

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for *The Churchman* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_churchman_os.php

The Doctrine of the Sacraments in the Thirty-nine Articles¹

ROGER BECKWITH

The Thirty-nine Articles of Religion are a basic statement of Anglican theology. They were first drawn up by Archbishop Cranmer as Forty-two Articles in Edward VI's reign (1553), and after being suppressed (with the rest of the reforming programme for the church) in Mary's reign, were revived by act of Convocation in Elizabeth's reign (1563). A modest revision took place (1563 and 1571), reducing them to Thirty-nine Articles, and in 1571 the English clergy were required, by act of Parliament, to give their assent to them, as a condition of being instituted to a cure of souls. Though forms of subscription have changed over the years, this is still a requirement in the Church of England and in many other Churches of the Anglican Communion, at ordination or institution or both.

The sacraments were one of the main topics of controversy at the Reformation, and it was chiefly for their teaching on the Lord's Supper that the martyred Anglican bishops (Cranmer, Ridley, Latimer, Hooper and Ferrar) were put to death. We have in Oxford a great stone cross in the surface of the road, marking the spot where Ridley and Latimer, and afterwards Cranmer, were burned to death; and one hundred yards away stands an elegant memorial erected in the nineteenth century, which those who have visited Oxford will have seen, from which the figures of Cranmer, Latimer and Ridley look out northward, westward and eastward across the university city.

Latimer was the great preacher among the Reformers, but Ridley was an able theologian, who led the way for his companions in his reformed eucharistic beliefs; while Cranmer was the great man of learning, slow in reaching conclusions but establishing them with great care, and it is to him that we owe not only very extensive theological writings on the Lord's Supper, but also most of the brief summary statements on the sacraments which are included in the Thirty-nine Articles. As commentary on these Articles we have not only Cranmer's own writings, but the Latin text of the Articles, which is of equal authority with the English; the Book of Homilies (of which two homilies in particular are concerned with the sacraments); the sacramental services of Cranmer's Book of Common Prayer; and the Prayer Book Catechism, of which the part on the sacraments was

added by Bishop Overall slightly later, in 1604, though drawing to some extent on the Elizabethan catechism of Alexander Nowell.

The sacraments are the last main doctrinal topic in the Articles, occupying the six articles 25, 27–31 and being touched on in five others (16, 19, 23, 24 and 26).

The Number of the Sacraments

The Articles draw a sharp distinction (Art. 25) between the two sacraments of the gospel, baptism and holy communion, and other practices which have been commonly called sacraments, such as the rest of the seven sacraments of the mediaeval church (confirmation, penance, extreme unction, marriage and ordination). The distinction made is that baptism and holy communion are based on a New Testament command ('*ordained* by Christ our Lord in the Gospel'), whereas the other five have at most a New Testament *example*; and secondly, that this command includes 'a *visible sign or ceremony* ordained of God', whereas in some of the other five cases the visible sign is uncertain or variable. The Catechism adds the further distinction that the two great sacraments are directly concerned with the salvation of those who receive them:

Question: How many sacraments hath Christ ordained in his Church?
Answer. Two only, as generally necessary to salvation.'

The other five, though they may be helpful, are not divinely commanded, and therefore not strictly necessary. The gospel promise of salvation is not attached to them in the same definite way. The Homily 'Of Common Prayer and Sacraments', in a passage jointly written by Bishop Jewel and Queen Elizabeth, deals with this matter at a little greater length:

Now with like, or rather more brevity, you shall hear how many sacraments there be, that were instituted by our Saviour Christ, and are to be continued and received of every Christian in due time and order, and for such purpose as our Saviour Christ willed them to be received. And as for the number of them, if they should be considered according to the exact significance of a sacrament, namely, for the visible signs, expressly commanded in the New Testament, whereunto is annexed the promise of free forgiveness of our sin, and of our holiness and joining in Christ, there be but two; namely, Baptism, and the Supper of the Lord. . .

