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Abstract
In this article the authors focus on Roman Catholic funeral rites, and investigate how the past and future of the deceased are reflected in the attitudes of participants at these funerals. The main question of the article is: In what sense are past and future of the deceased represented in Roman Catholic funerals today, as reflected in the attitudes of participants? Past and future are aspects of memory. According to Jan Assman, rituals have a unique possibility to enact different types of memory through which a “we-identity” is shaped. The theoretical framework of Assman is used to describe the anamnetic-epicletic nature of Roman Catholic funeral liturgy. On the background of this theoretical framework the results of a research are described into the attitudes of more than 220 participants of Roman Catholic funerals with regard to past and future of the deceased in the Netherlands.

1. INTRODUCTION
Participants at a funeral are confronted with a challenge: a person who is part of their social network has died. His or her earthly life has ended in a physical sense. The bereaved feel the need to give the deceased a new place – e.g. by remembering the past or imagining a good future, often in a religious sense. The status of the deceased changes, from a member of a social and cultural network to someone who is no longer physically present, yet who will continue to play a role in the narratives of those who knew or were related to him or her in some way. Death affects a social cultural network (Turner 1969, 166ff.) in the sense that a status transition of part of the network changes the whole social cultural network. Can the funeral play a role in the change of the individual and collective identity? How does ritual express the old status of the deceased and the new status that he or she will acquire? And what are the attitudes of participants at a funeral toward these questions?

Religious communities are one of the major sources of a ritual tradition that enables people to express the status transition of their loved ones. In modern society, the funeral is one of the most frequently requested rites in
Christian churches (Dekker, de Hart & Peters 1997, 15; Felling, Peters & Scheepers 2000, 68ff.). Nevertheless, one wonders whether the religious ritual repertoires that churches offer, express the status transition of the deceased in a way that is recognizable and satisfying to the participants. In a modernized, individualized and secularized society, the relation of Christian rites to people’s lives has changed significantly (Schillebeeckx 2001; Quartier e.a. 2001). It can no longer be taken for granted that the past and future status of the deceased will be expressed specifically by Christian images. People coming from very different religious backgrounds and frames of reference attend Christian funerals (Zulehner 2001), and individualized elements are included (Grimes 2000; Van Tongeren 2004). Can the different participants come together to form a community in a Christian funeral, and what role can Christian tradition play in this? The problem we see here is a liturgical one. Liturgical scholars frequently struggle with the question of how the experience of participants of Christian funerals can be combined with images from the Christian tradition. In funeral homiletics, a trend towards eulogy instead of homily has been identified (Melloh 1993), and the question of whether the funeral is a memorial service or whether it is still a chiefly religious rite is one that cannot be ignored.

In this article we focus on Roman Catholic funeral rites, and investigate how the past and future of the deceased are reflected in the attitudes of participants at these funerals. We also look at how funeral rites can connect religious images to the concrete loss people experience. Does the religious ritual adequately mark the transition of the deceased (cf. Bell 1997, 94), and does it reflect his or her past and future? We formulate the following main question: In what sense are past and future of the deceased represented in Roman Catholic funerals today, as reflected in the attitudes of participants?

To answer this question we will first analyse in a general sense how a collective can deal with the past and future of the deceased. For this we rely on the cultural concept of memory, as it is developed by Jan Assmann (2). After this we turn to funerary liturgy. Past and future have a liturgical-theological meaning in funeral liturgy. We will try to elaborate this by explaining the anamnetic-epicletic nature of the funeral in the third part (3). Based on the expectations of our theoretical model, we formulate our research questions. We also describe and discuss the results of a survey of more than 200 participants in Roman Catholic funeral liturgy that we designed in order to provide answers to these questions (4). The article ends with the conclusions of the research questions and a discussion of some unexpected research findings (5).
2. Communicative and cultural memory

How does a person adjust to the loss of a significant other? The death of an individual affects the social and cultural network of which the deceased was a part, and poses a problem for the community, which must reconstruct its relation to the deceased. How is this done? Does a collective have a memory? And what role do rites play in this memory? These are the questions addressed in the following.

2.1. Connective structure: temporal and social dimension

The way in which a “we” is constructed can be understood with the help of the concept of a “connective structure”, as developed by Jan Assmann (Assmann 1992, 16). The connective structure has two dimensions which are related, namely a temporal and a social dimension. Temporally, past and future are connected in the present in a symbolic way. Socially, individuals are bound together by a common frame of reference (“symbolische Sinnwelt”), a shared past and a shared future.

Firstly, we discuss the temporal process that occurs when a person is confronted with the death of a significant other. Human beings lead their life within the limits of time. Their life cycle has a beginning and an end. Within this lifecycle there are several shifts or transitions that have to be made, such as the passage from childhood to adulthood, marriage, and death (Van Gennep 1999). At these moments of transition, when the ‘sting of time’ is felt particularly acutely, humans are confronted with the limits of existence, and need to reconstruct their personal identity. Self-knowledge is an interpretation: to know who we are, is to interpret our existence (Ricoeur 1991, 188). This interpretation must relate to the past. In the midst of change, there needs to be some continuity. A person needs to remember his or her past in order to construct continuity between the past and the present. Continuity is not just the result of sameness, or repetition. In the present a person can do a variety of things that can be interpreted as belonging to oneself. Narrative memory not only connects to the past but also gives a future to the self. Paul Ricoeur calls this the continuity of keeping a promise (Ricoeur 1992, 123). I promise myself to be loyal to myself as the person “who I am”.

In addition to this past-future structure there is also a second element of narrative identity we like to refer to, namely the self-other structure. People construct their narrative identity out of the many narratives people tell about themselves and that are told about them by others. In constructing my iden-
tity, I tell a story about myself (Ricoeur 1992). At the same time, I am part of the narratives of others, especially those of the social networks in which I live. This self-other structure refers to the second dimension of the connective structure, namely the social dimension. According to Assmann a “we-identity” can be constructed through remembrance (Assmann 1992, 15-16). What is characteristic of memory is that there is a difference from today (“Differenz zum Heute”, Assmann 1992, 32). The fundamental experience of this difference is death (Assmann 1992, 33). Through memory the deceased is given a place in the collective, and does not just disappear into nothing.

