

‘BY FORCE OF PARTICIPATION AND CONJUNCTION IN HIM’: JOHN JEWEL AND RICHARD HOOKER ON UNION WITH CHRIST

ANDRÉ A. GAZAL*

Northland International University

ABSTRACT. The author of a *Christian Letter* cited a passage from John Jewel’s *A Reply to Harding’s Answer* in which the first major apologist of the Elizabethan Settlement spoke of the role of faith and the sacraments in union with Christ. Andrew Willet, the likely author of this work, quoted it against Richard Hooker in order to show how the latter contravened the sacramental theology of the national Church as interpreted by Jewel as one of the foremost expositors of its doctrine. Jewel, however, in his *Reply to Harding’s Answer*, enumerates four means of the Christian’s union with Christ: the Incarnation, faith, baptism, and the Eucharist—a fact overlooked in *A Christian Letter* by its author in his endeavor to impeach Hooker’s orthodoxy. Proceeding from the observation that both Jewel and Hooker believed that the locus of Christian salvation is union with Christ, this essay compares the two divines’ respective views of this union by examining the manner in which they understand the role of each of these means forming and maintaining this union. On the basis of this comparison, the essay argues that *A Christian Letter* misrepresented Jewel’s position and that Hooker’s view of union with Christ was essentially the same as the late bishop of Salisbury’s, notwithstanding some differences in detail and emphases. The article concludes with the opinion that Hooker represents continuity of a particular soteriological emphasis in the Elizabethan Church that can possibly be traced back to Jewel as a representative of the Reformed tradition stressing this doctrine.

KEY WORDS: John Jewel, Richard Hooker, union with Christ, participation, sacraments

Introduction

In Article 14 of *A Christian Letter*, Andrew Willet, the most likely author, severely castigates Richard Hooker’s doctrine of the sacraments. Advancing his argument against Hooker, Willet proceeds to quote from three of John Jewel’s works in order to prove that Hooker’s view contradicts the official position of the Church of England. Among these writings of the late Bishop of Salisbury, Willet cites most extensively Jewel’s *Reply to Harding’s Answer*:

* ANDRÉ A. GAZAL (PhD 2009, Trinity Evangelical Divinity School) is Professor of Historical and Systematic Theology at Northland International University. Email: Andre.Gazal@ni.edu.

This marvelous conjunction and incorporation is first begonne and wrought by faith, etc. Afterward the same corporation is assured unto us and increased in our baptisme, etc. And for that we are verie unperfect of our selves, and therefore must dailie proceede forward, that we may grow unto a perfect man in Christ: Therefore hath God appointed that the same incorporation should bee often renewed and confirmed in us by the use of the holy misteries; wherein must bee considered, that the said holie misteries doe not beginne but rather continue and confirme this incorporation (Hooker, 1982: 38-39).

Acknowledging Jewel as the authoritative expositor of the Church's doctrine as defined by the Thirty-Nine Articles, Willet, by means of this conflated citation shows that the first major apologist of the Elizabethan Settlement understood the end of salvation to be 'this marvelous conjunction and incorporation' in Christ (for the full passage, see Jewel, 1845a: 1:140-41). Moreover, he identifies faith as the means by which this union with Christ is formed with the sacraments of baptism and the Eucharist serving to increase and strengthen it. Willet then goes on to contrast Jewel's position with Hooker's by excoriating his ascription of the same 'generative force and virtue' equally to both the sacraments and the Word (Hooker, 1982: 39) as well as his insistence that partaking of the sacraments is as necessary as faith to receive grace, thereby accusing him of adding works to faith contrary to the teachings of the Church (Hooker, 1982: 40).

In his endeavor to expose Hooker as heretical by stressing his alleged departure from the Church's faith, Willet overlooks other passages in Jewel's works, including his *Reply to Harding's Answer*, where this renowned exponent of the Church's theology does ascribe intrinsic efficacy to the sacraments in their function of nurturing the Christian's union with Christ. This discussion specifically occurs in the section dealing with Real Presence in the *Reply to Harding's Answer*, where Jewel particularly examines the four means whereby Christians are united to Christ (Jewel, 1845a: 1:474).

Even though the *Christian Letter's* criticism of Hooker's sacramental theology via contrast with Jewel's is an aspect of the proceeding discussion, this essay does not focus on Jewel's and Hooker's doctrines of the sacraments *per se*, but rather their respective understandings of the soteriological framework in which these ordinances function, which is the Christian's union with Christ. As we have argued elsewhere, Jewel located Christian salvation chiefly in the believer's union with Christ (Gazal, 2013: 3). Likewise union with Christ as means of divine participation figures very prominently in Hooker's understanding of salvation especially in relation to the sacraments as evident in his discussions in Book V of the *Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity*. Furthermore, as mentioned above, it is apparent that Willet, in citing the passage from Jewel's *Reply to Harding's Answer*, in which the apologist enumerates means by which the union is formed and fostered, shares the late bishop's view of it being the essence of salvation.

This essay will explore the possible relationship between Jewel's and Hooker's understandings of union with Christ with the view of suggesting that the bishop provided the possible if not likely basis upon which Hooker developed his far more systematic and comprehensive doctrine. Such a proposal would be plausible for a number of reasons. First, Hooker was personally acquainted with Jewel as he was the beneficiary of the bishop's patronage early in his collegiate career. Secondly, Hooker esteemed Jewel as 'the worthiest Divine that Christendome hath bred for the space of some hundreds of yeres...' (Hooker, 1977a: 171). Despite the hyperbolic nature of this statement, it does clearly indicate that Hooker regarded Jewel highly as a theologian. Thirdly, in the passage that Willet cites from Jewel's *Reply to Harding's Answer* against Hooker's sacramental theology, the Christian's union with Christ is the end served by faith and the sacraments. Fourthly, although Hooker does not explicitly mention Jewel in his notes on the *Christian Letter* in which he responds to the criticism regarding his sacramental views, Jewel was regarded as one of the primary theological authorities in the Elizabethan Church, which would mean in this instance that doctrinal disagreement within the official church entailed differing interpretations of major expositors of official doctrine, including Jewel (Hooker, 1982: 39).