And although there are retained by the order of the Church of England, besides these two, certain other rites and ceremonies about the institution of ministers in the church; matrimony; confirmation of children, by examining them of their knowledge in the articles of the faith, and joining thereto the prayers of the church for them; and likewise for the visitation of the sick; yet no man ought to take these for sacraments, in such signification and meaning as the sacrament of

Baptism and the Lord's Supper are: but either for godly states of life, necessary in Christ's church, and therefore worthy to be set forth by public action and solemnity, by the ministry of the church; or else judged to be such ordinances as may make for the instruction, comfort, and edification of Christ's church.²

The Importance of the Sacraments

It will already be clear that the Articles place great weight on the sacraments. The reason for singling out two is because of their importance. Three of the sacramental articles (Arts. 25, 27 and 28) each begin with a 'not only': sacraments are 'not only badges or tokens'; baptism is 'not only a sign of profession', the eucharist is 'not only a sign of the love that Christians ought to have among themselves'. Rather, they are 'sure witnesses and effectual signs' (Art. 25), 'effectual because of Christ's institution and promise' (Art. 26); by baptism we are 'grafted into the church' (Art. 27); and the holy communion is 'a partaking of the body of Christ. . . a partaking of the blood of Christ' (Art. 28). You will recall many parallels to the latter statements in the sacramental services of the Prayer Book, and also in the Catechism.

The Nature of Sacraments

The way in which the sacraments bring about these beneficial effects is noteworthy. It comes about, say the Articles, through their character as signs or symbols. Article 25 says that they are 'witnesses' and 'signs' of God's grace, by which he 'quickens' (that is, awakens, Lat. *excitat*) and 'strengthens' our faith in him. Through the sign of baptism he *awakens* our faith and through the sign of the holy communion he *strengthens* our faith, since baptism marks the beginning of the Christian life and holy communion its continuance. In his treatise *On the Lord's Supper*, Cranmer expounds the character of sacraments as signs or symbols in the following way:

And although our carnal generation (that is, begetting) and our carnal nourishment be known to all men by daily experience, and by our common senses; yet this our spiritual generation and our spiritual nutrition be so obscure and hid unto us, that we cannot attain to the true and perfect knowledge and feeling of them, but only by faith, which must be grounded upon God's most holy word and sacraments.

And for this consideration our Saviour Christ hath not only set forth these things most plainly in his holy word, that we may hear them with our ears, but he hath also ordained one visible sacrament of spiritual regeneration in water, and another visible sacrament of spiritual nourishment in bread and wine, to the intent, that as much as is possible for man, we may see Christ with our eyes, smell him at our nose, taste him with our mouths, grope him [that is, handle him] with our hands, and perceive him with all our senses. For as the word of

God preached putteth Christ into our ears, so likewise these elements of water, bread, and wine, joined to God's word, do after a sacramental manner put Christ into our eyes, mouths, hands, and all our senses.

And for this cause Christ ordained baptism in water, that as surely as we see, feel, and touch water with our bodies, and be washed with water, so assuredly ought we to believe, when we be baptized, that Christ is verily present with us, and that by him we be newly born again spiritually, and washed from our sins, and grafted in the stock of Christ's own body, . . . So that the washing in water of baptism is, as it were, shewing of Christ before our eyes, and a sensible touching, feeling, and groping of him, to the confirmation of the inward faith, which we have in him.

And in like manner Christ ordained the sacrament of his body and blood in bread and wine, to preach unto us, that as our bodies be fed, nourished, and preserved with meat and drink, so as touching our spiritual life towards God we be fed, nourished, and preserved by the body and blood of our Saviour Christ . . . And no less ought we to doubt, that our souls be fed and live by Christ, than that our bodies be fed and live by meat and drink. Thus our Saviour Christ, knowing us to be in this world, as it were, but babes and weaklings in faith, hath ordained sensible signs and tokens whereby to allure and to draw us to more strength and more constant faith in him. So that the eating and drinking of this sacramental bread and wine is, as it were, shewing of Christ before our eyes, a smelling of him with our noses, feeling and groping of him with our hands, and an eating, chewing, digesting, and feeding upon him to our spiritual strength and perfection.³

