



AUSTRALIAN ACADEMY OF LITURGY

AUSTRALIAN JOURNAL OF LITURGY

Volume 5 Number 3 May 1996

AUSTRALIAN ACADEMY OF LITURGY

COUNCIL 1995-96

| | |
|----------------------|---------------------------------------|
| PRESIDENT: | Tom Elich, BA, BD, DTh/DHistRel |
| PAST PRESIDENT: | Russell Hardiman, BTL, STL, DSLit |
| SECRETARY/TREASURER: | Inari Thiel, MA, MSc |
| EDITOR OF AJL | R. Wesley Hartley, BA, BD, MTh, DipLS |
| CHAPTER CONVENORS: | |
| QLD | David Lowrey |
| NSW | Ursula O'Rourke, sgs, MA(LitStud) |
| ACT | H. D'Arcy Wood, MA, BD, PhD |
| VIC | Colleen O'Reilly, MTh |
| TAS | Cathryn Murrowood, BA, DipEd |
| SA | Anthony Kain, MA, DMin |
| WA | Angela McCarthy, BA |

MEMBERSHIP OF THE ACADEMY

Admission to the Academy is open to those who have recognised qualifications in liturgical studies and related disciplines. The Academy also admits those who have demonstrated in other ways their professional competence in these fields or who evidence a developing contribution in the area of worship.

The Academy hopes that the work of members will serve to animate the liturgical spirit of the traditions and congregations to which they belong.

Applications for membership are invited and should be made on an Application Form available from:

The Secretary
Australian Academy of Liturgy
GPO Box 282
Brisbane Qld 4001
Facsimile: (07) 221 1705

The annual membership fee is \$30.00; or \$40.00 for couples. The membership fee includes subscription to *AJL*.

AUSTRALIAN JOURNAL OF LITURGY

Volume 5 Number 3 May 1996

EDITOR

R. WESLEY HARTLEY

EDITORIAL PANEL

JOHN BAUMGARDNER (Assistant Editor)
CHARLES SHERLOCK (Book Review Editor)

ROBERT GRIBBEN
RUSSELL HARDIMAN
CARMEL PILCHER, rsj
PAUL RENNER

AJL is the journal of the Australian Academy of Liturgy and exists to further the study of liturgy at a scholarly level and to comment on and provide information concerning liturgical matters with special reference to Australia.

AJL is published each May and October.

ISSN 1030-617X

Editorial

In a way this is a 'conference issue' of the journal. The national conference of the Academy was held in Canberra last December and had the theme 'Children in the Christian Community'. The Secretary, Inari Thiel, reports on the conference. The articles by the Revd Robert Gribben, Fr David Orr, and Sister Ursula O'Rourke were presented as papers at the conference. The general meeting of the Academy made some significant changes to the Constitution and the revised Constitution is printed in this issue.

The article by Bishop Silk continues the discussion of the new Anglican prayer book, *A Prayer Book for Australia*. The article was presented as the Marshall Memorial Lecture for 1995. The Warden of Trinity College Melbourne, the Revd Dr Evan L. Burge, has kindly supplied the following information about the lecture.

The Marshall Memorial Lecture has been sponsored by Trinity College Melbourne and delivered annually in the College Chapel since 1971 in thanksgiving for the life and work of the Reverend Dr Barry Marshall. For the decade of the 1960s Dr Marshall was Chaplain and theological lecturer at the College, and was esteemed for his pastoral gifts, his scholarship, his ecumenism, and his interest in liturgical renewal. He died after a fall in Pusey House, Oxford, of which he had recently become principal, on 12 August 1970.

In order to include in this issue material from the conference I have had, unfortunately, to hold over to the next issue Part 2 of Brian Dawson's article 'In Search of Meaning' the first part of which appeared in *AJL* volume 5 number 2.

Strathmore Vicarage
Ascension Day 1996

RWH

CONTENTS

| | |
|--|-----|
| An Anglican Epiclesis The Barry Marshall Lecture 1995 <i>David Silk</i> | 130 |
| The Christian initiation of children in a biblical, theological, and historical perspective <i>Robert Gribben</i> | 145 |
| The development of Confirmation as a separate celebration in Christian initiation <i>David Orr</i> | 158 |
| Integrating children into the Christian community with particular reference to confirmation and eucharist <i>Ursula O'Rourke</i> | 165 |
| Conference Report | 177 |
| Constitution | 179 |
| Contributors..... | 184 |

An Anglican Epiclesis

The Barry Marshall Lecture 1995

David Silk

1 In July 1995 the General Synod of the Anglican Church of Australia adopted *A Prayer Book for Australia* which contains three orders for the Eucharist. The Holy Communion Second Order offers a selection of five eucharistic prayers, the first of which is to be regarded as primary and normative. In this first Eucharistic Prayer or Thanksgiving the paragraph which precedes the Institution Narrative reads as follows:

Merciful God, we thank you for these gifts of your creation, this bread and this wine, and we pray that by your Word and Holy Spirit we who eat and drink them may be partakers of Christ's body and blood.

In the third Eucharistic Prayer the paragraph which precedes the Institution Narrative reads as follows:

Hear us, merciful Lord; through Christ accept our sacrifice of praise; and by the power of your Word and Holy Spirit, sanctify this bread and wine, that we who share in this holy sacrament may be partakers of Christ's body and blood.

2 This paragraph of the Eucharistic Prayer is customarily called the consecratory "Epiclesis" or "Invocation". In the eucharistic prayers of the Western and Alexandrine tradition it precedes the Institution Narrative while in those of the Antiochene and other Eastern traditions it generally occurs after the Narrative.

3 But the texts which I have quoted from *A Prayer Book for Australia* are unique in one significant respect. While a consecratory epiclesis of some kind is now an almost universal feature in the liturgies of all the major churches across the world, such an epiclesis almost invariably invokes the Holy Spirit, and – with the exception of the traditional revision of the American Anglican rite to which I shall refer later – in no case of which I am aware does it invoke the Word, or Logos. The Anglican Church in Australia has adopted at this point a text which, because it is addressed to God the Father, is more fully and explicitly trinitarian than almost any other.

4 Where does it come from, this epiclesis of both Word and Spirit? Does it have any precedent? Or is it yet another manifestation of that rugged independence of spirit and preference for liturgical innovation and singularity for which Australian Anglicans have been criticised, and accused – with some justification – of sheer insularity and idiosyncrasy. A prime example is the text of the Gloria Patri in *An Australian Prayer Book*: "Glory to God: Father, Son and Holy Spirit".

5 Eucharistic epikleses which invoke jointly both Word and Holy Spirit are, of course, not unknown in the history of Anglican liturgy, even if there are no revisions in modern language to have continued the tradition. Indeed, the first English Prayer Book of 1549 set the course with these words immediately before the Institution Narrative:

Hear us, O merciful Father, we beseech thee; and with thy Holy Spirit and Word vouchsafe to bless and sanctify these thy gifts and creatures of bread and wine, that they may be unto us the body and blood of thy most dearly beloved Son Jesus Christ:

6 In 1552 this epiklesis was replaced by a petition merely that the communicants should be partakers of the body and blood of Christ.

Hear us, O merciful Father, we most humbly beseech thee; and grant that we receiving these thy creatures of bread and wine, according to thy Son our Saviour Jesus Christ's holy institution, in remembrance of his death and passion, may be partakers of his most blessed body and blood.

7 The prayer is at this point at great pains to avoid any express reference to the consecration of the creatures of bread and wine, and of the work of the Word and Holy Spirit in consecration: it is carefully worded to avoid the expression of any specific theory of consecration, of any way in which the outward and visible sign becomes the conductor of inward and spiritual grace.

8 It was the formula of 1549, combined with that of 1552 and 1559, which was adopted in the Scottish Liturgy of 1637, and canvassed unsuccessfully by Cosin and Sancroft for the *Book of Common Prayer* of 1662:

Hear us, O merciful Father, we most humbly beseech thee, and of thy almighty goodness vouchsafe so to bless and sanctify with thy word and Holy Spirit these thy gifts and creatures of bread and wine, that they may be unto us the body and blood of thy most dearly beloved Son; so that we, receiving them according to thy Son our Saviour Jesus Christ's holy institution, in remembrance of his death and passion, may be partakers of his most precious body and blood.

9 The 1549-1637 formula surfaced again in the Scottish Liturgy of 1764. It did, however, feature two very significant developments. First, the 1552 words were omitted and replaced by a prayer for the presence of Christ in the bread and wine which was even more emphatically realist than that of 1549. "May be unto us", which explicitly related the sacramental presence to the reception of holy communion was now simply "may become". Secondly, the epiklesis was transferred to a later position after the Institution Narrative and Memorial/Offering of the gifts.

10 It was from Scotland that the formula joining Word and Holy Spirit sailed the ocean blue with the historic episcopate, and found its way into the American

Liturgy, where it remains, combined with 1552-1662, as part of the first (traditional) order of the Eucharist:

...of thy almighty goodness, vouchsafe to bless and sanctify, with thy Word and Holy Spirit, these thy gifts and creatures of bread and wine; that we receiving them according to thy Son our Saviour's holy institution, in remembrance of his death and passion, may be partakers of his most blessed body and blood.

11 This American text, together with the two texts in *A Prayer Book for Australia*, would seem to be the only working survivors of the 1549/1647 species. Of the two Australian texts I shall concentrate on that which is in the new Eucharistic Prayer - Thanksgiving 3, since it includes all that appears in Thanksgiving 1 and develops it further. Indeed, Thanksgiving 1 is notably thin in a number of ways. The text in Thanksgiving 3 has in common with the American text four notable features: first, it is prefaced by an offering; secondly, it makes a joint epiklesis of Word and Spirit; thirdly, it uses the verb "sanctify"; and fourthly, it relates the presence of the body and blood of Christ in the gifts to the receiving of holy communion.

12 First, the offering. The text begins:

Hear us, merciful Lord; through Christ accept our sacrifice of praise;

The use of these words anchors the prayer in the liturgical tradition of both East and West with words which have consistently and widely been taken to include both an offering of words and an offering of gifts. But they are sufficiently reticent not actually to require the interpretation which includes a material offering.

13 Secondly, the joint epiklesis of Word and Spirit. The text continues:
and by the power of your Word and Holy Spirit,

I shall return to these words and examine them and their antecedents later. For the moment it suffices to draw attention to the addition of "the power of" to the 1549 text.

14 Thirdly, the use of the verb "sanctify". The text continues:

sanctify this bread and wine, that we who share in this holy sacrament...

The verb "sanctify" was used in 1549 as a co-ordinate or synonym for "bless", and clearly invokes the Word and Spirit to act upon the inanimate creatures of bread and wine.

15 This must invite reflection upon the place of the Word and Spirit in creation, when all things were made through Christ and the Spirit of God moved over the face of the waters. It will also recall the Baptism of Christ. While some Anglicans consider that the doctrine is false which allows prayer inviting the Lord God to sanctify, bless, hallow inanimate objects, there is one text in the 1662 Book of Common Prayer which provides precedent for doing so. In the prayer over the

water before its use for baptism we pray:

Sanctify this water to the mystical washing away of sin...

There is considerable debate within the Anglican tradition about what exactly is meant here by “sanctify”. Minimalists would define it as meaning no more than “set apart”, while others understand it to mean “impart holiness to”. Like “sacrifice of praise” there is here a typically Anglican *double-entendre* which may be written off as “fudge”, or welcomed as affording unity of practice and richness of meaning. The additional words “in this holy sacrament” correspond to “mystical” in the 1662 baptismal formula.

16 Fourthly, the presence of the body and blood of Christ in the gifts related to holy communion. The text reads:

that we who share in this holy sacrament may be partakers of Christ’s body and blood.

This reflects a significant emphasis of Anglican liturgy. 1549 was a step along the way to 1552, and the fundamental thesis of the 1552 Order was expressed in the words at the delivery of the sacrament: “Take and eat this, in remembrance that Christ died for thee, and feed on him in thy heart by faith, with thanksgiving.” and “Drink this in remembrance that Christ’s blood was shed for thee, and be thankful.” This understanding of the Eucharist is essentially subjective.

17 This view of consecration and holy communion is paralleled at the offertory. The Comfortable fiords were, with the rest of the penitential preparation for receiving holy communion, transferred in 1552 to a position immediately before the *Sursum Corda*. For Cranmer the liturgical offertory is not a material offering but the inward disposition of the communicants and their dependence on the propitiation of Christ: “If any man sin we have an Advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous, and he is the propitiation for our sins...Lift up your hearts...”.

18 The eucharistic remembrance or memorial was not, then, seen to be in the celebration of the whole rite of taking, thanking, breaking and giving, but in the receiving of the bread and wine. In that was the memorial; and the thanksgiving was not in the Eucharistic Prayer, but in the response of the communicant to the tokens which bring to mind the love and saving death of the Lord.

19 The whole point of the rite was to eat and drink, and the relation of the presence of Christ to the gifts of bread and wine was effected in the mind and soul of the communicant, not in a consecration. Cranmer¹ even claims support for this view from Saint John Damascene, who “meant not that the bread considered in itself, or the wine in itself being not received, is his (i.e. Christ’s) flesh and blood; but to such as by unfeigned faith worthily receive the bread and wine, to such the bread and wine are called by the Damascene the body and blood of Christ”. When

Cranmer and Saint John meet in heaven their meeting will need to be braked, brokered and buffered! Whatever other factors suggested the transposition of the Prayer of Oblation, it was necessary to locate the reception of communion at the medieval highpoint - the elevations - by truncating the Eucharistic Prayer and inserting the reception after the Institution, and thus make reception the anamnesis.

20 Thus the epikleisis of 1549 would not pray that the bread and wine should “become”, but “be for us”, the body and blood of the Lord, and in 1552 the comparable paragraph would be content to pray only that those who receive should partake of Christ. But then the majority of the texts which are characteristic of the Eastern rites pray for the action of the Spirit both on the gifts and on the worshippers. Thus the text which we are considering today draws on both 1549 and 1552, and does justice both to the Catholic/Orthodox tradition and to the caveats and concerns of the Reformation.