This essay will examine the manner in which Hooker understands and appropriates the four means of union elucidated by Jewel in his section on the real presence in his *Reply to Harding's Answer*, and thus show that Jewel's and Hooker's understandings of the Christian's union with Christ are strikingly similar, thereby representing a consistent continuity within this particular aspect of the soteriology of the Elizabethan Church.

Jewel's Four Means of Union with Christ

Within the context of his extensive discussion on the real presence in the Eucharist in his *Reply to Harding's Answer*, Jewel succinctly identifies four principal means by which a Christian is united to Christ:

Four special means there be whereby Christ dwelleth in us and we in him: his nativity, whereby he embraced us; our faith, whereby we embrace him; the sacrament of baptism; and the sacrament of his body. By every of these means Christ's body dwelleth in our bodies; and that is not by way of imagination, or by figure or fantasy; but really, naturally, substantially, fleshly, and indeed (Jewel, 1845a: 1:472).

The four means by which the Christian is united to Christ are the Incarnation, justifying faith, baptism, and the Eucharist. The order in which Jewel lists these means is deliberate as it suggests the union's origin in divine initiative via the Incarnation, and its consummation in continuous, human participation by way of faith and the sacraments. Moreover, the bishop emphasizes the intrinsic reality of this spiritual union. Throughout this section of the *Reply to Harding*, Jewel elaborates further upon each of these means of the Christian's union.

Whereas Jewel immediately addresses the salvific goal of union with Christ via the four means, beginning with the Incarnation, Hooker, throughout his *Laws*, approaches the question of human salvation from the standpoint of the universal innate desire of humanity for communion with the divine. In Book I, chapter 5 of the *Laws*, Hooker cites as evidence of this longing to participate in God the degrees of goodness or ‘kindes of perfections’ (Hooker, 1977a: 73) which humanity seeks. Among the types of ‘perfections’ Hooker identifies are particularly those that ‘are not expressly desired unlesse they be first knowne, or such as are not for any other cause, then for knowledge it selfe desired’ (Hooker, 1977a: 73). Pursuant towards this end, he notes that the human soul possesses the capacity to apprehend realities which transcend sensible objects, indicating therefore capability of ‘more divine perfection’ (Hooker, 1977a: 75).

Further in Book I Hooker observes that human beings seek such ‘good things’ as riches, health, virtue, and knowledge not so much for themselves, but as means towards that ‘soveraign *good* or *blessednes*’ which when obtained, ‘there can rest nothing further to be desired’, because ‘with it our souls are fully content and satisfied, in that they have they rejoyce and thirst for no more’ (Hooker, 1977a: 111). To desire particular goods as wealth, honor, or anything else that is attainable in this life as ‘our finall perfection’ is to ‘doe evill’ (Hooker, 1977a: 112). Such things cannot be infinitely desired; rather, only that good which itself is infinite can be infinitely desired. For the object of ultimate desire to be infinite, it must be the highest of all such things to be desired. There is no infinite good except God. Therefore, God is the supreme good, and thus ‘our felicitie and bliss’ (Hooker, 1977a: 112). ‘Moreover desire tendeth unto union with that it desireth’ (Hooker, 1977a: 112). If God is the ultimate good to be desired, and is himself the source of all happiness, then such blessedness comes ‘by force of participation and conjunction with him’ (Hooker, 1977a: 112). Hooker’s discussion about the purpose of divine law revealed in Scripture shows how sinful humanity can now obtain salvation which is the divine union it still inherently desires.

Working within different polemical contexts, both Jewel and Hooker understand the end of human salvation as being union with the divine. Because Jewel seeks specifically to argue against the Roman doctrine of Christ’s physical presence in the Eucharist, he immediately proceeds to the subject of union with Christ and the four means by which it is formed. Hooker, who in Book I of the *Laws* is discussing the nature and function of different types of law in generally, does so by constructing an overall metaphysical and likely Neo-Platonic framework (Kirby, 2005) in which the goal of humanity is to achieve union with the divine. Although he approaches the subject from the broader metaphysical question of divine participation, Hooker nevertheless perceives of this general end of salvation as specifically being union with Christ. Moreover, while Hooker does not enumerate these means of union in the manner as does Jewel, they are, nevertheless present in his discussions regarding divine participation via union with Christ. From here will

proceed a comparison of Jewel's and Hooker's appropriation of each of these means in constructing their doctrines of union with Christ.

The First Two Means: the Incarnation and Faith

The Incarnation is the unilateral, divine initiative taken towards this union. Through the Incarnation, Christ united himself to humanity by assuming a human body and with it a human nature. In so doing, Christ became one with the human race, sharing in its life. Quoting such authors as Bernard of Clairvaux, Basil of Caesarea, and Gregory of Nyssa, in the *Reply to Harding's Answer* Jewel alleges that in joining himself to humanity, Christ also makes himself ours, and truly part of us with his body becoming our body (Jewel, 1845a: 1: 472). Jewel further construes this incarnational solidarity as the primary meaning of Jesus' figure of the vine and branches as well as Paul's description of Christ's relationship with believers as an organic one between the head and body since these 'be names of most near and natural conjunction' (Jewel, 1845a: 1: 472-73). In both of these Scriptural instances, Jewel highlights the real spiritual union between Christ and the church as the ultimate expression of this incarnational solidarity. The divine initiative of Incarnation hence provides the fundamental basis for active human participation in the spiritual union.

