

## **- Chapter 4 - Participation as Fellowship**

### **INTRODUCTION**

Is there an objective ground for our judgments of the good? Is there a connection between Christian cognitive and practical commitments and the generation of communities who embody the mind of Christ? How does the community of Christ reliably discern the good? In this chapter, we will only begin to answer these questions because we will quickly see that the question of how the mind of Christ is formed in communities is deeply theological. Our inquiry quickly leads us into the ecclesiological, epistemological, and soteriological domains. We'll enter each of these domains in order to explore more fully the epistemic role of the Spirit. The task of this chapter will be to consider in depth the agency of the Spirit in calling the elect into fellowship with Christ. I will argue that the Spirit actuates a reciprocal knowing of and responsiveness to Christ mediated by a sociality, an interactivity, and a history of shared life, all of which are constituted by a restored rationality. Such fellowship, we shall see in the next chapter, provides the epistemic ground of our ethical reasoning.

The key move is to notice Hooker's two levels of description of the real presence of Christ. The first level describes the real presence in the relational terms of the covenant of grace, while the second level clarifies how Christ is truly present to us in our personal relationships with him, redirecting our reification of the real presence from physically proximate things to the hearts of believers. Reflection on these two levels of description of the real presence sets up our consideration of practices in the next chapter.

The arguments of this chapter unfold in three movements. The first movement recalls Hooker's distinction between our universal participation in Christ the Creator and Governor and our personal participation in and fellowship with Christ the Reconciler, and describes that participation in relational terms of the covenant of

grace. The second movement explains why our personal experience of Christ's real presence is best described in grammar appropriate to the space of reasons. The final movement explains how Christ is really present to the community both diachronically and synchronically.

In my exegesis of Hooker's account of participation which is presented throughout this chapter, I largely agree with readings of Kirby,<sup>365</sup> Shuger,<sup>366</sup> Harrison,<sup>367</sup> and Irish.<sup>368</sup> Kirby and Shuger both take note of Hooker's deployment of dual epistemologies, describing them as Platonic and Augustinian. I propose that these are best rendered as the grammars appropriate to the spaces of causes and reasons, respectively. I disagree with Rasmussen's 'presence and absence' description of Hooker's sacramental hermeneutic.<sup>369</sup> My reading of Hooker's account of participation disagrees with those who read his account as largely Thomist in character. Though there are strong similarities, the anthropological and epistemological commitments examined in chapter two required that Hooker re-describe our participation in Christ in a Reformation grammar.

## PARTICIPATION IN CHRIST

---

365. Kirby refers to Hooker's dual epistemologies in most of his descriptions of Hooker's account of the law, usually describing them in terms of Neoplatonic ontology and Augustinian political theology, wherein he, like me, focuses on Hooker's use of a relational semantic field (e.g., conjunction, copulation, etc.) and the hypostatic union. For a good example of this emphasis, see Kirby, *Richard Hooker, Reformer and Platonist*.

366. Shuger, *Habits of Thought*. 43.

367. Harrison makes the point, with which I agree, that the subject of *Laws* is sanctification, not justification. Harrison, "Powers of Nature and Influences of Grace in Hooker's *Laws*,"

368. Charles W. Irish, "'Participation of God Himself': Law, the Mediation of Christ, and Sacramental Participation in the Thought of Richard Hooker," in *Richard Hooker and the English Reformation: Studies in Early Modern Religious Reforms*, (Dordrecht ; Boston: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 2003).

369. Barry G. Rasmussen, "Presence and Absence: Richard Hooker's Sacramental Hermeneutic," in *Richard Hooker and the English Reformation: Studies in Early Modern Religious Reforms*, (Dordrecht ; Boston: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 2003).

## Real Presence as Conjunction

In his account of the real presence of Christ, Hooker re-describes Thomas' account using the grammar of a thinner ontology implied by Luther's insight regarding Christ's personal indwelling. For Hooker, this results in two levels of description. The first follows from the Reformation insight that faith forms charity,<sup>370</sup> and the second is an effort to redirect a misplaced reification of the real presence in his interlocutor's descriptions of the sacraments.

The first level of description engaged Puritan colleagues dialectically. Because intellection of transcendentals is no longer possible (carrying on in the same way as the magisterial Reformers),<sup>371</sup> Hooker's task was to describe how participation in Christ is possible given our finitude. One sees in Hooker's solution the marks of both Thomist and Augustinian thinking. Aquinas described life with God in terms of love and fellowship, and Hooker certainly imagined a life with God in which such fellowship leads to transformation. Nonetheless, Aquinas described Christ's real presence relatively more within the semantic field of participation (e.g., intellection of transcendentals, transformation, theosis), and Hooker described it relatively more within the semantic field of the covenant (copulation, conjunction, interaction). In doing so, Hooker follows Augustine in relying upon hypostatic concepts to describe our access to Christ's divinity through his humanity.<sup>372</sup>

Hooker turned to a second level of description in order to respond to philosophical puzzlement that ensued in light of Luther's insight regarding the nature of Christ's real presence within the heart of believers. This puzzlement had theological consequences related to the doctrines of election and predestination that included anxieties about whether one has or does not have Christ, and whether one's

---

370. Here I allude to Reformation 'givens' regarding the human possibility of *a priori* knowledge of the good, discussed above in chapter two. See "What's at stake", page 33.

371. See "Hookerian psychology" on page 54.

372. This relatively greater emphasis on hypostatic union may have been a rhetorically strategic move. Torrance Kirby argues that the doctrine is central to Hooker's argument for the female royal headship of the Church of England. See W.J. Torrance Kirby, *Richard Hooker's Doctrine of the Royal Supremacy* (Leiden ; New York: E.J. Brill, 1990), Chapter IV.

relation to Christ could be threatened by the alleged heresy or apostasy of others within one's community. It also had ecclesiological consequences in the form of questions about 'superstitious' ecclesial practices, the role of ordained ministers, and the possibility of female leadership of the church. This second level of description sought to correct a misplaced reification of the real presence in the sacraments.

In what follows, I will first examine these two levels of description exegetically. The key moves are to recognize that Hooker describes the real presence in term of conjunction, that he locates that real presence within the heart and soul of the believer, and that our participation in Christ grows by steps and degrees as we are sustained in a personal relationship - a fellowship - with him.

### **Universal participation in Christ**

Hooker's first level of description engages the magisterial Reformers dialectically. Luther's decisive insight, for Hooker, is that charity is formed by faith. Encapsulated in this pithy statement are premises about the impossibility of finite and sinful creatures knowing God without God's prior gracious action, the presence of Christ in the heart of the believer, and the Augustinian emphasis on the conjunction of Christ's humanity and divinity. Christ justifies, giving his indwelling and personal presence, and such presence constitutes the forgiveness of sins (*favor*) and the gift of God himself (*donum*).<sup>373</sup>

Yet Luther's view is dualistic. Either one is possessed by Christ or possessed by sin. No knowledge of God is possible without Christ's indwelling. Luther was deeply skeptical of Erasmus' account of mimetic virtue.<sup>374</sup>

Hooker embraced most of this. The clear point of departure was that Hooker strived to imagine a coherent account of mimetic virtue consistent with the insight that charity is formed by faith. For Hooker, the human *telos* is participation in the divine rationality.<sup>375</sup> Hooker's account of the real presence is thus bounded on the one

---

373. Tuomo Mannermaa and Kirsi Irmeli Stjerna, *Christ Present in Faith: Luther's View of Justification*, 1st Fortress Press Ed ed. (Fortress Press, 2005-01-31), 19.

374. For Luther's skepticism of mimetic virtue, see Herdt, *Putting on Virtue*, Chap 6.

375. "Concerning perfections in this kind [those desires which grow externally] that by

hand by the asymptote of human finitude, and on the other hand by a teleological account of the cosmos which presupposes that all creatures participate in their Creator.<sup>376</sup>

For Hooker, participation, when fully realized, is fundamentally *relational*, characterized by mutual subjection and reciprocity. We possess Christ and Christ possesses us by “special interest property and inherent copulation.”<sup>377</sup> This is the participation of those who know Christ as Reconciler. But not all persons manifest such knowing. There are those who know Christ only as Creator and Governor. There is thus a level of participation fundamental to all, and another level that characterizes only those who know Christ as Reconciler.

The first level of participation in Christ is that which is common to all creation. Hooker begins with an allusion to the observation that a cause inherently participates in its effects and an effect in its cause:

... we may from that which hath been before sufficiently proved assume to our purpose these two principles, that every original cause imparteth itself unto those things which come of it, and Whatsoever taketh being from any other the same is after a sort in that which giveth it being.<sup>378</sup>

With these principles, Hooker demonstrates that the Father and the Son mutually participate in one another: “It followeth hereupon that the Son of God being light of light, must needs be also light in light.”<sup>379</sup> Following a reflection on the inner life of the triune God, Hooker concludes that “The Son [is] in the father as light in that light out of which it floweth without separation; the father [is] in the Son as light in that light which it causeth and leaveth not.”<sup>380</sup>

We see in Hooker’s Trinitarian illustration a significant echo of the Thomist understanding of participation and communion. Creaturely participation in the divine

---

proceeding in the knowledge of truth and by growing in the exercise of virtue, man amongst the creatures of this inferior world aspireth to the greatest conformity with God.” *Laws*.I.5.3; I.73.32-74.3.

