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CHAPTER 1

THE OXFORD MOVEMENT AND DR. PUSEY

An Anglican Church Today

Walk into a church in the Anglican Province of America on a Sunday morning and there are a number of things that an evangelical would find different from his normal worship experience. The eyes of this evangelical observer would first be drawn to the high altar in the sanctuary, which is the focal point of the interior of the church building. On the altar would be candles, and possibly a large, elaborately decorated wooden box centered over the altar (although the observer would not know the name of this box, the parishioners would call it the Tabernacle). There may be a single candle suspended from the ceiling, a bronze eagle staring out from the lectern, and even Stations of the Cross spaced evenly along the walls of the nave.

The parishioners would call the interior of the church where the pews are located, the nave, as opposed to the sanctuary, which is reserved for the East end of the church, where the altar is located. It is called the nave because it resembles the hull of a naval vessel from antiquity, and the nave may have transepts, which would give the church building a cruciform shape. In a transept, there could be included: a low altar, icons, votive candles, statues, pews to sit on, or any number of other ornaments. When the uninitiated evangelical sat down on a pew in the nave, he’d find a kneeler under the pew and notice parishioners kneeling while praying before the service began. At the beginning of service, the ministers would not be in the sanctuary; rather there would be procession
from the back of the nave (from the narthex) towards the sanctuary, being led by an acolyte carrying a processional crucifix.

The acolytes would have on black flowing cassocks with white surplices. The priest would be the last person in the procession and could be vested in a cope or in a chasuble. The observer would then notice quite a bit of bowing and genuflecting and walking and coming and going in the sanctuary amongst the acolytes and the priest.

An hour or so later, after the service has come to its conclusion, when the observer finally stepped outside, and took a deep breath of the fresh air, (there very well may have been incense burning during the service), he would feel as if he had just experienced something very different. Perhaps he would feel that he had been a part of something set apart from the outside world, something that had involved all of his senses: hearing, taste, touch, smell, and sight.

The evangelical Christian might well wonder, was this a Protestant service at all? If he had recently been to a Roman Catholic Mass, he would know that not even the local Roman parish looked this medieval. It was as if he had stepped back in time to the Middle Ages and been a part of something ancient and mysterious at this Anglican parish.

Churches in the Anglican Communion have not always looked like this (nor do they always look like this today, the scene described would be considered High Church or Anglo-Catholic in nature). The roots of such ritual practices can be traced back to the mid-nineteenth century, back to England, back to an ecclesiastical revival known as the Oxford Movement.
The Tractarians

At the turn of the nineteenth century, the Church of England was badly in need of reform. As the Established Church, it had devolved into an arm of government, hamstrung by a bloated bureaucracy and political intrigue. The leadership of the Church was inept and in places even morally corrupt. The Church clergy suffered from absenteeism, nepotism and graft.\(^1\) She was also losing some of her most vibrant members as the Methodists were forming their new denomination after the death of John Wesley in 1791.

The Parties that were most active in the Church at the time were: the Latitudinarians, the Evangelicals and the High Churchmen. With the Latitudinarians, continental rationalism was beginning to creep into their liberal tendencies. The Evangelicals were typically low churchmen, were enthusiastic, but beholden to the existential and subjective aspects of Christianity. Grafton compares the low churchmen to John the Baptist, crying out for an awakening, preaching a conversion to Christ.\(^2\) The High Churchmen were isolated Tory aristocrats and at times more concerned with politics than with theology.

Ecclesiastically, prior to 1828, all members of Parliament had to swear an oath to the Church of England and had to sign statements that foreswore Catholic doctrines such as transubstantiation. Due to this requirement of conformity, Catholics and Jews were not allowed to serve in Parliament. When Parliament repealed the Corporations and Test Acts


in 1828 and in the following year passed the Catholic Emancipation Act, in theory, they were giving Roman Catholics and Jews oversight of the Church of England.  

These Acts riled the Evangelical party in the Anglican Church, but it also upset the Tory High Church party that believed in the ecclesiastical authority of the ordained orders of Priest and Bishop. One of these high churchmen, John Keble, the poet, professor, scholar, and priest from Oxford, outraged by what he saw as a secularization of the Church, decided to take a stand.

In 1833, in the midst of the Industrial Revolution and the polluted spiritual climate of the age, John Keble, of Oriel College, Oxford went before the Judges of Assize at St. Mary’s Church, Oxford and preached a sermon before the assembled judges and laity. Keble warned of the dangers of national apostasy. In his sermon, he said that the Church of England was something more than an arm of the government. It was a real Church that had a right to stand on her own without interference from the government. He attacked the liberalism of the current generation, and the decay that had crept into the Church. In poetic language, Keble called for repentance from national apostasy and a return to true religion. He spoke boldly before the Judges of Assize saying,

God forbid, that any Christian land should ever, by her prevailing temper and policy, revive the memory and likeness of Saul, or incur a sentence of reprobation like his. But if such a thing should be, the crimes of that nation will probably begin in infringement on Apostolical Rights; she will end in persecuting the true Church; and in the several stages of her melancholy career, she will continually be led on from bad to worse by vain endeavours at accommodation and compromise


4 The Judges of Assize were a legal body that traveled circuits hearing judicial cases. Keble took the occasion to preach on National Apostasy.
with evil. Sometimes toleration may be the word, as with Saul when he spared the Amalekites; sometimes state security, as when he sought the life of David; sometimes sympathy with popular feeling, as appears to have been the case, when violating solemn treaties, he attempted to exterminate the remnant of the Gibeonites, in his zeal for the children of Israel and Judah (2 Sam. xxi. 2). Such are the sad but obvious results of separating religious resignation altogether from men's notions of civil duty.  

Keble’s passionate sermon left an impression on the judges and the congregation there present. John Keble’s sermon was well received by the Evangelicals and High Churchmen alike because it called for reform and sought to reestablish the autonomy of the Church as an ecclesiastical body and warned against the dangers of Liberalism. According to John Henry Newman, it was this sermon on July 14, 1833 that was the spark that ignited the Oxford Movement.

The Oxford Movement is best known for the tracts produced by its adherents, 90 in total from 1833 until 1841. The tracts came to be known as The Tracts for the Times, hence its members were known as Tractarians. The Tractarians were a group of concerned academics and clergymen, most of whom were close friends from Oxford University. They were all High Churchmen who looked in horror at the state of the Church of England. The Tractarians first met at Hadleigh Rectory, only a few weeks after Keble’s sermon. John Keble and John Henry Newman were invited but were unable to attend. Richard Froude, Hugh Rose, William Palmer, and Arthur Perceval were present. They agreed on two central premises: the importance of the Prayer Book, and a defense

---


of Apostolic Succession. After the meeting, Newman and Keble joined the group and, under John Henry Newman’s leadership, they set about writing the Tracts.⁸

Early in the movement, the Evangelicals and the Tractarians were allied. The Evangelicals supported the Tractarians’ call for the independence of the Church from the State, and for their call for reform of clerical abuses. The admiration was reciprocated as the Tractarians appreciated the Evangelical call to repentance and shared their zeal for converting people to Christ. But where the Evangelicals based their appeal on the more subjective existential values such as the positive feelings associated with conversion (something the Tractarians did not oppose, and supported), the Tractarians supplemented the existential teachings with an objectiveness rooted in ecclesiology and the sacraments.⁹

As time went on, the Evangelicals became wary of the Tractarians as the Tractarian positions became more Catholic in nature, and the two sides, perhaps inevitably, became full-fledged opponents over doctrinal issues.

Isaac Williams, one of the early Tractarians, writes of a conversation that took place in late 1833 that would not only change the course of the Oxford Movement, but the Anglican Church:

Pusey was at this time not one of us, and I have some recollection of a conversation which was the occasion of his joining us. He said, smiling to Newman, wrapping his gown round him as he used to do, “I think you are too hard on the Peculiars,¹⁰ as you call them. You should conciliate them; I am thinking of writing a letter myself with that purpose.” “Well!” said Newman,

---


⁹ Grafton, 22.

“suppose you let us have it for one of the Tracts!” “Oh, no, “ said Pusey, “I will not be one of you!” This was said in a playful manner; and before we parted Newman said, “Suppose you let us have that letter of yours which you intend writing, and attach your name or signature to it. You would then not be mixed up with us, nor in any way responsible for the Tracts!” “Well,” Pusey said at last, “if you will let me do that, I will.” It was this circumstance of Pusey attaching his initials to that tract, which furnished the Record and the Low Church party with his name, which they at once attached to us all.\textsuperscript{11}

\textbf{Edward Bouverie Pusey}

Edward Bouverie Pusey was born on August 22, 1800, the son of the Honorable Philip Pusey whose father was the Viscount Folkestone.\textsuperscript{12} He graduated from Christ Church, Oxford and became a fellow at Oriel College in 1824. He studied in Germany from 1826-1827 under Schleiermacher and Eichhorn at the University of Göttingen. In 1828, he returned to Oxford and was ordained deacon, then priest, in the Church of England, and then installed as the Regius Professor of Hebrew and Canon at Christ Church in Oxford.\textsuperscript{13}

Shortly after being installed as Professor of Hebrew, he was accused of harboring Rationalistic sympathies in part due to his time in Germany and some of his earlier writings. He vigorously defended himself against these charges. He did regard Schleiermacher highly on a personal level, and wrote that he believed Schleiermacher

\textsuperscript{11} Isaac Williams, \textit{The Autobiography of Isaac Williams, B.D.}, 3\textsuperscript{rd} ed. (London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1893), 70-72.


\textsuperscript{13} King Henry VIII established the Professorship; the position included a Canonship at Christ Church Cathedral, requiring an ordained Priest. Ordinarily before ordination into the priesthood, a yearlong deaconate is necessary; Dr. Pusey’s deaconate was shortened in order to install him into the Regius Professorship.
was “feeling his way back from rationalism towards positive truth.” Dr. Pusey maintained a warm personal relationship with Schleiermacher and was influenced by his emphasis on religious feeling, but Pusey remained suspicious of Schleiermacher’s theology, considering it pantheistic at points.

Dr. Pusey was a latecomer to the Tractarians. The first tract he wrote was Tract 18 on Fasting and published in January of 1834. His writing and scholarship was a marked improvement in the quality of the tracts and his academic standing gave the movement more credibility. The author and Anglican priest William Tuckwell was a student at Oxford during the 1850s and 60s and wrote of Pusey:

In learning Pusey stood probably supreme amongst English divines of his century: the other leaders of the [Oxford] movement – even Keble, much more Newman were by comparison half-educated men. They knew no German-he was an adept; they were not Orientalists- he had toiled over five years for sixteen hours a day at Hebrew, Arabic, Chaldee, under the Semitic scholar Freytag. His vast patristic knowledge is shown in his exhaustive catenæ, and in the “Library of the Fathers” which he conceived and conducted. He was familiar with the entire range of Protestant Reformation literature, with the English Deists of the seventeenth century, with the German Rationalists of the nineteenth.

---

14 Liddon, 1:82.
15 Ibid.
16 For an extended account of the events around Pusey’s first Tract, his immediate impact on the Tractarians and why he was the first to affix his initials to the Tracts see: Liddon, 1:279-284.
17 William Tuckwell, also known as the Radical Parson, was an advocate of Christian Socialism and was a champion of other progressive movements in the late nineteenth century. Owen Chadwick was distrustful of him as a source for the Oxford Movement because Tuckwell implies that he was at Oxford at an earlier time than he really was, but if it is understood that Tuckwell was a student at Oxford after the Oxford Movement, in the fifties and sixties, his Reminiscences can be valuable. For Chadwick’s view on Tuckwell see Owen Chadwick, *The Spirit of the Oxford Movement*, (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1990), 137.
18 The Library of the Fathers is an approximately 50 volume set of the writings of the Early Church Fathers translated into English. Pusey was the main force behind the project, serving as both editor, and translator. Keble and Newman also contributed to the project.
Isaac Williams also saw Pusey’s genius as unique, writing, “Setting aside the moral weight of Dr. Pusey’s character, and that of his station as Canon of Christ Church, as a man of genius, neither the University nor the nation have seen his superior for centuries.” Newman himself is no less complimentary, stating, “Dr. Pusey's influence was felt at once. He saw that there ought to be more sobriety, more gravity, more careful pains, more sense of responsibility in the Tracts and in the whole Movement. It was through him that the character of the Tracts was changed.”

**Significant Relationships**

There were three important persons in Dr. Pusey’s life that had an impact not only on his personal life, but also on his ecclesiastical life. The most obvious are his two fellow Tractarians, John Keble and John Henry Newman. Pusey knew both of these men from his earliest days at Oxford, in the early 1820s. The other was the love of his life, Maria Pusey (née Barker).

Of the Tractarian Triumvirate, John Keble (1792-1866) was the oldest and at the beginning of the Movement, the most well known. Pusey looked to Keble as a mentor years before the Movement began. In 1828, writing to his fiancée, Pusey states, “I always loved J.K…. all he has said and done and written makes me esteem him more. There is a moral elevation in his character which I know in no other.” Up until 1828, Bishop Lloyd had been Pusey mentor at Oxford, a father figure, that Pusey had looked up to, but

---


after Bishop Lloyd’s death in 1828, John Keble began to fill that role in Pusey’s life.\textsuperscript{23} That role culminated in Keble becoming Pusey’s confessor in 1846.

While Keble was a father figure and a moral model for Pusey, John Henry Newman (1801-1890) was a great friend and existential support. Pusey and Newman became close friends in 1823 and their friendship grew over the next several years, including a series of correspondences while Pusey was studying abroad. Pusey writes his wife about his admiration for Newman in 1835,

\begin{quote}
He [Newman] has held a steady course, I have not: I studied evidences, when I should have been studying the Bile: I was dazzled with the then rare acquaintance with German theology and over-excited by it: I thought to do great things, and concealed self under the mask of activity: I read; he thought also, and contemplated: I was busy; he tranquil: I, self-indulgent; he, self-denying: I exalted myself: he humbled himself.\textsuperscript{24}
\end{quote}

It is true that Pusey was of a different cut from Keble and Newman. He was the most academically inclined, and he held closer sympathies for the Evangelical party than either Keble or Newman. Pusey’s admiration for, and friendship towards, Keble and Newman, led him to gloss over possible theological differences in the 1830s. Pusey knew what was at stake in the Tractarians battle against secularism and liberalism and Pusey wanted to show a united front where perhaps he was not as Catholic as his fellow Tractarians.\textsuperscript{25} John Henry Newman writes in his autobiography,

\begin{quote}
I had from the first a great difficulty in making Dr. Pusey understand such differences of opinion as existed between himself and me. When there was a proposal about the end of 1838 for a subscription for a Cranmer Memorial,\textsuperscript{26} he
\end{quote}

\begin{footnotes}
\item\textsuperscript{23} Ibid., 63.
\item\textsuperscript{24} Ibid., 74.
\item\textsuperscript{25} Ibid., 76.
\item\textsuperscript{26} The Cranmer Memorial, also known as the Martyrs Memorial, was proposed after the posthumously published diaries of the Tractarian Richard Hurrell Froude. Froude’s writings were not sympathetic to the Marian Martyrs of the Reformation. The Martyrs Memorial was intended as a refutation
\end{footnotes}
wished us both to subscribe together to it. I could not, of course, and wished him to subscribe by himself. That he would not do; he could not bear the thought of our appearing to the world in separate positions, in a matter of importance.  

Keble and Newman were extremely significant in Pusey’s life, but of the three, Maria Pusey, is the hardest to quantify, and perhaps the most significant. Trench writes that it was love at first sight in the summer of 1818 when young Edward Pusey and Maria met when they were both 17 years old. Pusey went to Oxford six months later, and they would not see much of each other for the next eight years. During the Long Vacation of 1820, Pusey went to Paris to visit his brother Philip. Upon returning and disclosing his attachment to Maria to his parents, he was forbidden to see or to write to her. It wasn’t until 1826 that Pusey was able to contact Maria and they were engaged in 1827.

The Romantic Movement influenced Pusey and his wife. Before they were married, they shared a mutual interest in the poetry of Lord Byron. Pusey was particularly fond, and found comfort in the melancholy of Byron after his father forbade his relationship with Miss Barker. The introspective poetry of Byron did little to alleviate Pusey’s heartache, but Pusey read him voraciously during these years although he later came to regret it. Among Pusey’s other Romantic literary interests were family friends Samuel Taylor Coleridge and Sir Walter Scott. Pusey and his new bride spent part of of the Tractarians. The Memorial was completed in 1841 and stands to this day at Oxford. See Liddon 1:64-76 for the controversy surrounding the Memorial.


29 Ibid., 13.

30 Forrester, 10.

31 Trench, 16.

32 Forrester, 100.
their honeymoon in Abbotsford with Scott in 1828. Scott was a favorite author of many of the Tractarians who loved his Romantic and Gothic literature. To that end, the Tractarians would gather and celebrate Scott’s birthday each year.

Maria had a lively personality, while Pusey was stoic in demeanor. David Forrester, in his book, *Young Doctor Pusey*, hints at a codependent relationship in which Maria needed Pusey’s love and in turn Pusey needed to turn Maria from a boisterous lighthearted person into a somber and dour religious adherent. In this Forrester’s claims are open to serious questioning, as is Forrester’s claim that Pusey was particularly rough in punishing his children. These were accusations that were thrown at Pusey by his contemporary opponents, possibly originating in Pusey’s view of the seriousness of post-baptismal sin. William Tuckwell was familiar with these types of accusations while Pusey was alive, and inquired of Pusey if he had punished his children in an extreme manner; Pusey replied the he had never punished his children despite what his detractors had said. Tuckwell also records that Philip, Pusey’s son, when questioned about his punishments as a child, replied that the worst he could remember was his father yanking his ear and playfully calling him a “heathen” for reading a novel on a Sunday.

