

Open Research Online

The Open University's repository of research publications and other research outputs

William Dodsworth 1798-1861: the origins of Tractarian thought and practice in London

Thesis

How to cite:

Young, Stephen Edward (2003). William Dodsworth 1798-1861: the origins of Tractarian thought and practice in London. PhD thesis The Open University.

For guidance on citations see [FAQs](#).

© 2003 The Author

Version: Version of Record

Copyright and Moral Rights for the articles on this site are retained by the individual authors and/or other copyright owners. For more information on Open Research Online's [data policy](#) on reuse of materials please consult the policies page.

oro.open.ac.uk

**WILLIAM DODSWORTH 1798-1861:
THE ORIGINS OF TRACTARIAN THOUGHT AND PRACTICE
IN LONDON**

Submitted by

Stephen Edward Young, BD, AKC,

For the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

**In the Department of Religious Studies
Open University**

February 2003

Abstract

William Dodsworth 1798-1861: The Origins of Tractarian Thought and Practice in London

This thesis presents William Dodsworth as a central figure in the transmission of Tractarian ideas from Oxford to London. His career reveals a unique interface between radical Evangelicalism and the first impact of the Oxford Movement on the religious life of the capital.

Dodsworth's formation is set within the variety of religious responses produced by the ideological upheaval consequent upon the French Revolution, and in particular the revival of adventism. His life-long quest for a unified theological system that would resist liberalism in church and state underlies his early involvement in the prophetic studies movement, and his enduring commitment to pre-millennialism. Dodsworth's adventism is the key to his development from Evangelical, through Tractarianism to the Roman Catholic Church. The impetus for this evolution can be traced to his association with Edward Irving and his circle. Irving's eschatology and reinterpretation of traditional Evangelicalism led Dodsworth to an incarnation-centred soteriology which enabled him to develop a new 'Catholic' ecclesiology worked out in his preaching and sacramental practice at the Margaret Chapel from 1829.

Distanced from Irving and drawn into the incipient Tractarian Movement, Dodsworth's potential for leadership was recognised by Newman, and utilized by Pusey in the establishment of Christ Church, Albany Street as a prototype of the Anglo-Catholic parish, and a first embodiment of the Oxford Movement's pastoral ideals in London.

Evaluation of Dodsworth's ministry, preaching and publications not only calls for a reappraisal of his hitherto obscured place in Anglo-Catholic history, but demands a re-examination of the origins of Tractarianism in the capital and especially its relationship to contemporary Evangelicalism. This thesis concludes with a critique of Dodsworth's contribution as an Anglican convert to the Roman Catholic Church, and offers him as a promising subject for future study of nineteenth century religious history.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Title Page	1
Contents	2
Abbreviations	3
Introduction	4
Chapter One: Early Life and Influences	18
Chapter Two: Dodsworth Amongst the Prophets? 1823-1829	44
Chapter Three: The Margaret Chapel: Part One, 1829-1832	68
Chapter Four: The Margaret Chapel: Part Two, 1833-1836	92
Chapter Five: Christ Church, Albany Street, 1837-1844.....	123
Part One: The Parish and Dodsworth's Ministry	
Chapter Six: Christ Church, Albany Street, 1837-1844	156
Part Two: Dodsworth's Impact on the Tractarian Movement	
Chapter Seven: Christ Church, Albany Street, 1845-1850	191
Chapter Eight: Roman Catholic Period, 1850-1861	235
Conclusion.....	269
Bibliography	273

ABBREVIATIONS

BS	British and Foreign Bible Society
CAC	Catholic Apostolic Church
CCAS	Parish Records, Christ Church, Albany Street, London
CMJ	Church's Ministry among the Jews
CMS	Church Missionary Society
CRO	County Record Office
<i>DNB</i>	<i>Dictionary of National Biography</i>
EBP	Edward Bouverie Pusey
<i>GD</i>	<i>Gladstone Diaries</i>
<i>JEH</i>	<i>Journal of Ecclesiastical History</i>
IGI	International Genealogical Index
<i>LDJHN</i>	<i>Letters and Diaries of John Henry Newman</i> : various editions, 31 volumes, Oxford 1861
HEM	Henry Edward Manning
JHN	John Henry Newman
MP	Manning Papers
PP	Pusey Papers
SPCK	Society for the Propagation of Christian Knowledge
SPG	Society for the Propagation of the Gospel
WD	William Dodsworth

INTRODUCTION

This thesis is not a biography in a narrow sense; rather it uses the life, writings and career of William Dodsworth, as a subject for study that opens up wider perspectives on the religious movements of the first part of the nineteenth century.

William Dodsworth was born in Hull in 1798, and brought up as an Anglican Evangelical. His involvement with the Irvingites led to his appointment as minister of the Margaret Chapel in London. Attracted to the incipient Oxford Movement, he became a leading pioneer of London Tractarianism and converted to Roman Catholicism as a result of the Gorham Judgement. He died in 1861. With the benefit of recent scholarship Dodsworth's theological development is presented to demonstrate the interrelatedness of the Evangelical and Tractarian Movements. This is set against the wider picture of early nineteenth century religious history, giving centre stage to the rise of the prophetic studies movement. Whilst it is generally acknowledged that this movement profoundly affected the outlook and self-understanding of Evangelicalism, it has not hitherto been argued that Tractarianism itself owes a significant debt to the 'study of Prophecy'. This is a debt acknowledged by Newman in his *Apologia*, but neglected by subsequent students of the Tractarian movement.

I proceed to refer to the chief preachers of the revived doctrines... and to draw attention to the variety of their respective antecedents. Dr. Hook and Mr. Churton represented the high Church dignitaries of the last century; Mr. Perceval, the Tory aristocracy; Mr. Keble came from a country parsonage; Mr Palmer from Ireland; Dr. Pusey from the Universities of Germany and the study of Arabic MSS; Mr. Dodsworth from the study of Prophecy.¹

The role of pre-millennialism as it influenced Dodsworth is the common theme that runs throughout his career from Evangelical to Roman Catholic. It is difficult to overestimate its effects on his theological development. The 'study of Prophecy' lay at the heart of his belief and motivation, and it is through an examination of his interaction with this 'study' that we can gain new insight into his role in the Tractarian revival.