What happens when a person dies? For the deceased, death is the limit of the process of narrative reconstruction. However, the deceased is still part of the narrative reconstruction of people in the social networks of which he or she was a part. The members of this network need to relate to the past and future of the deceased. We seek to establish continuity in time when we remember the past of the deceased and our past with that person; and we give that person a future in some form. For example, we may name a street or public building after the deceased, or remember the person when we come together. In this case narrative memory is a not a function of an individual person, but of a collective. A number of individuals form a collective if and only if

(i) they act in ways whose significance can be adequately captured only by an ineliminable reference to some corporate body as part of which they are acting, where
(ii) what that corporate body does is distinct from anything which they as individuals, do, and where
(iii) the corporate body is a persisting one whose survival is relatively indifferent to the persistence of the particular individuals which compose it at any particular moment (Graham 2002, 68-69).

When can an act of memory be characterized as collective remembrance? This is the case when the act of remembrance cannot be understood without the inclusion of a collective actor (cfr. i). For example, when the Dutch nation each year on the fourth of May remembers those who died during the Second World War, or when a family meets on the birthday of the father or mother (or grandfather/grandmother) who has passed away. This act of remembrance is distinct from anything they do as individuals (cfr. ii). Of course, the act of remembrance always takes place in the mind of individuals, but it cannot be understood without a collective actor (e.g. the nation
or the family). And lastly, the corporate body of the collective continues to exist when one or more individuals cease being part of the collective (cfr. iii). The Dutch nation continues to remember its dead on the fourth of May, whether particular individuals take part in this act or not.

2.2. Communicative and cultural memory: remembrance and hope

The connective structure is constructed within the memory of the community. Memory can give coherence to life in a community that is in a crisis after the loss of a significant other. According to Assmann, there are two types of collective memory: a communicative and a cultural type. We will elaborate both types in view of funeral rites.

Communicative memory, according to Assmann, is concerned with the recent past, with experiences that are shared by the members of a certain community (Assmann 1992, 50). This memory does not reach further than two or three generations, in ‘real’ time. ‘Real’ time is ‘clock-time’, which can be measured in intervals. Relations within this framework of time refer to concrete relations between individuals. For example, person A is the daughter of person B, who is the daughter of person C. Communicative memory is caught up in the limits of time. The memory of person C depends on the knowledge that people have of that person. They may not have known her personally, but they will at least know stories about this person. Within the limits of time, there are limits to the transcendence of real time in the communicative memory.

One may also feel the desire to transcend the realistic experience of time and rely on an unrealistic time, as Richard Fenn has suggested (Fenn 1997, 10). Cultural memory is concerned with events in a distant past (Assmann 1992, 52). This distant past refers to a mythical dimension of time, which is different from ‘clock time’. In order to transcend the limits of ‘clock time’, we must shift to a different time-frame.

How do these forms of memory relate to the death of a significant other? First, communicative memory is made up of narratives about the life of the deceased, who was known to a group of people. When this life is remembered, we are entitled to ask whether it has simply ended with death or whether it will continue to have meaning in the future also. And this is where cultural memory comes into play. Because the position that the deceased person will occupy in the future is not automatically clear to those who were connected with him or her, they often rely on images and narratives from a mythical or ‘unrealistic’ time (Assmann 1992, 16). These may be applied to the past of the deceased, as well as to the future that awaits him.
or her, because inherent in them is a future perspective, which might not be readily available from the temporal position of those ‘left behind’. Confronted with death, we remember the life of the deceased and form our experiences with that person into a narrative. We may anticipate the meaning of the deceased in the future, and the relation of the community to this future. This is what we could call communicative memory. At the same time people feel the need of a broader perspective to deal with the loss of a member of the community. Narratives and images from a mythical time are recalled, which have a past and a future “without limits”. Here cultural memory is connected to communicative memory, for which people rely on a world of meaning (Assmann 1992, 16).³

According to Assmann, those two kinds of memory relating to past and future of the deceased consist of both remembrance (“Erinnerung”) and hope (“Hoffnung”) (Assmann 1992, 16). In both cases memory connects the past with the present (remembrance) and with the future (hope). Communicative remembrance means remembering the actual life of the deceased that members of the community shared with that person. Communicative hope is part of creating a new community structure, in which the members relate to the deceased in the new status of “not living” as part of the social network. All this remains within ‘clock time’. In cultural memory, the past is interpreted in the larger context of a mythical time. The life of the deceased is remembered in the context of his or her religious origin, which lies beyond a biological origin. Hope relates not only to a future within the earthly reality of ‘clock time’, but transcends this earthly reality towards the mythical future of the deceased.⁴

According to Assmann, one of the most direct symbolic expressions of communicative and cultural memory is through ritual (Assmann 1992, 17). In ritual, the connective structure is realized by remembrance and hope in a communicative and cultural sense (Assmann 1992, 21f.): the communicative memory refers to the biographical narratives of persons and groups, and the cultural memory refers to collective mythical history (Assmann 1992, 56).⁶ Ritual externalises that which members of a community share (Leach 1979). A ritual binds the members of the community together and makes it possible to connect what has become separated both temporally and socially. Within the ritual, the gap between past and future which creates discontinuity in time and a separation between people within the social network is “closed”. This is what Assman calls the connective structure. What is typical for rituals is that both types of memory are connected. Past and future of the deceased in “real time” are connected with past and future in a “mythical time”.
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Can the Roman Catholic funeral be seen as an enactment of the two types of memory which build the connective structure, namely the communicative and cultural memory? Memory is a core concept within liturgical theories about the Roman Catholic liturgy in the sense that liturgy is characterized by an anamnetic-epicletic nature. We begin with a definition of the anamnetic-epicletic nature of liturgy (3.1), and then relate this structure to the two types of memory of the connective structure, which we label as communicative-liturgical and cultural-liturgical (3.2).

3.1. Anamnetic-epicletic nature of liturgy

To understand the forms of memory in a theological-liturgical sense, we turn to the anamnetic-epicletic nature of funerary liturgy. Scheer describes how the opposition between life and death can be bridged by memory in a liturgical sense (Scheer 1993, 166). We first elaborate on the two concepts of anamnesis and epiclesis as they are used in theological-liturgical discourse, mainly with regard to the Eucharist, involving past and future. After that we apply the theological meaning of these concepts in a broader sense to funeral liturgy.

