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1 Introduction

The present contribution to *Grief, Identity, and the Arts* extends the discussion beyond the limited realm of art in a hard-to-define “high-brow” sense, which views artistic production as "l'art pour l'art" or as the bringing-into-existence of artifacts which are ideally devoid of an ulterior practical function but achieve the ultimate expression of what it means to be human. Of course, such characterizations are open to many vectors of attack, not least by pointing out the social and economic realities of the arts “market.” However, for our present purposes such an understanding of art may serve usefully as contrast against which to position the funerary arts; that is to say all the “arts” that come into play in the design and adornment of cemeteries as well as the rituals taking place in them. The concept of “funerary arts” thus understood (that is, including vernacular art) has a far more mundane, democratic, and pedestrian ring to it, akin to concepts such as artisan, crafts- and workmanship, and handiwork; however, even though the latter concepts do not feature prominently in the aestheticizing, elitist sense of “the arts,” they are still part of it, through a long history of art as is rooted in workmanship and the like. In this sense, we expect that the following inquiry provides motifs and categories that are applicable beyond the field of cemeteries.

The question addressed in this chapter arises from the simple observation that there are many visible and invisible borders in a cemetery: in the instructions to build a new cemetery, there are typically specifications of the outer

---


2 Most apt is Richard Anderson’s definition of art as “culturally significant meaning, skilfully encoded in an affecting, sensuous medium” (cited in Cynthia Freeland, *But Is It Art? An Introduction to Art Theory* (Oxford: 2002), 77).
perimeter; much energy is spent on defining the type of spatial segregator—a fence, wall, hedge or ditch—that should cordon off the place of the dead from those of the living. However, specifications often go beyond that and include instructions for the inner arrangement of the cemetery. And even if such separation of different fields, plots, or rows are absent at the time of original planning of the cemetery, they easily arise later on: for instance, deciding to separate the later addition of a Muslim section from the rest of the cemetery, or to bring a children’s section into smaller, more intimate, and emotionally manageable proportions. Sometimes, again, such borders are torn down along the course of the biography of a cemetery, but still the borders have left their mark: for instance, in the spatial orientation of an ensemble of grave monuments, which is only logical in realizing that a long-disappeared border influenced their design and placement. Another example is the frisson of a visitor, who avoids a certain section in a cemetery, because in a long-forgotten past it was the place for the excluded and consequently may possibly be haunted. The spatial orientation and design of grave markers is usually undertaken with such visible and invisible borders in mind. Grave markers can variably underscore, mitigate, controvert, or undermine the social order that is suggested by such borders. Grave markers conduct, as it were, a dialogue which reveals deceased’s place in society.

In short, the cemetery is more than an undifferentiated place to lay the dead to rest; it is a place of far-reaching social, religious, political, and cultural differentiation. In order for such differentiation to “materialize,” two counteracting tendencies must be in place: exclusion and inclusion, to identify individuals as belonging to specific groups, and at the same time to separate those groups as different. In this chapter we trace the function of the funerary arts as exclusionary and inclusionary. “Exclusionary” and “inclusionary” should not be understood in the truncated sense of the sociological lexicon. Indeed, sociologists tend to define “exclusion” (and its antonym “inclusion”) primarily as connected to advantages and disadvantages, and thus as highly significant at a normative moral and political level. Anthony Giddens, for instance, defines social exclusion as “[t]he outcome of multiple deprivations which prevent individuals or groups from participating fully in the economic, social and political life of the society in which they are located.” However, this is only one facet of the meaning of inclusion and exclusion. According to the New

---

*Shorter Oxford English Dictionary*, the verb “include” signifies, in a meaning going back to the mid-16th century, inter alia to “[p]lace in a class or category; treat or regard as part of a whole; allow to share in a right, privilege, or activity.” Here, the first two definitions are related to membership in a group or set, and only the last one is related to the normative and political issues around the advantages of membership in a group. This broader definition of inclusion and exclusion makes perfect sense: the formation of groups is a fact of life. The identity and existence of a group depends on drawing boundaries, on differentiating between those inside (inclusion) and outside (exclusion) of the group. As such, processes of inclusion and exclusion are no less than necessary elements of our “world-making.” The acts of including and excluding can—but need not—be connected with advantages or disadvantages, discrimination, and so forth in the economic and political realm, but it is important to realize that the connection—even if it is a frequent one—is not necessary.

