

Anglican-Thomistic Eucharistic Presence: The Principles of the *Summa Theologiae* within the Articles of Religion

Jay Thomas¹

Thomastic metaphysics has been often overlooked as a means of understanding Anglican Eucharistic theology because of St. Thomas' association with Transubstantiation. However, Thomas' method is not rejected by the Articles, merely his conclusion. When the Articles of Religion and the Summa Theologiae are read together, there is a notable amount of harmony which opens up the Articles to a more robust and incarnational exposition of sacramentology which is native to the exposition of early subscribers.

Keywords: Eucharist, Aquinas, Articles of Religion, Anglican Theology, Sacramental Theology, Sacramentology, Incarnation, *Summa Theologiae*

Introduction

Article XXVIII of the Articles of Religion states that “Transubstantiation (or the change of the substance of Bread and Wine) in the Supper of the Lord, cannot be proved Holy Writ; but is repugnant to the plain words of Scripture, overthroweth the nature of a Sacrament, and hath given occasion to many superstitions.”² These words, in no uncertain terms, condemn the doctrine of transubstantiation, and it might also be presumed that they condemn the Eucharistic teaching of Thomas Aquinas as well who is noted for having most

¹ The Rev. Canon Jay Thomas is the Rector of St. Mark's Anglican Church, Moultrie, GA. He also serves as a Chaplain in U. S. Navy Reserve and as an Honorary Canon Theologian in the Jurisdiction of the Armed Forces and Chaplaincy. He can be contacted at jay.b.thomas14@gmail.com.

The Author would like to acknowledge the invaluable insight gleaned from the Rev. Dr. Thomas Holtzen on this topic. This paper is the outgrowth of work originally done while studying under him at Nashotah House Theological Seminary.

² Article XXVIII, *The Articles of Religion*, in *The Book of Common Prayer and Administration of the Sacraments with Other Rites and Ceremonies of the Church According to the Use of the Anglican Church in North America: Together with the New Coverdale Psalter* (Anglican Liturgy Press, 2019), 783.

fully articulated the concept of *transubstantiatio*.³ However, the rejection of transubstantiation need not be considered as a rejection of the entire Thomistic position; rather, it is a specific and narrow objection that both refuses to grant Thomas' final logical conclusion while allowing for most of the other foundational presuppositions. While the Anglican formularies (not the least of which are the *Articles of Religion*) reject Thomas' definition of transubstantiation because it overthrows the nature of sacrament, these same formularies articulate a Eucharistic presence which is framed in language which shows remarkable continuity to Thomistic formulations.⁴ While this does not mean that Thomas is the definitive key to interpreting the Anglican Formularies, the Thomistic sacramental metaphysic is explored here as a method of understanding a notably complex topic.

The Nature of a Sacrament

The *Articles of Religion* reject transubstantiation because it overthrows the nature of a sacrament; therefore, the nature of a sacrament as articulated in both the Anglican Formularies and the *Summa Theologiae* must be examined before exploring the doctrine of transubstantiation. Article XXV teaches that "Sacraments . . . be not only badges or tokens of Christian men's profession, but rather they be certain sure witnesses, and effectual signs of grace, and God's good will towards us, by the which he doth work invisibly in us, and doth not only quicken, but also strengthen and confirm our Faith in him."⁵ Thomas defines a sacrament as "a sign of some sacred reality pertaining to men . . . which is a sign of a sacred reality inasmuch as it has the property of sanctifying men."⁶ The Anglican definition, therefore, follows the same grammatical logic of Thomas' *responsio*: sacraments are effectual signs of grace (signs of a sacred reality) which quicken, strengthen, and confirm our faith (which sanctify). That these signs of a sacred reality are effectual signs of grace (as the Articles posit) is further articulated by Thomas when he says "[Baptism]

³ St. Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Theologiae: Latin Text and English Translation, Introductions, Notes, Appendices, and Glossaries*, trans. William Barden, vol. 58, *The Eucharistic Presence* (3a 73–78) (Blackfriars, 1965), 88, 3.75.8. The Blackfriars translation of the English text of the *Summa* will be utilized throughout.