To achieve this, some background is required to set Dodsworth within the Evangelical world of his earliest years. In the face of the lack of any existing biography,² and a scarcity of primary sources, the opening chapters of this thesis trace his formation, and go on to examine his first encounters with the new radicalism within Evangelicalism. The nature of his eschatological perspectives are viewed in relation to Edward Irving's revolutionary Incarnational theology. This reinterpretation of Evangelicalism was a key factor in Dodsworth's development towards Tractarianism, and it will be argued that his association with Irving has far reaching implications for our understanding of the antecedents of the Catholic movement in the Church of England.

Such a consideration is related to the question as to how the essentially academic Oxford Movement transformed itself into an urban and pastoral phenomenon. It will be argued that this question has not hitherto been adequately addressed by ecclesiastical historians. Dodsworth's career as a pioneer of the movement in London bears directly on this matter. The construction of a continuous and coherent biographical account of this middle period of his career is necessary if this neglected aspect of Anglo-Catholic history is to be assessed. To this extent Dodsworth's pastoral ministry at the Margaret Chapel and Christ Church, Albany Street furnish a credible ground for providing answers to this challenging question of Tractarian origins and development.

The challenge lies mainly in the need to allow primary source material to speak for itself, since it is a fundamental axiom of this thesis that preconceived Anglo-Catholic views of the origins of the Movement have obscured or even distorted our perception of it.³ P. Nockles in a historiographical introduction to his *The Oxford Movement in Context* (1994), argues that only comparatively recently has scholarship in this area endeavoured to free itself from partisan and polemical concerns. He notes that a selective and biased use of sources was a feature of much Anglo-Catholic literature from the earliest days of the Movement's self-reflection. Dodsworth himself is an example of Nockles' point, since H.P. Liddon's seminal work on Pusey set a general tone for future authors by stressing Dodsworth's perceived betrayal of Pusey after the Gorham Judgement, thus effectively excluding him from Anglo-Catholic folk memory.⁴ Nockles observes that even such authoritative undertakings as R.W. Church's history of the Movement (1891),⁵ suggest a defensive (and sometimes aggressive) self-reflection that owes as much to the needs of the Movement to survive in the hostile circumstances of subsequent ecclesiastical politics, as to the material evidence of the case.

Among a number of studies produced around the time of the Oxford Movement's centenary, Y. Brilioth's *The Anglican Revival* (1925)⁶ broke new ground in showing Evangelicalism as an important influence on the Tractarians. E.A. Knox in *The Tractarian Movement 1833-1845* (1933),⁷ writing from an Evangelical standpoint set the Movement in the wider context of a European religious revival. However, J. Kent in *The Unacceptable Face. The Modern Church in the Eyes of the Historian* (1987) has argued that the ecclesiastical presuppositions of even these innovative students of the Movement have stood in the way of an objective appraisal of religious history, observing that much scholarship reproduced 'myth invented in the heat of action, but repeated without serious attempt at historical understanding.'⁸ He commends J. Obelkevich's 'social historical' approach,⁹ not least for making 'Revivalism and adventism ... almost respectable

subjects',¹⁰ and reserves particular criticism for the 'guardians of the myth', who have obstructed historians from relating Anglo-Catholicism and Anglican Evangelicalism to one another.¹¹ Kent even regards much post-war scholarship as inadequate, remarking in 1987 that 'No revolutionary advances have been made in the study of Anglo-Catholicism'.¹²

The more recent contributions of W.S.F. Pickering *Anglo-Catholicism. A Study in Religious Ambiguity* (1989),¹³ J. Shelton Reed's *Glorious Battle. The Cultural Politics of Victorian Anglo-Catholicism* (1996),¹⁴ and P. Vaiss, *From Oxford to the People, Reconsidering Newman and the Oxford Movement* (1996),¹⁵ are in some measure an answer to Kent's criticism, and demonstrate the value of a social history of Tractarianism. Representing a new process of reappraisal of the Movement, they have particular bearing on this thesis since they challenge the presuppositions and methodology of previous historians of Anglo Catholicism. Central to much of their 'reconsideration' is a concern for the social context and cultural import of the Movement beyond Oxford, 'bringing about a revolutionary change in the practical conduct of worship in the Church of England'.¹⁶

With this in view the conceptual starting point of this thesis lies in the work of R.W. Franklin in *Nineteenth Century Churches. The History of a New Catholicism in Württemberg, England, and France* (1987).¹⁷ Franklin's thesis anticipated the concerns of this recent scholarship in working from the now generally agreed view that the French Revolution and its aftermath, together with the social upheavals of the Industrial Revolution era, led to serious dislocation in European religious consciousness.¹⁸ From this standpoint he has demonstrated connective elements in the religious movements of the early nineteenth century. He argues that the Oxford Movement, and in particular its expression in urban Tractarianism, was a result of this wider reaction to changed circumstances. Particular attention will therefore be paid to his methodology,¹⁹ namely, his use of parish and other relevant records as primary sources for constructing 'case studies'

that throw light on his thesis. Furthermore Franklin's focus on the pastoral context has not only stimulated enquiry into Dodsworth's ministry, but has drawn attention to the actual conditions under which this 'New Catholicism' was planted in London.

Franklin broke new ground with his wide perspective on the Movement. By attracting attention to the ecclesiological setting of his 'case studies', and pursuing an analysis of the new Catholic movement, the prior Evangelical landscape of West London inevitably came into focus. This was ground that had been well prepared by the researches of a generation of students whose concern for Evangelical origins has provided a wealth of literature on the crisis in British Evangelicalism in the first part of the nineteenth century. They have argued that a revival of interest in various forms of millennialism was a key factor in this critical period. An investigation of Dodsworth's early career demonstrates his involvement in the rising 'study of Prophecy' from his first encounter with this radical wing of the Evangelical movement at Simeon's Cambridge, and then throughout his first ministries. His moderate pre-millennialism seems to have been developed during the time of the prophecy movement's greatest expansion and maximum influence on the wider church. B. Hilton has explained this eschatological enterprise in terms that to a very large extent correspond with Franklin's understanding of the 'New Catholicism', that is to say, as an attempt to reconcile changing social conditions with traditional concepts of cultural and economic order.²⁰ Other students of the prophecy movement, including S.C. Orchard,²¹ E.R. Sandeen,²² and W.H. Oliver,²³ trace the interrelatedness of various religious movements of the period in terms of their reaction to changed conditions. They interpret Mormons in the USA (1830), Plymouth Brethren (1830) and Adventists (1831), as radical responses shot through with a concern for eschatology and often developing a strong sense of ecclesiology. Each was an attempt to create an 'Apostolic Christianity', and can thus be treated as sharing the same dynamic that was fuelling the prophecy movement within the established churches. Central to such a thesis is Edward Irving. An upsurge of interest in