In Book V of the *Laws*, where he defends the form of worship in the Book of Common Prayer, Hooker devotes considerable attention to Christology. Specifically, his very detailed Christological discussions occur prior to his treatment of the sacraments. Though he does not explicitly enumerate it as such in the way Jewel does, Hooker, nevertheless alleges the Incarnation as the principal condition for union with Christ. However, while Jewel's discussion of the place of the Incarnation as the first means of union is quite brief, Hooker situates its necessary perquisite in divine participation within the larger context of orthodox creedal Christology in general. Following his extensive discourses on the hypostatic union and Christ's omnipresence, both of which factor significantly in the doctrine of the Incarnation, Hooker comes to the subject of 'union or mutual participation' in Christ in chapter 56. A comparison of this chapter with Jewel's statement regarding the Incarnation as the first means of union will show that Hooker not only included, but expanded upon elements present in Jewel's comments in addition to making his own original contribution.

Hooker begins by defining participation in Christ as 'that mutuall inward hold which Christ hath of us and wee of him, in such sort that ech possesseth other by waie of speciall interest propertie and inherent copulation' (Hooker, 1977b: 234). This very formal and technical definition starts by employing a vivid description of the union as involving a mutual holding by Christ and believers of one another. This description parallels the one given by Jewel in his introduction of the four means of union with Christ. There, Jewel stresses the reciprocal aspect of the union in the functions that he ascribes to the first two means, the Incarnation,

‘whereby he embraced us,’ and faith, ‘whereby we embrace him’ (Jewel, 1845a: 1: 472). Although more precise, Hooker’s definition of participation in Christ consists primarily of language depicting it as mutual spiritual embracing that seems to be quite reminiscent of Jewel.

As mentioned above, upon citing the Incarnation as the means ‘whereby Christ embraced us,’ Jewel goes on to highlight its function in uniting Christ to humanity. Hooker proceeds in the same vein, except that he expands more considerably on the way in which Christ, through the Incarnation, joined himself to humanity. After discussing the manner in which the Persons of the Trinity relate to one another within the unity of the Godhead, Hooker proceeds to show the first way in which the Incarnation joined to Christ to humanity. The Incarnation established the possibility of human participation in God.

His incarnation causeth him also as man to be now in the father and the father to be in him. For in that he is man he receiveth life from the father as from the fountaine of that everlivinge deitie which in the person of the worde hath combined it selfe with manhood and doth thereunto imparte such life as to no creature besides him is communicated (Hooker, 1977b: 236).

Because of the Incarnation, the Son, now joined to the Father as a human being, receives from him even though this humanity is united to his deity. Obviously because the Son is both human and divine his relationship with the Father is unique to him; nevertheless, the Incarnate Son, as a human being, initially forges the reality of human participation in the divine.

At this point, Hooker distinguishes degrees of relationship between creatures and the divine. Because all things, especially living creatures, depend upon God for their initial and continuing existence, they are, in a fundamental sense, ‘partakers of God,’ and his ‘offspring’ (Hooker, 1977b: 236). Since all created things are for these reasons, ‘the offspring of God,’ they are united to him or are ‘*in him*’ as ‘effectes’ of the highest cause, and conversely, God is ‘*in them*’ by virtue of his influence upon them as well as his sustaining of them (Hooker, 1977b: 237). Yet, the union with God the Incarnation makes possible for humanity is something that far transcends mere dependence of created things upon the divine for their existence.

Hooker now addresses the role of the Incarnation in actually uniting humans to God through Christ. While God indeed created humanity when he created Adam, humans in and of themselves are not children of God. ‘The sonnes of God wee neither are all nor anie one of us otherwise then onlie by grace and favor’ (Hooker, 1977b: 237). Following a substantial discussion regarding God’s eternal foreknowledge of those in Christ, Hooker focuses attention on union with Christ in this present world (Hooker, 1977b: 238). It is here that one encounters an apparent appropriation and elaboration of a Scriptural argument advanced by Jewel in support of the union between Christ and the Church as a consequence of the

Incarnation, the vine and branches passage in John 15. Jewel stated as his proposition John 1:14 from the Vulgate: *‘Verbum caro factum est, et habitavit in nobis: “The Word was made flesh and dwelt in us”’* (Jewel, 1845a: 1: 472). In order to allege from this a genuine union between Christ and believers who make up the church by way of the same book, Jewel then summarizes the passage from John 15 in which Jesus says he is the vine and believers the branches, declaring what the bishop understood as ‘a most near and natural conjunction’ (Jewel, 1845a: 1: 472). In constructing what amounts to a very succinct argument, Jewel, stated as his proposition and supporting arguments a verbatim statement from Scripture followed by a summary of a corroborating passage.

In describing the nature of union with Christ, Hooker incorporates the same Pauline language of it involving the joining of head and body that Jewel uses, and explicitly references, in stressing the organic character of this communion. Hooker further accents the organic and hence, intimate aspect of this union in his additional allusion to Ephesians 5:30 whereby he speaks of it as if the bodies of believers become part of Christ’s (Hooker, 1977b: 238-39). The use of this allusion also seems to indicate an emphasis that Jewel stressed early in his discussion, and that is the actual solidarity between Christians as human beings and Christ as a human being formed by the Incarnation, which then becomes the principal basis for union.

It is in emphasizing the Incarnation as the basis of union that Hooker applies the vine and branches passage in John 15, thus developing the point Jewel made succinctly. Very significantly, Hooker gives onus to a principle that Jewel does not mention at all in relation to this passage, but rather in his introduction to the four means of union and his discussion of faith as the second of these means, namely that union with Christ is conditional not simply on believers dwelling in him, but he dwelling in them. The indwelling of Christ in Christians makes the union effectual. ‘No man actuallie is in him but they in whome he actuallie is’ (Hooker, 1977b: 239). One must possess the Son to have life from him. Hooker, at this junction, proceeds to quote the salient parts of the passage in John 15 verbatim, and draws this conclusion: ‘Wee are therefore adopted sonnes of God to eternal life by participation of the onlie begotten Sonne of God, whose life is the wellspringe and cause of ours’ (Hooker, 1977b: 239). Interestingly, Hooker connects adoption (often viewed as almost exclusively a forensic act) to participation in Christ by way of this passage—something notably absent from Jewel’s comments.