Closely related to this teaching is the statement in Article 27 that baptism is a 'seal' whereby 'faith is confirmed and grace increased'. A seal usually bears an impression which signifies something, but its use is unlike that of other symbols, in that it is put on a document to confirm what the document says. The document in this case is the biblical gospel, which if we hear it in faith confers grace, but when it is sealed by baptism that faith is confirmed and that grace increased. Notice the close link here, as also in the quotation from Cranmer, with the ministry of the word: the Reformers were much influenced by such passages of the New Testament as I Peter 1:23–25, where the regenerating grace of baptism is attributed instead to the preaching of the gospel, and John chapter 6, where, long before the institution of the holy communion, those who respond to Christ's person and teaching by 'coming to him' and 'believing on him' are apparently said to feed on him as the 'bread of life', to 'eat his flesh' and 'drink his blood'. The word and the sacraments should therefore be thought of together, as jointly evoking faith and effecting grace. If the sacraments 'effect what they signify' (to use the early mediaeval formulation), the word similarly effects what it promises; and since the effects are the same, the means (word and sacrament) must be thought of together. They both combine to evoke faith, and the faith then lays hold on the grace promised or symbolized.

Used in this way, with faith, the sacraments are not just 'signs' and 'witnesses' of grace but, as Article 25 says, '*effectual signs*' and '*sure* (Lat. *certa*) witnesses'. Thus, grace operates through baptism 'as by an instrument' to those who receive the sacrament 'rightly' (Art. 27).⁴ In the language of the Catechism, a sacrament is 'a means whereby we receive the same (that is, the grace signified), and a pledge to assure us thereof'. And what is true of the sacramental signs is also true of the gospel promises, to which the sacraments are attached as seals: embraced by faith, they effect the grace of which they speak.

Infant Baptism

It is noteworthy that, in speaking of baptism as a seal whereby faith is *confirmed* and grace *increased*, the Articles are thinking of faith and grace as already existing in the candidate through the ministry of the word. They are thus taking adult baptism, not infant baptism, as their theological model, though in practice adult baptism hardly existed when they were written, and the same article (Art. 27) emphatically endorses the practice of infant baptism, as 'in any wise to be retained in the Church, as most agreeable with the institution of Christ' [Lat. *optime congruat*, that which 'agrees best' with the institution of Christ]. Cranmer's reasons for maintaining infant baptism were (as in the case of the continental Reformers) biblical. In his posthumous treatise *A Confutation of Unwritten Verities* [that is, Unwritten Truths], he puts it like this:

But in deed the baptism of infants is proved by the plain scriptures. First, by the figure of the old law, which was circumcision. Infants in the old law were circumcised; *ergo*, in the new law they ought to be baptized. Again: infants pertain to God, as it is said to Abraham, 'I will be thy God, and the God of thy seed after thee' (Gen. xvii). Christ saith also: 'Suffer children to come to me; for of such is the kingdom of heaven' (Luke. xix). And again: 'See that ye despise not one of these little ones: for their angels in heaven always behold the face of my Father which is in heaven: for the Son of man is come to save that which is lost' (Matthew xix). And again, Paul saith, that 'your children are holy now' (I Cor. vii). By these, and many other plain words of scripture, it is evident that the baptism of infants is grounded upon the holy scriptures.⁵

The reason why the Articles nevertheless take adult baptism as their theological model is doubtless that in adult baptism the ministry of the word and the ministry of the sacrament are more closely combined, and the New Testament link between baptism and faith is more obvious (the candidate can profess his own faith on the occasion); whereas in infant baptism the candidate is not yet capable of being taught, and the faith, though still just as important, has to be supplied by others until the infant comes of age to supply it for

himself. Other indications of the same use of adult baptism as the theological model are Article 16, which deals with the old patristic controversy whether sin after baptism can be forgiven (the sin being that not of infants but of adult converts, who, after being baptized, had apostatized under stress of persecution), and also the repeated statements on right reception of the sacraments, which is 'by faith and rightly' (Art. 26, speaking of both sacraments), 'rightly, worthily and with faith' (Art. 28, speaking of the holy communion), and which applies equally to baptism: 'those that receive baptism *rightly* (that is, with *faith*) are grafted into the church' (Art. 27). The Articles, therefore, do not favour a concept of sacramental grace which ties it too closely to the *moment* when the sacrament is received: the *fact* that the sacrament is received, and the *faith* which then or later reflects upon the fact, are the important things.⁶

