

# Different logics of liturgy

## Deductive and inductive forms of Catholic funerary rites as perceived by participants

*Thomas Quartier, Chris A.M. Hermans & Anton H.M. Scheer*

The situation regarding the form of funerary rites in our society is increasingly changing. Formerly the churches with their established form of funerary ritual had a virtual monopoly in this area, but in recent times this has changed. The changes may be termed diversification and individualisation.

*Diversification* of funerary rites means that funerals may assume various forms, both religious and non-religious.<sup>1</sup> Within a religious tradition such as Christianity different forms of funerals may emerge,<sup>2</sup> and among the diverse religions represented in a multicultural society one likewise finds varying forms of burial services.<sup>3</sup> The second aspect of the present situation, *individualisation*, refers to the possibility of choice. This influences the approach to the deceased in funerary rites.<sup>4</sup> Since 1 July 1991, for instance, the new Dutch burial act has included the following stipulation: 'The burial is conducted according to the wishes or supposed wishes of the deceased, unless that cannot reasonably be demanded' (section 18; our translation). Hence it is a question of a preference expressed during the person's lifetime for the kind of funeral he or she would like to have. It is no longer taken for granted. A market has emerged, which offers people planning their own funerals or those of relatives, et cetera a whole repertoire to choose from,<sup>5</sup> and individualisation permits them to make a personal choice.

As a result of these developments the form of ecclesiastic funerals is no longer a matter of course. Modern society requires churches to respond appropriately to the phenomena of diversification and individualisation. But are ecclesiastic funerals not bound by their own Christian traditions? Are they not supposed to convey that tradition to people, especially in the existentially crucial situation of death and relating to a deceased person? New ritual practices, both liturgical and non-liturgical,<sup>6</sup> could be a source for innovating ecclesiastic

<sup>1</sup> J.W. WILSON: *Funerals Without God. A Practical Guide to Non-Religious Funerals* (Buffalo / New York 1990).

<sup>2</sup> J.A. VAN DER VEN: *Ecclesiology in Context* (Kampen 1993) 320-321.

<sup>3</sup> M. BOT: *Een laatste groet. Uitvaart- en rouwrituelen in multicultureel Nederland* (Rotterdam 1998).

<sup>4</sup> L. VAN TONGEREN: 'Individualizing Ritual. The Personal Dimension in Funerary Liturgy', in *Worship* 78,2 (2004) 117-138.

<sup>5</sup> AVVL: *Gids voor de uitvaart* (Diemen 1991).

<sup>6</sup> P. POST: *Het wonder van Dokkum. Verkenningen van populair religieus ritueel* (Nijmegen 2000).

funerals, but they must not eliminate the church's heritage. This poses a liturgical hermeneutic problem: on the one hand there is a prescribed liturgical form for funeral services, on the other there is a contemporary form. This article examines how the problem could be handled in our modern context.<sup>7</sup> Our principal question is this: *what forms of Roman Catholic funeral liturgies do different groups of participants discern in our modern context?*

First we analyse Peter L. Berger and Thomas Luckmann's approach to the process of assigning meaning in the present societal context. Their theory gives us a better understanding of the diversification and individualisation of contemporary funeral liturgy. We also consider how to respond liturgically to the challenge of the modern situation. To this end we turn to various strategies that Peter Berger proposes for religious institutions in their dealings with modernisation (1). In the next section we distinguish between two aspects of the form of funeral liturgy: mediation and participation. These are aspects of liturgy as symbolic activity according to Louis-Marie Chauvet's interpretation (2). On that basis we identify two types of liturgical forms of funerary rites, a deductive and an inductive type. We analyse the two types in terms of both mediation and participation, and illustrate them with reference to two concrete funeral liturgies (3). In the fourth section we report the results of an empirical liturgical study of the form of funerary rites (4). The final section comprises a brief conclusion and discussion (5).

## 1. Roman Catholic funerary rites in modern society

What exactly does the altered position of Roman Catholic funerary rites in modern society entail? And how can churches respond to that position with appropriate funerary rites? This poses a liturgical hermeneutic problem of mediation between tradition and situation, between a prescribed and an individual form – a key issue in liturgical studies. In this regard Nathan Mitchell distinguishes between two explicit views of the diversification and individualisation of rites.<sup>8</sup> Some liturgists maintain that a ritual that complies with the requirements of diversification and individualisation loses its essential character. Ritual ought to be canonical, that is to say, it must conform to the traditional, codified form.<sup>9</sup> In this context Mitchell refers to 'orthodox consensus', which ensures that the ritual is conducted according to canonical precepts even in a changed context. On the other hand there are liturgists who argue that, in view of the

<sup>7</sup> T. QUARTIER, A. SCHEER & J. SCHILDERMAN: 'Some Aspects of Roman Catholic Funerary Rites in Modern Society in a Ritual Perspective', in *Proceedings of the North American Academy of Liturgy* (Notre Dame 2001) 142-156.

<sup>8</sup> N.D. MITCHELL: *Liturgy and the Social Sciences* (Collegeville MN 1999) 16-38.

<sup>9</sup> R.A. RAPPAPORT: *Ritual and Religion in the Making of Humanity* (Cambridge 1999) 224.

changed context, rituals have to assume a totally new form, also in ecclesiastic tradition.<sup>10</sup> For this they invoke ritual potency, which is often overlooked in orthodox consensus. It includes contextual ritual gestures and symbols that could enrich liturgy and give it a more personal character, known as ‘emerging rituals’ for funerals.<sup>11</sup> According to the first approach a funeral should be conducted on traditional ritual lines, retaining time-honoured liturgical elements. According to the second view new forms of ritual expression deriving from participants’ experience should be incorporated into ecclesiastic funerals. In this section we consider the following problem: what form should Roman Catholic funerals assume in a context of diversification and individualisation? The aforementioned two positions offer different answers to this question. First we analyse modern society as the context of present-day funeral liturgy (1.1). Then we deal with various strategies for responding liturgically to that context (1.2).

### 1.1. The altered context of modern society

An ecclesiastic funerary rite reflects people’s way of dealing with the death of a significant other in a particular social network. Because the network is affected by death people collectively enact their farewell to the deceased member of the network.<sup>12</sup> In an ecclesiastic funerary rite people act as a community, hence the rite may be seen as an intersubjective process of interpretation, in which participants seek to make sense of the loss of their loved one.

Peter Berger and Thomas Luckmann see intersubjective interpretive processes as human actions in which people assign meaning to life and, along with others, gather knowledge about the world.<sup>13</sup> In everyday life they do so as a matter of course. People have internalised the necessary knowledge and procedures to guide them on their way through everyday life to such an extent that as a rule it is clear what they should or should not do. But there are situations where conventional behaviour no longer suffices. Thus the transition from one phase of life to another may mean that they no longer perceive their lives as coherent.<sup>14</sup> This applies particularly when they are confronted with somebody’s death. Then conventional, prescribed knowledge from everyday life is no longer adequate. How should people deal with the questions evoked by death? According to Berger and Luckmann this calls for institutions that enable them

<sup>10</sup> POST: *Het wonder van Dokkum* 72s.