Responding to a written question by the author of this thesis, Dr. Barry Orford, Custodian of the Library and Archivist of Pusey House, Oxford, writes:

---

33 Trench, 57.
35 Forrester, 58-63.
36 Tuckwell, 143-144.
37 Ibid., 139.
I suspect that the approach to raising their children by Dr. Pusey and his wife would be seen as quite strict by the standards of today - there is a letter here from Edward Hawkins, the Provost of Oriel, reminding Pusey that children need to be allowed to run and play - but people must be judged by the standard of their own time, not ours. I can add that in the journal of Marion Milner, a document which I am editing, she gives rare evidence of the elderly Pusey at home, and it is clear that he was devoted to his grandchildren and loved to meet the children from the orphanage at Ascot Priory. She also gives invaluable witness to his kindness and sense of humour.\(^{38}\)

Pusey biographer Maria Trench, also goes to some lengths to show that Pusey had a good relationship with his children, and was generally very gentle and accommodating to children.\(^{39}\) As for his relationship with his wife, Forrester implies that Pusey dominated his wife into a religious piety, but this seems improbable following Forrester’s own description of their personalities: that Pusey was reserved, while Maria had a powerful personality. Tuckwell relates a poignant conversation he had with Pusey, showing Pusey’s deep feelings for his late wife,

> A common friend was sacrificing an important sphere of work in order to seek with his delicate wife a warmer climate, and I asked him [Pusey] – no doubt a priggish query – if the abandonment were justifiable on the highest grounds. “Justifiable?” he said, “I would have given up anything and gone anywhere, but-“; his voice shook, the aposiopesis remained unfilled.\(^{40}\)

Trench and Liddon both paint a picture that agrees with Tuckwell’s: that Pusey had a loving relationship with his wife, that included a mutual respect, and that Pusey was not the type of husband or father to use religion to intimidate and coerce his family into a forced piety.\(^{41}\) Dr. Orford writes, “Certainly Dr Pusey enjoyed a warm relationship

---

\(^{38}\) Barry Orford, e-mail message to author, January 10, 2012.

\(^{39}\) Trench, 381-385.

\(^{40}\) Tuckwell 138.

\(^{41}\) For a picture of Dr. Pusey’s home life, Trench relays a number of letters written by Pusey and his wife between 1837 and Maria’s death in 1839. These letters can be found: Trench, 112-118; 122-130; 135-159. Also see Liddon 1:81-106.
with his son Philip when the latter was a man, and Philip seems to have been much attached to his father.” This warmness in the relationship is evidenced in the fact that Philip worked and lived with his father until Philip’s untimely death in 1880. It will be shown that Pusey’s love for his family and the tragic deaths in his family moved Pusey to seek the substantial comfort that he found in the Eucharist. Forrester sees Pusey’s religion as forcing tragedy on the Pusey family; while one of the contentions of this thesis is that the tragedies in Pusey’s life, the loss of his wife Maria, and two young children Katherine and Lucy, moved Pusey towards defining his Eucharistic doctrine. It was in the Eucharist that Pusey found the comfort for which his soul longed.

**Pusey’s Doctrine of Scripture**

Of the Tractarians, Pusey was the leading Biblical scholar. He was involved in several controversies during his lifetime, but one of the most important ones involved what could be called anachronistically, Biblical inerrancy. As a high churchman, he oftentimes found himself at odds with the Evangelical party in the Church of England. It was a one-sided fight, with the Evangelicals attacking his positions, Pusey himself was fond of the Evangelical party, and was happy to come to its defense in matters of the faith, especially against the growing threat of Liberalism. Dr. Pusey wrote to his cousin, the Lord Shaftesbury in 1864,

> I always sought to live in peaceful relations with those who love our dear Lord and adore His redeeming mercy… I have ever loved the (to use the term) Evangelical party, even while they blamed me, because I believed that they loved

---

42 Barry Orford, e-mail message to author, January 10, 2012.
our Redeeming Lord with their whole hearts. So now I am one heart and one mind with those who will contend for our common faith against this tide of unbelief.\textsuperscript{43}

Dr. Pusey was in fact, one heart and one mind, with the Evangelicals over the defense of Scripture. At the urging of the Evangelicals he came to the defense of the book of Daniel, in the controversy over the veracity of the book. The Essayists who were students of the emerging schools of German higher criticism wrote essays condemning Daniel as provably false in light of modern liberal scholarship. In response, Dr. Pusey’s published his lectures titled: \textit{Daniel the Prophet}.\textsuperscript{44} Charles Spurgeon wrote of Dr. Pusey’s work on Daniel, “To Dr. Pusey's work on Daniel all subsequent writers must be deeply indebted, however much they may differ from him in other departments of theological study.”\textsuperscript{45} Spurgeon also commented on Pusey’s work on the Minor Prophets, “All authorities speak of this work with great respect and so would we; but it is evident that Dr. Pusey is far too much swayed by patristic and mediaeval commentators.”\textsuperscript{46}

Liddon summed up Pusey’s view of scripture, “It was neither Scripture interpreted by the individual, nor tradition, nor a philosophy independent of Scripture, but Scripture interpreted by the consent of the Fathers, which was the real rule of catholic and Christian Faith.”\textsuperscript{47} Pusey saw Scripture as the first authority and then the Church Fathers as the means to understand the Scriptures. Pusey writes on Scripture, “”Scripture is the

\begin{itemize}
\item [43] Trench, 405.
\item [44] Edward Pusey, \textit{Daniel the Prophet}, (Oxford: John Henry and James Parker, 1864.)
\item [46] Trench, 189.
\item [47] Liddon, 3:422.
\end{itemize}
document of faith, tradition the witness of it; the true Creed is the Catholic interpretation of Scripture, or Scripturally proved tradition.” \(^{48}\)

**Pusey and the Eucharist**

Beginning in 1836, Dr. Pusey began to focus his considerable intellect on the Anglican doctrine of the Holy Eucharist. He wrote Tract 81 on the Doctrine of the Eucharistic Sacrifice, and then preached two pivotal sermons- ten years apart- that would change the Anglican Church forever. These sermons were: “The Holy Eucharist: A Comfort to the Penitent”, preached in 1843 at Christ Church Cathedral, and “The Presence of Christ in the Eucharist”, preached in 1853 also at Christ Church. During this time from the early 1840s through the mid 1850s, a number of prominent Clergy and theologians from the Church of England seceded to Rome. Amongst these was Pusey’s close friend and fellow Tractarian John Henry Newman. Pusey biographer Henry Liddon remarked that Pusey was a “marked man, and that he was considered dangerous by many” since he decided to remain in the Church of England and to fight for the High Church cause.\(^ {49}\)

The following Chapters will explore these three pivotal treatises of Dr. Pusey. These treatises and Pusey’s supplemental work on the Eucharist form a theological basis for the ritual practice that is such a large part of High Church or Anglo-Catholic Anglicanism to this day. Dr. Pusey himself was not a ritualist, and was much more concerned with personal piety, sound doctrine, and reverence for the Sacrament. When


\(^{49}\) Liddon, 1:399.
the ritualist movement began as an offspring of the Oxford Movement, Pusey himself was reticent to lend his support, but he did end up supporting many of the persecuted ritualists because their goal was reverence for the Holy Eucharist. For Pusey, ritualism was not an end unto itself.

Dr. Pusey was a eminent Anglican Divine, whose doctrine of the Holy Eucharist, has had a effect on Anglicanism to this day, but his teachings of piety and devotion associated with the Holy Eucharist have been somewhat obscured over time, although the ritual has remained. It is the hope of this author that the proper understanding of Dr. Pusey’s doctrine of the Eucharist for Anglicans will edify the Church by bringing back to the forefront the doctrine Pusey taught of the mystical union- the “piercing beyond the veil”- that takes place between Christ and His Holy Church through the Eucharist.
CHAPTER 2

THE SACRIFICE OF THE EUCHARIST

1836

Edward Pusey and Maria were married in 1828. Between 1828 and 1836, Maria had given birth to four children: Lucy born in 1829, Philip born in 1830, and Mary born in 1833. Katherine born in January of 1832, had been baptized by Newman shortly thereafter, but sadly died later in that year.¹ By 1836, Dr. Pusey and Maria had begun sacrificially giving to the Church and leading a more austere lifestyle. They sold their carriage in 1836, and in 1837 Mrs. Pusey sold her jewels.² The proceeds for both went to the Bishop of London’s Fund.³ Also in 1836, Pusey and his wife opened their house to several young men who would stay and read for a Divinity degree. Pusey believed that the wealth he had been given was meant for the Church rather than his personal convenience.⁴

Later in 1836, Dr. Pusey wrote Tract 81 entitled: “Testimony of Writers of the Later English Church to the Doctrine of the Eucharistic Sacrifice.” The Tract was divided into two parts; the first part was an introduction to the topic by Dr. Pusey and is over

² Maria Trench, The Story of Dr. Pusey’s Life, (London: Longmans, Green, and Co, 1900) 99,115.
³ The Bishop of London’’s Fund was a charity designed to build churches for the poor around London. Pusey began to express an interest in contributing to this fund in 1835. Trench, 92-93.
⁴ Trench, 107.
sixty pages long. The second part is a *Catena Patrum*, which translated means literally “chain of the fathers”. The *Catena* was meant to demonstrate that, like links in a chain, quotes from Anglican divines since the Reformation, revealed the acceptance of a certain doctrine.

Tract 81 was the fourth *Catena* in the Tracts for the Times. The first three, composed by different authors, dealt with Apostolic Succession, Baptismal Regeneration, and Church Tradition. The Tractarians were always concerned with the Church of antiquity, but the *Catena* was meant to be uniquely Anglican and to show the existence amongst Anglican divines of the doctrines being propounded. Tract 81 would contain extended excerpts of writings from 65 divines (many more than the previous *Catena*es) starting with the Anglican Reformers and ending with Bishop Phillpotts who was the current Bishop of Exeter.

**Tract 81**

In Tract 81, we see the beginning of Dr. Pusey’s Eucharistic doctrine; it is his first published work on the subject. Originally Pusey had been asked to complement his Tract on Baptism with a Tract on Adult Baptism, but Pusey felt inclined to write on the Eucharist which led to Tract 81, saying “my own wishes, as you know lead me to Absolution and the Lord’s Supper.”

The author David Newsome believes that Pusey’s most important contribution to the Oxford Movement was his teaching on post-baptismal sin and the significance of sin

---

5 Liddon, 2:31.
and the forgiveness of sin for a Christian. ⁶ Newsome writes that the connection between Pusey’s doctrine of baptismal regeneration and his Eucharistic doctrine are so connected that it would be impossible to separate the two: “[The] supreme importance of [the Eucharist’s] mediatory role was so closely related to his baptismal teaching, that challenging one would have to at least partially repudiate the other.” ⁷

The Doctrine of the Sacrifice of the Eucharist was an important doctrine for Pusey because he held such a serious and somber view of sin. Pusey’s Tracts of 67, 68, and 69 were his great baptismal treaty, on baptismal regeneration, and the seriousness of post baptismal sin. Sin was so horrible, such an estrangement from God, that Dr. Pusey felt it was his pastoral duty to revive and expound on the doctrine of the sacrifice of the Eucharist as a way to elevate the importance of the Sacrament from its current neglected position in the Church of England. Pusey did not intend to innovate or pronounce a new doctrine, he simply wanted to express what he believed was the forgotten and lost doctrine of the sacrifice of the Eucharist. Historian Peter Nockles notes that, “Initially, the Tractarians were concerned only to exalt the importance of the sacrament and did not engage in doctrinal speculation.” ⁸ Tract 81 was not meant to be speculative, rather it was supposed to be the grounds for a theological understanding of the Eucharist.

Church attendance for the celebration of the Holy Eucharist had fallen to such a low point at that time that Dr. Pusey felt the compulsion to bring the issue to the forefront. He writes: “foreign Reformers have brought down our celebrations of the

---


⁷ Ibid.

Communion from weekly to monthly, or quarterly, or three times in the year.”⁹ Dr. Pusey and the Tractarians desired to change this formula, to turn it around, and to increase the frequency of Communion, because they saw the Sacraments, and specifically the Eucharist as capable of bringing healing to the Church through the sacramental grace it bestowed.

Dr. Pusey was struck by how often the word Sacrifice was connected to the Eucharist, both in the works of the Church Fathers and in the Anglican Divines.¹⁰ As his opponent William Goode¹¹ pointed out, the word Sacrifice can have many different meanings,¹² but Dr. Pusey set out to define what the Sacrifice of the Eucharist meant from a distinctly Anglican perspective.

This was a difficult and challenging task because there was no unified Anglican Eucharistic doctrine. Newman believed that the growing influence of Arminianism was even further fragmenting the Church of England’s Eucharistic doctrine. Newman wrote that the “cold Arminian doctrine”¹³ of the Eucharist was causing much harm to Anglicanism.¹⁴ One of the goals of the Tractarians was to unify Anglican doctrine. The task of unifying the doctrine of the Eucharist fell largely to Dr. Pusey.

---


¹⁰ Ibid., 2:31.

¹¹ William Goode held an M.A. from Cambridge and was the Rector of St. Antholin, London. For a number of years he was the editor of the Evangelical periodical the Christian Observer.


¹⁴ Newman believed the Arminians held their view of justification in an almost sacramental way, in which obedience solely provided grace and the Eucharist was bereft of grace. For more on Newman’s discussion on the Eucharist and the Arminian position see, John Henry Newman, Lectures on the Doctrine of Justification, (London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1908) 182-185.
Dr. Pusey began Tract 81 by establishing what the ancient Church taught on the Sacrifice of the Eucharist. In looking to the ancient Church, Dr. Pusey did not believe that the Church came to the Doctrine of the Sacrifice of the Eucharist by reason, but rather that they were taught it, and they received it, and that it was not a point of contention in the early Church.\(^\text{15}\) The ancient heresies of the Church were much more thoroughly written about, Dr. Pusey explains, because of their controversial nature, but the sacrifice of the Eucharist was outside of the realm of controversy. This meant that the Sacrifice is often referred to by the Fathers but rarely expounded upon. Dr. Pusey summed up the view of the ancient Church on the Sacrifice of the Eucharist as this:

This commemorative oblation or sacrifice they doubted not to be acceptable to God who had appointed it; and so to be also a means of bringing down God’s favor upon the whole Church. And, if we were to analyze their feeling in our way, how should it be otherwise, when they presented to the Almighty Father the symbols and memorials of the meritorious Death and Passion of His Only-Begotten and Well-Beloved Son, and besought Him by that precious Sacrifice to look graciously upon the Church which He had purchased with his own Blood – offering the memorials of that same Sacrifice which He, our great High-Priest, made once for all, and now being entered within the veil, unceasingly presents before the Father, and the representation of which He has commanded us to make?\(^\text{16}\)

### The English Reformation

Dr. Pusey describes how it is possible that a doctrine can be maintained by a Church but not be an overtly promulgated doctrine. Dr. Pusey deemed that such a doctrine could be, “withdrawn from sight… less it be misapplied or profaned.”\(^\text{17}\)

\(^{15}\) Pusey, *Tract 81*, 5.

\(^{16}\) Ibid., 5.

\(^{17}\) Pusey, *Tract 81*, 2.
Pusey believed that the doctrine of the Sacrifice of the Eucharist was just such a doctrine. Dr. Pusey argues that the doctrine had been known and passively accepted but not prominently taught since the Reformation. This lack of prominence for the doctrine caused it to fall into obscurity, which was the current occasion for the writing of Tract 81.

In Tract 81, it is revealing which authorities Dr. Pusey accepts and which he rejects. In the *Catena*, it is notable that Dr. Pusey treats the English Reformers with a great deal of respect, even defending Archbishop Cranmer, something that many of the other Tractarians would not be inclined to do. Froude wrote to Newman complaining of Pusey’s views: “I have to grumble at you for letting Pusey call the Reformers, the Founders of our Church… *Pour moi*, I never mean, if I can help it, to use any phrases even, which connect me with such a set.”18 Much to the annoyance of even Newman, Pusey once referred to Calvin as a Saint.19 Dr. Pusey was sympathetic to the Reformers. He realized that Cranmer was an extremely complex individual who lived in a difficult time and that Cranmer’s resulting theology and the Prayer Books produced under him were a reflection of this time of turmoil.

Dr. Pusey wrote that the doctrine of the Sacrifice began to fall into obscurity when the Anglican Reformers were under duress, and were heavily influenced negatively by Continental Reformers. Specifically Cranmer was influenced and pressured by Peter Martyr Vermigli and Martin Bucer during the writing of the 2nd Edwardian Prayer Book of 1552. It was produced 3 years after the 1549 Prayer Book that had been written in close conjunction with Bishop Nicholas Ridley. Dr. Pusey saw the 1549 Prayer Book as a truer reflection of the English Reformation, because it featured the doctrine of Sacrifice.

---


19 Liddon, 1:234. MS of letter from Newman to Pusey dated December 5, 1832.
more prominently than the 1552 Prayer Book. Dr. Pusey believed that due to the inadequacies of the 1552 Prayer Book the English Reformation didn’t truly come to an end until after the Caroline Divines and the completion of the 1662 Prayer Book. Dr. Pusey writes,

The Divines of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries had different offices; in the sixteenth, we are to look for strong broad statements of truths… in the seventeenth we have the calmer, deeper statements of men to whom God had given peace from the first conflict… a well-proportioned and equable exhibition of the several parts of the Catholic Faith, which was, in the appointed order of things, rather reserved for the Seventeenth.  

Pusey also wrote of the negative influence that Peter Martyr Vermigli, Martin Bucer, and John A’Lasco, had on Anglican theology after the 1552 Prayer Book, which had lasting consequences on subsequent Prayer Books. Pusey said,

When this our genuine English Liturgy, was framed, one foreign reformer only of any note, [P. Martyr] had arrived in England; A’Lasco, whose influence was subsequently most pernicious, and Bucer, came not until the Liturgy was completed. But the kindness wherewith England has made itself the refuge of the oppressed, was in this case also abused… we find the poor Archbishop unhappily surrounded by foreigners, who had in their own countries rejected Episcopacy, some, the doctrines of the Sacraments.