376. Hooker develops this teleological cosmology fully in *Laws*.I.5.

377. *Laws*.V.56.1; 2:234.29-31.

378. *Laws*.V.56.1; 2:234.31-235.3

379. *Laws*.V.56.1; 2:235.3-5.

380. *Laws*.V.56.2; 2:235.25-27.

is grounded in the principle of “impartation” of causes in their effects.

Hooker develops his doctrine of participation in four moves within his defense of the sacraments. By tracing these moves, we see more clearly that the account of practices in chapter five is derived from first principles.<sup>381</sup> The first move is to ground his doctrine in reflection on the Trinity. The second move is to consider differences between the participation of the Triune Persons in each other and participation of humans in Christ. A third move establishes the possibility of the local and ongoing presence of Christ within history using Hooker’s doctrine of conjunction. Finally, Hooker describes the material interaction through which Christ gives himself in covenantal relationship through sacramental practices. I will trace the first of these in this chapter and the fourth in the next chapter.

### **Participation within the Trinity**

Hooker grounds his theory of participation in doctrine of the Trinity. He follows his metaphor of the Christ who is both “light of light” and “light in light” with an extended discussion of the relationship between the persons:

The persons of the Godhead, by reason of the unity of their substance, do as necessarily remain one within another as they are of necessity to be distinguished one from another, because two are the issue of one, and one the offspring of the other two, only of three one not growing out of any other. And since they all are but one God in number, one indivisible essence or substance, their distinction cannot possibly admit separation. For how should that subsist *solitarily* by itself which hath no substance but *individually* the very same whereby others subsist with it, seeing that the multiplication of substances in particular is necessarily required to make those things subsist apart which have the selfsame general nature, and the persons of that Trinity are not three particular substances to whom one *general* nature is common, but three that subsist by one substance *which itself is particular*, yet that all three have it, and their several ways of having it are that which maketh their personal distinction? The Father therefore is in the Son, and the Son in him, they both in the Spirit, and the Spirit in both them.<sup>382</sup>

Hooker's presentation is instructive. Shared participation in the divine Being does not cause the relation of Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. That is, shared participation is not logically prior to their relatedness. Rather, relatedness is constitutive of the identity of both Father and Son. The self-determination of the Father is to be in

---

381. This derivation from first principles answers one of the common criticisms of the ecclesial ethicists. See “Criticism of the Ecclesial Ethicists”, page 193.

382. *Laws*.V.56.2; 2.235.5-21; Emphasis original.

relation to the Son, and the identity of the Son is determined by relation to the Father. The determination of the Son by the Father is that the Son should “flow without separation” from the Father, and the self-determination of the Father is that the Father shall cause and “leaveth not” the Son. In the self-determination of the Father and in the determination of the Son by the Father, their “mutual inward hold” and “copulation” are “inherent.” The Son participates in the Father not as a consequence of an innate intellection of the mind of the Father made possible through a common material Being, but as a consequence of their *inherent* relatedness. For Hooker, Father and Son are essentially related because the Father determined that it would be so.

### **Human participation in the Trinity**

As noted above, Hooker distinguishes two degrees of human participation in God. The first, common to all creatures, is the ontological participation of the effect in its cause and the cause in its effect. The second, arising exclusively from the acceptance of the human's election in Jesus Christ, is interpersonal, though “in no sort like unto that” of the interpersonal relation between Father and Son.<sup>383</sup> This second level of participation corresponds to Luther's indwelling of Christ in the heart of the believer.

The participation in God common to all creatures is that which is integral to the relation between Creator and creature. Hooker sees this within the framework of his description of Christ the Creator, for “all things which God in their times and seasons hath brought forth were eternally and before all time in God as a work unbegun is in the artificer which afterward bringeth it unto effect.”<sup>384</sup> This universal participation in God results from the objective presence of Christ in all created things. Christ participates in all things in the sense of piercing them with his animating power:

All things are therefore partakers of God, they are his offspring, his influence is in them, and the personal wisdom of God is for that very cause said to excel in nimbleness or agility, to pierce into all intellectual pure and subtile spirits, to go through all, and to reach unto every

---

<sup>383</sup>. *Laws*.V.56.5; 2.236.21-22.

<sup>384</sup>. *Laws*.V.56.5; 2.237.15-18

thing which is. Otherwise, how should the same wisdom be that which supporteth, beareth up, and sustaineth all?<sup>385</sup>

Hooker's second degree of human participation in Christ is personal in analogy to the relation of the persons of the Trinity. As I will explain in the next section, *personal* participation is not potential but *actual* and *historical*,<sup>386</sup> denoting a knowledge of and union with one another that arises through a concrete history, like that of a daughter with her mother.

Hooker clarifies that the personal participation of humans in Christ is radically different from that of the incarnated Son in the Father due to human finitude:

All other things that are of God have God in them and he them in himself likewise. Yet because their substance and his wholly differeth, their coherence and communion either with him or amongst themselves *is in no sort like* that before mentioned.<sup>387</sup>

Human participation in Christ, therefore, has two degrees corresponding to Hooker's version of the *duplex cognitio Dei*. All created things participate in Christ the Creator and Governor, where participation is described in terms of causes and effects. Yet not all created things participate personally in Christ in the sense of having a lived history through which both God's nature and authentic human nature are revealed through interactions occurring within time and space. Only those who accept their eternal election by Christ participate personally in Christ through a mystical

---

385. Laws.V.56.5; 2:236.26-32

386. My usage of the phrase 'historically and actually' is an intentional invocation of Barth's actualistic ontology and ecclesiology, which I suggest Hooker would embrace. As Woodard - Lehman observes, "Like faith itself, in both its kerygma and dogma, the Church is nothing other than its common conversation and confession that results. We might call this Barth's 'actualistic ecclesiology.'" Woodard-Lehman, "Freedom and Authority," 210. "Actual and historical" are the hallmarks of Barth's "actualism," and, for George Hunsinger, have precise technical meaning in Barth's usage. My usage of these terms follows Hunsinger's explanation of Barth's actualism: "This pattern appears again and again in the *Church Dogmatics*. The church, the inspiration of Scripture, faith, and all other creaturely realities in their relationship to God are always understood as events. They are not self-initiating and self-sustaining. They are not grounded in a neutral, ahistorical, or ontological relationship to God independent of the event of grace. Nor are they actualizations of certain ontologically given creaturely capacities. Rather, they have not only their being but also their possibility only as they are continually established anew according to the divine good pleasure. They have their being only in act - in the act of God which elicits from the creature the otherwise impossible act of free response." George Hunsinger, *How to Read Karl Barth: The Shape of His Theology, With Special Reference to the Conception of Truth*, Kindle ed. (Oxford University Press, USA, 1994-04-29), Kindle loc. 439, Chap 1, para 7.

387. Laws.V.56.6; 2:236.18-26. Emphasis added.



conjunction:

For in him we actually are *by our actual incorporation into that society* which hath him for their head and doth make together with him one body (he and they in that respect having one name) for which cause by virtue of this mystical conjunction we are of him and in him even as though our very flesh and bones should be made continue with his.<sup>388</sup>

Thus, Hooker acknowledges the ontological basis by which all creatures participate in Christ the Creator, but distinguishes between that and the personal participation in Christ that mystically transforms the eternally elect as they respond responsibly to the revelation of Christ the Reconciler. The participation fundamental to all creatures does not constitute “being in Christ” in its fullest, saving sense:

It is too cold an interpretation, whereby some men expound our being in Christ to import nothing else, but only that the self-same nature, which maketh us to be men, is in him, and maketh him man as we are. For what man in the world is there which hath not so far forth communion with Jesus Christ? It is not this that can sustain the weight of such sentences as speak of the mystery of our coherence with Jesus Christ. The Church is in Christ as Eve was in Adam. Yea by grace we are every of us in Christ and in his Church, as by nature we are in those our first parents. God made Eve of the rib of Adam. And his Church he frameth out of the very flesh, the very wounded and bleeding side of the Son of Man. His body crucified and his blood shed for the life of the world, are the true elements of that heavenly being, which maketh us such as himself is of whom we come.<sup>389</sup>

Here Hooker strikes a soteriological note that will be important in what follows. All humans participate ontologically in Christ the Creator and Governor, but it is only that personal participation in which Christ is known as Reconciler which mystically and salvifically transforms. The soteriological point is that the means of that personal participation in Christ - the means of grace - is the encounter with Christ in his human nature - the human nature reconciled to the divine, “his body crucified and his blood shed.” The body and blood offered “for the life of the world” are inseparable from the divine; they are indeed “the true elements of that heavenly being” which transform us into that which he is eternally - authentic humanity, reconciled to the Father. Fellowship - understood as personal, reconciling participation in the Christ - is participation in the human nature that is inseparable but distinct from the divine nature of our risen Lord, the *Logos ensarkos*.