this fascinating figure has resulted in a number of studies of his impact on Evangelicalism. W.J.C. Irvine²⁴ and S. Gilley²⁵ are two of the most helpful. Dodsworth's interaction with Irving and his patron Drummond, who appointed Dodsworth to the Margaret Chapel in 1829, is a crucial factor in his development and his subsequent role in the Tractarian Movement. Whilst Drummond's effect on Dodsworth was largely strategic, Irving's was primarily a theological one, turning on his revolutionary interpretation of Scripture, in which his pre-millennialism led him to a reappraisal of current Atonement-based Evangelicalism. Developing an Incarnation-centred approach to the biblical revelation, he laid foundations for a radical sacramentalism going behind the controversies of the Reformation era, to a reformulation of Christian doctrine that eventually resulted in his own deposition from office, and propelled Drummond and others in the Albury circle to form the breakaway Catholic Apostolic Church. Dodsworth, however, despite a close association with this group, was to find that his absorption of Irving's radicalism led him in a very different direction.

With this in mind it will be argued that Franklin's 'New Catholicism' should be seen less in denominational terms, and having a broader reference to these elements within Evangelicalism. The search for apostolicity took many and unpredictable forms. Dodsworth was one of these forms. Hilton and Sandeen regard these developments as indicative of a major shift in nineteenth century religious thought.

It is generally recognised that Irving and Drummond's activity had a shattering effect on the Evangelical consensus.²⁶ And R.H. Martin (1974, 1983)²⁷ has related this to the nature of the Movement as a coalition of societies, the Bible, Missionary, and Jews, within which Dodsworth was active during the 1820s, and through which he encountered the leading figures of the new radicalism.²⁸ C. Flegg's work on the formation of the Catholic Apostolic Church (1992) draws attention to this close association of pre-millennialists operating

within the society network, and who exercised increasing influence through such gatherings as the Albury conferences.²⁹ However it is important to distinguish between those who separated from the Established Churches, and those who remained in them. Most were influenced in varying degrees by Irving, but not all should be labelled 'Irvingites'. Dodsworth never quite threw off this label, despite remaining committed to the Church of England. Unlike many within the Albury 'circle', he did not found or join a new religious sect, but carried his distinctive brand of Evangelicalism into the Tractarian enterprise.

N. Yates³⁰ and K. Hylson-Smith³¹ have shown Evangelicalism as possessing strong sacramental and ecclesiological integrity prior to the impact of Tractarianism. In this context Anglo-Catholic 'history', and the reaction of mid-nineteenth century low churchmen, can now be seen as having obscured the high nature of the moderate Calvinism that characterised main stream Evangelical theology and practice during the first quarter of the nineteenth century. Dodsworth's own publications, and his sacramental practice at the Margaret Chapel before 1833 are of particular significance. His distinctiveness lay in an original blend of such high Calvinism with Irving's incarnationalism. This is the key to an appreciation of Dodsworth's contribution. It will be argued that his sacramentalism predated the Oxford Movement and was initially independent of its ideas. Nor was it in any way derived directly from the High Church party. An analysis of Dodsworth's publications reveal much commonality with patristic and classical Anglican authors, but the particular blend is peculiar to Dodsworth himself. E. Jay³² has demonstrated the common ground between pre-millennialists and the Oxford Movement leaders, and a similar view emerges in M. Hennell's *Sons of the Prophets* (1979),³³ which, alongside Clegg's research,³⁴ can be said to have finally laid to rest the idea that Evangelicals at this period were anti-sacramentalists. Even so, Clegg points out that the seeds of later conflict were contained within the theological outlook of much pre-Tractarian Evangelicalism. Dodsworth

illustrates this principle as a product of the diversity and fluid nature of theological positions before 1833, and yet by the middle of the decade he was encountering hostility from some of his former colleagues. This may best be seen as Evangelicals regrouping after the Irving crisis, and a reaffirmation of Atonement-centred thinking. The clash with the Oxford Movement (and Irvingites) resulted in a suspicion of sacramentalism and certain types of ecclesiology, bringing about the hardening of attitudes which left Dodsworth outside the boundaries of the new Evangelical orthodoxy.

P. Toon's *Evangelical Theology 1833-1856: A Response to Tractarianism* (1979),³⁵ has been augmented by Hylson-Smith, both stressing the extent to which Tractarians and Evangelicals were changed by the impact of the Oxford Movement. Individuals responded in a variety of ways. Dodsworth's former colleague at the Albury Conferences, Hugh McNeile,³⁶ was to become an exponent of the new Evangelicalism, whilst Dodsworth's pioneering place within Tractarianism demonstrates how two individuals with a shared pre-millennialist outlook and a common experience of the prophecy movement, could move in such different directions.

The Catholic elements in Dodsworth's Evangelicalism do more than explain his ecclesiastical choices. They are an indication of how the ideals of the Oxford Movement were transplanted and flourished in the very different environment of West London. Thus this thesis challenges the received view of Anglo-Catholic origins as exemplified in W.A. Whitworth's history of All Saints, Margaret Street, *Quam Dilecta* (1890),³⁷ which is restated by P. Galloway, both in his account of the vicars of All Saints, Margaret Street (with C. Rawll), *Good and Faithful Servants* (1988), and, most recently, in his informative study *A Passionate Humility, Frederick Oakeley and the Oxford Movement* (1999).³⁸ Dodsworth, not Oakeley, will be seen to have the prior claim as purveyor of Oxford ideas to London.