<sup>11</sup> R.L. GRIMES: ‘Emerging Ritual’, in *Proceedings of the North American Academy of Liturgy* (Valparaiso 1990) 15-31, p. 25.

<sup>12</sup> T. QUARTIER, C. HERMANS & A. SCHEER: ‘Remembrance and Hope in Roman Catholic Funerary Rites. Attitudes of Participants towards Past and Future of the Deceased’, in *Journal of Empirical Theology* 17,2 (2004) 252-280, p. 254s.

<sup>13</sup> P.L. BERGER & T. LUCKMAN: *The Social Construction of Reality. A Treatise in the Sociology of Knowledge* (New York 1967).

<sup>14</sup> BERGER & LUCKMANN: *The Social Construction of Reality* 42.

to make sense of their experience even in the crisis triggered by death. Institutions make it possible for them to find a meaningful attitude in such situations as well, even though it may not be immediately obvious. It means that there must be structures to preserve coherence.<sup>15</sup> These authors maintain that in the case of life's transitions the appropriate structures are rites of passage, which regulate human transitions and thus impart meaning to a person's biography.

When somebody in a social network dies it means that the person's immediate circle must make the transition to a life without him or her. An ecclesiastic funeral is one way of interpreting the transition implied by the departure of that member of the community. In Berger and Luckmann's sense a funeral is an institution, an intersubjective process which enables people to assign meaning to their experience.

What makes the institution of ecclesiastic funerals meaningful? Its meaning lies in a 'symbolic universe of meaning'. The institution of ecclesiastic funerals belongs to the Christian tradition of liturgical forms, part of a system of symbols, ritual behaviours, texts, et cetera that impart meaning to human experience.<sup>16</sup> The form always relates to a prescribed funeral repertoire. Especially at a ritual level the codification – the prescribed formal element of the funeral – is always done by people other than the actual performers of the rite.<sup>17</sup> This codification constitutes the symbolic universe of meaning which shapes contemporary funerary rites.

An ecclesiastic funeral is a procedure in which meaning from this symbolic universe is made palpable and accessible to the participants, who face the risk of meaninglessness. Inter alia the funeral preserves the coherence of their lives even when confronted with the death of their significant other. In this context Berger and Luckmann<sup>18</sup> describe rituals – including funerals – as follows:

While the individual may improvise reality-maintaining procedures in the face of crisis, the society itself sets up specific procedures for situations recognized as involving the risk of a breakdown in reality. Included in these predefined situations are certain marginal situations, of which death is by far the most important.

In Berger and Luckmann's sense a funeral may be seen as a procedure to impart meaning to the experience of losing a significant other. The question is, does modern society still have a symbolic universe of meaning shared by the participants in the funeral service? For instance, are these people actually familiar with the form of Christian funerals and do they accept it? This can no longer be taken for granted in view of the diversification and individualisation

<sup>15</sup> BERGER & LUCKMANN: *The Social Construction of Reality* 19.

<sup>16</sup> BERGER & LUCKMANN: *The Social Construction of Reality* 92.

<sup>17</sup> RAPPAPORT: *Ritual and Religion* 32.

<sup>18</sup> BERGER & LUCKMANN: *The Social Construction of Reality* 156.

of ecclesiastic funerals. People have different worlds of meaning. They no longer share one all-encompassing universe of meaning.

## 1.2. Deductive and inductive strategies for ecclesiastic funerals

How can the institution of ecclesiastic funerals disclose meaning if that meaning is no longer considered self-evident by individual participants? What strategy should one adopt? In this subsection we identify two strategies for shaping funeral liturgy: a deductive and an inductive strategy. The deductive strategy corresponds with the aforementioned liturgical view that ecclesiastic funerals should be canonical. The inductive strategy corresponds with the view that ecclesiastic funerals should also include new forms of ritual expression conforming to modern people's experience.

According to Peter Berger the essential difference between modern society and earlier societies is the wide range of possible choices that modern people have at their disposal.<sup>19</sup> Every human being in our society is placed in such a situation of diverse possible choices. The plurality also applies to the religious sphere. The assurance once offered by certain religious systems automatically diminishes, because images of that which transcends human beings are no longer unambiguous. In the case of funerals, too, people can actualise their own ideas and make choices, a result of the diversification and individualisation of funerals. If in the event of a death people opt for an ecclesiastic funeral, Berger identifies three options for the form it should take: a deductive, a reductive and an inductive option. He describes them as follows:

The deductive option is to reassert the authority of a religious tradition in the face of modern secularity. The tradition thus having been restored to the status of a datum, of something given a priori, it is then possible to deduce religious affirmations from it at least more or less as was the norm in pre-modern times.<sup>20</sup>

This assumes a religious reality independent of the present context and socio-historical situation. The strategy has a clear advantage: the objective validity of religious thinking and action is restored. There is a fixed, reliable tradition. The question is, in how far can this reality be made plausible to modern people?

The reductive option is to reinterpret the tradition in terms of modern secularity, which in turn is taken to be a compelling necessity of participating in modern consciousness.<sup>21</sup>

<sup>19</sup> P.L. BERGER: *The Heretical Imperative. Contemporary Possibilities of Religious Affirmation* (New York 1979) 11.

<sup>20</sup> BERGER: *The Heretical Imperative* 61.

<sup>21</sup> BERGER: *The Heretical Imperative* 62.

Here the authorities are switched. Modern thinking and its assumptions rather than religious tradition become authoritative. This option has the advantage that it appears to pose fewer problems for modern people. But it raises a fresh problem in that the religious tradition with all its contents disappears. One might well ask whether any dialogue between experience and tradition is left.

The inductive option is to turn to experience as the ground of all religious affirmations – one's own experience, to whatever extent this is possible, and the experience embodied in a particular range of traditions.<sup>22</sup>

This strategy has the advantage of offering openness, which permits a non-authoritarian approach to questions about truth. There is great openness to modern people's experience. The drawback is a risk that such actions will be vacuous and may lack direction.

Do Berger's strategies afford insight into the liturgical hermeneutic problem of how to accommodate both modern people's range of choices and the church's liturgical tradition? In the case of ecclesiastic funerals we look at two strategies only, not three. In the context of ecclesiastic liturgy the reductive strategy is problematic, in that the contents of the Christian message are measured according to modern criteria. Hence it raises the question of the extent to which the religious dimension is still recognised, since by definition the criterion of orthodoxy is abandoned and it is no longer a matter of handing down tradition.<sup>23</sup> Since our research object is religious, ecclesiastic funerals, we confine ourselves to two strategies for shaping Catholic funerals: the deductive and the inductive strategy. Although the reductive strategy is certainly encountered in liturgical practice, it is not relevant to our discussion of religious rites in that it makes no attempt to mediate between the present situation and tradition.

Applied to the liturgical hermeneutic problem of the predetermined meaning codified in liturgy and the present-day experience of the loss of a significant other, then, two strategies for shaping ecclesiastic funerals can be identified in the modern situation: a deductive and an inductive strategy. The deductive strategy focuses on preserving and objectively validating the message contained in the tradition. An inductive strategy for funerals will focus more on linking that message to people's experience in their real-life situation, that experience being the point of departure.

<sup>22</sup> BERGER: *The Heretical Imperative* 62s.

