Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

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

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

https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology

https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb

PayPal https://paypal.me/robbradshaw

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

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

of the word inspiration. In their mouths it no longer means the action of the Divine mind on that of the writer, but the action of the writer's mind on the minds of his readers.

Putting inspiration aside, as we are thus compelled to do, should we feel more or less sure of the accuracy of the facts recorded if we believed them to be recounted by one who witnessed them, or by a literary man who lived about a thousand years afterwards, and reported them in the words of other writers, the oldest of whom lived about 700 years after the times at which they occurred, and the greatest number of whom were his own contemporaries?

We are constantly told by men who have not studied the subject, and desire the reputation of not being bigoted, that the only question raised by critics is a question of authorship which does not affect the substance of the Bible, and need not affect our belief in its authority. It is not true. We can see that it is at least possible that Moses wrote the Pentateuch, and therefore we are able to believe that he did so. We can see that it is impossible that C could have written it in the way suggested, and therefore we cannot believe it. We can suppose that if Moses wrote, he wrote honestly. We cannot regard J, E, P, H, D as anything but falsifiers representing themselves as living when they did not live. We can believe that Moses was inspired; no one even professes that C, or those whose works he mutilated, were inspired in the hitherto accepted sense of the word inspired. We can believe in the occurrence of a miracle, such as the crossing of the Jordan, if narrated by an eyewitness, even on human testimony, but what guarantee for its truth have we in the fact that it found a place in a narrative not Divinely guarded from error, written 700 years after the event, and quoted by an unknown editor living in Babylon 300 years later? At least, let us recognise the seriousness of the issue. *De vita et sanguine agitur.*

F. MEYRICK.

ART. II.—A CRITICAL SURVEY OF THE CHARACTER AND WORK OF DR. PUSEY.[1]

PART II.

IT is not quite apparent what period of her history seemed to Pusey to furnish the model to which the Church should conform. One thing, however, is quite clear, that Pusey

[1] "Life of E. B. Pusey, D.D., Canon of Christ Church, Regius Professor of Hebrew in the University of Oxford," by Henry Parry Liddon, D.D., Canon of St. Paul's.

regarded the Protestant conception of the Church and Christianity as utterly defective and unsound.

There are many expressions that prove this verbatim, but no stronger proof of it can be given than the following quotation of Pusey's own answer to the question, "What is Puseyism ?" (vol. ii., p. 140).

After specifying as distinctive tokens of Puseyism high estimate of the Sacrament, of Episcopacy, of the visible Church and of the externals of worship, Dr. Pusey further expounds his system in contrast with what he calls the system of Calvin in the following terms:

"There is a broad line of difference between Puseyism and the system of Calvin. Such points are:

"(1) What are the essential doctrines of saving faith? The one says, those contained in the Creeds, especially what relates to the Holy Trinity. The other (Calvinist), the belief in justification by faith only.

"(2) The belief of a universal judgment of both good and bad, according to their works.

"(3) The necessity for continued repentance for past sins.

"(4) The intrinsic acceptableness of good works, especially of deeds of charity (sprinkled with the Blood of Christ) as acceptable through Him for the effacing of past sins.

"(5) The means whereby a man, having been justified, remains so. The one would say (the Calvinist) by renouncing his own works and trusting to Christ alone; the other, by striving to keep God's commandments through the grace of Christ, trusting to Him for strength to do what is pleasing to God, and for pardon for what is displeasing, and these bestowed especially through the Holy Eucharist, as that which chiefly unites them with their Lord.

"(6) The Sacraments regarded in this, the Calvinistic system, as signs only of grace given independently of them; by our Church, as the very means by which we are incorporated into Christ, and subsequently have this life sustained in us.

"(7) The authority of the Universal Church as the channel of truth to us. The one (our Church) thinks that what the Universal Church has declared to be matter of faith (as the Creeds) is to be received by individuals antecedently to, and independently of, what they themselves see to be true. The other, that a person is bound to receive nothing but what he himself sees to be contained in the Holy Scriptures."