A major concern of this thesis is that students of the Catholic Movement within Anglicanism have given too little consideration to its original context, especially in so far as it relates to Evangelicalism. Traditional antagonisms are partly to blame, but the result is the neglect and consequent distortion of the earliest phase of the Movement in London. These years constitute a gap between the Oxford Movement proper, and the rise of Ritualism as an urban phenomenon after 1850. This tendency to equate Tractarianism with Ritualism seems to be responsible for the misunderstanding that attributes the origins of Catholic teaching and practice at the Margaret Chapel to Oakeley's ritualism, thus obscuring Dodsworth's essential role as the real link with the wider religious Movement. This thesis attempts to correct this misapprehension by demonstrating that Dodsworth's publications and ministry at Margaret Street, his influence on such characters as Gladstone and Manning, present a very different picture of Tractarian origins before Oakeley's arrival, as well as placing this new Catholic Movement in the much broader picture of the religious movements of the period.

Although Newman indicated in his *Apologia* the pioneering role he assigned to Dodsworth, it is only in the last forty years or so that scholarship has taken an interest in him. A.M. Allchin's *Silent Rebellion* (1958)³⁹ may be said to have begun the process of rehabilitation. Although Allchin was primarily concerned with the revival of religious life within Anglicanism, his analysis of Dodsworth's role in this revival drew attention to him as pastor of Christ Church, Albany Street. T.J. Williams and A.W. Campbell (1965) further contributed to this rediscovery. J.O. Waller's research (1969) into Christina Rossetti's adventist poetry was significant in its recognition of Dodsworth as 'an improbable combination of High Church adventist and pre-millennialist preacher', and went a long way towards identifying Dodsworth's unique 'prophetic' contribution to Tractarianism.⁴⁰ During the years that followed, Dodsworth's name increasingly appeared in the footnotes and bibliographies of the growing output of publications that a revived interest in

nineteenth century religious history was producing. However he was rarely if ever treated as a subject in his own right, and was normally viewed as a minor character in the upheavals that troubled Tractarians from Newman's conversion to the Gorham Judgement.⁴¹ As we have already noted, it was Liddon's unfavourable treatment of Dodsworth's post-conversion controversy with Pusey that had excluded him from Anglo-Catholic hagiography, and led to his effective obliteration from the official memory of the party. His entry in the *Dictionary of National Biography* is a masterpiece of reinvention as (Roman)'Catholic author',⁴² in which his Evangelical and Tractarian achievement is clearly either unknown or disregarded. Whilst Allchin, Waller and others initiated the slow process of rediscovery, it was the rejuvenation of Anglo-Catholic scholarship in the following decades that drew attention to the considerable body of primary sources from which the real significance of first Christ Church, Albany Street, and then Dodsworth himself emerged. S. Dessain and T. Gornall's work on Newman's diaries, and the flood of Newman-related literature that followed, could not help but bring this hitherto unrecognised character into focus. Likewise renewed interest in Manning drew students to the extensive correspondence between the two friends which is in the Bodleian Library. Similarly the renaissance in Gladstone studies achieved a sharpened profile for Dodsworth that not only recognised his ministry at Christ Church, Albany Street during the 1840s, but as playing an influential role through his preaching and ministry at the Margaret Chapel in the previous decade.

As early as 1970, R. Chapman in *Faith and Revolt* had exemplified a creative and original consideration of this newly emerging source material.⁴³ In his study of Christina Rossetti's Tractarian formation, Dodsworth's preaching and teaching ministry had come into focus. A new picture of the early years of Tractarianism in London was emerging, and Dodsworth was central to it.

Work on Pusey at this time drew out the implications of the Pusey House correspondence for this line of research.⁴⁴ It became clear that Pusey's oversight of St. Saviour's Leeds was not an isolated example of his 'planting' of Tractarian parishes. He and Dodsworth worked closely together in the construction of a model Tractarian parish in London. Christ Church, Albany Street was not just the next stage of his ministry after the Margaret Chapel, but a conscious and planned attempt by the Oxford leaders to plant their ideals in the capital. Dodsworth was their choice, and far from being a secondary character, he was emerging as the pioneer of Tractarianism at parish level.

Even so, as this role became more obvious, scholarship was slow to grasp its implications. G. Rowell in *The Vision Glorious* (1983) devoted a chapter to 'Pioneers in the Parish', yet tended to identify the expansion of Tractarianism into the parishes with the early phases of Ritualism.⁴⁵ Whilst J. Shelton Reed has recently (1996) endorsed the view that the ceremonial development of the Movement must be seen as continuous, and is not usefully broken down into pre-Ritualist or other subdivisions,⁴⁶ nevertheless most studies of this question have overlooked the pastoral roots from which Ritualism as a movement grew and expanded after 1850.

N. Yates' work, especially on St. Saviour's Leeds, had set a precedent for research at ground level,⁴⁷ thus evaluating Tractarianism from its parish context. Franklin's application of the same method to Christ Church, Albany Street confirmed its place as a pioneer parish of the movement through detailed analysis of its records, demonstrating the link between the Oxford Movement as a set of academic ideals, and the implementation of them in the urban setting of West London.

More recently F. Knight's article 'The Influence of the Oxford Movement in the Parishes 1833-1860: A Reassessment' in P. Vaiss *From Oxford to the People* (1996), admitted that.

‘Very little seems to be known about Tractarianism in places outside Oxford in the period before about 1860. This is perhaps a reflection of the way in which the entire Oxford Movement has been studied, rather as a heroic narrative focused on the lives and thoughts of a handful of Oxford men...’ Knight also notes the special difficulties in investigating the earliest period 1833-1845 due to lack of information.⁴⁸ However her identification of the problem and her appeal that more work needs to be done, points the way for Dodsworth to be viewed and evaluated from a social historical perspective free from the ecclesiastical presuppositions of Anglo-Catholic history.