21 What exactly *is* the consecratory epikleisis in the Eucharistic Prayer, and what are its origins? It is now generally accepted that the Eucharistic Prayer is derived from the Jewish *birkat ha-mazon*, the blessing at the end of a meal. It has three components: the blessing of God for himself, thanksgiving for the covenant and a great benefit or deliverance, and supplication that the benefit or deliverance might be continued, repeated or replicated. Just as those in the Jewish tradition might insert into the text an embolism which related to a particular event, so Christians modelled their own Eucharistic Prayer on the same shape, and inserted a specifically Christian embolism. Thus the Eucharistic Prayer always proceeds from blessing to thanking (sometimes fused together, the former being but a remnant) to supplication. A simple example of this basic pattern and content is to be discerned in the *Te Deum Laudamus*. Indeed, that is one of the chief reasons why some have canvassed the notion that the *Te Deum* is a relic of an early Eucharistic Prayer².

22 The Christian embolism invariably consists of the Institution Narrative or at least a reference to the Last Supper, followed by a memorial/offering. In later times a memorial acclamation might be inserted between the Narrative and Memorial, and would have the character of a memorial of the saving acts of Christ. A common modern example is:

Christ has died;
Christ is risen;
Christ will come again.

23 In the Passover *birkat ha-mazon* the eucharistic embolism, particularly referring to the saving death and resurrection of the Lord, would most naturally occur in the second section of the prayer. That is, it would be included in the thanksgiving catalogue and lead to the supplication, as it does in the Eucharistic

Prayers which follow the Antiochene pattern with what is often described as a “later” epiklesis. In this instance an acclamation of a different nature frequently appears between the thanksgiving and the supplication, and it has the character of a hinge between the two sections of the prayer. One traditional text might be rendered:

O God, we bless you!

Lord, we give you glory!

Have mercy on us all and show us your love.

24 However, because of the eschatological theme of the Supper and the Eucharist, the embolism might be inserted into the third section of the prayer, the supplication. This is what has happened in the Alexandrine and Western prayers. Thus the epiklesis begins before the Institution Narrative and includes it, and may be described as an “earlier” epiklesis. In fact, it is more appropriate to express the difference between the two shapes of Eucharistic Prayer not so much in terms of the position of the epiklesis, or supplication, but more in terms of the position of the Christ-event embolism. In general the Eastern rites turn to supplication after the thanksgiving and Institution/Memorial/Offering, while the Western and Alexandrine rites turn to supplication after blessing and thanksgiving but before the Institution/Memorial/Offering; sometimes there is a buffer between the Sanctus/Benedictus and the change to supplication, and sometimes, as in the Roman Canon, the Church gets straight down to business in the supplication immediately after the Sanctus/Benedictus.

25 The epiklesis, then, is no more and no less than a development of a prayer that God may accept our worship, bless it and us, and grant us the fruit of a good communion. In its simplest form it need make no reference to either Word or Holy Spirit. It is essentially a petition that our offering may be received, and that the communicants may receive the sacramental food of the body and blood of Christ.

26 In the Roman Canon, for example, two such prayers are to be found. They occur one before and one after the Institution/Memorial/Offering:

Bless and approve our offering;

make it acceptable to you,

an offering in spirit and in truth.

Let it become for us the body and blood of Jesus Christ,
your only Son, our Lord.”

and later,

Look with favour on these offerings

and accept them as once you accepted

the gifts of your servant Abel,

the sacrifice of Abraham, our father in faith,

and the bread and wine offered by your priest Melchizedech.

27 It is now appropriate generally to consider the background which led Cranmer to devise his particular text in 1549, and particularly to examine possible antecedents for the joining of Word and Holy Spirit in the epiklesis.

28 At one time it was generally held that the text which we are considering was framed in conscious dependence upon, and imitation of, the epiklesis of the Liturgy of Saint Basil. But that text does not include a reference to the Word, and it is more than likely that Cranmer was not influenced by eastern rites, but, as in most other matters liturgical, by traditional and contemporary western doctrine.

29 It is much more likely that the epiklesis is derived from the fourth lesson, appointed in the Sarum Breviary, for Mattins of Sunday in the Octave of Corpus Christi, according to which consecration of the eucharist “in verbo efficitur Creatoris et in virtute Spiritus sancti” - in the word of the Creator and in the power of the Holy Spirit³. This was in turn a liturgical expression of a well-known doctrine which had descended to the sixteenth century from Paschasius Radbertus⁴, by way of Gratian’s *Decretum*⁵. Layfolk would be familiar with this through the Corpus Christi sermon in John Mirk’s Festyual⁶. The sacrament is “goddes owne body in fourme of breed made by the uertue of crystes wordes that the preste sayth & by werkyng of ye holy ghooste”.

30 It should also be noted that the shape of Cranmer’s text is not that of an eastern epiklesis, but that of the benediction of food in medieval Manuals.⁷

31 But what lies behind Paschasius Radbertus? In the early days of the Church the Eucharistic Prayer had been the text recited by the presiding minister, the bishop, which, together with the actions of taking, breaking and eating/drinking, accomplished the eucharist after the precept and by the example of Christ. The reference to the Institution in that prayer linked the particular celebration of the eucharist with Christ, and with all other celebrations “at all times and in all places”. His words spoken in the prayer identified the action as the Eucharist. Moreover, “this is my body” is as much a statement about the bread on the altar, as about the people who offer the bread and with it themselves. “This is my Body” and the words of delivery, “The Body of Christ”, may be taken to refer as well to the mystical Body as to the sacramental Body.

32 By the fourth century, the “operative”, “consecratory”, part of the prayer is taken to be the recital of the words of the Lord. What then consecrates the bread and wine? The answer is narrowed from a rite, to a prayer, to the Institution Narrative, to the Dominical formula. This narrowing down the “moment of consecration” to the Institution narrative first makes its appearance at the end of the fourth century in the writings of Ambrose of Milan⁸, and is formally defined by the Council of Florence (1438-45).

33 Behind the fourth century, some roots of this notion are found in c A.D. 155 in the writings of Justin Martyr⁹:

For we do not take these (the 'eucharistized' bread and wine) as common bread or common drink. But as by the Word of God Jesus Christ our Saviour was made flesh and took flesh and blood for our salvation, so also we have been taught that the food which has been 'eucharistized' *by a word of prayer which is from him*, by which food our blood and flesh are nourished by assimilation, is the flesh and blood of that Jesus who was made flesh. For the apostles in the memoirs which came from them, called 'gospels', have recorded that thus it was commanded them - that Jesus took bread and gave thanks and said, 'Do this for the remembrance of me; this is my body'; and likewise took the cup and gave thanks and said, 'This is my blood'.

34 "By a word of prayer" is a literal translation of the Greek words: *di'euches logou*. It may also be fairly translated "by the word of prayer" or "through the prayer of the Word". On the one hand, if the correct rendering is "by the word of prayer which came from him" the meaning must be that the Eucharistic Prayer is founded upon the thanksgiving pronounced at the Last Supper by Jesus over the bread and wine. That may mean that the Eucharistic Prayer, as far as its contents were in any way formed at the time of Justin, was identifiably derived from a Jewish berakah, or that the Prayer included an institution narrative, or that the Prayer, like that of the Liturgy of Addai and Mari in East Syria, was considered adequate with a reference to the example and command of Jesus.

35 En passant I might share with you a further thought. Is it possible that Justin was also thinking of the use of the Lord's Prayer in some quasi-consecratory sense? There is ample evidence that daily communion at home from the sacrament reserved from the Sunday Eucharist was a regular practice in pre-Nicene times¹⁰. Moreover the recipients were probably advised to recite the Lord's Prayer by way of preparation, partly on the general grounds of its origin and authority, and partly because of the immediacy of the petition "Give us this day our daily bread". Certainly Tertullian, Saint Hippolytus and Saint Cyril of Jerusalem all interpret this petition sacramentally. But communion at home was, of course, under the species of bread alone. Let me cite one example, from the Apostolic Tradition of Hippolytus (written in Rome c.A.D. 215) and claiming to represent practice for the preceding generation at least¹¹.

Let everyone of the faithful be careful to receive the eucharist before they eat anything else...and let them be careful that no one not of the faithful eat of the eucharist nor a mouse nor any other animal, and that none of it fall or be lost. For it is the body of Christ to be received by the faithful, and not to be thought of lightly. Having blessed a cup in the name of God, you have received as it were the antitype of the Blood of Christ...

36 In this part of the work Hippolytus is concerned not with the public liturgy, but with the daily pattern of Christian living. First then you receive the bread

consecrated by the bishop or presbyter at the corporate eucharist, which is “the body of Christ”. Then you yourself bless “a cup in the Name of God”, by which you receive (note the significant change of language) “as it were the antitype (or representation) of the Blood of Christ”. The word “antitype” has been used earlier to signify the offerings which have yet to be “eucharistized” or consecrated.

37 Now this is precisely what survived for centuries in the Roman Mass of the Pre-sanctified on Good Friday. With its instinct for retaining, particularly on Good Friday, a number of very ancient features, the Roman Rite remained in this respect unchanged until 1956. First the celebrant blessed a cup “in the name of God” by reciting the Lord’s Prayer over it. He then broke the bread into three portions and dropped a particle into the chalice - a ceremony derived from the *fermentum*, with all its associations and implications of quasi consecration. He then made his communion from the reserved Bread and consumed the wine from the blessed chalice¹².

38 If one were to look for confirmation that the Lord’s Prayer might be deemed to have a function related to blessing, and crept into the public liturgy from the practice of domestic communion from the reserved sacrament, it might be found in some curious aspects of its usage. The first positive evidence for its use at the end of the Eucharistic Prayer is by Cyril of Jerusalem in A.D. 348. It is mentioned by Ambrose in c. A.D. 395 in Milan and at about the same time by Augustine in North Africa. It may not have been adopted in Rome for another two hundred years. However, practice was not entirely consistent. In Jerusalem it was recited in unison by celebrant and people; in the West it was treated as part of the Eucharistic Prayer and said by the celebrant only with the people responding by saying the last clause or simply the Amen. In Jerusalem it was said after the Eucharistic Prayer and before the fraction; in Milan it was included in the Eucharistic Prayer before the doxology; in Africa it appeared between the fraction and reception of communion.

39 It thus appears that the phrase *di'euches logou* may have a number of meanings if *logou* is translated with the initial letter in the lower case. But what if the initial letter should be translated in the upper case? It may be argued that Justin uses *logos* in the personal sense – the Word. In that case the rest of the phrase, “which is from him” will refer to God. This is consistent with other passages in Justin’s writings¹³. Moreover, this interpretation would present a parallelism between the operative power of the Logos in the Incarnation and in the Eucharist. Justin does attribute to the Logos functions which later on were ascribed to the Holy Spirit¹⁴ and does point the way to a development of thought in Irenaeus and the association of the Logos with the Eucharist.

40 Writing about A.D. 180¹⁵ Irenaeus speaks of the bread and cup as “receiving the invocation (epiklesis in a nontechnical sense) of God” and

“receiving the word of God”. Although this naturally and explicitly refers back to¹⁶ Saint Paul: “foods...received with thanksgiving...consecrated by the word of God and prayer”, the use of Logos in that passage is interpreted by Origen¹⁷, not to mention Gregory of Nyssa¹⁸, in the personal sense. This understanding of what happens at the Eucharist was to be characteristic of the tradition in Alexandria. A few examples must suffice: Origen¹⁹: “...bread sanctified by the word of God and prayer...”, Athanasius²⁰: “when the great prayers and holy supplications have been sent up, the Word comes down into the bread and the cup, and they become his body”, and the Anaphora of Sarapion of Thmuis (A.D. 339-360):

God of truth, let your holy Word (Logos) come upon (be at home in) this bread that the bread may become the body of the Word, and upon this cup, that the cup may become the blood of the Truth”.

41 It is only fair to say that the orthodoxy of this text has been questioned. It contains a few features which are liturgically unusual, notably that the offering of the bread and cup is not perceived as proceeding from the institution and memorial, but as located at the offertory. “To you we *have offered the bread...*”. The text also has two invocations. Before the recital of the Institution we find “Fill also this sacrifice with your power and your participation...” and after the Institution we read the text above. Some scholars claim that Sarapion’s material has been reworked by someone with Arian sympathies, and others that it represents a binitarian doctrine of God. But in its epiklesis of the Logos it does stand firmly in the Alexandrine tradition of Clement, Origen and Saint Athanasius, and not in the Syrian tradition of an epiklesis of the Holy Spirit. The Alexandrine tradition is also reflected in a few Gallican and Mozarabic texts.²¹ “Send your Word from heaven, O Lord, to wipe away faults and to hallow the oblations”. Moreover, it does suggest that the tradition reflects the insertion of the Institution-Memorial embolism in the supplication rather than the thanksgiving.

42 The tradition in the eastern rites is an epiklesis of the Holy Spirit, which appears to be derived from the text of *The Apostolic Tradition of Hippolytus* (c. A.D. 215)²²: “Send your Holy Spirit upon the offering of your Church”. In the *Apostolic Constitutions*²³ (c. A.D. 380) it is developed as follows: “...send down upon this sacrifice your Holy Spirit, the witness of the sufferings of the Lord Jesus, that he may manifest this bread as the body of your Christ, and this cup as the blood of your Christ: so that those who partake...” The Greek word for “manifest” is *apophainein*. Its primary meaning is undoubtedly “manifest” or “show”, but it can sometimes (particularly from the fourth century) be found to mean “render, make, or produce”. Rather more definite words are used in the Liturgies of Saint Basil and Saint James, and by Saint Basil and Saint Cyril of Jerusalem.²⁴ “We beseech the merciful God to send forth the Holy Spirit upon the elements, that he may make the bread the body of Christ and the wine the blood of Christ; for whatever the Holy Spirit has touched is sanctified and changed”.

43 But the notion of manifestation needs to be taken quite seriously in its own right. The text of the *Apostolic Constitutions* contains in the Institution Narrative another striking expression in the introduction to the dominical words about the bread: "... (Jesus) gave it to his disciples, saying, 'This is the mystery of the New Covenant; take of it and eat...'" A comparison might be made with the words in the Roman Canon in connection with the cup, and which have now been transposed as an introduction to the memorial acclamations: "the mystery of faith".²⁵ "Manifest" suggests the notion of a mystery, an open or opening secret, a revelation of what is already there.