We may, then, take Puseyism to be both a temper of mind and a system of belief. The Puseyite temper may be described as one the ruling idea of which is a love for what is visible, orderly, antique, and beautiful in religion. Few persons will quarrel with this temper. It is a recovery from the

slovenly Church of Hanoverian times, and from the bareness of Puritan worship. It is a temper wholly consonant with the genius of Protestantism. It decayed under the influences of that Puritan development which the foolish persecution of the High Church bishops under James and Charles I. rendered almost unavoidable.

The praise of its revival belongs chiefly to the Oxford school. This praise should be conceded without grudging. Oxford possesses the very *genius loci* for such a revival, and Pusey and his fellows certainly deserve thanks for awakening purer and more genial tastes in the accessories and outward parts of devotion.

But Puseyism, as Pusey here asserts, is not only a temper of mind and a direction of taste; it is also and much more a system of belief. Puseyism is set forth as the opposite of Calvinism. I doubt whether the scheme of belief against which Pusey contends is correctly described. It seems to me likely that the main positions which he here condemns are positions common to all reformers, and not distinctive of Calvin alone. I doubt, moreover, whether any of the Reformers ever taught, as an essential doctrine of saving faith, what Pusey puts first in his account of Calvinism—*i.e.*, the belief in justification by faith only.

The Reformers did unanimously teach the doctrine of justification by faith, but they did not teach that a belief in this doctrine was essential to salvation. For they knew that to believe in believing could not justify man, while they maintained, with the New Testament, that a man is justified only by believing. It is, however, certain that the Reformers would have repudiated with energy and unanimity the fourth point which distinguishes Puseyism from its opposite. That good works, especially deeds of charity, sprinkled with the blood of Christ, can ever be acceptable for effacing past sins, according to Pusey's teaching, strikes at the very foundations of the Gospel as taught by Luther, and as taught by St. Paul. It is but another form of that compound salvation in which Christ and the sinner, grace and law, faith and works, are coupled together, and which is so unsparingly exposed, so solemnly rebuked, in the Epistle to the Galatians.

This doctrine has ever been dear to devout but unenlightened teachers. It is the parent whose offspring in the first generation is legal Christianity, but by a degeneration, sometimes gradual, at other times sudden, and always inevitable, the doctrine issues in complete identity with Romanism.

In three great particulars Puseyism contradicts the Christianity of the Reformation. It does not make the Bible alone the supreme rule of faith; it does not place the justification of

man in faith alone without works; it does not assert the priesthood of all believers as the only priesthood on earth acknowledged by the New Testament. Space forbids me to enlarge upon these doctrines; but the most superficial reader will see that they touch the essence of Christianity, and that opposing views about them must separate Christian men as widely as it is possible for Christian men to be separated from one another.

No wonder, then, that Pusey's doctrines on the rule of faith, on justification, and on the priesthood excited grave alarm; no wonder that they were tested by the Thirty-nine Articles, and no wonder that the Thirty-nine Articles required Newman's utmost skill to admit these doctrines into their language and their spirit.

It is alleged by Dr. Liddon that the Tractarian movement was a completion of the Evangelical revival. Few Evangelicals can subscribe to this statement. It may be true, as Dr. Liddon says, that the teaching of the early Evangelicals was defective; but if it had been far more defective than it was, if it had even been the thin and rudimentary type of Christianity which Dr. Liddon supposes it to have been, no Evangelical would allow that Puseyism was its proper supplement. That supplement is found, not in an earthly and sacerdotal institution interposing priestly mediators between the soul and God, making the Word of God nugatory by its traditions, having one standard of holiness for the religious, and another for Christians living the common lot of all men, but in the noble and simple ideal of the Church sketched in the New Testament, and partially restored by the English Reformers—a Church whose ministers are pastors and teachers, overseers and evangelists; whose members are kings and priests unto God; whose sacrifice is the finished self-offering of Jesus once for all; whose ordinances are signs and seals of grace; whose infallible rule in faith and conscience is God's Word written and freely to be read under the light and teaching of the Holy Ghost.

