Journal of Anglican Studies (2026), **24**, 39–47
doi:10.1017/S1740355325100508

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1740355325100508 Published online by Cambridge University Press

RESEARCH ARTICLE

Pusey, Scripture and Epistemology

Brian Douglas

Australian Centre for Christianity and Culture, Charles Sturt University, Canberra, ACT, Australia
Email: brian.douglas@icloud.com

(Received 30 March 2025; revised 30 March 2025; accepted 27 April 2025; first published online 04 July 2025)

Abstract
A paper exploring the epistemology of Edward Pusey's work on Scripture.

Keywords: critique of reason; epistemology; exegesis; mediating style; Pusey; Scripture

Pusey is accused by Colin Matthew of abandoning the supposed more liberal and broad church vision of his early years and adopting instead 'a strict, dogmatic, and closed view of faith and scholarship'.[1] Matthew accuses him of leaving behind his professional, scholarly and intellectual interests and substituting a 'dogma' that was 'incompatible with the liberal Anglican view of history'[2] and leading Anglo-Catholicism 'into a dead end'.[3] For Pusey, says Matthew, 'any approach not wholly committed to doctrinal catholicity became dangerous', and so, he spent the rest of his life 'devoted to the construction of a vast anti-modernist edifice',[4] which included, in Matthew's view, a retreat from Protestantism since he argued, perhaps correctly, that Pusey saw Protestantism as too open to individual self-analysis and so untrustworthy. These negative views of Pusey are not universally accepted and others such as David Brown, George Westhaver, Tobias Karlowicz and myself have taken a more positive view of Pusey and his scholarship.[5]

[1]See H.C.G. Matthew, 'Edward Bouverie Pusey: From Scholar to Tractarian', *The Journal of Theological Studies 32.1* (1981), p. 115.

[2]Matthew, 'Edward Bouverie Pusey', 118.

[3]Matthew, 'Edward Bouverie Pusey', 125.

[4]Matthew, 'Edward Bouverie Pusey', 118.

[5]David Brown, 'Pusey as Consistent and Wise: Some Comparisons with Newman', *Anglican and Episcopal History 71* (2002), 3, 328–349; George Westhaver, *The Living Body of the Lord: E.B. Pusey's 'Types and Prophecies of the Old Testament*, PhD Thesis, Durham University, 2012. Available in Durham E-Theses Online: http://etheses.dur.ac.uk/6373, 33; Brian Douglas, *The Eucharistic Theology of Edward Bouverie Pusey: Sources, Context and Doctrine within the Oxford Movement and Beyond* (Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2015); and Tobias Karlowicz, *The Sacramental Vision of Edward Bouverie Pusey* (London: T&T Clark, 2022).

© The Author(s), 2025. Published by Cambridge University Press on behalf of The Journal of Anglican Studies Trust. This is an Open Access article, distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution licence (https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/), which permits unrestricted re-use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

Check for updates

Matthew saw Pusey's dogmatism as explicit[6] in his 1864 lectures on the biblical book of *Daniel*, entitled *Daniel the Prophet*,[7] where he says, Pusey specifically rejected the emerging higher criticism of the Bible in the nineteenth century expressed in contemporary works such as *Essays and Reviews.*[8] *Essays and Reviews* aimed for free enquiry in religious matters, including a liberal interpretation of Scripture.[9] Pusey described *Essays and Reviews* as 'that tide of scepticism … let loose upon the young and uninstructed'.[10] For Pusey, *Essays and Reviews* had taken the position that 'the old faith was no longer tenable'[11] and in so doing had undermined people's faith. Pattison, one of the authors of *Essays and Reviews*, pointed to 'the growth and gradual diffusion through all religious thinking of the supremacy of reason'.[12] Pusey rejected this thinking in his 1836 *Lectures on Types and Prophecies* and dismissed 'the treatment of prophecy as a kind of evidence' where there is a 'superficial rationalizing character'.[13] Pusey in *Daniel the Prophet* denied the view 'that God should reveal Himself to His creature man, in any other way than by operation of man's natural reason'.[14] Westhaver argues that what Pusey rejected 'is the type of thinking that combines confidence in autonomous reason with the empiricist view that knowledge is limited to the experience of the senses and reflection on it'.[15] For Pusey, this type of thinking resulted in too much emphasis on the rational and empirical where science can easily become 'as if our faith were to depend upon *our* knowing the answer'[16] or where people were 'laying down the laws upon which it beseems their Maker to act' and that when this happens 'they forget that He *is* their Maker'.[17] Pusey saw reason as much more than this and so rejected any epistemology that defines reason narrowly as scientism or mere sensual evidence. For Pusey, reason involved participation in the divine life, operating as character and perception where there are matters 'which human reason cannot explain'.[18] This is why in the *Lectures on Types and Prophecies,* he is able to say that 'our highest knowledge of God must be our indistinctest'.[19] Pusey's epistemology presented a critique of reason that allowed for the supernatural as a way of knowing. For Pusey, Westhaver argues, 'the study of Scripture requires not