The Real Presence and the Eucharistic Sacrifice

It is here, I suppose, that we tread upon the most delicate ground. Article 28 denies transubstantiation. Article 29 implicitly denies Lutheran consubstantiation also, saying that, if the wicked receive the holy communion, they do not receive the body and blood of Christ, though they profane the sacrament through which Christ is offered to repentant believers.⁷ These denials, if at first sight they perhaps seem shockingly negative, are directly analogous to the Reformers' doctrine of the Church invisible. It is the members of the Church invisible, and not of the whole Church visible, who, by faith, feed upon Christ. Nevertheless, those who partake of the sacrament without faith, are not unaffected by doing so. The objectivity of sacramental grace is safeguarded, both in Article 29 and in Article 25, by the teaching that, where there is no response of faith to God's grace, this does not mean that nothing happens but that judgment (Lat. *damnatio*, condemnation) ensues instead. The basis of this teaching is, of course, 1 Cor. 11:27–34, and its application is, in Article 25, extended by analogy to baptism as well.

Article 28 uses two arguments against transubstantiation. First, it is said to be 'repugnant to the plain words of Scripture': this, as we know from the Reformers' writings, is because Scripture refers to 'bread' and the 'fruit of the vine' even at the point of reception (Mk. 14:25; 1 Cor. 10:16f.; 11:26). Secondly, transubstantiation is said to 'overthrow the nature of a sacrament': this is because it makes the symbols mere appearances, and not what they seem to be. It might be replied that Thomas Aquinas takes a very positive attitude to the outward accidents, treating them like substances, and giving them the power of being broken, of being mixed with other substances and even of nourishing (*Summa Theologiae* 3:77:6–8). However, to treat accidents, in isolation from their substance, as having these powers, is surely in itself a philosophical anomaly?

As to the devotional practices which in the Middle Ages had grown up round transubstantiation, or became attached to transubstantiation (including elevation and reservation of the consecrated elements, and adoration directed towards them), these are simply stated by Article 25 and 28 to be no part of the ordinance of Christ. They had disappeared, and in some cases been prohibited, in the contemporary revision of the liturgy. The Articles speak more definitely about the denial of the cup to the laity. This was a practical consequence of transubstantiation, motivated by fear that the wine might be spilt, and it had been defended by Aquinas from the related doctrine of concomitance (*Summa Theologiae* 3:80:12); but Article 30 firmly condemns it, as contrary to 'Christ's ordinance and commandment'.

Is all this a denial of the real presence? No, certainly not. But it implies a different view of the real presence. The real presence is not in the elements, in such a way that those who receive the elements necessarily receive the body and blood of Christ. Rather, the real presence is in the *administration* of the sacrament, in such a way that those who *with faith receive* the sacrament receive Christ's body and blood. Article 28 states it as follows: 'The Body of Christ is given, taken and eaten in the Supper only after a heavenly and spiritual manner. And the mean whereby the Body of Christ is received and eaten in the Supper is Faith.' One may compare the language of the Catechism: 'the Body and Blood of Christ, which are verily and indeed taken and received by the faithful [Old English for believers] in the Lord's Supper.' One may also compare the language of Hooker: 'the real presence of Christ's most blessed body and blood is not therefore to be sought for in the sacrament, but in the worthy receiver of the sacrament,' that is, the one who receives with faith (*Ecclesiastical Polity* 5:67:6). One may add that, earlier in the same section (5:67:2), Hooker says that the widest division in Christendom is between those who affirm a real participation of Christ in the sacrament and those who deny it (as Zwingli came close to doing), and not between those who affirm or deny a change of substance in the elements. Nevertheless, he *does* go on to deny this change, and is faithful to the Articles in doing so.