Anamnesis involves past, present and future simultaneously. In anamnesis, the past becomes a present reality by being remembered. At the same time this opens a new perspective for the future, as the past promises a salvation that is still to come, but that is already anticipated (Jasper & Cuming 1987, 9; Schimdt-Lauber 1995, 231-232). In this sense we can see anamnesis as a form of ritual enactment in the present “between memory and hope” (Johnson 2000). In his narrative analysis of the Eucharistic prayer, Chauvet points out that the ecclesial “we” is presupposed in anamnesis: only the collective body of the assembly can constitute the memory of Jesus Christ which is at the same time an offering of the assembly within the liturgical present (Chauvet 2001, 130-135). The liturgical concept of anamnesis has to be understood as a form of memory of the community of believers (collective).

In epiclesis, the Holy Spirit becomes present as an actor of the liturgy. Thus epiclesis relates to the presence of God, the transcendent realm of liturgy. Already in the Jewish rite of the pascha meal, the anamnesis of the exodus from Egypt is followed by a prayer for Jerusalem and its future meaning. In Christian liturgy this element becomes the epiclesis, which means a prayer that asks for the presence and help of God and especially
the Holy Spirit for the whole assembly (Schimdt-Lauber 1995, 235). In an epicletic sense the Spirit acts in human beings and realizes the salvation that is given by the risen Christ. God becomes present and acts in the most human forms of existence, and will also be there in the future. In this sense we can say that the epicletic aspect of liturgy attests that the relation to past and future established through anamnesis is not just human activity. In epiclesis God himself becomes present in the Holy Spirit, as Chauvet points out, and this is why the Church lives in grace, and “becomes one in Christ” (Chauvet 2001, 137). The two concepts of anamnesis and epiclesis are closely connected in liturgy: anamnesis cannot be thought without epiclesis (Chauvet 2001, 136). What we call the anamnetic-epicletic nature of liturgy means that past and future are expressed through liturgical activities (anamnesis) within the presence of God (epiclesis) by a collective: the community of the liturgical assembly.

The theological concept of the anamnetic-epicletic nature of liturgy reflects the connective structure of memory within the Christian community. This applies in a cultural sense: there is a social connection within the liturgical collective (assembly) which shares a common world of meaning, and a temporal connection (anamnetic), as the past is connected to the future within the present. The epicletic nature of the liturgy (God’s presence) represents the mythical element and creates the connection to cultural memory.

But what about the communicative dimension? The divine presence that is represented in liturgy, is at the same time closely connected to everyday life, as Chauvet points out: “Individual Christians and the Church give to the risen Christ a body of history and humanity” (Chauvet 2001, 137). Mutual love is, according to Chauvet, the major way of expressing the roots of liturgy in everyday life. This means that the basis of the cultural dimension of the connective structure is closely interrelated with the communicative dimension. Also here, people share a common frame of reference, which is related to their experience (social), and the past of the community is related to its future (temporal).

3.2. Communicative-liturgical and cultural-liturgical memory

What might be the meaning of liturgical remembrance and hope as implied in the anamnetic-epicletic nature of liturgy in funerary services? What are the stories that might be told during funerary liturgy that externalise the attitudes towards past and future of the deceased in a liturgical way? Following Assmann, we distinguished between a communicative and cultural memory, and referred to rituals as places of a connective structure between
members of the community and past and future (see section 2). The anamnetic-epicletic nature of liturgy suggests that both dimensions should also play a role in Christian funerals. Are both types of memory, communicative and cultural, reflected in the anamnetic-epicletic nature of funerary liturgy, or is the communicative memory missing from this liturgical structure?

In the past, the goal of funerary liturgy was first of all to reassure the faithful in their faith. Traditionally this includes glorifying God, sanctifying human beings and building up the church (Melloh 1993, 504). In terms of liturgy this meant that the content of funerary liturgy was God’s salvation and its meaning for the deceased, as we still see, for example, in the prayer texts of the Roman Catholic ordo for the funeral (Scheer 1991, 250; Rutherford 1990). This content relates to what Assmann calls the cultural memory. In recent decades, however, there has been a growing sense that the participants in the liturgy should be able to identify with that which is proclaimed. Proclamation only functions well if it takes into account the concrete circumstances of the actual participants (Melloh 1993, 506-508; Goumans 1980, 216). Therefore, to be most effective, memory should never mean remembrance and hope solely focused on a salvation that is unrelated to real time. It should also relate to the “real” trouble experienced by real people confronted with the limits of time (Odenthal 2002, 119). This is how we interpret the meaning of the presence of Christ for everyday life, as Chauvet identified it (Chauvet 2001, 137).

A comparison with funerary homiletics might be helpful to clarify this dimension. Henau distinguishes two functions of funerary preaching: a therapeutic-diaconal function and a kerygmatic one (Henau 1980, 56). The therapeutic-diaconal function makes it necessary to include the worldly existence of the deceased and also his or her possible worldly meaning in the future. This is what participants experience in the sense of communicative memory. The kerygmatic function, meanwhile, makes it possible to proclaim faith in relation to and connected with the worldly reality of the past and future of the deceased. Here religious stories can be told and religious symbols used (cf. Jetter 1986), and here the inheritance of the Roman Catholic faith can be expressed. Similarly, the anamnetic-epicletic nature of funerary liturgy requires doing justice to God and also to human beings (Scheer 1993, 169).

From a liturgical perspective there should be two dimensions of memory in an anamnetic-epicletic sense in modern funerary liturgy: a dimension which does justice to the worldly reality of the transition made by the deceased, and a dimension that refers to religious narratives and images of life and life after death in the light of the Christian message. We call these
dimensions communicative-liturgical and cultural-liturgical. We distinguish four dimensions within the anamnetic-epicletic nature of funerary liturgy: communicative-liturgical remembrance; cultural-liturgical remembrance; communicative-liturgical hope; and cultural-liturgical hope. In the following we will elaborate these four dimensions.