---

388. *Laws.V.56.7; 238.29-239.5; Emphasis added.*

389. *Laws.V.56.7; 2:239.13-26*

## **Copulation and conjunction**

For Hooker, the Church is conjoined to Christ as Eve was to Adam, formed by Christ's body and blood just as Eve was formed from Adam's rib. The joyful and transforming participation in Christ to which all are called is not merely Platonic, but, in analogy to the sexual union, is material and personal, a deep fellowship characterized by a reciprocal "inward hold," "possession," and "inherent copulation."<sup>390</sup> Similarly, the community of those who respond responsibly to their election are "offspring of God"<sup>391</sup> who are "sprung out of [Christ]"<sup>392</sup> and whom "Christ... knoweth and loveth... even as parts of himself,"<sup>393</sup>

This portrait of a union that is material and personal raises a significant philosophical question: how can Christ be present locally and across time? If Jesus died two thousand years ago, how can such union - in analogy to the sexual union of Adam and Eve - be possible for disciples living in the twenty-first century? How can the body and blood of Jesus of Nazareth by which we are conjoined to Christ be locally present to Christian communities in our time?

The question of how the body and blood of Jesus is present locally is not merely a question in sacramentology; it is immediately christological and ultimately soteriological. For our purposes, it is not just about the Eucharist. Rather, consideration of how Christ is present in the Eucharist is decisive for our understanding of how Christ is present in all ecclesial practices, and therefore becomes decisive for our understanding of the role of practices in the formation of Christ in community.

We saw in the previous section that, for Hooker, personal, reconciling participation in Christ just is participation in the human nature that is inseparable but distinct from the divine nature of our risen Lord, the *Logos ensarkos*. But how does one

---

390. *Laws*.V.56.1; 2:234.29-31.

391. *Laws*.V.56.5; 2:237.23

392. *Laws*.V.56.6; 2:238.5-6

393. *Laws*.V.56.7; 2:239.5-6

encounter Christ's human nature? Calvin was willing to grant Christ's reconciling presence in the Lord's Supper "in a special manner" yet insisted that Christ's local presence is constituted by his divine nature because his flesh "will remain in heaven till he come to judgement." Undergirding this is the Reformed doctrine that the Lutherans dubbed *extra Calvinisticum* which gives us the concepts of *Logos asarkos* and *ensarkos*. The concepts were:

... an attempt by the Reformed to maintain: (1) the proper, Chalcedonian distinction between the natures, and (2) that the natures remain unaltered and undiminished. Therefore the Word is fully incarnate in the human Jesus, but is etiam extra carnem – *also* outside the flesh.<sup>394</sup>

Darren Sumner observes that Calvin's method of refuting the Lutheran doctrine of ubiquity was problematic to the extent that it posits a Word that is both "fully incarnate in the human Jesus" and "also outside the flesh." The conception seems to imply the existence of a Christ who can be known apart from Jesus of Nazareth:

The primary concern of the Fathers was that the body of the Word did not bind him to time and space, bringing a hiatus to his divine transcendence. This has more to do with the character of the person who becomes incarnate (as emerged in the kenosis debates) than with the metaphysical reality of the hypostatic union per se. The subtle shift in the extra's center of gravity among the Reformed after 1564 is evident in the illustration of 'Antwerp on the ocean': that Antwerp is located on the ocean does not mean that Antwerp covers the whole world. The analogy was originally to explain Christ's presence at the right hand of the Father: so the fact that Christ is everywhere by virtue of his divinity (the ocean) does not mean that his humanity is everywhere as well.<sup>395</sup>

As Sumner concludes, "The implication of this constructive use of an ancient principle is that the *extra Calvinisticum* retains for the Logos a transcendent way of being in which he is not incarnate."<sup>396</sup>

Hooker seems to have been aware of this problem. He agreed with Calvin that Christ's "human substance in itself is naturally absent from the earth, his soul and body not on earth but in heaven only."<sup>397</sup> Yet Hooker importantly diverges from Calvin<sup>398</sup> in granting the possibility of the local presence of Christ's human body "after

---

394. Darren Sumner, "The Twofold Life of the Word: Karl Barth's Critical Reception of the *Extra Calvinisticum*," *International Journal of Systematic Theology* 15, no. 1 (January 2013): 42-57. 43.

395. Ibid.

396. Ibid., 44.

397. *Laws*.V.55.6-7; 2.231.22-24.

398. Here I diverge from Kirby. By my reading, Hooker is more nuanced than Calvin in

a sort”:

.... because this substance is inseparably joined to that personal word which his very divine essence is present to all things, the nature which cannot have in itself universal presence hath it *after a sort* by being nowhere severed from that which everywhere is present. For inasmuch as that infinite word is not divisible into parts, it could not in part but must needs be wholly incarnate, and consequentially wheresoever the word is it hath with it manhood.<sup>399</sup>

Hooker quickly dismisses the Lutheran doctrine of ubiquity but endeavors to preserve Luther’s key insight that Christ must be present locally to us in his humanity if we who are finite are to know the divine. His constructive method is to adopt analogical language. He deploys the phrases “after a sort” and “in some sort” to point to a mystical reality that can only be described with the humility of metaphor: “The nature which cannot have in itself universal presence hath it *after a sort* by being nowhere severed from that which everywhere is present.”

Hooker distinguishes between “the person of Christ” and “the whole of Christ.” A person, as I suggest below,<sup>400</sup> is one with whom it is possible to share a lived history through which his or her nature is revealed. A person, therefore, is both a subject who reveals himself and an object that is capable of being known. One can know a person without encountering all of a person. So it is, “after a sort,” with Christ:

*For the person of Christ is whole*, perfect God and perfect man wheresoever, although the parts of his manhood being finite and his deity infinite we cannot say that *the whole of Christ* is simply everywhere, as we may that his deity is and that his person is by force of deity.<sup>401</sup>

How do we encounter the humanity of the risen Lord locally though it is located at the right hand of the Father in heaven and lacks the attribute of ubiquity? “By force of deity.” The force of deity causes the possibility and the efficacy of our personal

---

describing how Christ’s humanity can be locally present while Christ’s body sits at the right hand of the Father. Kirby sees Calvin and Hooker as nearly identical in locating the risen Lord at the right hand of the Father, and notes that Hooker holds that the mystical body is not present locally. My reading has Hooker addressing the problem I mention with the *extra Calvinisticum* more subtly by gesturing towards an explanation of how we can claim we encounter Christ’s humanity even though he reigns at the right hand of the Father. This is not a claim that Christ’s body is located otherwise, but an explanation of how we can nonetheless experience his humanity locally in our sacramental practices. Kirby and I agree that Hooker describes our experience of the presence locally in terms of the hypostatic union.

399. *Laws*.V.55.6-7; 2.231.24-31. Emphasis added.

400. See “Personhood” on page 134.

401. *Laws*.V.55.8; 2.231.33-232.13. Emphasis original.

participation in Christ through the conjunction of the divine and human natures in Christ:

For *somewhat of the person of Christ* is not everywhere in that sort namely his manhood, *the only conjunction* whereof with deity is extended as far as deity, the actual position restrained and tied to a certain place. Yet presence *by way of conjunction* is in some sort presence.<sup>402</sup>

## Reification Redirected

I turn now to Hooker's second level of description. Here the key moves are to understand that there are two forms of justified knowing - one in the realm of causes and the other in the realm of reasons, that a personal relationship is manifest in a shared history, and that our personal experience of Christ's real presence is experienced in the space of reasons, not causes. On the basis of this account, we can understand how the Spirit creates the personal relationships with Christ that are essential to the account of mimetic virtue I will introduce in the next chapter.

## Reconstructing Calvin's de-reification project

Earlier, I alluded to Hooker's effort to redirect a misplaced reification of the real presence on the part of his interlocutors. The interlocutors in view here clearly include those holding Roman and Lutheran perspectives of the real presence.<sup>403</sup> It is easy to imagine, however, that Hooker also addressed his Elizabethan colleagues, whether for or against Genevan reforms, who evinced an insufficient valuation of the real presence, failing to appreciate its sanctifying role in ecclesial practices.<sup>404</sup>

We saw in the previous section that all humans participate in Christ naturally, but that only those elect who respond responsibly to their election participate in Christ personally in the sense of the mutual indwelling that Luther describes. Hooker describes this personal participation in terms of the encounter with Christ's humanity which is conjoined with Christ's divinity. Given Luther's dualistic proclamation that one either has Christ within or does not, much is at stake in the doctrine of the real

---

402. *Laws*.V.55.8; 2.231.33-232.13. Emphasis original.

403. *Laws*.V.67.11; 2:340.2-15.