44 It would be a mistake to polarise the notions of manifestation and transformation, and the epikleses of Word and Holy Spirit. Before the Council of Nicea the incarnation of the Lord was attributed not to conception "by the Holy Spirit of the Virgin Mary" (Nicene Creed), but by the Logos of the Virgin Mary. The eternal Word of God himself, the creative Logos, "coming down to us", says Athanasius²⁶, "formed for himself the Body from the Virgin". It is an interpretation unanimous among second century Christian writers to identify as the *Second Person* of the Trinity the Holy Spirit and the Power of the Most High who came upon and overshadowed Mary²⁷. This interpretation was accepted by Saints Athanasius, Hilary, Ambrose and Gregory of Nazianzus. "The Word = the Spirit" terminology (to borrow a shorthand expression from Gregory Dix, is a survival of the New Testament conception of the "presence" of the heavenly Christ as the "quickening Spirit" in his members on earth²⁸).

45 From Justin Martyr onwards it is possible to discern in Christian thinking a parallel between the incarnation and the consecration of the eucharist. As soon as the incarnation came to be seen as a conception by the *Holy Spirit*, and not a conception by the *Logos*, the purely pneumatic epiklesis was made for life. This, of course, was not the only such parallel to be perceived. From the fourth century it is possible to discern the influence of a parallel perceived between the creation and eucharistic consecration, but that need not distract us now.

46 However, Cranmer could not have been aware of much of this earlier material and thinking. Many of the documents and texts, especially the Anaphora of Sarapion, were not available to him. Rather, he inherited a medieval doctrine, a text in the Breviary, and common practice in domestic and paraliturgical activity, and it fitted some of his fundamental instincts and presuppositions. His use of "the Word" did not always distinguish between God's living Word and God's Word written, and his attitudes owed much to the personal and quasisacramental features in the response of the devout Jew to the Torah²⁹. This is evident in his view of Absolution.³⁰ "...that by the ministry of God's holy Word he may receive the benefit of Absolution..." is of a piece with his attachment (in belt and braces fashion) of the Comfortable Words to the Absolution in the Eucharist. In the

Institution Narrative the Words of Christ denote the holy use to which the gifts are put by the recipients, and declare the figurative meaning which Christ attached to the bread and wine. They are not so much spoken over the gifts as to the communicants, to inspire in them faith that Christ gave his body and shed his blood upon the cross for them.

47 1549 was a step on the way to 1552, and a happy accident. Its epiklesis reflected the Reformed position, and seemed to be wholly scriptural, and faithful to the Lord who had said,³¹ “. . . the Holy Spirit, whom the Father will send in my name...(will) bring to your remembrance all that I have said to you.”³² “. . . the Spirit of truth...will take what is mine and declare it to you”. The words of the Word were made operative by the Spirit.

48 But it was a happy accident in that it recalled an early understanding of the Eucharist which had slipped out of the mind. A sea change in the understanding of the incarnation had left an early view of the nature of eucharistic consecration stranded, but surviving. The Gallican Missal had kept it alive.³³

May-your Holy Word come down, we pray, O almighty God, upon these things which we offer you; may the Spirit of your inestimable glory come down; may the gift of your ancient favour come down, that this oblation may become a spiritual victim, accepted as a fragrant sacrific”.

It was for Cranmer, almost in a fit of absence of mind, to refloat it in the Anglican tradition.

49 It was to be the end of the twentieth century before Cranmer’s text was to come into its own through the Lima Text *Baptism, Eucharist and Ministry*, published by the Faith and Order Commission of the World Council of Churches in 1982. Section C 14-15 has a familiar ring:

The Spirit makes the crucified and risen Christ really present to us in the eucharistic meal, fulfilling the promise contained in the words of institution. The presence of Christ is clearly the centre of the Eucharist, and the promise contained in the words of institution is therefore fundamental to the celebration. Yet it is the Father who is the primary origin and final fulfilment of the eucharistic event. The incarnate Son of God by and in whom it is accomplished is its living centre. The Holy Spirit is the immeasurable strength of love which makes it possible and continues to make it effective. The bond between the eucharistic celebration and the mystery of the Triune God reveals the role of the Holy Spirit as that of the One who makes the historical words of Jesus present and alive. Being assured by Jesus’ promise in the words of institution that it will be answered, the Church prays to the Father for the gift of the Holy Spirit in order that the eucharistic event may be a reality: the real presence of the crucified and risen Christ giving his life for all humanity.

It is in virtue of the living word of Christ and by the power of the Holy Spirit that the bread and wine become the sacramental signs of Christ's body and blood. They remain so for the purpose of communion.

50 So it is that in the Lima Liturgy, which gives liturgical expression to the theological convergence of the BEM text, a convergence of East and West, of Catholic, Orthodox, Anglican, Lutheran and Protestant, the Institution/Memorial embolism is located in the supplication section of the Eucharistic Prayer. The consecratory epiklesis is followed by, and the narrative of the institution is prefaced by, these words:

May this Creator Spirit accomplish the words of your beloved Son, who, in the night in which he was betrayed...

51 Barry Marshall was an Anglican, a liturgist and a pastor.

To the Australian Anglicans we say, "O felix culpa. By luck or divine providence we have a text for the eucharistic epiklesis which reflects ancient usage and contemporary ecumenical convergence. Be thankful, and may we always measure our texts by those yardsticks."

To the liturgiologists we say, "Here are a couple of bones to gnaw: First, is it possible that the Te Deum is in fact the relic of an ancient eucharistic prayer? Can it really be that the cherubim and the seraphim are the Son and the Spirit? Secondly, is it possible to establish that the Lord's Prayer crept into the public eucharistic liturgy from the arrangements for domestic communion from the reserved sacrament?"

To the pastors we say, "American Anglicans, not to mention some others, place the embolism before the supplication, and the Australians on the whole place it during the supplication, except in the case of Thanksgiving 2 in the Second Order. Traditionally both positions for the embolism, and therefore for the epiklesis, are justifiable, and may be sustained by the same theological rationale, but is it possible for one individual or even one congregation, to live with a mixed economy? Should we rejoice in such diversity, and regard the variety a part of the richness which makes the liturgy like an onion: as we peel away, we uncover and discover yet more, even if it makes our eyes water. Or is the tradition, not for a *moment* of consecration but for a *focus* of consecration, is the value not only of memorability but also of regularity, predictability and rhythm so great, and is the need for worship to operate, not at the cerebral level but deep in the heart and soul, that living with a mixed economy would be for most people our duty, but not our joy and our salvation?"

NOTES

- 1 Cranmer: *A Defence of the True and Catholic Doctrine of the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of our Saviour Jesus Christ*: Reprint 1907 pp. 136, 161, 181f, and 196.
- 2 cf. Le Te Deum, type anonyme d'anaphore préhistorique. *Revue Benedictine* 34 (1907) pp. 180-223.
- 3 *Sarum Breviary*, ed Proctor and Wordsworth, Fasc.1 1881, colt mlxxxvii.
- 4 e.g. "illius carnis sacramentum, quod per sacerdotem super altare in verbo Christi per Spiritum sanctum divinitus consecratur", "caro Christi et sanguis...non in merito consecrantis, sed in verbo efficitur Creatoris t in virtute Spiritus sancti...in hoc mysterio credendum est, quod eadem virtute Spiritus sancti per verbum Christi caro ipsius efficiatur invisibili operatione". *Liber de Corpore et Sanguine Domini*, IV (3), and IX (1) (Migne, P.L. 120, 1279 B and 1310 C
- 5 Pars III. *De Consecratione Dictinctio II*, cfl [xxii.
- 6 London 1508 fol. xlix verso.
- 7 For example, the Benedictio carniū in die Paschae in the Sarum Manual reads: "benedic et sanctifica hanc creaturam carnis, ut nobis done tua sumentibus animae et corporis sanitatem concedes." "benedic et sanctifica" are echoed in Cranmer's text, and his construction certainly reflects the "ut...concedas".
- 8 *De Mysteriis*. 9. 52.
- 9 *Apology* 1.66:
- 10 *Apostolic Tradition* 32. 1-4.
- 11 *Ibid*
- 12 The Commixture is a ceremony which first appears in the Roman Rite in *Ordo Romanus Primus*. Quite soon afterwards it acquired an accompanying text: "Fiat commixtio et consecratio corporis et sanguinis Domini nostri Jesu Christi accipientibus nobis in vitam aeternam. Amen." What is the force of "consecratio"? The word has been something of an embarrassment and has been dropped from *Missa Normativa*. What else can it mean but that the consecrated host had some consecratory effect on the contents of the chalice? Is that why the Ambrosian Rite has skilfully amended the text, and the Sarum Missal sidestepped it altogether?
- 13 *Apology* 1. 6, 32, 33.
- 14 *Apology* 1. 33, 46
- 15 *Adversus Haereses* 4.31.4.
- 16 1 Timothy 4.5
- 17 *Commentary on Saint Matthew* 11.14.
- 18 *Oratio Catechetica* 37
- 19 *Commentary on Saint Matthew* 11.14.
- 20 *Ad nuper baptizatos* (P.G. 26. 1325)
- 21 *Liber Sacramentorum*, col 200. Ed Ferotin
- 22 *Apostolic Tradition* 4

- 23 *Apostolic Constitutions* 8.12.39
- 24 *Mystagogical Catecheses* 5.7
- 25 1 Timothy 3. 9,16
- 26 *De Incarnatione* 18
- 27 Saint Luke 1.35
- 28 1 Corinthians 15.45
- 29 e.g. Psalm 119
- 30 *Book of Common Prayer*. First exhortation to Communion.
- 31 John 14.25
- 32 John 1 6n1 3-1 4
- 33 Gallican Missal, (PL 72. 342 nd 345)

The Christian initiation of children in a biblical, theological, and historical perspective

Robert Gribben

The theme of children in the Christian community, and particularly the question of the initiation (as distinct from the integration) of children into that community, is a sub-set of the larger question of Christian initiation. Most recent liturgical work on the issue of initiation has been done in relation to the initiation of adults, and in this the Roman Catholic church has taken the lead, the rest of us being mostly variations on the theme.

After the Second Vatican Council enacted the Constitution on the Liturgy (1963), the first revised rite published (in 1969) was the *Ordo baptismi parvulorum*, followed by a new rite of confirmation in 1971. Then, in an unintended ecumenical coup, the “Rite for the Christian initiation of adults” arrived in 1972 and set the benchmark: the initiation of adults is the norm, and what we do with our children will begin theologically, liturgically and catechetically from that renewed understanding which followed the work of the Second Vatican Council. But what will any new rites for the Christian initiation of infants¹ look like? And what will be their theology of children in the church?

That Council began a revolution in our thinking about Eucharist; that is, about word and sacrament. And it began a revolution in our thinking about initiation. All denominations have benefited from the wealth of biblical, theological and historical research which has been slowly building up over this century. One result of that has been that our liturgical productions tend to look much the same. That, however, does not mean that they are the same.

An important factor is the authority of the Roman See, and its methodology, which is recognisably its own. Rome does not move until it has formulated an integrated theology. We may not agree with that theology, it may have some unresolved or unexamined areas, and the Pope may use his blue pencil; yet it underlies its rites and liturgies. It approves rites for universal use and keeps a more or less restraining hand upon their development and use. The rest of us have no such central authority, less integrated theology and no universal control. Our new liturgies look more like experiments, or borrowings, or perhaps the work of particular groups and presiding geniuses.

What is initiation?

Christian baptism is different in important ways from the baptism of Jesus. Jesus' baptism by John inaugurated his messianic ministry. It was a unique event. What it meant in relation to our baptism – truly, sinners in need of repentance – is echoed from the earliest days and in the earliest documents of the church. The descent of the Spirit and the voice of the Father as Jesus emerged from the water inaugurated a new covenant and a new age. Christian baptism brings us into that new covenant. Jesus' baptism is of primary importance in our understanding of what our baptism means and why the church baptises, but there is a difference. Christian baptism does not imitate the baptism of Jesus; it enters into what is achieved. It is entry into a new community of believers. It is many other things which the New Testament spells out in many places – rebirth, adoption, dying with Christ, becoming a member of his body, receiving the Spirit, engrafting into the vine, to name some major ones.

To what extent, then, is baptism seen as complete initiation in the Christian churches? The answer to that depends, at least in part, on one's church tradition.

Let me give an example from a recent pastoral encounter. A young couple came to us at Wesley with a problem about their forthcoming marriage. He was Greek Orthodox from a devout and traditional family. She had a Muslim father and a non-practising Anglican mother. She had not been baptised. Unless she was baptised, they could not be canonically married in the Greek church, so she had come to ask for baptism from us – her father was a Cypriot, and the thought of his daughter becoming Greek Orthodox was too much to ask! Baptism under the Uniting Church rite would be regarded as true Christian baptism by the Greek church (which assurance came directly from the Greek bishop in Melbourne) but would not make her Orthodox. Although she would be able to attend the liturgy with her children and bring them up as Orthodox, she herself would be unable to receive communion until she received chrismation in the Orthodox Church. She understood this and was willing to leave that question until later years. This story powerfully illustrates that for the Orthodox tradition, initiation does not only mean baptism. It also essentially involves chrismation. (And so that you are not left in pastoral suspense, I must sadly report that her Greek in-laws elect were unimpressed by any of this ecumenical gymnastics; faced with a choice of complete subjugation to their demands, or maintaining something of her own integrity, she called the marriage off.)

Nor, in my student days, was baptism a complete initiation for Anglicans. For some time a fellow student and I responded to a young Anglican priest's plea for help in a small inner Melbourne parish. Every Sunday we were at the parish Eucharist. My friend, being, as the 1662 Book of Common Prayer states, "ready

and desirous to be confirmed” but not yet confirmed, received communion every Sunday. I was confirmed in the Methodist Church and was neither ready nor desirous of confirmation elsewhere; I was refused communion. Initiation according to the Anglican church was incomplete without confirmation.

Neither did the Baptists consider baptism necessarily a complete initiation in itself. At various times in my youth, I encountered convinced and well-tutored Baptists who were after my soul. There were many possible replies to the Question “Are you saved, brother?”. “Yes, at Calvary about the year 33 AD” was one. Or, “Yes, at my baptism about May 1943”. What my Baptist friends clearly thought was, whatever had happened to me in May 1943, I was too young to understand it. Now that I did, I should confess my faith in Calvary and be baptised properly. Unless I was a believer myself, unless I understood, true baptism could not take place.