3.2.1. Communicative-liturgical remembrance and hope
What can be the concrete content of communicative remembrance and hope in funerary liturgy? Turning to the Dutch philosopher Ludwig Heyde (Heyde 2000, 142ff.), we note that remembrance of the deceased and hope for that person’s future can be expressed in two ways: individual and social. The individual way is based on a Kantian tradition and is rooted in the intrinsic value of each individual person that is experienced in morality (Heyde 2000, 142). Death does not destroy this value, hence the individual characteristics of the deceased are remembered and the person is made present at the funeral. This can be called individual communicative-liturgical remembrance. If this intrinsic value is not broken by death, it will continue to have importance for the life of the community in the future. It is impossible to think that this value will disappear into nothing. This future perspective we call individual communicative-liturgical hope.

The second way of expressing remembrance and hope is the social way. Everything the deceased meant for the people around him or her is remembered. All the love that person gave and the relationships he or she was part of are made present at the funeral. This is social communicative-liturgical remembrance. At the same time the continuing meaning of the deceased in a social sense is anticipated. All that he or she leaves behind – work, children, loved ones – will continue to have importance for the life in the here and now (Heyde 2000, 142ff.). All this is part of social communicative-liturgical hope.

3.2.2. Cultural-liturgical remembrance and hope
According to Chauvet there are always two theological principles in anamnesis which “rule the thanksgiving of the Church”: what God has done for humankind according to the Scriptures and the paschal mystery of Christ (Chauvet 2001, 131). In the context of the funeral, we can distinguish cultural-liturgical remembrance and hope concerning salvation and concerning resurrection. These are two major topics of theology. The first draws on creation theology, because God created the world and in this creation the salvation of all humans is already present (Vorgrimler 1990, 34). The second aspect concerns a theology of grace, where Jesus Christ has suffered
for all humans – and they will resurrect with him (Vorgrimler 1990, 33). Salvation is what God affirms in general during the course of salvation history. Resurrection is a concrete answer to the question how we will live on after death.10

Cultural-liturgical remembrance concerning salvation at funerals means that God’s relation with the deceased is remembered. Since God is the origin of human life and He guides people through their lives, one can also say that the origin of the deceased is remembered. The theological basis for this kind of remembrance can be seen in salvation history: God who created the world and saved his people (Vorgrimler 1990, 34).11 From the very beginning, God never abandoned the deceased during his or her lifetime. At the same time it is expected that the deceased will be with God in the future. The future salvation of the deceased becomes present at the funeral (praesentia salutis), and the presence of God makes it possible to articulate this hope (Wohlmuth 1992, 83). This is what we call cultural-liturgical hope concerning salvation.

On a christological level the paschal mystery of Jesus Christ is the major source for liturgical remembrance and hope (Vrogrimler 1990, 33). Cultural-liturgical remembrance concerning resurrection means that the death and resurrection of Jesus Christ are remembered in connection with the deceased. To remember the resurrection of Jesus is Christian only if it is connected to Christian existence (Chauvet 1995, 260-261).12 At the same time the paschal mystery implies that each person who followed Jesus will rise with him (Wohlmuth 1992, 105-108). That is cultural-liturgical hope concerning resurrection: The person who has died will also rise with Jesus Christ. In this sense the paschal mystery includes past, present and future for the liturgical assembly (Wohlmuth 1992, 128) and the deceased.

In these concepts we see that it is possible to combine the content of Christian faith with the actual life of concrete persons in liturgy, and this is exactly what is meant when we talk about cultural memory and communicative memory. Ideally all of these dimensions should be present in funerary liturgy in order to externalise communicative and cultural memory. The combination of these concepts can be seen as the hermeneutical task of funerary liturgy, where Christian existence is interpreted in the light of Christian faith (Zimmerman 1999).

Along with these various forms of remembrance and hope, there is also the possibility of no hope for the deceased. In this case life on earth is the only relevant horizon, and the question of hope does not arise (Heyde 2000, 142). The funeral is then only a memorial service. While this possibility is not likely to be a major element at a Roman Catholic funeral, nevertheless
given the diversity of potential participants, it may indeed play a role in the attitudes of the participants. We call this last possibility no hope.

4. Research results

In the empirical-liturgical study that is described in the following, we set out to determine whether the different forms of liturgical remembrance and hope can be identified in the attitudes of participants of Roman Catholic funerals. In this section we present the research questions (1), describe the research design and the sample (2), present the instruments used (3), and lastly present and discuss the results (4).

4.1. Research questions

To understand how past and future of the deceased are represented in the attitudes of participants of Roman Catholic funeral rites (the main topic of this article), it makes sense to ask the participants about what, in their view, constitutes the core of a Roman Catholic funeral. Our aim is to determine whether we will find the different forms of remembrance and hope that we distinguished in the last paragraph in the attitudes of participants of contemporary Roman Catholic funerals (question 1). Based on the theoretical considerations presented above, we would expect the respondents to distinguish between all the different forms we described. Next it is important to know which of these forms of remembrance and hope receives the highest level of acceptance among the respondents (question 2), particularly since the respondents’ attitudes could be biased in one direction or another. Although theoretically we would expect acceptance for all of the forms, it is possible that in modern society the aspect of communicative-liturgical memory might be most highly appreciated. The connective structure that we derived from Assmann includes the assumption that past and future are linked together in communicative and cultural memory, and that both should be integrated in the rite. Therefore it is important to know how the different forms of liturgical remembrance and hope relate to one another (question 3). We expect to find a relation between remembrance and hope, both cultural-liturgical and communicative-liturgical. This is the temporal aspect of the connective structure. Lastly we also want to determine how the background of the respondents influences their attitudes towards liturgical remembrance and hope. We choose two characteristics that might play a role: the respondents’ relationship to the deceased and their church involvement (question 4). These background variables refer to the social dimension of
the connective structure. We expect a closer relation to the deceased to correlate with a higher agreement with communicative-liturgical remembrance and hope. We further expect that people with a higher degree of church involvement will agree more strongly with cultural-liturgical remembrance and hope.

The research questions are therefore as follows:

1. Can cultural-liturgical and communicative-liturgical remembrance and hope be identified in the attitudes of participants at contemporary Roman Catholic funeral rites?
2. To what extent do the respondents agree with these different kinds of liturgical remembrance and hope?
3. What relations do respondents see between these kinds of liturgical remembrance and hope?
4. How does social the background of the respondents, specifically their relation with the deceased and their church involvement, relate to the attitudes of remembrance and hope?