⁴ Thomas' fullest explanation of transubstantiation can be found in *Summa Theologiae* (ST) 3.75.1–8.

⁵ Article XXV.

⁶ ST 3.60.2.

causes grace, and by the same token the other sacraments of the Church do likewise.”⁷

Moreover, the formularies continue to utilize language which is consonant with Thomas through their use of the instrumentality of the sacraments. Thomas distinguishes between principal (*principalis*) and instrumental (*instrumentalis*) efficient causes. He understands sacraments as instrumental causes which “act not in virtue of [their] own form, but solely in virtue of the impetus imparted to [them] by the principal agent.” The principal agent is “God alone.”⁸ This distinction between principal and instrumental causes does not denigrate the sacraments, but rather emphasizes the efficacious nature by which they cause grace, because the principal cause standing behind them is God himself, rather than their being a cause in themselves. This same language of sacramental instrumentality is maintained by the Article on Baptism which states that “Baptism . . . is a sign of Regeneration or new Birth, whereby, as by an instrument (*tanquam per instrumentum*), they that receive Baptism rightly are grafted into the Church.”⁹ Moreover, another articulation of this logic of instrumentality within the Anglican tradition that is contemporary with the Articles can be seen in Richard Hooker, when he writes: “Sacraments serve as the instruments of [God’s saving grace], moral instruments, the use whereof is in our hands, the effect in his. . . . For we take not baptism nor the Eucharist for bare resemblances or memorials of things absent . . . but for means effectual.”¹⁰

In addition to the Thomistic definition of a sacrament, which may be summarized as “a sacred sign which, as an instrument of God, efficaciously causes sanctifying grace,” Anglican sacramentology has one further layer of depth which must be understood in order to comprehend its ultimate rejection of transubstantiation. Although not explicitly specified in Article XXV, the Anglican Formularies, through the Catechism of the 1662 *Book of Common Prayer*, follow the basic Augustinian understanding of a sacrament as “an

⁷ ST 3.62.1 s.c.

⁸ ST 3.62.1.

⁹ Article XXVII.

¹⁰ Richard Hooker, “The Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity” in *The Works of that Learned and Judicious Divine, Mr. Richard Hooker* (Oxford, 1865), 5.LVII.4, 5.

outward and visible sign of an inward and spiritual grace.”¹¹ This Augustinian influence, which might be summarized as the twofold sacramental nature of instrumental materiality and principal spiritual cause will ultimately be the metaphysical point of distinction between Roman transubstantiation and Anglican Eucharistic theology as expressed in the formularies.

Unworthy Reception

St. Paul teaches that “whoever . . . eats the bread or drinks the cup of the Lord in an unworthy manner will be guilty concerning the body and blood of the Lord. . . . For anyone who eats and drinks without discerning the body eats and drinks judgment on himself” (1 Cor. 11:27, 29 ESV). This verse has led to many theological theories as to what constitutes an unworthy manner, and just as many theories on what the unworthy recipient actually receives in the sacrament. Thomas deals with this topic within the confines of the question: “Whether there are two ways of communicating (*manducandi*).”¹² Within the discussion, Thomas’ *sed contra* is based on the aforementioned verses in 1 Corinthians and advocates that in the Eucharist there are “two manners of eating (*manducandi*).” In his response, he demonstrates that the worthy recipient perfectly receives both the sacrament as well as its effect which he terms “spiritual eating (*spiritualem manducationem*).” This effect is the means “whereby a person is spiritually joined to Christ in faith and charity.” On the other hand, the unworthy recipient does not eat spiritually, but only eats “sacramentally (*sacramentalis manducationem*)” without the effect of unitive participation with Christ.¹³

This distinction that Thomas draws is noteworthy. For instance, he states that unlike Baptism which is “achieved in being received . . . this sacrament [the Eucharist] is achieved in the consecration of the matter, and hence its being received whether sacramentally or spiritually is consequential to the

¹¹ A Catechism, in *The Book of Common Prayer and Administration of the Sacraments & Other Rites and Ceremonies of the Church, According to the Use of the Church of England, Together with the Form and Manner of Making, Ordaining, and Consecrating of Bishops, Priests, and Deacons*; the Book of 1662 (University Press, 2004), 305. See also, “An Homily wherein is declared That Common Prayer and Sacraments Ought to Be Ministered in a Tongue That is Understood of the Hearers,” in *The Book of Homilies: Certain Sermons or Homilies Appointed to Be Read in Churches, in the Time of the Late Queen Elizabeth of Famous Memory* (London: The Prayer-Book and Homily Society, 1852). 325.