From there, Hooker proceeds to detail the manner in which the Incarnation serves as the basis for union. In regard to the relationship between the Incarnation and the Christian’s union with Christ he dismisses the view which he considers ‘too cold [of] an interpretation,’ that being in Christ means nothing more than sharing the same human nature (Hooker, 1977b: 239). ‘For what man in the world is there which hath not so farre forth communion with Jesus Christ?’ (Hooker, 1977b: 239). Hooker further avers that this view is inadequate in accounting for

the myriad of passages in Scripture which speak ‘of the mysterie of our coherence with Jesus Christ’ (Hooker, 1977b: 239). At this point Hooker employs a realist / traducianist analogy between the Church in Christ and Eve in Adam. ‘The Church is in Christ as Eve was in Adam’ (Hooker, 1977b: 239). As God made Eve from Adam’s rib, so he formed his Church ‘out of the verie flesh, the verie wounded and bleeding side of the Sonne of man... His bodie crucified and his blood shed for the life of the world, are the true elementes of that heavenlie beinge, which maketh us such as him selfe is of whome wee com’ (Hooker, 1977b: 239). For this reason, Adam’s words to Eve, ‘Flesh of my flesh and bone of my bones,’ can also aptly describe the basis of union between Christ and the Church (Hooker, 1977b: 239). These considerations, along with support from Cyril of Alexandria, lead Hooker to state explicitly the meaning of the vine and branches passage in relation to the Incarnation as the basis for union with Christ: ‘Christ is therefore both as God and as man that true vine whereof wee both spirituallie and corporallie are branches’ (Hooker, 1977b: 241). When compared to Jewel’s use of the passage, it is apparent that Hooker understood this passage in the same manner with respect to the Incarnation as the basis of union with Christ, with the only major difference being that Hooker explicated in detail the exegetical and patristic support for it while Jewel summarized the same passage in order to corroborate succinctly to establish it as biblical truth.

While differing in the degree of comprehension as well as certain points of emphasis, Jewel and Hooker both view the Incarnation as the primary grounds for the Christian’s union with Christ. What Jewel generally provides by way of broad outline, Hooker fills out with immense detail. Most telling in this respect are the passages of Scripture they commonly appropriate, especially the vine and branches passage in John 15, in support. In addition to the Incarnation, Jewel and Hooker alike assign a vital role to faith in this ‘mysticall conjunction’.

In the section of Jewel’s *Reply to Harding’s Answer*, which the *Christian Letter* cites in criticism of Hooker’s view of the sacraments, the bishop clearly states that union with Christ, ‘This marvelous conjunction and incorporation is first begonne and wrought by faith’ (Hooker, 1982: 38-39; Jewel, 1845a: 1: 140). Later in the *Reply*, where Jewel writes concerning the Real Presence, he specifically enumerates faith as the second means by which this union is formed. Specifically, he distinguishes faith as the means ‘whereby we embrace him’ (Jewel, 1845a: 1: 472). Although Jewel understands faith as being a gift of the Holy Spirit, in both section of the *Reply to Harding’s Answer* Jewel stresses faith as the human aspect of participation in Christ.

Of the means of union with Christ which Jewel identifies in this section of his *Reply to Harding’s Answer*, he discusses faith the least in this work. Without commentary, Jewel confirms faith as the instrument whereby Christ indwells believers by quoting Ephesians 3:17 (‘Christ by faith dwelleth in your hearts’) and part of 2 Peter 1:4 (‘Hereby we are made partakers of the divine nature’), as well as chapter

11 of Ignatius of Antioch’s epistle to the Traillians in which he says: ‘By his passion and resurrection (that is by our faith in the same) we are made the members of his body’ (Jewel, 1845a: 1: 473). While Ephesians 3:17 explicitly supports the apologist’s point, the other two quotations do so by implication and parenthetical statement respectively.¹ Reconciling his reading of Scripture with subsequent patristic tradition, Jewel interprets Ignatius’ statement as having assumed the appropriation of Christ’s death and resurrection by faith to be the prerequisite of union with Christ’s body.

Although Jewel devotes considerably brief attention to the active role of faith in the Christian’s union with Christ in the *Reply to Harding’s Answer*, he discusses it extensively in his sermon on Romans 13:12-14 (Gazal, 2013: 7-10). Preaching on Paul’s admonition in verse 14, ‘Put you on the Lord Jesus Christ’, Jewel maintains that the Christian ‘puts on’ Christ and draws spiritual life from him by exercising faith. Faith not only is the means by which the Christian unites himself / herself to Christ, it also constitutes the believer’s own necessary role in maintaining and strengthening it. Even though, as a Reformed divine, Jewel would grant the supernatural origin of faith, he nevertheless conceives of faith as an instrument which the Christian must utilize both to join him / herself to Christ, and ceaselessly take life from him. Within the spiritual union the Christian feeds upon Christ or draws life from Christ by effectually hearing the preached Word of God (Jewel, 1845b: 1: 1042). Faith serves the specific function of processing the Word, and thus Christ so received.