A final aspect of this thesis is Dodsworth’s move through Anglo-Catholicism to reception into the Roman Catholic Church. This was a movement intimately connected with his continuous theological development since his Evangelical years, and closely related to his eschatological world view. P. Adams’ study of the experience of convert Anglicans has provided useful criteria for an evaluation of Dodsworth as a Roman Catholic.⁴⁹ Starting from G. Parsons’s reappraisal of the so-called ‘Second Spring’, it will be argued that Dodsworth’s reinvention as a ‘Catholic Author’ was a product of this wider transition by English Catholicism to a new self-conscious and exclusive ethos and identity.⁵⁰ Against this background, John Wolffe’s study of the hardening of Protestant attitudes during the second quarter of the century, sets Dodsworth’s Roman Catholic experience in the context of a more hostile relationship between the communities, and the extent to which eschatology served to harden positions.⁵¹

This thesis presents a comprehensive account of William Dodsworth, Newman’s choice for pioneer and planter of Oxford Movement ideas in London. His radical Evangelicalism, especially the place of pre-millennialism in his theological mind-set, was seen by Newman as a key ingredient in those varied antecedents of his ‘chief preachers’. Dodsworth is

therefore offered as a promising study for a further appreciation not only of Tractarian history, but the very nature of religious movements in the nineteenth century.

¹ J.H. Newman, *Apologia Pro Vita Sua*, edition 1965, (first published 1864), p.170.

² PP. O. Phillips to H.P. Liddon, 8 August 1887. Dodsworth's daughters, Olivia (Phillips) and Anna (Drummond) told Liddon that they wished to publish a 'short memoir' based on material from Manning, Newman and Pusey. Nothing appears to have come of this project.

³ P.B. Nockles, *The Oxford Movement in Context 1760-1857*, Cambridge, 1994.

⁴ H.P. Liddon, *Life of Edward Bouverie Pusey*, 4 vols, 1893-1894.

⁵ R.W. Church, *The Oxford Movement, Twelve Years, 1833-1845*, 1891.

⁶ Y. Brilioth, *The Anglican Revival. Studies in the Oxford Movement*, 1925.

⁷ E.A. Knox, *The Tractarian Movement 1833-1845*, 1933.

⁸ J. Kent, *The Unacceptable Face. The Modern Church in the Eyes of the Historian*, 1987, p.89.

⁹ J. Obelkevich, *Religion and Rural Society: South Lindsey 1825-1875*, Oxford, 1976.

¹⁰ J. Kent, *op. cit.* p.11.

¹¹ *Ibid*, p.88.

¹² *Ibid*, p.90.

¹³ W.S.F. Pickering, *Anglo-Catholicism, A study in religious ambiguity*, 1989.

¹⁴ J.S. Reed, *Glorious Battle. The Cultural Politics of Victorian Anglo-Catholicism*, Nashville and London, 1996.

¹⁵ P. Vaiss, ed., *From Oxford to the People. Reconsidering Newman and the Oxford Movement*, Leominster, 1996.

¹⁶ W.S.F. Pickering, *op. cit.*, p.21. See also, S. Mumm's social history of the monastic revival in *Stolen Daughters, Virgin Mothers, Anglican Sisterhoods in Victorian Britain*, Leicester 1999.

¹⁷ R.W. Franklin, *Nineteenth-Century Churches. The History of a New Catholicism in Wurttemberg, England and France*, New York & London, 1989, chapter 6.

¹⁸ P. Vaiss, ed., *op. cit.*, G. Rowell, *Church Principles and Protestant Kempism*, 1996, p.18.

¹⁹ P. Vaiss, ed., *op. cit.*, J. Morris *The Regional Growth of Tractarianism* etc, 1996, p.156, footnote 1. Morris notes similar case studies outside London, but is unaware of Franklin's.

²⁰ B. Hilton, *The Age of Atonement: The Influence of Evangelicalism on Social and Economic Thought, 1785-1865*, Oxford, 1988.

²¹ S.C. Orchard, 'English Evangelical Eschatology 1790-1850', PhD. Thesis, Cambridge, 1968.

²² E.R. Sandeen, *The Roots of Fundamentalism*, Chicago, 1970.

²³ W.H. Oliver, *Prophets and Millennialists*, Auckland and Oxford, 1978.

²⁴ W.J.C. Ervine, 'Doctrine and Diplomacy: some aspects of the life and thought of the Anglican Evangelical Clergy 1797-1837', PhD. Thesis, Cambridge, 1979.

²⁵ S.W. Gilley, 'Edward Irving: Prophet of the Millennium', in *Revival and Religion since 1700, Essays for John Walsh*, eds., J. Garnett, and C. Matthew, 1993.

²⁶ W.J.C. Ervine, *op. cit.*, chapter 6.

²⁷ R.H. Martin, *Evangelicals United*, 1983.

²⁸ R.H. Martin, 'The Pan-Evangelical Impulse in Britain 1795-1830, with special reference to Four London Societies', DPhil. Thesis, Oxford, 1974.

²⁹ C.G. Flegg, *Gathered Under Apostles. A Study of the Catholic Apostolic Church*, Oxford, 1992.

³⁰ N. Yates, *Buildings, Faith, and Worship. The Liturgical Arrangement of Anglican Churches, 1600-1900*, Oxford, 1991.

³¹ K. Hylson-Smith, *Evangelicals in the Church of England, 1734-1984*, Edinburgh, 1988.

³² E. Jay, *The Evangelical and Oxford Movements*, Cambridge, 1983.

³³ M. Hennell, *Sons of the Prophets*, 1979.

³⁴ H. Clegg, 'Evangelicals and Tractarians', MA. Thesis, Bristol, 1965.

³⁵ P. Toon, *Evangelical Theology 1833-1856, A Response to Tractarianism*, 1979.

³⁶ J.A. Wardle, 'The Life and Times of the Revd. Dr. Hugh McNeile', MA. Thesis, Manchester, 1981.

³⁷ W.A. Whitworth, *Quam Dilecta*, 1890.

³⁸ P. Galloway and C. Rawll, *Good and Faithful Servants*, 1988. Also P. Galloway, *A Passionate Humility, Frederick Oakeley and the Oxford Movement*, Leominster, 1999, pp. 43,44,63.

