and repeated reuse of prehistoric and ancient themes and forms in medieval and early modern élite mortuary commemoration, what effect did these experts, and the popularising of interest in the distant human past, have on modern burial practices?

In order to answer this question, I start by giving a cursory description of the history of professional antiquarians and archaeologists. Then the prehistoric engagement vis-à-vis their own burials are presented in greater detail for some of the most prominent Director-Generals of the Swedish National Heritage Board. These individuals belonged to the male-dominated upper-class stratum of society, and could through various channels make their voices and choices heard and seen. It is only from the nineteenth century and onwards that it is possible to detect prehistoric influences in the burial monuments of ordinary people, seemingly inspired by the example and agency of these archaeological advocates.

Burying, and excavating, antiquaries and archaeologists

Antiquarian research has a long history in Sweden. The predecessor to the present-day Swedish National Heritage Board was founded in the beginning of the seventeenth century and King Gustav II Adolf (1594–1632) installed the first Director-General (*‘Riksantikvarie’* in Swedish) in 1630. With the exception of a

few legislations from the Vatican, Sweden has the oldest regulation protecting ancient monuments in Europe. The legislation from 1666, 'Placat och Påbudh om Gamle Monumenter och Antiquiteter', declares that ancient monuments and antiquities should be mapped out, protected, and preferably also researched. This legislation must be contextualised. For one thing, during the seventeenth century in Sweden, and indeed Europe, ancient monuments were topics of discussions since they were connected to current scientific interests (Jensen, 1999, 2002, 2006; Trigger, 2006). For another, the seventeenth century was Sweden's period as a great political and military power and this century also saw the birth of the State administration. This new and expanded nation/state needed to (re)create or (re)produce its history and prehistory. The strive to find powerful and glorious monuments and antiquities (expressed through the legislation and the appointment of Director-Generals) was a way of boosting Sweden's past and thereby further increasing its perceived importance in the present.

The endeavour to create a glorious past cannot be underestimated. Olof Rudbeck the Elder (1630–1702) went to such extremes as to make 'corrections' in the world famous book *Codex Argenteus*, the Silver Bible, from the sixth century (Johansson, 1955). Thereby he could claim that Jesus had visited the ancient temple of Uppsala, Sweden, regarding it as the cradle of Western civilisation. During Sweden's period as a great power, the nobility developed more ostentatious rituals surrounding their burials. For instance, crypts or burial vaults in churches, their design alluding to earlier Romanesque crypts, were built to harbour the aristocratic dead. These practices came to serve as a model for the nobility in large parts of northern Europe (Beijer, 1993). While the nobility introduced the lavish crypt burials, this custom was picked up by the Swedish bourgeoisie a few decades later (Beijer, 1993). Here we have an example of 'gesunkenes kulturgut', a cultural behaviour from a higher social stratum that spreads to other, lower social groups. This concept was developed by Hans Naumann (1921). Although this argument fails to accommodate hybridisation processes between classes (e.g. Bhabha, 1994), this concept serves to explain how burial practices of wealthy people, the bourgeoisie or landed nobility, have spread to lower social groups. This is especially relevant when it comes to monuments employing prehistoric forms and designs.

Director-General Olof Verelius

Olof Verelius (1618–1682) was a runologist, historian, antiquarian and linguistic researcher who was appointed Director-General between the years 1666 and 1675. In preparation for his death, Verelius had given very specific instructions for his own burial (Hägg, 1886). He wanted to be buried in a crypt, like many of his nobility friends and colleagues. However, the crypt was not to be placed inside a church, but on a piece of land he had acquired six years prior to his death. This piece of land had functioned as a churchyard since the mid 1600s, but only for poor and sick people (Ridderstedt, 2001). In his will, Verelius donated money to build a wall around the churchyard. A small mound (similar to Late Iron Age

mounds) covered his crypt (Figure 1). It is known that Verelius excavated at least one ancient burial mound during his lifetime. This excavation was implemented to find out whether bodies were always cremated during heathen times, or if bodies also could be inhumed. To his satisfaction the excavated burial mound, located close to the Broby manor in Ullåker hundred, contained both burnt and unburnt bones (Jensen, 1999). A few years after Verelius' death, his apprentice, the well-known Olof Rudbeck, put a replica rune-stone on top of Verelius' grave. Thereby Verelius' connection to ancient great men, mentioned on rune-stones, and Swedish prehistory was materialised, as was Rudbeck's connection to both his great master and prehistory.