404. As Lake observes, Archbishop Whitgift, ostensibly an early sponsor of Hooker's project, defended the rites and ceremonies of the Church of England by denying them the duty of edification. Lake, *Anglicans and Puritans*. 39.

presence within the heart of believers. Does one have Christ or not? Is my neighbor's sinfulness, heresy, or apostasy potentially a threat to Christ's real presence within me? Is my own sin? And what is the significance of ecclesial practices grounded in the premise that Christ is really present in the community and in individuals?

In different ways, Roman and Lutheran doctrine reified real presence in the sacraments. Calvin resisted this reification, famously responding with his weak form of the real presence, which firmly locates Christ's humanity at the right hand of the Father. Hooker's challenge was to defend the ecclesial practices of the Elizabethan Church against claims that those practices are tainted by the 'dangerous superstition' of Rome. Hooker responded by rationally reconstructing Calvin's account in order to illuminate the essential connection between one's personal relationship with Christ and one's successive encounters with Christ's real presence, particularly in the sacraments.<sup>405</sup>

### **Two kinds of knowing**

Hooker's second level of description is signaled by his repeated use of linguistic cues such as "after a sort" which qualify his explanation of how Christ's humanity is present even though Christ is exalted in heaven. These qualifications imply that there are at least two ways of experiencing the presence of phenomena. Hooker, however, is vague here, and does not tell us what he is denoting. In what follows, I shift into a more constructive register to suggest that Hooker's 'after a sort' cues reflect an ontology described in the grammar appropriate to the space of reasons.

As noted in chapter two,<sup>406</sup> all human knowledge is derived from the phenomenal due to creaturely finitude. Given Hooker's rich conception of the empirical, I suggest

---

405. Here I depart from Kirby, who sees Hooker's account as identical to Calvin's. My proposal is that Hooker subtly adapted Calvin's weak doctrine of the real presence in order to suggest that, though the risen Christ's body is located in Heaven, we nonetheless encounter it locally. This is not a claim that Christ's body is located otherwise, but a suggestion that we can nonetheless experience his humanity locally in our sacramental practices. I shall demonstrate in what follows that, for Hooker, Christ's body can indeed, "in some sort," be present locally by force of deity even though his body is constrained to be at the right hand of the Father in heaven. Neelands also sees Hooker's position as diverging from Calvin and owing inspiration to Cyril of Alexandria via Thomas instead. Cf. Neelands, "The Theology of Grace of Richard Hooker". 312-4.

406. See page 59.

that 'the phenomenal' is that which appears to ordinary human perception and reason in the spaces of causes and reasons. The phenomena we experience reliably refer to the reality of the objects we encounter (though, as Hooker himself emphasized, we are vulnerable to probabilistic error in our apprehension of all phenomena). There is that which we know because we comprehend cause and effect empirically - the realm of causes in which we know *scientifically* through inductive identification of material and efficient causes. Such knowledge is communicable diachronically and synchronically, and capable of being gathered as endoxa and tested dialectically.

Yet the space of causes is not the only manner of our knowing. We also know things and ideas that are manifest to us - through experience of their 'manifest image.' That is, we know them not through our identification of their material or efficient causes but through our experience of them as final causes.

Aristotle taught in his *Physics* that descriptions which adequately explain phenomena include accounts of their material, formal, efficient, and final causes. Yet there is an important distinction between having sufficient comprehension of all four causes and having justification to make claims about the phenomena encountered. If we encounter a statue of a president, we are justified in our claim that it is a statue of a president even if we don't know its material or its sculptor. Though we may be unable to offer a scientific description of it that would satisfy Aristotle, its final cause is manifest to us.<sup>407</sup>

Final causes are manifest to us rationally. Such knowing is the product of rational causation. We need not be skeptical of such knowing. We are justified in making claims about them and can offer justification for our claims. When we make such claims, we place our characterization of the object of our knowing in 'the logical space of reasons.'<sup>408</sup>

---

407. Aristotle, *Complete Works Vol 1. Phys.*194b23-35

408. Wilfrid Sellars, *Science, Perception and Reality* (Ridgeview Pub Co, 1991-06-01). §36. My treatment and deployment of Sellars' conception of the logical space of reasons is informed by Kevin Hector, *Theology Without Metaphysics: God, Language and the Spirit of Recognition* (*Current Issues in Theology*, No. 8) (Cambridge University Press, 2011-10-31).

## Personhood

Personal relationships belong not to the realm of material relations and efficient causation but to the realm of rational relations and final causality. They belong to the logical space of reasons.<sup>409</sup> In personal relationships, we know persons as persons - their final end. Or, better, as persons carrying on towards their final end. We know them as both formal and final causes.

Not all persons are human,<sup>410</sup> and personhood is not synonymous with human nature. There is a distinction between a human and a person that is akin to the distinction between the potential and the actual. A human is a neuro-physiological system, but a person is more than this. A person has the capacity to feel, to experience emotions, to think, and to act, and the patterns in which these capacities are actuated constitute dispositions in the literal sense. A person's "second nature" is manifest as dispositions.<sup>411</sup>

Dispositions constitute the nature of a person, but their nature is represented through successive acts. To know the nature of a person, therefore, requires encounters of the successive acts through which their dispositions are revealed. Dispositions will be central in this study when I turn to the question of mimetic virtue in the next chapter, but for now the key point is that a person's nature is manifest to us as dispositions, and dispositions are revealed to us through successive representations, which is to say one's person is manifest to us through successive encounters with their thoughts, words, and actions.

A personal relationship, therefore, is one in which the attention of two persons is directed to each other such that they encounter the successive acts of the other through which their natures are revealed. Such attention requires an initiating

---

409. I am indebted to my colleague, Derek Woodard-Lehman, for introducing me to Sellars and the reasons/causes distinction.

410. Per the account offered here, other communicable mammals might be described as persons. And so can the Trinity.

411. Wilfrid Sellars, "Metaphysics and the Concept of a Person," in *Box 34, Folder 3*, ed. Special Collections Department Archives of Scientific Philosophy, Wilfrid S. Sellars Papers, 1899-1990 (Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh), 28.



instance of attention-getting (such as the Thomist moment of doxastic causality), and then a series of reciprocating representations, of action and response, through which revelation of natures is communicated. More simply: a personal relationship is constituted by a shared history of address and response.<sup>412</sup>

### **Real presence**

The foregoing helps us to imagine the possibility of the local presence of Christ's human nature. We saw before that we encounter the humanity of Christ in spite of his body's location at the right hand of the Father in heaven by way of the conjunction of his human and divine natures. We now are in a position to see how this is possible. His human nature is integral to his personhood, and is locally and universally present by the force of his divine nature.

Perhaps this is best comprehended through an analogy. Imagine one sees a daughter just as she walks past a window. All one captures is a glimpse of the shoulder of a female form in a red sweater but one's shared history enables one to recognize that form as "daughter." All that was present was the shoulder, but yet in that glimpse of a shoulder we encounter the whole person: "that's my daughter, my beloved!" Through the conjunction of her body with her personality which we have come to know, the fullness of her person is present to us and our shared history with her is evoked immediately in us. We experience her presence even though we have seen only a part of her body. "... presence *by way of conjunction* is in some sort presence."

The reverse case is also true. When we capture only a glimpse of an aspect of her

---

412. This account of personhood, derived from philosopher Wilfred Sellars, compares remarkably well with Barth's distinction between a 'state' and 'history.' Neder notes, "Barth defines history by contrasting it with what he calls a state (*Zustand*). According to Barth, the concept of a state 'involves the idea of something completely insulated within the state in question, the idea of a limitation of its possibilities and therefore of its possible changes and modes of behavior.'" Neder, *Participation in Christ*, 32-33. In contrast, Barth says that "History, therefore, does not occur when the being is involved in changes or different modes of behaviour intrinsic to itself, but when something takes place upon and to the being as it is. *The history of a being begins, continues and is completed when something other than itself and transcending its own nature encounters it, approaches it and determines its being in the nature proper to it, so that it is compelled and enabled to transcend itself in response and in relation to this new factor.* The history of a being occurs when it is caught up in this movement, change and relation, when its circular movement is broken from without by a movement towards it and the corresponding movement from it, when it is transcended from without so that it must and can transcend itself outwards." Barth, *CD*, III/2, §44.3.158. Emphasis added.

personality which we have come to know through our shared history, the fullness of her person, which is inseparable from her body, is evoked immediately in us. There is a *rational* presence. Though her body is at the same time elsewhere, it is in some sort present to us by force of her personality (or, what some might call her *spirit*). Presence *by way of conjunction* is in some sort presence.

So, Hooker points out, Christ's body can indeed, in some sort, be present locally by force of deity even though his body is constrained to be at the right hand of the Father in heaven. He does not try to explain the nature of this presence beyond the linguistic cues indicating metaphor (*after a sort* and *in some sort*), but rather describes it as mystical. Yet he seems to hint here at something quite important to our contemporary discourse. This hint leads me to propose the reconstruction of Hooker's account of being that follows.

It seems that "after a sort" refers to a relational presence that is manifest within a *personal relationship* in the sense of a shared sociality, actualized in interactions of address and response across the horizon of time. Such presence is real because the relationship is real. That is, it is the presence of a significant relation that is forged only through a shared history. Presence need not be *physically* proximate in order to be real.