¹² *ST* 3.80.1.

¹³ *Ibid.*

sacrament.”¹⁴ This comes from Thomas’ earlier statements concerning the substantial change of the elements which will be addressed later in this article. However, the fundamental point must not be glossed over. For Thomas, the sacrament of Baptism is achieved in its worthy reception; whereas in the Eucharist the sacrament is achieved in consecration apart from reception. However, since the nature of a sacrament depends upon the recipient’s participation in sanctifying grace, then, even though the achievement of the sacrament exists in the consecration alone, Thomas must delineate whereby the unworthy recipient does not participate in this sanctifying grace.¹⁵

In noting the division between sacramental and spiritual eating, Thomas grants that due to the change effected in the consecration, “sinners, and not only the just, receive the body of Christ sacramentally (*peccatores corpus Christi sacramentaliter manducant*).”¹⁶ However, in the same discussion Thomas agrees that “the sinner cannot receive this sacrament, which is the living bread”¹⁷ but he does so by distinguishing that these words can only “be understood of spiritual receiving, which does not apply to sinners.”¹⁸ Thomas, in discussing this matter, is very specific in his language. He is establishing a precise metaphysic which must be understood before considering the Anglican Formularies. For Thomas, both the sinner and the just receive the Body of Christ, but the sinner only eats sacramentally whereas the just eats spiritually.

With the Thomistic metaphysic in mind, Article XXIX can be considered. This Article, from an initial gloss, has been interpreted as the most wholesale rejection of the Thomistic Eucharistic system. The title of the article: “Of the wicked which eat not the Body of Christ in the use of the Lord’s Supper (*De manducatione corporis Christi, et impios illud non manducare*)”¹⁹ fundamentally seems to disagree with Thomas’ previously quoted statement that “sinners . . . [eat] the body of Christ sacramentally.” However, the title does not exist in isolation, rather, it must be understood in the context of the contents of the Article. Both the contents and the title serve as interpretive lenses for each other. While the title of the article refers to eating the Body of Christ, the contents of the Article refer to participation with Christ: “The wicked, and such as be void of a lively faith, although they do carnally and visibly press with their

¹⁴ ST 3.80.1 ad.1.

¹⁵ ST 3.60.2.

¹⁶ ST 3.80.3 s.c.

¹⁷ ST 3.80.3 arg.1.

¹⁸ ST 3.80.3 ad.1.

¹⁹ Article XXIX.

teeth (as Saint Augustine saith) the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ, yet in no wise are they partakers of Christ: but rather, to their condemnation, do eat and drink the sign or Sacrament of so great a thing.”²⁰ In comparing the text of the Article with its title, E. B. Pusey draws the following conclusion:

There can be no question, that the phrase “eat not the Body of Christ,” is taken from [John 6]; nor that, in that chapter, it is always used of such eating, whereby a man dwelleth in Christ, and Christ in him. . . . So then the words, to “eat the Body of Christ and to drink His Blood,” understood as our Lord spake them, is, so to eat them as to dwell in Christ. But this is the same as to be “partakers” of Christ.” . . . If then, we take the two scriptural phrases each in the sense of Holy Scripture, they mean precisely the same thing; but they only state, in different terms, that the wicked are not “partakers of Christ,” that they do not, in the true intent of the words, “eat His Flesh and drink His Blood.”²¹