<sup>23</sup> S.D. GAEDE: 'Review Symposium. Peter L. Berger's *The Heretical Imperative*. Broadening the Possibilities of Contemporary Religious Affirmation', in *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* 10,2 (1981) 181-185; G. VAN GERWEN: *Pastorale begeleiding door vrijwilligers. Empirisch theologisch onderzoek naar de motivatie tot deelname aan pastorale zorg in levenscrises* (Kampen 1990) 28-34; IDEM: *Catechetische Begeleiding. Een onderzoek naar het effect van een educatieprogramma voor onderwijsgeevenden aan het basisonderwijs* (Kampen 1985) 124s.

## 2. Aspects of the form of funeral liturgy: mediation and participation

What does the distinction between a deductive and an inductive strategy imply for the actual liturgical form of funerary rites? Which aspects of the liturgy are affected by this distinction? And what distinctions between funerary rites can be made in ecclesiastic funeral liturgy in modern society? In this section we look into the aspects of liturgical forms that could be important when one considers what form an ecclesiastic funeral should take.

On the basis of the liturgical concept of liturgy as symbolic activity<sup>24</sup> we first distinguish between two aspects of the *form* of funeral liturgy. A funeral is seen as an intersubjective process that helps to maintain a *symbolic* world of meaning. Chauvet's theory of liturgy as symbolic activity<sup>25</sup> seeks to re-examine the efficacy of liturgy in modern society. By efficacy is meant that the funeral makes the meaning that people ascribe to that human experience real and accessible. Hence the theory may help us to differentiate funeral liturgy as an intersubjective religious procedure in more detail. In this section we distinguish between *mediation* and *participation* in liturgy on the basis of Chauvet's theory. We then differentiate mediation into *language* and *guideline*, and participation into *individual* and *collective* participation.

Chauvet discerns two aspects that are essential for shaping liturgy: mediation and participation. The 'symbolic order' is mediated in symbolic activities. This is what is meant by *mediation* of the symbolic order.<sup>26</sup> Secondly, the 'subject of the participant' in the liturgy is assimilated into the symbolic order.<sup>27</sup> We call this the *participation* of the liturgical subject.

By a symbolic order Chauvet means a system of symbols, actions, texts, et cetera that help to shape the liturgy. At the death of a significant other people fall back on elements from the symbolic order to shape a funeral liturgy for their loved one. That form is co-determined by the way they participate in the liturgy, the way they become liturgical subjects. Hence the aspects of mediation and participation are also relevant to the form a funeral liturgy takes.

*Mediation* as an aspect of the form the liturgy takes<sup>28</sup> has two aspects of its own: *language* and *guideline*. The symbolic order is actualised mainly in the semi-otic system of *language*. The language of the liturgy provides a basis for symbolic mediation between the participants' various frames of reference and the

<sup>24</sup> L.M. CHAUVET: *Symbol and Sacrament. A Sacramental Reinterpretation of Christian Existence* (Collegeville MN 1995); IDEM: *The Sacraments. The Word of God at the Mercy of the Body* (Collegeville MN 2001).

<sup>25</sup> CHAUVET: *The Sacraments* 8.

<sup>26</sup> CHAUVET: *The Sacraments* 13.

<sup>27</sup> CHAUVET: *The Sacraments* 19.

<sup>28</sup> CHAUVET: *The Sacraments* 13s.

church's liturgical tradition.<sup>29</sup> This language is associated with a high degree of recognisability and repeatability. Chauvet points out that the language, too, is programmed and prescribed. There are 'rules' in the symbolic order of the liturgy, a *guideline* that determines its structure.<sup>30</sup> The guideline for liturgy derives from the church's liturgical tradition.

Who is the subject of participation in the symbolic order? Who may participate in liturgy? These questions pertain to *participation* in liturgy. Chauvet makes a distinction between an individual and a collective component of liturgical subjects. Hence we refer to two aspects: *individual* participation and *collective* participation.

Individual participation refers to individual participants who, through their participation, construct a Christian identity or find meaning. An individual Christian identity evolves partly through assimilation into the symbolic order of the liturgy. But, says Chauvet, such assimilation is inconceivable at a purely individual level. It can only happen in the collective of a liturgical assembly, a celebrating community. That is how the individual becomes imbedded in the ranks of a *communio* that evolves through participation in a liturgy.<sup>31</sup> Individual identity is bolstered and constructed only through interactive activities with others as part of a liturgical assembly – through collective participation in liturgy.<sup>32</sup> Both aspects – *individual* and *collective* – are pertinent to the manner in which a liturgical identity is actualised.

### 3. Logics of deductive and inductive funerals

What are the respective features of a deductive and an inductive ecclesiastic funeral liturgy? In the preceding section we differentiated the form of the liturgy into mediation and participation. Mediation refers to language and the guidelines that are followed. Participation refers to the individual and the collective as ritual participants. In this section we consider a deductive and an inductive type of funeral liturgy characterised by different logics: a logic of communion and a logic of difference (3.1). We illustrate these by means of two actual rites. To this end we use the text of the *Rituale Romanum* of 1969 (3.2) and a liturgy for the dead by the Dutch liturgical poet Huub Oosterhuis of 1970 (3.3). We chose these two liturgies because they originated in the same period, the late 1960s. During those years the hermeneutic question regarding mediation between liturgical tradition and present-day religious understanding was perti-

<sup>29</sup> CHAUVET: *The Sacraments* 14-17.

<sup>30</sup> CHAUVET: *The Sacraments* 106s.

<sup>31</sup> CHAUVET: *The Sacraments* 20.

<sup>32</sup> CHAUVET: *The Sacraments* 34.



nently asked by the liturgical movement as a result of renewed interest in liturgy in the wake of Vatican II.<sup>33</sup>

### 3.1. Two types of funerary rites

If we want to speak of different types of funeral liturgy, we must first spell out what we mean by a type of funeral liturgy. For that we make use of Chauvet's concept of the logic of liturgy. He distinguishes between two such logics: a logic of communion and a logic of difference.<sup>34</sup> The former is a closed type of liturgical form shared in the ranks of the church, where individuals are assimilated into a group of participants. This logic is particularly applicable to communities which put the accent on hierarchical structures. The second is the logic of difference. In terms of this logic the ritual subject can achieve self-realisation without subordinating herself to the identity of the group and the broader context of the liturgical assembly. The difference between the two logics can be described with reference to the four aspects that, following Chauvet, we defined above. They are also decisive for the two types of funeral that we want to describe. Let us briefly explain.

What, according to Chauvet, do the four aspects of the logic of liturgy imply for the form of a deductive and an inductive type of funeral liturgy?