Hooker seems to have in view here an account of being that describes reality (and participation) not merely in terms of material or efficient causation, but in other terms ('after a sort'). He does not make explicit those other terms, but only gestures toward his perspective with his emphasis on the possibility of interpersonal relations that communicate the whole person without being dependent on the proximate physical presence of that person. This is a different ontology, an account of being that is based not on material or efficient causation but on relation, reason, and action. It is an account of being described in terms of formal and final causation.

Authentic relationships in which persons participate in one another are mediated by physical things and events (shared bread, shared wine, shared water, shared milk, shared honey, shared oil). They are also mediated by memories of shared experiences

which are also physical to the extent they are mapped in phonemes and graphemes in the mind. Yet real relationships cannot be reduced to the material or physical things that mediate them or to the sum of all such material events through which they are mediated. Relationships are more than the materials that mediate them. That is, the physical properties of the persons or things in relation do not, themselves, determine the structure of their relation. We can relate to humans as though they are inanimate resources to be discarded when consumed, and we can relate to wooden things as though they are gods. And, tragically, we do. The relational presence which communicates the whole person is not determined by physical proximity of the person's matter.

Authentic relationships are expressions of communion between persons within history, and not exchanges of properties that can be sufficiently described in terms of material or efficient causation. Expressions of communion occupy "the space of reasons" in the sense that there exists a reciprocal knowing of and responsiveness to one another arising from a shared history. Hooker seems to be gesturing toward something like this in his description of interpersonal participation that is not determined by physical proximity but by something else. "After a sort" thus seems to indicate a different account of being: a relational presence that is not determined by physical proximity but is nonetheless real, a presence mediated by reciprocal address and response across the horizon of time. It denotes a well known phenomenon - the meaningful presence of persons united through their shared history.

If this is correct, then Hooker seems to be implying that participation in Christ does not depend upon an exchange of properties, and therefore no theories of transubstantiation or consubstantiation are needed in order to justify claims that Christ is really and locally present in our sacramental practices.<sup>413</sup> The reality of our relation to Christ within the context of a sacramental act is not dependent upon the physical presence of Christ's humanity. Instead of an exchange of properties (*communicatio idiomatum*), our participation entails an expression of interpersonal

---

413. This is in fact the move Hooker makes when discussing the Eucharist. See See page 177 for Hooker's rejection of transubstantiation and consubstantiation.

knowing of and responsiveness to Christ arising from a shared covenantal history.

*Communicatio actionis reconciliantis Christi*, not *communicatio idiomatum*.<sup>414</sup> The meaning of our relation to Christ within the context of our sacramental acts is dependent upon the intelligibility of our responsiveness to Christ given the context of our shared history with him.<sup>415</sup> To the extent that our practices express our recognition of and response to the grace communicated as a summons to have our lives determined by Christ's covenant of grace, our participation in Christ in our sacramental practices is real.<sup>416</sup>

### **The communication of Christ's real presence**

Yet more must be said. The assertion that the reality of our relation to Christ is not dependent upon the physical proximity of Christ's humanity is not a claim that our relation to Christ is possible without the real presence of Christ's humanity. Rather, it is a claim that real presence is not to be confused with physical presence. The real presence of Christ's exalted body *is* essential to Hooker's soteriology.

To understand why, we need merely recall Hooker's account of the eternal law and the discussion with which this chapter began regarding human participation in the Trinity.<sup>417</sup> Pre-temporally, God willed that all creation would be eternally in a

---

414. The communication of the reconciling actions of Christ, not the communication of properties, more clearly describes what is expressed in the personal relationship the Spirits creates between the elect and Christ.

415. *Fellowship*, rather than *participation*, more carefully describes the communion with Christ in which the divine is simultaneously alterior and immanent. This subtle distinction partially answers one of John Webster's criticisms of those who emphasize practices. Participation understood as fellowship clarifies that the real presence through which the Spirit acts in practices never ceases to be alterior even as the practices proclaim Christ's immanence. Compare Barth: "To put it in the simplest way, what unites God and us men is that He does not will to be God without us, that He creates us rather to share with us and therefore with our being and life and act His own incomparable being and life and act, that *He does not allow His history to be His and ours ours, but causes them to take place as a common history.*" *Ibid.*, IV/1. §57.1.7. Emphasis added. As Neder notes, per Barth, "God share[s] his being with humanity.... by including humanity in the history of the Covenant." Neder, *Participation in Christ*, 44. For Webster's criticism and my response, see "John Webster's Barthian Critique" on page 193.

416. Compare Barth: "What is the nature of objective participation in Christ? The answer, [Barth] responds, 'is that *we ourselves are directly summoned*, that we are lifted up, that we are awakened to our our truest being as life and act, that we are set in motion by the fact that in that one man God has made Himself our peacemaker and the giver and gift of our salvation.'" *Ibid.*, 46-47. Neder quotes Barth, *CD*, IV/1 §57.14.. Emphasis added.

417. On human participation in the Trinity, see "Human participation in the Trinity" beginning on page 125. On the essentiality of human relatedness to God and other creatures, see "Hookerian ontology" on page 44.

particular relation to its Creator, a relation of action in which God moves eternally towards God's creation. Furthermore, God willed that the very being of God's creatures entails a relatedness to God and to each other that is essential to their nature, a relation of action in which all creatures move symphonically and reciprocally toward their Creator. Precisely because of the covenant of grace, humans are essentially relational and related to Christ and each other, and their reality consists of this action, this movement. Real presence is not to be confused with physical presence because real presence is manifest as an event in which one experiences being addressed by one wholly other than oneself in the logical space of reasons.

*Relatedness* to Christ is not an abstraction, but a pretemporal act of creation. The real *presence* of Christ, similarly, is not an abstraction but a temporal event in which one recognizes that one is addressed by Christ. Communion with Christ, therefore, requires neither the capacity to participate innately in the divine Mind nor materiality in order to be real. Communion with Christ requires a re-membering, a re-cognition, a re-conciliation of a relation that is already intrinsic to humans. Real presence is not to be confused with physical presence because its reality consists of this actual and historical re-membering, re-cognition, and re-conciliation of a relation that just is the reciprocal address and response of Creator and creature.<sup>418</sup>

### **Real presence to the community**

For Hooker, it is insufficient to claim that we share in Christ's destiny and the benefits of his exaltation simply because we share his human nature:

It is too cold an interpretation, whereby some men expound our being in Christ to import nothing else, but only that the self-same nature, which maketh us to be men, is in him, and maketh him man as we are. For what man in the world is there which hath not so far forth communion with Jesus Christ? It is not this that can sustain the weight of such sentences as speak of the mystery of our coherence with Jesus Christ.<sup>419</sup>

---

418. Compare Barth. *Ibid.*, III/2. §44.3.164. As Neder notes, "Barth describes the event of human fellowship with God in a variety of ways: the transcending of human beings by God and the corresponding human transcendence of one's state; the procession of divine action and the return of fitting human action; the divine election of humanity and the human election of God, and so on. All these ways of speaking point to the same event: the union of God and humanity that occurs as God's command is met with human obedience." Neder, *Participation in Christ*, 35.

419. *Laws*. V.56.7; 2:239.14-19

Participation in Christ requires more than mere sharing of his human nature. As Paul taught the Philippians, participation entails a “know[ing of] Christ and the power of his resurrection and the sharing of his sufferings by *becoming like him in his death*” (Phil. 3:10 NRSV). Participation in Christ’s exaltation entails necessarily a sharing in his humiliation; there can not be a knowing of one without the other, because they dynamically interpret one another. To share in his humiliation and exaltation - to claim the events of his death and resurrection as one’s shared history with him - is to share in his body and blood.

The Church is in Christ as Eve was in Adam. Yea by grace we are every of us in Christ and in his Church, as by nature we are in those our first parents. God made Eve of the rib of Adam. And his Church he frameth out of the very flesh, the very wounded and bleeding side of the Son of Man. His body crucified and his blood shed for the life of the world, are the true elements of that heavenly being, which maketh us such as himself is of whom we come.<sup>420</sup>

Hooker implies a distinction that highlights the importance of human sharing in Christ’s body and blood. The participation in Christ that all creatures share - as the effects caused by Christ the Creator - can be qualified as *natural* participation. This is the participation all humans share as sons and daughters of the First Adam. Our natural participation in Christ is *potentially* personal, arising as it does from the persons of the Trinity whose desire it is to be known by creation with the clarity and consequent adoration natural to the heavenly hosts. As we saw in the previous section, *actual* personal participation in Christ entails a reciprocal knowing of and responsiveness to Christ mediated by a sociality, an interactivity, and a history of shared life, all of which are constituted by rationality. Our rationality, however, no longer avails for us naturally because the noetic effects of sin include a distorted rationality, a blindness, a forgetfulness of our creaturely relation to our Creator, and the adoration of idols.