Although it was not common for graves to reference Swedish ancient burial practices at this point of time, in his work as Director-General, and indeed through his own interment, Verelius can be said to introduce a number of ancient traits later used in burials. One example is especially pertinent in this context. In 1664 Verelius published a Swedish translation of the Icelandic 'Götrik and Rolfs saga' and in this the word 'bauta stone' is used for the first time in Sweden. The introduction served as a high status mark to show the old age of the Swedish language. The use of the concept 'bauta stone' spread slowly and the word was not established until 1790. At this point of time, 'bauta stone' was found as an entry in a Swedish dictionary, and was thereafter increasingly used, though with some variations through time (Haugen, 2007). Importantly, 'bauta stones', or bautas, came to be materially re-invented as sepulchral monuments in churchyards during the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, at the very time when research and interpretations of archaeology became publically known in Sweden (see below, section "Bautas and other monuments of stone"). Of course, a number of factors are decisive for why certain burial monuments and practices are used and become

Figure 1. The grave of Director-General Olof Verelius (1618–1682) whose mound was decorated with a newly made rune stone, reminding of the passion Verelius had for runes and ancient monuments. The rune stone replica was placed on its top some 16 years after his death by his devoted apprentice Olof Rudbeck. Photo: Howard Williams.

popular at certain moments in time. However, a long-term perspective enables insights otherwise not within reach and this study suggests that it was the impact of antiquarian research that facilitated the reuse of ancient material culture.

The neoclassical period for Sweden's part started in the 1780s (Beijer, 1993). Wealthy neoclassic burials give ample references to ancient monuments in the form of, for instance, obelisks, pyramids, columns and stelae. Architect Jean Eric Rehn (1717–1793) created a number of monuments with (neo)classical references such as pyramids and obelisks. It must be pointed out that elements typical for Swedish ancient times, such as the mound, were also integrated into these monuments (Figure 2). An example of this form can be seen on the island of Lovö, close to the royal castle Drottningholm. Here Rehn designed a walled grave for Crown Prince Gustav's counsellors Olof von Dahlin (1708–1763) and Samuel Klingenstierna (1698–1765). The monument on top of the mound consisted of a 4.5 metre slender obelisk crowned by a golden five-pointed star. Queen Lovisa Ulrika (1720–1782) herself participated in the burial ceremony, and linguistic researcher Erik af Sotberg (1724–1781) gave an address, later published, where he declared that the mound was in fact a family mound. Thus not only was the burial built to look like an impressive mound reminiscent of older, heathen mounds, it was also specifically spoken of as a family mound [ättehög]. Already at this time it was known, through medieval laws and sagas, that the family [ätt] had been a structuring principle in prehistoric society regulating for instance inheritance of land. A family mound was also a concept traditionally used to refer to prehistoric burial mounds encountered by antiquaries in the Swedish landscape. Dahlin and

Figure 2. The burial monument of von Dahlin and Klingenstierna at Lovö. Source: The Antiquarian Topographical Archive, ATA.

Klingenstierna were further described as having been *put in a mound* [lagd i hög], an expression known from medieval written sources referring to the burial of ancient kings and heroes. Through the grandiose burial of the counsellors, the present was linked to a glorious and re-created past. The choice of words not only demonstrated the old age of the Swedish language but also how the royal lineage stretched far back in time.

The two examples described above are not singular incidents of the reuse of past mortuary monuments. Architect Rehn came to use the burial mound for other prominent people as well, and the mound [ättehög] came to be used increasingly for wealthier people throughout the nineteenth century (Beijer, 1993).