Therefore, although the title of the Article seems to directly contradict Thomas, when read in light of a scriptural gloss and the text of the article itself, it actually follows the exact same line of logic employed in the *Summa*. Both the worthy and unworthy recipients “visibly press with their teeth”²² and “eat sacramentally,”²³ yet only those who “rightly, worthily, and with faith”²⁴ receive, do so “as to partake also of its effect:”²⁵ to be “partakers of Christ.”²⁶ Following the grammar of Thomas, the Article can help parse the phraseology in the “Prayer of Humble Access” when the communicants pray that God would grant them, “so to eat the flesh of thy dear Son Jesus Christ, and to drink his blood, that our sinful bodies may be made clean by his body, and our souls washed through his most precious blood.”²⁷ The faithful pray that they may not only eat, but eat in a manner (“so to eat”) to receive the effects proper to the sacrament: the sanctifying cleansing and washing. Thereby the Prayer Book seems to presume that there is a means of eating which does not partake of this effect.

²⁰ Article XXIX.

²¹ Edward Bouverie Pusey, *The Real Presence of the Body and Blood of Our Lord Jesus Christ: The Doctrine of the English Church* (Oxford, 1857), 254–56.

²² Article XXIX.

²³ *ST* 3.80.1.

²⁴ Article XXVIII.

²⁵ *ST* 3.80.1.

²⁶ Article XXIX.

²⁷ Holy Communion, in *The Book of Common Prayer* (1662), 261.

In Thomistic terms, they pray that they might eat spiritually, and not just sacramentally; in the terms of the Article, they pray that they may be filled with a lively faith in order to partake of the Body of Christ rather than merely eating the sacrament. Therefore, Article XXIX need not be viewed in bald contradiction to Thomas; rather, it can be read in a manner which is open to his underlying position.

Only Heavenly and Spiritual

One of the objections that Thomas contends with in his discussion of Eucharistic presence is that “it was because of their attachment to [Christ’s] bodily presence that the Apostles were hindered from receiving the holy Ghost. . . . Christ is not then by bodily presence in the sacrament of the altar.”²⁸ In response, Thomas does not disagree with the objection itself, rather he deals with the presuppositions that stand behind it: “This objection considers the presence of Christ’s body [in the Sacrament] as if it were present in the way that is natural for a body to be present. . . . It does not envisage a spiritual (*spiritualiter*), non-visible presence, in the way of a spirit and by the power of the Spirit (*modo et virtute spiritus*).”²⁹ As such, Thomas agrees that what is encountered in the Eucharist is not a body in the way one normally thinks of and understands a material body. He earlier says that “the body of Christ is not in this sacrament in the way a body is in a place. . . . Christ’s body is there . . . in a way that is proper to this sacrament.”³⁰ The way that is proper to this sacrament is that which “is right for the perfection of our faith. . . . Faith has to do with unseen realities (*et quia fides est invisibilibus*), and just as [Christ] offers his divinity to our acceptance as something that we do not see, so in this sacrament he offers his very flesh to us in like manner.”³¹ Therefore, according to Thomas, the Eucharistic presence is bodily present, but only in a spiritual manner (invisible and by the Spirit) which can only be apprehended by faith.

Although Thomas’ definition of transubstantiation is easily misinterpreted as articulating a physical real presence, he actually posits a sacramental or spiritual real presence; a presence which is made manifest “purely by God’s power.”³² This delineation between physical and spiritual, or visible and

²⁸ ST 3.75.1 arg.4.

²⁹ ST 3.75.1 ad.4.

³⁰ ST 3.75.1 ad.3.

³¹ ST 3.75.1.

³² ST 3.75.4.

invisible, is fully in accordance with the presence taught in Article XXVIII. The Article teaches that “The Body of Christ is given, taken, and eaten, in the Supper, only after an heavenly and spiritual manner. And the mean whereby the Body of Christ is received and eaten in the Supper is Faith (*Corpus Christi datur, accipitur, et manducatur in Coena, tantum coelestis et spirituali ratione. Edium autem quo corpus Christi accipitur et manducatur in Coena, fides est*).”³³ This Article is open to a Thomistic interpretation in three specific ways. First, it affirms that the Body of Christ is present in the Sacrament as an effect of the consecration rather than just the reception.³⁴ It shows this by its threefold emphasis on the actions related to the Body of Christ within the Supper: it is given (*datur*), taken [received/accepted] (*accipitur*), and eaten (*manducatur*). Therefore, the presence pre-exists the eating of the sacrament by the faithful. Second, it affirms that the manner by which this Body is given, taken, and eaten is spiritual. This is not a physical body, but rather a spiritual body; this is spiritual presence.³⁵ And finally, the Article concurs with Thomas that faith is the mode by which this Body is received and eaten (*accipitur et manducatur*) so as to receive the effects proper to it.³⁶