Pusey noted that one of the most obvious differences between the two Prayer Books were the words of administration at the Eucharist. The words of administration in the 1549 Prayer Book are derived from the much older Sarum rite and are: “The Body of our Lord Jesus Christ, which was given for thee, preserve thy body and soul unto everlasting life.” In the 1552 Prayer Book these words of administration were replaced

---


22 The Sarum Rite was an 11th century liturgy that originated in Salisbury, England under Bishop Osmund. For more on the formation of the Anglican Liturgy and the Sarum Rite see, Massey Shepherd, *The Worship of the Church*, (Greenwich, Connecticut, Seabury Press, 1952), 86-91.
and the new sentence: “Take and eat this in remembrance that Christ died for thee, and feed on him in thy heart by faith, with thanksgiving.” was taken from the Protestant Hermann’s book *Consultation*.  

The same pattern can be seen in the sentences pertaining to the Cup. The 1549 Prayer Book reads, “The Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, which was shed for thee, preserve thy body and soul unto everlasting life.” The 1552 Prayer Book instead says, “Drink this in remembrance that Christ’s Blood was shed for thee and be thankful.” As a compromise, both sets of sentences were used in Queen Elizabeth’s 1559 Prayer Book. Both sentences also remained in the 1662 Prayer Book. Pusey uses the differences in the Words of Administration as the prime example of the differences in the two Edwardian Prayer Books and how the more explicit idea of Sacrifice began to be removed or hidden in the Liturgy due to outside influences. Pusey also notes that Queen Elizabeth restored the Communion Tables to where the Altars had once been in the Churches, at least implying the sacrificial nature of the Eucharist while still allowing them to be called either Holy Tables or Altars. Dr. Pusey writes,

On the accession of Q. Elizabeth, the worst alteration, that of the words used at the delivery of the holy elements, was modified so as to restore the old doctrine of a real Communion… and with regard to her doctrine of the Sacrifice, the restoration of the Communion table to the place which the altar had formerly occupied, showed that the Church recognized the doctrine.

---


24 Both sets of sentences remain in the 1928 American Prayer Book, reflecting both the Commemoration and Oblation of the Sacrament.


26 Ibid., 19.
It was Newman and not Pusey who first insisted on using the term Altar instead of Holy Table. Despite this, Pusey noted that Newman (while still an Anglican) consecrated from the North end of the Altar (as directed by the 1662 Prayer Book), instead of facing East with his back to the congregation, which was the preferred orientation of many Anglo-Catholics. Pusey admits that the term altar conjures to mind “Romish Sacrifice.” Pusey himself was quite conservative when it came to ornamentation of churches and ministers.

Of the Anglican Reformers, Dr. Pusey most closely identified with Bishop Ridley, one of the three Oxford Martyrs. Nicholas Ridley was the Bishop of London and had been Archbishop Cranmer’s personal chaplain. He was closely associated with the writing of the 1549 Prayer Book, and with the removal of the stone altars from the churches in London. Ridley’s Eucharistic doctrine was complex and was influenced heavily by Ratramnus’ book on the Eucharist that denied a real physical presence in the Eucharist. Pusey writes that Bishop Ridley was a moderating force between Cranmer and the more radical reformers: A’Lasco, and Bishop Hooper, both of whom had been heavily influenced by Zwingli. Pusey writes, “It was, then, natural that Cranmer should

---


vacillate, and that the more as to the doctrine of the Eucharist, since he had arrived at the Catholic views, through the aid of Ridley, and contrary perhaps to his own bias.”

MacCulloch, in his biography of Cranmer, writes that Ridley was able to secure the support of Vermigli and Bucer for the 1549 Prayer Book and its inclusion of wearing vestments by isolating Hooper and A’Lasco and making it difficult for the Continental Reformers to support Hooper and A’Lasco’s radical position. Ridley prevailed and vestments were kept in the 1549 Prayer Book. The Continental Reformers Bucer and Vermigli had a greater influence on the 1552 Prayer Book than did Ridley. Both Continental Reformers wrote critiques of the 1549 Prayer Book and were asked by the English government to work on the new Prayer Book with Cranmer.

Pusey wrote that the Anglican Reformers were under pressure to leave unwritten the proper understanding of the Eucharistic Sacrifice due to the influence of Continental Reformers. After explaining the circumstance of the English Reformation, Dr. Pusey turns to the Church Fathers for an untainted understanding of the doctrine of the Eucharistic Sacrifice. Dr. Pusey held the Church Fathers high in his esteem—writing,

Reverence for and deference to the ancient Church, of which our own Church is looked upon as the representative to us, and by whose views and doctrines we interpret our own Church when her meaning is questioned or doubtful; in a word, reference to the ancient Church, instead of the Reformers as the ultimate expounder of the meaning of our Church.

---


31 Diarmaid MacCulloch, *Thomas Cranmer: A Life*, (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1996), 480. This isolation was in part due to pressure put on A’Lasco for not adopting English practices in the Polish exile Church he was leading in England.

32 MacCulloch, 505.

33 Liddon, 2:140.
Dr. Pusey explains that the Church Fathers had to couch the terms and understanding of the Eucharistic Sacrifice in such a way as to distinguish it from the sacrifices of the Jews and Pagans. It is plain that they use the term Sacrifice, and they use it often, but they used such terms as “commemorative sacrifice” and “unbloody sacrifice.” Pusey places the word Sacrifice into the context of the world in which the Church Fathers lived,

They [Church Fathers] preferred to speak of it in language which, while it guarded against the errors of their days, the confusion with the sacrifices of Jew or Pagan, expressed their reverence for the memorials of their Saviour’s Body and Blood and named it ‘the awful and unbloody sacrifice.’

**Impetratory Sacrifice**

When reading the Fathers, Pusey believed that their teaching on the Eucharist consisted of two parts: the “commemorative sacrifice” and the “communion.” In Tract 81 he does not much discuss the latter part, the “communion,” it will be much more fully explored in his 1843 sermon, “The Holy Eucharist, a Comfort to the Penitent.” Rather Tract 81 is concerned with the first part: the “commemorative sacrifice.” Dr. Pusey writes that the “commemorative sacrifice” is an impetratory sacrifice, a commemoration that effectually pleads for alleviation of sin for the penitent.

In the *Catena*, Pusey quotes Herbert Thorndike who describes the sacrifice as an impetratory sacrifice joined with the Sacrament. “The Sacrifice of Christ upon the Cross, propitiatory and impetratory for them who communicate in it by receiving the elements.”

---

34 Pusey, *Tract 81*, 5-6.

means making satisfaction or appeasing. Dr. Pusey makes very clear his view of Christ once offered on Calvary, and that Christ alone is the Christian’s propitiation. The Eucharist is not a re-propitiation, but a re-presentation, a pleading of the propitiation of Christ’s cross, in which there is benefit to the communicant through the impetration.

William Goode, the evangelical author, wrote a response to the Tracts in 1842, and he directly responds to Tract 81 arguing against the idea that there is an impetratory Sacrifice in the Eucharist. He agrees that in one sense “sacrifice” is an appropriate term if it has to do with Christians sacrificing their hearts, or a sacrifice of praise or thanksgiving to God. But Goode rejects any notion that the Eucharist has any value that can be presented to God in a way that produces forgiveness. He argues that Pusey gives the Eucharist a stand-alone propitiatory nature, but Pusey explicitly denies this writing to the Bishop of London,

I believe most entirely, that the Offering of Christ once made is that perfect redemption, propitiation, and satisfactory for all sins of the whole world, both original and actual; and there is no other satisfaction for sin, but that alone. 

John Cumming joins Goode in arguing against the Sacrifice of the Eucharist being propitiatory. Cumming argues that there are thousands of Sacrifices a day that are well pleasing to God, such as a prayer, alms-giving, doing good, but these are in no way propitiatory. Cumming is unable to rise above partisanship when he specifically says

36 Goode, 2:102.
38 John Cumming was a Scotch Presbyterian minister at Covent Garden, located in London.
39 John Cumming, Lectures on Romanism, (Boston: Jewett and Company, 1854), 163.
that the views of the author of Tract 81 are identical to transubstantiation.\textsuperscript{40} It is a hollow accusation when Tract 81 is more thorough in denouncing transubstantiation than Cumming’s own lectures. Pusey quotes Bishop Ridley, “Transubstantiation is the very foundation, whereon all their erroneous doctrine doth stand.”\textsuperscript{41} Then Pusey adds, “Transubstantiation (as is well known) was not expressed or implied in any of the Liturgies used anywhere in the Church, down to this very period.”\textsuperscript{42}

Dr. Pusey never uses the word propitiatory in relation to the Eucharist itself in the Tract, although in the \textit{Catena}, some of the divines do use this word; instead Pusey writes that the Eucharist is impetratory. When Pusey writes against the Roman abuses of the Eucharistic doctrine, he specifically writes that the Eucharist is not propitiatory for souls in Purgatory, and later Pusey completely clarifies this point in his letter to the Bishop of London, in defense of the Tracts, writing that the belief that the Eucharist is propitiatory (in and of itself) is to be believed under the “pain of anathema.”\textsuperscript{43}

This is a point where the Tractarians may have disagreed amongst themselves. Liddon notes that in 1836 Newman writes to Pusey saying, “As to the sacrificial view of the Eucharist, I do not see that you can find fault with the formal wording of the Tridentine Decree. Does not the Article on “the Sacrifices of Masses,” supply the doctrine or notion to be opposed?”\textsuperscript{44} Pusey does not accept this argument completely as is shown in Tract 81, where he writes about the two major abuses of the Roman church in

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{40} Ibid., 162.
\item \textsuperscript{41} Pusey, \textit{Tract 81}, 11, citing from Nicholas Ridley, \textit{Brief Declaration of the Lord’s Supper}, 16.
\item \textsuperscript{42} Pusey, \textit{Tract 81}, 11.
\item \textsuperscript{43} Pusey, \textit{Letter to Bishop of London}, 29.
\item \textsuperscript{44} Liddon, 2:33.
\end{itemize}
the doctrine of the Eucharistic Sacrifice as he sees them: transubstantiation and purgatory.

**Roman Abuses**

Pusey first addresses the issue of transubstantiation. He believed that to conflate transubstantiation with the doctrine of the Eucharistic Sacrifice leads to the error of believing that Christ himself is offered again in the Mass. Pusey quotes Pierre Nicole, the Roman Catholic Theologian: “the Sacrifices on the Cross and the Altar were the same, because it is the same Jesus Christ who offers Himself in the one as in the other.” Pusey argues against the Eucharistic Sacrifice having any merit independent of the Cross. Pusey has kind words for the Reformers, rebuking Rome for shedding the blood of Reformers who moved against the ramifications of transubstantiation, while refusing to address the issue of “a fresh immolation and death.” Later, Dr. Pusey clearly states that the “Doctrine of the sacrifice cannot be the same, where transubstantiation is held and where it is not.”

“If the ‘true and proper sacrifice’ in the Tridentine decree means ‘an actual immolation of the real and substantial Body and Blood of Christ’, an Anglican must reject it according to Pusey; if on the other hand, it could have meant only “a real oblation, commemorative of the One Sacrifice of our Lord and pleading and applying its merits, the phrase in itself would have nothing objectionable.”

---

46 Ibid.
47 Ibid., 47.
48 Ibid.
Secondly, Pusey takes issue with the Roman doctrine of Purgatory and how it relates to the Eucharistic Sacrifice. In Medieval times, it was believed that most people went to Purgatory upon death, and that the pains of Purgatory were nearly as unbearable as the pains of hell. The only practical way for the soul in Purgatory to be alleviated of the pains endured was the Sacrifice of the Mass. In essence, to the medieval mind, saying Mass redeemed people, not Christ once offered on the Cross. Pusey acknowledges that this error was technically corrected at Trent, but still sees the underlying issue to be transubstantiation. Without transubstantiation, there would not have been the abuses such as private masses for the dead and a misunderstanding of the Sacrifice of the Eucharist.

**Sacrifice in Scripture**

Biblically, Dr. Pusey believed the doctrine of the Eucharistic Sacrifice was expounded in the Old Testament through prophecy and typology. In the New Testament he saw it in the Words of Institution and in the allusions to the Christian Altar. “In the Eucharist,” Pusey wrote, “an oblation or sacrifice was made by the Church to God, under the form of His creatures of bread and wine, according to our Blessed Lord’s holy institution, in memory of His Cross and Passion.”[^49] This was the “pure offering” that the Gentiles would offer according to Malachi, enjoined by the Lord in the words “Do this for a memorial of Me;” and that was alluded to in the Christian “altar” found in Matthew 5:23 and Hebrews 13:10.[^50] Pusey sees in Abel’s sacrifice a type of the Eucharist[^51] as he also sees the Eucharist in Melchizedek’s meal with Abraham.[^52]

[^50]: Pusey sees in Abel’s sacrifice a type of the Eucharist as he also sees the Eucharist in Melchizedek’s meal with Abraham.
In the Old Testament, Dr. Pusey sees the relationship between the Eucharistic Sacrifice and the Sacrifice of Christ on the cross, as similar to the relationship between the first Passover sacrifice and the subsequent Passover sacrifices. The Passover meal was a meal on a sacrifice, or an oblation. Our Lord’s Supper is likewise an oblation, a meal on a sacrifice once offered, but perpetuated through Christ’s ordinance and command. Again, this was an unbloody sacrifice that had no merit outside of Calvary, but was connected to Calvary through Mystery- not the unity of transubstantiation.\textsuperscript{53} Dr. Pusey sums up the difference between his position and that of his opposition thus: “The real point of difference between the primitive Church and modern views, is whether there be in this oblation a mystery or no.”\textsuperscript{54}

\textbf{Catena Patrum}

The \textit{Catena} proper of Tract 81 begins with Bishop Jewell, the Anglican Reformer, and ends with the then current Bishop of Exeter Phillpotts. The purpose of the \textit{Catena} was to show that the Doctrine of the Eucharistic Sacrifice was known by a continuous chain of Anglican divines from the time of the Reformation to the present time. The divines are normally quoted in the context of distinguishing the Anglican position from

\textsuperscript{50} Ibid., 5.

\textsuperscript{51} Ibid, 39.

\textsuperscript{52} Dr. Pusey addresses the 16\textsuperscript{th} century controversy over whether a Christian Church should have a Table or an Altar. The argument is that the Last Supper was served on a table. But Dr. Pusey counters with the references to the Christian Altar as well as to the witness of the Ancient Church.

\textsuperscript{53} Pusey, \textit{Tract 81}, 50.

\textsuperscript{54} Ibid. 60.
the Roman Catholic position. A typical exchange in the Catena is found on page 64 under the writings of Bishop Bilson:

Philander (Romanist). All the Fathers with one consent stand on our side for the Sacrifice.

Theophilus (Anglican). … the Fathers with one consent call not your private Mass, that they never knew, but the Lord’s Supper a Sacrifice, which we both willingly grant and openly teach.

The Evangelical William Goode objects to the Catena, saying that putting such a broad range of Divines and Fathers together, who mean the word Sacrifice in different senses, is essentially deceitful. Goode uses the Anglican Reformer Richard Hooker as an example of Pusey’s misuse of quotes. Pusey quotes, “this cup, hallowed with solemn benediction, availeth to the endless life and welfare both of soul and body, in that it serveth as well for a medicine to heal our infirmities and purge our sins, as for a sacrifice of thanksgiving.” Goode counters with a quote from Hooker that would seem to lessen or negate the Sacrificial nature of the Eucharist: “The Church of Christ… although it have properly now no Sacrifice… in truth the word presbyter seem more fit (than the title priest).” Goode admits that the term “sacrifice” is often used with the Eucharist, acknowledging that even the Reformer Beza used the word Sacrifice in this context. Goode points out that most of the writings of the Divines are in the context of refuting Romanism and transubstantiation, a point that Pusey also makes. Goode believes that this engagement with Romanism muddies the waters to the point that it is too difficult to make out what the Divines meant by the term Sacrifice.

55 Goode, 2:106.
56 Pusey, Tract 81, 70.
57 Goode, 2:107.
Dr. Pusey never makes any attempt to argue that the *Catena* represents the comprehensive view of the Divines listed. In fact when referencing the English Reformers; he specifically recognizes that they held different views at different times, and that Cranmer specifically was under duress and vacillated between positions.\(^{58}\) He does note that he has left a number of sources out of the *Catena* because he felt that their overall views would have been contrary to the ancient Church’s understanding of the Sacrifice of the Eucharist, and therefore not germane to the Tract. He was aware that he would be ridiculed if he was found to have used quotes out of context.\(^{59}\) But Pusey is content if a Divine at least acknowledges that there is a doctrine of Sacrifice in the Eucharist, even if the view of that Divine is murky, it means the Divine at least recognized the existence of the doctrine. Assent is not necessary for its existence, and he wanted to prove the unbroken chain of the doctrine’s existence.

**Difficulty with Terminology**

The difficulty for both parties, Tractarian and Evangelical, was that the term Sacrifice is difficult to comprehend when used in such a varied fashion. Hooker is not against the term Sacrifice, as Goode himself is not against it, and agrees that the Eucharist contains sacrificial elements such as the praise and thanksgiving of the communicants. Hooker is against, as is Pusey, considering the Eucharistic Sacrifice a re-offering of Christ on the Christian altar. Pusey was privy to counsel from fellow

\(^{58}\) Pusey, *Tract 81*, 16.

\(^{59}\) Ibid., 60.
Tractarian John Keble, widely acknowledged as the foremost scholar on Hooker at the time, so Pusey no doubt had a depth of knowledge concerning Hooker’s views and still thought it proper to add him to the *Catena.*

The problem occurs with the words propitiation, oblation, and impetratory sacrifice. Is there an inherent value in the Eucharist that is outside of Christ’s propitiation on the Cross? All would agree, including the Roman Catholics, in theory, that there is not. But the Roman Catholics are the most in danger of this error according to Dr. Pusey because of their belief in transubstantiation, which can lead to serious abuses. Dr. Pusey clearly does not believe there is any re-propitiation in the Eucharistic Sacrifice. Rather the Eucharistic Sacrifice is a re-presentation of Christ’s Sacrifice on the Cross unified in mystery not in unity of substance. In the *Catena* he quotes Bishop Jewell quoting St. Augustine, “Christ hath given us to celebrate in His Church, an image or token of that Sacrifice for the remembrance of His Passion,” and, “the Flesh and Blood of this Sacrifice is continued by a Sacrament of remembrance.”