- a. Language of the rite: A deductive funeral liturgy uses traditional language with the accent on proclamation. An inductive funeral liturgy seeks to find the language of the participants. Consequently it will be a contemporary language.
- b. Guideline of the rite: The deductive type of funeral may be said to be universally applicable and to follow the guideline of the ecclesiastic tradition. Proclamation happens according to fixed rules, with little scope for creative ritualisation. The inductive type of funeral liturgy proceeds from the particular situation in which the ritual is performed and engages it in dialogue with the beliefs of participants. Thus the guideline is individual experience and the structure is open.
- c. Role of individual participants in the rite: The deductive type of funeral does not primarily focus on the participants in the rite. Proclamation is not couched in the framework of their individual situation. They are seen as church members and believers. In the inductive type the individual characteristics of participants are more pertinent and it is closely linked with the (individual) situation of the survivors, who are not necessarily believers.
- d. Collective participation in the rite: The deductive type of funeral presupposes an assembly of believing participants. The ecclesiastic structure typical of Western church history is an example of this model. The inductive type tries to accommodate the diversity present in the assembly. Participants vary greatly in

<sup>33</sup> H. WEGMAN: *Riten en mythen* (Kampen 1991) 351s. H. OOSTERHUIS: *Licht dat aan blijft. 30 jaar liturgie-vernieuwing* (Kampen 1990).

<sup>34</sup> CHAUVET: *The Sacraments* 177s.

their level of faith, and some are unbelievers. The four aspects are summarised in figure 1.

**Figure 1: Aspects of deductive and inductive funerals**

Aspect of the rite	Logic of communion in deductive funerals	Logic of difference in inductive funerals
language	traditional	contemporary
guideline	closed structure/rules	open structure/contextual
individual participation	premise: believers/faith of the church	premise: searchers/contrast experience
collective participation	assembly of faithful people	open assembly of people with different starting points

This analysis of the two types of funeral liturgy offers a point of contact with the liturgical hermeneutic problem that we are researching: the link between tradition and experience in liturgical activities. Whereas a deductive liturgy is shaped according to the logic of communion, an inductive liturgy is shaped according to the logic of difference. In terms of our theory this has implications for the language and guideline of the liturgy (mediation). It also has implications for both the individual participants and the collective of the celebrating assembly (participation).

### 3.2. Illustration of a deductive type of funeral

As an example of the deductive type of Catholic funeral we cite the official funerary rite of the Roman Catholic Church of 1969, the *Rituale Romanum*. The new, post-Vatican II *Rituale Romanum* has two outstanding features: greater emphasis on the paschal mystery, and greater consideration of the individual circumstances of local churches (*Constitution for the sacred liturgy*, no. 81).<sup>35</sup> We examine the texts of this rite from the perspective of the four aspects outlined above.

Regarding the first aspect, the language of the *Rituale* is traditional. This is especially noticeable in the prayer texts: they use traditional language and images to express the contents of the Christian faith, and it is assumed that the participants understand what these traditional images mean.<sup>36</sup> Examples of such

<sup>35</sup> R. KACZYNSKI: 'Sterbe- und Begräbnisliturgie', in *Gottesdienst der Kirche. Sakramentalische Feiern* II, Part 8 (Regensburg 1984).

<sup>36</sup> A. SCHEER: 'Vivas in Deo. Aanzet tot een thematische analyse van de uitvaartliturgie', in *Tijdschrift voor liturgie* 75 (1991) 238-257; E. SCHILLEBEECKX: 'Naar een herontdekking van de christelijke sacramenten. Ritualisering van religieuze momenten in het alledaagse leven', in *Tijdschrift voor Theologie* 40,2 (2000) 164-187.

traditional images are Christ's resurrection and the salvation of God the Father, which have no direct connection with the language of contemporary people who do not share the church's tradition. The language is informed by that tradition. It is God's revelation that has to be proclaimed to the faithful, which is the norm for the shape of the liturgy. An example of proclamation of the salvific perspective in terms of the resurrection is the following prayer from the Dutch edition of the *Rituale Romanum*:

Goede Vader, Gij zijt ons steeds goedgezind, in Uw handen bevelen wij onze broeder N. Wij hebben het vaste vertrouwen dat hij met Christus zal verrijzen op de jongste dag, zoals allen die in Christus zijn gestorven [Dear Father, you who are always kindly disposed towards us, into your hands we commend our brother N. We firmly believe that he will rise again with Christ on the last day, as will everyone who has died in Christ].<sup>37</sup>

This brings us to the second aspect, the guideline of the rite. The *Rituale Romanum* was created for the entire Roman Catholic Church. Although, as noted above, local circumstances should play a role, the main focus is the church community. This makes the rite suitable for all situations where the rules of Roman Catholic liturgy are observed. The guideline is spelled out in the rules of the Roman Catholic Church and is not dictated by the particular situation. Here the historical process of centralisation, which made a particular funeral model normative in the Middle Ages, is still discernible.<sup>38</sup>

The third aspect, the role of the participants, especially those closest to the deceased, is evident in the following. The transition facing the bereaved as participants in the funeral service<sup>39</sup> is not explicit in the texts of the *Rituale*. This is surprising, as they, too, undergo fundamental changes. Thus life will no longer be the same for the relatives; the structure of the community will likewise change: one of its members is gone and has to assume new meaning for the bereaved as a deceased, no longer living member of the network. In the *Rituale Romanum* the survivors need to have strong faith in God's salvation and the paschal mystery. This, rather than their individual experience, is what makes them liturgical subjects. This firm belief is presupposed and only needs to be articulated and expressed.<sup>40</sup> An example is the following prayer:

<sup>37</sup> NATIONALE RAAD VOOR LITURGIE: *Liturgie van de Sacramenten en andere kerkelijke vieringen. De uitvaartliturgie* (Hilversum 1976) 52.

<sup>38</sup> R. RUTHERFORD: *The Death of a Christian. The Order of Funerals* (Collegeville MN 1990) 75s.

<sup>39</sup> P.M. ZULEHNER: *Heirat – Geburt – Tod* (Freiburg i.Br. 1976) 194.

<sup>40</sup> A. GOUMANS: 'Hopen op verrijzenis. Grenzen en ruimte van deze thematiek in het vernieuwde Romeinse rituale van de uitvaartliturgie', in *Tijdschrift voor liturgie* 64 (1980) 209-227; G. LUKKEN: 'Kernvragen rond de christelijke dodenliturgie', in *Tijdschrift voor liturgie* 64 (1980) 146-164.

Laat ons bidden: luister, Heer, naar ons gebed, nu wij een beroep doen op uw barmhartigheid: Gij hebt uw dienaar geroepen uit deze wereld heen te gaan; geef hem nu een plaats in het land van licht en vrede en neem hem op in het gezelschap van uw heiligen. Door Christus onze Heer. Amen [Let us pray. Lord, hear our prayer as we invoke your mercy. You have called your servant from this world; now grant him a place in the land of light and peace and admit him to the company of your saints. Through Christ our Lord, Amen].<sup>41</sup>

The collective of participants is viewed in terms of the faith. The community is considered to be a uniform assembly of believers who share a firm belief in God's salvation and the paschal mystery (fourth aspect). Here the logic of communion, not the logic of difference, is dominant in the *Rituale Romanum*.<sup>42</sup>

On the basis of these examples the funeral liturgy according to the *Rituale Romanum* may be seen as illustrating the deductive type of Roman Catholic funeral. Our analysis relates exclusively to the liturgical texts. Features of the logic of communion that characterise the deductive type of funeral liturgy are recognisable in the *Rituale Romanum*. Of course, that does not mean that the *Rituale* cannot be used in very different ways.