Both Jewel and Hooker believed in forensic justification on the basis of Christ’s imputed righteousness and received by faith alone. Jewel clearly affirms this distinctive feature of Protestant soteriology in the *Apologia Ecclesiae Anglicanae* (Jewel, 2002: 38-39) and in the *Defence of the Apology of the Church of England* against Harding (Jewel, 1845d: 3: 243-46). While Jewel upholds equally forensic justification and union with Christ with the latter being the source of salvation, Hooker, in Book V, chapter 56 of the *Laws*, more specifically unites the two by making the imputation of Christ’s righteousness one aspect of participation:

1 In his use of 2 Peter 1:4, Jewel relies on his understanding of the context as well as his reader’s assumed familiarity with it in connecting participation in the ‘divine nature’ to faith. At the beginning of the epistle, the author addresses it to those ‘which have obtained like precious faith with us by the righteousness of our God and Saviour Jesus Christ’. Moreover at the beginning of verse 4, the same author reminds his audience of the ‘great and precious promises given’ to them by which they ‘should be partakers of the divine nature’. In the following three verses, the author of the epistle admonishes his readers to supplement their faith with sundry virtues. It thus becomes readily apparent that Jewel construes from this biblical passage the instrumentality of faith in the ‘great and precious promises’, which he understands to be the gospel, towards divine participation, or union with Christ. This understanding of faith in the promises of the gospel as uniting one to Christ would also seem to account for the parenthetical comment Jewel inserts within his citation of Ignatius of Antioch.

Thus wee participate Christ partelie by imputation, as when those thinges which he did and suffered for us are imputed unto us for righteousness; partelie by habituall and reall infusion, as when grace is inwardlie bestowed while wee are on earth and afterwards more fullie both our soules and bodies made like unto his in glorie (Hooker, 1977b: 243).

Imputed righteousness constitutes only part of salvation, again with salvation being participation in Christ. In so assessing imputed righteousness, Hooker by no means minimizes it, for he goes on to say that imputation makes possible Christian participation in the righteous deeds of Christ as his or her own; thus, Hooker represents imputation as an indispensable element of participation (Hooker, 1977b: 243-44). Yet as indicated by the citation above, imputation is only one manner of participation in Christ.

It becomes quite apparent that Jewel conceives of this incorporating and vivifying faith as containing a significant intellectual component: ‘To eat the body of Christ, and drink his blood is not the part of the body: it is rather a work of our mind’ (Jewel, 1847: 1042). In contradistinction from the corporeal eating of a transubstantiated host, the actual ingesting of Christ’s life, and hence Christ himself, from one’s union with him occurs initially in the intellect as this is the faculty through which it is received in the preached Word. Jewel’s appropriation of Jesus’ discourse in John 6 whereby he relates the actions of ‘eating’ and ‘drinking’ to the receiving of Christ’s life as communicated through the preached Word by faith indicates that he ascribes a sacramental quality to the same preached Word. Put simply, Jewel’s understanding of faith as a means of joining the Christian to Christ is predicated upon his view of the preached Word as a means of grace.

Hooker clearly discusses the role of faith in the Christian’s union with Christ in *A Learned Discourse of Justification*. As in the *Laws*, which he wrote later, Hooker affirms union with Christ as the source of spiritual life, and hence the locus of salvation: ‘The cause of life spirituall in us is christ, not carnally nor corporally inhabiting but dwelling in the soule of man as a thinge, which when the minde apprehendeth it is said inhabit and posses the mynde’ (Hooker, 1990: 137). The last part of this statement serves as a transition to a discussion of the intellectual component of faith. Christ is initially introduced to the intellect: ‘The mind conceyvethe Christe by hering the doctryne of christianitye’ (Hooker, 1990: 137). While the ‘light of nature’ enables the mind to comprehend ‘those truthes which are meereley rationally,’ salvific, or ‘saving truth which is far above the reache of humayne reason cannott otherwise then by the spirite of the almighty be conceyved’ (Hooker, 1990: 138). By way of analogy, as reason enables the intellect to understand facts of nature, so the Holy Spirit moves upon it to apprehend the doctrine of Christ salvificly. Even though the illumination of the Holy Spirit is required for a soteriological understanding of the doctrine of Christ, it must still initially come to the intellect. Like Jewel, this is how Hooker understands the exercise of faith in receiving life from Christ—hearing and believing the Word. Also

with Jewel, Hooker identifies the Holy Spirit as the source of faith (Hooker, 1990: 137). Finally, in a manner very similar to Jewel's sermon, Hooker speaks of faith as 'the onely hand which putteth on Christ unto Justification' (Hooker, 1990: 151). Faith also unites one to Christ.

Jewel and Hooker equally assigned a significant role for faith in the Christian's union with Christ. Primarily both understood it as the work of the Holy Spirit, although Hooker emphasizes this more emphatically than Jewel. While both regarded faith as the human element within this union, involving largely the exercise of the intellect, it was nevertheless gift of the Holy Spirit—something on which Hooker places particular onus. Both divines also upheld equally union with Christ and forensic justification on the basis of imputed righteousness received by faith, with the former being the actual source of human salvation. However, Hooker more explicitly joined the two together with imputation being one manner of participation in Christ which the other involved the continuous activity of the indwelling Spirit.

The Second Two Means: Baptism and the Eucharist

In addition to faith, Jewel identified two more means by which 'Christ dwelleth in us, and we in him', the sacraments of baptism and the eucharist, but before examining this, it will be important to compare Jewel's and Hooker's views of the sacraments in general in relation to participation in Christ. It should go without saying that Jewel and Hooker equally assign an essential role to the sacraments in the Christian's union with Christ. As indicated above, Jewel explicitly identifies baptism and the Eucharist as the third and fourth means of forming the Christian's union with Christ. Hooker, in Book V of the *Laws*, devotes all of chapter 57 to 'The necessitie of Sacraments unto the participation in Christ' (Hooker, 1977b: 244).

As noted at the beginning of this essay, *A Christian Letter* cited against Hooker's doctrine of the sacraments the passage from the *Reply to Harding's Answer* in which Jewel is refuting the Roman Catholic practice of private masses and its theological basis. There Jewel averred that 'this marvelous conjunction and incorporation' is formed by faith, and afterwards sustained by the sacraments of baptism and the Eucharist (Hooker, 1982: 38-39; Jewel, 1845a: 1: 140-41). The author of *A Christian Letter* then proceeded to use the passage to accuse Hooker of ascribing greater force to the sacraments in terms of their intrinsic efficacy and their divine requirement than did the venerable expositor of the Church's doctrine. Before proceeding with Jewel's and Hooker's respective understandings of the relationship of baptism and union with Christ, comparison should be made between the passage from Jewel's *Reply to Harding's Answer* cited by *A Christian Letter* against Hooker with the later one in which the bishop speaks of the sacraments as among the four means of union with Christ, and from there with Hooker's view of the role of the sacraments in participation in Christ. The object of such an exercise would be

to determine the accuracy of Willet's charge in order to better understand the relationship of the two divines' views of the role of the sacraments in salvation.

