

to think that all their faults are covered if they can only point to something as bad in England. Among Americans in general, however, the feeling against the Mother Country has decreased almost to vanishing point, and given place to a friendliness which betokens the complete reconciliation and moral reunion of the race. There is no country in which individual Englishmen are half so kindly received, or in which they find everything so generously thrown open to them as the United States. The bitterness lingers in the breasts of literary men, soured by rivalry with British authors whose competition presses upon them unfairly, because in the absence of international copyright, the American publisher chooses rather to appropriate than to pay, and thus starves the literary profession in his own country. One of these gentlemen has been graciously describing the women of England as so grossly devoid of delicacy that a trait of it on the part of American women, whose character is its special seat, is enough to provoke their hatred. A man who goes through London society in this frame of mind, and in the belief, which often crops out, that the kindness shown an American is not courtesy, but the tribute of fear to the power of the republic, may easily bring back impressions the truth of which is limited to his personal experience. American periodicals circulating in England, which make themselves the vehicles of this antipathy, pay a compliment to British magnanimity, which we will hope is not ill-deserved.—*The Bystander*.

TWO VIEWS OF DR. PUSEY AND THE OXFORD MOVEMENT.

TWO papers on Dr. Pusey and the Oxford movement, both written in a generous and appreciative spirit, but from different points of view, have appeared, one by Professor Shairp in *Good Words*, the other in the *Fortnightly Review* by the Warden of Keble College, Oxford. Mr. Shairp is a Presbyterian, but he has never hesitated to acknowledge his indebtedness to the great leaders of the movement, Keble, Newman, and Pusey, who exercised so powerful an influence in Oxford during his undergraduate days, and he pays here a warm and evidently sincere tribute to the work and character of Dr. Pusey. But there are naturally aspects of the movement, and of the mind of its chief representative during the last forty years which perplex, if they do not repel, him. And it is a curious coincidence that Mr. Talbot, writing at the same time, should have undertaken to solve precisely what to Mr. Shairp appears inexplicable or inconsistent in the attitude of the great divine. Professor Shairp takes, so to say, as his text a passage from Dr. Liddon's speech at the meeting held the other day to found the Pusey memorial, in which he quoted Dr. Dollinger's estimate of his departed friend, as "a personality in whom are combined a great man of learning, a deeply pious Christian, a perfect gentleman, and a character of great mildness and loveableness," to which Canon Liddon himself added "of remarkable firmness and courage." And he proceeds to trace Dr. Pusey's "many-sided activity" during that period of "tremendous reaction which followed Dr. Newman's secession to Rome," as exemplified at once in his literary labours, his direction of individual consciences—which brought him into conflict with the late Bishop Wilberforce—and his energetic interest in University affairs, in what proved to be the hopeless struggle against the secularisation of Oxford. Professor Shairp frankly acknowledges Dr. Pusey's services as a champion of revelation against the renewed assaults of modern rationalism, but notes as a "weakness" in the line of defence adopted by him and those whom he guided their "absorption in doctrinal and ecclesiastical questions," and consequent "isolation" from their Protestant fellow-Christians at home and abroad; and he accordingly sees in Dr. Pusey's readiness to unite with Evangelicals against the "Essay and Review" writers a partial and tardy correction of a grave mistake. Mr. Talbot, as will presently appear, points out the perfect consistency of his line throughout. Professor Shairp appreciates more clearly Dr. Pusey's relation to the Ritualists, whom he felt to be "carrying out in practice what he had taught in doctrine and theory, though for ceremonial details as such he cared little himself, and rightly attributes to his "chivalrous nature" his vigorous defence of them when attacked, while at the same time exerting his

influence to control extravagances of word or act. It is indeed most true that "a glance over the list of his works published between 1850 and 1880 astounds one by the variety of interests, social and academical, as well as ecclesiastical, which they betoken," and the more so when we recollect in how many spheres besides the literary his constant activity was manifested.