[6]Matthew, 'Edward Bouverie Pusey', 115.

[7]Edward Pusey, *Daniel the Prophet: Nine Lectures delivered in the Divinity School of the University of Oxford* (London: Parker, 1868).

[8]*Essays and Reviews* (London: Parker, 1860).

[9]Benjamin Jowett, 'On the Interpretation of Scripture', in *Essays and Reviews* (London: Parker, 1860), 330–433.

[10]Pusey, *Daniel the Prophet*, iii.

[11]Pusey, *Daniel the Prophet*, iv.

[12]See Mark Pattison, 'Tendencies of Religious Thought in England 1688–1750', in *Essays and* Reviews (London: Parker, 1860), 257.

[13]Edward Pusey, *Lectures on Types and Prophecies*, Unpublished manuscript in the Library of Pusey House, Oxford, 1836, 9. See also Brian Douglas, 'Pusey's "*Lectures on Types and Prophecies of the Old Testament*": Implications for Eucharistic Theology', *International Journal of Systematic Theology 14* (2012), 2, 194–216.

[14]Pusey, *Daniel the Prophet*, xiv.

[15]See Westhaver, *The Living Body of the Lord*, 33.

[16]Pusey, *Daniel the Prophet*, xxiv.

[17]Pusey, *Daniel the Prophet*, xvi.

[18]Pusey, *Daniel the Prophet*, xxiv.

[19]Pusey, *Lectures on Types and Prophecies*, 2.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1740355325100508 Published online by Cambridge University Press

simply certain analytical tools and extensive knowledge, but a character which displays likeness with God'.[20] In Westhaver's analysis, Pusey believed 'the Christian seeks understanding by acting on what is grasped only imperfectly and by faith, and by this response of the whole person, the eye of intellect is turned toward the divine light'[21] rather than mere human intellectual contemplation.

Leighton Frappell argues that Pusey's move from liberal thinking to Anglo-Catholicism was less clear-cut and that there was continuity between the earlier and later periods.[22] Frappell noted that at the early stage of Pusey's life, 'his liberalism was entirely at the service of his orthodoxy'[23] thereby suggesting that Pusey was exposed to the influence of liberal ideas but committed at the same time to orthodoxy. Frappell calls this a 'mediating position'[24] where Pusey was prepared to accept aspects of what he had seen in Germany, particularly the scholarship and piety, alongside his commitment to orthodoxy. Westhaver agrees with Frappell, arguing that the differences between Pusey's views before and after his visits to Germany are nowhere near as great as some would argue.[25] For Westhaver, there is a need to be clearer about the distinction between what Pusey saw as knowledge since religious knowledge was not merely intellectual knowledge, related to a move from liberalism to Anglo-Catholicism, but participation in the divine life.[26]