### 3.3. Illustration of an inductive type of funeral

As an example of an inductive type of Catholic funeral we use a rite that the Dutch liturgical poet Huub Oosterhuis composed in the 1960s: 'Een dodenliturgie' ['Rite for a deceased person'].<sup>43</sup> In many Dutch parishes texts from this rite are commonly used in liturgical practice.

In this rite the orientation of the language (first aspect) is different from that of the official Roman Catholic rite. It is not confined to a narrow framework of words and images. Instead it encompasses a vast, elastic scheme, which gives some kind of direction to the assembly and in a way structures the proclamation. The structure derives from the inherited Christian tradition, which functions as a source and helps the participants to find their own words. The service is not argumentative and discursive, but poetic, associative and suggestive. The rite is a 'collage of images and parables', which are also drawn from the participants' life world.<sup>44</sup>

The second aspect concerns the guideline for the liturgy. It is open and contextual. This is based on the idea that Christian worship ritualises crucial

<sup>41</sup> NATIONALE RAAD VOOR LITURGIE: *De uitvaartliturgie* 27.

<sup>42</sup> CHAUVET: *The Sacraments* 177.

<sup>43</sup> HUUB OOSTERHUIS: *In het voorbijgaan* (Utrecht 1968) 123-136.

<sup>44</sup> G. LUKKEN: 'Een dodenliturgie van Huub Oosterhuis', in G. LUKKEN, A. BLIJLEVENS & W. BOELENS (eds.): *Op dood en leven* vol. 2, *Uitvaartliturgie* (Hilversum 1990) 230-254.

points in human life and therefore has strong anthropological and social roots,<sup>45</sup> which can differ in each particular liturgy. Hence Oosterhuis tries to construct *one* possible funeral rite which lays no claim to universality. His starting point is two individual experiences: the deaths of two people he knew well, the Dutch bishop Bekkers and his own father. Thus the guideline is the real-life occasion for the performance of this liturgy and his real-life individual experience. Referring to Oosterhuis's rite the German liturgist Albert Gerhards says: 'There is a core of truth, independent of time, and this lies in the fragility of human existence and hope confronted with the contrast experience'.<sup>46</sup> Human experience, then, is the starting point for the form of the liturgy.

The contrast experience assigns a key role to the family of the deceased and other individual participants (third aspect). A prayer from the Oosterhuis rite illustrates this:

Ik sta voor u in leegte en gemis,  
vreemd is uw naam, onvindbaar zijn uw wegen.  
Gij zijt mijn God, sinds mensenheugenis, –  
dood is mijn lot, hebt gij geen and're zegen?  
Zijt gij de God bij wie mijn toekomst is?  
Heer, ik geloof, waarom staat gij mij tegen?

[I'm standing before you empty-handed in my loss, your name is strange to me, your ways inscrutable. You have been God to me in all my living memory, death is my lot, have you no other blessing? Are you the God who holds my future? Lord, I believe, why don't you help me?].<sup>47</sup>

As Gerhards observes, this prayer expresses the experience of human fragility. Schillebeeckx's reference to it as a 'contrast experience'<sup>48</sup> makes it possible to search for heavenly reality within *this* world. According to the texts the anthropological basis of the rite has to be connected with its religious content. Thus the individual participant – the liturgical subject – is not necessarily a believer with clearly defined, traditional convictions but could equally well be a searcher, whose individual starting point has to be taken into account.

The assembly – the fourth and last aspect of collective participation – is understood in a more diversified way than in the *Rituale Romanum*. The exploratory orientation referred to above makes one realise how heterogeneous the assembly at a funeral rite can be, thus allowing greater scope for a diverse

<sup>45</sup> SCHILLEBEECKX: *Naar een berontdekking*; R.L. GRIMES: *Deeply into the bone. Re-inventing rites of passage* (Berkeley etc. 2000).

<sup>46</sup> A. GERHARDS: 'Eschatologische Vorstellungen und Modelle in der Totenliturgie', in IDEM (ed.): *Die größere Hoffnung der Christen* (Freiburg i.Br. 1990).

<sup>47</sup> OOSTERHUIS: *In het voorbijgaan* 129.

<sup>48</sup> E. SCHILLEBEECKX: *Mensen als verhaal van God* (Baarn 1989).

assembly to identify with the rite. According to Oosterhuis one should not construct a rite that does not take note of who is sitting around the altar and does not acknowledge that this has implications for the rite that is conducted. In Chauvet's terms, this approach displays a logic of difference rather than a logic of communion.<sup>49</sup>

Against this background we consider Oosterhuis's rite to be an illustration of an inductive type of Roman Catholic funeral rite in the sense described above. As in the case of the *Rituale Romanum*, we base our argument on the texts of the rite. These display the characteristic features of the inductive type of funeral liturgy. Of course, this does not mean that the texts cannot be used in very different ways.

## 4. Empirical findings

The empirical liturgical study described below aimed to establish whether the various aspects of deductive and inductive funeral liturgy can be identified in the attitudes of participants in Roman Catholic funerals. In this section we present the research questions (4.1), outline the research design and sample (4.2), describe the instruments used (4.3) and, lastly, report the results (4.4).

### 4.1. Research questions

We formulated the following research questions, which we explain below.

1. In how far do participants distinguish between a deductive and an inductive form of liturgical mediation in ecclesiastic funeral liturgy?
2. In how far do participants distinguish between a deductive and an inductive form of participation in ecclesiastic funeral liturgy?
3. In how far do respondents agree with aspects of a deductive and an inductive form of funeral liturgy?
4. What relations do respondents see between the respective aspects of a deductive and an inductive form of funeral liturgy?
5. How does the social background of the respondents, specifically their relation with the deceased and their church involvement, relate to their attitudes towards the form of the funeral liturgy?

To understand how the different types of forms of Roman Catholic funerary rites are perceived by liturgical participants it makes sense to inquire into their ideas about the various aspects of deductive and inductive forms of funerals. These aspects concern liturgical mediation in the sense of language and guide-

<sup>49</sup> CHAUVET: *The Sacraments* 177.

line, and liturgical participation in the sense of the participation of individuals or the collective.

Firstly, we want to know whether the aspects of liturgical mediation identified in the previous section are interpreted deductively or inductively in participants' minds (*question 1*). Secondly, we want to know whether the aspects of liturgical participation are interpreted deductively or inductively (*question 2*). On the basis of our liturgical theorising we anticipate that participants will identify all aspects. It is also important to find out which form (deductive or inductive) has the greatest support from liturgical participants (*question 3*). It seems likely, especially in our modern context, that the inductive strategy would attract greater support, because it conforms more closely to modern people's needs. Consequently we need to know how the various aspects of the deductive and inductive liturgy interrelate in participants' attitudes (*question 4*). We expect deductive participation to correlate positively with deductive mediation, and inductive mediation with inductive participation. The inductive and deductive aspects, on the other hand, could be expected to correlate negatively. That would mean that according to participants the different forms cannot be combined. But there could also be a positive correlation, with certain aspects of the deductive form featuring in conjunction with aspects of an inductive form. In that case the two forms would not be antithetical. Finally there is the important question of how liturgical participants' backgrounds associate with their attitudes towards a deductive and an inductive funeral liturgy (*question 5*). Two variables are particularly relevant when it comes to their preferences. The first is their church involvement. It could be that those who are closely involved with the church would be more inclined to prefer a deductive liturgy than those who have no such involvement. The second is their relationship with the deceased, since those who were close to the deceased may well have a greater need for a liturgy that includes individual elements deviating from the universal liturgical order. People who had no close ties with the deceased may be less inclined to feel this need.