The Director-Generals of the nineteenth and early twentieth century were not called antiquarians but archaeologists, since archaeology had been accepted as an academic discipline in the late nineteenth century. Two archaeologists have been recognised world-wide as the forefathers of the discipline: Hans Hildebrand and Oscar Montelius. Both scholars were actively engaged in the cultural liberal movement, and were as such involved in number of current societal and political issues, for instance the rights of women to vote (Baudou, 2006, 2010; Malmer, 1994). Another agenda was, in the spirit of democracy, to make archaeology a matter of public interest. This was accomplished through popular public lectures, courses and not least through popular science articles in journals and newspapers. One of Montelius' central arguments for archaeology to be publically known was its unique position to mediate knowledge on ancient people's everyday life, burial practices and beliefs, as well as the advances of culture in Sweden (Baudou, 2010). Hildebrand's and Montelius' views on the treatment of the dead body (including their own) in current society was likewise informed by their profession.

Director-General Hans Hildebrand

Hans Hildebrand (1842–1913) is buried together with his wife Elin (1845–1922) at Solna churchyard, to the north of Stockholm. The name of him and his wife, as well as their years of birth and death, can be found on a cross-shaped stone, which also carries the inscription 'In excelsis', taken from the start of the 'Gloria' in the Mass (Figure 3). Hildebrand's main engagement in current burial practices can be found in his daily life and work. He was engaged in the introduction of cremation in Sweden. In his position as Director General (1879–1907) of The Swedish National Heritage Board and as a member of The Swedish Academy, he was one of the initiators of the Swedish Association for Cremating Corpses (Ekström, 2007). This association attracted a number of prominent scholars, engineers, doctors, officers, factory owners, and scientists such as Gustaf Retzius and Alfred Nobel (Åhrén, 1994). In fact, Alfred Nobel felt such a passion for cremation that, in one early version of his will, he made a generous donation to the cremation movement (Ekström, 2007).

Modern cremations were introduced in Europe during the second half of the nineteenth century (e.g. Åhrén, 1994; Davis & Mates, 2005). The first modern cremation in Sweden took place in Hagalund, Stockholm, in 1887 and without a

Figure 3. The grave of Elin och Hans Hildebrand at Solna churchyard. Source: Wikipedia commons.

permission of the Swedish government (Ekström, 2007). Although the Swedish church was heavily opposed to cremation (Enström, 1964), cremation became legal only a year later, in 1888. Despite its legalised status, in order to be cremated it was required that the deceased went through an autopsy. Moreover, the deceased had to express her or his wish to be cremated in writing. Finally, in each and every separate case, a permit had to be issued from the Swedish government (Ekström, 2007, pp. 27–28). The autopsy demand was abolished in 1917. The practice of modern cremation was primarily of interest to the Swedish bourgeoisie, of which archaeologists were part, but gained a foothold within the working classes in the 1930s (Åhrén-Snickare, 2002). Its popularity has steadily grown and in Sweden today more than 70% of the contemporary dead are cremated. In larger cities where most crematoria are located, about 80–90% of the population chooses cremation (Ekström, 2007).

There are a number of reasons why cremation appealed to the European societies in the nineteenth century. These include the hygiene factor, the aesthetics of cremation, and the invention of the technique to cremate human bodies in a more effective way (Åhrén, 1994; see also Åhrén Snickare, 2002; Davis & Mates, 2005; Ekström, 2007; Enström, 1964; Johnsson, 1964; Övdén, 1932; Sørensen & Bille, 2008). However, an often-overlooked incentive for the introduction of modern cremation practices is what can be called the

‘archaeological’ reason. Not only were archaeologists actively involved in the cremation movement, but prehistoric cremation practices described by archaeologists were also used as fundamental arguments for the introduction of modern cremation practices.

The Swedish Association for Cremating Corpses published yearly a newsletter, *Meddelanden* [Announcements] where detailed arguments for cremation were presented, members of the association were listed, and thorough bibliographies on the topic of cremation during the last 400–500 years were made available. Poems and songs in praise of cremation were also printed. Crucially, in the *Meddelanden*, archaeological sites are also used as arguments for the introduction of cremation. For instance, it is maintained that the Black Earth of Birka is nothing less than the cinders of thousands of funeral pyres (*Meddelanden*, 1883). Equally, Hans Hildebrand’s book *Folkens tro om sina döda* [Peoples’ Ideas about their Dead] published in 1874 was frequently used as an argument for the ancient precedent of cremation and the re-introduction of cremation practices in Sweden. In the book, he uses arguments from Jacob Grimm (1849), who expressed thoughts on the superiority of peoples who practice cremation and, more specifically, the superiority of the Germanic people (Åhrén, 1994). The most appealing reason for cremation, according to Hildebrand, can be found among the anthropogenic myths of the ancient Greeks and Romans as well as in Norse literature. These myths relate to how human beings were created in connection with the birth of fire. Fire and people thus have the same origin ‘... and through cremation, when fire touches the body, a re-union is made possible; the soul and the visible fire are joined together and may rise to heaven, to their place of origin’ (Hildebrand, 1874, p. 118, my translation).