In a final note on this subject, it is worthwhile to note the similarities of expression between a Roman Catholic author commenting on Aquinas and an Anglican author commenting on the Articles regarding this topic. Regarding Thomas’ articulation of Spiritual Presence, Frederick Bauerschmidt writes: “The presence of Christ is not less real for being spiritual, and ‘spiritual’ should not be taken to mean ‘purely symbolic.’”³⁷ And Pusey writes regarding the Article: “Every thing, as I said, is spiritual; but it is not, therefore, . . . the less, yea, it is more, real.”³⁸ Although a Thomistic metaphysic is not necessary to interpret the Articles, both the *Summa* and the Articles are open to the same interpretation of how they understand the reality implied by spiritual presence.

³³ Article XXVIII.

³⁴ Cf. *ST* 3.80.1.

³⁵ Cf. *ST* 3.75.1.

³⁶ Cf. *ST* 3.75.1. ad.3 and 3.80.1.

³⁷ Frederick Christian Bauerschmidt, *The Essential Summa Theologiae: A Reader and Commentary* (Baker Academic, 2021), 388, footnote 19.

³⁸ Edward Bouverie Pusey, “Holy Communion: Exceeding Danger in Careless Receiving, Death in Neglecting” in *Plain Sermons, by Contributors to the Tracts for the Times*, 1841 (London, 1841), III, 92.

Transubstantiation

The *Articles of Religion* cite three primary reasons why transubstantiation is rejected: “It cannot be proved by Holy Writ; but is repugnant to [contrary to (*adversatur*)] the plain words of Scripture, [and] overthroweth the nature of a Sacrament.”³⁹ That it cannot be directly proved by Holy Scripture without additional philosophical postulations is indisputable. Moreover, it is contrary to Scripture’s plain words because Scripture continues to speak of the consecrated Sacrament as bread and wine, whereas in transubstantiation the bread and wine cease to be.⁴⁰ The manner in which it overthrows the nature of a Sacrament, though, must be more closely considered. It has already been shown that Thomas and the Articles are in general agreement as to what constitutes a sacrament: a sacred sign which, as an instrument of God, efficaciously causes sanctifying grace. These signs are by necessity material because, as Thomas says, “it is characteristic of men that they achieve an awareness of things which they do not know through things which they do know.”⁴¹ Although not stressed in Thomas, this necessity of materiality also points to the twofold nature of the person: body and soul. The materiality of the body is not in opposition to the soul, but rather for the fullness of a person the body must be united to the soul and vice versa. In like manner with the sacraments which require both a visible (material) sign united to the invisible (spiritual) sanctifying grace. The problem with transubstantiation is that it voids the material in favor of the spiritual. As summarized by Brett Salkeld, Thomas rejects the possibility that the bread and wine could remain after the consecration:

Since it is impossible that Christ be locally moved—that would imply leaving heaven, passing through space, and being available in only one location at a time—the only way Christ could come to be in the sacrament is by the change of the substance of the bread into the substance of his body. . . . But “what is changed into something else is no longer there after the change,” and so the bread and wine are no longer present.⁴²

³⁹ Article XXVIII.

⁴⁰ Cf. John 6:58; 1 Corinthians 10:16–17; and Luke 24:35.

⁴¹ *ST* 3.60.2.

⁴² Brett Salkeld, *Transubstantiation: Theology, History, and Christian Unity* (Baker Academic, 2019), 93.