Pusey certainly rejected modern historical-critical thinking, especially in his lectures entitled *Daniel the Prophet*, although care is needed here since Pusey's objections to historical criticism were more about epistemology than biblical theology. Pusey's concern was to reject an over-reliance on science and empirical method and to place science in right relationship to faith, rather than to reject science *per se*. Nockles confirms that this was the Tractarian attitude to science and in fact the Tractarians saw scientific discovery as positive and having little or nothing to do with negative reactions to science by the Evangelicals.[27] According to Nockles, 'it was not science as such, but the new breed of "gentlemen of science" represented by the activities of the British Association, and the new and radical definition of the meaning and realm of science that they propagated, which the Tractarians repudiated', since the British Association presented 'claims to absolute intellectual authority, without regard to the claims of Revelation'.[28] At the Church Congress in Norwich in 1865, Pusey explained the Tractarian view and delivered a paper related to Scripture and science.[29] Here, Pusey argued that:

[20]Westhaver, *The Living Body of the Lord*, 87.

[21]Westhaver, *The Living Body of the Lord*, 88.

[22]Leighton Frappell, '"Science" in the Service of Orthodoxy', in Perry Butler (ed.) *Pusey Rediscovered* (London: SPCK, 1983), 1–33.

[23]Frappell, '"Science" in the Service of Orthodoxy', 12.

[24]Frappell, '"Science" in the Service of Orthodoxy', 12.

[25]Westhaver, *The Living Body of the Lord*, 43, Note 59.

[26]Westhaver, *The Living Body of the Lord*, 81.

[27]Peter Nockles, 'An Academic Counter-Revolution: Newman and Tractarian Oxford's Idea of a University', *History of Universities 10* (1991), p. 161.

[28]Nockles, 'An Academic Counter-Revolution', 163. The British Association was a symbol of a rationalizing and liberalizing spirit which the Tractarians rejected.

[29]Edward Pusey, 'The Spirit in which the researches of learning and science should be applied to the study of the Bible', in *Authorized Report of the Church Congress held at Norwich on the 3rd, 4th and 5th October, 1865* (Norwich: Cundall and Miller, 1866), 181–198.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1740355325100508 Published online by Cambridge University Press

> Physical science and faith are not commensurate. Faith relates to that which is supernatural; science, to things natural; faith *rests* upon the supernatural; science, upon man's natural powers of observation, induction, combination, inference, deduction; faith has to do chiefly with the invisible; science, with this visible order of things. Science relates to causes and effects, the laws by which God upholds His material creation, or its past history. It is purely material. Faith relates to God, His Revelation, His Word. Faith has the certainty of a Divine gift; science has the certainty of human reasoning. Faith is one Divine, God-given, habit of mind.[30]

Pusey does not reject science out of hand, rather he distinguishes science from faith and notes that faith is based on the supernatural whereas science is based on the natural. Pusey did not reject human reason but made the point that human reason is not how people come to faith and know the revelation of God. While science and faith were not commensurate in Pusey's view, each was also seen as a legitimate way of knowing. Pusey's concern here was about epistemology, that is, with the different ways of knowing for both faith and science, not some conservative rant dismissing science and scientific method altogether. Pusey's fear was that science, narrowly and exclusively applied, in the form of higher criticism, as he saw it expressed in *Essays and Reviews*, would 'supplant historic Christianity by a new religion of science'.[31]

Frappell's position is that Pusey cannot be so easily classified as Protestant at one point of time and then suddenly Anglo-Catholic at another. Frappell also argues that the Oxford Movement involved not only a recovery of the catholic tradition of Anglicanism but that it was 'also a movement of Protestant regeneration'[32] since it always stood for the all-sufficiency of Scripture but at the same time took the mediating position of acknowledging the teaching authority of the Church and renewing the connections between credal formularies and the inspired Word of God. In all this, Frappell argues that Pusey was 'the most Protestant' since for Pusey, it was always important 'to prove the ancient credal foundations of the faith against scripture'.[33] Pusey took the view that the single witness of the Apostolic and Reformed Anglican Church based its authentic expression on scriptural faith. Such a Protestant reverence for Scripture never left Pusey in his later years and so he moved from a liberal to a more conservative or perhaps more accurately, to a more cautious position, in relation to higher criticism. Frappell argues that 'Scripture exegesis was ... at the heart of Pusey's divinity'[34] over his whole scholarly career. This suggests that 'on inspection Pusey's "liberalism" often turns out to be a conservative tactic to spike the guns of liberal and evangelical opponents'[35] since it was the balancing of a seemingly Protestant respect for Scripture with Catholic respect for tradition which involved him in a harmony of Scripture, creed and holiness of life.