In passing from the paper in *Good Words* to what may not unfitly be called Mr. Talbot's weighty and closely-reasoned Apology for "Dr. Pusey and the High Church Movement" in the *Fortnightly*, we feel at once that we are in the presence not only of a reverent admirer who looked up to him as a great preacher of righteousness, but of a disciple, who offers however no blind and indiscriminate homage, but seeks at once to justify and to interpret the career of the master from whom he believes himself to have learnt so much. As Mr. Talbot puts it, to suppose "The Puseyism was to Dr. Pusey what Positivism was to Comte" is a complete misapprehension; he was not seeking to find room in the Church of England for his own views, but enforcing what he believed to have been all along her genuine teaching. And what gave so peculiar and persuasive a power to his enforcement of it was undoubtedly that "deep religious seriousness" ascribed to him by Cardinal Newman, and which (it is interesting to learn from Mr. Talbot) led the late Professor Conington—also a deeply religious man, but of widely different views—to say, "I put Dr. Pusey in a class by himself above all the other preachers whom I hear at St. Mary's." But with Dr. Pusey this religious seriousness was based on an intensely keen belief in Divine revelation as a communication to man, unique in kind and designed to shape the whole character, dignity, and bearing of human life, while it had left, as its specific and permanent effect in the world, the Church of Christ. The abnormal intensity of this concentration of mind, if not necessary for an ordinary believer in Revelation, "at least, to one who is to be in any sense a prophet of it, is the first of gifts." And a passage follows which seems to us exactly to explain what to Professor Shairp is repulsive or perplexing in Dr. Pusey's mental attitude towards other parties in the Church:—

Accordingly we can deduce from this [intensity of conviction] the whole order of Dr. Pusey's thought. It explains his relations to parties and opinions. It explains the difference between his attitude to the Evangelicals, and to those with whom he might have seemed to have naturally, in culture, in subjects of interest, and in academical associations much more affinity, the "Freethinkers," even the Broad Church men. With the first he felt that he was entirely at one on the great Fact, and therefore he felt for them that sympathy and affection which is so tenderly expressed in a well-known passage at the beginning of his *Eirenicon*. He parted from them when they seemed to him not only to narrow arbitrarily the limits of the Fact, but also to impair precisely those parts of it which connect it by a vital continuity and communication with the believers, and with the individual believer, of the present day. But with the others he felt that he had a greater difference; he thought that they effaced, more or less consciously, the distinction between the supernatural and the natural—that the excepted Christian truths rather as a human climax than as a divine boon—that they relied upon reason in contradistinction to faith or to that instinct of reason by which it acknowledges its own limits and knows when it must bow.

Hence again may be understood, what also Mr. Shairp fails adequately to apprehend, Dr. Pusey's habitual appeal to the Early Church. It has been represented, or resented, as a crotchet, at a time when men crave for what is simple, massive, and permanent in religion, or even—in words cited from a paper of the late Archbishop Tait's—as "taking refuge in the warm air of the fourth century from the cold blasts of modern thought." But with Dr. Pusey this appeal was a matter of fundamental principle. He had little difficulty in showing by documentary evidence what "in truth was a historical truism"—that the English Reformation had always taken the shape of an appeal to Antiquity, and accordingly that those who, either in courts of law or elsewhere, treated the Church of England as a creation of the sixteenth century were taking a line, whether right or wrong, different from that which the Church of England had herself professed to take. Still the necessity of proving all this in detail could not fail to impart a certain air of archaic technicality, as well as a cumbrousness, to a good deal of the early Tractarian literature. A further and more important question remained behind, as to whether this appeal to Antiquity was worth making at all, and was not in reality an unprofitable appeal to a vague, undefined, conflicting authority. The objection was urged with more or less force from very opposite quarters, till it almost seemed as if Dr. Pusey's teaching "was condemned by the consent and coalition of all the talents." But he stood firm.

Against these odds a rare combination of qualities enabled Dr. Pusey to stand firm. His simplicity, his utter unworldliness, the predominance in him of the historical and constructive faculties over the speculative and critical, made him insensible to the glamour of intellectual popularity. His line of battle was too deep to be shaken by the suddenness of any onset on its front. His vast knowledge marshalled under the beliefs which he maintained defied an intellectual *coup de main*, and compelled a regular siege. His was just the character and just the intellect, trained with just the training, to "hold" in a moment of confusion, in what one of the most distinguished living actors in those times has often referred to as "the smash." He "held," and subsequent events have shown that "the Movement" recognised in him the true embodiment of it, mind and conscience.