Although Hildebrand advocated cremation, he and his wife were both interred inhumed in coffins upon their deaths (in 1913 and 1922, respectively). In view of his commitment to the cremation movement this may seem odd. However, it must be remembered that a deceased person does not bury him-/herself, others do. Cremation was not a common practice at this time, and given the religious interest of some of Hildebrand’s relatives, and remembering the opposition of the Swedish church towards cremation, inhumation was perhaps considered the best alternative.

Oscar Montelius was the successor of Director-General Hans Hildebrand. Almost of the same age, he seemingly did not share Hildebrand’s interest in the contemporary debates on cremation practices, although he and his wife did partake in debates on a variety of current topics such as the emancipation of women. They chose cremation nonetheless, and the way the Montelius’ sepulchral monument was constructed is of great importance in this context.

Director-General Oscar Montelius

Oscar Montelius lived between the years 1843–1921. He worked closely with his wife Agda (1850–1920), who accompanied her husband on his many working journeys and made several drawings of archaeological objects. At times she also

acted as editor in Oscar's place (Bokholm, 2001; Malmer, 1994). She died in the autumn of 1920, and Oscar died almost to the day one year later. Hanna Rydh (1937), professor in archaeology, described the last journey of Oscar as a radiant celebration. She claims that the sun was his symbol since he had often written and spoken about the sun wheel. Consequently his coffin was decorated with flowers in the shape of such a symbol. Ten years after his death his ashes, together with those of his wife, were deposited within a monumental grave designed by the architect Harald Wadsjö (1883–1945) (Figure 4). Wadsjö had for decades been involved in reforming Swedish churchyards, and was also frequently hired as an architect to make changes or renovations to churches (see below). For Montelius, he chose to make a Stone Age dolmen, with a stone slab door ornamented in the same style as the Late Iron Age Gotlandic Picture Stones. The Royal Swedish Academy of Letters, History and Antiquities and the Society for Charity Arranging [Föreningen för välgörenhetens ordnande] organised the event of the re-burial. Agda was the Society's chairman and director for a number of years. In addition to close relatives, the Crown Prince, high officials and different institutional representatives were also present at the occasion (Bokholm, 2001). The then-Director-General Sigurd Curman described the grandeur of the event: the Viking ship on the entrance door to the dolmen was the very ship that Oscar and Agda were sailing in to unknown territories. He also contended that the monument would make future generations remember the deceased chief and his achievements, thus missing out on the archaeological work made by Agda (Bokholm, 2001). Despite the fact that both Agda and Oscar were interred in the monument (and later in 1948 Agda's relative Agda Christina Reuterskiöld) only Oscar's name is written on door.

Figure 4. The impressive burial monument of Agda and Oscar Montelius, designed by the architect Harald Wadsjö. The monument only carries Oscar's name on the entrance door which carries allusions to, or copies, Gotlandic picture stones from the Late Iron Age (550–1050 AD). The grave is supposed to look like a Stone-Age dolmen, thus amalgamating different time archaeological time periods. The monument is found on what August Strindberg called the Vanity Fair, that is the Lindhagen hill of North Burial Ground. Source: The Antiquarian Topographical Archive, ATA.

North burial ground

Agda's and Oscar's grave can be found at the North Burial Ground [Norra begravningsplatsen] in Stockholm, a piece of land belonging to the royal farm Karlberg. The land was donated for the establishment of a new public churchyard in 1815, the same year as burials inside churchyards were forbidden. The burial ground has since been expanded and adjusted to the needs of the growing capital, Stockholm, especially during the 1860s and 1870s. A number of famous people have been buried here, and this was also where the first crematorium of the Nordic countries was built in 1887.