-
- ³⁹ A.M. Allchin, *The Silent Rebellion: Anglican Religious Communities 1845-1900*, 1958. J. Kent calls this an 'approving narrative', *op. cit.*, p.95. Also T.J. Williams and A.W. Campbell, *The Park Village Sisterhood*, 1965.
- ⁴⁰ J. O. Waller, 'Christ's Second Coming: Christina Rossetti and the Pre-Millennialist William Dodsworth', *Bulletin of the New York Public Library*, 73, (1969), pp.465-482.
- ⁴¹ A typical treatment of Dodsworth is, W.J. Sparrow Simpson, *The History of the Anglo-Catholic Revival from 1845*, 1932, pp.52,53.
- ⁴² Thompson Cooper, 'William Dodsworth', *DNB*.
- ⁴³ R. Chapman, *Faith and Revolt: Studies in the literary influence of the Oxford Movement*, 1970.
- ⁴⁴ PP, also, P. Butler, ed., *Pusey Rediscovered*, 1983.
- ⁴⁵ G. Rowell, *The Vision Glorious*, 1983.
- ⁴⁶ J. S. Reed, *op. cit.*, p.15.
- ⁴⁷ N. Yates, *The Oxford Movement and Parish Life: St. Saviour's Leeds 1839-1929*, York, Borthwick Institute of Historical Research, Papers, 48, 1975.
- ⁴⁸ P. Vaiss, ed., *op. cit.*, pp.128,129.
- ⁴⁹ P. A. Adams, 'Converts to the Roman Catholic Church in England, circa 1830-1870', BLitt. Thesis, Oxford, 1977.
- ⁵⁰ G. Parsons, ed., *Religion in Victorian Britain, vol !.: Traditions*, Manchester, 1988, chapter 4.
- ⁵¹ J. Wolffe, *The Protestant Crusade in Great Britain*, Oxford, 1991, p.115.

CHAPTER ONE: EARLY LIFE AND INFLUENCES

Little has been hitherto known of Dodsworth's family origins, early life, and first years of his ministry. This chapter reconstructs as far as possible the main features of his early years, against the background of influences that shaped him, and determined his future course.

An interpretation of Dodsworth's life and contribution should be made against this ideological backdrop of Britain in the post-French Revolutionary and Napoleonic era. The spread of 'enlightened' and rationalist ideas was met by political and religious reaction, and it was within this context that the young Dodsworth received his formation; a conflict best seen in his father's choice for him of a liberal education contrasted with his mother's strongly Evangelical background. Whilst it would be unwise to overstate this case, it is possible to indicate certain connective elements in Dodsworth's development, enabling us to gain insight into his character and religious evolution.

It was probably during his Cambridge career and first ministries that these early tensions resolved themselves through his attraction and eventual attachment to the 'study of Prophecy'. The central contention of this thesis is that the interpretative key to Dodsworth's development from an Evangelical, through Tractarianism, to the Roman Catholic Church, is his life long concern for the eschatological dimension of the Christian religion.

1. Family Origins and First Years

William Dodsworth's forebears came from York. His father John was baptised in the Church of St. Mary, Bishophill Senior, in the city of York, on 9 December 1765.¹ The

residents of this part of the city, within the ancient walls, were mainly middle class and professional, lawyers, doctors, printers, and a number of merchants whose offices were on the west bank of the river Ouse. John's father, also called John, was probably one such merchant. Indeed it appears that there were a great many Dodsworths involved in shipping, commerce and trade in the York area. William's father grew up in a modest but industrious family who were benefiting from the vast growth in trade and industry that was transforming Yorkshire.² He married Harriet Haydon on 20 January 1791 in Holy Trinity Church,³ Kingston upon Hull, one of the ancient parish churches of the rapidly expanding town. The register entry indicates that John was still resident in York prior to the marriage, whilst Harriet was resident in Hull. From this date they lived in the High Street, Hull, where John developed his business as a raft merchant.⁴

Laurence Stone has demonstrated the extent to which financial considerations played a part in marriage plans of the middle classes, especially those engaged in 'trade.'⁵ John's move to Hull at the time of his wedding is an example of an alliance of two enterprising families expanding their business interests through marriage.⁶ Harriet Haydon was probably not a native of Hull, and was part of a clan of families centred in Surrey. There had been Haydons in Surrey since at least the late seventeenth century and probably much longer.⁷ There was some connection between certain branches of the family and Dissent, and it is not unlikely that Harriet herself may have been brought up as a Nonconformist.⁸ Certainly the Guildford branch of the family had become keen Evangelicals by the early years of the nineteenth century, although they were also loyal Anglicans. By this time they were leading bankers, and this alliance of religion and capital may have been a key element in the marriage between John and Harriet.⁹ It would explain John's move to Hull, and his considerable success as a raft merchant and ship owner in the years after his marriage. His marriage took him out of the ranks of his ancestors as middle ranking merchants into the upper reaches of the new commercial aristocracy.

In coming to live and work in the High Street, John Dodsworth was at the heart of the business centre of Hull. The High Street had been both the residence and business premises of the merchant community since the Middle Ages. The geographical position of Hull and the relative proximity of the Baltic with its increasing trade in raw materials, gave to this town a prosperity that made possible the rise of hitherto humble merchants to dizzy financial heights within the space of a generation or less. It was to this group that John Dodsworth graduated when he settled in Hull. His business ability, family and marriage alliance brought him into contact with the ruling elite amongst whom were many self-made families, such as the Thorntons, Sykeses and Wilberforces. They would play a significant local, and in some cases, national role in the commercial, social, and religious history of England, and were inseparably bound up with the development of the Evangelical Movement.

During the 1790's Hull merchants expanded trade in iron and wood beyond the Baltic to Russia, an expansion which brought sudden wealth to raft merchants like John Dodsworth. By the opening years of the nineteenth century, he and his brother Benjamin extended their business concerns to ship owning, not always with financial success.