## 4.2. Research design and sample

To answer our research questions we chose an exploratory descriptive survey design, which means that we cannot generalise the results. The object of the questionnaire-based research was to determine what attitudes towards inductive and deductive funeral liturgy occur among respondents who have recently attended a Roman Catholic funeral. Our method of data collection was as follows. We carried out observations in 20 Roman Catholic parishes in the Netherlands, from which we ultimately chose ten, based on the criterion that these ten parishes conducted funeral liturgies typical of the various liturgical styles in the Netherlands. Because of the sporadic nature of funeral services, the data collection, which took place between February and August 2002, was difficult.

Researchers also had to display the necessary piety when addressing people who are in a state of mourning. Data collection proceeded in several stages. Initially we enlisted the cooperation of parish pastors, who distributed the questionnaires to the bereaved. Later we established direct contact with members of the deceased's family and gave them the questionnaires. We also asked them for names of other participants in the funeral. In addition we used parish networks to identify groups whose members were known to have taken part in a funeral in that parish recently. We distributed 539 questionnaires; 229 were returned, which corresponds to a response rate of 40 percent.

### 4.3. Measuring instrument

We constructed two new instruments to measure respondents' attitudes towards deductive and inductive funerary liturgies, one for mediation and one for participation. The instruments are based on the following *indicators* relating to the various aspects of funeral liturgy that, following Chauvet, we identified. When participants displayed a preference for the prescribed language of church tradition, this indicates deductive linguistic mediation; if they accept the church's guideline as the norm for funeral liturgy, it indicates deductively ruled mediation. A preference for contemporary language is indicative of inductive linguistic mediation; when participants' needs are seen as the norm it indicates inductively ruled mediation. The view that funerals are directed exclusively to believers indicates deductive individual participation; if the assembly gathered for the funeral is seen as a uniform community, it indicates deductive collective participation. If respondents feel that participants need not necessarily be believers, it is indicative of inductive individual participation; and if the community is considered to extend beyond church members, it indicates inductive collective participation.

In the operationalisation based on the foregoing indicators we formulated three items for each concept and constructed two separate instruments for mediation and participation. The items were listed in random order and presented to the respondents. Respondents were asked to indicate to what extent they agreed with each concept (from 1, 'totally disagree' to 5, 'totally agree'). Figure 2 gives examples of items for each of the theoretical concepts described in the previous section.



**Figure 2: Operationalisation of aspects of funeral liturgy, classified into deductive and inductive forms of mediation and participation**

<p><i>Deductive linguistic mediation</i> A church funeral should articulate the ecclesiastic tradition.</p> <p><i>Inductive linguistic mediation</i> The language of a church funeral service should be attuned to the participants.</p> <p><i>Deductively ruled mediation</i> A church funeral should abide by the rulings of the ecclesiastic authority.</p> <p><i>Inductively ruled mediation</i> A church funeral should be attuned to the participant's needs.</p> <p><i>Deductive individual participation</i> In a church funeral service the participants should be addressed as members of the church.</p> <p><i>Inductive individual participation</i> Non-members of the church should also be addressed at a church funeral.</p> <p><i>Deductive collective participation</i> The people who gather for a church funeral should all share the church's faith.</p> <p><i>Inductive collective participation</i> Participants in a church funeral need not necessarily be a group of believers.</p>
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

#### 4.4. Analysis of results

To answer the first research question according to aspects of deductive and inductive funeral liturgy we conducted two factor analyses, based on our theoretical expectation that the cardinal distinction between deductive and inductive liturgical forms will be discernible in both mediation and participation. First we did a factor analysis of responses to items on liturgical mediation (first instrument) for the first research question, then a second of responses to items on liturgical participation (second instrument) for the second research question. First we look at the factor analysis of responses to items on liturgical mediation (*question 1*), reflected in table 1:

**Table 1: Oblimin rotated factor matrix, communalities (h<sup>2</sup>), percentage of explained variance, estimated reliability (alpha) regarding deductive and inductive mediation**

	% dis- agree	% dis- agree/ agree	% agree	h <sup>2</sup>	f1	f2
If a person asks for a church funeral, it has to be conducted according to the official rules	31.8	32.7	35.4	.69	<b>.82</b>	-.02
A church funeral should observe the rules of the ecclesiastic authority	39.7	35.7	24.6	.64	<b>.78</b>	-.06
Texts in a church funeral should accord with the church's official doctrines	25.8	38.7	35.6	.57	<b>.76</b>	.02
A church funeral service should refer to the precepts of the ecclesiastic tradition	34.4	33.9	31.7	.51	<b>.73</b>	.04
The form of a church funeral should be determined by the tradition	45.1	32.3	22.6	.47	<b>.67</b>	-.03
A church funeral should articulate the ecclesiastic tradition	17.1	28.6	54.4	.43	<b>.66</b>	.02
The language used in a church funeral service should be attuned to the participants	5.9	21.3	72.9	.46	-.01	<b>.67</b>
A church funeral should be attuned to the participants' needs	8.1	22.4	69.5	.43	.03	<b>.66</b>
In a church funeral service one should use people's ordinary language	4.4	13.6	82.0	.38	.07	<b>.64</b>
In a church funeral service people should be addressed in a language they understand	4.0	11.0	85.0	.34	.03	<b>.60</b>
The participants' situation should determine the form of a church funeral	22.8	33.9	43.3	.37	-.09	<b>.57</b>
The form of a church funeral service should depend greatly on the individual case	9.6	21.8	68.6	.36	-.09	<b>.55</b>
Alpha					.88	.78
Scale average (mean)					3.0	3.9
standard deviation					(.88)	(.65)
Number of valid cases					225	223

explained variance: 47.1%

scale from 1 (totally disagree) to 5 (totally agree)

f1: *deductive mediation*

N = 229

f2: *inductive mediation*

Respondents make a distinction between deductive and inductive mediation (see table 1). In the items on inductive mediation they make no distinction between language and guideline. The same applies to the items on deductive mediation.

The second factor analysis pertains to the items on liturgical participation (*question 2*). The results appear in table 2. Here one item was omitted from the factor analysis ('A church funeral must be accessible to a group of people with widely divergent ideas'), because its factor loading was too low. Respondents make a distinction between deductive and inductive participation, but in the items on deductive participation they make no distinction between individual and collective participation. The same applies to the items on inductive participation.