The Montelius' monument was built on Lindhagen's Hill, a part of the cemetery with magnificent mausolea and other spectacular monuments named after the politician and city planner Albert Lindhagen (1823–1907). Lindhagen's Hill was shunned by author August Strindberg (1849–1912) who described it as a Vanity Fair where he certainly did not want to be buried (Björnberg, 1998). The monuments of Lindhagen's Hill have a number of references to ancient times. There are numerous mausolea, at times enhanced with additional references to prehistory, such as the medieval relic shrine on top of the grave of professor and architect Helgo Zetterwall (1831–1907).

Up till now, my focus has been on the burial practices and burial monuments of a few, wealthy people. In this last part of the paper I will briefly discuss how prehistoric references in burial circumstances were reflected in more ordinary burial contexts in churchyards. It must be emphasised that by ordinary I do not mean poor people but a working class stratum of society which includes, for instance, farmers, tailors, teachers, and skippers. Presumably, these were the people that Hildebrand, and especially Montelius, reached through their numerous public seminars throughout Sweden as well as their popular scientific articles in newspapers and journals (Figure 5).

Bautas and other monuments of stone

During the first part of the nineteenth century most burial monuments in churchyards were made of wood (Andréasson, 2009). The prohibition of burials inside churches in 1815 saw the emergence of other, larger and more costly, monuments, often made of stone, in the churchyards. Similarly, ideas connected to the Enlightenment and Romanticism contributed to an increased interest, not only in burial monuments, but also in the architecture of the churchyards themselves. Equally important for the increase in burial monuments made of stone was the industrialisation of local stone quarrying commerce in the late nineteenth century (Andréasson, 2009). The nineteenth and early twentieth centuries show great varieties in the styles of sepulchral monuments in churchyards. They were made, for instance, in New Gothic Style, or in Jugend/Art Nouveau Style, and were sometimes constructed as broken columns, as stones with broken tops, as obelisks and, importantly, as the bautas, discussed above. The bautas were stones that

Figure 5. Oscar Montelius in the summer of 1907 at the National Historical Museum standing in front of a Stone Age dolmen, similar to the one he was later to be interred in. The photo is taken from a summer study course he held for the public, presumably informing them on prehistoric burial practices, cultural advancements in Sweden and Stone Age finds. Source: The Antiquarian Topographical Archive [ATA], The National Heritage Board [Riksantikvarieämbetet].

commonly were crudely chopped on all sides but one, the front side, which was cut and polished. Inspiration for these stones was found, again, in prehistory. Accordingly, some of the bautas were adorned with rune stone loops, thus perhaps unintentionally but neatly connecting not only to the ideas of the Swedish ancient grandeur as invented/researched by Verelius, but indeed also to Verelius' own burial. Both Montelius and Hildebrand wrote several scientific articles discussing bautas as prehistoric monuments, and their knowledge was made publically known on a number of occasions.

In the 1920s there were protests and a growing criticism against the variation in sepulchral monuments in churchyards, and especially the bautas were considered inappropriate. In particular architect Harald Wadsjö, who designed the monument for (the ashes of) Agda and Oscar Montelius, was opposed to the use of bautas. As an architect he considered the smaller churchyards, and the blocks within larger churchyards, as rooms. These 'rooms' were equipped with furniture where the burial monuments constituted the 'furniture' (Wadsjö, 1930). This meant that the bautas were furniture with only one presentable side. The unpolished, rough sides were frequently disguised by trees, leading to churchyards perceived to lack serenity and harmony. Consequently the totality of the churchyards needed to be considered, and there was a wish for harmony through symmetry (Andréasson, 2009). Nonetheless, despite the shunning of the prehistorically-oriented bautas, inspiration for the new burial monuments was once again sought from classicist ideals and prehistory. The desire to create new, agreeable churchyards involved not only architects but also a number of district associations, making it a popular national movement. As a result, in the late

1920s, Skansen, the first open air museum in the world, presented a variety of newly-designed sepulchral monuments that were considered proper and correct for a harmonious churchyard. The exhibition was later published to serve as inspiration for churchyard administrative bodies and monumental masonry industries. From the abundant photos in this publication (Wadsjö, 1930) it is clear that not all models became popular.