Such a Church system alone agrees with the primitive teaching of the Evangelicals. But to attempt to unite Evangelical doctrines to the system distinctively known as Puseyism would have been only to do what our Lord declared could not be done, to put a patch of new cloth on an old garment.

But surely it is demonstrably erroneous to say that primitive Evangelicals taught a Christianity that was highly defective, and it is something more than an error—a culpable error—to say that their Gospel was limited to a few chapters in two of St. Paul's Epistles.

A very cursory inspection of the life of the Rev. Richard Cecil, the father of Evangelical clergy, suffices to disprove this accusation. Cecil was deeply versed in Christian evidences, and during his ministry in London, while he used to preach in the evening the great doctrines which are, after all, the peculiarity and essence of the Gospel, he used on Sunday mornings frequently to take the various evidences of religion as the subject of his sermon.

John Wesley's published sermons range over a surprising variety of topics; they are by no means confined to conversion and cognate themes.

Mr. Simeon's skeletons of sermons embrace almost every point which can be treated by the Christian preacher.

It is needless to cite further instances. Instead, therefore, of looking upon Puseyism as a supplement to the Evangelical revival, I regard it as adverse to that revival, tending to retard and to deprave the power and purity of the Gospel within our Church.

Though Pusey from time to time let fall expressions of pity rather than of hearty love for the Evangelicals, his attitude towards them gradually became one of devout estrangement. Nor is this surprising; for both the great parties within the Church of England know that each wants to hold the helm, and each to steer in a direction widely distant from the other. This fact gives dramatic vividness to the narrative. Pusey wished to make the Church of England mediæval; Evangelicals wished to keep her Protestant.

In this vital struggle it is material to know on which side lies the *à priori* right; in other words, what do the Articles and the formularies of the Church mean? All the world knows that Newman wrote Tract XC. to show that the Articles might be understood in a sense not Protestant—that is, in a Roman sense. Newman afterwards found that this would not do; the Church of England was too stubbornly Protestant for a man of his make. Pusey clung tenaciously to the paradox.

It is a delicately painful question, What was Pusey's ecclesiastical position in 1846? It is a larger and more momentous one, Is that position tenable within the Church of England without violating the laws of grammar, the conclusions of logic, and the obligations of conscientious loyalty?

On both these questions I propose, in conclusion, to make a few observations; but before doing so, I pause to sketch the contrast between Pusey and Newman—a contrast which throws a kind of tragic splendour around the speculative inquiry.

There is, probably, not in our ecclesiastical history a pair of names suggestive of more vivid contrast than those of Pusey

and Newman. No two of our reformers stand so close, so contrasted. Chillingworth had no *alter ego;* neither had Jeremy Taylor. Richard Baxter stood in solitary grandeur among the Puritans—at least, so far as concerns his fame with posterity. In the dreary annals of the eighteenth century no name vies in sacred renown with that of John Wesley. But neither John's saintly brother Charles, nor his splendid fellow-labourer George Whitfield, furnishes a contrast so strikingly pathetic as is that between Pusey and Newman. Newman was first in the field of Catholic reaction. The enterprise of reversing the Reformation became clear to his mind sooner than to Pusey's. From the outset he shaped the movement and led the van. For a long time the whole body of Tractarians followed his lead. When the moderates began to waver or to pause, the fervent advanced with Newman at their head. Step by step he moved further and further from the old positions, and nearer and nearer to Rome. He resigned his vicarage; for two years he hesitated at Littlemore, then he resigned his Fellowship. At length he seceded from the order, system, and life of Reformation Christianity. A scheme for bringing back the Church and realm of England into Roman obedience proved to be beyond even his wonderful powers. That great enterprise, if ever effected, must be prosecuted from without. Catholic principles had, indeed, been sown in the Church of England which might take root and flourish there, and thus prepare the wilderness of heresy to become the paradise of Catholic truth. But Newman felt sure that the Church of England, as she is, can never be Catholic. She is too deeply committed to Protestant Christianity by her spirit, her traditions, her relations with the civil power, her articles, homilies, and Prayer-Book, and, above all, by her deference to the Bible open in the hands of all her members. This Church cannot be amalgamated with the Catholic system. Before that amalgamation she must cease to exist; must die to herself and her past; must in penitent humiliation, abhorring the schism and the sin of three centuries, prostrate her pride at the feet of the Roman Pontiff, receive his absolution, and in newness and innocency of life start reconciled upon her path at the point whence she swerved in the evil days of 1532.