Feeding, by faith, upon Christ the Bread of life, is a mystery of which we all, probably, have some conception, as a union with the holy Person of the Son of God, and a participation of eternal life in him. But, after speaking of this in John chapter 6, our Lord goes on in the latter part of the chapter, as in the institution narratives of the Lord's Supper, to speak of the eating of his flesh (or body) and the drinking of his blood. This reminds us that we can only be united with his holy Person through his atoning sacrifice for our sins; and so, in the Prayer Book words of administration we say, 'Take and eat this *in remembrance that Christ died for thee*, and feed on him in thy heart by

faith with thanksgiving.' This is a *representative* eating of his body and blood—a participation of the fruits of his saving death. Are we, however, to think of a *more than representative* eating of Christ's body and blood—a participation of the fruits of his saving death? Consider the other half of the Prayer Book words of administration: 'The body of our Lord Jesus Christ, which was given for thee, preserve thy body and soul unto everlasting life.' The participation of Christ's body and blood is what the outward ceremony symbolizes, and in the opinion of Calvin and Hooker, and implicitly, I think, of Cranmer too (who, as Peter Brooks in his learned book has shown, was closest to Calvin among the continental writers on this subject):⁸ in the opinion of Calvin, Hooker and Cranmer, then, the partaking of Christ's body and blood is not merely representative, but speaks of a real union with his humanity as well as his divinity, though his humanity is no longer on earth but has now ascended to heaven.⁹ This takes place through the ministry of the Holy Spirit (who unites us with the incarnate, not the pre-existent Christ), and is possible through the union between Christ's omnipresent divinity and his finite humanity, a union which Hooker expounds as a union of Person, of co-operation and of efficacy (*Ecclesiastical Polity* 5:55: 1–9). And if it be said that there is a problem not just of space but of time, since his humanity is now glorified, whereas the sacrament speaks of his body *given* and his blood *shed*, as in *death*, we must remember that to the divine Christ the past and future are always in some manner present: 'Before Abraham was, I am' (Jn. 8:58). It could therefore, perhaps, be said that, whereas in Aquinas's eucharistic theology we are united with Christ's divinity through his humanity, in Hooker's we are united with Christ's humanity through his divinity;¹⁰ and this seems a much more acceptable theological proposition, since it involves no superfluous miracles, such as the transubstantiation of the elements, and no threat of confusion between our Lord's two natures, such as the assertion of a quasi-local presence of his ascended body here and now on earth.¹¹ As Calvin said, He does not descend to us, but we, through his Spirit, ascend to him (*Institutes* 4:17:31,36f.).

Such teaching is today often alleged to be subjective, as if *we* created the faith we exercise, and our *faith* created the presence of Christ. But the Articles firmly deny this. 'The Body of Christ is *given*,' that is, by God, says Article 28; and the faith, by which alone we receive his body, is stated by Article 25 to be 'quickened,' that is, awakened, by God, through his means of grace. It is in neither respect or own doing.

Conformably with this, we have already noted the repeated teaching of the Articles that the sacraments affect *all* participants, for judgment if not for blessing.

The other main criticism levelled at this teaching today is that it is individualistic. But if faith links the individual with God, it also links him with many of his fellow churchmembers, and more closely than any merely formal relationship can do. Individualism is therefore a perversion of this teaching rather than an implication of it.

Article 31 brings us on to the matter of the eucharistic sacrifice. After emphatically affirming Christ's all-sufficient and finished work of atonement on the cross, much as in the consecration prayer of the Prayer Book service, Cranmer goes on to deny very sharply that Christ can be offered as an atoning sacrifice in the eucharist.¹² Thus, any celebration of Christ's sacrifice today can only be a thankful commemoration, not a repetition or prolongation. There are indeed sacrifices for Christians to offer, as Cranmer states elsewhere, but they are different in kind from Christ's atoning sacrifice, and entirely dependent upon it. He writes,

And that sacrifice (that is, Christ's own sacrifice on the cross) was of such force, that it was no need to renew it every year, as the bishops (that is, high priests) did of the old testament, whose sacrifices were many times offered, and yet were of no great effect or profit, because they were sinners themselves that offered them, and offered not their own blood, but the blood of brute beasts; but Christ's sacrifice once offered was sufficient for evermore.