To study the inclusionary and exclusionary functions of the funerary arts is a timely exercise: not only is our age characterized by mass migration, but also by fervent discussions around “multiculturalism” in which the boundaries between, and representation of, groups is a key concern. This has knock-on effects for the funerary arts. Reiner Sörries has argued that after 200 years, the dominance of the model of a collective, universal cemetery which was the result of the Enlightenment is coming to an end. Its position is eroded by new forms of non-cemetery based funerary arrangements such as ash dispersals but also, and crucially, by new forms of group-affirmation on existing cemeteries: dedicated arrangements for groups identified by specific spiritualities and world-views, ranging from neo-Paganism to supporters of specific soccer teams; by sexual orientation or even for the sake of emphasizing the centrality of the Christian faith to the lives of a church community in the midst of secular society.5

Our case study is the municipal cemetery on Tongerseweg, Maastricht, the capital of the southernmost province of the Netherlands which has historically been predominantly Roman Catholic. This cemetery is of particular historical value and has been called, admittedly with some exaggeration, the “Père Lachaise” of the Netherlands. Whatever the status of the Maastricht dead compared to their Parisian counterparts, there are quite a few similarities between the two cemeteries; this includes the strong vertical orientation of grave markers, a number of grave “houses” that are so characteristic of Père Lachaise, and likewise the inscriptions are frequently in French. All this betrays the historical

provenance of the cemetery. It was planned and realized in the early 19th century under French occupation, in the name of public health and societal reform.6

The cemetery was planned and presented itself as a “civic” or “universal” cemetery that catered to all groups in society. One might, therefore, expect Tongerseweg to be a modern cemetery, i.e., a cemetery in line with French Enlightenment ideology. One might also expect the cemetery to achieve a certain sense of inclusivity by way of a far-reaching visual uniformity, thus being ostensibly oblivious to any specific religious and world-view leanings, or by demoting specific ritual provisions as optional. However, taken in this sense, Tongerseweg was never a modern cemetery. High hedges and walls cordoned off the graves of citizens who deviated from the Roman Catholic mainstream. Some of the hedges were cut down in the 1960s (more on that later), but we can get a sense of the (now invisible) separations from features still evidenced.

In what follows, we first present a brief overview of the cemetery’s biography by looking at five exemplary graves (Figure 2.1). We then analyze the interplay of inclusion and exclusion, and finally draw out the lessons to be learned for a wider range of funerary art.

2 Tongerseweg Cemetery: A Biography

Tongerseweg Cemetery was planned and realized in the early 19th century under French occupation, in the name of public health and societal reform.7 The decision to build a general cemetery to the west of the crowded medieval town center of Maastricht was made in 1805. The cemetery was meant to replace several cemeteries run by several religious communities in the old town center and was to cater to the dead of different religions and social echelons. It was consecrated in 1812.

---

Tongerseweg Cemetery was planned as a “municipal” cemetery to serve all groups in society. This did not mean, however, that the cemetery was oblivious to the specific religious leanings of the people to be buried. In line with the French, and thus intensely Roman Catholic Enlightenment ideology, the specific religious identity of the dead was discernible by their placement in the cemetery. A French law decreed on 12 June 1804 ordered that in cases where a community had only one cemetery, sections for the different “cults” should be cordoned off by means of “walls, hedges or trenches.” In effect, this law ordered the manifestation of a collection of separate cemeteries, each in accordance with the size of the various religious groups, each with a separate entrance.

You see already how this legal situation sanctioned and stimulated a cemetery landscape which emphasized separation by means of spatial segregators; walls separating the Jewish part from “the rest,” and hedges that separate a Protestant section on unconsecrated ground, and excluded from the majoritarian Roman Catholic part. While many of the hedges have disappeared, we must imagine them to be significant barriers, which would have interrupted visual lines and thus created a clear sense of division.