And my native Methodism had a variation on the theme. I had been baptised and had a certificate to prove it, but my own church would not invite me to communion until I had had a series of classes with the Minister after church and been welcomed with the “right hand of fellowship” by him and one or two senior members at a Sunday Service. During the service I was asked to confirm my response to the call of Christ to be his faithful servant to my life’s end, echoing words used in the Methodist baptismal service. The second asked for various commitments to the study of Scripture and the use of the means of grace. Then followed Holy Communion. For the Methodists, too, my initiation was not complete in baptism, but needed a further personal response from me.

A detailed history of the origins and development of initiation would be difficult. To look at developments in the Anglican/Episcopalian, Lutheran, Reformed, Methodist and United rites, not to mention Baptist, Churches of Christ and Pentecostal, nor ignoring initiation as understood non-sacramentally by the Religious Society of Friends and the Salvation Army would be an impossible task. But there is room for a kind of survey, a picking up of important milestones, a tracing of the origins of some perennial problems. First, I want to go right back to the roots and note the place of children in the Christian community. To do that, I must begin with the parent faith of Judaism.

Jewish Origins

The root from which Christianity springs embraces children; Judaism is essentially a familial faith. A boy child was a mere 8 days old when the sign of his belonging was marked upon him in what was then the domestic ritual of circumcision. Within the daily and weekly patterns of family life, children were brought to live and learn their faith: through the telling of the stories of what God

had done for them; through the reading of the Scriptures; with the lighting of candles and the blessing of God with which the mother would start each evening meal; and the Sabbath meals, punctuated by grace and many blessings over bread and wine. And with these family rituals and practices, were intertwined the Temple and synagogue rituals and attendances and the great festivals of the year. Jewish children were thus daily integrated into their faith, both within their family life and through the cultural and festival life of their community, in temple and synagogue. It is clear that Christian homes also were marked by regular daily prayer and that, therefore, children in those homes observed and were taught it.

What role the temple played in the life of children, we can infer from the story of the 12 year old Jesus going up to Jerusalem for Passover (Luke 2.41f). The child was obviously involved, and there were enough of his relatives and friends with him for him to be missed on the journey home. Further, it is only in the context of a world which has excluded children from the ordinary experiences of daily life that we are surprised at how often children are around Jesus.

But let us return from the general environment of “catching faith” to the specific matter of initiation. Wherein does the Jewish background and Christian baptism connect?

Proselyte Baptism and Christian Origins

There is still dispute amongst scholars about the origins of proselyte baptism; evidence dates from the latter half of the first century. Such baptism was added to circumcision for heathen converts to Judaism because of heathen impurity. Beckwith² cites several Jewish tractates which suggest that women and children also received this baptism. It has been suggested that for men the period required for healing after circumcision before baptism (naked, by immersion) and the period of instruction which intervened, is the beginning of the catechumenate.

The baptism of John is innovative in a number of ways, especially in that it was offered to Jews as well as Gentiles. It too was offered to women. So was Christian baptism innovative, not only adding the name of Jesus and the Spirit (Mark 1:7 and parallels; Acts 8:14-17, 19:1ff) to the ritual, but in deciding not to require the circumcision of males beforehand. We may venture that children were among the families coming to the Jordan, and that the household baptisms in the New Testament included children. However, these assumptions have been the subject of famous intra-Christian debate, including the view of William Tabernée (of the Churches of Christ) that history, including theological history, is too often written by the victors and that there can be no argument here from silence.

We are on secure grounds from at least the third century. The Apostolic tradition sets out that children are baptised first (21:4); Tertullian is aware of

infant baptism and does not approve of it (de Bapt, 18); Cyprian in North Africa discusses the timing of infant baptism (and supports it!). Interestingly, some of Cyprian's protagonists were insisting that baptism not occur until the eighth day. Cyprian argued for no such delay. But, this is the beginning of the flourishing of the catechumenate, which rests on the assumption of sufficient years of maturity to learn and grow in the practice of Christian life and faith.

Nevertheless, having been baptised, with whatever accompanying rites such as anointing with oil, these Christian children were initiated. They were now part of the family of God. What then of any later initiatory ceremonies, the equivalent of confirmation (in the west) and bar/bat mitzvah, or even of first communion?

Bar Mitzvah and Confirmation

The Mishnah states that "at thirteen one is fit for the fulfilling of the commandments" (Aboth 5:21, Niddah 5:6); some scholars think that this was the reason Jesus went up to the Temple at about that age. However, we do not know if and what ceremonies this involved, and the whole area of Jewish initiation and the development of the Passover at this time is still very unclear. John H. Westerhoff claimed in a lecture that I heard in 1986 that the custom of the time was that one became bar mitzvah the day before one married; the exception was for the rabbinical students who were regarded as being married (for the time being) to the Torah. What this points to is the change in our definition, not so much of childhood, as to the end of childhood. Before Freud and other modern inventions, one was a child until one had a child, then one was an adult. Adolescence and that much vaunted Church category of "youth", if they exist at all, are recent concepts. We might also add that, as to the origin of the later ceremonies of bar mitzvah and confirmation in the west, Judaism, living cheek-by-jowl with the church in Europe, may well have borrowed at least some of the customs of bar mitzvah from Christianity, or vice versa; which makes for interesting speculation, but not more.

Children and Communion

Origen, in the early third century in Palestine (and perhaps at home in Egypt), seems to think that children are not given communion, and there is other support at this time. It is possible that there is Jewish influence here for waiting a period before full adult participation. The Reformers certainly thought they had such precedents in Judaism and the early church, but they lacked historical bases.

It is interesting that the Orthodox Churches, although they have practised from earliest times³ the unitive rite of baptism and chrismation, giving communion to the newly-initiated infant, there is nevertheless a natural space which opens up between infancy and about the age of eight when children are again encouraged

to receive communion. The Orthodox seem hardly to notice (officially) that this happens!

The Catechumenate as a Substitute for Baptism

We ought to note that, if infant baptism was commonly practised in the third century, as attested by the Apostolic Tradition, Tertullian, Cyprian and others, it is equally notable that it was dying out a century later. Children, not infants, were being baptised at the time of Gregory Nazianzus and Augustine. The view of Augustine's time was that baptism was perhaps best undertaken when the fires of youth had died down and temptation to (certain) sin was not so sharp. Think of the saints who were born to Christian parents but who were not baptised until late in life: Ambrose, Augustine, Chrysostom, Gregory Nazianzus (whose father was a bishop!) and Jerome. This I find quite a comfort as a parent awaiting the maturity of his own children's faith! However, the catechumenate began now to take on a different meaning. It became the ceremony to make a person's first involvement with the church; a kind of "Clayton's baptism". It was not so much a preparation for baptism as an in-between form of membership of the church until real membership was safe. Thus did some of the children find Christian initiation pass them by in the 5th and 6th centuries – at least, in some places.

However, the fact remains that Christianity was now widespread in what was left of the Roman empire, and Christian faith had been, at least formally, practised for several generations. Adult initiation, the catechumenate, linked with the *disciplina arcani* (which only works for adults!), drew to a close after three short centuries of brilliant flowering. The baptism of infants became the norm. Many of the earlier ceremonies of Christian initiation atrophied, telescoped, or lapsed.

Infant Initiation in the 6th-8th Centuries

For the next two centuries, the church in Rome tried to cope with the collapse of its adult basis for initiation. The customs and ceremonies of the catechumenate and the complex initiatory rites were now applied to infants, who could neither understand nor respond. They were enrolled in Lent, scrutinised, exorcised and given salt (a kind of substitute for the Eucharist for those who earlier had delayed baptism); their shell pink ears received the creed and the Lord's prayer, which their godparents recited on their behalf before baptism. They were asked the three-fold questions as they were thrice dipped in the water (the Trinitarian formula does not appear until the 8th century) and anointed as members of the royal and priestly body of Christ, and were finally sealed by the bishop who prayed that they might receive the sevenfold graces of the Spirit (Cf. Isaiah 11.2), then they received communion.

The break-down of the initiatory rite is now well known. In emergencies – in an age of high infant mortality – certain ceremonies could be omitted and retained until the child recovered and came to church and bishop. The child could receive baptism and communion, but not chrism, the rite associated with the giving of the Spirit. Confirmation began its long search for a *raison d’etre*. Then, in England, the bishops decided to encourage parents to bring their children for confirmation by withholding communion until they had been confirmed. Children ceased to know communion as they grew up.

The 16th Century Reformation

The late mediaeval reformers never really had a chance to get it right. They accepted that infant baptism was the norm of Christian initiation, and cut away everything around it.

First, they had to justify baptising children at all, using those same Scriptures which caused their fellow Protestants, the Anabaptists, to withhold baptism from children. J.D.C. Fisher⁴ has summarised the five principal arguments:

1. Since God has made a covenant with Abraham, promising to be his God and the God of his children’s children, the children of Christian parents, being within the promises of the new covenant, were eligible for membership in God’s people.

2. Since the infant sons of Jews were received into God’s people by circumcision, Christians should be received into the new Israel by its equivalent, which is baptism.

3. Jesus welcomed children; so, therefore, should the church.

4. If the children of one believing parent were deemed holy, so also were the children of two believing parents (Cf 1 Corinthians 7.14 “For the unbelieving husband is made holy through his wife, and the unbelieving wife is made holy by her husband. Otherwise your children would be unclean, but as it is, they are holy” NRSV). Being therefore holy, children were eligible for baptism.

5. Some of the households that the New Testament shows to have been baptised must have included children.

The conservative Luther keeps an exorcism of the child, reads the gospel (Mark 10. 13-16) and the Lord’s prayer. The godparents renounce Satan and all his works, and respond to a threefold, interrogative creed; the child is dipped, with the Trinitarian formula, and vested in white. Both Luther’s revisions, in 1523 and 1526 retain these vestiges of the former rites. He adds, of course, his famous Flood prayer, in which Noah’s flood and the Exodus are treated as Types of baptism.

In other German-speaking Reformed provinces, such as those under Zwingli’s

or Bucer's leadership, the essentials remain – just these: the Gospel reading (Mark 10), the dipping in water and the Triune name. These are the essential matter and form of Christian baptism. Minimal though these are, Lutherans have nevertheless preferred to place their fonts at the east end of the church so the congregation can see what is going on.

Luther thought that confirmation was a mere human invention, and he was right – for the wrong reason. In its place, he introduced his shorter and longer catechisms for the children to learn before they were admitted to communion. Other reformers, such as Bucer, thought there were biblical precedents for the laying on of hands for such purposes. Calvin agreed, but did not provide for it in Geneva.

Calvin required infants to be brought for baptism at the time of catechism (Sundays at 3:00), or at morning sermon during the week. (There was plenty of catechetical instruction available!) The Genevan rite has the Gospel (Mark 10), prayers for the child, its parents and godparents, and baptism in the three-fold name without further elaboration; the starkest form of Christian initiation in all history. Calvin believed that in this he had recovered the form of baptism as “Jesus Christ has ordered, as the apostles have preserved and followed, as the primitive church has used”. The rite is severely truncated, but the theology is very rich, as can be seen in Calvin's exhortation.

Worse was to follow. John Knox, Calvin's disciple who found himself reforming Scotland, took water in his hand and laid it on the child's head while saying the Trinitarian formula. His (and Calvin's) view was that baptism preached what God wills to confer, rather than actually conferring it. In a recent visit to Scotland, I saw several churches of the 17th and 18th centuries which had iron brackets, rather like those designed for hour-glasses, affixed to pulpits, where the baptism must have taken place by the Minister dipping his fingers in the bowl of water and allowing it to drip on to the infant held below. I was relieved to find several such basins now holding plants and flowers, being thus rendered liturgically harmless!

Meanwhile, in Zurich, Zwingli was drowning those whose reading of the Scriptures caused them to baptise by submersion.

Cranmer's Anglican rites of 1552 are only slightly less radical. Bucer's writings convinced him to restrict baptism to Sundays and feast days, and his criticisms convinced Cranmer to remove most of the older ceremonies connected with baptism, chrismation and the catechumenate. Bucer also helped move the ceremonies from the church porch to the nave. He did not succeed in connecting baptism with the Eucharistic liturgy. One result of such reduction was that the child's name was only used immediately before baptism, giving rise, as Fisher

nicely says, to “the mistaken notion that christening and naming are synonymous”.⁵ The great Prayer Book of 1662 largely followed 1552 in its baptismal rite.

From Cranmer’s reform onwards, infant confirmation (which had been known in England) ceased, and episcopal confirmation was given to children who, like their counterparts in Geneva, could recite the Lord’s Prayer, the Creed and the Ten Commandments in the vulgar tongue. For this purpose, parish priests were required regularly to catechise children, apprentices and servants sent to them, for half an hour before Evensong.⁶ The laying on of hands by the bishop conferred protection and strength against sin, of which, having reached the age of discretion, they were now capable. But in the Book of Common Prayer of 1662, there is a catechism separate from the confirmation rite.

The Twentieth Century

Stirrings for a higher view of baptism and confirmation in Anglicanism began with the recovery of ancient and mediaeval texts by the Oxford Movement in the mid-nineteenth century. The 1928 proposed Prayer Book showed some signs of a new liturgical awareness and opened the door to wider practices; for example, that of chrismation in certain Anglo-Catholic parishes. At the same time, questions were being asked about the status of the rite thus elevated – confirmation – and the significance of the giving of the Holy Spirit at this point.

The Roman Catholic Church saw a recovery of sacramental practice and liturgical spirituality through the work of Dom Guéranger and the abbey of Solesmes, with a strong emphasis of the concept of Church as the people of God and the body of Christ. This meant that the initiatory rites, whether or not given to infants, could not easily be regarded as private or individualistic.

Before long, the churches were all feeling the impact of the confluence of the missionary, liturgical and biblical – and, later, ecumenical – movements which so marked the first part of this century. On the mission field there was a new interest in the initiation of adults. The early work of the Faith and Order movement raised interest in the theology and practice of baptism in the various traditions, not least because baptism was potentially the sacrament of unity. At the same time, it became obvious that the churches were less than clear in their baptismal theologies. And this is where the remarks with which I began become clear: the churches meant very different things by initiation. Even the word “baptism” does not mean baptism only! And confirmation means many things.

One final aspect of this survey. From the 1970s, the influence of the Pentecostal or charismatic experience began to affect all the churches, and raised once again the rôle of the Spirit. Is the Spirit received in baptism? Or is the Spirit received quite separately and manifested by speaking in tongues and other

phenomena? Is “baptism in the Spirit” to be distinguished from “baptism in water”?