Not until the beginning of the 1990s did the laws regulating sepulchral monuments become more liberal in Sweden (Gustavsson, 2003). This immediately resulted in more individually and personally designed burial monuments. The hobby of the deceased may be illustrated on the stone, or the monument could be equipped with objects on top, or next to, the stone (Gustavsson, 2003). Seemingly, there is an increased need to express self-fulfilment and individuality today in churchyards. The same development has been observed in newspaper obituaries (Dahlgren, 2000, 2005). There is also an increased number of requests to authorities to deposit the ashes of deceased persons in places other than in memory groves (Levander, 2009). A memory grove is a separate space within a churchyard where the ashes of deceased may be spread or put in an urn and placed underground. The spreading of the ashes is done without the presence of relatives, and as such the memory grove is an anonymous and collective burial practice. It is not uncommon for memory groves to have prehistoric allusions, and in Sweden a new form of memory grove seemingly embraces this tendency to a greater extent. This new form of burials can be described as a mixture between anonymous memory groves, ordinary burial grounds (Johnsson, 2006) and the possibility of making individuals more visible. In Swedish it is called 'askgravlund', which may be translated to a grove with ash burials. Such a grove contains the ashes of deceased persons, which are distributed within a certain area, but where a small memory plaque of metal with the name of the deceased can be found nearby. The memory plaque may, for instance, be placed on a newly created monument, that sometimes has prehistoric references. Bronze Age or Viking Age ship burials are examples of such reinvention of material culture (Williams, 2011). The growth in number of the 'askgravlunds' is unique in the sense that the groves are not defined in the judicial sense, although they are organised and formal (Johnsson, 2006). A great variety can be recorded for these groves throughout Sweden regarding their designs and cultural expressions. These practices have recently been investigated on a state level (SOU, 2009: 79), with suggestions on how this current burial practice should be judicially regulated through precise and thorough definitions. However, it will take additional time before any regulative legislation can be passed.

Conclusion

A number of social, cultural, and other current factors are decisive for how burial monuments and churchyards are constructed. In the case of Crown-Prince Gustav's informants von Dahlin and Klingenstierna, the Lovö monument was built some time after their respective deaths. Apart from the prehistoric staging of

material culture itself, their funeral was impregnated with prehistoric references through choice of words, songs, and other rituals. The participation of Queen Lovisa Ulrika naturally also gave weight to the occasion. In a similar vein, the Montelius' monument was constructed some 10 years after the couple's death and the re-deposition of the ashes in a Stone Age/Late Iron Age amalgamation monument gathered a number of prominent guests. This puts emphasis on the fact that deaths become arenas for various cultural and political statements that may or may not be immediately linked to the deceased's own interests and wishes.

In this paper I have primarily discussed the roles of archaeologists and their antiquarian predecessors. It is suggested that they have influenced burials in Sweden two ways. On the one hand, as part of an upper-class stratum of society, they have encouraged the re-invention of prehistoric monuments in contemporary burial practices. On the other, archaeologists have been involved in introducing the practice of cremation. It must be emphasised that this influence is not only due to the fact that the advocates were antiquarians, and later archaeologists, but rather that these professionals throughout the seventeenth, eighteenth, nineteenth, and early twentieth century have belonged to the bourgeoisie or upper-class stratum of society. They were interested in ancient monuments for various reasons, and they also had the education and wealth to pursue their activities.

Not until the nineteenth/twentieth centuries and onwards is it possible to detect burial monuments with prehistoric references for ordinary people. This should perhaps be seen as a result of an increased possibility for individualistic expressions. Equally, the more general establishing phase of cremation practices coincided with the democratic breakthrough of the inter-war years, when values previously connected with the nineteenth century bourgeoisie also could be embraced by more ordinary people in society (Åhrén-Snickare, 2002). However, another decisive factor for this change, it is argued in this paper, is the emergence of archaeology as an academic discipline. The earliest archaeologists were part of a cultural liberal movement where the subject of archaeology was made a matter of public interest. Hereby Swedish prehistory and ancient burial practices came to be publically known. Further, through their profession, general engagement in societal issues and through their own deaths archaeologists came to be both agents and participants in the reuse of prehistoric material culture. Hence, while it is commonly recognised within the history of archaeology that archaeological interpretations are flavoured and influenced by contemporary political interests and ideals from 'outside' the academic sphere, this study emphasises the reverse: how archaeology is an active and opinionated voice *within* society with a clear desire to inform, and in extension affect, the everyday person's life and death.