We want to trace how the exclusionary tendency of the cemetery’s spatial segregators were, and are constantly being mitigated by the counterbalancing force of art, to produce or signal inclusion, over a very long time.

FIGURE 2.1 Map of Tongerseweg Cemetery, with location of graves discussed in the text
PHOTOS 1 EV; 2 CJ; 3–5 MW

Let us begin with the 19th century. Directly behind the entrance, there are three tombs in sarcophagus style. Facing the entrance, there is the grave of Pieter Daniel Eugenius MacPherson, a member of the Protestant elite. He had been a member of the Council of State and governor of the Duchy of Limburg, of which Maastricht was the capital city. He died in Maastricht in 1846. His grave was created in a classicist style that makes the sarcophagus strongly resemble an ancient Greco-Roman temple, with pronounced cornices, a relief of flowers and a lion’s head in the tympanum, and corner acroteria with palm motifs. On one crosscut side, a central acroterium contains a winged hourglass as a memento mori above MacPherson’s coat of arms. On the other crosscut side, the central acroterium contains burning torches turned to the ground—another memento mori symbol—above the relief of a male’s profile, probably MacPherson.

In order to fully understand what we see, we have to realize that in the 19th century, a long hedge ran immediately behind MacPherson’s sarcophagus, cordoning off the Protestant section of the cemetery from the Roman Catholic part. While normally a section close to the entrance would be a place of honor, we can easily imagine how the narrow strip of land would have come across as quite forbidding and inhospitable, due to the sheer height and length of the hedge, which stretched the whole breadth of the cemetery. Against this background, the placement of the inscriptions is significant. The inscription outlining MacPherson’s high public office faces towards the cemetery entrance; information about his birth and death are displayed on the back side and would have been virtually inaccessible.

The other two sarcophagi mirror MacPherson’s tomb. They are the sarcophagi of MacPherson’s brother-in-law who had died two years later (1848) and of MacPherson’s wife, who had remarried, was soon widowed again, and was laid to rest more than 40 years after MacPherson. Both the brother-in-law and MacPherson’s wife were members of the Roman Catholic Van Meeuwen dynasty of North Brabant. Their sarcophagi were placed on the other side of the hedge, resting within consecrated Roman Catholic ground. Also in their case, inscriptions outlining their connections and public offices are facing away from the hedge so as to be most accessible to visitors of the Roman Catholic section.

But whatever their location, all three sarcophagi are restrained in their iconography. MacPherson’s palm, hourglass, and torch are stock examples of Christian iconography; they do not demarcate a specific denomination. Likewise, the “Roman Catholic” sarcophagi of MacPherson’s wife and brother-in-law are restrained, indeed almost Protestant, in their iconography, carefully avoiding specifying their denomination.
There is only one convincing way to read all this: the sarcophagi represent a strategic attempt at producing inclusion against a background of exclusion; of reaching, as it were, across the hedge of separation, underscoring family bonds, a non-denominational Christian identity, and a record of public service demonstrated to the civic community visiting the cemetery.

The fact that the sarcophagi are visible in their current state is due to the fact that the hedge had eventually been removed. However, its removal was not due to changes in the cultural and political climate, as one might think. France had seen public outcry against segregated cemeteries and the 1804 law was abolished in 1881. No comparable objections happened in Maastricht. In fact, it was only in the 1960s at the request of the then-mayor’s wife, that the hedge was removed. She was a descendant of the Van Meeuwen dynasty and felt that the graves of her illustrious ancestors were insufficiently visible.

Let us move forward to the early 20th century: we can do so by following the hedge of separation between Protestants and Roman Catholics. At the outer fringes in front of the green barrier, the “godless” were buried, comprising of such categories as “murderers, suicides, vagrants, dedicated non-believers as well as communists and socialists.”