The author of *A Christian Letter* cites the passage in question from the *Reply to Harding's Answer* seemingly with the purpose of portraying Jewel as presenting faith as the primary means of forging union with Christ, with the sacraments being secondary towards this end. This apparent representation of Jewel is evidenced by the following objection Willet raises with respect to union with Christ:

They [Jewel] say that grace (which they call *this marvelous conjunction and incorporation*) is *first begun and wrought by faith*, and *afterwarde is assured and increased* by the Sacramentes: you say, *the sacraments have the generative force and virtue as well as the worde* (Hooker, 1982: 40).

Willet thus faults Hooker with advocating a role for the sacraments in the Christian's union with Christ that on the surface contradicts Jewel's.

In his endeavor to characterize Hooker's position as antithetical to Jewel's, Willet seemed to have ignored the context of the passage from the *Reply to Harding's Answer* which he quoted. In the previous paragraph, having quoted Cyril of Alexandria to the effect that all believing in Christ, 'whether they be far or near, Jews or Gentiles, free or bond, they are all one body in Christ Jesus' (Jewel, 1845a: 1: 140), Jewel proceeds to reference Chrysostom in alleging that 'Christ by the sacrament of regeneration... hath made us flesh of his flesh and bone of his bones; that we are the members and he is the head' (Jewel, 1845a: 1: 140). Jewel and Chrysostom are undoubtedly referring to baptism as the sacrament whereby Christ unites people the world over to himself within his body the church. When read in the light of this preceding statement, the passage quoted by *A Christian Letter* appears to evince a different meaning than the one advanced by Willet.

If indeed baptism, as 'the sacrament of regeneration', is that by which Christ unites people to his body the church, then certainly it is not secondary in itself to faith with regards to participation in Christ. Rather what Jewel in this passage describes is a logical rather than a necessary order in the means of union with Christ, and when compared to the discussion in the section on the Real Presence, it is the logical order of human participation in that union (after all, Jewel does not reject the baptism of infants). With this said, faith initiates the human element of participating; next, baptism confirms and strengthens this union; finally, partaking of the Eucharist continues and confirms this 'incorporation'. Furthermore, the complete passage in Jewel's actual work attests to this meaning. The conflated version given in *A Christian Letter* omits the quotations from Augustine, both of which seem to confirm equal intrinsic efficacy of the sacraments in union with Christ. For instance, regarding baptism, Jewel quotes Augustine saying, 'To this availeth baptism, that men, being baptized, may be incorporate into Christ, and made his members' (Jewel, 1845a: 1: 141). Hence the logical priority of faith does not diminish the equal the intrinsic role of the sacraments in union with Christ.

In the section of the *Reply to Harding's Answer* where Jewel specifically enumerates the means of union with Christ, the bishop does not prioritize one over another, but rather speaks of all the means as equally interrelated or cooperating elements in forming and maintaining the Christian's union with Christ. The Incarnation initiates the union as it is the essential basis of it, and faith serves as the human action within this union; however, although it is distinct, Jewel nevertheless regards faith as inseparable from the last two means of union as it derives life from Christ through them.

Throughout chapter 57 of Book V in the *Laws*, Hooker confirms the sacraments as conveying the grace they signify, and like Jewel he views them as two distinct means of participating in Christ. 'Wee receive Christ Jesus in baptisme once as the first beginner, in the Eucharist often as beinge by continewall degrees the finisher of our life' (Hooker, 1977b: 248). He further alleges that in baptism we receive 'Christ Jesus,' and from him 'savinge grace' (Hooker, 1977b: 248). Also, 'By the other sacrament wee receive him also imparting therein him selfe and that grace which the Eucharist properlie bestoweth' (Hooker, 1977b: 248). The Christian, within union with Christ, receives Christ himself through baptism, in one way; in another within the context of the same union, a believer receives Christ in the Eucharist. As indicated in both sections of Jewel's *Reply to Harding's Answer*, Jewel regarded the role of the sacraments in union with Christ as inseparable from faith; faith and the sacraments are distinct, but integrated means in forging and maintaining this union. Hooker held generally the same view as Jewel because fundamentally they both subscribed to the same doctrine of union with Christ. This will first become more apparent in their positions regarding baptism as a means of participation.

Following his succinct comments concerning the role of faith in his *Reply to Harding's Answer*, Jewel speaks of how Christians daily desire

God to amend our life, and to augment our faith, even so we daily pray that this conjunction between Christ and us may be increased, that Christ may come nearer and nearer into us, and that we may grow into a perfect man in him (Jewel, 1845a: 1: 473).

It is especially for the purpose of further strengthening this union with Christ that God appointed the sacraments (Jewel, 1845a: 1: 473). As would be expected, since this discussion concerning the means of the Christian's union with Christ occurs within the larger context of his debate with Harding regarding Christ's Real Presence in the Eucharist, the function of the sacraments in affecting the believer's union comprises most of the discussion in this section of Jewel's *Reply to Harding's Answer*. Furthermore, the bishop devotes considerable attention to this particular operation of the sacraments in his *Defence of the Apology* as well as his *Treatise on the Sacraments*.