Only our relationship with Jesus, the Second Adam, perfects our rationality and restores our sight, re-establishing the possibility of an actual personal participation in Christ. We participate in the First Adam *naturally* through our sharing in the rib he

---

420. *Laws*.V.56.7; 2:239.19-26

gave for the First Eve. We participate in the Second Adam through our sharing in the body and blood he shed for the Second Eve, the Church. The risen and glorified body of the Second Adam, which encompasses simultaneously his exaltation and humiliation, his Resurrection and Cross, is the cause of the Second Eve. The Church, as the effect, participates in its cause in a way that transcends time and space by sharing in the body and blood which alone perfects human rationality and restores human sight, recovering for us our forgotten but natural identity, our shared history through which Christ the Creator, Governor, and Reconciler is really, personally present.

Perhaps, then, ‘after a sort,’ is indeed a different kind of presence, a presence that is not only genuine communion because it is mediated by a sociality, an interactivity, and a history of shared life, but a presence that is also appropriate to Christ’s particular body in its identity as the cause of our redemption - that non-material rational presence of a cause in its effects.<sup>421</sup>

### **Real presence to discrete individuals**

There is a distinction between this claim of the possibility of Christ’s humanity being locally present rationally, socially, actually, and historically to the Church, and the further claim that Christ is so present to discrete individuals. How is Christ present in such a way that we individually encounter the phenomenon of “that mutual inward hold which Christ hath of us and we of him in such sort that each possesseth other by way of special interest property and inherent copulation?”<sup>422</sup>

For Hooker, the answer arises once again from the universality of the presence of the human nature *by way of conjunction*. “Session at the right hand of God is the actual exercise of that regency and dominion wherein the manhood of Christ is joined and matched with the deity of the Son of God.”<sup>423</sup> The Son in his humanity wills what the

---

421. I am indebted to my colleague, Jeff Boldt, for helping me to clarify my thinking about the possibility of a presence appropriate to a cause that Christ’s body possesses but which our bodies do not possess.

422. *Laws*.V.56.1; 2:234.29-31.

423. *Laws*.V.55.8; 2:233:12-14.

Father wills, and, as “the head to the Church which is his body<sup>424</sup>” reigns as the “one to whom all hearts are open, all desires are known, and from whom no secrets are hid.”<sup>425</sup> The Son’s soul and, “in some sort,” his body “is present in all things in which [his] deity... worketh”:

Touching the manner how he worketh as man in all things, the principal powers of the soul of man are the will and the understanding, the one of which two in Christ assenteth unto all things, and from the other nothing which deity doth work is hid. So that by knowledge and assent the soul of Christ is present in all things which the deity of Christ worketh. And even the body of Christ itself although the definite limitation thereof be most sensible doth notwithstanding admit in some sort a kind of infinite and unlimited presence likewise.<sup>426</sup>

In similar fashion, we encounter not only Christ’s human nature, but that particular humanity that cooperates perfectly with and is reconciled to the divine “in all things”:

Again as the manhood of Christ may after a sort be everywhere said to be present because that person is everywhere present from whose divine substance manhood nowhere is severed; so the same universality of presence may likewise seem in another respect applicable thereunto, namely by *cooperation with deity* and that *in all things*.<sup>427</sup>

By way of conjunction of the two natures, even though Christ’s body sits at the right hand of the Father in heaven, we encounter universally and locally the obedient Second Adam - authentic humanity - and we *as individuals* are possessed by the one who gave himself for us: “This government therefore he exerciseth both as God and as man; as God by essential presence with all things, as man by cooperation with that which is essentially present.”<sup>428</sup>

### **Real presence across generations**

A final soteriological point remains. So far we have seen that the exalted Christ’s body is physically located on his divine throne from which he rules creation as Christ the Governor, and that his body is present locally and individually to all things through

---

424. *Laws*.V.55.8; 2:233.23.

425. “The Collect for Purity.” *The Book of Common Prayer and Administration of the Sacraments and Other Rites and Ceremonies of the Church Together With the Psalter Or Psalms of David According to the Use of the Episcopal Church* (The Church Hymnal Corporation, 2006). 355.

426. *Laws*.V.55.8; 2:233.30-234.7.

427. *Laws*.V.55.8; 2.231.33-232.13. Emphasis original.

428. *Laws*.V.55.8; 2: 233.28-30.



our historical natural relation to his whole person as God's Son. We have also seen that *actual* personal participation in Christ entails a reciprocal knowing of and responsiveness to Christ mediated by a sociality, an interactivity, and a history of shared life, all of which are constituted by a restored rationality. This rationality is restored through our sharing in his body and blood, as we are re-created by our share in the rib of the Second Adam. But how is our encounter with his humanity salvific *in our time* given our great chronological distance from the events of his life, death, and resurrection? How do we relate to his person as Reconciler given the great gulf of time?

Hooker reasons that the aforementioned universal encounter with the person of Christ which draws us to recognize him as Lord and Reconciler is, through the conjunction of his divine and human natures, locally and actually present not only across time but "throughout all generations of men." His divinity - which transcends time - causes his humanity to be present across time:

For his body being a part of that nature which whole nature is presently joined in deity wheresoever deity is, it followeth that his bodily substance hath everywhere a presence of true conjunction with deity. And for as much as it is by virtue of that conjunction made the body of the Son of God by whom also it was made a sacrifice for the sins of the whole world, this giveth it a presence of force and efficacy throughout all generations of men.<sup>429</sup>

Thus, the properties of his divine nature render the acts of his humanity - especially his "sacrifice for the sins of the whole world" - infinitely communicable from generation to generation. Though his death on the cross was that of a man who shared our humanity, nonetheless, the triune God communicates that finite act infinitely for the benefit of each generation so that God's will of reconciliation shall be done:

Albeit therefore nothing be actually infinite in substance but God only in that he is God, nevertheless as every member is infinite by possibility of addition, and every line by possibility of extension infinite, so there is no stint which can be set to the value or merit of the sacrificed body of Christ, it hath no measured certainty of limits, bounds of efficacy unto life it knoweth none, but is also itself infinite in possibility of application.<sup>430</sup>

---

429. *Laws*.V.55.9; 2.234.7-13.

430. *Laws*.V.55.9; 2.234.14-20.

## A Barthian clarification

Before turning to the implications of Hooker's doctrine of participation for our study of how the mind of Christ is formed in community, a Barthian clarification of Hooker's doctrine is warranted. This clarification is related to the insight the *logos asarkos* and the *logos ensarkos* are neither chronological nor exclusive. Rather, they mutually participate in the humiliation and glorification of God.<sup>431</sup>

This leads to a potentially fruitful conversation between Hooker and Barth. As we have seen, Hooker develops the *extra Calvinisticum* by showing that the humanity of Christ, and indeed the merits of the humiliation of the *Logos asarkos*, are present in the encounter with the risen Lord, even though the location of Christ's body is the throne of God in heaven. Hooker's "after a sort" and "by way of conjunction" are the rhetorical vehicles by which he argues for the immanence of Christ's humanity, an argument that is central to his project of defending the sacramental practices of the Church of England as essential ways in which the mind of Christ is formed in community. Barth adds some helpful clarity to Hooker's constructive suggestion.

From our perspective in history, we never can know the eternal law as anything but *logos ensarkos*. As Barth cautioned, "Do not ever think of the second Person of the Trinity as only Logos. That is the mistake of Emil Brunner. There is no Logos *asarkos*, but only *ensarkos*."<sup>432</sup> That insight follows from his crucial observation that Jesus Christ just is the subject of election. God can not be known apart from "the perception of His presence and action as incarnate Word."<sup>433</sup> Hunsinger summarizes this point: "We have noetic access to the Holy Trinity only through this mode, which represents its secondary objectivity."<sup>434</sup> Thus, the objective content we encounter in

---

431. Sumner, "The Twofold Life of the Word: Karl Barth's Critical Reception of the *Extra Calvinisticum*". 55-7.

432. Barth, *Karl Barth's Table Talk*. 49 in Sumner, "The Twofold Life of the Word: Karl Barth's Critical Reception of the *Extra Calvinisticum*". Sumner notes "These sessions occurred between the winter of 1953 and the summer of 1956."

433. Barth, *CD. Vol. 4, Part 1*. 181. Subsequent citations will follow the standard convention of listing the Volume and Part-Volume. For example, *CD IV/I*.181.