[30]Pusey, 'The Spirit in which the researches of learning and science should be applied to the study of the Bible', 189.

[31]Nockles, 'An Academic Counter-Revolution', 163.

[32]Leighton Frappell, 'Protestant and Catholic in the Oxford Fathers', in John A. Moses (ed.) *From Oxford to the Bush. Essays on Catholic Anglicanism in Australia* (Adelaide: SPCKA, 1997), 263.

[33]Frappell, 'Protestant and Catholic in the Oxford Fathers', 268.

[34]Frappell, 'Protestant and Catholic in the Oxford Fathers', 269.

[35]Frappell, 'Protestant and Catholic in the Oxford Fathers', 269.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1740355325100508 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Pusey's more mediating style acknowledged that the intellect was never enough in a life of faith. This is why Frappell suggests that any liberalism on the part of Pusey was in fact a conservative tactic to establish his mediating position more firmly. What seems to be commented on less is that through the whole German period and into his later life, Pusey maintained a continuity with his commitment to the Fathers of the early Church.[36] Any discontinuity in Pusey's thinking may not be as clear cut as some might suggest.

Instead of decisively leaving his liberalism behind, Pusey actually adopted it long after his early years. Pusey's transition from liberal Protestantism to Anglo-Catholicism seems less related to moving from a liberal position to a conservative one and more to the development of a cautious mediating style. It was the study of the Fathers that convinced Pusey of 'catholic truth', since for Pusey, this encompassed a reverence for Scripture free of modern dependence on reason alone. This did not mean that Pusey became uncritical but rather it meant that he embraced a wider epistemology and rejected intellectual reason alone as a source of knowledge.

Even as early as 1836, Pusey was taking this mediating position in his *Lectures on Types and Prophecies of the Old Testament* where he used the Scriptures, the analogical approach of the Fathers, the insights of the Romantic poets and the creative assumption of realism to argue for a rediscovery of sacramental efficacy, while at the same time taking the account of the Old Testament seriously as a type of the New Testament. Frappell picks this up as he comments that for Pusey, the incarnation was the centre of this work, 'expressing his sense of mystery and awe at God's condescension in a developed sacramentalism'.[37] For Pusey, this seems to be re-appraisal or perhaps a development in theological understanding and epistemology rather than a clear-cut change.

Those who see Pusey only through the lens of obscurantism and conservatism will usually cite Pusey's lectures on the Book of *Daniel*, entitled *Daniel the Prophet,* as evidence to support such a view, since it is here that Pusey distances himself from any higher criticism of the biblical text.[38] Avis argues that *Daniel the Prophet* was a witness to 'the betrayal of the light'. Pusey had seen as a young scholar in Germany and that the work is an 'acceptance of a life-rejecting spirituality and theological defensiveness'.[39] Forrester refers to these lectures as 'monumentally conservative',[40] but for Pusey, the choice of the Book of *Daniel* as the subject of a biblical commentary was a test case, since the emerging higher critics saw the Book of *Daniel* as a vindication for their views against conservative views.[41] Pusey himself admitted this when speaking of 'unbelieving critics' who 'considered their attacks upon it [The Book of Daniel] to be one of their greatest triumphs'.[42] Pusey, however, set out 'to meet the pseudo-criticism on its own grounds'[43] taking the words of Jesus

[36]William Franklin, 'The Impact of Germany on the Anglican Catholic Revival in the Nineteenth Century', *Anglican and Episcopal History*, LXI (1992), 4 December, 442.

[37]Frappell, '"Science" in the Service of Orthodoxy', 25.

[38]Matthew, 'Edward Bouverie Pusey', p. 115 and Avis, *Anglicanism and the Christian Church*, 213.

[39]Paul Avis, *Anglicanism and the Christian Church*, (London: T&T Clark, 2002), 233.

[40]David Forrester, *Young Doctor Pusey: A Study in Development* (London: Mowbray, 1989), 50.