The moral force of his position is indisputable; it is another question whether the movement made good its claim to respect from an intellectual point of view. Mr. Talbot devotes most of the remainder of his paper to an examination of that question, and he brings out with much force the evidential value of the tradition of the Christian Church as an historical witness, and indicates with precision Dr. Pusey's deliberately chosen position between the rival alternatives—that the Church must be always outwardly one, or that having forfeited external unity it has lost all visible and distinctive marks of corporate identity:—

The structure and faith of the Church he held to be ascertainable beyond all practical question, and therefore where a part of either was absent in a body claiming to be a part of the Christian Church, he denied the claim; there was no option, he felt on grounds either of loyalty or of reason; of loyalty, because he had no right to pronounce this or that Christian institution indifferent; of reason, because otherwise the reality of a visible Church on earth with a continuous existence in fact from the earliest times would have been either disguised or stretched to include the most various and alien forms of Christian religionism.

Mr. Talbot fairly insists that the Oxford Movement has vindicated its reality as well by the internal testimony of thousands of consciences of all ranks, as by the orderly organic and vigorous development of the Colonial and Missionary Churches abroad, and the deepening and extension of religious life and work in the Church at home, which are mainly due to it. To mediate between the faith and modern thought is a true continuation of his work, but one which it was not his mission to undertake, and which must be partly carried on by those whom he could not have accepted as fellow-labourers. He laid the foundation; "the question of the future is whether the Church of England has the courage and faith to build upon it." The problem, adds the writer, is one which may well engage the attention both of men of action and men of thought.—*Saturday Review*.

BISHOP WILBERFORCE.

A PORTRAYER of the character of Bishop Wilberforce, whose knowledge was limited to the first two volumes of his biography, would have been very imperfectly furnished with materials for a true picture of the man. The image presented by those volumes was that of a saintly, meek and martyr-like prelate, wholly absorbed in spiritual questions, the persecuted but patient and devoted champion of the Church, amidst a perverse, gainsaying, and erring generation. The only thing which seemed to break this picture was a restless locomotiveness. The Apostles, no doubt, travelled much in the course of their missionary enterprises, but they would hardly have rushed about by train; as Bishop Wilberforce did, to dinner parties and country houses. The third volume, with the extracts from the Diary which have set the literary and social world by the ears, opens a window in the prelate's breast, and by its contrast with what preceded, warns us once more of the delusiveness of biography. The character of Bishop Wilberforce was eminently mixed and equivocal, but its chief infirmities were due less perhaps to natural temperament than to a desperate position. As an ecclesiastical statesman, he was compelled to provide himself with a platform; and it was in his efforts to do this that he floundered about like a man breaking through thin ice, and brought himself into disrepute as a shifty intriguer, when sheer perplexity was often the cause of his variations. Making theological platforms, it must be owned, is a business which, even more than that of making political platforms, affords openings for the scoffer. At one time the Bishop strove to combine the Evangelicals with the Anglicans in resistance to Rome and Dissent by superposing upon Anglican Sacramentalism the Evangelical doctrine of Conversion; and his soul, supposing it to have accepted this combination, would, if disembodied, have appeared like a man with two coats put on opposite ways. Safety and danger, not truth and falsehood,

were his. wor
the quarter fr
and just at th
Ritualists to l
chester, put
every timber

In another
the Bishop of
courtliness w
Sam* sprang
propensity.
Cut off from
from the sup
canism has
closely with
Crown, or th
tical power.
fancied tha
safety when
of the king.
though his
provoked je
Wilberforce
taking up I
ries, follow
his powers
Court, of
whom pol
Lord Arth
is the obje
took kindly
admirably
part which
the dabble
excuse: ye
at least, h
known law
is the me
itself an e
hop culti
and in all
magpie co
would li
London, i
the count
was mani
with his
suddenly
federates
manifest
offended
most eq
question.
Winches
sonal ag
bition; l
own ag
that of l

As a d
saving
party l
His pov
himself
thing.
preache
suffered
were p
activity
brains
tute.
called
hopeles
served
which
impair
was n
of inte
the in
in the
gifts v
To do
that t
equal
loose
hand.
er m
It l
draw
mous
publ
its p
A m
if he
sanc

A
the
acco
perh
The
Pott
the d
The
tered
wit
occu