You see here a grave stela that is situated in this stigmatized location. It is dedicated to Jean H. Beckers who died in 1916. The stela is adorned with an oar of grain and a burning torch as the main iconographic elements. In contrast to the torches on MacPherson’s sarcophagus, which were directed towards the ground indicating memento mori, the Beckers stela depicts a torch which points upwards, and accented by the wavy pattern of the torch’s fire; this is accompanied by the inscription ‘VOORLICHTING’ (meaning information, education, or counseling in Dutch), thus underscoring the interpretation of the torch, not as a Christian symbol, but as a symbol of Enlightenment and social activism. The headstone's main inscription connects this iconographic element to biographical information: Beckers was a civil servant concerned with the protection of workers’ rights. Under the main inscription we find the wreath, with another inscription revealing that the stela was erected by the deceased’s friends. The latter is a regular feature of the socialist graves in Tongerseweg Cemetery, indicating not only the deceased’s symbolic immortality, but also giving the deceased a spiritual community, and a spiritual home. It gestures at his important place in society even though he is marginalized by the position of his grave.

The next exemplary grave brings us from the front-right to the far-left corner of the cemetery. In 1932, after extensive discussions by the city council, and

---

9 Servé Minis, Als de stemmen zweijen spreken de stenen (Maastricht: 2012), 57 (our translation).
in light of growing political influence of the socialist movement in Maastricht, a new grave field was opened for “andersdenkenden” (dissenters) in the cemetery’s north-western corner, in order to less aggressively stigmatize non-Catholic burials. A new form of segregation needed new forms of inclusion. A case in point is the grave of Johannes Hubertus Paris (1873–1939), an important figure in Maastricht’s unionist and socialist movement. The headstone prominently features a bronze relief of the deceased’s portrait surrounded by a wreath. The limestone grave marker summarizes in bronze lettering Paris’s public service: “Hij werkte voor zijn stad en voor het volk” (He worked for his city and for the people). As with other socialist graves, symbolic immortality is underscored by a further inscription noting that the monument was funded by gifts. At the bottom of the headstone, a bronze relief depicting a sun rising behind a hilltop, illuminating the path of two workers in front of the skyline of Maastricht above the city’s five-armed star, represents Paris’s life in the context of local politics and workers’ emancipation. Paris’s socialist identity is not played out against religion; the headstone’s design is clearly inspired by a Christian cross; the Maastricht skyline in the bronze relief likewise concentrates on its iconic churches, and on the slab, bronze lettering quotes a verse from the New Testament: “WAT GY DEN MINSTE DER MYNEN HEBT GEDAAN, / HEBT GY MY GEDAAN” (whatever you did for one of the least of these brothers of mine, / you did for me—Matthew 25:40 NIV). In the context of Tongerseweg Cemetery the inscription as well as the other attributes of the grave invite members of the community to rethink the balance of exclusion and inclusion. Even if Paris was a socialist for whom a burial in the main Roman Catholic part was out of the question, he was fulfilling with his life the core ethical demands of the Christian gospel. The grave monument thus gestures at a more practice-centered, as well as ecumenic, understanding of Christianity.

The previous examples have shown how, for a long time, funerary art functioned to counterbalance exclusion by signaling inclusion in a larger civic community. It appears as though that function has come to an end. While the older graves of recognizable, familiar minorities had established iconographies to fall back on in order to signal inclusion, the integration of new minorities began to pose far more problems for stakeholders such as their families, the stonemasons, and cemetery administration teams.

While the celebration of differences was arguably always a part of funerary art, we now find it elevated to new heights, effectively crowding out its integrative endeavors. The stones evoke a smaller family, ethnic or religious circle, but they have ceased to gesture at a broader civic community. In extreme cases, graves become alien entities with inscriptions unreadable to Dutch visitors of the cemetery. This trend is visible in three Islamic graves in the heterodox section.
The first one is the oldest Islamic grave in the cemetery, dating from 1984. By placing the grave in this heterodox section, the ritual orientation towards Mecca could be achieved. The grave belongs to an Islamic man with a Turkish name. The text on the bottom of his grave reads “Merhumun Ruhuna Fatiha;” this is a request to pray for the soul of the departed and is commonly engraved on Turkish Islamic gravestones. This grave lacks the elaborate decorations of some later Islamic graves.