[41]Jowett, 'On the Interpretation of Scripture', 371.

[42]Pusey, *Daniel the Prophet*, vi.

[43]Pusey, *Daniel the Prophet*, xii.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1740355325100508 Published online by Cambridge University Press

on Daniel as recorded in the Gospels[44] as the end of the matter. In Pusey's view, if these words of Jesus were dismissed, then this is no true prophecy since Jesus could not have said something erroneous. Pusey believed that the modern critics had questioned the prophecies of the Book of *Daniel* on historical grounds but this was no argument for Pusey since the historical portions of the Book of *Daniel* were for him 'no history'[45] and 'the Book of Daniel has nothing to do with secular history'[46] but is rather a record of God's supernatural events where 'whatever details are given, the prophecies are neither chronology nor history'.[47]

Larsen tells us that Pusey in *Daniel the Prophet* puts the case for the date of this book as early (around the sixth century BCE). Modern scholars reject this traditional date and argue for a later date (around the second century BCE).[48] Pusey, however, took the view that the stories in *Daniel* were divinely inspired prophecy and so raised the question of conflict between criticism and faith.[49] This in itself suggests a mediating position where there is balance between scholarship and experience and the idea that for Pusey, there is a moral question about how Scripture functions in the church and the lives of people and about the relationship between the two testaments and the nature of prophecy and how that works. Pusey, as Seitz observes, is therefore concerned about the text, the church and the world,[50] and these allow us to see his concern for the whole text of Scripture operating in the church and the world, without making any judgments about whether Pusey was right or wrong about matters of dating. Pusey had convinced the Book of *Daniel* was either divine or an imposture and so believed that the position adopted by the higher critics must rest on a dogmatic, reasoned denial of the possibility of predictive prophecy.[51] Seitz argues that this meant for Pusey that the 'Christian faith, insofar as it is reliant on Scripture's two-testament presentation, is under massive and unprecedented assault, and Pusey is standing on a fault line of enormous proportions'.[52] Pusey's earlier criticism of the theology of Germany and his belief in the typological approach to the Old Testament, therefore, led him to reject the higher criticism and to affirm the Book of *Daniel* as a prophetic work with the traditional date, but did not lead him to reject a mediating style. Larsen says that it is not sufficient to dismiss Pusey's *Daniel the Prophet* as obscurantist simply because it is conservative in its dating and instead argues that what is needed is an examination of this work, as cogent biblical analysis, and with its contents in context.[53] This

[44]Matthew 24: 15 – 'So when you see the desolating sacrilege standing in the holy place, as was spoken of by the prophet Daniel (let the reader understand)' and Mark 13: 14 – 'But when you see the desolating sacrilege set up where it ought not to be (let the reader understand), then those in Judea must flee to the mountains'.

[45]Pusey, *Daniel the Prophet*, viii.

[46]Pusey, *Daniel the Prophet*, ix.

[47]Pusey, *Daniel the Prophet*, x.

[48]See John Goldingay, *Daniel: World Biblical Commentary. Volume 30* (Nashville, Tennessee: Thomas Nelson, 1989) and John J. Collins, *Daniel. A Commentary on the Book of Daniel* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1993).

[49]Goldingay, *Daniel*, xxxvi and xxxix.

[50]Christopher Seitz, *Figured Out: Typology and Providence in Christian Scripture* (Louisville and London: Westminster John Knox Press, 2001), 17.

[51]Collins, *Daniel*, 26.

[52]Seitz, *Figured Out*, 18.