Dr. Pusey writes in his letter to the Bishop of London, a further explanation of the issues. Pusey points out that Ridley used the word propitiable in two different senses, rejecting the one but approving of the other, Pusey quotes Ridley: “There is also a doubt in the word ‘propitiable,’ whether it signify here that which taketh away sin, or that which may be made available for the taking away of sin; that is to say, whether it is to be taken in the active or in the passive signification.”

---

60 Forrester, 196.


The Eucharistic Sacrifice pleads to God in mystery with Christ, who pleads continuously before God, interceding for sinners with his Body and Blood. The Eucharistic Sacrifice is impetratory because Christ is truly present in the Eucharist, but it is not a re-sacrifice and not truly propitious in and of itself. Christ in heaven is the Christians’ only and sufficient propitiation, and the Word did not become bread (impanation), but in mystery Christ is present in the Eucharist.

**Impact of Tract 81**

Tract 81 was the first attempt by Dr. Pusey to elevate the Anglican understanding and appreciation of the Eucharist. He brought to light that the term Sacrifice was attested to and often used by the Church Fathers and the Anglican divines. The Tract was controversial with some factions, but there were no significant immediate ramifications when it was published. Opponents tried to connect Tract 81 with transubstantiation, but were largely unsuccessful.

The controversy that did exist revolved around what Sacrifice means. Dr. Pusey wanted to revive the Sacramental understanding of the Eucharist. In Tract 81 he wasn’t trying to define exactly what the Sacrifice entailed, as the schoolmen, but rather he wanted people to appreciate the antiquity of the word and the mystery that surrounded it. To Pusey, the term Sacrifice was important because it was the term that united the present Church with the ancient Church. Sacrifice expressed the solemnity of the Eucharist. It was a term of reverence and respect that properly elevated the Sacrament in the minds of people. Pusey saw the Eucharist as more than just a memorial, although he certainly
agreed that it was a memorial. Speaking to an evangelical friend he said, “I believe all which you believe; we only part where you deny.” 63

The Sacrifice of the Eucharist meant that God was doing something for man; a mere memorial meant that man was doing something for God. Pusey believed with all his heart that in the Eucharist, God was working in a unique and special way in the Church. God was not being sacrificed on the Altar, but the Eucharistic meal was a meal on a Sacrifice that was mysteriously connected to Christ in heaven.

Tract 81 was written at the height of the Oxford Movement. Richard Hurrell Froude, who had been at Hadleigh Rectory and was one of the original Tractarians had passed away, but his controversial personal diary, Remains, with its anti-Reformational diatribes had not yet been posthumously published. Newman’s incendiary Tract 90 was still several years away from being published. The Oxford Movement was under pressure at this point, but not under the vehement attacks that it would be in the next few years.

Newman was still squarely an Anglican. Pusey, who had already endured the death of his infant daughter, several years earlier, would again be touched by tragedy in 1839 and 1844 with the heartrending loss of his wife and daughter. While Tract 81 represents a theological and academic examination of the Sacrifice of the Eucharist, Pusey’s thoughts would turn more towards the virtue and comfort found in the Sacrament. What had begun in Tract 81 as distant and perhaps abstract examination of the Eucharist would become much more personal and controversial in the years to come.

---

CHAPTER 3
THE GIFT OF CHRIST IN THE EUCHARIST

Bereavement

Dr. Pusey’s beloved wife, Maria, died on May 26th, 1839. Newman, his closest friend, was a pillar of strength during those dark days. Within hours of Maria’s death, Pusey mother, the Lady Lucy, had sent for Newman to come to the house, where Pusey sat grieving beside the earthly remains of his wife. Pusey did not want to receive anyone, but at his mother’s urging, Newman was allowed in. Pusey would write to Keble that Newman’s appearance on that day, was, “like the visit of an angel.”1 Newman, more than anyone else, continued to uphold Pusey in the months after Maria’s death.

Newman understood the deep bond that Edward and Maria shared, writing to a mutual friend the day after Maria’s death, he said,

It is now twenty-one years since Pusey became attached to his late wife, when he was a boy. For ten years after he was kept in suspense, and eleven years ago he married her. Thus she had been the one object on earth in which his thoughts had centered for the greater part of his life. He had not realized till lately that he was to lose her.2


It was a blow that would leave its mark on Pusey for rest of his life. From that moment on, Pusey withdrew from society, no longer attending social functions or hosting them.³ For the rest of his life he wore black crepe material over his hat, and a crepe scarf for mourning while attending the Cathedral.⁴

He would continue to teach, preach, and write, but except for his closest friends little was seen of him socially. In the year after Maria’s death, Pusey blamed himself, believing that her passing was punishment for his past sins. Keble and Newman both counseled against this line of thought. It is against this backdrop that Pusey began to search for the comfort and peace of the Lord.

**Tract 90**

Two years after the death of Maria, the ultimate tract, Tract 90 was published in 1841. Written by John Henry Newman, it was the most controversial of the Tracts. In Tract 90, Newman attempted to show how The 39 Articles, especially the 14 most Anti-Roman Catholic articles were not meant to condemn official Roman beliefs, but rather were intended to curtail the extravagances which came from the abuse of certain Roman doctrines.⁵ Tract 90 set off a firestorm against the Tractarians. Newman writes in his

---


⁴ Liddon, 2:108.

autobiography, “I was quite unprepared for the outbreak, and was startled at its violence.”

In contrast, Tract 81 by Pusey in 1836 had elicited some controversy and protests but was largely seen as “within the bounds of Reformed Doctrine.” W. H. Mackean contends that there was a drastic change in Dr. Pusey’s Eucharistic Doctrine after Tract 81, which can be traced to the influence of Newman’s Tract 90. In Mackean’s view, Tract 90 gave Dr. Pusey theological license to move his Eucharistic understanding closer to the Roman understanding of the Eucharist.

Pusey never wrote that Tract 90 had this liberating effect on him but he did whole-heartedly support Tract 90. Rather, Dr. Pusey wrote that his understanding of the doctrine of the Eucharist came about due to his concern over post-baptismal sin and from his upbringing. According to Dr. Pusey, he received much of his Eucharistic understanding as a child from his mother, the Lady Lucy Pusey, “I was educated in the teaching of the Prayer-book...The doctrine of the Real Presence I learnt from my mother's explanation of the Catechism, which she had learned to understand from older clergy.”

---


8 W.H. Mackean’s book on the Eucharistic Doctrine of the Oxford Movement is referenced by both Forrester and Nockles and recognized as an authority on the subject.

9 In 1842 Dr. Pusey wrote a public letter to the Archbishop of Canterbury defending the Tracts for the Times, especially Tract 90. Dr. Pusey believed that other parties (Wesleyan, Calvinists) had been twisting the Articles to their benefit, and that Tract 90 was an attempt to show that the Articles could also be viewed in a more favorable light towards the Tractarians interpretation. In this letter he writes: “I must, however, candidly avow my belief, that had there not been a strong, traditional but unauthorized, interpretation in the one direction, which Tract 90 struck at the roots, there would not have been alarm, which at first certainly prevented an unbiased view being taken of it.” From E. B. Pusey, *A Letter to His Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury*, (London: John Henry Parker, 1842), 81.

10 Liddon, 1:7
Tract 90 may have given him theological cover to further explore the doctrine of the Eucharist but it wasn’t the motivation behind Dr. Pusey’s expanding and expounding his Eucharistic doctrine in the 1840s. It was through personal loss and through personal conviction that his Eucharistic doctrine developed.

The death of Maria in 1839 was the catalyst, while Tract 90 published in 1841 was an enabler. The Eucharist brought both his wife and daughter comfort and also brought Dr. Pusey great comfort. Tract 90 may have been a spark that gave Dr. Pusey the theological license to further explore the Eucharist, but it was the virtue of the Sacrament to the communicant that inspired Dr. Pusey’s Eucharistic doctrine. Tract 81 had been an academic exercise on the Eucharist, but by the time of the condemned Sermon in 1843, Pusey’s study of the Eucharist had become a deeply personal and pious undertaking. By 1860, the Eucharist had become such a central part of Dr. Pusey’s life, that with special permission from Bishop Wilberforce, Dr. Pusey celebrated the Holy Eucharist in his house every morning at around 4:00 AM and would be joined by his son and any others who may be staying with them at the time.¹¹

The title, “The Holy Eucharist: A Comfort to the Penitent,” is a clue to where Pusey found respite after the loss of his wife Maria. Pusey often associated himself and called himself, a penitent and a sinner. Liddon writes that from the date of his wife’s death, Dr. Pusey, “regarded himself habitually as a penitent.”¹² That he should entitle his


¹² Liddon, 2:467
sermon “The Holy Eucharist: A Comfort to the Penitent,” in this light, can be seen to have autobiographical overtones.  

This major Eucharistic treatise was not born from tragedy alone, but also had a strong pastoral and pedagogical basis. Previously, Dr. Pusey’s emphasis on the grievous nature of sin, especially post-baptismal sin as seen in Tracts 67-69, led many of his students and parishioners to inquire about the remedy. Pusey held a highly Augustinian view of Baptism, believing that it not only washed away the stain of Adam, but also washed away all real sin committed by the person prior to baptism, and that post-baptismal sin was harmful to the soul. Pusey writes in Tract 67,

Our life in Christ is, throughout, represented as commencing, when we are by Baptism made members of Christ and children of God. That life may through our negligence afterwards decay, or be choked, or smothered, or well-nigh extinguished, and by God’s mercy again renewed and refreshed; but a commencement of life in Christ after Baptism, a death unto sin and a new birth unto righteousness, at any other period than at that one first introduction into God’s covenant, is as little consonant with the general representations of Holy Scripture, as a commencement of physical life long after our natural birth is with the order of His Providence.

---

13 Another example of this can be seen at St. Savior’s Leeds, the Church that Pusey built, in which Pusey has inscribed a request for prayers for himself, pseudonymously “a sinner.”

14 A first hand account of one who heard the Sermon on post-baptismal sin, based on Hebrews 6:4-8 can be found in Thomas Mozley, Reminiscences, 2 vol. (London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1882) 1:146-149. Mozley describes the scene at Christ Cathedral as “full to the corners” and that it was so quiet a pin drop could be heard. He said the Sermon was a “revelation” and delivered to terrible affect.

15 Augustine writes in “Enchiridion” Chapter 43, “For from the infant newly born to the old man bent with age, as there is none shut out from baptism, so there is none who in baptism does not die to sin. But infants die only to original sin; those who are older die also to all the sins which their evil lives have added to the sin which they brought with them.” Augustine then writes in Chapter 46, “Here lies the necessity that each man should be born again, that he might be freed from the sin in which he was born. For the sins committed afterwards can be cured by penitence, as we see is the case after baptism.” “Enchiridion” A Select Library of the Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers Series 1, vol. 3. ed. Philip Schaff, (Peabody: MA, Hendrickson Publishing, 1995), 252-253.

The Sermon: “The Holy Eucharist, a Comfort to the Penitent”

On May 14, 1843, Dr. Pusey delivered a sermon at Christ Church Cathedral, in Oxford, which would become one of the most important sermons of his life. It was entitled: “The Holy Eucharist, a Comfort to the Penitent.” The sermon was pastoral in tone and purposely not intended to be theologically intensive.\(^\text{17}\) His intent was to bring comfort to repentant sinners.\(^\text{18}\) In his sermon, he meant to illustrate the gifts of grace in the Sacrament which included: unity with Christ, strengthening, and forgiveness. The major themes in the sermon were piety, *perichoresis*, *theosis*, and forgiveness.

In his sermon, Dr. Pusey said that the life of the Christian is enlarged, renewed and supported through the Holy Eucharist because it is the Body and Blood of Christ. He taught that in scripture, remission of sin was connected with the Sacrament, so that a Christian could find solace and forgiveness in the Holy Eucharist. At the outset of his sermon he proclaims, “The Holy Eucharist imparteth not life only, spiritual strength, and oneness with Christ, and His Indwelling, and participation of Him, but in its degree, remission of sins also.”\(^\text{19}\) To Dr. Pusey, the forgiveness of sins is a by-product of the oneness that the Eucharist brings to the communicant.

Dr. Pusey stresses the importance of knowing Christ and that knowing Him is connected to experiencing Christ through the Sacrament. Christ is known through Scripture, He is known through prayer and through the ministering of the Holy Ghost,

\(^{17}\) Pusey writes in the preface to the publication of his 1853 Sermon: My former Sermon: “The Holy Eucharist a Comfort to the Penitent” was misunderstood by some, because it was not controversial.

\(^{18}\) In the previous 5 years, Dr. Pusey had lost a daughter and his wife. He administered Communion to his wife on her deathbed hours before she died. The need for comfort no doubt weighed heavily on his mind. In letters to Keble during this time, Pusey is despondent and often lamenting his own sinfulness in his letters.

and He is uniquely present and known through the Sacrament of Christ’s Body and Blood. “And when our Lord most largely and directly is setting forth the fruits of eating His Flesh and drinking his Blood, He speaks throughout of one Gift, life; freedom from death, life through Him, through His indwelling, and therefore resurrection from the dead, and life eternal.”

In this sermon he sets out to show that the penitent who comes to the Lord’s table, who as the Prayer Book states: “do truly and earnestly repent you of your sins, and are in love and charity with your neighbors, and intended to lead a new life, following the commandments of God, and walking from henceforth in His holy ways,” will receive God’s grace at communion. The Confession is a central part in the Eucharist, and this confession is directly to God, who through the Priest pronounces Absolution.

The Communion, which follows the confession and absolution, adds to the penitent:

Yet can we say that we are so freed, that nothing remains to be washed away? That the absolution, which admits to the cleansing Blood, is everything, that cleansing Blood Itself, in this respect also, addeth nothing? Rather, the penitent’s comfort is, that, as, in S. Basil’s words on frequent communion, ‘continual participation of life is nothing else than manifold life’ so, often communion… is manifold remission of those sins over which he mourns.

In the Eucharist, the forgiveness of sins is secondary to the primary benefit of the Sacrament, which is Union with Christ. But that as the manna from heaven “contented every man’s delight, and agreed to every taste,” the Eucharist becomes to every man what he needs most, to the penitent – forgiveness. Dr. Pusey notes that the Bible often invokes

---

20 Pusey, Comfort to the Penitent, 10.
21 Ibid., 19.
22 Ibid.
23 Ibid., 7.
a close relationship between the blood of Christ and the forgiveness of sins. His blood shed on Calvary forgives sins, and Christ himself in heaven offers His Body and Blood to the Father, but according to Pusey’s doctrine of the Eucharist, there is a mystical and Sacramental union, the objective real presence which confers real benefits in the Eucharist.

Cappadocian Fathers

The fourth century Eastern theologians known as the Cappadocian Fathers are a significant influence on Dr. Pusey’s Eucharistic doctrine. Pusey was well acquainted with their works and quotes liberally from them in numerous sermons and books. The Cappadocian Fathers’ doctrines of *perichoresis* and *theosis* are key to Dr. Pusey’s doctrine of the Eucharist. Dr. Pusey sees *theosis*, the union of God and man, as the chief goal of the Eucharist.

*Perichoresis* can be defined as the mutual indwelling life of the Three Persons of the Trinity living in perfect unity. *Theosis* is closely related to *perichoresis*, in that the believer is brought into the indwelling life of God to share in that life. 24 Athanasius of Alexandria succinctly describes *theosis* by writing, “He [God] indeed assumed humanity, that we might become God.” 25

The Cappadocian Father’s were the stalwarts of the Trinitarian definition that came from Nicaea (325) and were present at, and defended the Nicene definition at


Constantinople (AD 381). The Cappadocian Fathers were the fierce opponents of Nestorianism and Arianism. They defended the Trinitarian doctrine from these heresies in part by their doctrines of *perichoresis* and *theosis*.²⁶ They derived the Trinitarian doctrine of *Perichoresis* from their Christology. It builds from the unity of the hypostasis of the two natures of Christ, as Man and God, and then applies the concept of hypostases to the ontological Trinity.²⁷ As the Son lives in the Father and the Father lives in the Son, there is a mutual indwelling, this idea can be seen in the Scripture in such places as John 14:10²⁸ and Colossians 2:9.²⁹

*Theosis* and *perichoresis* are two very central concepts of the Cappadocian Fathers Trinitarian doctrine.³⁰ Norman Russell sums up the Cappadocian contribution to *theosis* deification in this way,

> The Cappadocians took the doctrine of deification from the Alexandrians and adapted it to a Platonizing understanding of Christianity as the attainment of likeness to God so far as was possible for human nature. Only the body of Christ, the ensouled flesh which the Logos assumed, is deified in the sense of being ‘mingled’ with the divine. Human beings are not deified in accordance with a realistic approach, the emphasis being as much on the ascent of the soul to God as on the transformation of the believer through baptism.³¹

---


²⁷ Ibid.

²⁸ “Believest thou not that I am in the Father, and the Father in me? The words that I speak unto you I speak not of myself: but the Father that dwelleth in me, he doeth the works.”

²⁹ “For in him dwelleth all the fullness of the Godhead bodily.”


Dr. Pusey strongly advocates *theosis* and *perichoresis* in this sermon and strongly advocated these doctrines in ecclesiastical matters. Pusey dives into this language of mutual indwelling and ascension into the Life of God. In the sermon he states, “All are His Life, flowing through all His members, and in all, as it is admitted, effacing death, enlarging life,” and, “The Life which He is, spreads around, first giving its own vitality to that sinless flesh which He united indissolubly with Himself and in it encircling and vivifying our whole nature.” This is the language of *perichoresis* and *theosis*, the mutual indwelling life of the Trinity and in lifting humans into the life of God, Pusey is also following the Cappadocians understanding of deification.

To Pusey, the Eucharist is key to this union, “and then through that bread which is His Flesh, finding an entrance to us individually, penetrating us, soul and body and spirit and irradiating and transforming in to His own light and life.” Dr. Pusey returns again and again to this theme in the sermon, and related the indwelling of the Trinity, and the lifting up of the Church into the life of the Trinity through the Sacrament of the Body and Blood.

---

32 Dr. Pusey was a strong supporter of the Athanasian Creed. He was involved in a controversy over whether it should be kept in the Prayer Book and read once a year. The Athanasian Creed is the most explicit in stating the doctrine of *perichoresis* and *theosis* of the ancient creeds. More on the Athanasian Creed can be found in, Philip Schaff, *The Creeds of Christendom*, 3vols., (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1919), 1:34-42.