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank the two anonymous referees as well as my colleagues Fredrik Fahlander and Marta Lindeberg for their most valuable comments on an earlier version of this paper. I am also grateful to Patrik Nordström for information on Montelius' grave. I am further heavily indebted to Howard Williams for his most

valuable comments on this paper, and I would also like to thank him for inspiration, enthusiasm, and for inviting me to write in this issue. Without Milton and Per, this work would not have been done.

REFERENCES

- ABADIA, O.M. (2010). Beyond externalism. Exploring new directions in the history of archaeology. *Archaeological Dialogues*, 17(2), 215–236.
- ÅHRÉN, E. (1994). *Renande lågor: Den svenska eldbegängelserörelsens framväxt under 1800-talets sista decennier*. Stockholm: Stockholm University.
- ÅHRÉN-SNICKARE, E. (2002). *Döden, kroppen och moderniteten*. Stockholm: Stockholm University.
- AMBROSIANI, S. (1919). Kulturhistorisk inledning. In H. WADJÖ (Ed.), *Kyrkogårdskonst* (pp. 11–41). Stockholm: AB Svenska Teknologförenings Förlag.
- ANDRÉASSON, A. (2009). Historia i sten – historisk arkeologi bland svenska gravstenar. *Sten*, 2, 18–22.
- BAUDOU, E. (2006). Det arkeologiska året 1906. Oscar Almgren, Oscar Montelius och Fornvännen. *Fornvännen*, 101, 75–84.
- BAUDOU, E. (2010). Arkeologins socialisering och de första föreläsningarna vid Stockholms högskola. *Fornvännen*, 105, 30–42.
- BEIJER, Å. (1993). *Gravmonument i Sverige 1800–1850*. Stockholm: Stockholm University.
- BHABHA, H. (1994). *The location of culture*. London: Routledge.
- BJÖRNBERG, K.-A. (1998). *Kungliga och Norra begravningsplatserna. Vandringar bland berömda personers gravar*. Stockholm: Per Bäckström Förlag.
- BOKHOLM, S. (2001). *En kvinnoröst i manssamhället. Agda Montelius 1850–1920*. Stockholm: Stockholmia förlag.
- DAHLGREN, C. (2000). *När döden skiljer oss åt: anonymitet och individualisering i dödsannonser 1945–1999*. Lund: Lund University.
- DAHLGREN, C. (2005). Dödsannonsers symbolspråk. *Småländska kulturbilder*, 63–75.
- DAVIS, D.J., & MATES, L.H. (Eds.). (2005). *Encyclopedia of cremation*. Aldershot: Ashgate.
- EKSTRÖM, S. (2007). *Från pionjär för eldbegängelse till modern branschorganisation: Sveriges Kyrkogårds- och Krematorieförbund*. Stockholm: Sveriges kyrkogårds- och krematorieförbund.
- ENSTRÖM, B. (1964). *Kyrkan och Eldbegängelserörelsen i Sverige 1882–1962*. Lund: Berling.
- GRIMM, J. (1849). *Ueber das Verbrennen der Leichen*. Berlin.
- GUSTAVSSON, A. (2003). *Gravstenar i Norge och Sverige som symboler för känslor, tankar och idéer i vår egen tid: en tilltagande individualitet under 1990-talet?* Oslo: Novus.
- HÄGG, S.A. (1886). *Beskrifning öfver Upsala kyrkogård och dess på olika tider tillkomna områden*. Uppsala.
- HAUGEN, S. (2007). *Från bautasten till bautastor. Studier över fornvästnordiska bautasteinn och svenska ord bildade med bauta(-)*. Umeå: Umeå University.
- HILDEBRAND, H. (1874). *Folkens tro om sina döda*. Stockholm: Klemmings antiq.
- JENSEN, O. (1999). *Historiska forntider. En arkeologihistorisk studie över 1000–1600-talens idéer om forntid och antikviteter*. Göteborg: Göteborg University.
- JENSEN, O. (2002). *Forntid i historien: en arkeologihistorisk studie av synen på forntid och forntida lämningar, från medeltiden till och med förupplysningen*. Göteborg: Göteborg University.
- JENSEN, O. (2006). *Fornlämningsbegreppets historia: en exposé över 400 år*. Stockholm: Riksantikvarieämbetet.
- JOHANSSON, J.V. (1955). Om Codex Argenteus - Kring ett hundraårsminne. *Ord och Bild*, 64, 173–191.
- JOHNSSON, C. (2006). *Askgravlund – ett nytt gravskick*. Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences: Faculty of Landscape Planning, Horticulture and Agricultural Science.
- JOHNSSON, U.G. (1964). De första svenska krematorierna och deras förutsättningar. *Konsthistorisk Tidskrift*, 3–4, 117–126.
- LEVANDER, V. (2009, January 12). *Allt fler kommer att vilja välja plats för askspridning* [Radio broadcast]. Linköping: Sveriges Radio Östergötland. Retrieved from <http://www.sr.se/ostergotland/nyheter/artikel.asp?artikel=2560930>
- LINDQVIST, S. (1915). *Den helige Eskils biskopsdöme*. Stockholm.