[53]Timothy Larsen, 'E. B. Pusey and Holy Scripture', *Journal of Theological Studies 60* (2009), 2, 507.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1740355325100508 Published online by Cambridge University Press

meant, as Seitz argues, that 'for Pusey, the scriptures in their entirety required a consistent view of prophecy and miracle, on the one hand, and on the other, the record of the second testament was used as a guide to the proper interpretation of the first'.[54] The wisdom of Pusey's work relates more to the consistency of his position and the quality of his linguistic work than to his aversion to higher criticism and its overly intellectual approach. As Knetsch concludes: 'What remains constant in Pusey's thought is a rigid rejection of the "orthodoxism" that simplifies the Christian faith into a purely propositional form'.[55] For Pusey, as I have argued elsewhere, it was a question of degree rather than complete rejection of liberalism and reason, and it was this preparedness to embrace a mediation between reason and a more conservative view that distinguishes him and his method and prevents a too simplistic analysis of rapid change or conversion during his early years from a liberal to a more conservative view in subsequent and later years and marks the work *Daniel the Prophet* as a remarkable piece of scholarship which remained current for many years.[56] A sole reliance on the propositional nature of the intellect was never sufficient for Pusey, since mystery and the supernatural were not dependent on empirical methods, inevitably focused on physicality in relation to the sacraments, and it is here that the epistemological focus in Pusey comes to the fore.

Pusey's mature theology was based on an epistemology emphasising biblical and patristic models of typology, as well as catholic and Anglican tradition. Pusey's epistemological commitments also valued the mystical experience beyond scientific methodology. An examination of these epistemological commitments is an important way of reassessing Pusey as a theologian since it was here that Pusey employed creative thought in exploring ways of knowing, and it is also here that Pusey's work has much in common with modern thinking. These epistemological commitments hold out the hope of assessing the depth of Pusey's theological output in ways that move past the psychological caricatures of Pusey which seem to divert the study of Pusey's work into character assessment alone.

For Pusey, George Westhaver observes, there was a vital 'distinction between a higher kind of reason which offers an intuitive vision of spiritual and supra-sensual realities and a lower form of discursive or analytical reason'.[57] It was this spiritual and supra-sensual higher kind of reason that underlay Pusey's epistemological commitment to realist sacramental theology and at the same time his rejection of empiricist methodologies. Pusey, in his rejection of the higher criticism of the Bible, was rejecting the emphasis on the empirical – both evidence and method in the study of theology, but not reason *per se*. He was objecting to the type of epistemology that focussed on the intellect alone and so under-valued the spiritual, the supernatural and the mystical to be found in a sacramental ontology.

For Pusey, there was much more at stake than mere intellectual activity. The epistemology that he adopted in his rejection of higher criticism displayed a deep

[54]Seitz, *Figured Out*, 19.

[55]Robert Knetsch, *A Darkened Reading: A Reception History of the Book of Isaiah in a Divided Church* (Cambridge: James Clarke & Co, 2014), 130.

[56]See Brian Douglas, 'Pusey and Scripture: Dead End or Fertile Ground,' *New Blackfriars*, *100.1096* (2020), pp. 698–715.

[57]Westhaver, *The Living Body of the Lord,* 113.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1740355325100508 Published online by Cambridge University Press

dissatisfaction with the Enlightenment appeal to reason alone, narrowly defined, and in fact what Pusey creatively demonstrated was a critique of reason which inspired a mediating position where he pointed to 'the inadequacy of speculative reason in matters uncognizable by sense'.[58] Speculative reason and empirical methods were not sufficient for Pusey, since, he argued, they could never understand how the Scriptures and the sacraments worked in a supernatural, mystical or spiritual way. Rather for Pusey, what was necessary was to listen 'to the voice of nature, the revelation of God within them, and to seek as the direct result of consciousness, the truths which speculation was unable scientifically to justify'.[59]

This is why Pusey, in his *Lectures on Types and Prophecies*, spoke of much more than the exclusive power of speculative reason but instead of 'awe, wonder, the absorbing sense of infinity, of purity, and of holiness' which could 'infuse conviction more directly than reasoning'.[60] In was in so speaking that Pusey perceived God in the natural world by faculties other than the intellect alone. For Pusey, God could not be reduced to concepts alone and to a matter of mind alone. For Pusey, knowing God involved a 'frame of mind'[61] that involved not only the intellect but also the will, affections, conscience and imagination. 'This frame of mind [worked to] impress the feeling of God upon the soul more than any artificial reasoning from final causes' such that this impression is 'made upon us incidentally' in the sense of 'wondering awe'[62] rather than any search for evidence or strategies which 'make conviction their professed object, and recall our minds from the contemplation of these works to reflect on their own convincingness'.[63] So for Pusey:

> We are not formed to seek conviction but to have it. It is brought to us in the way of duty. In all practical matters we live in belief and through acting on belief, believe in the things of God, and thereby attain a higher kind of belief and an insight into our belief. To make a business of obtaining conviction or of providing truth to oneself is, at best, but going out of our way.[64]

Westhaver helpfully observes that Pusey 'describes prophecy as appealing to "feelings" rather than "reasons"'.[65] For Pusey, this is 'feeling and following after the Infinite',[66] and in his discussion of the life of ancient Israel, he believed that this can apply to the rites and institutions as 'feelings which were to them as sense'.[67] Pusey had earlier confirmed the same in his *Theology of Germany I* where in a critique of reason and seemingly, with influence from the Romantic poets, he said: 'the original seat of religion is in the feeling, not in the understanding'.[68] In the material

[58]Pusey, *Theology of Germany,* I, 164.
[59]Pusey, *Theology of Germany,* I, 164.
[60]Pusey, *Lectures on Types and Prophecies,* 6.
[61]Pusey, *Lectures on Types and Prophecies,* 6.
[62]Pusey, *Lectures on Types and Prophecies,* 6.
[63]Pusey, *Lectures on Types and Prophecies,* 6.
[64]Pusey, *Lectures on Types and Prophecies,* 6.
[65]Westhaver, *The Living Body of the Lord',* 124.
[66]Pusey, *Lectures on Types and Prophecies,* 16.
[67]Pusey, *Theology of Germany*, I, 31.
[68]Pusey, *Theology of Germany*, I, 52, note 3.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1740355325100508 Published online by Cambridge University Press

associated with Pusey's *Lectures on Types and Prophecies*, entitled 'Emblematic Language', Pusey says: 'And thus our very words are two-fold; they are taken from material things, have a material substance, yet act invisibly, have an immaterial meaning, as they are received by the eyes and ears but act on the soul'.[69]

For Pusey, knowledge of God was something to be found and into which to grow, through the grace of God in the Scriptures, in the tradition and in the sacraments, rather than something built on scientific evidence and intellectual activity alone. This analysis puts a new light on Pusey's so-called conservatism and places his thought firmly within an ontological framework where there is a preparedness to mediate between intellect and experience. Pusey's epistemology was prepared to accept that knowledge came to people through a variety of sources. This was not to deny the value of science or even higher criticism, but rather in a mediating fashion, to argue that these were not the only ways that humans come to know. For Pusey, as he points out in his *Spiritual Letters* and *Private Prayers*, the knowledge of God gained experientially through Scripture and the sacraments was just as important as any knowledge gained by the scientific endeavour, or through the senses, and there was no purpose in Pusey's mind to deny the spiritual, supernatural and mystical and to affirm only that which could be known through empirical methods.[70]

Pusey does not abandon reason but rather seeks a critique of reason. Pusey does this in his mediating style, where he embraces the hermeneutic of Catholic truth, valuing the experience of the individual seeking God through Scripture and the sacraments. Pusey had a place for the supernatural and the mystical in coming to know God and refused to exclude these ways of knowing in the pursuit of empirical purity. In doing so, Pusey's work and legacy are far from a dead end and in fact fertile ground as part of a chain of knowing in the continuing critique of reason in the modern world. Hence, it is right and good that we consider him in this way in this series of talks.

[69]Edward Pusey, 'Emblematic Language', Supplemental Material to the *Lectures on Types and Prophecies*. Loose papers held at Pusey House, Oxford.

[70]Edward Pusey, *The Spiritual Letters* (London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1901) and Edward Pusey, *Private Prayers* (Henry Liddon, ed.) (London: Rivington, 1883) together with many of his sermons express an ecstatic joy in the knowledge and experience of God that was beyond any empirical investigation.

Cite this article: Douglas, B. (2026). Pusey, Scripture and Epistemology. *Journal of Anglican Studies* **24**, 39–47. https://doi.org/10.1017/S1740355325100508

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1740355325100508 Published online by Cambridge University Press