Although Thomas' solution is logically consistent, even in such a way that he upends Aristotelian metaphysics in favor of the omnipotence of the creator God,⁴³ the problem with Thomas' definition of the complete change of substance is that the matter of the sacrament ceases to exist. In essence, there is no longer a material instrumental cause within the sacrament, but only the principal cause: God. But this, then, is not a sacrament in the proper sense; the nature of a sacrament has been overthrown. Without an instrument, there is only a principal cause, but according to Thomas' definition, sacraments require both instrumental means and the principal cause. This is why Thomas must insist that the sacrament is achieved in the consecration rather than reception. Properly speaking, in transubstantiation, the reception of the sacrament is not a sacramental act because there is no longer any substantive instrumental materiality to convey to spiritual grace.

Incarnational Sacramentology

Although the Articles refuse to grant that the natural substances of bread and wine are wholly changed in the consecration, they are open to an otherwise Thomistic metaphysic. Thus, it must be asked: what might a fully integrated Anglican-Thomistic Eucharistic theology look like? First, there is an intrinsic nature to the sacrament which is two-fold: inward spiritual grace (principal agent) and outward visible sign (instrumental materiality).⁴⁴ Second, after the consecration the spiritual and heavenly Body of Christ is present in the Sacrament. This presence relates to the consecration, and not necessarily to the eating of the Sacrament; however, the sanctifying effect of the sacrament can only be apprehended by the faithful. Third, both faithful and unfaithful receive the spiritual Body of Christ, but only the faithful receive it so as to partake of Christ; the unfaithful to their judgement. This much which is consonant with Thomas is a viable interpretation of the Formularies, and to move beyond is conjecture; therefore, this article proceeds speculatively.

The key to articulating an Anglican-Thomistic Eucharistic theology lies in the Incarnation. In short, the archetypical spirit: God, joined himself to the archetype of materiality: humanity. The foundational articulation of the Incarnation comes from the Chalcedonian formula:

⁴³ Salkeld, *Transubstantiation*, 81.

⁴⁴ The Catechism, in *The Book of Common Prayer* (1662), 305, and ST 3.62.1.

Jesus Christ is to be confessed as . . . perfect in Godhead and perfect in manhood, very God and very man. . . . In two natures, unconfusedly, immutably, indivisibly, inseparably [united], and that without the distinction of natures being taken away by such union, but rather the peculiar property of each nature being preserved and being united in one Person and subsistence, not separated or divided into two persons.⁴⁵

Thomas utilizes incarnational language when he discusses how it is fitting that God would come to us sacramentally in an invisible (spiritual) form only able to be apprehended by faith: “it fits in perfectly with that charity of Christ which led him to take a real body having human nature and unite it to himself in order to save us. . . . This sacrament, because it joins Christ so closely to us, is the sign of the extreme of his love and lifts our hope on high.”⁴⁶ Thomas sees the Incarnation as indicative of this fittingness because in like manner to how God chose to dwell among us, even now while he is physically in heaven, God continues to dwell spiritually with us in the sacrament. However, Thomas does not continue to follow his own incarnational logic once he theorizes the substantial change of bread and wine. Following this logic, though, leads to an incarnational principle of sacramentality. Sacraments are types of the archetypal sacrament: Christ. In Christ we have the perfect union of material and spiritual; therefore, sacraments (material instruments communicating the divine) are proper to the Christian faith because that faith is rooted in the principal cause joining himself to materiality in the Incarnation. This incarnational logic allows us to retain the Thomistic grammar while speaking of a local spiritual presence as the principal agent in the sacrament which does not necessitate the cessation of the materiality. In like manner to how the Holy Spirit overshadowed the Virgin Mary and what was conceived in her womb was fully God and fully Man, when the sacrament is consecrated the fullness of deity,

⁴⁵ Henry R. Percival, ed., *The Seven Ecumenical Councils of the Undivided Church: Their Canons and Dogmatic Decrees, Together with the Canons of All the Local Synods Which Have Received Ecumenical Acceptance*, vol. XIV, A Select Library of Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church, Second Series (Eerdmans, 1979), 264–65.