**Table 2: Oblimin rotated factor matrix, communalities (h<sup>2</sup>), percentage of explained variance, estimated reliability (alpha) regarding deductive and inductive participation**

	% dis-agree	% dis-agree/ agree	% agree	h <sup>2</sup>	f1	f2
Participants in a church funeral should be a group of the same traditional religious faith	88.0	8.4	3.6	.56	<b>.71</b>	-.22
A church funeral should be a gathering of people who all share the church's faith	74.9	13.0	12.1	.43	<b>.66</b>	.02
Participants in a church funeral should be addressed as church members	54.9	19.9	25.2	.38	<b>.62</b>	-.06
A church funeral should be directed to people who confess the traditional Christian faith	61.8	20.0	18.2	.30	<b>.48</b>	-.25
Participants in a church funeral should feel united by their shared faith	27.9	23.5	48.7	.24	<b>.48</b>	.12
Participants in a church funeral should be confirmed in the religious faith in which they were brought up	29.8	33.8	36.4	.19	<b>.44</b>	-.07
Not all participants in a church funeral are believers and pastors conducting the liturgy should take this into account	24.1	23.7	52.2	.53	.06	<b>.73</b>
If there are unbelievers attending a church funeral, the liturgy should be adapted to accommodate them	58.4	20.4	21.2	.40	.09	<b>.63</b>
A church funeral should create a community of people who may differ widely on matters of belief	17.6	18.0	64.4	.30	-.11	<b>.53</b>
A church funeral should also address non-members of the church	13.2	14.9	71.9	.29	-.13	<b>.53</b>
Participants in a church funeral do not necessarily have to be a group of believers	4.8	11.5	83.7	.30	-.32	<b>.44</b>
Alpha					.73	.72
Scale average (mean) <sup>1</sup> standard deviation					2.5 (.70)	3.5 (.74)
Number of valid cases					214	221

explained variance: 35.8%

scale from 1 (totally disagree) to 5 (totally agree)

f1: *deductive participation*

N = 229

f2: *inductive participation*

These two factor analyses yielded four reliable scales for the form of a funeral liturgy: deductive mediation, inductive mediation, deductive participation and inductive participation.

Our second research question was: how do our respondents react to these four aspects of various forms of funeral liturgy (*question 2*)? We observe that they agree with inductive mediation ( $\bar{X}=3.9$ ). They are dubious about inductive participation (3.5), although inclined to agree. There is greater ambivalence about deductive mediation (3.0) and actual disagreement with deductive participation (2.5). From this we infer, firstly, that in the case of both mediation and participation respondents agree more strongly with the inductive than with the deductive aspects. Another interesting feature is that in their responses to both inductive and deductive items they agree more with the mediation scales and less with the participation scales. Clearly respondents prefer an inductive liturgy and find mediation, in the sense of language and liturgical guideline, more important than participation in either an individual or a collective sense.

As for the third research question – what relation our respondents perceive between the various aspects of deductive and inductive forms of funeral liturgy (*question 3*) – we find a high correlation between deductive participation and deductive mediation (.61). There is also a high correlation between inductive participation and inductive mediation (.53). By contrast there is a negative correlation between deductive and inductive mediation (-.37) and between deductive mediation and inductive participation (-.30).

In our respondents' minds deductive and inductive mediation and participation belong together, and deductive participation and mediation relate negatively to inductive participation and mediation (*table 3*). This affirms the antithesis between a deductive and an inductive form of liturgy.

**Table 3: Correlation between factors (>.20)**

	inductive mediation	deductive mediation	inductive participation	deductive participation
inductive mediation		-.37**	.53**	
deductive mediation			-.30**	.61**
inductive participation				
deductive participation				

\* $p \leq .01$ ; \*\*  $p \leq .001$

When it comes to independent variables, we have said that the respondents' church involvement and their relationship with the deceased are important (*question 4*). We expect respondents who are closely involved with the church to

agree more strongly with the deductive aspects of funeral liturgy and less strongly with the inductive aspects. In addition we expect respondents who had a close relationship with the deceased to agree less strongly with the deductive aspects of funeral liturgy and more strongly with the inductive aspects (*table 4*).

**Table 4: Associations (eta's) between liturgical mediation and participation and church involvement and relationship with the deceased (>.20)**

	inductive mediation	deductive mediation	inductive participation	deductive participation
Relationship with the deceased				
Church involvement	.20*	.20*	.26*	.24*

\*  $p < .01$

In the case of *inductive mediation* we note a significant association with the respondents' church involvement. The Scheffé test (see appendix) shows that modal church members (3.8) agree significantly more with inductive mediation than respondents who are either lapsed or non-members (4.2). There is no significant association between inductive mediation and relationship with the deceased. As for *deductive mediation*, we again find a significant association with church involvement: modal members agree significantly more (3.1) than respondents who are either lapsed or non-members (2.5). Again there is no significant association with relationship with the deceased. *Inductive participation*, too, correlates significantly with church involvement: modal members agree significantly less (3.4) than peripheral members (3.5) and respondents who are either lapsed or non-members (4.1). In the case of this aspect, too, there is no significant association with the relationship with the deceased. Finally, there is a significant association between *deductive participation* and church involvement. The association with the relation with the deceased is significant, but with an eta of .18 it is still below our .20 cut-off point, so we do not consider the association relevant.

To sum up: the relation between church involvement and inductive and deductive ritualism accords with our expectations: modal church members agree more strongly with deductive participation and mediation than respondents who are either lapsed or non-members. They also agree less with inductive mediation and participation. Respondents' relationship with the deceased does not correlate with deductive and inductive participation and mediation. The sole exception is that family members agree more strongly with deductive participation, but because of the low eta we do not consider this finding relevant.

## 5. Conclusion and discussion

The key problem considered in this article is the following: which different types of forms of Roman Catholic funeral liturgy do various groups in a modern context discern? On the strength of the empirical liturgical study presented above we offer the following answers to this question. We identified four aspects of funeral liturgy, which we examined in terms of two logics. A deductive liturgy is characterised by a logic of communion, and an inductive liturgy by a logic of difference. The participants in Roman Catholic funerals whom we questioned recognise the distinction between inductive mediation and participation and deductive mediation and participation. Within the mediation aspect of the liturgical form they do not distinguish between language and guideline. The same applies to participation: respondents do not distinguish between individual and collective participation. They agree more strongly with inductive mediation (3.9) than with deductive mediation (3.0). They also agree more strongly with inductive participation (3.5) than with deductive participation (2.5). As for the two main aspects of liturgical forms (*mediation* and *participation*) we observe a clear preference for the inductive variant of the relevant aspect. When we compare the inductive scales we find that respondents agree more strongly with mediation than with participation. Comparison of the deductive scales reflects the same picture: again respondents agree more strongly with mediation than with participation. Their church involvement influences their agreement with all aspects of the liturgical form. Those who are more closely involved with the church agree less with inductive mediation and participation, and are more in favour of deductive mediation and participation.

The four scales led us to a way of classifying people's perception of the form of the liturgy. Chauvet's two logics are recognised, as well as the two ways of shaping the funeral liturgy. For liturgical studies this is a significant finding in that it enables us to systematise and structure the liturgy as a symbolic activity. This is extremely useful for analysing funeral liturgy and reflecting on it. Probably it would work equally well with other forms of liturgy, but without further research we obviously cannot comment on that. Apart from the confirmatory results of our study, there are a few other noteworthy findings and questions, which we shall briefly examine.

The first is that our respondents make no distinction between language and guideline, nor between individual and collective participation (1). Secondly, within the types of liturgical form they favour an inductive rather than a deductive form of funeral liturgy (2). Thirdly, their preference correlates more strongly with their church involvement than with their relationship with the deceased (3).