A few rows in front of the first grave, we see a more recent Islamic grave. To citizens outside this specific ethnic and religious group, the Arabic inscription signals merely the Islamic identity of the deceased; gender, name, and background remain unrecognizable to the larger public.

The third grave is from 2015. The headstone shows clear Islamic and Turkish symbolisms, such as the reference to the request to pray for the soul of the departed (similar to the first stone), prayer beads, and a Turkish poem. The gravestone clearly displays a contraction of communicative focus: apart from the deceased's Turkish name and a Turkish poem, her surname signals her marriage to a Dutch husband, and a small inscription is made in Dutch. The inscriptions in Dutch and Turkish place primary emphasis on her family relations: in the Turkish text, she is referred to as a “sister,” the Dutch inscription reads “our beloved daughter, sister, aunt and dear mother” (Figure 2.2).

What the three graves have in common, is an emphasis on a drastically shrunken community; effectively it is reduced to the family of the deceased or, at the utmost, a religious and ethnic community, but hardly the wider Maastricht society. The funerary art of newer minorities highlights the community of the direct family and subgroup. At this stage, the grave markers have ceased to counteract the segregating placement of the grave by producing and signaling inclusion.

Concluding our route, we reach the stage of contemporary planning for future development. At present, Tongerseweg is in the process of being redesigned. The increase of cremation in the Netherlands, combined with liberal laws regarding the storage and dispersal of ashes and new types of disposal have led to a decline in traditional burials in the Netherlands, leaving traditional cemeteries economically strained. In a move typical of a wider trend in the Netherlands and abroad, the management of Tongerseweg, together with the Maastricht city council, have approached a specific group—the Armenian Christian community—for the planning of a dedicated Armenian section in the cemetery.

This is a very recent development, so at present, only one member of the Armenian community is buried in this new section. Having been offered a dedicated cemetery section, members of the Armenian community are currently
thinking about an appropriate design for “their” part of the cemetery, as well as suitable grave marker designs. Plans have been made to plant low hedges around the field, and to erect an Armenian cross, thereby clearly marking the exclusiveness and segregation of the grave field. The Armenian community’s thinking is thus returning to the old markers of segregation that structured Tongerseweg at its inception. It is too early to tell whether and how the new Armenian graves will produce and signal inclusion.
Analysis

Above, we have highlighted how borders produce and signal group identification and belonging. For a long time, grave monuments aspired to signal an inclusion and connection above and beyond one’s own ethnic or religious group: the exemplary graves signal in their own ways, and from within their specific historical circumstances, the connection to an overarching civic community. However, the more recent gravestones, of which the Muslim graves in Tongerseweg Cemetery erected after 1984 are high-profile examples, do not emphasize the theme of civic inclusion to the same degree. Arguably, the use of the Dutch language might serve as a stand-in for civic bonds, but even so it is remarkable how relatively little Dutch is used in the inscriptions—wherever present—of the Muslim graves. If anything, we can see in the bilingualism of the inscriptions a signal of multiple identities, but then probably also a signal of the limited role played by the Dutch civic identity. Ethnicity, religion, and family bonds are featured far more prominently.

It is hard to give a definitive analysis of why this change happened. An explanation along the lines of the new minority-groups being culturally too alien to be integrated by means of tried-and-tested iconographic strategies does not hold up to closer scrutiny: “Autochtonous” graves exhibit a similar retreat into the bubble of smaller groups below the level of the civic community. Also, it would be tempting to point towards Charles Taylor’s analyses of the modern ethics of authenticity. As Taylor’s analysis goes, Rousseau and, in particular, Herder mark the advent of an unprecedented culture of authenticity, the idea that every individual has a unique way of being human. While this sweeping historical analysis has a lot going for it, the identified long-term cultural trend cannot explain on its own how the significant change in funerary art took place so late as the 1980s. In short, we need to identify more immediate cultural changes.