Not even Newman could effect so vast a revolution. His duty, therefore, to himself left him no alternative but to save his soul where alone his soul could feel sure of salvation.

In thus reasoning, Newman appears to me perfectly correct; the logic has no flaw. Granting the existence of a visible Church, with bishops and priests descended from the Apostles, and possessing exclusively, indefectibly, the deposit of grace

and truth, the Church of Rome is probably that Church, and the Church of England is probably not that Church. The truth of this postulate is that point where Protestants part company with Catholics. But to Newman it had become a necessity. His lucid understanding, reluctantly indeed, but inevitably, saw the issue of such Church principles. In this respect Pusey stands in contrast with Newman. His ardour for the Catholic view was not less than Newman's, but the clearness with which he conceived it was far inferior. His development of it, therefore, in his writings and in his life had none of that finish and fulness which belong to Newman. It cost him something, no doubt, but he never made for it those sacrifices which cut life to the root. He had not to renounce professional income, station, and prospects. He had not to break with his past; to confess himself deceived at forty-six; to descend from the eminence of a unique and trusted teacher to the low degree of a neophyte. Some have imputed Pusey's conduct to sordid motives; some have blamed Newman for temerity; but it cannot be doubted that, of the two, Pusey suffered least for the cause of which both were champions.

Nor is it in their career and character alone that these two friends present a contrast. Their mental gifts were very different. The most obvious point in this difference is their literary style. Pusey wrote a rugged, dark, and unmelodious speech, difficult to understand, and impossible to admire; its ugliness is occasionally repulsive. Newman's English, in its finest vein, is, perhaps, the most beautiful written in our century, and has no superior in the English of any age. Absolute clearness, natural simplicity, ease and strength, and aptitude for every theme, are its qualities. If Pusey was more technically learned, Newman had a wider and more varied knowledge. Pusey was no poet and no historian; Newman wrote exquisite verse, and had the true eye for history. Pusey dealt in details, with events as they arose; he cared less about great principles or the larger harmonies of things.

Had Newman been able to remain in the Church of England, he might have inflicted upon the Protestant religion a wound which no human skill could heal. Happily for the precious interests of the Church of the Reformation, he could not abide within her, and the work of her undoing passed from his hands into the less capable management of Pusey.

What, then, was Pusey's position when he and his friend reached the parting of the ways? Newman went boldly over to Rome. Some of Newman's disciples recoiled into that region of thin beliefs in which living Christianity breathes her last; others, like the Vicar of Leeds, remained in the Church of

England—anti-Roman at least, if not at heart Protestant. Pusey's position was not exactly the same as either of these, His secession was expected and prayed for by many devout Catholics. His tenderness for Rome had long been growing; it had shown itself in translations from Latin service-books, of Latin books of devotion, of Latin directories for priests. His favourite models not only belong to the Latin Church, but belong to the most Latin department of that Church. His gaze had been attracted to that ancient, vast, and gorgeous communion of which whoever looks upon her with clear and competent knowledge must confess that she is either the one holy and catholic Church or the Enchantress of Babylon.