Baptism as a sacrament unites the Christian to Christ. Jewel ascribes this function to baptism on the basis of Paul's statements throughout his epistles: 'They

that are baptized are planted into Christ'; 'they have put Christ upon them'; and 'by one Spirit they are baptized into one body'; 'We are buried together with Christ by baptism unto death' (Jewel, 1845a: 1: 473; 1845d: 3: 484). He then confirms his reading of these apostolic statements with quotations from patristic and medieval authorities such as Gregory of Nyssa, Gregory of Nazianzus, Pope Leo I, Hillary, Chrysostom, Jerome, Augustine, and Bonaventure (Jewel, 1845a: 1: 473-74; 1845d: 3:493-94). In citing Augustine, Jewel notes that this particular church father frequently speaks of baptism as making one 'incorporate in Christ' (Jewel, 1845a: 1: 473). Arguing for a Reformed understanding of the sacraments, Jewel typically maintains the distinction between the sacramental sign and the thing signified (Jewel, 1845c: 2: 1101). Although the sign by itself imparts nothing, the sacrament, of course, does not consist of only the sign, but also the specific grace that the sign displays (Jewel, 1845c: 2: 1102). One truly receives Christ in baptism when this sacrament is received by faith. '[I]n baptism, notwithstanding we have Christ present unto us, of his part "only by his grace"; of our part "only by our faith"' (Jewel, 1845d: 1: 488). What is apparent in Jewel's discussion of the four means of union with Christ is that while he distinguishes faith and baptism as instruments of union, they are inseparable.

What Hooker affirms regarding the role of baptism in union with Christ is essentially identical with Jewel's description above. Like Jewel, Hooker distinguishes the sign in the sacrament from the grace it signifies; moreover, when Hooker describes their function as 'meanes effectuall whereby God when wee take the sacraments delivereth into our hands that grace available unto eternall life, which grace the sacraments represent or signifie' (Hooker, 1977b: 247), he assigning to them the same operation as Jewel, who also credited them with conveying the grace they signified. Respecting the role of baptism as a means of union with Christ, Hooker, in chapter 60 of Book V in the *Laws*, characterizes it generally in the same manner as Jewel except with more specific details. In discussing the relationship between *water* and *Spirit* in John 3, Hooker maintains 'that to our regeneration *his Spirit* is no lesse necessarie then regeneration it selfe necessarie unto life' (Hooker, 1977b: 254). Again, this is important given Hooker's emphasis on the Holy Spirit in union with Christ as noted throughout up to this point. Regeneration is an act of the Holy Spirit. Furthermore, Hooker alleges that just as the Holy Spirit is the necessary inward cause of regeneration, 'so *water* were a necessarie outward meane to our regeneration...' (Hooker, 1977b: 254). As observed earlier, Hooker assigned the work of effecting union with Christ to the indwelling Holy Spirit by his production of faith. Thus, Hooker's emphasis on the regenerative activity of the Holy Spirit in baptism coincides with Jewel's position that one receives Christ in baptism by faith since this is fundamentally a gift of the Spirit. The only difference hence is one of emphasis with Jewel placing the onus on faith, and Hooker explicitly on the source of faith, the Holy Spirit.

Just as adamantly as Jewel, Hooker credits baptism with incorporating the Christian into Christ. However, unlike Jewel, Hooker expounds extensively on what the Christian receives via union with Christ resulting from baptism:

baptisme is a sacrament which God hath instituted in his Church to the ende that they which receive the same might thereby be incorporated into Christ and so through his most pretious merit obtaine as well that savinge grace of imputation which taketh away all former guiltines, as also that infused divine vertue of the holie Ghost which giveth to the powers of the soule their first disposition towards future newnes of life (Hooker, 1977b: 255).

While Hooker is more specific in enumerating the two aspects of the benefits of union with Christ, imputation and infused virtue, Jewel, as cited above, is also concerned with ‘emend[ment] of life’ and growth in faith. More explicitly, both point to receiving Christ through the sacrament of baptism by faith that unites Christians to Christ—a faith produced by the indwelling Holy Spirit whereby they are justified on the basis of his imputed righteousness.

While Jewel and Hooker view baptism as initially incorporating one into Christ, they equally regard the Eucharist as the means whereby Christians continue their participation in him. As would be expected, the vast majority of Jewel’s comments regarding the Christian’s union with Christ occur within the context of defending Christ’s spiritual presence in the Eucharist. This is seen in both his *Defence of the Apology of the Church of England* and the *Reply to Harding’s Answer*. In keeping with the Protestant distinction between the sign and the grace signified, Jewel distinguishes between ‘Christ’s flesh’ and the ‘bread of the sacrament’ (Jewel, 1845d: 3:418-19). As the veritable source of spiritual life, Christ’s flesh can be ingested apart from the sacrament (Jewel, 1845d: 3: 418-19). This does not minimize the Eucharist as one of the principal means of uniting the Christian to Christ. The issue for the bishop at this juncture is the manner in which the Christian eats Christ’s flesh. The Christian eats Christ’s flesh, or body, in the sacrament with faith (Jewel, 1845a: 1: 529). Whether he is speaking of faith as one of the four means itself, or as the operation of reception from the sacraments, Jewel describes it as the function of ‘eating’ the flesh of Christ. Moreover, it is by this continual spiritual eating of Christ’s flesh in the sacrament that ‘we become bone of his bones, and flesh of his flesh, so as he may dwell in us, and we in him’ (Jewel, 1845: 1: 529). The continuous feeding upon Christ’s flesh in the Eucharist by means of faith results in union with him. The idea that union with Christ is affected in the Eucharist by the spiritual eating of his flesh incorporates the first means of this union which Jewel cited, the Incarnation. As a result of the Incarnation, whereby Christ united himself with humanity by assuming human flesh and blood, which he sacrificed on the cross, Christians now spiritually participate in his humanity by sacramentally feeding upon his flesh and blood’ (Jewel, 1845d: 1: 530). Jewel’s discussion of the Eucharist shows how for the apologist the individual means of

union with Christ are altogether inseparable. The Eucharist most clearly illustrates this as it is a sacrament, but its efficacy in joining the Christian to Christ depends principally upon the Incarnation, and instrumentally on the believer spiritually feeding upon his flesh and blood by faith.