And that all men may the better understand this sacrifice of Christ, which he made for the great benefit of all men, it is necessary to know the distinction and diversity of sacrifices.

One kind of sacrifice there is, which is called a propitiatory or merciful sacrifice, that is to say, such a sacrifice as pacifieth God's wrath and indignation, and obtaineth mercy and forgiveness for all our sins, and is the ransom for our redemption from everlasting damnation.

And although in the old testament there were certain sacrifices called by that name, yet in very deed there is but one such sacrifice, whereby our sins be pardoned, and God's mercy and favour obtained, which is the death of the Son of God our Lord Jesu Christ; nor never was any other sacrifice propitiatory at any time, nor never shall be.

This is the honour and glory of this our high priest, wherein he admitteth neither partner nor successor. For by his own oblation he satisfied his Father for all men's sins, and reconciled mankind unto his grace and favour. And whosoever deprive him of his honour, and go about to take it to themselves, they be very antichrists, and most arrogant blasphemers against God and against his Son Jesus Christ, whom he hath sent.

Another kind of sacrifice there is which doth not reconcile us to God, but is made of them that be reconciled by Christ, to testify our duties unto God, and to shew ourselves thankful unto him. And therefore they be called sacrifices of laud, praise, and thanksgiving.

The first kind of sacrifice Christ offered to God for us; the second kind we ourselves offer to God by Christ. . . .

And this sacrifice generally is our whole obedience unto God, in keeping his laws and commandments. Of which manner of sacrifice speaketh the prophet David, saying: 'A sacrifice to God is a contrite heart' (Ps. 1). And St. Peter saith of all Christian people, that they be 'an holy priesthood to offer spiritual sacrifices, acceptable to God by Jesu Christ' (1 Pet. ii). And St. Paul saith, that 'alway we offer unto God a sacrifice of laud and praise by Jesus Christ' (Heb. xiii).¹³

It is difficult to state these parts of the sacramental teaching of the Articles today without seeming to reflect on the Catholic revival in the Anglican Church since the nineteenth century; and it has, I think, to be admitted that, though the situation in the nineteenth century was different from what it had been in the sixteenth, the revival was not carried through with full attention to the lessons learned at the Reformation. In consequence, Anglo-Catholics have understandably tended to be a bit shy of the Articles, and I am so glad that those who organized this conference are determined to face up to them and come to terms with them. Most of the new Anglican service books have tried to ease the problems of Catholics by a sort of cutting of the Gordian Knot; but the loss that this process involves, of Scripture, of theology and of our historic Anglican heritage, is such as few of us, probably, would think worth incurring. At the same time, Evangelical Anglicans are not blameless in the matter either, since their frequent neglect of the sacraments over the last century, which is equally foreign to the teaching of the Articles, has no doubt been one of the causes which has provoked Anglican Catholics to the more excessive expressions of their sacramentalism. It beseems both of us to consider our ways and to learn from each other, and especially from the Articles and from the Holy Scriptures themselves, which the Articles are seeking to expound.

ROGER BECKWITH is Warden of Latimer House, Oxford.

NOTES

- 1 This paper was originally delivered in June 1989 at a conference on the Thirty-nine Articles held at the University of King's College, Halifax, Nova Scotia, and organized by Anglo-Catholics determined to come to terms with the Reformation. It is here reproduced, with acknowledgements, from the conference report, published by St. Peter Publications, Charlottetown, Prince Edward Island, Canada.
- 2 G.E. Corrie's edition (Cambridge, 1850), p. 356f.; Focus Christian Ministries Trust reprint (Lewes, 1986), p. 244f. On the authorship of the passage, see J.T. Tomlinson, *The Prayer Book, Articles and Homilies* (London, 1897), pp. 249–251.
- 3 Parker Society edition, 1844, p. 41f.
- 4 On receiving baptism 'rightly', see below. 'Instrument' in Article 27 has sometimes been taken to mean a *legal* instrument, but to speak of such an instrument 'grafting' people 'into the church' would be, at best, a mixed metaphor. The background of the language tells even more strongly