This mercantile community had produced a flourishing social life in and around Hull, including a considerable number of wealthy men who were both indistinguishable from, and accepted by, the 'county society' to which they aspired. John Dodsworth was no exception to this trend, although on a humbler scale than his friends the Sykeses. Furthermore he made his fortune at a time of change when more and more of the richer families were leaving Hull to reside in nearby 'country seats'. John, like many others, now styled himself 'gentleman' even though openly immersed in business concerns.¹⁰

Among those men was the business associate and friend of Dodsworth's, Daniel Sykes (1766-1832).¹¹ His father Joseph Sykes (1723-1805) was a prominent member of the merchant 'aristocracy' living in an imposing mansion at 42 High Street where he had acquired a virtual monopoly of the trade in Swedish iron ore. In 1756 he purchased West Ella Hall, and thus arrived in the ranks of the landed gentry. His fifth son Daniel inherited considerable wealth, and practised law in Hull, eventually becoming Recorder of the town in 1821. As a Whig, a man of liberal, progressive opinions, he represented the town in Parliament after 1820. He was founder of the Peace Society and the Anti-Slavery Society in Hull, as well as promoting the cause of a national system of education. He believed in complete religious toleration, especially Catholic Emancipation. His religious views were highly individualistic, perhaps close to Quakerism, and he was a fervent opponent of what he regarded as sectarian dogmatism. He was related through the marriage of his sister and one of his brothers to Henry Thornton and Henry Venn. Despite being broadly sympathetic to the social and moral aims of the Clapham Sect, he regarded the historical and doctrinal aspects of their faith as irrelevant, and was implicitly sceptical of organised religion as such.¹² John Dodsworth's association with Daniel Sykes seems to have been a close one. He would later name Sykes as an executor and a guardian to his children.¹³ Not only were both families allied through business, but as will be seen, their pursuit of property was also closely connected.¹⁴ This bond may be of great significance in evaluating John Dodsworth's religious outlook and its effect on his son William.

By 1800 John Dodsworth was acquiring property in the East Riding, and had moved to Kirk Ella Hall. This substantial and ancient house was situated in the rural village of Kirk Ella a few miles to the northwest of Hull, in an area particularly favoured by the merchant elite. Daniel Sykes' own residence "Raywell" was only a mile away. Later in 1806 Sykes would purchase Kirk Ella Hall from Dodsworth,¹⁵ possibly to help him out of a difficult financial situation.

Dodsworth's arrival in the 1790s in Kirk Ella, signalled his acceptance within the highest ranks of the Hull merchant community, having successfully turned his origins in 'trade' into the higher social currency of the 'landed gentry'. The society in which he moved was undergoing transformation, particularly in its perception of religion. The Evangelical Revival in this part of the country is well documented.¹⁶ Its impact in Hull was felt after 1746, and from Wesley's first visit in 1752 the movement grew steadily. The conversion of Joseph Milner¹⁷ (by Whitefield's followers) was a landmark, for as master of the Grammar School and lecturer of Holy Trinity, his influence was crucial. At first the wealthy were hostile; even the Wilberforces were suspicious. However before long the Thorntons, patrons of the living of St. Mary's, were appointing Evangelical ministers, and in 1783 Milner's pupil Thomas Clarke became Vicar of Holy Trinity. In 1792 another of Milner's followers, Thomas Dikes, built the new church of St. John to serve the expanding suburbs outside the old town.¹⁸ This popular and gifted preacher filled his church through his powerful expression of the Gospel, and established himself as the most brilliant light in an already shining firmament of Hull Evangelical 'stars'.

There has been much discussion as to how far Methodists and Anglican Evangelicals regarded themselves as separate bodies at this time. Anglican Evangelicals held Calvinistic, or semi-Calvinistic views, whilst most Methodists were Arminian, yet despite these doctrinal differences, many "Methodists" attended St. John's until the end of the Napoleonic Wars, so it would seem that the divergence of Methodism as a separate identity came rather more slowly in Hull than in most other places.¹⁹

At least at first the new Evangelicals kept an harmonious relationship with 'Old Dissent' in Hull, although in time political differences would draw these groups apart. Evangelical Anglicans and Methodists tended to be Tories. Dissenters were not. When a large proportion of Dissenting ministers began to favour many of the ideas associated with the

French Revolution, relations between them and the Anglicans became less happy. Even so, despite emerging differences, cooperation between the parties was such that one minister could describe his arrival in Hull in 1816 as “like joining an informal Evangelical Alliance”.²⁰

The character of Hull was changing towards a new “seriousness” in manner of life and morals.²¹ In a revealing passage from a sermon preached by Dikes on 22 January 1804 in aid of a ‘society for the suppression of vice in Hull’, he not only calls for a clearing up of the morals and manners of citizens, but blames the French Revolution as the origin of lawlessness. “From this mist of Darkness a horrid spirit issued forth, which breathed defiance to the God of Heaven, and subverted the thrones of princes. All laws, human and divine, were trampled under foot.”²²

The Dodsworth family knew Dikes well enough to invite him to conduct the marriage of their eldest daughter Jane in 1819. It is therefore reasonable to assume that like many of the leading families, the Dodsworths were influenced by the Evangelical Movement, although how far John Dodsworth was himself sympathetic is less certain. He was diligent in his church duties at Kirk Ella,²³ and may have attended Dikes’s St. John’s church. John Dodsworth, like many ‘gentlemen’, certainly took his public duties as a Christian citizen seriously as can be seen from his oversight of the poor in 1804.²⁴ Yet there are no clear indications of his personal commitment to Evangelicalism, in fact, the evidence suggests quite a different picture.

Our initial picture of John Dodsworth is of a typical early nineteenth century merchant, with all the aspirations and acumen of that small but nationally significant group made wealthy by the industrial revolution. He was blessed with a flourishing if precarious business, a prestigious home, and wealth enough to warrant the title of a gentleman. He

had excellent connections in the business world, and also within Hull society in general. Furthermore his marriage had brought him into an alliance with wealthy Surrey bankers. Yet this is not the full picture. It seems more likely that, like Daniel Sykes, Dodsworth possessed an independence of spirit that marked him out from many contemporaries, and does not allow us to categorise him easily. Given also the possible Dissenting background of his wife, Harriet, this autonomy of mind may well be an important key to our understanding of the character of their son William.

John and Harriet had at least seven children.²⁵ William was born on 19 March 1798,²⁶ and was baptised on 15 April 1798 in Kirk Ella Parish Church (St. Andrew). His first years were spent in the comfort and security of Kirk Ella Hall, and during this time his father expanded his business and bought up property in the neighbourhood. The precarious nature of early nineteenth century commerce is illustrated by what seems to be a downturn in the family fortunes in 1805. The loss of merchant vessels was followed by the sale of Kirk Ella Hall the following year to Daniel Sykes. This event precipitated the removal of the family to the rather remote and unfashionable area of Holderness. This lies to the northeast of Hull, bordering the sea. It is a flat and bleak agricultural area, and certainly lacked the attractions and prestige of Kirk Ella. Even so, by 1808 John was buying land again, this time in Holderness.²⁷ The sale of his former home may well have given him the capital necessary for recovery.