33 Pusey, *Comfort to the Penitent*, 1.

34 Ibid., 11.
In uniting *theosis* with the Sacrament of the Eucharist, Pusey is following all three Cappadocian Fathers. But only Gregory of Nyssa really delves into *theosis* and the Eucharist. In Gregory of Nyssa’s Great Catechism, chapter 37 he writes,

> That by this communion with Deity mankind might at the same time be deified, for this end it is that, by dispensation of His grace, He disseminates Himself to every believer through that flesh, whose substance comes from bread and wine, blending Himself with the bodies of believers, to secure that, by this union with the immortal, man, too, may be a sharer in incorruption.

Dr. Pusey maintains a strong element of this *theosis* throughout the sermon, that the believer is raised up and brought into the life of God through the Sacrament. Pusey stated, “He, by the truth of the Sacrament, dwelleth in us, in Whom, by Nature, all the fullness of the Godhead dwelleth; and lowest is joined on with highest, earth with heaven, corruption with incorruption, man with God.” This is the primary purpose of the Sacrament, the joining of man with God, only secondarily does it forgive sins, but it does forgive sins because to be brought into union with God is to be washed by the Blood of the Lamb.

### Scriptures

The Old Testament had many sacramental types that pointed toward the Sacraments of the New Testament: the Lord himself alludes to this in John 6, that just as the manna in the wilderness provided strength to the Israelites, the bread from heaven spiritually enlivens the Christian. Other examples of Old Testament foreshadowing of the

---

35 Russell, 233.


38 Ibid., 8.
Sacraments that Dr. Pusey mentions in his sermon include: the tree of life which was given as “nourishment and immortality”, the bread and wine of Melchizedek, the Paschal Lamb, the Manna from heaven, the shew-bread of the priests, and the cake brought to Elijah from heaven.  

In the New Testament, Pusey focuses tightly on John 6 and its Eucharistic implications, and then on John 10, 14, and 17 with the implications for divinization and perichoresis. In John 6 the type is explained by the reality, the archetype. What was shown beforehand in the Old Testament, is now revealed in Christ in the New Testament. Later in John, Jesus fully expounds how He and the Father are one, and how by being in Christ the believer is brought into life with God. Pusey expounds:

He is the Living Bread, because He came down from Heaven, and as being One God with the Father, hath life in Himself, even as the Father hath life in Himself; the life then which He is He imparted to that Flesh which He took into Himself… and since it is thus a part of Himself, “Whoso eateth My Flesh and drinketh My Blood… eateth Me,” and so receiveth into Himself in an ineffable manner his Lord Himself, “dwelleth” (our Lord says) “in Me and I in him.”

Dr. Pusey also explores First Corinthians 10. In this passage St. Paul links the Body and Blood of Christ to the elements of the Eucharist. For Dr. Pusey, this has profound importance in linking the Blood of Calvary to the Blood of the Cup.

Forgiveness of Sin

In the sermon, Dr. Pusey states: “If we are wise we shall never ask how they can be elements of this world, and yet His very Body and Blood.” The sermon never dealt with issues of how or in what manner the elements became the Body and Blood of Christ,

---


40 Pusey, Comfort to the Penitent, 11.
only that they were the Body and Blood of Christ, because Christ said they were (Matthew 6:26-28, 1 Cor. 11:24-24). Pusey will clarify his view of the Presence of Christ in a sermon he will preach ten years after this sermon entitled: “The Presence of Christ in the Holy Eucharist.”

In the Eucharist, both realized and symbolically, the Church is seen as being lifted up into the fellowship of God. Through the Sacrament, the Church is partaking in the life of God, as it takes the Lord’s Supper in a remembrance that is pointing forwards toward the time when Jesus will partake of it with the Church.

Pusey longs for the Eucharist to be a unifying Sacrament instead of the source for disputes, “Would that, instead of vain and profane disputings, we could but catch the echoes of these hallowed sounds, and forgetting the jarrings of our earthly discords, live in this harmony and unity of Heaven, where, through and in our Lord, we are all one in God.”

Unfortunately in the short term this sermon was extremely divisive. But it was through this controversy that Pusey’s sermon was able to reach more people.

Pusey wrote later that, “My object throughout that Sermon was to show how, through the Holy Eucharist, we have life from our living and loving Lord Himself, re-creation in Him, and the earnest of endless joy and bliss in Him.”

The Gift in the Eucharist was Christ himself. All benefits of the Eucharist derived from this Gift.

To Dr. Pusey, forgiveness of sins accompanied the Eucharist. Not to an unrepentant sinner but to the penitent. Dr. Pusey states,

In each place in Holy Scripture, where the doctrine of the Holy Eucharist is taught, there is at least, some indication of the remission of sins. Our blessed

---

41 Pusey, Comfort to the Penitent, 14.

42 Ibid., v.
Lord, while chiefly speaking of Himself as the Bread of life, the true meat, the true drink, His Indwelling Resurrection from the dead, and Life everlasting, still says also, ‘the Bread that I will give is My Flesh, which I will give for the life of the world.’

Dr. Pusey argues that Christ himself differentiates between the physical sacrifice that He will make on Calvary and the spiritual sacrifice of the Eucharist, and that in both cases remission of sins is accomplished by His Body and Blood. Dr. Pusey argues that in the Last Supper discourse, Christ is not using the future tense at the distribution of the elements; rather he is using the present tense. Pusey notes that Chrysostom makes the same point, that Christ’s body is broken in the Last Supper (to be shared with the communicants) while His Body was not broken on the Cross, rather according to Scripture He remained whole and not a bone was broken. To Pusey, this indicates that the benefits that were won at Calvary are present in the Eucharist.

In First Corinthians 10:16, St. Paul writes, “The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not the communion of the blood of Christ?” Pusey uses this verse to link the sacrifice of the Eucharist with the one sacrifice at Calvary. By linking the two, the benefits of the one Sacrifice are shared with the Eucharist. To participate in the benefits of Calvary, one must participate in the Eucharist.

Dr. Pusey appeals to the earliest Liturgies of the Church, those of St. James and St. Mark, both very early Eastern Liturgies. The Liturgy of St. James could date to the first century, although most scholars date it to the fourth century. In these liturgies the words of consecration, “develop the sense that they relate not only to the past act of His

---

43 Ibid., 16.
44 Pusey, Comfort to the Penitent, 17.
Precious Bloodshedding on the Cross, but to the communication of that Blood to us now." Dr. Pusey notes that this isn’t so far removed from the Prayer Book liturgy that reflects the Western tradition by saying, “that our sinful bodies may be made clean by His Body and our souls washed by His most precious Blood.”

**Conclusion of the Sermon**

In the last section of the Sermon, Dr. Pusey makes a plea for more frequent communions, “How should there be the fullness of Divine life, amid all but a month-long fast from our “daily Bread?” He writes that it was the tradition of the undivided Church to observe daily celebrations of the Eucharist, and that the East fell away from the practice first and then the West. Dr. Pusey remarks how weekly Communions were still celebrated before the English Civil War, which Pusey calls the “Great Rebellion.”

Dr. Pusey encouraged more frequent celebration of the Eucharist. He said that it was the practice of the ancient undivided Church to observe frequent celebrations, and that it was in fact the Eastern Church that first “relaxed in her first love,” and fell into less frequent Communion Services while the West continued the practice.

Dr. Pusey again showing a pastoral position, calls on people who abstain from taking the Eucharist to understand that those who wish to partake of it often, are not being innovators but observing a very ancient practice. He also warns those who wish to

---

46 Pusey, *Comfort to the Penitent*, 18.

47 1662 Prayer Book wording that dated back to the 1549 Prayer Book. The same wording is used in the American 1928 Prayer Book.

partake often not to look down at those who wish to abstain from frequent communion, because they are doing so because they feel it more reverent to abstain.⁴⁹

In the last paragraph of the Sermon he sums it all up in sweeping sentences reflecting the piety of the penitent, the wonder of *perichoresis* and our fellowship through divinization, and forgiveness through unity with Christ. “we have already far more than we deserve; (for whereas we deserved hell, we have the antepast of Heaven)… For where He is, how should there not be forgiveness… if we may indeed hope that we thereby dwell in Him and He in us… we in Him in Whom if we be found in that Day, our pardon is for ever sealed, ourselves for ever cleansed, our iniquity forgiven, and our sin covered.”⁵⁰

**Repercussions**

By 1843 the Tractarians had a bevy of influential and high placed opponents who were waiting to waylay anyone associated with the Movement. Dr. Pusey, months before the sermon, in a letter to Newman wrote that, “It comes heavily to me sometimes, to think that some of the miserable judgments passed upon you… must at times be wearisome to you. I have wished to obtain some share of what has fallen peculiarly upon you, but I have not been worthy.”⁵¹ After this sermon, Pusey would find himself subjected to the scorn that had not, so far, touched him personally.

---

⁴⁹ Ibid., 21.

⁵⁰ Pusey, *Comfort to the Penitent*, 22.

⁵¹ Liddon 2:304-305
Despite Pusey’s denial of the doctrine of transubstantiation in Tract 81, his opponents were not placated and accused him of advocating the forbidden doctrine in this sermon. Conversely, the Dublin Review, a Roman Catholic journal, wrote that Dr. Pusey’s sermon was a fair representation of the teaching of the Fathers, but they did not believe he went far enough.\(^5^2\)

Pusey had been conscious that the opponents of the Tractarians would be eager to pounce on any theological defect in his sermon. In an attempt to avoid controversy, he does not use his own words but drew on the Church Fathers and Caroline Divines. He specifically quoted St. Augustine when he said that the penitent who partakes in the Holy Eucharist “drinks his ransom”\(^5^3\) and consumes “the very body and blood of the Lord, the only Sacrifice for sin.”\(^5^4\) He also quoted from the Caroline Divines, Lancelot Andrewes and Archbishop Bramhall, staying within what he believed was Anglican Orthodoxy. Dr. Pusey did not want to be an innovator but a traditionalist who reintroduced Christians to the earlier teachings of the Church.

Three days after his sermon Dr. Pusey was sent a letter from the Vice Chancellor of the University informing him that an enquiry into his sermon was being established. In the letter the Vice Chancellor wrote that he had doubts, “with regard to its [the sermon] strict conformity to the doctrines of the reformed Church of England.”

Pusey was offered the chance to recant. By way of Dr. Jelf, the one sympathetic judge on the tribunal, a message was delivered to Dr. Pusey for his signature. The words

\(^{5^2}\) Pusey, *Comfort to the Penitent*, vi.


\(^{5^4}\) St. Augustine. c. Cresc. Don. i.25.
in italics are taken directly from the sermon.\textsuperscript{55} Dr. Pusey’s reply to Dr. Jelf proceeds directly after each statement that Pusey was to assent to.

Will Dr. Pusey say, among other things which might be put in this same form:-

We do not \textit{touch with our own lips} in the Holy Eucharist \textit{that cleansing Blood}, \textsuperscript{56} meaning the very blood of Christ.

‘I do not say it after any corporeal manner; I say it no other sense than St. Chrysostom says, “Our tongues are reddened, &c.” I say it only because after consecration they are called the Body and Blood of Christ. It was an adaption of the words of the Ancient Church, “Lo, this hath touched my lips,” &c.’

\textit{God poureth not out for us now the most precious blood of His only begotten.}\textsuperscript{57}

‘I adopt St. Augustine’s words in no other sense than as our Church teaches us, to thank God “for that He doth vouchsafe to feed us, who have duly received these holy mysteries, with the spiritual food of the most precious Body and Blood of His Son,” &c. It never crossed my mind to make any allusion in these words to the Sacrifice, or, until I saw the objection yesterday, that any one could connect the doctrine with them.’

By “\textit{elements of this world and yet His very body and blood}”.\textsuperscript{58} I mean only that they are spiritually so, and not carnally; not His natural flesh and blood.

‘Yes. I had no physical meaning. I deny everything physical, and I meant only a spiritual body in a spiritual and sacramental way.’

Pusey’s answers were not satisfactory for the inquiry. The inquiry itself proceeded with a number of irregularities, including the fact that one of the six judges who presided over the case was also one of the original accusers who brought the charges to the

\begin{enumerate}
\item \textsuperscript{55} As recorded by Henry Liddon 2:326-327.
\item \textsuperscript{56} Ibid., 23 citing St. Chrysostom. Homily on Penitence. and St. Gregory. Dial. Iv. 58.
\item \textsuperscript{57} Ibid., 18 citing St. Augustine Sermons 216 § 3.
\item \textsuperscript{58} Ibid., 7, Pusey cites St. Chrysostom in St. John. 1.Iv. P 362. Add p. 358. 5.
\end{enumerate}
Also, Pusey was never given a chance to address the inquiry in person, never having been invited to speak in his own defense. Five of the six judges went against Pusey, only Dr. Jelf sided with Pusey. The Provost, writing for the majority admitted that Dr. Pusey, “did not design to oppose the doctrine of the Church of England, but was led into erroneous views and expressions, partly by a pious desire to magnify the grace of God in the Holy Eucharist, and partly by an indiscreet adoption, in its literal sense, of the highly figurative, mystical and incautious language of certain of the old Fathers.”

The tribunal had disapproved of quoting the Greek Fathers, especially those 4th century Greek Fathers who were so enthusiastic about theosis. The tribunal seemed to be saying that the Cappadocian Fathers were too enthusiastic in their Trinitarian fervor, and some of the things they said were unguarded and inappropriate.

Pusey was suspended from the pulpit on June 2nd, 1843, for two years. He had never had a hearing, and only had limited communication with the Vice Chancellor, who led the inquiry, through written correspondence. If the tribunal had hoped to quell the controversy by quietly suspending Dr. Pusey without a hearing, the strategy failed. At Newman and Keble’s urging, Pusey published his protest, and found that he had many supporters. Next he published the sermon, which went on to have a large circulation in

59 Liddon, 2:310.
60 Ibid., 2:317.
61 Ibid., 2:317.
62 These letters can be found in Liddon, 2:319-331.
63 These supporters included a number of non-resident members of the Convocation who signed a protest addressed to the Vice Chancellor. These signatories included, John Taylor Coleridge and William Ewart Gladstone, future Prime Minister of the United Kingdom.
64 Gladstone wrote Pusey a personal letter of congratulations upon it’s publishing, see Liddon 2:348.
part due to the controversy surrounding it. In many ways, it was a call to arms for the High Church party. The Eucharistic revival in the Church of England had begun.

But to others, it was the last straw. Newman was disheartened. He would leave the Church of England within the next eighteen months, before Pusey’s suspension had been lifted. In Newman’s correspondence with Pusey during this time, he was careful when advising Pusey of the affect Pusey’s actions would have on those who were leaning towards secession to Rome. Newman had no desire to lead fellow Anglicans Roman-ward or to give the appearance of pushing people towards the Roman Church. Newman writes on July 31st, 1843, “If your suspension passes, sub silentio, it is in vain to tell people who are inclined towards Rome that the world thinks you wronged. Did I wish to lead on persons towards Rome, my best step would be to recommend acquiescence on your part.”65 Newman’s advice for Pusey was to battle the suspension, even seeking re-dress outside of Oxford at the Queen’s Bench.66 This was a solution Pusey contemplated, but never pursued.

End of the Movement

In 1844, during Pusey’s suspension, his eldest child Lucy died. She was fourteen years old. Pusey tenderly writes to his son about celebrating communion at home (with the Bishop’s permission) for his Lucy in her deathbed.67 The father and daughter’s

65 Liddon 2:353

66 Ibid.

67 In the letter to his son dated, April 23, 1844, Pusey writes, “I felt sure, however that it would be a blessing to her to receive the Holy Communion again, so I proposed it to her, and she was much pleased. But she sunk into such a state of half consciousness that, although she had listened…. She did not know what I was doing… She said ‘What is this?’ When I answered, ‘The Body of Christ,’ she collected herself
devotion to the Eucharist was so strong that while Lucy was dying of consumption, they worked on the design of a Chalice together, which would be used in the Church Dr. Pusey was building in Leeds.  

Newman again was a great comfort to Pusey during this time of sorrow. Newman saw to many of the personal arrangements including the purchase of the casket. Lucy was laid to rest in her mother’s grave in Christ Church on April 27th. Pusey’s closeness to Newman can be seen in the last stage of his daughter Lucy’s illness in 1844: “God reward you, my dear friend; this is now the second of mine, at whose parting I have felt what a blessing your sermons and your love have been to them.”  

The circumstances around the condemned sermon was seen by many in the Tractarian party one of the last straws, but the last straw for Newman was the joint Anglo-Prussian Bishopric in Jerusalem. Newman saw it as a denial of Apostolic Succession and felt that there was no longer room in the Church of England for a theological High Church party. Newman seceded.

At Newman’s secession in November of 1845, Pusey and anyone associated with the Movement, were all held in high suspicion. The Oxford Movement had ended, and many of adherents were Rome-ward bound. Pusey became ill in 1846, and was near death at once, and she then received the Cup with such eagerness and devotion, that I could not but drop on my knees in joy and thankfulness for this mercy.” Trench, 239.

68 Liddon, 2:480.

69 Liddon, 2:385.

70 The original design of this bishopric was for the Church of England and the Prussian Church, which was Lutheran, to share the See, and alternate primates. The Tractarians were alarmed that the Church of England would recognize a Lutheran Primate who had no claim (or desire to claim) Apostolic Succession over Anglican parishioners. See R.W. Greaves, *The English Historical Review*, Vol. 64, No. 252 (July, 1949) 328-352, for the Tractarians’ negative reaction to this Bishopric.
on several occasions.\textsuperscript{71} Newman’s secession appeared to have taken a physical toll on Pusey. Pusey would get physically ill after corresponding with Newman, sometimes for days and weeks at a time. Eventually their correspondences had to be cut off, and they did not speak or write for seven years. This break in communication was not because of lack of affection, according to Liddon, but because they had to become accustomed to the new nature of their relationship.\textsuperscript{72}

At Newman’s secession, the leadership of the Movement passed to Pusey. Pusey was the academic stalwart of the Tractarians; but Newman had been the soul of the Movement. Now Pusey would take on a new role, as the gravitational center of the Movement. Newman writes in his autobiography of Pusey’s leadership after his own secession, “When I became a Catholic, I was often asked, ‘What of Dr. Pusey?’ when I said that I did not see symptoms of his doing as I had done, I was sometimes thought uncharitable. If confidence in his position is, (as it is,) a first essential in the leader of a party, Dr. Pusey had it.”\textsuperscript{73}

\textbf{Confession and Absolution}

Pusey returned to the pulpit in Christ Church on February 1\textsuperscript{st}, 1846 for the first time since his suspension. To understand Dr. Pusey’s doctrine of forgiveness in the Eucharist, it is helpful to understand his doctrine of Absolution, and Dr. Pusey set about clarifying his position with two sermons on Absolution, the first being on February 1st, the second being on November 29th of that same year. Pusey declared that the reason for

\textsuperscript{71} Trench, 310-315.