⁴⁶ *ST* 3.75.1.

by the overshadowing of the Holy Spirit, comes to dwell spiritually (invisibly) and indivisibly in a material substance (bread and wine).⁴⁷

It is important to note, though, that the incarnational principle does not mean that the sacrament is a re-incarnation of Christ; Christ is incarnate as fully God and fully man, not fully God and fully bread. However, what the incarnation offers is a language to understand the union of the un-uniteable. If the language of Chalcedon is borrowed and the incarnational principal is granted, then it might be said that in the Eucharist there are “two [substances], unconfusedly, immutably, indivisibly, inseparably united, and that without the distinction of [substances] being taken away by such union, but rather the peculiar property of each [substance] being preserved and being united in one [sacrament].”⁴⁸

This incarnational method of understanding follows Thomas’ fundamental presuppositions as retained by the Articles and in fact, is more fitting because it allows the Incarnation to inform one’s sacramentology which happens to be the order of discussion utilized in the organization of the *Summa*.⁴⁹ While speculative, this incarnational model was held by at least one early Anglican divine within a generation of the implementation of the *Articles of Religion*. Lancelot Andrewes wrote in 1605, at the request of the King, that:

Concerning the method of presence, we define nothing rashly . . . any more than how the Human and Divine Natures are united in one Person in the Incarnation of Christ . . . At the almighty power of the Word, the nature is changed so that what before was the mere element now becomes a Divine Sacrament, the substance

⁴⁷ The overshadowing of the Holy Spirit at the annunciation as akin to the source of Eucharistic presence, although only implicit in both the *Summa* and the Formularies, is ultimately the source of substantial Eucharist agreement in the modern era through epicleptic articulations. Although the Epiclesis is easily posited at a way to side-step the disagreements of previous centuries, the Thomistic understanding of Spiritual Presence as being “by the Power of the Spirit” demonstrates that the modern articulations potentially share far more in common with their traditional antecedents than might have been previously assumed. Cf. Anglican-Roman Catholic International Commission I. Eucharistic Doctrine, ARCIC 51 (8 Sept. 1971), III.10. and Lambeth Conference 1958, *The Encyclical Letter from the Bishops, Together with the Resolutions and Reports*. (London: Society for the Promotion of Christian Knowledge, 1958), 2.85.

⁴⁸ Henry R. Percival, ed., *The Seven Ecumenical Councils of the Undivided Church: Their Canons and Dogmatic Decrees, Together with the Canons of All the Local Synods Which Have Received Ecumenical Acceptance*, 264–65. In this quote, *nature* has been rendered as *substance* and *person* as *sacrament*.

⁴⁹ *ST* 3.60 prologue: “Now that we have completed our consideration of the mysteries of the Incarnate Word, our next field of investigation is the sacraments of the church, seeing that it is from this same Incarnate Word that these derive their efficacy.”

nevertheless remains what it was before . . . There is that kind of union between the visible Sacrament and invisible reality of the Sacrament which there is between the manhood and the Godhead of Christ, where . . . the Manhood is not transubstantiated into the Godhead.⁵⁰

This incarnational sacramentology, therefore, not only follows the logic of the Thomistic principles utilized in the *Articles of Religion*, but is a native interpretation of those Articles by an early defender and subscriber.

Conclusion

Anglicanism, as expressed in the *Articles of Religion*, rejects transubstantiation; however, this rejection need not be viewed as a rejection of Thomas Aquinas or the metaphysical presuppositions by which he formulates the doctrine of transubstantiation. Instead, the principle rejection of transubstantiation metaphysically is that it overthrows the nature of sacrament which requires the maintenance of the material instrument as a derivation of the incarnational principal. While transubstantiation is not maintained, the *Articles of Religion* are open to a thoroughly Thomistic interpretation. They do so through their emphasis that Christ's presence in the sacrament is spiritual (by the power of the Spirit) rather than physical. This presence is inherent to the sacrament after its consecration, but the benefits of the sacrament are available only to those who with true and lively faith receive worthily; or, in Thomistic terms: all eat the sacrament, only those with faith eat spiritually.

⁵⁰ Lancelot Andrewes, "Responsio," in *Anglicanism: The Thought and Practice of the Church of England: Illustrated from the Religious Literature of the Seventeenth Century*, ed. Paul Elmer More and Frank L. Cross, (Morehouse, 1935), 464.