- against this interpretation. Aquinas speaks of sacraments as 'instrumental causes' of grace (*Summa Theologiae* 3:62:1). Ridley, at his Disputation in Oxford, is prepared to accept such instrumental language, and explains how he understands it: that 'the sacrament hath not grace included in it; but to those that receive it well, it is turned to grace' (*Works*, Parker Society edition, 1841, p. 240f.). Hooker gives a similar explanation, calling sacraments 'moral instruments of salvation', which are 'ordinarily' necessary to the receiving of God's grace, since God uses them to communicate his grace to those who receive the sacraments worthily (*Ecclesiastical Polity* 5:57:1-5; 6:6:11).
- 5 *Remains and Letters* (Parker Society edition, 1846), p. 60.
 - 6 If it be asked, what are the *immediate* effects of infant baptism, a cautious answer seems wisest. Cranmer's Homily 'Of the Salvation of Mankind' says that baptism remits the guilt of original sin in infants (*The Homilies*, Corrie's ed., pp. 19,26; Focus ed., pp.13,17f.). The Prayer Book service says 'this child is regenerate', a statement giving rise to various interpretations, which culminated in the Gorham Controversy.
 - 7 Article 29 was the last of the Articles to be added, though its teaching broadly corresponds to a passage on the lines of the Black Rubric which the Elizabethan revisers had omitted from Article 28. It was proposed in 1563 and introduced in 1571. It was resisted by Bishops Guest and Cheney, who (alone among the Elizabethan bishops) accepted Lutheran consubstantiation; though Guest claimed to have drafted the Elizabethan form of Article 28, which strongly suggests the negative consequences made explicit in Article 29. Presumably he had drafted it in such a way as to marginalize his own view without actually excluding it, in the hope of avoiding an article which went still further.
 - 8 And not to Zwingli, as Dix and others had claimed. See Peter Brooks, *Thomas Cranmer's Doctrine of the Eucharist* (London, 1965).
 - 9 The Reformers were content to think of heaven as a place, which is the analogy used by the New Testament. Quite possibly it is the closest analogy of which our minds (at least within the boundaries of an earthly experience) are capable. The contemporary tendency to substitute the analogy of a condition or state may lead us further from the truth rather than nearer to it, however much it may appear to ease some conceptual problems.
 - 10 This contrast was queried at the conference where my paper was delivered, but on reflection I am inclined to adhere to it. In Aquinas's eucharistic theology, we are united with Christ's humanity through the transubstantiation of the elements into his body and blood, and with his divinity through concomitance (*Summa Theologiae* 3:76:1f.). In Hooker's eucharistic theology, we are united with Christ through the Holy Spirit, but specifically with his humanity through its union of Person, co-operation and efficacy with his divinity; that is, we are united with his humanity through his divinity. It is after expounding the sort of presence of his ascended humanity to those on earth that is possible through its union with his divinity, in book 5, ch. 55, that Hooker proceeds directly in ch. 56 to the subject of the union between Christ and the Church in the present world, and in ch. 57 to the participation of Christ through the sacraments. However, the contrast with Aquinas is somewhat qualified, as Wayne Hankey has kindly pointed out to me, by Aquinas's regular insistence that Christ's humanity is the instrument through which his divinity acts.
 - 11 I say 'quasi-local', since Aquinas does of course deny that the presence is strictly local, because the dimensions of Christ's body are greater than those of the sacramental bread (*Summa Theologiae* 3:76:5).

- 12 That the phrase 'the sacrifices of masses' in Article 31 means nothing different from the sacrifice of the mass, has been very fully demonstrated by the evangelical Nathaniel Dimock (*Dangerous Deceits*, London, 1895) and by the Roman Catholic, Francis Clark (*Eucharistic Sacrifice and the Reformation*, London, 1960).
- 13 *On the Lord's Supper*, Parker Society edition, p. 346. The cautious extension of sacrificial language, under patristic influence, by seventeenth-century and eighteenth-century writers, was not in opposition to this teaching, but was designed to explore in what further senses the eucharist might properly be called sacrificial. Where such writers passed the bounds of good judgment, the balance was restored by others, as by the great Daniel Waterland (*A Review of the Doctrine of the Eucharist*, 1737, etc.).