The Uniting Church in Australia

Perhaps you might permit me to describe briefly the rites of the Uniting Church; I think they illustrate where we all are. In *Uniting in Worship* (1988), there are no fewer than five services in the section called “Baptism and related services”.

The first, entitled *Baptism and the reaffirmation of baptism called confirmation*, is devised for use with adults and older children, and with families. It contains a renunciation of sin and questions concerning turning to Christ and allegiance to the Trinity. The effeta rite is a possibility. The Apostles’ Creed is recited in interrogative form. There is a version of Luther’s Flood Prayer over the water, in which the Holy Spirit is invoked on the water and on those who are to be baptised in it. The mode of baptism may be immersion or dipping (but not sprinkling) listed in that order; afterwards the neophyte is signed with the sign of the cross and received into “the holy catholic Church”. The prayer at the laying on of hands (by the Minister and the elders) draws on the images of the Spirit in Isaiah 11:2. The prayer for each candidate at confirmation asks that they be a “faithful witness to Christ all the days of [their] life”. There is no provision for chrismation. Promises (which, in my view, are expressed in over-simple and pietistic terms) follow baptism and confirmation. There may be a Eucharist, and a candle is given in the dismissal rite – a good evangelical touch.

The Baptism of children follows the structure of the first service. The parents renounce evil and join with the congregation in the interrogative creed. Before baptism, the prayer addressed to the child from the French Reformed tradition expresses a very strong “theology of grace” by which the church baptises infants: “all for you, little child, even though you do not know it”.

Having said the Confirmation might alternatively be named the “Reaffirmation of baptism”, *Uniting in Worship* goes on to provide a service for a Congregational reaffirmation of baptism not unlike that used by other churches at Easter, and a Personal reaffirmation of baptism for the individual returning to or recovering faith. The former Methodist Covenant service is included for good measure, to preserve the tradition, but it is firmly recast in terms of a baptismal understanding.

In a section called “Pastoral services”, there is a Celebration of new beginnings in faith, which is mainly an opportunity for personal testimony to newfound faith, but it has no reference to baptism. It is potentially a first step in a catechumenate. In the same section is a Thanksgiving for the gift of a child, which may precede baptism; indeed, the final prayer asks that the child might be “brought by grace to

the sacrament of baptism". In terms of a full understanding of initiation, we may also note that there is a Service of reconciliation, a personal rite of penance, and a Great Prayer of Thanksgiving (D) "especially suitable when children are present" at a celebration of the eucharist.

It is a minor miracle that the Uniting Church Assembly approved these rites, for they are a very long way ahead of the church's general understanding and traditional practice. Nor are we a church much inclined to accept the word of experts. This illustrates a point in general about contemporary liturgy – that it is done by people who are "ahead". (I make a self-serving value judgement here!) It further illustrates the need for teaching, for bringing the church up-to-date with the discoveries which are obvious and familiar to those caught up in the biblical, missionary and ecumenical movements. Moreover, it suggests the potential for complete fragmentation of the churches, of the superficiality of the unity of modern rites, for many of our people are simply not ready for them.

After the publication of the "Rite for the Christian initiation of adults", the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith published an "Instruction on infant baptism" entitled *Pastoralis actio*, which denied that "the Church prefers the postponement of baptism ... or regards it as normal"⁷. Problems had clearly arisen, and they have for all the paedo-Baptist churches. The Uniting Church exhibits the problems in full measure.

- By placing its adult baptismal rite first, the Church implies, but nowhere states, its priority. In so doing, it has taken a theological and an ecumenical step of some significance. However, we are a long way from having got our evangelical practice to the point where our normal candidates for baptism are adults.

- We speak of Confirmation as "Reaffirmation", yet we have nowhere defined when that reaffirmation appropriately occurs, or what it means in relation to other reaffirmations made in life. Does the pastor gather up the early teenagers, or the late ones, and why? Should they be gathered up at all? The number of people coming to confirmation in recent years has plummeted until it might be described as a crisis. Liturgical cognoscenti appear largely unconcerned with this; pastors and local elders are very concerned, but quite confused. Our regulations define membership of the Church much more by confirmation than by baptism, presumably because of some notion amongst church lawyers about adult responsibility. We now go to great lengths to involve a group of children in our synods and assemblies, of which they cannot be members until they are confirmed!

- The Uniting Church Assembly of 1985 admitted baptised children to communion, but almost nothing was done to prepare local churches, pastors, elders, or the children themselves for this step. I gather that it is widely practised,

but I often encounter pockets of doubt and concern among older members. The didactic legacy of the mediaeval period remains strong: “they don’t understand what they are doing”. I suspect that the concerns of the older members are not only with doctrinal understanding (they usually acknowledge their own deficiencies), but with the manners, the customs of participation – behaviour in church, the way to hold one’s hands to receive, a sense of prayer, and so on. These are serious matters, and they raise the whole question of catechesis. They equally raise the question of the whole church’s behaviour at communion.

- Nor have we dealt with the implications for unbaptised children in our midst. Pastorally, we ignore the distinction in most churches. Perhaps in the late 20th century we are justified in making yet another change in order – communion leading to baptism, an updated Wesleyan view of the converting power of the Lord’s Supper! In any case, the issue of catechesis comes up once again: a catechumenate while being admitted to communion? Large questions have been raised; no answers even hinted at.

- I might add that the Uniting Church Assembly has now established a Task Group (which I chair) to draw up a form of the catechumenate, and to work with several other groups to produce material to educate the church in matters related to baptism.

- And in a final Uniting Church perspective, John Emmett remarked to me that, if the Sunday School had closed down in my parish (which it has), I had better make sure that some other form of Christian Education existed, for the sake of the children. And he is right. At least, in the state of Uniting Church liturgy (including the restrictions of the architecture of my historic building!), and in the manners of my adult congregation, I am not sure we can rely on the liturgy alone to incorporate younger members into the mystery of being Christ’s body.

Surveying the survey

The issue of the Christian initiation of children highlights its own problems. If we survey the history of Christian initiation, and attempt to keep the place of children in mind, we distort the picture from beginning to end. It is now commonplace to deplore the early separation of the rite into two parts: a service of baptism for infants and a later confirmation, a pattern which became the norm in the west. Equally, we may say that to start from the baptism of infants both reduces what we can say about the meaning of baptism and makes it impossible to understand the baptism of adults. It raises the problem of meaningful response, of growth and conversion, of the rôle of the Spirit, and of catechesis.

On the other hand, we have found ourselves in a position where we are in danger of excluding children from the initiation discussion by our concentration on adults.

It is wonderful to read of the convergence of the different streams in the Lima document (1982)⁸, of the dynamic view of baptism which provides room for both paedobaptism and believer baptism. Though by no means all are convinced, and not all have heard the good news, Protestants are beginning to see new possibilities of unity across the “baptismal divide”; for example, in the United Reformed Church in the UK and in the Church of North India. And within churches who have traditionally defended infant baptism, there is a new openness to the baptism of adults, and new discoveries about how to do it! All fine and good, but we have potentially diminished our commitment to the initiation of children.

We are likely to remain in this confused state for some time. There may well be a reaction against the progress of liturgical reform in some churches. It will take a long time, and perhaps a drastic reduction in church numbers (and parish structures) before ordinary Christians recognise the real perspective of mission and worship in the 21st century. I believe there will be a truly ecumenical perspective and that we will, most of us, find a consistent vision and a common way of expressing the faith and worship of the church of the next century. Ecumenical documents like Lima (BEM) challenge the churches to think about what initiation means for them, theologically and ritually because they acknowledge the breadth of understanding within and between the world’s churches. I believe that most of us have learned from the renewed catechumenate that we will learn by doing, that conversion takes place in the context of the liturgy, and that educational programs which do not catch us up in the celebration of the mysteries are unlikely to convince people of anything important. So we are working on the right front!

The warning, and the challenge, to take from the history of Christian initiation, is not to allow the children to be squeezed out, even in our enthusiasm for an adult perspective, a perspective vital for the future of the church. Those born into the church – I mean those born and raised in Christian families – are vital too!

NOTES

- 1 Children in school (as distinct from infants) are open to the RCIA adapted to their age groups.
- 2 C. Jones, G. Wainwright and E. Yarnold, eds., *The Study of Liturgy*, SPCK/OUP, revised edition 1992, p. 73.
- 3 Cyprian knew of infant communion – see Noakes, in Jones &c, op.cit., p. 124 and 127 n.38.
- 4 Fisher, in Jones &c, op.cit., p. 155.
- 5 Fisher, *ibid.*, p. 159.
- 6 *Ibid.*, p. 164.
- 7 Peter Hinchcliff et al, Jones &c., op.cit., p. 177.
- 8 *Baptism, Eucharist, Ministry*, Faith and Order Paper No. 111, World Council of Churches, Geneva, 1982. See especially para Baptism/ 12 and its commentary.

The development of Confirmation as a separate celebration in Christian Initiation

David Orr

History of Separation

The process of “becoming Christian” has had a long and varied tradition. Rather than attempt to detail the development of the ritual of initiation, it is probably adequate just to highlight an established stage in its history. This discussion will focus upon the liturgical tradition of the Roman Church recorded in the work of Hippolytus, *The Apostolic Tradition* (219 AD) – a ritual which developed from the biblical source within the living tradition of the ecclesial community of Rome¹.

We know that in the third century Christian initiation involved a “journey of faith” which took up to three or more years (ch 17). Those who entered the catechumenate were accompanied by sponsors as they learned to hear and to heed the Word of God. It was not enough for a person just to want to be Christian – he or she had to show by their way of living that they had undergone a conversion that conformed their lives to the pattern of Jesus Christ. It is important to note that, after a long period of catechumenate, there would be a single celebration of Christian initiation focused upon the celebration of Easter, presided over by the Bishop and celebrated with the active participation of the local church (ch 21).

i. The paschal character of the celebration was maintained by its celebration at Easter, in the context of the vigil service.

ii. The original minister was the bishop, as he was the focus for all ministrations in the local Church.

iii. However, the celebration was not exclusively focused on the clerical: there was a diversity of ministries which preceded and accompanied its celebration. Its celebration was never seen to be a personal celebration, but the action of the local Church.

iv. Its ritual elements included in the one ceremony the baptism in water, the giving of the Spirit and the celebration of eucharist. It is important to note that Hippolytus includes an anointing by the presbyter after baptism in water (21.11-15) and by the bishop after the imposition of hands and the prayer for the Holy Spirit (21.15-20). Both anointings are made with the “oil of sanctification”. The first is made with the words: “I anoint you with the holy oil in the name of Jesus

Christ”; while the second invokes the Trinity in the words: “I anoint you with the holy oil in the name of God the Father almighty, and Jesus Christ and the Holy Spirit”.

v. It should also be noted that Christian initiation would include both adults (“those who are able to speak for themselves, do so” = “viro”/“mulieres”), children old enough to answer for themselves (“parvulos”), and the other children in their parents’ arms (“parents speak for them”) (ch 21).

However various pressures were to fragment this celebration:

- loss of unity within the local church, especially with the possibility of multiple eucharists within the same church,
- loss of the bishop as the presider of initiation,
- the eventual failure of the catechumenate adequately to prepare candidates for life in the church; this may be due to the great influx of numbers into the Church, and
- the clericalisation of liturgy with the demise of active participation of all in the liturgy.

(The discussion of these questions is left to another forum, but they do provide clues to the disintegration of the unified celebration of initiation in the Western Church. ²)

The local Churches responded differently to these developments. In the area of initiation a major difference was established between East and West in that the East delegated full authority to the presider (bishop or presbyter) to celebrate all the elements of initiation in the one ceremony. In the West the bishops reserved to themselves the right to impose hands for the giving of the Spirit. Thus this liturgical element of the giving of the Spirit was withdrawn from the celebration of initiation and began to take on a life of its own.

Interestingly, in the Spanish and Gallican churches, (which enjoyed a blending of East and West), this development gave rise to a major confusion in the understanding of this episcopal imposition. The Latin Church had known the episcopal imposition for the giving of the Spirit to be accompanied by a physical anointing. The Eastern Church on the other hand had always associated the giving of the spirit with the anointing itself. As the bishop became less frequently present for initiation, the presbyter would baptise the infant without the imposition of hands for the giving of the spirit; but the usual post-baptismal anointing remained with baptism in water. In the Spanish and Gallican Churches which were strongly influenced by the eastern traditions, this post-baptismal anointing came to be interpreted as the giving of the spirit – a clear confusion of the post-baptismal anointing with the episcopal anointing; the anointing given in the Eastern Churches by the presbyter was for the giving of the Spirit, while in the West it was

only an explanatory ritual for baptism in water. (Authors like Ambrose would compare this baptismal anointing to the anointing of an athlete, while the second anointing would be linked with priestly functions.) Consequently when Charlemagne imposed the Roman, liturgical tradition upon his kingdom, the episcopal imposition was simply added to the existing ritual of initiation of water and anointing. Thus emerged the difficulty of trying to explain the importance of the episcopal anointing, by reference to the two givings of the Spirit³.

This confusion of theology is clearly evident in the works of Faustus of Riez (410-495 AD), and Rabanus Maurus (740-856 AD):

Faustus simply reflects the difficulty created by the separation of episcopal imposition from the celebration of initiation⁴. He asks, "What is the significance of episcopal imposition?" The answer he offers is given in terms of the contemporary understanding of the Christian life as warfare with the devil. As the military commander not only signs the new recruit, but also arms him (Homily 12-13), so "in baptism we are reborn to life, and after baptism we are confirmed for the fight. In baptism we are washed, in confirmation we are strengthened" (ibid 23-25). Faustus however continues to reflect the distinction between the working of the Spirit in the waters of baptism (ibid 20) and the giving of the Spirit in episcopal imposition (ibid 3). He does however introduce a novel understanding of the gift of the Spirit in terms of spiritual warfare – an understanding which was to enter into the authority of Church statements in the Decrees of Pope Mechiadis⁵ and into the Prayer of Consecration of the Chrism in later Pontificals⁶.

The medieval Church which had been schooled in the priestly understanding of anointings (but had forgotten the patristic adage that the priestly anointing was not a physical anointing with oil, but the anointing by the Spirit), began to speak of any anointing in initiation as being an anointing to priesthood. Alcuin was one who would speak of the presbyteral anointing after baptism in terms of the giving of the Spirit. So it is not surprising to find his student, Rabanus developing such a teaching. Consequently, when Rabanus comes to the familiar teaching on episcopal imposition for the giving of the Spirit, he has to acknowledge that there are two givings of the Spirit: "for the baptised is signed on the head by the priest and on the forehead by the bishop to signify that in the former the Holy Spirit descends to establish his dwelling place and in the second, the seven-fold grace of the same Spirit"⁷. The purpose of this second coming of the Spirit is "that they may be strengthened to preach to others"⁸.