434. George Hunsinger, "Election and the Trinity: Twenty-Five Theses on the Theology of Karl Barth," *Modern Theology* 24, no. 2 (April 2008): 179-198. 194.

our time historically and actually is never an abstract *logos asarkos* but rather always the enfleshed Son, Jesus Christ. Hooker seems to anticipate this conclusion:

God hath glorified in heaven that nature which yielded him obedience and hath given unto Christ even in that he is man such fullness of power over the whole world that he which before fulfilled in the state of humility and patience whatsoever God did require, doth now reign in glory till the time that all things be restored.<sup>435</sup>

Quite simply, if we encounter Christ at all, we encounter the enfleshed Christ, and if we encounter the enfleshed Christ at all, we encounter Christ whose divinity and humanity dynamically interpret one another<sup>436</sup>:

Does not everything depend on our doing justice to the living Jesus Christ? But, at root, what is the life of Jesus Christ but the act in which God becomes very God and very man, positing Himself in this being? What is it but the work of this conjunction? Presupposing that we are speaking of the living Jesus Christ, can the being of Jesus Christ be distinguished from what actually takes place, as the act of God, in His existence as the Son of God and Son of Man?<sup>437</sup>

For Barth, that Christ's humanity is present in any encounter with the divine follows from the recognition that God is the one who in his self-determination chose never to be except to be for humankind, and therefore that the humiliation of the Son of God is integral to the identity of the exalted Son of Man. Any encounter with Christ is simultaneously and necessarily an encounter with both Christ's divine and his human nature:

Does not everything depend on the inter-connexion: that the exaltation of the Son of Man begins and is completed already in and with the happening of the humiliation of the Son of God; and conversely that the exaltation of the Son of Man includes in itself the humiliation of the Son of God, so that Jesus Christ is already exalted in His humiliation and humiliated in His exaltation? Is it not the case, then, that His being in the unity of God and man is this history in its inter-connexion? If we are speaking in any respect of this history, can we really abstract from the literal sense of the two concepts? Do we really see and understand Him concretely if we do not see Him in this twofold movement, and at the same time in both the one movement and the other, so that there can be no question of a halt and therefore of a "state"? We ask again: How could He be the living Jesus Christ if He were not the One He is in this movement?<sup>438</sup>

Barth enables us to be more emphatic in asserting the possibility of local real presence of Christ while at the same time proclaiming Christ as the King who sits at

---

435. *Laws*.V.55.8; 2:232.31-233.5

436. Sumner, "The Twofold Life of the Word: Karl Barth's Critical Reception of the *Extra Calvinisticum*". 56.

437. CD IV/2.109

438. CD IV/2.110.

the right hand of the Father. For, as Sumner observes, Barth closes the gap between Creator and creature:

Where Lutheran Christology suggested that the Word crosses the gap between the Creator and the creature, and Reformed Christology that the Word bridges the gap (remaining on both sides), Barth's actualist Christology suggests instead that in his person Jesus Christ closes the gap. God and humanity remain distinct, but are unequivocally reconciled in the event of the Son's incarnate life.<sup>439</sup>

Precisely because he closes the gap between Creator and creature (while maintaining divine alterity), *de facto* participation in Christ is, for Barth, the direct work of “the living Jesus Christ” upon the heart of the believer, testifying to and imparting himself through the agency of the Holy Spirit:

The beginning of the Christian life takes place in a direct self-attestation and self-impartation of the living Jesus Christ, in His active Word of power which goes forth *hic et nunc* to specific men in the work of the Holy Ghost.<sup>440</sup>

To which our reconstructed Hooker, sitting today in a pub drinking a beer with Barth, might reply in imitation of Barthian prose, “Yes, and the living Jesus Christ testifies and imparts himself to the believer without requiring a “substantialist form of ancient metaphysics as applied to the problem of an ontology of the person,”<sup>441</sup> and while remaining wholly other to the believer. And he does this by the action of his Spirit who establishes a personal fellowship between Christ and the believer in the logical space of reasons.”

## COMMUNION WITH CHRIST

So far we have observed Hooker as he derives from first principles an account of being that describes how humans participate in Christ's humanity, as well as the necessity and possibility of participation in Christ's humanity by sharing in his body and blood, and I've suggested a few points which might be more fruitfully re-described

---

439. Ibid., 56.

440. Barth, *CD*, IV.4.31-32.

441. Bruce L. McCormack, “Karl Barth's Historicized Christology: Just How “chalcedonian” is it?,” in *Orthodox and Modern: Studies in the Theology of Karl Barth*, (Baker Academic, 2008-10-01), Kindle location 2602, Sect 2, para 8.

in a contemporary grammar which borrows from Barth and Sellars. But I have said very little so far about how the fellowship with Christ that's in view here actually happens. In what follows, our focus begins to shift from theoretical to practical reason, for the question becomes, "from a practical perspective, how are Christians sanctified?"

In framing the question this way, I hope to evoke Hooker's distinction between *episteme* and *phronesis*. While the virtue of *episteme* cultivates in us the habit of seeing the world realistically (i.e., with resurrection eyes), Hooker sees the self-ordering of the Church as the subject matter of the virtue of *phronesis* (i.e., how we manifest the good given what we see with resurrection eyes). The practical things we do to cooperate with God in the cultivation of virtue, in God's sanctification of our community, arise from practical wisdom. They require cultivation of skills in phronetic judgment. To learn what is conducive to the good, we gravitate to the givens - those signs and tokens of God's presence among us about which we learn from the testimony of the voices of men. As with all such *endoxa*, they are only contingently known, fraught as they are with the probabilistic nature of human judgments.<sup>442</sup>

When we consider the question of how we are sanctified, we therefore enter the realm in which all answers offered are necessarily contingent and inherently probabilistic efforts to clear "the mists that cloud our eyes."<sup>443</sup> Hooker's optimistic account of how the Spirit works through our dialectical discourse gives us cause for confidence that we can in fact recognize how we best cooperate with God in nurturing the fellowship that sanctifies.

### **The most genuine communion**

I've already anticipated much of what follows in describing the real presence using the grammar of a personal relationship with Christ within the logical space of reasons. In what follows, it only remains to apply the foregoing concepts in describing the Christian journey. The journey metaphor is appropos because Hooker's account of

---

442. *Laws*.III.3.2; 1:210-1-13.

443. *Laws*.V.9.2;1.43.29-30.

sanctification begins with the assertion that we begin our walk along the Way as an open book; Christ imparts himself not instantaneously in a solitary event, but “by degrees.”<sup>444</sup> Charity does not bloom instantly at the point of doxastic causality. Rather, Christ gives “the Spirit of Christ,” a knowing of “that saving truth,” that justifying faith in Christ which Peter called “the seed of God.” From this seed alone, communion with Christ grows, and, through that communion, the mind of Christ is formed within us.

According to Hooker, the first degree of communion with Christ consists of “the participation of his Spirit.”<sup>445</sup> This expression immediately generates the potential for confusion, for, in the preceding sections treating his account of being, I have asserted that all creatures participate naturally in Christ the Creator. I named that natural participation “the first degree of participation.” The important key to interpretation is attention to the distinction between communion and ontological participation. In the preceding sections, I distinguished between this natural participation that is proper to all creatures and the *personal* participation that is a *potentiality* for all humans. We saw that this potentiality for personal participation is actualized only in the space of reasons in which a reciprocal knowing develops through our sociality, interactions, and shared history. This *actualized* personal participation in Christ corresponds to what Hooker describes as “communion with Christ.”<sup>446</sup> The first degree of communion marks the transition from merely potential personal participation to actual personal participation:

That which sanctified our nature in Christ, that which made it a sacrifice available to take away sin is the same which quickeneth it, raised it out of the grave after death, and exalted it unto glory. Seeing therefore that Christ is in us as a quickening Spirit, the first degree of communion with Christ must needs consist in the participation of his Spirit which Cyprian in that respect well termeth germanissimam societatem, the highest and truest society that can be between man and him which is both God and man in one.<sup>447</sup>

Here we see why I have spoken of a first degree of participation which precedes

---

444. *Laws*.V.56.10; 2:242.5.

445. *Laws*.V.56.8; 2:240.27.

446. *Laws*.V.56.8; 2:240.26.

447. *Laws*.V.56.8; 2:240.22-30.

Hooker's first degree of communion. Hooker identifies this transition point as what Cyprian called the most genuine communion, *germanissimam societatem*, that "highest and truest" communion created by the action upon us "of his Spirit." The selfsame Spirit who sanctified Jesus, consecrating him so that he might be for us a holy sacrifice, washing away our sin and its effects, sanctifies us. "Christ is in us as quickening Spirit;" we participate in him through the agency of the Holy Spirit, who gathers the sons of God through the gift of "vocation or adoption" in Christ, a gift that brings about their re-birth in the second Adam.

Christ acts upon us through the agency of the Spirit he sends, creating this most genuine communion, grasping us in order to create that "mutual inward hold... in such sort that each possesseth other by way of special interest property and inherent copulation."<sup>448</sup> The movement from that first degree of participation, which is common to all creatures, to the next degree of participation in which our potential for a personal relationship with Christ is actualized, is marked by Christ's gift of his own Spirit. This corresponds to what Luther describes as the real presence of Christ in the heart of the believer.

### **An actualized personal relationship**

We see now that this movement from potential to actualized personal participation or, more simply, fellowship, is coincident with what Augustine called the outer and inner graces. Though we may have known of God's great deeds in history, though we may or may not have heard of Jesus of Nazareth, these downward movements by God in history seem initially external to us, a story about and for someone else. In moving us from natural participation to genuine communion, however, Christ acts upon us, giving us the inner grace of his Spirit so that we recognize him, and, in that meeting, we discover ourselves willing and empowered to respond intelligibly to him. The seed of faith is planted, and in that seed the flowering of our worship is already, though only potentially, present. By degrees, his story becomes our story, God's great deeds become God's great deeds *for us*, and we

---

<sup>448</sup>. *Laws*.V.56.1; 2:234.29-31.

discover ourselves in a new personal relationship - the most genuine communion - with God and with all creation. The seed of faith flowers over time into hope, charity, and the perfection of character that is the good fruit of worship and the content of obedience.