\textsuperscript{72} Liddon, 2:507-514.

\textsuperscript{73} Newman, \textit{Apologia Pro Vita Sua}, 138.
writing the previous sermon on the Eucharist was to show that the Eucharist was a comfort to the penitent as a Sacrament and as a commemorative Sacrifice. Pusey states,

I dwelt then first on the comfort of the Holy Eucharist to the penitent, as a Sacrament and as a commemorative Sacrifice. As a Sacrament because in the words of our Liturgy, in it “our sinful bodies are made clean by His body, and our souls washed through His most precious Blood;” as a commemorative Sacrifice, I will simply rehearse to you some of the words of Apostolic Bp. Wilson74, who in his *Sacra Privata*, thus prays: “May it please Thee, O God, who has called us to this ministry, to make us worthy to offer unto Thee this Sacrifice for our own sins and for the sin of thy people.”75

Pusey humbly acknowledges the previous controversy, and then defended the purpose of his condemned sermon on the Eucharist. Pusey stated that its purpose was to mitigate the stern doctrine of post-baptismal sin, by “pointing out the mercies of God which might reassure the penitent.”76 Pusey contended that through God’s grace, God gives gifts that apply His grace, and that the Holy Eucharist is the great Gift of grace he gives.

The biblical text for this first sermon on absolution which was preached on February 1st, was John 20: 21-23. Dr. Pusey originally had in mind preaching this sermon before the condemned sermon, but thought that the condemned sermon was less controversial.77 While the sermon on the Holy Eucharist began to change people’s

---

74 Bishop Thomas Wilson (1663-1755) Was the Anglican Bishop of Sodor and Man. He stressed morality and piety and was quoted a number of times in the Tracts.


76 Ibid., 1.

77 Liddon records Pusey saying in a private conversation, “For I chose the Holy Eucharist as the subject at which they would be less likely to take offence than at Absolution. But we know what happened.” Liddon, 2:307
perspective on the Eucharist, these two sermons on confession and absolution brought back sacramental confession to the Church of England.

Dr. Pusey was a man who was greatly grieved by his own sin and was acutely aware of the ramifications of sin. Pusey saw different sins as having different remedies. He encouraged auricular confession but stated that corporate confession, specifically the confession found in the Liturgy preceding the Eucharist as adequate. According to Pusey individual auricular confession was also appropriate and may be more appropriate depending on the seriousness of the sin and the toll it was taking on the person’s conscious. Pusey warned of the error of Stoical philosophy, and said, “because all sin is deeply offensive to Almighty God, the deepest sins need no deeper repentance than the slightest.” Rather, Dr. Pusey quotes the Cappadocian Father St. Basil, “that in proportion to the fault thou admit also the restoration from the remedy.”

Pusey notes that the Prayer Book twice specifically calls for confessions; the first confession being the General Confession before the Holy Eucharist. This confession is said by all who desire to take communion and is done “humbly kneeling”. The second time the Prayer Book specifically condones confession is at the Visitation of the Sick, in which the priest is entreated to enquire if there are any sins the sick person wishes to confess.

---

78 After his wife’s death, Dr. Pusey set about to use his personal wealth to build a church in anonymity in a destitute part of Leeds. He had inscribed on the West door: “Ye who Enter this Holy Place, Pray for the Sinner who Built It.”


Absolution by the Priest is derived from the authority from Christ, who gave it to the Church and was recorded in the Prayer Book in both the ordination of Priests and in the Absolution of the sick. Pusey writes,

There is no middle way. Either the Church speaks truly wherein she says, "our Lord Jesus Christ hath left power with His Church to absolve all sinners who truly repent and believe in Him," or those her most solemn acts of Ordination and Absolution would be, (as those without her have alleged,) year by year and day by day, accumulated blasphemy.  

By establishing that the Prayer Book sanctioned confession, Pusey could advocate the “regular and systematic use of confession”. Nockles writes, “Pusey claimed the sanction of the Prayer Book and sought to keep within the bounds of Anglican formularies, by conceding that sacramental confession was not ‘necessary to salvation’. The connection between absolution and the Eucharist is in the forgiveness of sin. This can be seen in the liturgy, where confession and absolution precede Communion. The Eucharist strengthens, enlivens, and empowers to life. Pusey disagrees in his 1843 sermon with what he describes as the Roman position of the Eucharist only forgiving venial sins, because to come to the Eucharist in mortal sin, is itself a mortal sin. Pusey sees this as reading too fine a point on God’s gift. The absolution over the penitent pronounced by the Priest allows the penitent to approach “to salvation, not to condemnation.” In Pusey’s thought, there is a much more organic relationship between Absolution and the Eucharist, rather than an automated or robotic relationship.

---

83 Ibid.
Absolution was the doorway to the Eucharist, it allowed the penitent to pass to the Holy Table with a clear conscious, and after the Eucharist the penitent was assured of a greater washing of his sins.

As a result of this sermon, devout Anglicans began going to priests for private auricular confession. The anonymous modern Anglican axiom on confession that, “All may, none must, most should” was an apt reflection of the new practice of Anglican confession. Pusey the confessor, in the midst of the heartache and turmoil of the late 1840s, began availing himself of confession with his longtime mentor John Keble. 

---

85 Liddon 3:99.
CHAPTER 4

THE REAL PRESENCE OF CHRIST IN THE EUCHARIST

Pusey’s Second Sermon on the Eucharist

“The Holy Eucharist is plainly the closest union of man with God.” This is the opening sentence in Dr. Pusey’s 1853 sermon, “The Presence of Christ in the Holy Eucharist.” The sermon was preached in Christ Church Cathedral, Oxford, and 10 years after his condemned sermon on the Holy Eucharist. Pusey had been allowed to resume preaching after his two-year suspension, and had preached a number of sermons, but this 1853 sermon was the first sermon on the Eucharist since the controversy.

Much had changed in the past ten years, many of the Movement’s adherents had seceded to Rome, but many people, including many undergraduates at Oxford, had begun to take up the cause of the Tractarians. In Reminiscences of Oxford, William Tuckwell, a student during the fifties, wrote that Pusey had become popular among the undergraduates, although not always for the right reasons. He describes the scene of Pusey delivering a sermon in the early 1850s at Christ Church,

As mystagogue, as persecuted, as prophet, he appealed to the romantic, the generous, the receptive natures; no sermons attracted undergraduates as did his. I can see him passing to the pulpit through the crowds which overflowed the shabby, inconvenient, unrestored cathedral, the pale, ascetic, furrowed face, clouded and dusky always as with suggestions of a blunt or half-used razor, the bowed grizzled head, the drop into the pulpit out of sight until the hymn was over, then the harsh unmodulated voice…

Pusey intended this Eucharistic sermon to be a theological treatise, in contrast to his 1843 sermon with its more pastoral intentions. This new sermon, in conjunction with the follow-up publication in 1855 of: The Doctrine of the Real Presence was intended to make a categorical defense of the Objective Real Presence of Christ in the Eucharist.

Pusey’s biographer Henry Liddon writes of the 1853 Sermon:

It differed from the earlier sermon on the Eucharist (1843), as a careful statement of doctrine might differ from a devotional appeal. The doctrine enunciated was the same in both sermons; but the first was the language of unguarded fervour, the second that of precise definition… Thus the second sermon differs from the first in the distinctness with which it insists not only on the Reality of the Sacramental Presence resulting from consecration, but also it deals with the continued existence of the substance in those consecrated elements, which are the veils of our Lord’s presence.²

Pusey wrote to Keble before the sermon that its purpose was, “to set forth the greatness of the mystery that they [the congregation at Christ Church] may be more careful to live as they should, to whom such gifts are vouchsafed.”³ The gifts were the Body and Blood of Christ, and Pusey intended to clearly define the doctrine of the objective Real Presence.

The importance of the doctrine of the Real Presence to Pusey was that it was foundational to his earlier Eucharistic treatise, and by setting it forth in a clear manner, Pusey hoped to vindicate his earlier Eucharistic teachings. In 1836, Pusey wrote Tract 81, in support of the Sacrifice of the Eucharist as attested to by the Scriptures, the Church Fathers and the Anglican Divines. The Real Presence is implied, because without Christ present there was no sacrifice. Only Christ is both the Victim and the High Priest. In his sermon, “The Holy Eucharist, A Comfort to the Penitent”, Pusey showed that the great

---
² Liddon 3:425.
³ Ibid., 3:424.
gift of the Eucharist was the union between Christ and man, and the many benefits that flowed from this union. The benefits occurred because Christ was truly present, without Christ present in the Eucharist there was no union between man and God in the Sacrament. The Real Presence was the doctrinal glue that united Pusey’s Eucharistic doctrine. The Sacrifice was possible; the Union between God and Man was realized, through the Real Presence of Christ in the Eucharist. To Pusey, all things come together in Christ, and His Real Objective Presence in the Eucharist was the catalyst for the work of the Sacrament.

Scripture and the Real Presence

Pusey believed the Real Presence was taught in Scripture. It was taught typologically in the Old Testament, explicitly in the Words of Institution and in Christ’s testimony about His Body and Blood, and exemplary in the breaking of bread passages in the New Testament. Dr. Pusey believed that in the Old Testament there was an abundance of foreshadowing of what was to come in the New Testament. He writes in the sermon, “The ritual of the Old Testament was prescribed, the history of the chosen people was overruled, to foreshadow that which was to come.”

Dr. Pusey speaks of the coal, which touched Isaiah’s lips, as a foreshadowing of the Eucharist, and writes, “the emblem of the burning coal… was received throughout the East, implies an inward real Presence, and a real outward substance.” Pusey discusses Exodus 24:8, with Moses sprinkling the blood of the covenant on the people. Pusey

---


5 Pusey, *The Presence of Christ* 39-40
compares that to St. Paul’s writing that the blood of bulls and goats availed nothing, but it pointed toward the Blood of Christ that washes away sin. Pusey shows that forgiveness of sins in the New Testament is most often (more so than calling on the Name of Jesus, and more than the Baptismal waters) found in the Blood of Jesus. The wine of the cup is the Blood of Jesus, Christ attests to at the institution of the Eucharist, and that forgiveness comes from his blood, not metaphorically but substantially. In the Old Testament, it was forbidden to consume blood, because it contained life but in the New Testament the Church is commanded to do the opposite, consume the Blood of God. The Church is commanded to consume the Blood of God, because it contains the life of God, and it is truly communicated through Christ’s Real Presence in the Sacrament.

Pusey again draws on the *theosis* of the passage in John 6:54-56, “Whoso eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, hath eternal life; and I will raise him up at the last day. For my flesh is meat indeed, and my blood is drink indeed. He that eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, dwelleth in me, and I in him.” To Pusey, the plain words of Christ here at the end of John 6 are that His Body and Blood are present in the bread and wine and that those who eat and drink of him, he will dwell in them, and they in him, but it’s a spiritual presence and not a physical presence.

In the New Testament, Pusey often points towards the breaking of bread passages. The Lord was known by the disciples through the breaking of bread on the road to Emmaus. St. Paul, in his ministry recounted in Acts, is often portrayed as breaking bread with believers. St. Paul breaks bread after raising Eutychus in Acts 19 and Paul also

---

6 Genesis 9:4; Leviticus 3:17, 19:26
breaks bread with the sailors after surviving the storm. Pusey sees these as Eucharistic references in which the Sacrament conveys a spiritual strengthening to the communicants.

Dr. Pusey argues that the shadows are gone with the Old Testament, and that Christ has left His Church not with mere shadows and figures, but with His Real Presence in the Eucharist. The Rock in the wilderness was a foreshadowing, but the Eucharist is the reality of the life-giving source for His people. Pusey sees the Real Presence as one way that the Lord’s fulfills his promise, “Lo I am with you always, even to the end of the world.”

Church Fathers

At the beginning of the 1853 sermon, Dr. Pusey returns to the Cappadocian themes of *perichoresis* and *theosis*. Pusey describes the oneness between the believer and Christ, and the oneness with Christ and the Father. Pusey states, “God of God, and God with God… took the Manhood into God,” and “He, the Life of the world, maketh those alive, in whom He is.” The Eucharist is the mode of this impartation of life, this *theosis* of the believer into the life of God. “Through these (the Body and Blood of Christ), He

---

7 Matthew 28:20


9 Ibid., 10.
The Cappadocians saw this union as occurring through the Sacraments, \(^{11}\) as did Dr. Pusey who stated,

> We could not be united to Him, save by His communicating Himself to us. This He willed to do by indwelling in us through His Spirit; by making us, through the Sacrament of Baptism, members of His Son; by giving us, through the Holy Eucharist, not in any carnal way, but really and spiritually, the Flesh and Blood of the Incarnate Son, whereby “He dwelleth in us, and we in Him; He is one with us and we with Him.”\(^{12}\)

Pusey also appeals to the Greek Father, St. John Chrysostom. Chrysostom points toward the Union of the believer in Christ in the Sacrament, “For we communicate, not by sharing only and partaking, but also by being united. For as that Body is united to Christ, so also are we united to Him by this Bread.”\(^{13}\) Unity between the believer and Christ is central to Pusey’s Eucharistic thought, and this unity is facilitated through the Real Presence in the earthly elements of bread and wine. The Eucharist must be received through Faith with Thanksgiving, Pusey writes to clergy on retreat saying, “Sacraments, until God give it repentance, have lost their power, and could be received only to hurt,”\(^{14}\) echoing St. Paul’s warnings in 1 Corinthians 11, that a believer must examine themselves or risk injury if receiving the Sacrament in an improper condition.

In the *Doctrine of the Real Presence*, Pusey describes his purpose behind using the Fathers in defense of the doctrine: “In the present collection, I have adduced the

---

\(^{10}\) Ibid., 11.

\(^{11}\) For the Cappadocians concept of *theosis* in relation to the Eucharist, see Russell Norman *The Doctrine of Deification in the Greek Patristic Tradition*, [New York: Oxford University Press, 2004] 206-234. Norman’s sees the Cappadocians as successfully assimilating Origen’s ascent of the soul to Athanasius’ distinction between Creator and Creation.


\(^{13}\) Ibid., 33, citing John Chrysostom. *Homily on First Corinthians* § 4, 24 p. 327. Oxf. Tr.

Fathers, not as original authorities, but as witnesses to the meaning of Holy Scripture. I have called them on the old, although now, on both sides, neglected rule, that what was taught ‘every where, at all times by all,’ must have been taught to the whole Church by the inspired Apostles themselves.”

It is important to Pusey to show that Church Fathers did not support Transubstantiation. Pusey’s point is that the Fathers wrote of a change, but not of a physical change where the bread no longer existed. Pusey writes that,

The object of the likenesses used by the Fathers, is either to illustrate the power of God, as put forth in our behalf, in things which we know, that we may not start back at the greatness of His gift in the Holy Eucharist, or to show how things, outwardly the same, may be inwardly, yet spiritually, not physically, changed or how grace may be conveyed through visible symbols.

Pusey was aware that the Scholastics used the Cappadocian Father Gregory of Nyssa in support of their doctrine of Transubstantiation, but Dr. Pusey refutes the point:

S. Gregory of Nyssa, cited in proof of transubstantiation, illustrates the grace of Baptism, by the holiness of an Altar, the change in the Holy Eucharist, the oil of confirmation, the consecration of a priest, the rod of Moses, the mantle of Elijah, the wood of the Cross, the bush where God was seen. These are valid to the end for which S. Gregory quotes them, that God uses the mean things of this world in showing forth His own glory. But since the changes are of every sort, nothing can be inferred as to the nature of that change. The Altar has but an outward sanctity. The bush was but the place of a miracle… So far was S. Gregory from contemplating a physical change that he, as well as others compares together the sacred oil, and the wine of the Holy Eucharist.

As Pusey often does, he finishes he discourse with a lengthy catena. The quotes he chooses support the idea of Christ being present in the Eucharist, therefore validating


the Real Presence. Pusey quotes from St. Augustine: “In place of all those sacrifices and oblations, His Body is offered and is ministered to Communicants,”18 And from St. John Chrysostom: “That very Body which sitteth above, is adored by Angels, is nigh to the Power incorruptible, of this do we taste.”19 Pusey quotes both St. Hilary and St. Cyril as using the phrase: “Christ cometh to be in us through His own Flesh,”20 denoting that Christ resides in the believer through the Sacrament of His Body and Blood.

Pusey quotes liberally from the Cappadocian Fathers in the catena portion of the sermon. From St. Basil he quotes: “be holy and spotless, and so eat the Body of Christ and drink the Blood of Christ.”21 From Gregory Nazianzus he writes, “the priests’ approach to the approaching God.”22 And from Gregory Nyssa he writes, “That deathless Body coming to be in him who receives It, transmutes our whole being into Its own Nature.”23 The Cappadocian Fathers emphasize that Christ comes to the believer in the Sacrament. They write about this eloquently and emphasize the transformative nature of the Sacrament and the Real Presence of God in the Sacrament. The Cappadocians stress the importance of the imitation of Christ by the believer and how the Sacrament enables the believer to imitate the life of Christ.24

18 Pusey, The Presence of Christ, 54, citing Augustine, City of God, xvii. 20§ 2.
19 Ibid., 63, citing Chrysostom, in Homily on Ephesians. 3, § 3. See p. 130, Oxf. Tr
21 Ibid., 56, citing St. Basil, the Morals, ch. 22.
23 Ibid., 63, citing S Gregory of Nyssa. Catechetical Oration, according to Maii’s text, Nov. coll. Vi. 368.
The Mystery

Dr. Pusey warns against conjecture on the mode of the Sacrament, and affirmed Article 28 (of the 39 Articles) in a rejection of transubstantiation as commonly understood by the Divines. Pusey explicitly denied the Aristotelian logic of accidents and substances inherent in the Transubstantiation of the Scholastics. Pusey stated that the teaching of the Scholastics went against nature and were not in accord with St. Paul’s teachings that the natural substances were not removed from the elements. Pusey acknowledges that some Church Fathers used such terms as: transmute, trans-make, and transform, but that the Scholastics incorrectly believed this to mean a change of substance. Pusey states, “And further, all these words are also, by the very same Fathers, used of spiritual changes, which do not involve change of substance, and in some of which to suppose a change of substance would be blasphemy, or would contradict an article of faith.”