Thus we arrive at a situation where the interplay of diverse liturgical practices and significations, and theological opinion combine to create a new understanding of confirmation as the second giving of the Spirit who empowers the baptised to take up the armory of preaching. In such a context it is not surprising that the

practice of confirmation reaches an all time low. The Spanish Church may have been obedient to Rome in re-introducing the episcopal imposition, but they would do so with a different meaning – so the practice of confirming was weakened. It is not surprising that we find the Councils of the twelfth century imposing, under pain of mortal sin, a responsibility upon pastors to preach regularly on the need to receive confirmation.

Reformation Period

By the time of the creation of the Pontificals in the pre-Reformation period, we find that:

1. Confirmation has gained its own celebration which:

- is reserved to the Bishop
- is linked with episcopal visitation of the parish
- is divorced from any liturgical environment, and specifically divorced from eucharist
- lacking any clear theological understanding. Thomas Aquinas, while acknowledging that Confirmation is the gift of the Spirit, will speak of the necessity of confirmation by reminding his hearers that the necessity of receiving confirmation is like the necessity of a taking a horse to make a journey, “without it the end becomes less easy of attainment”⁹ – apparently you can get to heaven without being confirmed! (Amalarius of Metz expressed this opinion earlier when he spoke of those who had not received the imposition of hands “not being excluded from the kingdom of God”¹⁰).
- finally confirmation is being neglected by most in this period, but its celebration is being demanded by the bishops. Councils will invoke the power of sin to enforce its celebration¹¹.

The opinion of Jerome was to return to haunt the bishops: that the insistence upon the rights of the bishop “has more to do with their honour than the requirements of law”¹². Thus it is not surprising that the teaching and practice of confirmation was the object of the Reformers’ attention.

It is in this context that Luther’s rejection of confirmation needs to be placed: “I would permit confirmation as long as it is understood that God knows nothing of it, has said nothing about it and that what the bishops claim for it is untrue”¹³. In his rejection of confirmation, Luther laid the foundation of the “catechetical model” of confirmation which focused on an intellectual preparation of communicants by teaching them specific elements of the Christian faith. This preparation may or may not have concluded with any specific ritual, such as an episcopal imposition. The emphasis however would be upon the candidate’s understanding of the faith profession of baptism.

In response to the Reformers, the Council of Trent (1545-1563) restored confirmation to its position between baptism and eucharist, but because these sacraments were dealt with as stages in a process of education, First communion was not received until the early teenage years. Both for Luther and for the reform of Trent, confirmation was caught up with education rather than initiation.

The Twentieth Century

In 1910, Pius X seeking to revitalise the church, decided that young Catholics should be able to receive communion earlier to ensure they had greater access to the grace and strength of the eucharist. He brought First Communion back to the age of discretion, but, since no one still really understood confirmation as an initiation sacrament to be received before eucharist, confirmation once again found itself out on a limb, with people having to give it a meaning of its own.

In the middle of this century, the first effort was made to give meaning to this sacrament. Much of this effort was drawn from the Anglican tradition by establishing confirmation as an opportunity of personal affirmation of the baptismal commitment, the “catechetical model”. Thus developed an understanding of confirmation as the sacrament of affirmation. This understanding found fertile ground in the catechesis of adolescence. Such a focus on personal commitment and maturity in faith, strengthened by the spirit in the sacrament, has been widely welcomed because of its recognition of young people in the life of the church, and the opportunities it offered them.

The second effort came from a very different field of research. Confirmation has stood alone from other sacraments of the church since the period of the Pontificals. It had begun to gain almost a separate identity as the sacrament of Christian maturity. The French church began to recognise the link with eucharist in its proposal for a solemn celebration of eucharist after confirmation. This pastoral initiative was the early fruit of the research which was becoming available about the early liturgical tradition of the church in which there was only one sacrament of initiation, with a variety of moments. Slowly there dawned the awareness that confirmation did not stand alone, but was a part of the large picture of Christian initiation. In this context confirmation is placed in the “initiation model”.

So emerged the awareness that Christian initiation is a single celebration which should be celebrated in its integrity. This awareness bore fruit in the restoration of the catechumenate and initiation of adults. Their celebration was returned to the Easter Vigil with the integral celebration of baptism, confirmation and eucharist in the same ceremony. If this was the place for confirmation in the scheme of initiation, then where was the place for confirmation of children? Thus began a

painful re-evaluation of the emerging understanding of confirmation in the catechetical world. The context for judging this understanding had been the great success which has been achieved in the implementation of various sacramental programs which had focused upon the personal affirmation of the baptismal promises. There was needed a great shift in thinking to grapple with the tradition of the church which would focus on confirmation as initiation, not as a separate, free-standing sacrament of affirmation: the need to move from a “catechetical model” to an “initiation model” for confirmation.

This shift also allowed the theologians to return once again to the vexed question of the relationship of the Spirit to confirmation. When the emphasis was being placed on the need to witness to the world the faith received in baptism, it was presumed that the gift of the Spirit was to be understood only in this context: thus the gift of the Spirit was read in the light of confirmation’s being a strengthening of what was given in baptism. Logically it was asked if this giving of the Spirit was distinguishable from the action of the Spirit in baptism. Of course, most agreed that it was not – and so developed the misunderstanding that the Spirit was given in baptism (reminiscent of the teaching of Rabanus Maurus!), where in fact the early church had spoken of the Spirit working in the waters of baptism, and being the gift of episcopal imposition.

However, the rediscovery of confirmation as an element of initiation, which would culminate in eucharist, offered the possibility of re-reading our emerging practice. Clearly, the giving of the Spirit was situated in history with the apostolic tradition of the imposition of hands, as witnessed in Hippolytus. This ritual was linked with the gift of the Spirit. As eucharist is the focus of Christian initiation, so the gift of the Spirit must be seen in this light as the means to eucharist. No longer is there need to see this gift in competition with baptism; confirmation simply situates the possibility of eucharist by the gift of the Spirit. The patristic church could comfortably speak of confirmation as the priestly “anointing” by the Spirit which empowered the neophyte for active participation in eucharist. This was clearly not made with a physical anointing, (as Jerome recorded that “the anointing was not with oil, but by the Spirit”¹⁴); rather the anointing by the Spirit was for the specific purpose of eucharist.

Consequently, confirmation is returning to its servant role (along with baptism) as preparation for eucharist.

NOTES

- 1 References will be to the critical Latin edition of this work: *La Tradition Apostolique de saint Hippolyte*. ed by B. Botte. Munster. 1972.

- 2 cf N. Mitchell: "Dissolution of the Rite of Christian Initiation" in *Made, not Born*. Notre Dame. 1980. p. 50-82).
- 3 cf J. Fisher. *Christian Initiation: Baptism in the Medieval West*. London. 1965. p. 6; M. Vanhegel. "Le rite et la fomule de la Chrismation postbaptismale en Gaule..." in *Sacri Erudiri*. 21. 1972.1973. p. 161-222; J.Levesque. "The theology of the postbaptismal rites in the seventh and eighth Gallican Church" in *Ephimerides Liturgicae*. XCV. 1981. p. 3-43.
- 4 Homilia De Pentecosten. in L.VanBuchen: *L'Homelie Pseudo-Eusebienne de Pentecote*. Nijmegen. 1967. p 40-44..
- 5 PL 130 Collectio Decretalium.
- 6 E .Martene: *De Aniquis Ecclesiae Ritibus Libri Tres*. Bk IV: XXVII in Vol III. p. 309.
- 7 *De Clericorum Institutione*. Bk 1: XXX PL 107:314 A-B.
- 8 Ibid.
- 9 *S.Th* III q.65 art.4 Reply.
- 10 *Liber Officialis* Bk 1.1:XXVII,15 .
- 11 Council of Lucana (1351 AD). Cf *Mansi* Vol 26:260.
- 12 *Dialogus contra Luciferianos* 9 PL 23:164-165.
- 13 "Sermon on Married Life". Quoted by L.Mitchell, "Christian Initiation: The Reformation Period" in *Made Not Born*. Notre Dame. 1980. p. 86.
- 14 *Comm on Ps104*. In *CCL* 72:230.

Integrating children into the christian community with particular reference to confirmation and eucharist

Ursula O'Rourke

Introduction

A story is told of someone asking a child if they'd been confirmed! The child replied: "Is that the one where you get the bread, or the one where he hits you in the face?"

Has that child been integrated into the Christian community?

How ready was the child for the celebration of these sacraments?

What is the faith experience of this child?

What is the role of the family?

What is the responsibility of the faith community?

At a recent workshop I heard – what do we do with children in the Assembly? Are they welcome? Is the worshipping assembly just for adults? These are some of the crucial questions that confront us today as we reflect on this topic of integrating children into the Christian community.

The focus for this paper is the integration of children into the Christian community through the sacraments of confirmation and eucharist in the Roman Catholic tradition. This paper has been developed by exploring the Rite of Christian Initiation of Adults [RCIA] which is normative for the preparation for the celebration of the Sacraments of Initiation – baptism, confirmation and eucharist, and then to see how this is applied to the initiation process for children, and their integration into the worshipping assembly.

The historical background to the separation of the sacraments of baptism, confirmation and eucharist will give some insights into the movement over the centuries in the theological and liturgical understanding and in the pastoral celebration of these sacraments. [See David Orr's paper above.] Some models for celebrating these sacraments with children will be highlighted according to current theological and liturgical practices.

Preparation for the sacraments of confirmation and eucharist has developed over decades through the development of various programs used in Catholic schools and in Religious Instruction classes in public schools. The focus on family

based preparation for the sacraments with the celebration in the parish worshipping community is a shift from an earlier model where the preparation and the celebration of the sacraments was, and continues to be in parts of the Catholic Church, the sole responsibility of the Catholic school; parental involvement would consist of meetings to inform them of the program being used in the classroom, and the practical organisational aspects of the celebration. This shift to a family/parish focus will be discussed, particularly exploring the role of the Catholic school which is still vital in the total process.

Integral to the process of integrating children into the Christian community is their formation based on the Word of God. Many parishes have begun the practice of celebrating children's Liturgy of the Word each Sunday. Using a lectionary-based catechesis rather than a particular catechetical program would be the preferred approach.

A number of pastoral issues are related to this question – How does the parish understand itself as the initiating community? Should children be initiated into the faith community if they do not participate regularly in the worshipping community? The question of the most appropriate time to celebrate Sacraments of Initiation is a challenge for parish communities. In the past, the appropriate liturgical season was not considered!

Rite of Christian Initiation of Adults

The reforms of the Second Vatican Council through the Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy [1963] stated that the catechumenate was to be restored. The Rite of Christian Initiation of Adults [RCIA] was promulgated in 1972. It marked a significant shift in the practice of welcoming new adult members into the Catholic community. Prior to this, most parishes would have followed the format of convert classes/instructions given by a priest to an individual, with the individual being baptised or 'received into the church' privately, without the rest of the parish being involved.

The RCIA shifted the focus dramatically: women and men, responding to an often inexplicable call, are formed at the hands of the local community around the Word of God, discerning and welcoming God's invitation to embrace life in the Catholic community, and thus serving the mission of Jesus in the world today.

The RCIA is a restoration of the ancient practice of initiation into the Church – a process of discerning and ritualising stages of conversion, which leads to sacramental initiation through the sacraments of baptism, confirmation and eucharist. These sacraments are celebrated at the Easter Vigil and they empower women and men for lives of service, charity, and justice as witnesses to the reign of God. The parish community, through its witness, worship, service and catechesis,

offers the invitation and support necessary for women and men to be initiated into the Church community.

The basic theology of the RCIA is found in the introduction to the rite. Some of these theological principles help give an overall picture of the dynamics of the rite. The RCIA facilitates the experience of conversion and the response of faith [#1]*, and the heart of this experience is the proclamation of the saving death and resurrection of Jesus Christ – the paschal mystery! It respects the individual experience of conversion, and offers a process that accommodates and adapts to a person's journey in faith in the midst of the faith community [#1,2,4,5]. The sharing of faith and life based on the Word of God is integral to the total process. There is a close relationship between liturgy and catechesis. A person's growth in faith is ritualised at various times throughout the liturgical year, and appropriate for the individual person's conversion. The various liturgical rites dotted throughout the journey, culminate with the celebration of the sacraments of initiation at the Easter Vigil. A variety of ministries are called for from the parish and this affirms the responsibility for ministry and service of all the baptised. Provision is made in Part II of the RCIA document for the initiation of children of catechetical age – this is the vision for current pastoral developments.

Initiation of Children

The RCIA provides a model of initiation for unbaptised children who have reached catechetical age [cf. RCIA 252 ff]. This is one rite within the larger RCIA with appropriate adaptations for children. The RCIA's theology and vision informs the praxis for children. Provision is made for the celebration of baptism, confirmation and eucharist for the unbaptised children of catechetical age to join with baptised children completing sacramental initiation who are in the same catechetical group. Parents, sponsors, and the whole faith community are encouraged to participate in the process with these children, journeying with them, celebrating the various ritual moments, and culminating in the celebration of the sacraments at the Easter Vigil – the place where the Christian community gathers to welcome its new members. If for pastoral reasons, it may not be possible to celebrate these sacraments at the Easter Vigil, then the pastoral team may determine to shift the time of initiation for the children to Easter Sunday morning.

The RCIA gives us the traditional order of the sacraments of initiation – baptism, confirmation and eucharist – not only with adults, but with children. This sequence is explained as the liturgical expression of the church's

* [#] References to Rite of Christian Initiation of Adults document.

understanding of what God did in the Christ-event and how we come to share in that reality.

The reforms of Vatican II give no grounds for deviating from this principle when completing the initiation of children baptised in infancy. Consequently, there is a definite movement in the church to restore the order of sacraments of initiation with children – baptised in infancy, then celebrating confirmation and eucharist in that order, at a later age.