4.2. Research design and sample

To be able to find answers to these research questions, we chose an explorative-descriptive survey design. This means that we do not claim to generalise the results. The object of the questionnaire-based research was to determine what attitudes relating to cultural-liturgical and communicative-liturgical remembrance and hope can be found among respondents who recently participated in 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 carried out funeral liturgies typical of the different liturgical styles in the Netherlands. Because of the incidental nature of funeral services, the data collection, which took part between February and August 2002, was difficult. Researchers must also bear in mind the piety that is required when addressing people who are in a state of mourning. The data collection proceeded in several stages. Initially we enlisted the cooperation of the pastors of the parishes, who gave the questionnaires to the bereaved. Later we were brought into contact directly with family members of the deceased and handed the questionnaires to them. We also asked them for names of other participants of the funeral. In addition, we used parish networks to identify groups of whom we knew that the members had taken part in a funeral in that particular parish recently. We dis-
tributed 539 questionnaires; 229 were returned, which corresponds to a response rate of 40%.

4.3. Measuring instrument

We constructed a new instrument to measure the attitudes of the respondents towards liturgical remembrance and hope. From our analysis of liturgical texts frequently used in funerary liturgy, we had strong indicators that the different dimensions of liturgical remembrance and hope do in fact play a role in Roman Catholic funerals. Often the issue at stake is how the individual and the religious elements of the funeral can be brought together, which is linked to the different expectations of the pastor and the bereaved. We also observed funerals in the selected parishes and found that the groups of participants assembled at these events were very diverse. For this reason we expected to find differences in attitudes regarding liturgical remembrance and hope, and we chose the following concepts from our theoretical investigation which we expected would play a role in the attitudes of the participants (Figure 1):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concept</th>
<th>Remembrance</th>
<th>Hope</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cultural</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salvation</td>
<td>God’s salvation during the life of the deceased</td>
<td>God’s salvation for the deceased in the future</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resurrection</td>
<td>death and resurrection of Jesus Christ for the deceased</td>
<td>resurrection of the deceased with Jesus Christ in the future</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Communicative</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>intrinsic value of the deceased in his or her life</td>
<td>intrinsic value of the deceased in the future</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>meaning for others of the deceased during his or her life</td>
<td>meaning in the future in what he or she leaves behind</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As a last concept we added “no hope”. These concepts about liturgical remembrance and hope were operationalised with three items each. The list of items was mixed up and presented to the respondents. The respondents were asked to indicate to what extent they believed the concept to be a core theme
of a Roman Catholic funeral (from 1 – “completely disagree” to 5 – “completely agree”). In the next figure we give an example of an item used by each of our theoretical concepts from the last paragraph (Figure 2):

Figure 2. Operationalisation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concept</th>
<th>example of an item:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>cultural-liturgical remembrance –</td>
<td>The core of a Roman Catholic funeral is that . . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>salvation</td>
<td>God did not abandon the deceased during his life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cultural-liturgical remembrance –</td>
<td>Christ died and is risen for the deceased</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>resurrection</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>communicative-liturgical remembrance – individual</td>
<td>the deceased was a unique person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>communicative-liturgical remembrance – social</td>
<td>the deceased meant much to many people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cultural-liturgical hope – salvation</td>
<td>God will not abandon the deceased after his death</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cultural-liturgical hope – resurrection</td>
<td>the deceased will rise from death with Christ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>communicative-liturgical hope –</td>
<td>the deceased cannot simply disappear into nothing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>individual</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>communicative-liturgical hope –</td>
<td>the deceased will live on, for example in his work, his children or in memory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>social</td>
<td>death is the definite end of life</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.4. Analysis of results

To answer the first two research questions on liturgical remembrance and hope, we first performed a free factor analysis on all the items. This yielded four factors: the first factor consisted of all the cultural-liturgical items grouped together, i.e. cultural-liturgical remembrance and hope concerning salvation and resurrection. The second factor contained the items relating to individual and social communicative-liturgical remembrance. The third factor comprised the items on communicative-liturgical hope, and the fourth factor contained the “no hope” items.

Because we were particularly interested in the differences between communicative-liturgical and cultural-liturgical remembrance and between communicative-liturgical and cultural-liturgical hope, we carried out two
other factor analyses which were confirmative and theory-based: one on the remembrance items and one on the hope items. The items about no hope were included in the second factor analysis.

Table 1. *Oblimin rotated factor matrix, commonalities ($h^2$), percentage of explained variance, estimated reliability (alpha) regarding liturgical remembrance*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>% not agree</th>
<th>% not agree/agree</th>
<th>% agree</th>
<th>$h^2$</th>
<th>f1</th>
<th>f2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Christ died and is risen for the deceased.</td>
<td>26.4</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>47.6</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christ’s death is liberating for the deceased.</td>
<td>31.3</td>
<td>32.7</td>
<td>35.9</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christ saved the deceased from death.</td>
<td>39.6</td>
<td>32.4</td>
<td>27.9</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>God did not abandon the deceased during his lifetime.</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>31.0</td>
<td>50.4</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>God helped the deceased with many problems in his life.</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>39.5</td>
<td>37.7</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>God was close to the deceased in his life.</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>33.2</td>
<td>53.5</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The deceased had a high value for many people.</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>27.9</td>
<td>68.1</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The deceased was important to many people.</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>73.9</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The deceased had many special qualities.</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>72.6</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The deceased had a high value for the people around him or her.</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>74.7</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The deceased was a unique person.</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>77.4</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Alpha: .90 .89

Scale average (mean): 3.2 4.0
Scale deviation: (.76) (.91)
Number of valid cases: 222 226

explained variance: 63.2%

f1: factor loading on attitudes towards cultural-liturgical remembrance
f2: factor loading on attitudes towards communicative-liturgical remembrance

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

N = 229
We found that the respondents made a distinction between cultural-liturgical remembrance and communicative-liturgical remembrance. Within the items on cultural-liturgical remembrance they did not distinguish between salvation and resurrection. The same applies to the items on communicative-liturgical remembrance where no distinction was made between individual and social remembrance (Table 1).