Of this tenderness for Rome, and of the disparaging tone towards the Reformation, which grew together in Pusey's mind, examples abound, especially in the latter half of Dr. Liddon's second volume.

The later chapters, indeed, leave upon the mind the impression that Pusey, when Newman seceded, was ripe for seceding. He was Roman in almost everything but the name, with the Romanism of the Council of Trent, not of the ordinary Papist. The solution of the question, Why did Pusey not follow Newman? seems to be this: he did not think it worth while. He found himself holding a creed substantially the same with the creed of Newman, in a position which gave him opportunity and influence to teach the creed to many.

There were some points of difference between the two. Pusey could not worship the Virgin Mary, could not deny the cup to the laity, could not allow the Pope's supremacy in the Papist sense; but was it worth while to quit the Church of England for the sake of three or four Articles, when he could remain in her and with security propagate the rest? To all intents and purposes Pusey held and taught the doctrines of Trent in the Church of England. If the Anglican and the Roman are but two portions of one Church, why shift his position?

If this be a fair account of the matter, we are forced to inquire, Is such a position compatible with fidelity to the English Church? I do not hesitate to reply in the negative, without feeling obliged to charge Pusey with wilful and conscious unfaithfulness.

The question is not whether Protestantism or Romanism is the true religion, but whether the Church of England is Protestant or Roman. The former question must be answered by an appeal to the Bible; the latter by an appeal to history. Newman himself made this appeal, and because he found the verdict of history decisive in favour of the Protestantism of the Church of England, he quitted her. The shifts and

artifices by which Pusey evaded the witness of three centuries make a melancholy, and not honourable, exhibition. Wise and prompt firmness on the part of the Bishops might have averted the miserable sequel. By a dire dispensation, while Pusey was teaching in the Professor's chair, and Newman was preaching from St. Mary's pulpit, Bagot was Bishop of Oxford, and Howley Metropolitan of Canterbury. The pages which contain the letters of these two dignitaries make us burn, and sigh, and laugh by turns. Amiable and respectable in every private capacity, their published dealings with the Oxford school are, alas! faithful to the precedent of clerical misrule. The Archbishop appears wary and adroit; the Bishop of Oxford presents a spectacle of bewildered and mundane ineptitude. Having no clear views of their own, Howley and Bagot first patronized, then hectored, then muzzled the Tractarians. It was the old story over again. The ease and the sunshine of worldly prosperity produced in the Church a weak and tasteless theology, and rulers without strength.

A new era came. The Evangelical revival confounded by its novelty and spirituality prelates nurtured in an earthly tradition. A generation and a half later another movement, widely differing from the preceding, emerged from the stream of time. Once more the Bishops were unprepared to meet it. They could neither confute the arguments of the new teachers nor understand their temper and their design. Had they possessed profound erudition, they might have convinced the mass of English Churchmen that the new doctrines were untenable. Had they been men of splendid sanctity, they might have persuaded the earnest seekers after unworldly religion that the Church of England was the home of saints. Had they been inflexibly attached to the foundation-truths of the Protestant faith, they might have rigorously discouraged the advance of disguised Romanism.

The Prelates now before us appear neither as scholars, nor as saints, nor as rulers, but as officials whose golden rule was moderation, whose sovereign remedy was compromise, to whom peace meant torpor and novelty meant danger. It was impossible that such men should direct, control, or curb the genius of Newman and the sedulous zeal and activity of Pusey. For the ills that came after they are not a little responsible. Their feeble and temporizing rule only increased the trouble. They had the confidence neither of the Evangelicals, nor of the Tractarians, nor of the liberalizing sect. Thus forces antagonistic to each other acquired intensity and expanded, until they resulted in a conflict within the Church which cannot end without her detriment, and may end in her disruption.

H. J. R. Marston.