Dr. Pusey is clear; the elements do not change substance, but still the Body and Blood are present, and they convey grace to the penitent recipient. Dr. Pusey warns against undue speculation of when the elements of bread and wine become the Body and Blood of Christ. The elements become the Body and Blood of Christ by their Consecration by Christ’s testimony. In the sermon, Pusey quotes Herbert Thorndike’s view of the centrality of the Consecration, “It is not to be denied, that all Ecclesiastical writers do, with one mouth, bear witness to the Presence of the Body and Blood of Christ

in the Eucharist. Neither will any one of them be found to ascribe it to any thing but the Consecration.”

Pusey does not point to any exact moment in time, or an exact phrase uttered by the Priest during the liturgy that compels the Holy Ghost to do His work. With the Anglican liturgy it is often pointed out, the epiclesis occurs after the words of institution, the anamnesis. Regardless of the order of words, the importance is the Consecration by a Bishop or Priest in Apostolic Succession. Pusey wrote 14 years earlier to the Bishop of Oxford on this point, quoting Keble from the Tracts,

> Jesus Christ’'s own commission is the best external security I can have, that in receiving this bread and wine, I verily receive His Body and Blood. Either the Bishops have that commission, or there is no such thing in the world. For, at least, Bishops have it with as much evidence as Presbyters without them.

To demonstrate the importance of the consecration by someone ordained to that function, Pusey quotes from the Council of Nicaea Canon 18, “neither the rule nor practice handed down that they who have not power to offer should give the Body of Christ to those who offer.” To Pusey this demonstrates the necessity of consecration by an ordained minister as witnessed at the first ecumenical Council.

---


27 When differentiating between the Anglican, Lutheran, and Roman position, the Episcopacy is often a stumbling point. An understanding of the Church of England as an Apostolic institution that predates the reformation is important to Dr. Pusey’s Anglican ecclesiastical doctrine. Pusey was against the failed joint Anglican-Lutheran Patriarchate of Jerusalem on the grounds of the Lutherans not having Apostolic Succession. See R.W. Greaves, *The English Historical Review*, Vol. 64, No. 252 (July, 1949) 328-352, for the Tractarians' negative reaction to this Bishopric.


29 Pusey, *The Presence of Christ*, 57, citing from the Nicene Council (325), Can 18, Conc. ii 42 (18).
According to Dr. Pusey, the elements become the Body and Blood of Christ during the consecration, but they do not stop being what they already were, bread and wine. Dr. Pusey points to a number of places in Scripture where God makes something new, without it ceasing to be the old thing. Pusey writes, “Thus Holy Scripture says, ‘Man became a living soul;’ without implying that he ceased to be material.”

Pusey quotes John 1:12, “‘to those who believe, to them he gave power to become sons of God,’ yet did they not thereby cease to be, as men, common men.”

The most miraculous, or as Dr. Pusey states it, “awful” of these examples is that of the Incarnation. “The Word became Flesh,” yet did not cease being the Word. Dr. Pusey’s argument is that it is in accordance with God’s works, the bread and wine should not stop being bread and wine, yet really become what Christ said they were, “My Body,” and “My Blood”. The real outward substance of the elements does nothing to negate the real spiritual substance of the Sacrament.

Pusey saw his position as the via media between Geneva and Rome and said in his sermon:

If, as the Genevan school would have it, the words “this is my Body” were figurative, or if, as Roman Divines say, St. Paul’s words were figurative “the bread that we break,” yet, Our Lord does not say more distinctly, “This is My Blood of the New Testament which is shed for many for the remission of sins,” than He subjoins immediately, “I will not drink henceforth of this fruit of the vine, until that day when I drink it new with you in my Father’s Kingdom.” He says as plainly “the fruit of the vine,” as He had said, “This is My Blood.” He says both. We believe both.  

---

30 Ibid., 17.  
31 Ibid., 18.  
32 Ibid., 33-34.
Pusey’s point is that there is a spiritual change, not a physical change in the elements. Pusey argues against seeing the Words of Institution as figurative, which he believes is the Genevan understanding. There might not be a physical change in the elements (which remain bread and wine) but a real change has occurred, the bread and wine are not only what they were before the consecration, they are now by the Lord’s promise, His Body and His Blood through a spiritual change. Pusey is clear that the Lord is not using figurative language in the Eucharistic narratives. When Jesus describes Himself as “I am the Door,” or “I am the Vine,” or “I am the Good Shepherd,” he is using picture language to figuratively describe himself; he is not literally describing his profession as that of a shepherd. Pusey showed that each time figurative language is used, it is in a parable or it is otherwise signified, but that in the Eucharistic passages, Christ does not use any such figurative device. 33 Jesus truly means what he says about the bread and the wine.

Pusey draws on the figurative language in 1 Corinthians 10 where St. Paul declares Christ the Rock that the Israelites drank from in the wilderness. This is clearly figurative, there is no accompanying ritual for drinking from rocks or warnings or blessings for the Church to mimic the Israelites experience with the Rock. Rather the Rock, prefigures the true Rock, whose very Blood is the true drink that provides life for the faithful. Most plainly, Dr. Pusey quotes from the Prayer Book,

When we are taught to pray that we “may so eat the Flesh of Christ, and drink His Blood, that our sinful bodies may be made clean by His Body, and our souls washed through His most Precious Blood,” we mean a real, actual, though

33 Ibid., 29-33.
Sacramental and spiritual drinking; we do not mean a figurative cleansing by a figurative eating and drinking.\footnote{Ibid., 33, citing from the 1662 Prayer Book- the Prayer of Humble Access, that is said in unison by the congregation and priest directly before communion.}

Testifying to the uniqueness of the Eucharistic narratives, Pusey remarks that the Prayer of Consecration is closely related over four different New Testament authors, with Matthew and Mark being nearly identical; and Luke and Paul also closely related. \footnote{For a parallel view of the Prayer of Consecration found in the New Testament and its influence on the Prayer Book see Evan Daniel, \textit{The Prayer-Book: It’s History, Language, and Contents} 23rd ed., (London: Wells, Gardner, Darton & Co, 1901), 379.} For Pusey this is a sign of Divine Providence of the uniqueness and importance of this Prayer. These Eucharistic texts are different from any other literary or metaphorical method the Lord used to teach, instruct, or illustrate in the New Testament. In the Eucharistic passages, figurative language is not being used, and the narratives are not in the form of a parable according to Dr. Pusey. When Jesus declares that, “this is my Blood of the New Testament, which is shed for many for the remission of sins,” He is establishing the Sacrament, not telling a parable. The plain word of Scripture is that, “This is my Body,” and “This is my Blood,” to Pusey this prime authority that is necessary to believe in the Real Presence of Christ in the Eucharist. That Christ is present in the Eucharist means that it is absolutely necessary for the communicant to approach in holiness. Pusey has Matthew 22 in mind when he writes in his sermon,

\begin{quote}
But nearness to God has also an awful aspect. ‘Our God is a consuming fire.’ Your consciences, my younger brethren, can best tell you whether your souls are arrayed in the wedding-garment which Christ gives, and which Christ requires in those who would approach to His Heavenly Feast.\footnote{Pusey, \textit{The Presence of Christ}, 10-11.}
\end{quote}
Holiness and piety were such a large part of the Tractarian program and for Dr. Pusey they come together in the Eucharist. The Lord must be approached in Holiness, as the High Priest had written across his headband, Holiness to the Lord, so the communicant who is coming into the Real Presence must come in Holiness. As the High Priest had to put on Vestments designed by God, the penitent must piously put on Christ to approach Christ. Piety is one of the outcomes of union with Christ, as Pusey states as, “By His Body and Blood will Christ prepare you for your conflict. Satan stands in awe of you.”

**Unseen and Underneath**

Dr. Pusey states in his sermon,

And so, as to the Holy Eucharist, men can conceive that the elements after consecration are only what they seem and what they were before, not the vehicle of an Unseen Presence; or again, they can imagine that they are nothing but an outward show, and that the Body of Christ alone is present; they can forget either the Unseen Presence of the visible form, but they have difficulty in receiving the thought which the Church of England suggests in her words, “of the due receiving of the blessed Body and Blood of our Saviour Christ under the form of bread and wine.”

Dr. Pusey is adamant that the elements do not cease to be what they were, contra transubstantiation, but he also rejects consubstantiation. In Pusey’s book, the *Real Presence of the Body and Blood of Our Lord Jesus Christ*, Pusey goes to great lengths to prove that Luther did not teach consubstantiation. Pusey pointed out that

---

37 Exodus 28.


39 Ibid., 13-14.
consubstantiation was a term used by Luther’s opponents against him and not by Luther himself.\textsuperscript{40} Consubstantiation (in which the Body of Christ is one and the same substance with the bread) is blasphemous and treads too close to impanation, \textit{Deus panis factus}, according to Pusey.\textsuperscript{41} Pusey believes that co-existence, the term used by Occam, is the best definition of the Lutheran position of Christ’s presence in the Eucharist, a position that Pusey supports.

To Pusey, the bread and wine remain and are not annihilated, but at the consecration, Christ spiritually becomes truly present under the elements. Consubstantiation would mean that the natural elements and God had combined to make God a piece of bread. This is something that Pusey vehemently denied. Rather the bread remains bread, and is rightfully called bread, but there is a spiritual change, where Christ is spiritually present in the Eucharist, and the bread can now be called His Body, because Christ’s body is spiritually present under the bread.\textsuperscript{42}

Dr. Pusey invokes the Council of Ephesus where Christ’s consubstantial nature with humans in His humanity and consubstantial nature with God in His divinity was established. There is no hypostasis union with God and the elements of the Sacrament. The Word did not become bread; the Word became flesh. The union in the Eucharist is a

\textsuperscript{40} Edward Pusey, \textit{The Real Presence of the Body and Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ}, (Oxford: John Henry Parker, 1957), 32.

\textsuperscript{41} Dr. Pusey’s complete view on Consubstantiation and why it is not what the Lutherans taught can be found in \textit{The Doctrine of the Real Presence}, 1-29.

\textsuperscript{42} According to Pusey the issue between Lutherans and Roman Catholics revolves around the German “gestalt” and the Latin “species.” Pusey, a master linguist, writes: “Gestalt,” as used of the outward part of the Holy Eucharist, has two meanings, corresponding with the two uses of the Latin word “species,” of which it is a translation. The one sense it has, when used in the phrase of receiving the Sacrament “in” or “under both kinds.” In this sense, it is used for the Latin word “species,” not in the sense of “form or appearance,” but in that for which we have in English naturalized the Latin “species,” i.e. “kind.” \textit{The Real Presence} 18.
Sacramental union and not one of hypostasis. Dr. Pusey stands with Luther in his refutation of Zwingli in affirming that when Jesus said, “This is my Body,” that is exactly what Jesus meant. To Pusey, the believer isn’t free to go beyond what the Lord said, and isn’t free to go beneath this, the believer must take the Lord at His word.  

Dr. Pusey affirmed that the Presence of Christ in the Eucharist exists apart from the recipient and is objectively present. It does not have to be received by the communicant to be the Body and Blood of Christ; it is objectively the Body and Blood of Christ before reception. St. Paul says that when we eat and drink, “we shew the Lord’s death,” and that those who do so unworthily became sick because of it. The Bread and Wine were communally shared, but only those who took it unworthily suffered illness.

The objective yet unseen Presence of Christ in the Eucharist was due Adoration, but not the host element of bread. Pusey likened the host bread to the clothes of Christ while on earth. Pusey writes, “But faith regards not things visible, only or chiefly; as it regarded not the outward dress of our Lord, save when it touch the hem of His garment, and virtue went out of Him, and healed those who touched in faith.” It would be absurd to worship the clothes of Christ, but it was the Presence of Christ that was to be worshipped. Pusey makes clear in the Sermon that Christ is objectively present, but remains unseen, continuing his discussion of the outward symbols Pusey says,

Faith forgets things outward in His unseen Presence. What is precious to the soul is its Redeemer’s Presence, and its union with Him. It acknowledges, yet is not

---


44 Liddon, 3:425.
anxious about, the presence of the visible symbols. It pierces beyond the veil. It
sees Him who is invisible.  

As the sermon draws to a close Pusey reiterates his point, “See Him not, save by
the eye of faith; touching Him with the hands of the heart.” Christ’s presence is unseen
in the Eucharist, except through faith, which pierces beyond the veil of the physical
world. This unseeing is in accord with Christ’s words to Thomas, “blessed are those who
have not seen, and yet have believed.”

**Aftermath**

After the sermon, Dr. Pusey apprehensively awaited the possible fallout. Dr.
Faussett was present, as was the Provost of Oxford, both Faussett and the Provost had
voted to condemn Pusey’s sermon in 1843. Pusey wrote to Keble that Harrington,
Principal of B.N.C. had said, “they cannot attack him (Pusey) this time, he had
protected himself too well.” Harrington was correct. There were no charges brought up
against Pusey over the sermon, and Pusey took their silence as a vindication of not only
this sermon, but of the condemned sermon he had preached ten years prior.

---

46 Ibid., 72.
47 John 20:29b
48 Brasenose College, Oxford: Harrington had been Principal at BNC since 1842 when the former
Principal Dr. Gilbert became the Bishop of Chichester.
49 Liddon 3:425.
50 Pusey wrote to Keble that, “If Dr. Faussett, etc., let it pass then there is a gain, not for myself
(which does not matter), but for the doctrine.” Maria Trench, *The Story of Dr. Pusey’s Life*, (London:
Longmans, Green, and Co., 1900), 275.
against Pusey’s Eucharistic doctrine beginning with Tract 81 and continuing through the 1850s. Pusey’s, the *Real Presence of the Body and Blood of Our Lord Jesus Christ*, was partially a response to Mr. Goode’s objections to the sermon. This sermon was the culmination of Dr. Pusey’s Eucharistic doctrine. Pusey would supplement and defend the doctrine for the rest of his life, but the development of his doctrine, from Tract 81 in 1836 to this sermon in 1853 completed a journey in which Pusey defined what he believed to be the proper Anglican understanding of the Eucharist in accord with Scripture, the Fathers, and the Anglican divines.
CHAPTER 5
THE LEGACY OF DR. PUSEY

Battlefront

By the 1850s, there was open conflict between the Evangelicals and the successors of the Tractarians. Even as early as 1845, the Evangelicals had singled Pusey out, and published a pamphlet, “Is Our Minister a Puseyite? A Dialogue for the Unlearned,” warning against the telltale signs of Puseyism, which included: appealing to the Church Fathers and to Apostolic Succession.\(^1\) This confrontation between the Evangelicals and the High Churchmen was a seesaw battle, with neither side able to vanquish the other. The issues often came before secular courts, where laymen settled doctrinal and ecclesiastical issues. The Gorham Case\(^2\) was a defeat for the Tractarians in the 1840s, but the Tractarians would soon win a victory in the final outcome of the Denison Case (discussed below) a decade later.

The Evangelical party was understandably scared of what it saw happening in the Oxford Movement. Many of the Tractarians were defecting to Rome, and the Evangelicals simply did not trust those that remained. To make matters worse from the Evangelical point of view, by the 1860s, many of the High Churchmen that had stayed in

---


\(^2\) Gorham was an Evangelical who denied Baptismal regeneration. Bishop Phillpotts examined him for a total of 38 hours, and then dismissed him on grounds that Gorham’s views were not in line with the Church of England. Gorham took the case to court, originally lost the case, but the Privy Council, a secular court, overturned it. For more information on the Gorham Case see John Hunt’s *Religious Thought in England in the Nineteenth Century*, (London: Gibbings and Company, 1896), 181-185.
the Church began looking very Roman Catholic in their vestments and ritual practices. Pusey supported this ritual movement only in the hopes that it would offer an Anglican alternative to the Roman pomp and ritual, and stem the tide of converts, especially for young clergy.\textsuperscript{3} Pusey saw ritualism as a release valve that could ease the pressure for Anglicans who wished to remain loyal to the Church, but felt drawn to the aesthetics of Rome.

Theologically, the Evangelicals detested the Tractarian appeal to the Fathers. They believed that Scripture was the only warrant for Church doctrine. For Pusey, Scripture was first, but then he looked to the Fathers for their interpretations of the Scriptures. William Goode, representing the Evangelical party, would appeal to the Fathers at times, but would write negatively about appealing to Church tradition. Goode states, “Our opponents [the Tractarians] seem to care but little how they weaken the 

\textit{Scriptural} foundation for the doctrine and rites of the Christian religion. If only they can force us to a dependence upon their beloved ‘tradition.’”\textsuperscript{4} 

In opposition to the Tractarians, the Evangelicals believed: a) Apostolic Succession was not necessary for the consecration of the Sacrament,\textsuperscript{5} b) there was no Sacrifice in the Eucharist, it was a memorial of a Sacrifice once offered,\textsuperscript{6} and c) Scripture

\textsuperscript{3} For a summary of Pusey’s views on Ritualism see Reed’s, \textit{Glorious Battle}, 19-28. Also see Pusey’s letter to Bishop Bagot found in Henry Liddon, \textit{Life of Edward Bouverie Pusey}, 4 vols. (London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1893) 2:14-17. In this letter Pusey explains why he is allowing a young priest under his care to wear a stole. He writes, “it seemed a very safe way for the exuberance of youth to vent itself in.”