In chapter 67 of Book V in the *Laws*, Hooker expounds his view of the Eucharist. Along with Jewel, Hooker views the Eucharist as a means of continuing participation in Christ.

It is on all sides plainly confest, first that this sacrament is a true and reall participation of Christ, who thereby imparteth him selfe even his whole intire person *as a mysticall head* unto everie soule that receiveth him, and that everie such receiver doth thereby incorporate or unite him selfe unto Christ as *mysticall member* of him... (Hooker, 1977b: 335-36).

Hooker then goes on to say that as Christ is ‘communicated to them, he giveth by the same sacrament his holie spirit to sanctifie them as it sanctifieth him which is their head’ (Hooker, 1977b: 336). Once again, Hooker stresses the role of the Holy Spirit in affecting union with Christ with the Eucharist serving as a means of sanctification. As with the other means, Jewel and Hooker largely differ on emphasis and detail. While Jewel gives sustained attention to the idea of deriving life from the union via eating his ‘flesh’ by faith, Hooker, without interpreting the concept of eating, stresses the sanctifying effects of the Eucharist in fostering union with Christ (Hooker, 1977: 2: 339). Very significantly, like Jewel, Hooker links the efficacy of the Eucharist to the Incarnation. Specifically he does this in his emphasis of the sanctifying effects of the Eucharist in strengthening union with Christ. In this regard Hooker declares concerning the elements of the Eucharist:

... to us they are thereby made such instrumentes as mysticallie yeat trulie, invisible yeat reallie worke our communion or fellowship with the person of Jesus Christ as well in that he is man as God, our participation also in the fruit grace and efficacie of his bodie and blood, whereupon there ensueth a kind of transubstantiation in us, a true change both of soule and bodie, an alteration from death to life (Hooker, 1977b: 339-40).

What Jewel succinctly subsumed under the idea of deriving life from Christ amid union with by way of the Eucharist, Hooker describes extensively. Also as does Jewel, Hooker regards the means of union with Christ as distinct, but inseparable. Finally, despite Willet’s representation in *A Christian Letter*, Jewel regarded the sacraments as equal and inextricably related to the other means of union with Christ. This means that Jewel also viewed the sacraments having ‘the generative force and virtue as well as the worde’.

Conclusion

John Jewel, in his *Reply to Harding's Answer*, posited four means of the Christian's union with Christ, which the bishop believed was the locus of salvation. Richard Hooker, although he did not enumerate these means, nevertheless acknowledged each of them in forging the Christian's union with Christ, which he, like Jewel, also held to be the essence of salvation. An examination of how Jewel and Hooker understood the roles of the Incarnation, faith, baptism, and the Eucharist in forging and fostering this union with Christ showed that notwithstanding differences in detail and emphases, both generally understood this soteriological doctrine in the same way, and most importantly, the equal and interrelated functions of each of these four means with respect to this union. What this means for Willet's contention that Hooker contradicted Jewel's understanding of the role of faith and the sacraments in forming this 'marvelous conjunction and incorporation' is that in his endeavor to characterize Hooker as heterodox, if not heretical, Willet misrepresented Jewel by disregarding the late bishop's comprehensive understanding of union with Christ which he discussed in some detail in the same *Reply to Harding's Answer* that he quoted against Hooker. More significantly, however, than the accuracy of *A Christian Letter's* charge against Hooker, is that the author of the *Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity* represents a continuity in the soteriology of the Elizabethan Church whose central element being union with Christ is likely traceable to the Church's first major apologist. Thus, despite Willet's charge to the contrary, Hooker showed himself a faithful steward of his patron's bequest.

Bibliography

- Gazal, A (2013) 'Appareled in Christ': Union with Christ in the Soteriology of John Jewel. In *Sin and Salvation in Reformation England Conference*, Stratford-upon-Avon, United Kingdom, 26-28 June 2013.
- Hooker, R (1977a) The Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity. In Hill, WS and Edelen, G (eds) *The Folger Library Edition of the Works of Richard Hooker*, volume 1. Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.
- Hooker, R (1977b) The Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity. In Hill, WS (ed) *The Folger Library Edition of the Works of Richard Hooker*, volume 2. Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.
- Hooker, R (1981) The Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity. In Hill, WS (ed) *The Folger Library Edition of the Works of Richard Hooker*, volume 3. Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.
- Hooker, R (1982) *A Christian Letter* with Hooker's Notes. In Booty, JE (ed) *The Folger Library Edition of the Works of Richard Hooker*, volume 4. Cambridge, MA: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, pp. 1-79.
- Hooker, R (1990) A Learned Discourse of Justification, Workes, and How the Foundation of Faith Is Overthrowne. In Yeandle, L, Grislis, E (eds) *The Folger*

- Library Edition of the Works of Richard Hooker*, volume 5. Cambridge, MA: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, pp. 105-169.
- Jewel, J (1845a) *Reply to Harding's Answer*. In Ayre, J (ed) *The Works of John Jewel*, volumes 1-4. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 1: 81-2: 811.
- Jewel, J (1845b) *Sermon on Romans 13:12*. In Ayre, J (ed) *The Works of John Jewel*, volumes 1-4. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 2: 1035-46.
- Jewel, J (1845c) *A Treatise of the Sacraments*. In Ayre, J (ed) *The Works of John Jewel*, volumes 1-4. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 2: 1098-1139.
- Jewel, J (1845d) *The Defence of the Apology of the Church of England*. In Ayre, J (ed) *The Works of John Jewel*, volumes 1-4. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 3: 113-4: 1092.
- Jewel, J (2002) *An Apology of the Church of England*. New York, NY: Church Publishing.
- Kirby, WJT (2005) *Richard Hooker, Reformer and Platonist*. Aldershot: Ashgate.