Preparing and Celebrating Confirmation and Eucharist with Children

As Christians, we journey in community – the community of the family, and the community of the assembly, the body of Christ. Sacraments happen at various stages of human development. They celebrate the rhythm of lived experience, of telling our story, and then expressing that story through ritual action within a faith community. Children are part of this process which unfolds within the context of the family and of the Christian community. It is in the family that a child has the core experience of community, both in terms of human development and religious belief. This is crucial to the process of initiation of children. The Declaration on Education [#3] states that the parents' role in forming a child's life of faith is so decisive that scarcely anything can compensate for their failure in it.

The initiation of children into the Christian community is extended over a number of years. Baptised in infancy, their faith is nurtured within the family, the domestic church, and within the parish community. This is a huge challenge for families and for our faith communities.

Those who have studied models and stages of faith development show that by the age of five, a large part of a child's religious horizon has been formed. Some challenging questions emerge for those involved in this ministry – what resources for faith formation are available for families with preschool children? Does the parish provide opportunities for parents to come together to talk to each other about their own faith and to explore ways they can share that faith within their families? These sessions could address the real needs of families – eg. what are your hopes and fears for your children? How is communication within your marriage? As opposed to such questions as – what is the meaning of water etc. Such gatherings are led by other parents – parents ministering to parents – in order that they grow in faith together and that faith can be shared and lived with their children. This approach is a major positive step in the direction of community building and of creating an environment for growth in faith for these families.

Parents need help learning how to use family rituals, how to talk to their children about God and prayer in ways that will provide a positive foundation for

future formation and catechesis, especially during the times of preparation for the completion of their initiation into the Christian community. Examples of such family rituals are: birthday celebrations, anniversary of baptism, special feasts, birth of a child in the family, liturgical seasons, prayer at meal times, healing and forgiveness, blessings before celebration of sacraments etc. Excellent resources may be found in Book of Blessings; Catholic Household Blessings and Prayers.

It continues in the gathering of the faith community...

The focus on the family is integral to the role of the parish community which supports the faith of families. The parish is the church structure that best promises to be that kind of initiatory community and offers our best hope of providing the environment in which Christian initiation of children will be supported and enhanced.

When the faith community, of which the family is a part, gathers on a Sunday, one could ask: How are children seen in the assembly? How do they participate in the liturgical action of the community? Children are baptised in water and the Spirit and are members of the household of faith. They belong to the assembly and have a right to express their faith, to be nourished and strengthened in their faith as they celebrate with the worshipping community.

For those not fully initiated into the faith community through confirmation and eucharist, the parish needs to provide opportunities for children to celebrate the Word of God within the context of the Sunday assembly. The Directory for Masses with Children [1973] gives some fundamental principles for celebrating the Word with children. The document emphasises the importance of the family and the broader faith community in the formation of children in their faith. It respects the nature of childhood, and speaks of adapting to the age, abilities and capacities of the children. It stresses that the child is a member of the faith community and must always be given a sense of belonging so that they might fully and actively participate in the assembly of the parish faith community.

The Directory states: 'it is necessary to take great care that the children present do not feel neglected because of their inability to participate or to understand what happens and what is proclaimed in the celebration. Some account should be taken of their presence...Sometimes...if the place itself and the nature of the community permit, it will be appropriate to celebrate the Liturgy of the Word, including a homily, with the children in a separate, but not too distant, room.' [#17]

The Church is giving some direction in ways to form children in their faith. These celebrations of the Word are not catechetical sessions, but rather they are liturgical celebrations. They are liturgies expressed in narrative and song, made

visible in gesture and symbolic activity, and culminate in the eucharist. This directive places new challenges before a parish in terms of both their worship space and their personnel.

A typical Sunday morning celebration might be: After being welcomed and greeted by the presider, and praying the opening prayer of the liturgy, the children are invited to come forward with their leader who is entrusted with the children's lectionary and is instructed to break open God's Word for these children. They leave in a solemn liturgical procession to a separate space nearby where the readings of the day are proclaimed using texts suited to the child's ability to comprehend. Children interact with the Word proclaimed in the light of their own life experience. They experience a liturgical ritual not a classroom exercise. The atmosphere is prayerful, readers proclaim texts with the appropriate liturgical responses, psalms are sung, homiletic reflections lead the children being challenged by the Word in the light of their own experiences; some elements of a credal profession and intercessory prayer conclude the celebration. At times, ritual gesture and the generous use of symbols may be included in the liturgy eg. light, water, oil, bread, wine, incense, sign of peace, laying on of hands, signing of senses with the sign of the cross. [cf. Maureen Kelly and Robert Duggan in bibliography]

Like the model given in the RCIA, children are being formed in their faith through hearing the Word of God each Sunday within the context of the liturgical assembly. They are not dismissed from the liturgy, but their liturgy continues around the Word until they become full members of the worshipping community and can partake of full fellowship at the table of the Lord.

Maureen Kelly and Robert Duggan, authors of *The Christian Initiation of Children: Hope for the Future* [1991] state that if a parish is constant in its celebration of the Word with children each Sunday, fifty-two weeks a year, then the preparation for sacraments of confirmation and eucharist becomes integral to the Sunday assembly. The Word is foundational to the preparation for the sacraments and if children are nourished Sunday after Sunday, then is there need for a special program to be introduced to focus on the sacraments?

In the past, children have been prepared for the sacraments of confirmation and eucharist within the context of the classroom, where religious education is for the most part teacher directed, information oriented and age focused. Particular programs were used to teach about these sacraments, and when the program was completed, the sacraments were celebrated during a special liturgy, usually organised by the school, in the parish church either on a Sunday or during the week. This practice of "school based" preparation and celebration sacraments has dominated the approach in the Roman Catholic church for decades.

A different approach to the preparation of sacraments is expressed in the RCIA which offers a catechumenal process. This process is more suited to individual

readiness, to personal maturity and to group bondedness. Consequently, religious formation can take place in the context of small groups or family settings, with companions and the guidance of sponsors.

The catechumenal process is rooted in the paschal mystery of Jesus Christ; it is founded on the Word of God – listening to the Word, praying over it and reflecting on it personally and within a small group or within the family. This connection guides us to a lectionary-based catechesis – this model of catechesis provides the opportunity for individuals to study and “break open” the meaning of the great stories of salvation.

By focusing on the gospels, individuals gain a greater understanding of what the Christian life demands and who Jesus calls each of us to be. Some concern is often raised about this method - where are the basic doctrinal issues that must be taught? Preparation for sacraments is not about presenting a string of dogmas or a textbook of doctrine; the preparation is meant to be centred on Jesus Christ, the foundation of all truth. By using the lectionary as the basis for catechesis, issues of doctrine that are significant to Catholic tradition will emerge but they maintain their connection to their source in Jesus Christ.

Those preparing for the celebration of the sacraments are called to conversion of mind and heart, a conversion based on the Word and closely connected to the cycle of Sunday celebrations. This is possible with consistent opportunities for children to hear and celebrate the Word.

What happens with Confirmation?

The celebration of the sacraments of confirmation and eucharist has had a chequered history! It is often called “the sacrament in search of a theology”. With the separation of confirmation from baptism and eucharist, many different practices emerged. The sacrament of confirmation was seen as a rite to be celebrated with adolescents, as a consequence of catechesis rather than as a time of conversion and initiation into eucharist and the faith community. It was seen as one more hoop into religion classes, then it was time to ‘drop out’! Jim Dunning writes that confirmation was seen as a ‘graduation’ from church life into the ‘freedom of secular life’. He goes on to say too... ‘we withhold eucharist from children on the grounds that they can’t understand, which is as absurd as withholding affection because they don’t understand. We become the body of Christ, by being the Body of Christ...belonging to the body of Christ is not a cognitive reality...to eat and drink with the community is to be the community...’

The Constitution the Sacred Liturgy [1963] of Vatican II called for the reform of the sacrament of confirmation stating that this sacrament is not an isolated event but has an intimate connection with the whole of Christian initiation. It is related

to the rites of becoming a catechumen and election of the RCIA, closely related to the primary parish initiation liturgy the Easter Vigil, and related to celebrations of infant baptism and of first eucharist.

These connections are expressed more fully in the revision of the Rite of Confirmation [1971]: 'The faithful are born anew by baptism, strengthened by the sacrament of confirmation, and finally are sustained by the food of eternal life in the eucharist...The link between confirmation and the other sacraments of initiation is shown forth more clearly not only by closer association of these sacraments but also by the rite and words by which confirmation is conferred. Confirmation is so closely linked with the holy eucharist that the faithful, after being signed by holy baptism and confirmation, are incorporated fully into the body of Christ by participation in the eucharist.'

The rite strongly encourages the celebration of confirmation in the context of the eucharist [#13] emphasising that eucharist [not confirmation] is the climax of the initiation process in the church. Linda Gaupin writes that the reception of first eucharist before confirmation does violence to the meaning of both sacraments. Baptism is the way eucharist begins, and eucharist, not confirmation, is the way baptism reaches its fullness. We are not celebrating a 'graduation' by this liturgy, but growth in the baptismal way of life, which is meant to lead all to the eucharistic way of life.

When confirmation and eucharist are celebrated together, the unity of the rites of the sacraments of initiation is made more evident. The child is confirmed in the faith of baptism, and is led at once to the eucharistic table.

The question is often asked, how can confirmation and first eucharist be celebrated together for young children? So often the liturgy can be overloaded with activities that are inappropriate for this particular celebration and the essence of the rite can be lost. By studying the rites, one can see that there is a simplicity in its shape:

Introductory Rite: Gathering Song
 Greeting
 Call of candidates
 and lighting their baptismal candle from the paschal
 candle
 *[in the Ritual this is included at the beginning of the
 Rite of Confirmation, but for pastoral reasons it
 could be included here.]*
 Rite of Sprinkling with Water
 Opening Prayer

Liturgy of the Word
[Procession of Oil of Chrism]

Rite of Confirmation:

- Candidates called to stand
- Renewal of baptismal promises
- Laying on of hands and prayer
- Anointing with chrism
- General intercessions

Liturgy of Eucharist
Concluding Rite

This celebration would normally take place during the Easter season, with much of the immediate preparation done during Lent. This time of preparation coincides with the preparation that is happening with groups of catechumens and those baptised seeking full communion with the Catholic Church. A challenge for the faith community would be to bring the members of the faith community and these various groups together on a couple of occasions during Lent for prayer and reflection leading everyone to a deeper understanding of the need for conversion and the Easter sacraments. Such a practice would unite the faith community and give witness to the fact that this business of initiation belongs to the total faith community.

What are the models for celebrating these sacraments?

Mark Searle offers three models of celebrating these sacraments:

1. Baptism, confirmation (a minor rite) and eucharist – all celebrated at Easter. [This is the ideal!]
2. Infant baptism, confirmation, with its own identity as a step towards full initiation in eucharist. [If we take this option then we need to ask: what are the ecclesial effects of confirmation? It could say that baptism is for the forgiveness of original sin and that the Spirit doesn't arrive until after confirmation!]
3. Infant baptism, eucharist, confirmation as a rite of mature commitment completing childhood catechesis. [This model has no basis in our Catholic Tradition, and subordinates the sacramental nature of confirmation.]

In some of the writings over the past few years on models for initiation of children, several proposals have been made. The following suggestions were given in a recent article in *Catechumenate* by Jim Dunning

The first model is followed by some parishes today, the other two may be dreams for the future:

- | | |
|--|---|
| <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. • Infant Baptism<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Reconciliation offered• Confirmation with Eucharist at age of reason• Lent/Easter Rites 2. • Infant baptism, confirmation and eucharist<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Reconciliation• Lent/Easter rites 3. • Child's catechumenate<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Baptism, confirmation and eucharist at age of reason• Reconciliation• Lent/Easter Rites | <p>This model respects the order of the sacraments as well as infant baptism. Reconciliation is offered – not forced – before eucharist [cf.CCL]. Since confirmation/eucharist is separated from baptism, catechesis about the Spirit and chrismation at baptism is needed.</p> <p>This model respects infant initiation, unifies the sacraments and moves away from a rationalistic denial of eucharist to infants. Children are welcomed but not forced.</p> <p>This model might serve parents who need something like a children's catechumenate. A rite of acceptance could be celebrated with them and their child and give them a catechumenal community of faith and support.</p> |
|--|---|

Such models give some basis for further discussion and reflection by those involved in the initiation process of children into the christian community. They open some possibilities for the pastoral practice to 'catch up' with the theological and liturgical principles given by the church as part of its liturgical renewal.

Pastoral Issues

A number of issues emerge from this discussion that need constant reflection by those who are responsible for this ministry in the church. Does the parish really understand itself as the initiating community? Again the RCIA gives the vision. The first ministers of initiation are the faith community who give witness to the good news of Jesus, who live as a communion of disciples, supporting the mission of Jesus in service to their brothers and sisters; where people experience Christ's presence in the worshipping assembly, where their faith is expressed, nourished and strengthened; where all members are living their baptismal call to be on mission in the church and in the world. This is how a faith community forms its new members, and empowers them to continue to live the call of Christ in their lives.

Another issue that challenges us is – Should children be initiated into the faith community who do not participate regularly in the worshipping community? The parish community is called upon to be an evangelising community – reaching out to those who are searching, offering hospitality to those who may not feel welcome in the assembly. The ministry of sponsor is a vital one here. The challenge is constantly before an initiating community to reach out to those on the margins, and to offer the loving support of a caring, trusting community.

If a parish is to be an effective force in the initiation and integration of children into the community, it must do so as a community where belonging and having a strong identity with that community are values that are held strongly. A parish must have its own spirit, its own identity, and be specific about its Christian mission. It needs special occasions that allow members to celebrate their identity and belonging, and their hopes and dreams for a shared future. Such a parish community easily initiates and integrates children because their vision and practice are experienced, where the fundamentals of Christian living – community, message, service and liturgy – are available and flourish. It is a faith community where children feel ‘at home’ and are welcomed with great joy!

Let me conclude with thoughts from Jim Dunning – if children are more active in our rites, if we give them the kind of respect that Maria Montessori did when she named her schools ‘Children’s House,’ if we gather families and households to support them with something like a catechumenate, if those households bring deeper faith to the household of the church, might we become what Jesus told us to become: more like little children? ... Might we learn from infants that at times we come to God helpless, not earning communion but gifted by God’s love? Might our stale, ordered, rationalistic, cerebral liturgies be enlivened by childlike wonder, disorder, the nonrational, heart and hands as well as head? Might we become what Francis Thompson wrote of Shelley?