\textsuperscript{5} In this, Goode saw fit to quote the Church Father, Justin Martyr, in support of laymen celebrating the Lord’s Supper. \textit{The Divine Rule of Faith and Practice}, 2:41.

\textsuperscript{6} Ibid., 2:102-104.
alone, as interpreted by the Reformers, was to be appealed to for the understanding and celebration of the Sacrament.\textsuperscript{7}

In many ways the battle lines are much the same 150 years later. The Questions still exist: to what extent are the Fathers authoritative; and does Church Tradition have a bearing on worship? Before the Oxford Movement, these were not pressing questions being asked in the Church of England. She had settled into a vaguely Reformed theology, with views varying from Zwinglianism to Calvinism.\textsuperscript{8} The Oxford Movement had caused a delineation in doctrine, presenting a dichotomy between the party of the Reformation and the party of the High Church. Views on both sides hardened, causing an unfortunate pitting of Reformers against Church Fathers.

After Pusey’s 1853 sermon, “The Presence of Christ in the Eucharist,” events began to move quickly in regards to the Eucharistic doctrine of the Church of England. Pusey had succeeded in bringing the Eucharist to the forefront of Anglican thought. Victorian Anglicans were now fully engaged in the debate over the Eucharist amidst the controversies and publications of Dr. Pusey.

**The Reserved Sacrament**

Pusey’s initial goal was for his Eucharistic doctrine to be an acceptable expression of Anglicanism, not uniformly implemented and thrust on all Anglicans. From the early days of the Tracts until 1853, Pusey developed his doctrine, refined it, and taught it. After 1853, there were real life consequences to his doctrine beginning to take shape across

\textsuperscript{7} Ibid., 2:4

England and in the Episcopal Church in America. Piety and ritual were being reconsidered in light of the Pusey’s doctrine.

The first test of Pusey’s doctrine in the Church of England had to do with the reserve of the consecrated elements. It began with Archdeacon Robert Wilberforce in 1853, a few months after Dr. Pusey’s sermon.\(^9\) Wilberforce, a Tractarian sympathizer, wrote in favor of adoration due to the reserved Sacrament.\(^10\) Pusey was much disturbed by Wilberforce’s writings, and found them unsatisfactory. Pusey wrote to Keble on the matter, “He (Wilberforce) has not shown (from the Church Fathers) that it was reserved in order to be adored, or was adored when reserved. It was ‘reserved’ for the sick only.” Pusey continues, “But in any case, the Church of England plainly only maintains that our Lord did not institute it for this end, and the Council of Trent admits the same.”\(^11\) Pusey was not against adoration of the Presence of Christ, but he did not see warrant for reserving the Eucharist for the purpose of adoring it. Rather the purpose of the reserve was for the sick. This liturgical practice of reserving the host for adoration was found in the Roman Church and known as the Benediction of the Blessed Sacrament.

In 1856 Dr. Pusey writes to Keble, on the problem that they face with the doctrine of reserve,

I quite expected that we should have very few (yet some) who would commit themselves to the Adoration. I fear that the belief in the Real Presence is very often something very undefined: and among a large class, the presence of the


\(^10\) The reserved Sacrament consists of consecrated hosts that are kept in a Tabernacle or pyx to be distributed to the infirm.

Elements is a ground against Adoration, (as though in adoring Our Blessed Lord in the Flesh, people hesitated because of the dress under which it was veiled).  

Pusey believed that the presence of the bread and wine did not negate the Christian duty to adore the Presence of Christ. The Presence of Christ required adoration, although you would not adore the bread, much as the disciples could worship Christ, without worshipping the clothes that he wore. One was an element of this world (physical garments); the other was the Word become Flesh worthy of worship. In the Eucharist, there was an element of this world (bread), and then the spiritual presence of Christ, truly spiritually present in the Eucharist.

Not all High Church Anglicans were able to walk the fine line that Pusey was able to in regards to transubstantiation. Mackean, the author of the *Eucharistic Doctrine of the Oxford Movement*, writes, “In examining the doctrine of Pusey, we saw that the new Eucharistic theory as expounded by its chief, very cautious, and most learned defender. There was, however, a lower range of exposition (by other Anglican clergymen), which was often crude and materialistic… some even openly adopted transubstantiation.”

These were those clergymen who followed the Tractarians in the 1850s and 1860s, including C.F. Cobb and J.M. Neale.

**Archdeacon Denison**

The trial of Archdeacon Denison was the first case brought before the civil courts on the Eucharistic doctrine espoused by Pusey. George Anthony Denison was archdeacon

---

12 Liddon, 3:437


14 Ibid, 211.
of Taunton from 1851 and was the Vicar of East Brent from 1845 till his death in 1896. He was a rigid High Churchmen, with pronounced Eucharistic views. Archdeacon Denison was the Examining Chaplain for the Bishop of Bath and Wells, and in this office he rejected several candidates for ordination due to their rejection of Baptismal regeneration.¹⁵

Archdeacon Denison was prosecuted in civil courts for his Eucharistic views, which he expressed over the course of three sermons from autumn to spring in 1853-1854. Pusey was not fond of Denison’s tactics, believing that he was heavy handed at times, but still rose to his defense on the grounds of the preservation of the doctrine of the Real Presence. Pusey and Keble both wrote public letters to the Guardian in defense of Denison. Pusey, seeing that the case was heading to trial began writing his definitive book on the subject, the Doctrine of the Real Presence. This book was over 700 pages and was a comprehensive and in-depth patristic study of the Eucharist. Published in 1855, it was well received and helped allay some of the fears of the Evangelicals. Liddon writes that Bishop Phillpotts believed the book was a resounding success containing a “well-timed and triumphant” statement on the doctrine of the Eucharist as understood by the Church.¹⁶

In Pusey’s next book: the Real Presence of the Body and Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, Pusey defends the practice of adoration, but not adoration of the Sacrament, only adoration of the Lord spiritually present. Pusey also defends physical elevation of the

¹⁵ Liddon, 3:427

¹⁶ Liddon, 3:433.
Eucharist, pointing to other Protestants and specifically to Melanchthon who had supported the practice of elevating the Sacrament.17

**Ritual Advances**

The consequence of Dr. Pusey's Eucharistic doctrine and his defense of Eucharistic Adoration was that High Church clergy around England and America had a theological basis on which to advance ritual practices in the liturgy. This was an outcome with which Pusey was not pleased. In 1860, Pusey writes the Bishop of London:

> In regard to my ‘friends’ perhaps I regret the acts to which your Lordship alludes, as deeply as you do. I am in this strange position, that my name is made a by-word for that with which I never had any sympathy, that which the writers of the tracts, with whom in early days I was associated, always deprecated; any innovations in the way of conducting the service, anything of ritualism, or especially any revival of disused vestments.18

The best example of this new ritualism can be found in George Rundle Prynne’s “Eucharistic Manual.” Published in 1864, it includes many of the ornaments and practices still seen today in the Anglican Province of America. In this book, he advocates the use of incense, candles on the Altar, a cross on the middle of the altar, and for the Priest to wear an alb, girdle, maniple, stole, and the chasuble.19 None of these ritual renewals would have been possible without Dr. Pusey’s Eucharistic Doctrine.20

---

17 Pusey quotes Melanchthon: “Many of our people have abrogated it (the practice of Elevation); we here, retain it, according to the old custom; nor do I think that you should change that custom hastily” Edward Pusey, *The Real Presence of the Body and Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ*. (Oxford: John Henry Parker, 1857), 316-317, from Bretsch. iv. P 735 note 6. For more information on Melanchthon, his view of the Eucharist and it’s impact on the English Reformation see, John Schofield, *Philip Melanchthon and the English Reformation*, (UK: Ashgate Publishing, 2006), see especially 182-185.

18 Liddon 4:211

The Anglican Province of America (APA), received this tradition from her mother Church, The Episcopal Church (TEC). The APA separated herself from communion with TEC over issues of Church discipline in the 1960s. The APA can trace its liturgical heritage through TEC and such institutions as Nashotah House, which was founded by a “Puseyite”, the Rev. James Lloyd Breck in 1847, under the authority of the Episcopal Bishop Jackson Kemper, who himself was a supporter of the Tractarians. Several APA priests, including the current Archdeacon of the Diocese of the Eastern United States, have attended or are graduates of Nashotah House.  

Ecumenism

In 1869, Pusey wrote his third Eirenicon, the second addressed to John Henry Newman on the issue of Anglican - Roman Catholic ecumenism. In this Eirenicon, Pusey writes about the apprehension that some Anglicans may have over Eucharistic adoration. As with transubstantiation, Pusey notes that there seems to be a difference between the official doctrine of the Roman Catholic Church on the adoration of the Eucharist and in the popular practice of her adherents. Pusey quotes from two Roman authorities; the first is the Counter-Reformer Molanus,

> The whole Church of the Protestants is averse to the adoration of the Host, for fear of idolatry, not form, indeed but material; in the Roman Church, some teach that the adoration is directed to Christ present; some to the Host present.

---

20 For more on ritualism and Pusey’s relationship to it in the latter part of the nineteenth century see John Shelton Reed’s *Glorious Battle*, (Nashville: Vanderbilt University Press, 1996), especially 68-72.

Catholics, are requested… to teach that adoration should be directed to Christ Present Alone.\(^{22}\)

Pusey also quotes the Roman Catholic Francois Veron,\(^{23}\)

It is false and calumnious to say that we adore in the Eucharist any thing but Jesus Christ, veiled under the species of bread and wine… The adoration which we render to the Holy Sacrament is an absolute worship, in as far as it has for its object Jesus Christ present under the symbols… We adore Jesus Christ in the Sacrament of the Altar, as we honour the king wrapped in his mantle or borne in his carriage.\(^{24}\)

Pusey reasoned, “If such statements as these were authenticated by the Roman Communion… even the uninstructed among us approach the subject of the Roman doctrine on the Holy Eucharist would be essentially changed.”\(^{25}\)

What started as a small faction in the Church of England, pejoratively called Puseyites, had grown into a mainstream and powerful force within the Anglican Church. Dr. Pusey possessed a profound intellect, but his doctrine of the Eucharist was not new. His greatest contribution to the Church was to remind her of the ancient doctrine of the Eucharist found in the Church Fathers that had been neglected in England. His example of steadfastness in the face of Roman defections and rabid anti-sacramentalists is a powerful testimony to the power of the Sacrament outside of the Roman Catholic Church.

The Oxford Movement began as a reform movement to clean up the abuses by the clergy and by the government in the Church of England. It was as much an ethical


\(^{25}\) Ibid., 90.
movement as a theological one, concerned with right behavior as much as right theology. Dr. Pusey, throughout his life, was much more concerned with repentance than with ritual. His desire was that the doctrine that he espoused would lead to piety. Towards the end of Dr. Pusey’s life, the High Churchmen began to move towards a more ritualistic movement that propagated the elaborate ceremonial aspect of the liturgy; something that Pusey himself did not partake in, but accepted it as an outgrowth of his doctrine. Dr. Pusey defended the practice of these rituals as long as it conformed to right doctrine. He also believed that providing people with an aesthetically pleasing service would help them express their reverence within Anglicanism. He always believed ritual should be secondary to the correct theology of the Eucharist. When asked if he supported priests wearing copes he replied that he did not know what a cope was, showing his ignorance of current ceremonial trends.²⁶ Despite his reluctance to participate in the ritualization of the service, Pusey did go on to defend a number of Priests who were persecuted for their ritualistic practices. The practices prohibited at the time included putting candles on the altar, making the sign of the cross, the priest facing ad orientum, and singing of the Agnus Dei, all of which can be found in many current Anglican Churches, including those in the APA.

Even something as simple as celebrating the Eucharist every Sunday was a major achievement for Dr. Pusey and the Tractarians. Before the Oxford Movement, most churches celebrated the Eucharist only on Christmas, Easter and Whitsunday, with only

²⁶ The Cope is a special processional vestment that is like a heavily ornamented cape that clasps around the neck and covers the shoulders.
the really devout churches celebrating once a month. Dr. Pusey encouraged Priests to celebrate the Eucharist every Sunday in an early service before the regular Sunday morning service. This spiritual formation bore fruit in that many Anglican Churches, by the turn of the twentieth century, were celebrating the Eucharist every Sunday.

Dr. Pusey’s Eucharistic doctrine has also borne ecumenical fruit, between Anglicans, Orthodox, and Roman Catholics. Mascall writes that in 1937, the Province of Canterbury finally assented to the real objective presence. Mascall writes,

On January 20th (of 1937) both Houses of Canterbury convocation resolved that the Report of the Conference of Anglican and Rumanian theologians held at Bucarest in June 1935, was “a legitimate interpretation of the faith of the church as held by the Anglican Communion” and approved the Report.”

The Report written in 1935 contained the passage:

In the Eucharist the bread and wine become by consecration (metabole) the Body and Blood of our Lord. How? This is a mystery.

The Eucharistic bread and wine remain the Body and Blood of our Lord as long as these Eucharistic elements exist.

Those who receive the Eucharistic bread and wine truly partake of the Body and Blood of our Lord.

There has since been several Anglican–Orthodox joint statements that have included agreement on the Eucharist, including the Moscow Statement of 1976 and the Dublin Statement of 1984. The Moscow Statement affirms,

---

27 In 1800 on Easter Morning, St. Paul’s Cathedral in London only had 6 communicants for the only Eucharist service that day. John Shelton Reed, Glorious Battle, (Nashville: Vanderbilt University Press, 1996), 77.

28 John Shelton Reed records that by 1870, 5 out of every 6 churches in London celebrated the Eucharist at least weekly. Just ten years prior in 1860, less than half of the churches in London had a weekly Eucharist. Glorious Battle, (Nashville: Vanderbilt University Press, 1996), 77.


The Eucharistic understanding of the Church affirms the presence of Jesus Christ in the Church, which is his Body, and in the Eucharist. Through the action of the Holy Spirit, all faithful communicants share in the one Body of Christ, and become one body in him.33

The Dublin Statement acknowledges,

We are agreed that through the consecratory prayer, addressed to the Father, the bread and wine become the Body and Blood of the glorified Christ by the action of the Holy Spirit in such a way that the faithful people of God receiving Christ may feed upon him in the sacrament. But we have not yet discussed in detail what is the nature of the ineffable change effected through the consecratory prayer, nor have we considered how far the Eucharist may be regarded as a sacrifice.34

Dr. Pusey’s Eucharistic doctrine has also been fruitful in relations with the Roman Church. The Anglican – Roman Catholic International Commission (ARCIC) statement in 2007 of agreement on Eucharistic doctrine would not have been possible without Dr. Pusey’s Eucharistic doctrine. The report concludes that, “We believe that we have reached substantial agreement on the doctrine of the Eucharist.” 35

In light of Eucharistic ecumenical developments Perry Butler writes of the results of the Oxford Movement,

The ramifications of the Catholic Revival within Anglicanism have been enormous. From it have come the restorations of liturgical practices and sacramental teaching associated with Roman Catholicism, the revival of the religious life, greater emphasis on the priestly office and a deepening of devotion.

---


32 The Dublin Agreed Statement was published by SPCK, Anglican-Orthodox Dialogue: The Dublin Agreed Statement 1984, (London: SPCK, 1984)

33 The Moscow Agreed Statement, VI, 23.

34 The Dublin Agreed Statement 1984, VI, 111, d 18-19.

This was not without conflict, which was especially bitter in the ritual controversies of the second half of the nineteenth century. In the longer term, the Catholic Revival opened Anglicanism to a wider understanding of catholicity and sacramental spirituality with profound ecumenical implications for its relationship with the Orthodox and Roman Catholics, but its doctrine of the ministry has proved a stumbling clock in reunion with non-episcopal churches.\(^{36}\)

In this, Dr. Pusey is vindicated in his belief that Rome and Canterbury were compatible in belief in the objective Real Presence of Christ in the Eucharist. Dr. Pusey wrote in 1865 in his Eirenicon:

I should hope that the belief of the ‘real objective Presence’ as therein contained, and so often expressed in our writers, or even the formula in the notice at the close of our first Book of Homilies, “the due receiving of the Body and Blood of Christ under the form of bread and wine,” might become the basis of mutual understanding (between Anglicans and Roman Catholics) instead of any inquiries into the meaning of the words substance or Change.\(^{37}\)

**Conclusion**

Dr. Pusey died on September 16, 1882, with his lone remaining child, Mary, at his bedside. Dr. Pusey was laid to rest at Christ Church Cathedral on September 21, 1882. It was the same Cathedral at which he had preached the condemned sermon. The funeral procession began in the quadrangle and was led by the Pro-Vice Chancellor and senior Proctor. The procession was so large that people walked five abreast, and the procession wrapped around three corners of the quadrangle. When the funeral procession reached the Cathedral, the Bishop of Oxford met the procession along with Rev. Henry Liddon

---


(Pusey’s Biographer) who assisted the Bishop at the service. The Cathedral was full, with one biographer estimating that 300 people had to stand outside during the service.\textsuperscript{38}

Edward Bouverie Pusey had been accepted by his own, after serving as Regius Professor of Hebrew for 54 years. He was interred in the same tomb as his wife Maria and their child Lucy.

Dean Church, priest and author, eulogized his friend Dr. Pusey from the University Pulpit on the opening day of the first term after Pusey’s death, saying,

All who care for the Church of God, all who care for Christ’s religion, even those—I make bold to say—who do not in many things think as he thought, will class him among those who in difficult and anxious times have witnessed, by great zeal, and great effort, and great sacrifices for God, and truth, and holiness; they will see in him one who sought to make religion a living and mighty force over the consciences and in the affairs of men, not by knowledge only and learning, or wisdom and great gifts of persuasion, but still more by boundless devotedness, by the power of a consecrated and unfaltering will.\textsuperscript{39}

Dr. Pusey endured many hardships and controversies during his lifetime. There is little doubt that Dr. Pusey drew strength and comfort from the Holy Eucharist throughout his life, and strengthened others with his teachings on the Eucharist. Dr. Pusey did more than any other divine in the last one hundred and fifty years to restore the Patristic and Anglican understanding of the Eucharist back to the Anglican Church.

\textsuperscript{38} Trench, 554-557.
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