Christ achieves this by planting the “seed of God” within our souls, by pouring his Spirit into our hearts:

The first thing of his so infused into our hearts in this life is the Spirit of Christ, whereupon the rest of what kind soever do all both necessarily depend and infallibly also ensue, therefore the apostles term is sometime the seed of God, sometime the pledge of our heavenly inheritance, sometime the handsell or earnest of that which is to come.<sup>449</sup>

We see here Hooker’s continuity with the magisterial Reformers. Faith precedes charity. The content of the grace poured into our hearts is Christ himself, given through the agency of the Spirit, and the seed of faith grows through this unmerited presence of Christ within, flowering over time into charity.

Hooker’s claim that Christ infuses his Spirit into our hearts ought to be interpreted metonymically. Humans have no innate capacity for intellection of transcendentals, nor any natural access to the divine Mind. The planting of the seed of God is truly a real presence, truly an occupation and possession by the Spirit, but such real presence is not to be understood as the presence of an embodied material substance, as though the infinite were in some way confined within or dependent upon the finite. “Christ’s infused grace” is the unmerited gift of Christ’s presence to us, filling and possessing us, through the agency of Christ’s Spirit.

Hooker’s meaning can perhaps be best understood through analogy to what we denote when we describe someone as being “possessed by demons.” The concept of the demonic, common in some form to most cultures, denotes what seems to be an experience of one’s consciousness being so overtaken by a distortion of authentic humanity that one is no longer able to function with normal human agency, but rather manifests a destructive agency. In art, this phenomenon is often depicted with

---

449. *Laws*.V.56.11; 2:243.9-14.



abnormally large heads, upper arms, or genitalia, signifying how such distortion is commonly manifested in the mind and in our power and sexual relations. 'Possession' denotes an occupation of the mind by something external to it such that the self is no longer able to respond consistently to its own will. Healing consists of liberation from the alien force that controls one's will.

Similarly, when we say a person is filled with Christ's Spirit, we denote a state in which one's personal center seems to have been occupied by something external to it, though in this case it is a benevolent possession: she or he has been 'possessed' by Christ's Spirit, and responds to his will. Once again, there is transformed agency, except in this case, that agency is creative, constituted by a new-found charity, a "relational receptivity" to God and one's neighbor.<sup>450</sup> In both cases, one experiences the phenomenon of an external subject acting decisively upon oneself with the consequence of a change in human agency. When Hooker speaks of Christ's infused grace, he describes the real presence of Christ within us, benevolently occupying our personal centers, transforming us through the renewal of our minds<sup>451</sup>, so that our holiness is his.

That Hooker intends his description of the infusion of Christ's Spirit into our hearts to be understood metonymically is evident from his more detailed description of this moment in his *A Learned Discourse on Justification*. "Infused into our hearts" means "dwelling in the soul of man, ... inhabit[ing] and possess[ing] the mind":

The cause of life spiritual in us is Christ, not carnally or corporally inhabiting, but dwelling in the soul of man, as a thing which (when the mind apprehendeth it) is said to inhabit and possess the mind. The mind conceiveth Christ by hearing the doctrine of Christianity. As the light of nature doth cause the mind to apprehend those truths which are merely rational, so that saving truth, which is far above the reach of human reason, cannot otherwise than by the Spirit of the Almighty be conceived. All these are implied wheresoever any one of them is mentioned as the cause of spiritual life. Wherefore when we read that "the Spirit is our life," [Rom 8:10, KJV] or "the Word our life," [Phil 2:16; 1 Jn 1:1] or "Christ our life," [Col 3:4] we are in every one of these to understand that our life is Christ, by the hearing of the Gospel apprehended as a Saviour, and assented unto by the power of the Holy Ghost.<sup>452</sup>

---

450. "Relational receptivity" is John Milbank's phrase. John Milbank, *Theology and Social Theory: Beyond Secular Reason (Political Profiles)* (Wiley-Blackwell, 2006). 429.

451. Rom. 12:1-2

452. Richard Hooker, "A Learned Discourse of Justification," in *The Folger Library Edition of the Works of Richard Hooker, Vol. 5: Tractates and Sermons*, (Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1990-01-01). 137-8. Hereafter all references to this document will be indicated with the document short name, *Learned Discourse*. FLE 5.137-8.

This infusion of grace - this gift of possession by the Holy Spirit, that constitutes the most genuine communion, is not a material substance but rather is concomitant with a knowing of “that saving truth” wherein Christ is “apprehended as a Savior.” In Richard Rohr pithy’s phrasing, “The inner knowledge of God's love is itself the Indwelling Presence.”<sup>453</sup> A personal relationship is actualized, manifested as a knowing in the logical space of reasons wherein we are rendered able to justify obedience to his will. Christ encroaches upon us so that we can no longer maintain our distance from him.<sup>454</sup> We re-cognize the identity and relation received at birth that we have heretofore misapprehended, and discover ourselves motivated to respond rightly. This identity is first and foremost of one in *personal* and life-changing historical *relation* to Jesus Christ as Creator, Governor, and Reconciler, a covenantal relation in which we are summoned to a new path, a path walked by all called to a common life *in* Jesus Christ, sharing in the vocation of Israel to be a light to all the nations.

### **First steps of a lifelong pilgrimage**

This summons to a new path walked by all so called to a common life in him brings into view a second knowing that is concomitant with genuine communion. Our communion with the Second Adam is actualized through our communion within the Second Eve. We are in Christ actually by our actual incorporation into his Church:

Our being in Christ by eternal foreknowledge saveth us not without our actual and real adoption into the fellowship of his saints in this present world. For in him we actually are by our actual incorporation into that society which hath him for their head and doth make together with him one body (he and they in that respect having one name) for which cause by virtue of this mystical conjunction we are of him and in him even as though our very flesh and bones should be made continue with his.<sup>455</sup>

The first step of communion with Christ, therefore, marks the transition from merely natural participation in “Christ, working as a creator, and a governor of the

---

453. Richard Rohr, *Immortal Diamond: The Search for Our True Self*, Kindle ed. (Jossey-Bass, 2013-01-22). 163.

454. CD IV / 3.1.202.

455. *Laws*.V.56.7; 2:238.23-239.5

world by providence,”<sup>456</sup> to that “highest and truest society”<sup>457</sup> in which he implants the seed of God through the gift of his Spirit, possessing our minds so that we know him personally and are incorporated into his Church. Yet, that is just the beginning of our journey sanctification by him, for “Christ imparteth plainly himself by degrees.”<sup>458</sup>

But the participation of Christ importeth, besides the presence of Christ’s person, and besides the mystical copulation thereof with the parts and members of his whole Church, a true actual influence of grace whereby the life which we live according to godliness is his, and from him we receive those perfections wherein our eternal happiness consisteth.<sup>459</sup>

As we live with Christ as our head and within the body that is his Church, he is truly and actually present to us and in us, and our lives - to the extent we manifest obedience to his will - are his. We are consecrated for holiness and then led to a knowing of what holiness is, summoning us to live according to a godliness that is his. Our lives are journeys toward the summit of *scientia*. We are sanctified “by steps and degrees...till the day of [our] final exaltation to a state of fellowship in glory.”<sup>460</sup>

## Chapter Summary

Thus far, an account of how Christ the Reconciler is really and personally present in the heart and soul of the faithful. This account, derived from first principles, suggests that the reality of our personal relation to Christ is not dependent upon the physical proximity of Christ's humanity precisely because, as a final cause, it happens within the logical space of reasons. The Spirit causes a reciprocal knowing of and responsiveness to Christ mediated by a sociality, an interactivity, and a history of shared life, all of which are constituted by a restored rationality. The significance of our relation to Christ is dependent upon the intelligibility of our responsiveness to Christ given the context of our shared history with him. To the extent that our actions express our recognition of and response to Christ’s summons to have our lives determined by him, our fellowship with Christ is real.

---

<sup>456</sup>. *Laws.V.56.10* 2:242.11-12

<sup>457</sup>. *Laws.V.56.8*; 2:240.22-30

<sup>458</sup>. *Laws.V.56.10* 2:242.5-6

<sup>459</sup>. *Laws.V.56.10*; 2:242.28-243.4

<sup>460</sup>. *Laws.V.56.13*; 2:244.12-25

So we have seen now an account of how the Spirit actuates personal relationships with Christ, but that does not explain how the mind of Christ is formed in *community*. How does the community develop the capacity to discern the good that it must have, if it is to act as it must act, if it is to proclaim what it must proclaim, if its common life is to denote the triune God? Hooker answers by describing how ecclesial practices cultivate communities of character. We'll examine his description in the next chapter.