Among the items on liturgical hope the respondents make a distinction between cultural-liturgical hope, communicative-liturgical hope, and no hope, as we see in the second factor analysis. Among the items on cultural-liturgical hope they do not distinguish between hope concerning salvation and concerning resurrection. The same applies again to the items on communicative-liturgical hope: the respondents do not distinguish between individual and social communicative-liturgical hope. The only concept that we obtained as separate factor were the items on ‘no hope’ (Table 2).

These two factor analyses yielded five scales about liturgical remembrance and hope that are reliable: cultural-liturgical remembrance, communicative-liturgical remembrance, cultural-liturgical hope, communicative-liturgical hope, and no hope.

What was the reaction of the respondents to the five attitudes towards liturgical remembrance and hope (question 2)? We see that cultural-liturgical remembrance has an average score (X) of 3.2. The response to this concept is indecisive. Communicative-liturgical remembrance has an average score of 4.0 meaning that the respondents agree with it. Cultural-liturgical hope is also regarded indecisively (3.6), but with a stronger tendency towards agreement than cultural-liturgical remembrance. The respondents agree more strongly with communicative-liturgical hope (3.8). They do not agree with the items on ‘no hope’ (2.0).

We conclude that there is stronger agreement with communicative-liturgical remembrance and hope than with cultural-liturgical remembrance and hope. It is interesting that there is strong disagreement with ‘no hope’. It is also interesting that within the cultural-liturgical domain the respondents agree more strongly with hope than with remembrance. In the communicative-liturgical domain it is the other way around: here the respondents agree more strongly with remembrance than with hope. At the same time we see a high standard deviation on the items from the cultural-liturgical domain and the items on ‘no hope’. The communicative-liturgical items have a lower standard deviation. This means that the agreement of the respondents is more widely scattered in the cultural-liturgical domain and in the domain of ‘no hope’.
Table 2: Oblimin rotated factor-matrix, commonalities ($h^2$), percentage of explained variance, estimated reliability (alpha) regarding liturgical hope

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>% not agree</th>
<th>% not agree/agree</th>
<th>% agree</th>
<th>% agree</th>
<th>$h^2$</th>
<th>f1</th>
<th>f2</th>
<th>f3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The deceased will rise from death with Christ.</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>27.6</td>
<td>45.7</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The deceased will resurrect with Jesus.</td>
<td>28.3</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>45.2</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The deceased will live on with Christ.</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td>60.4</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>God will not abandon the deceased after his death.</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>79.8</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>God will take the deceased home after his death.</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>18.7</td>
<td>70.2</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>God will be with the deceased after his death.</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>31.8</td>
<td>54.7</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The deceased will live on in what he leaves behind.</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>26.8</td>
<td>58.5</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The deceased will live on, e.g. in his work, his children or in memory.</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>87.7</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The deceased will live on in what he has done in his lifetime.</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>79.6</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A part of the deceased will continue to exist after his death.</td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>25.7</td>
<td>54.1</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The life of the deceased has ended forever.</td>
<td>74.2</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no life after death for the deceased.</td>
<td>71.2</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Death is the definite end of life.</td>
<td>76.9</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Alpha .93 .73 .84

explained variance: 62.0%

f1: factor loading on attitudes towards cultural-liturgical hope

f2: factor loading on attitudes towards communicative-liturgical hope

f3: factor loading on attitudes towards no hope

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

2 N = 229

number of valid cases 222 225 221
The next research question (question 3) is the relationship between these factors. For this we look at the correlation between the five separate scales (Table 3):

Table 3: Correlations between the factors on liturgical remembrance and hope

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Cultural-liturgical hope</th>
<th>Cultural-liturgical remembrance</th>
<th>Communicative-liturgical hope</th>
<th>Communicative-liturgical remembrance</th>
<th>no hope</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cult-liturg hope</td>
<td>.79*</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.39*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cult-liturg remembrance</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td></td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comm-liturg hope</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.52*</td>
<td>-08</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comm-liturg remembrance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no hope</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .01

We find a high correlation between cultural-liturgical hope and cultural-liturgical remembrance (.79). There is a weaker, but still significant, correlation between communicative-liturgical remembrance and communicative-liturgical hope (.52). A significant negative correlation is found between cultural-liturgical hope and no hope (−.39).

These correlations reflect the temporal dimension of the connective structure proposed by Assmann, in that the past is connected to the future within the two domains (cultural-liturgical and communicative-liturgical).

We then asked how some selected background variables would influence the respondents’ agreement or disagreement with liturgical remembrance and hope (question 4). From the questionnaire we selected two background variables that we believed would be relevant for participants in a Roman Catholic funeral in the Netherlands: their relation to the deceased and their church involvement.

Table 4 shows the significant associations between these background variables and the categories of liturgical remembrance and hope. Significant differences between subcategories of the variables are shown in the appendix.
There is no significant association between communicative-liturgical hope and respondents’ relation to the deceased or church involvement. In the case of communicative-liturgical remembrance, on the other hand, we see significant associations with the relation to the deceased and church involvement. Based on the Scheffé test, we can say that the people from the family of the deceased and those who had a personal relationship with the deceased agreed significantly more strongly with items in this category than did respondents whose relation to the deceased fell into other categories. Concerning church involvement, we find a significant difference between marginal members and modal members, and between non-members and modal members. We expected the relation to the deceased to be significant, but found it interesting that church involvement also plays a role in a negative sense, in that non-members and marginal members agreed more strongly than did modal members.

Cultural-liturgical hope has significant associations with the relation to the deceased and church involvement. Respondents whose relation to the deceased fell into the “other” category agreed significantly more strongly with cultural-liturgical hope than did people with a personal relation to the deceased. Because those in the “other” category are mainly members of the parish, this result is understandable. This observation is supported by the associations with church involvement, where we see significant differences between all three groups: the groups with more church involvement agree more strongly with cultural-liturgical hope.

Cultural-liturgical remembrance shows the same associations as cultural-liturgical hope and also the same differences between groups. In the cultural-liturgical domain the associations between the background variables are the same for remembrance and hope.
The last scale is no hope. It shows significant associations with church involvement. Marginal members and non-members differ significantly from modal members. Those with stronger church involvement are less likely to agree with the concept of no hope.