In this vein, the following three larger cultural changes appear to predate that turning point rather closely: (1) In terms of political thinking, the 1970s saw the first development of communitarian responses to (Rawlsian) liberalism and the spread of multiculturalist ideals; so much so that they were transformed into official policies in a number of Western states. (2) As to cultural theory, the rise in the global importance of postmodernism was marked by

---

Jean-François Lyotard’s *La condition postmoderne* (1979), characterized pointedly by the loss of the credibility of established grand-narratives. Changes in economic thinking and policy, in particular the rise of what we now refer to as neo-liberal economics, with its agenda of rolling back the state, seems to have exacerbated the trend: people have learned to put less trust in an abstraction, an “imagined” civic community, and have subsequently prioritized the private realm. Ultimately, the economic aspect might be the most enduring and important one: at least in the Netherlands, the ideology of municipalities reducing costs, or even making profits, has increased the market-driven provision of segregated cemetery sections.

Whereas graves—that is, their monuments and their locations—used to be status goods and markers of social class (clearly on display in the historical sections), this was no longer overtly expressed. The empirical basis for such distinction, as Bourdieu would have it, eroded under the conditions of postmodernism due to its breaking down of the distinctions between high and low art. The gimmick of a grave marker with the text “Nobody rests here / (not until 2038)” (Hier ligt niemand / (pas in 2038)) is telling (Figure 2.3).

In the 19th and early 20th century there were different classes of burial, corresponding to affordability and visibility, that defied the idea of the Grim Reaper as the great equalizer. The historical grave markers on first- and second-class graves that now seem fairly unique, happen, in fact, to be vernacular art produced on a larger scale and ordered from a catalog. This differentiation was greatest in the main section; the one of the Roman Catholic mainstream. The Protestant section (actually subdivided between a Lutheran and a Dutch Reformed one) became the last resting place for quite a few from the higher echelons of society, in commerce and politics, respectively. As mentioned before, secularization has made inroads, and over the past decades there has been an increased tendency towards individualization. Strikingly, in a number

---


of Dutch cemeteries artists have replaced priests and pastors in secular commemorations of the dead around the time of All Souls’ Day. In Tongerseweg Cemetery the graves of artists from Maastricht add some local color with their individual funerary art. In a way, the Armenian Christian community does so too: Saint Servatius (†384), the patron saint of Maastricht, is said to have been an Armenian. In 2016, the Armenian community donated an Armenian cross-stone (khachkar) to Maastricht. The red memorial stele is placed against the wall of the Basilica of Saint Servatius, which was constructed on top of the saint’s tomb in the town center.

The Armenian Apostolic Church does not only use a church building with a Roman Catholic community, but also the new space dedicated to Armenians in Tongerseweg Cemetery is located in the area previously designated for Catholics. The latter, dwindling in number, seem to regard the Armenian newcomers as a welcome addition to their ranks. Funerary art, however, reveals a distinction: the icon of a competing (Christian) Maastricht devotion—the

Marian one to Our Lady Star of the Sea—adorns the headstones of a great many Catholic graves in Tongerseweg Cemetery.

The cemetery itself, increasingly conceived of as cultural heritage, is seen as characteristic of the town of Maastricht. It contributes to the town’s identity rather than being a mere reflection of that identity. Tongerseweg Cemetery entails the materialization of an “aesthetic philosophy symbolized in design, monuments, trees and shrubs.” However, despite the fact that a number of graves, and indeed the cemetery itself, are recognized as monuments, the cemetery’s representation of the community is constantly being rewritten.