1. What does the first finding, namely that no distinction is made between language and guideline in mediation, imply? Can this correlation be explained by

Chauvet's concept of a symbolic order of liturgy.<sup>50</sup> The symbolic order entails that language becomes a vehicle for conveying the meaning of a transcendent reality. This is made possible by a prescribed framework, the guideline, which reinforces the notion that religious symbolic language is not controlled by its users. As symbolic language it refers to a transcendent reality. It is programmed so that one can interpret the real-life situation in terms of the authority of a tradition. The programmed nature of liturgical language is evident in the guidelines for the liturgy.<sup>51</sup> Thus language as a vehicle of meaning and the guideline of tradition are two aspects that clearly must be linked in the minds of participants.

Our respondents also make no distinction between individual and collective participation. Does Chauvet's concept of a liturgical subject help us to understand this conjunction?<sup>52</sup> People can participate in liturgy only if they do so both as individuals and as a collective. Hence the two aspects of participation clearly have to be linked in participants' minds. Remarkably, this applies to both types of funeral liturgy. In the case of the deductive form of liturgy this is understandable because of the ecclesiastic network. The collective is a community of believers, and the individual is necessarily a believer. But is an individual participant automatically part of a collective of liturgical participants in the inductive type of liturgical form? There is no simple answer, since in the inductive form the community is not clearly circumscribed. But that does not mean that participants in such a liturgy have no sense of community. Perhaps one has to concede Durkheim's point that this is in fact the power of rituals. Could ritual maybe create a 'temporary' sense of community, that is for the duration of the liturgical assembly? A definite answer would require further research.

2. Our respondents show a preference for the inductive variants of liturgical mediation and participation. In their view liturgical mediation should proceed from the contemporary life world, which could also lead to new forms of ritual expression in the form of language and guidelines for liturgical activity. In the case of participation in liturgy the accent is on the immediate situation and diversity rather than on faith and uniformity. In Chauvet's terms we might say that our respondents agree more with the logic of difference than with the logic of communion.<sup>53</sup> There is a moderately strong negative correlation between deductive mediation and inductive mediation (-.37) and between deductive mediation and inductive participation (-.30). In Chauvet's terms, the two logics appear to be mutually exclusive. This raises liturgical questions. If it is seen as an unambiguous preference among the participants that we studied, is liturgy

<sup>50</sup> CHAUVET: *The Sacraments* 13.

<sup>51</sup> RAPPAPORT: *Ritual and Religion* 50-54.

<sup>52</sup> CHAUVET: *The Sacraments* 17.

<sup>53</sup> CHAUVET: *The Sacraments* 177s.

not in danger of losing its religious character? Can experience be a source of religious revelation as it has always been in the history of religion?

There are different modes of religiosity, associated with different kinds of ritual behaviour. Whitehouse distinguishes between a doctrinal mode and an imaginistic mode of religiosity. By the doctrinal mode he means a process of evolving a fixed, substantive revelation that can be taught. In the imaginistic mode individuals have to work it out for themselves, which makes the processes less readily accessible but greatly increases involvement.<sup>54</sup> According to Whitehouse the distinction between the two modes is always one of emphasis rather than of rigidly separable modes of religious ritual behaviour.<sup>55</sup> Experience appeals strongly to the imaginistic mode, hence this mode is also accessible to participants who are not church members. This is borne out by our respondents' preference for inductive participation. It suggests a need for further research to determine in how far the inductive form of funeral liturgy – our respondents' preference – is actually associated with an imaginistic mode of religiosity.

3. Finally, what does it tell us that the church involvement of the participants in Catholic funerals whom we investigated correlates more strongly with their preference for a particular form of liturgy than their relationship with the deceased? In this context the notion of the church as a *communio* is helpful, that is the notion that the church is a community of believers (*communio fidelium*) in which each member participates freely and equally in terms of their faith. The freedom and equality is based on the charisms that everyone in the church has received and continues to receive.<sup>56</sup> When it comes to liturgy, church involvement clearly ensures that a deductive form will take preference. The preference is understandable because of people's familiarity with the ecclesiastic tradition. But does the freedom and equality of all believers as liturgical participants not also imply agreement with the inductive form? That would entail a one-sided perspective on the liturgical hermeneutic problem of the mediation between tradition and experience among church-members.

The preference of different kinds of participants can be explained, but it leaves the liturgical hermeneutic problem intact – indeed, it confirms it. To solve it would require further reflection that seeks to transcend the polarity. Hence the question of the form of present-day Roman Catholic funeral liturgy can only be answered in the sense of 'both ... and' and not of 'either ... or'. In the past, as Chauvet points out, the accent was exclusively on the logic of communion. Modern society indeed requires a counterweight in the form of greater attention to contemporary experience in diverse contexts – hence a logic of difference. But liturgy remains an activity conducted in the church which,

<sup>54</sup> H. WHITEHOUSE: *Modes of religiosity. A cognitive theory of religious transmission* (Walnut Creek 2004) 74.

<sup>55</sup> WHITEHOUSE: *Modes of religiosity* 76.

<sup>56</sup> VAN DER VEN: *Ecclesiology* 89.



despite everything, remains a community, along with all the individual forms of worship. Chauvet calls this search for equilibrium a 'soft attitude' in liturgy.<sup>57</sup>

Thomas Quartier teaches Liturgical and Ritual Studies at Radboud University Nijmegen; Chris A.M. Hermans is professor Empirical Theology at Radboud University Nijmegen; Anton H.M. Scheer is emeritus professor Liturgical Studies at Radboud University Nijmegen.

Adres: Thomas Quartier, Radboud Universiteit Nijmegen, Faculteit der Theologie & Faculteit der Religiewetenschap, Postbus 9103, 6500 HD Nijmegen. <t.quartier@theo.ru.nl>

<sup>57</sup> CHAUVET: *The Sacraments* 193.

## Appendix: Independent variables

The first background variable is the respondents' *relationship with the deceased*. Respondents were questioned about that relationship. We classified the responses into three groups: (1) family member; (2) personal friend or other personal relationship; (3) other. The second variable is *church involvement*. Depending on what respondents said about their church attendance and the salience of their faith for their lives, we classified them into three groups: (1) non-member; (2) marginal member; (3) modal member. The following tables reflect the comparisons (Scheffé test).

### Inductive mediation according to level of church involvement

	Mean	peripheral member	non-member
Non-member	4.2		
Peripheral member	4.0		
Modal member	3.8		*

\*  $\alpha=.05$

### Deductive mediation according to level of church involvement

	mean	peripheral member	non-member
Non-member	2.5		
Peripheral member	2.9		
Modal member	3.1		*

\*  $\alpha=.05$

### Inductive participation according to level of church involvement

	mean	peripheral member	non-member
Non-member	4.1		
Peripheral member	3.5		
Modal member	3.4	*	*

\*  $\alpha=.05$

### Deductive participation according to nature of relationship with the deceased

	mean	family
Family	2.7	
Personal relationship	2.3	*
Other relationship	2.6	

\*  $\alpha=.05$

### Deductive participation according to level of church involvement

	mean	non-member
Non-member	2.1	
Peripheral member	2.4	
Modal member	2.6	*

\*  $\alpha=.05$