- MALMER, M.P. (1994). Oscar Montelius 150 år. *Fornvännen*, 89, 23–27.
- Meddelanden från Svenska LikbränningsFöreningen. (1883). Stockholm: Svenska LikbränningsFöreningen.
- NAUMANN, H. (1921). *Primitive Gemeinschaftskultur. Beiträge zur Volkskunde und Mythologie*. Jena.
- NITENBERG, A. (2009). *Liljestenar och stavkorshällar. Kulturmöten och social praktik i tidig medeltid*. Göteborg: Göteborg University.
- ÖVDÉN, O. (1932). *Eldbegängelsens historia i Sverige: Fem årtionden svensk eldbegängelserörelse 1882–1932*. Stockholm: Seelig.
- RIDDERSTEDT, L. (2001). *En levande kyrkogård. Vandringar på den gamla kyrkogården i Uppsala*. Uppsala: Hallgren & Fallgren.
- RYDH, H. (1937). *Oscar Montelius. En vägrödjare genom årtusenden*. Stockholm: Åhlén & Söners Förlag.
- SØRENSEN, T.F., & BILLE, M. (2008). Flames of transformation: the role of fire in cremation practices. *World Archaeology*, 40(2), 253–267.
- SOU. 2009: 79. *Några begravningsfrågor. Betänkande av begravningsutredningen*. Stockholm: Fritze.
- THÄTE, E. (2007). *Monuments and minds: Monument re-use in Scandinavia in the second half of the First Millennium AD*. Lund: Wallin & Dalholm.
- TRIGGER, B. (2006). *A history of archaeological thought*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- WADSJÖ, H. (1930). *Gravkonst*. Lund: Samfundet för hembygdsvård förlag.
- WIENBERG, J. (1997). Eskilstunamonumenter i Västergötland. *Fornvännen*, 92, 195–201.
- WILLIAMS, H. (2011). Cremation and present pasts: A contemporary archaeology of Swedish memory groves. *Mortality*, 16, 113–130.

Biographical Note

Ing-Marie Back Danielsson received her PhD in archaeology from Stockholm University in 2007. Her research interests include archaeologies of contemporary death, the history of archaeology and archaeological approaches to sex, gender and corporealities in the past, specifically in Late Iron Age Scandinavia (ca 550–1050 AD). Recent publications have focused on memory and materiality discussed through Late Iron Age boat-graves, figurines and masking practices. She is co-editor of *To Tender Gender – The Pasts and Futures of Gender Research in Archaeology* (in print) and *On the Threshold – Burial Archaeology in the 21st century* (2009). Currently, she works as a post doctoral researcher at the Department of Archaeology and Classical Studies, Stockholm University, with the project *Ways of Being, Ways of Dying. Staging different personas in Late Iron Age contexts in Middle Sweden*.