Due to the limited grave rest and subsequent turn-over of graves, only those with “snob appeal” (of value in terms of historical art connoisseurship) or underscoring or supporting officially approved history, remain. For example, the graves of an alleged son of Vincent van Gogh, and of an Afghan mother and nine-year old daughter believed to be victims of an honor killing, have vanished. Dissatisfied with the constant erasure, local historians have documented and photographed over 7,000 graves from Tongerseweg Cemetery, and made these available to the general public. Muslims have similarly objected to grave rights in their section being limited to 10 to 30 years at Tongerseweg Cemetery. Thereafter the graves are cleared unless extended time is secured, which again makes a mockery of the idea of eternal grave rest. The thought of clearing graves in the Jewish section has not come up yet and is probably unthinkable in the light of the persecution and murder of Maastricht Jews during WWII. A monument for the deported children who lost their lives has a text in the local dialect, which signals a posthumous and present-day inclusiveness. Several Jewish headstones from the 19th and early 20th century have decorative elements that resemble the ones on contemporary Catholic stones; another illustration of the past role of funerary art to mitigate the harshness of exclusiveness.

Ultimately, belonging to an overarching community of citizens, expressed in overlapping loyalties through the funerary arts, has been lost during the recent period. If our observations are correct, they can help to improve Sörries’s theory of the end of the universal Enlightenment cemetery on several counts. First, it is important to realize that cemeteries are far less collective

---

19 Graven op de begraafplaats Tongerseweg te Maastricht (Regionaal Historisch Centrum Limburg); online: https://www.archieven.nl/mi/1540/?mivast=1540&mizig=90&miadt=38&milang=nl&mizk_alle=Tongerseweg&miview=tbl.
and universal—or have started to evolve into that direction far later—than is presupposed by Sörries’s theory. From its inception, Tongerseweg Cemetery was planned so as to separate different religions, and this drawing of boundaries between different religions has continued, even beyond a level needed for diverse ritual exigencies. This is in line with analyses that underscore the rather late rise to prominence of bonds to abstract entities such as universal citizenship or the nation state.\footnote{For its echo in political theory, see Jürgen Habermas, \textit{Die Einbeziehung des Anderen: Studien zur politischen Theorie} (Frankfurt: 1996), using the work of Peter Sahlins, \textit{Boundaries: The Making of France and Spain in the Pyrenees} (Berkeley: 1989).}

Second, while the drawing of boundaries, and the interaction of inclusionary and exclusionary processes are inescapable facts of our world-making, it is important to realize the extent to which identities are multiple and tend to overlap. We saw this already in the MacPherson grave, but it is equally obvious in the analyzed Muslim grave dating from 2015. Overlapping identities are a well-theorized feature of social inclusion; anthropologists such as Gerd Baumann have used the term “cross-cutting cleavages,” which keeps together the exclusionary and inclusionary processes that are part and parcel of any group identity.\footnote{See Gerd Baumann, \textit{Contesting Culture: Discourses of Identity in Multi-Ethnic London} (Cambridge: 1996) and Gerd Baumann, \textit{The Multicultural Riddle: Rethinking National, Ethnic, and Religious Identities} (New York: 1999).}

Third, it seems, then, that Sörries’s thesis is too closely connected to a political conception of citizenship. We see, by contrast, the retreat of that specific idea of citizenship, not a generalized lack of overarching, potentially connecting identities. Such less expansive group identities thus become all the more compelling, since the abstract level of citizenship or membership in a nation-state fails to command emotional appeal. What is all but dead is a highly politicized conception of what a cemetery ought to have been, but never was.

4 Conclusion

In this chapter we looked at the function of the funerary arts in a broad sense as inclusionary and exclusionary in the Tongerseweg Cemetery, in Maastricht, as it evolved since 1812. Despite the differentiation of groups from various backgrounds by means of spatial separators, the funerary arts going beyond their differences and indicating similarities helped to maintain a sense of belonging to a single civic community. While the celebration of difference was arguably
always a part of funerary art, we find it now elevated to new heights, effectively crowding out its integrative side. We attribute that to a shift in economic, political, and cultural understandings that occurred in the 1970s, bringing forth municipal cemeteries subject to the effect of market forces. Rather than integrated service provisions (catering to diversity) for all citizens, cost-efficiency determines inclusion or exclusion of minorities. Like the funerary arts discussed in this chapter, other forms of vernacular art can also function towards inclusivity and exclusivity.
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