5. Conclusion and Discussion

The main question addressed in this article was: In what sense are past and future of the deceased represented in Roman Catholic funerals today, as reflected in the attitudes of participants? Taking communicative-liturgical and cultural-liturgical memory as the basic concepts, we identified different forms of remembrance and hope that can be externalised in the anamnetic-epicletic aspects of a Roman Catholic funeral rite, and that constitute social and temporal means of constructing identity. In this section we compare some of our theoretical assumptions with the research results described in section 4.

In our study we did identify attitudes of agreement with cultural-liturgical remembrance and hope and communicative-liturgical remembrance and hope among our respondents. However, the theoretical distinctions between cultural-liturgical remembrance and hope concerning salvation and resurrection, and between individual and social communicative-liturgical remembrance and hope, were not reflected in the survey responses.

The respondents agreed more strongly with the communicative-liturgical items than with the cultural-liturgical items. Cultural-liturgical remembrance and hope were connected, as were communicative-liturgical remembrance and hope. The temporal dimension of the connective structure was reflected in the minds of the respondents. Within the communicative-liturgical domain there was stronger agreement with remembrance (mean 4.0) than with hope (mean 3.8). In the cultural-liturgical domain the results were the reverse (mean 3.6 for hope and 3.2 for remembrance).

Concerning the social location of the different forms of remembrance and hope we looked at the background variables of relation to the deceased and church involvement, as aspects of the social dimension of the connective structure. We found that these two variables had associations with all forms of remembrance and hope, except communicative-liturgical hope, but that church involvement was more strongly associated than was the relation to the deceased. We had expected church involvement to have associations with cultural-liturgical remembrance and hope and relation to the
deceased with communicative-liturgical remembrance and hope. What we 
found is that all forms of remembrance and hope had associations with 
both background variables, except communicative-liturgical hope. Participants 
with higher church involvement agreed more strongly with cultural-lit-
urgical remembrance and hope, but less strongly with communicative-lit-
urgical remembrance. Participants whose relation to the deceased was not 
personal ("other"), agreed most strongly with cultural-liturgical remembrance 
and hope.

Having reviewed the results of the study in a general sense, we find sev-
eral results that raise questions meriting further discussion. (1) First there 
is the problem that the participants within the cultural-liturgical memory 
do not distinguish between remembrance and hope concerning salvation 
and concerning resurrection. (2) Then there is the question of the domi-
nance of the communicative-liturgical memory in comparison to the cul-
tural-liturgical memory, and the lack of a correlation between both types 
of liturgical memory. (3) A last point of discussion is the difference between 
participants’ attitudes about remembrance and hope as a function of their 
social position.

(1) In the cultural-liturgical dimension no distinction is made between 
salvation by God and the act of salvation by Jesus Christ (resurrection), in 
which all anamnesis should culminate (Chauvet 2001, 131). How can we 
interpret this research finding? Since the Second Vatican Council, in Roman 
Catholic funerary liturgy a strong emphasis is laid on resurrection. Some 
liturgists have been questioning this emphasis on resurrection because it 
would make it difficult for those in mourning to find a place for their grief 
in liturgy (Gerhards 1990, 157-158). If resurrection is understood as the 
glorification of the Son of God, through which the relation between God 
and man is restored, this difficulty could indeed arise. However this is not 
the only possible interpretation of resurrection. It all depends on the Chris-
tology that is used to interpret the meaning of resurrection. The interpre-
tation of the resurrection as the glorification of the pre-existent Son of God 
is typical for a so-called Logos-Christology (Schoonenberg 1991). Many 
of the liturgical texts presuppose this Logos-Christology, in which Christ 
is depicted as the pre-existent Logos that became man in order to save 
humankind. In this Christology the difference between Jesus Christ and 
mankind ("us") is stressed. The Dutch theologian Schoonenberg distinguishes 
a second type of Christology which can also be grounded biblically, namely 
a Spirit-Christology. This is not the place to give a detailed account of this 
christological theory. We only refer to some characteristic differences
between a Spirit-Christology and a Logos-Christology (Schoonenberg, 1991). In a Spirit-Christology, the focus is not on the descending pre-existent Logos, but on the ascending Son of God which received God's Spirit as man. Through his death and resurrection he became the Giver of this Spirit together with the Father. In a Spirit-Christology, there is more conformity between Jesus and man in comparison to a Logos-Christology. This brings God's acts in salvation history in general more closer to the specific history of God in Jesus Christ. From this perspective, the results of our research make sense. Our respondents seem not to differentiate conceptually between the concept of salvation in general and the resurrection of Christ with respect to religious understanding of the past and future of the deceased. Further research is needed to test our interpretation from the perspective of a Spirit-Christology. Is there indeed a change in understanding of resurrection among (Roman Catholic) believers in our time? Does resurrection from a Spirit-Christology give more room for grief in funeral liturgy compared to a Logos-Christology?

(2) The participants in Roman Catholic funerals which were involved in our research find it generally more important to remember the biographical past of the deceased (or the 'real time' past with the deceased). They are less inclined to focus on the mythical time of cultural-liturgical remembrance. Between this communicative-liturgical memory and the cultural-liturgical memory there is no correlation. This research finding confronts us with a problem, which is discussed in liturgical literature in the form of the dilemma whether a funeral liturgy should be a memorial service or a religious, liturgical service (Van Tongeren 2004). In pastoral liturgical praxis pastors are often confronted with this problem. Many people who come for a religious funeral want a memorial service around the life of the deceased. Also in homiletical literature this dilemma returns: should the homily be at the centre of the liturgy or a eulogy (Melloh 1993, 506f.). While an “eulogy” focuses on the life of the deceased, a “homily” focuses on the content of the Christian faith. Our research findings seem to confirm this dilemma. One of the major functions of funeral rites, namely to build a hermeneutical bridge between people’s experience with the death of the deceased and the tradition of the church, is not effectively being carried out. Our research findings give no clues how this problem can be solved. But if this dilemma is not solved, funeral liturgy looses its specific function which is precisely the connection between communicative and cultural memory. Which new and old liturgical forms can enact the connection between liturgical-communicative memory and liturgical-cultural memory? Should we perhaps focus on the connection of the future-dimension ("hope")
between the communicative and cultural memory instead of the past-dimension ("remembrance")? Again, more research will be needed into this topic.