Know you what it is to be a child?

It is to be something very different from the man of today.

It is to have a spirit yet streaming from the waters of baptism;

it is to believe in love;

to believe in loveliness;

to believe in belief;

It is to be so little that the elves can reach to whisper in your ear;

It is to turn pumpkins into coaches,

and mice into horses,

lowness into loftiness,

and nothing into everything.

No wonder Jesus commanded, ‘Let the children come to me. Of such is the reign of God.’

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Bernstein, Eleanor & John Brooks-Leonard, eds *Children in the Assembly of the Church*, Liturgy Training Publications, 1992.
- Brown, Kathy & Frank C. Sokol, eds *Issues in the Christian Initiation of Children: Catechesis and Liturgy*, Liturgy Training Publications, 1989.
- Cooke, Bernard *Sacraments and Sacramentality*, Paulist Press, 1981.
- Duffy, Regis 'Sacraments in General' *Systematic Theology: Roman Catholic Perspectives*, Vol II, Fortress Press, 1991.
- Duffy, Regis, ed *Alternative Futures for Worship*, [Vols 1-7], The Liturgical Press, 1987.
- Duggan, Robert and Maureen Kelly, *The Christian Initiation of Children: Hope for the Future*, Paulist Press, 1991.
- Elich, Tom, 'Confirmed in The Faith of Baptism' *Liturgy News*, March 1990.
- Elich, Tom, 'Young Children and the Sacrament' *Liturgy News*, June 1990.
- Fink, Peter E, *Worship" Praying the Sacraments*, The Pastoral Press, 1991.
- Fitzgerald, Timothy, *Confirmation: A Parish Celebration*, Liturgy Training Publications, 1983.
- Fitzgerald, Timothy, *Infant Baptism: A Parish Celebration*, Liturgy Training Publications, 1994.
- Guzie, Tad, *The Book of Sacramental Basics*, Paulist Press, 1981.
- Searle, Mark, ed *The Church Speaks about Sacraments with Children*, Liturgy Training Publications, 1990.
- Tufano, Victoria, ed *Readings in the Christian Initiation of Children*, Liturgy Training Publications, 1994.
- Wilde, James, ed *When Should We Confirm?* Liturgy Training Publications, 1989.
- Wilde, James, ed *Confirmed as Children, Affirmed as Teens*, Liturgy Training Publications, 1990.

CONFERENCE 1995

It was an interesting collection of people who gathered at Blackfriars Priory in Canberra for the 1995 AAL conference (11-14 December). Of course, our conferences always attract an interesting collection of people, but in this case, there was an unusual number of new members, which was an encouraging sign for the academy, and fitting for a conference hosted by our newest chapter. (The fact that a majority of these neophytes were from SA was particularly encouraging for the regeneration of that chapter, which had been dormant for some time, and a tribute to the energy of their then convener, Carmel Pilcher.)

Since the keynote papers are being published in this issue of AJL, those of you who were not able to join us there will be able to taste something of what was offered. I particularly enjoyed the opportunity to explore the issues involved and questions raised in each of these papers, in the small group discussions during each day. The group to which I was assigned was lively and good-humoured as well as erudite [It included one of the keynote speakers.], and I trust that others had similarly fruitful exchanges in their groups. This balance between formal presentation of papers and workshop discussion has been, I think, one of the attractive features of recent conferences.

One innovative element was the inclusion of a number of children from various Canberra churches in an afternoon workshop designed to give them a chance to tell us of their experience of integration into their faith communities. Some members of the academy found this enlightening, while others were less enthusiastic. One thing that the children made clear was that they appreciated opportunities to take responsible roles in liturgy, whether publicly, as acolytes or readers, or behind the scenes in preparation of the space, and so on.

During Wednesday afternoon's free time, the 'women's cabal' – ie as many of those women present who were available at that time – went off in search of a coffee-shop for their traditional (since 1994!) mid conference gathering; and on Wednesday evening, most conference participants gathered for the academy dinner where conversation flowed even more freely than the wine. (Why *did* our illustrious President need to investigate the cellar personally?? The rest of us made do with the wine list!)

At Thursday morning's General Meeting, the academy approved the revised constitution and heard news from each of the chapters. SA agreed to host the next conference (in January, 1997) with a topic relating to liturgy and indigenous Australian culture/s.

As usual, the conference was set in a matrix of worship – morning and evening liturgies, and mid-day prayers, all conducted with the grace one would expect from experts in the field. And, of course, one of the principal attractions of a conference such as this is the opportunity it gives us to come together in a congenial setting over a number of days, forming and refreshing friendships with fellow members of the academy.

The ACT/Southern NSW chapter and their convener, D'Arcy Wood, are to be congratulated; and I look forward to a different, but similarly stimulating experience, in Adelaide next year.

Inari Thiel

Miriam Therese Winter

Professor of Liturgy, Spirituality, and Feminist
Studies

returns to Australia to present
her creative workshops
and public lectures in:

Perth 17-23 June (09) 444 6679
Melbourne 24-26 June (02) 804 7960
Sydney 29 June-6 July (02) 804 7960
Adelaide 7-8 July (08) 373 3781
Brisbane 12-14 July (09) 3377 9777
Rockhampton 17 July (09) 3377 9777
Townsville 19-20 July (077) 289 861

For all other enquiries phone
Maureen Cleary on (02) 804 7960

Constitution of the Australian Academy of Liturgy

ARTICLE I – NAME

The name of this organisation is the Australian Academy of Liturgy, hereafter referred to as the 'Academy'.

ARTICLE II – GOALS AND PURPOSES

1. The Academy is an ecumenical association of specialists in Christian liturgy and related disciplines, with a particular commitment to the understanding and development of liturgy in the Australian context.

2. It is the Academy's purpose:

a) to provide channels for mutual professional assistance and for the sharing of methods and resources;

b) to exchange information concerning recent developments in liturgical matters;

c) to communicate information concerning research projects and activities of its members;

d) to foster liturgical research, publication, and dialogue at a scholarly level;

e) to publish *Australian Journal of Liturgy*;

f) to encourage exchanges with individuals and communities of other religious traditions.

3. It is the intent of the Academy that the work detailed above will ultimately serve to animate the liturgical spirit of the traditions and congregations to which its members belong.

ARTICLE III – ADMISSION

1. Admission to the Academy is open to persons of demonstrated competence in liturgical studies or related disciplines which contribute to worship in a significant way.

2. Members have permanent standing in the Academy contingent upon the payment of their annual dues.

3. (a) Candidates for the Academy must be recommended to the local Chapter by a member.

(b) Applications approved by the local Chapter will be forwarded to the Executive.

(c) The Executive will examine the credentials of the prospective members and accept those who qualify for membership.

(d) The Council is to be notified of the acceptance of new members.

4. The Council, from time to time, may grant Honorary Life Membership to persons deemed appropriate for such recognition.

ARTICLE IV – STRUCTURE

The Academy shall consist of several Chapters, each Chapter corresponding to a state or other regional division, as approved by the Council. Each Chapter shall elect a convener to represent it on the Council and to co-ordinate the work of the Academy within the Chapter, including liaison with the Executive.

ARTICLE V – COUNCIL AND OFFICERS

1. The officers of the Academy are the president, the secretary, the treasurer (or secretary-treasurer), the convener of each Chapter, the editor of *Australian Journal of Liturgy*, and the immediate past president.

2. These officers constitute the Council of the Academy.

3. The Executive of the Council is comprised of the president, the secretary, the treasurer (or secretary-treasurer), and the convener of the Chapter of which the president is a member.

4. (a) The president, the secretary, the treasurer (or secretary-treasurer) are elected by the members at the General Meeting, and shall hold office until the conclusion of the next General Meeting.

(b) Chapter conveners hold office for the same term as the Executive.

(c) These office-bearers are eligible for re-election.

5. In the event of a vacancy occurring, the Council is empowered to make a suitable appointment until the General Meeting.

ARTICLE VI – COMMITTEES

1. The Academy shall have standing committees as provided in the Constitution and By-Laws, and such committees as the president may establish.

2. The Conference Committee shall be responsible for the programme of the Conference. It will consist of the Executive of the Council plus the convener of the Chapter which is hosting the Conference. This committee will appoint a Conference Arrangements Committee to attend to the local organisation for the Conference.

3. The Editorial Committee shall be a standing committee. The editor is appointed from time to time by the Council and will recommend other members for the Editorial Committee to the Executive. The committee is responsible for *Australian Journal of Liturgy* and such other publications as the Council will determine.

ARTICLE VII – MEETINGS

1. The General Meeting of the members of the Academy is held during the Conference.

2. The Conference shall be held at least once every two years.

ARTICLE VIII – AMENDMENTS

1. Proposed amendments to this Constitution shall be presented in writing to the secretary, at least sixty days before the next General Meeting of the Academy. The secretary will circulate the petition to the members at least thirty days in advance of that same meeting.

2. A two-thirds majority of those members at the General Meeting is required for approval of amendments to this Constitution, provided that a quorum is present.

ARTICLE IX – QUORUM

A quorum for a General Meeting of the Academy will be one-fifth of the total number of members.

ARTICLE X – BY-LAWS

By-laws may be adopted by simple majority vote of those present and voting at the General Meeting.

ARTICLE XI – FINANCES

1. The Academy shall derive its revenue from membership dues, donations, and from such trusts as may support the goals and purposes of the Academy, and from such fund-raising activities as the Council may approve from time to time.

2. The Academy may receive donations from those who do not seek membership but who wish to support the work of the Academy by their donations.

3. The Council is empowered to set a minimum figure for the membership dues required of members.

4. Membership dues are to be paid in January and cover the period from January 1 to December 31. Any member whose dues remain unpaid by June 30

of the following year will be deemed unfinancial and removed from the membership. Such members will be notified in writing by the secretary, and invited to reapply for membership, should they so desire.

5. All monies are to be deposited in the Academy's bank account. Cheques drawn on this account are to be signed by any two of the members of the Executive.

ARTICLE XII – TERMINATION

In the event of the dissolution of the Academy, any surplus funds after realising on assets and discharging liabilities will be paid to an educational institute or institutions having goals or purposes similar at least in part to the goals and purposes of the Academy.

BY-LAWS

SECTION I – ELECTIONS

1. All elections are to be conducted under the auspices of the Academy Council.

2. Nominations for an office may be made by members.

3. All financial members are eligible to vote in elections and stand for office.

4. Balloting will be by standard preferential voting.

SECTION II – DUTIES OF OFFICERS

1. The president has the duty:

(a) to call, convene and preside at meetings of the Academy;

(b) to appoint committees;

(c) to preside at the meetings of the Council and Executive;

(d) to perform the duties applicable to the president.

2. The secretary has the duty:

(a) to perform the usual duties of the secretary;

(b) to keep a permanent record of all meetings and all the minutes;

(c) to organise the General Meeting in consultation with the president;

(d) to maintain an accurate membership list.

3. The treasurer has the duty:

- (a) to perform the usual duties of the treasurer;
- (b) to handle the monies of the academy;
- (c) to submit for audit the Academy's books before each General Meeting.

SECTION III – FINANCES

1. The annual membership fee for individuals and for married couples shall include the annual subscription to *Australian Journal of Liturgy*.

2. If a person is admitted as a member after July 1, he or she will pay the annual membership dues for that year.

SECTION IV – MEETINGS

1. General Meetings shall be conducted according to Joske's *Law & Procedure at Meetings in Australia*, unless otherwise determined by the Constitution or By-Laws.

2. At the General Meeting the president of the Academy shall make a report on the work of the Academy.

SECTION V – PROCEEDINGS

1. Those delivering papers at the Conference shall be invited to submit them to the editor for consideration for publication in *Australian Journal of Liturgy*.

2. A report of the Conference, including the General Meeting, shall be published in the Journal.

CONTRIBUTORS

The Revd Robert W. Gribben, a former President of the Academy, is Minister of Wesley Church, Melbourne. He is a member of the Council of Societas Liturgica.

Sister Ursula O'Roueke, sgs, a Good Samaritan Sister, is Director of St Scholastica's Centre, Glebe Point (Sydney). With a background in teaching in schools throughout Queensland, she was for ten years Director of Liturgy in the Diocese of Townsville.

The Revd David Orr, osb, is a monk of St Benedict's Abbey, Arcadia, and teaches liturgy for the Catholic Theological Union, Sydney.

The Right Revd David Silk is Bishop of Ballarat and was the Marshall Memorial Lecturer for 1995. He was a member of the Liturgical Commission of the Church of England 1976-91.

Inari Thiel, Secretary of the Academy, has been doing post graduate study in the Philosophy Department of the Universtiy of Queensland.

**Back issues of AJL
from Vol 1 No 2 to Vol 5 No 2
may be ordered from
Australian Academy of Liturgy
GPO Box 282
Brisbane Qld 4001
for \$7.50 each (including postage)**

AJL ADDRESSES

MANUSCRIPTS FOR PUBLICATION to:

The Revd R.W. Hartley
St Aidan's Vicarage
24 Williamson Avenue
Strathmore Vic 3041

Authors preparing manuscripts are requested to follow the style sheet jointly adopted by such publications as *Journal of Biblical Literature*, *Catholic Biblical Quarterly*, *Harvard Theological Review*, *Hermeneia*, *Australian Biblical Review* and *Colloquium*, except that Australian spellings should be used following *The Macquarie Dictionary*. This style sheet is printed in JBL 95 (1976) 331-346 and CBQ 38/3 (1976) 437-454. *Australian Journal of Liturgy* should be abbreviated as *AJL*.

Articles generally should not exceed 3,000 words in length. Articles may be presented on five and a quarter or three and a half inch IBM compatible disc in either WordPerfect or ASCII format. A hard copy should accompany the disc. *AJL* is indexed in *Australasian Religious Index*.

BOOKS FOR REVIEW to:

The Revd Dr C.H. Sherlock
1A South Terrace
Clifton Hill Vic 3068

SUBSCRIPTION PAYMENTS and all business communications
(including notice of change of address) to:

Australian Academy of Liturgy
GPO Box 282, Brisbane Qld 4001
Facsimile: (07) 221 1705

Subscription Rates:

Annual Subscription — \$15.00

AJL is sent anywhere in the world for an annual subscription of AUS\$15.00 if paid in Australian currency. If paid in any other currency the subscription is the equivalent of AUS\$20.00.

For Members of the Academy subscription to *AJL* is included in the membership fee.