(3) The collective “we” that is constructed by communicative and cultural remembrance and hope, is associated with closeness of the relation to the deceased and to the ecclesial network. As could be expected, the cultural dimension of memory seems to be more important for participants with stronger church involvement. Ecclesial networks are associated with shared cultural-liturgical remembrance and hope. There is also a weak association between different types of relation to the deceased and cultural-liturgical hope and remembrance. Social networks (relation to the deceased) associate moderately with communicative-liturgical remembrance, as could be expected. Modal church members have a lower attitudinal level towards communicative-liturgical remembrance than marginal members or non-members. This research result seems to suggest that the two types of memory are connected to two different types of social relationships, namely based on (different levels of) friendship and nearness, and based on (different levels of) church involvement. Both types of social relationship do not coincide in modern society. This causes a problem for funerary liturgy. The theoretical model of Assmann presupposes that there is one collective “we-identity” constructed within rituals through different types of memory. This theoretical presumption can be questioned (Zulehner 2001). What is this “we” that is enacted in liturgy? Is this a “monologic we” which is clear-cut and the same for all the participants? Can this also be a polyphonic “we” in which different forms of belonging and identity are constructed at the same time? How can we structure funerary liturgies in ways that are fitted for this complex condition? What does this mean for the complexity of ritual acts and texts? And is the leadership of the Church willing to accept this polyphonic “we” which is plural and open. Interesting questions, which ask for new liturgical research.

APPENDIX

The first background variable is the respondent’s relation to the deceased. The respondents were asked for their relation to the deceased, which we categorized into one of 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 one
of three groups: 1 – not a member of the church; 2 – marginal member; 3 – modal member.

**Comparison of the means (Scheffé-test) of cultural-liturgical remembrance for different levels of church involvement**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>mean</th>
<th>modal member</th>
<th>marginal member</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>modal member</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>marginal member</td>
<td>2.9 *</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>non-member</td>
<td>2.3 *</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* alpha = .05

**Comparison of the means (Scheffé-test) of cultural-liturgical hope for different levels of church involvement**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>mean</th>
<th>modal member</th>
<th>marginal member</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>modal member</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>marginal member</td>
<td>3.3 *</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>non-member</td>
<td>2.1 *</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* alpha = .05

**Comparison of the means (Scheffé-test) of communicative-liturgical remembrance for different levels of church involvement**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>mean</th>
<th>modal member</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>modal member</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>marginal member</td>
<td>4.2 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>non-member</td>
<td>4.3 *</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* alpha = 0.05

**Comparison of the means (Scheffé-test) of no hope for different levels of church involvement**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>mean</th>
<th>modal member</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>modal member</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>marginal member</td>
<td>2.3 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>non-member</td>
<td>2.5 *</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* alpha = 0.05
REMENBRANCE AND HOPE IN ROMAN CATHOLIC FUNERAL RITES

Comparison of the means (Scheffé-test) of cultural-liturgical remembrance for different types of relation to the deceased

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>mean</th>
<th>personal relationship</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>personal relationship</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other</td>
<td>3.4 *</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* alpha = 0.05

Comparison of the means (Scheffé-test) of cultural-liturgical hope for different types of relation to the deceased

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>mean</th>
<th>personal relationship</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>personal relationship</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other</td>
<td>3.8 *</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* alpha = 0.05

Comparison of the means (Scheffé-test) of communicative-liturgical remembrance for different types of relation to the deceased

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>mean</th>
<th>other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>other</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>personal relationship</td>
<td>4.1 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* alpha = 0.05

NOTES

1. We thank Dr. Ronald L. Grimes and Dr. Hans Schilderman for their conceptual input and critical remarks to this article.
2. According to Van Gennep these passages are present in every culture, and people deal with the passages in a comparable way in every culture (Van Gennep 1999, 13).
3. Another example where this is clearly the case, as shown in Assmann’s historical research, is festival: there we find a cultural phenomenon in which the cultural memory is acted out (Assmann 1991; cf. Post 2000, 128ff.).
4. Assmann calls this twofold memory of the dead “retrospective and prospective memory” (Assmann 1992, 61).
5. The second place where this happens is text. It is even more elaborated and complex than a rite. Both phenomena belong to what Assmann calls the external realm (“Außenbereich”), and construct meaning by externalising shared experiences and ideas (cf. Wils 2001, 11-12).
6. Aleida Assmann has pointed out that there are two dimensions to the memory of the dead: *pietas* and *fama*. Through *pietas* the dead come to be remembered more independently of their lives, in a religious perspective. *Fama* means remembrance of the life of the deceased (Assmann 1999, 33-34).

7. Chauvet says in this context: “As the moment of appropriation of God in what God has that is most divine in humankind in what it has that is most human, the Spirit has the mission of raising up for the Risen One a body of humanity and of world” (Chauvet 1995, 526).

8. Assmann equates the two dimensions of cultural and communicative also with "sacred" and "profane" (Assmann 1992, 58), which means that in liturgy they represent different realities. From this we presume to use the terms "communicative" and "cultural" in a liturgical context. By linking “communicative” and “cultural” with “liturgical” we want to express that the two dimensions are meant to be understood in this particular meaning of liturgical concepts.

9. The same combination of communicative-liturgical and cultural-liturgical dimensions within the liturgy applies also to other liturgical celebrations at life-cycle moments, as for example marriage, in which an anthropological reality and a religious reality are both addressed during the liturgy (Prößdorf 1999, 143f.).

10. According to Boismard, the reason for this is that we have to distinguish the ‘fact’ and the ‘how’ of a religious perspective on death (Boismard 1999, viii). The fact of salvation has been there from the very beginning, whereas the definite salvation act by Jesus Christ expresses how salvation will take place.

11. In the biblical sense we see that God forms a “You” for his people, as we see in Psalm 73: historically it seemed as though God had abandoned his people, but this is not true and the writer of the psalm remembers this, saying that he sees that God helps him and that he will be kept at the right hand of God.

12. In liturgy we give thanks for the unique death and resurrection of Jesus Christ and anticipate the future, which is anamnesis, as Thurian points out (Thurian 1976, 14, 24).
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