The Dodsworth's new home lay within the parish of Aldeburgh, a small settlement of scattered farms and hamlets. Although known as 'East Carlton Farm', this was not the title preferred by the new occupants, who constantly referred to it as Carlton Hall.²⁸ There had indeed been an ancient 'Hall' on or near the site of the farm, but by 1805 the site was (and still is) occupied by a large house.²⁹ Rather less substantial than their former home it was suitable for a moderately wealthy country gentleman. The truth however is that John

Dodsworth had ‘come down’ in the world, for the property was never owned by him, and remained in Daniel Sykes’ name until his death.³⁰

Whilst the move to Aldeburgh may have had consequences for the social standing of the family, it does not seem to have affected the education of young William. The choice of school is significant, because John Dodsworth rejected Hull Grammar School in favour of Richmond. At this time the great majority of the gentle classes still sent their sons to local schools. What is more, the choice of Richmond Grammar School is significant because of its reputation.

This establishment was run on the principles of its exceptional headmaster James Tate (1771-1843),³¹ who has been described as ‘a man dripping Greek’.³² He was patronised by the then Rector of Richmond, Francis Blackburne,³³ Archdeacon of Cleveland, sympathetic to Unitarianism and strong in his Whig convictions. Tate, a graduate and fellow of Sidney Sussex College, Cambridge, was appointed Master of Richmond School in 1796, which he turned into the leading classical school of the north, sending large numbers of exceptional scholars to Cambridge – the legendary “Tates Invincibles”. Twenty one became fellows, thirteen at Trinity College. The school became popular with the nobility including Earl Grey, the Whig Prime Minister. Through Grey’s patronage Tate was appointed as Canon of St. Paul’s Cathedral in 1833, where he pursued his liberal aims in tandem with Sydney Smith.

Tate was deeply influenced by his patron Blackburne’s liberal views, both in religion and politics, agreeing with his advocacy of the abandonment of clerical subscription to the Articles of Religion. Indeed Tate regarded himself as a ‘Low Churchman, boldly so, and in all the sentiments of toleration sincere and hearty’.³⁴ He saw himself as a champion of civil

liberty, and the equal rights of man, and would later support Catholic Emancipation.³⁵ He was 'hostile to the bad policy, and...the unchristian intolerance of High Churchmen'.³⁶

It was his progressive methods of classical education that brought renown to Richmond Grammar School. These seem to have consisted largely of trusting to a humane approach to learning, putting emphasis on understanding and questioning, rather than the contemporary method of beating the child into memorisation of the text. Tate regarded sympathy and individual attention of great importance.³⁷ The school was never very large, usually between fifty to sixty boys. Tate's interest in the wider world ensured a steady flow of distinguished and interesting guests, including a Mr. Demilly, a refugee from France of whom Tate says 'He is a very strict Roman Catholic in faith and practise, thinks the moral character of France to have suffered much by the Revolution, and from some appearances amongst the English fears they are not much better...'³⁸ It is very likely that this was William Dodsworth's first contact with Roman Catholicism.

Tate took a profound interest in his pupils, both at the school, and long after they had left. Referring to Dodsworth at St Paul's Cathedral in 1837, he notes in his diary,³⁹ ' June 11. William Dodsworth preached: The first of my pupils.'

Of Tate's one hundred and fifty university pupils, ninety-nine went to Trinity College Cambridge, sixty-two gained college scholarships, ten were university prizemen, fifteen became Wranglers, twenty-one were fellows of their college, two became Archbishops, two Deans, three were university professors, and seven headmasters of schools. The biographies of ten appear in the *Dictionary of National Biography*. William's name was not amongst the list of those Invincibles who became Fellows of Trinity, but he was in the best of company, for the years after 1811 were particularly successful for Old Richmondians at Trinity. It was during these years that William was exposed not only to a

first-rate education, but also to the political and religious influences that James Tate had no hesitation in exercising over his pupils.⁴⁰

It is reasonable to suppose that the young William had a happy time at the school, since there was an intimate, even family atmosphere amongst the boarders, who paid “five guineas entrance or sixty four guineas a year”.⁴¹ Mrs. Tate dined with them daily. Some boarded with Tate, others in the town. Although ‘a classical school’, there were lessons ‘in French, Drawing, Music, Writing and Arithmetic’.⁴² Religious education seems to have been unexceptional, and church attendance received hardly a mention in Tate’s papers. There is no record of Dodsworth’s Confirmation. In view of Dodsworth’s later views, his early education makes fascinating reading, yet even at his most polemical moments, there is in his writing and sermons an element of respect for sound learning and moderation in thought and argument, that perhaps echo the ‘humanity’ of those formative years in Richmond.

To an extent the formative influences in Dodsworth’s childhood were not dissimilar to those of a number of Tractarians, in particular J.H. Newman. Born into a newly successful commercial home, raised in relative comfort, with considerable Evangelical influence, William not only shared the material benefits of his class, but must also have been aware throughout his life, that he could expect financial security as well as an assured place in society.

His education at Richmond Grammar School was presumably planned by his parents to give him the advantages of a classical education that would carry him through Cambridge to Holy Orders. His brothers do not seem to have been given this treatment, doubtless because they were expected to go into commerce with their father. Throughout his life the backcloth of this security was evident, and his marriage into the ‘new aristocracy’ was a

natural development of such expectations. He was the son of a self made man, and there is often a note of self-improvement in his words and actions.

Equally there is a hint of insecurity, a need for certainty that may owe something to his earliest years. The apparent dip in family fortunes in 1805-6, when William was seven years old, and the consequent move to remote 'Carlton' was probably accompanied by a similar dip in living standards, and this may well have affected William, perhaps as sowing the seeds of his later overwhelming sense of the transient nature of this present world. His later millennialism could have some roots in this early experience of the precarious nature of his family's wealth. Likewise the remoteness of his childhood home, and the insular and 'serious' nature of contemporary Evangelical piety, with its emphasis on daily family prayers, strict obedience to parental authority and a repressive moralistic regime, are all elements that re-emerge in various guises throughout his life. Much of this he may have owed to his mother's strong family ties with Evangelicalism. From an early age his family's proximity to the preaching centres of Hull and their close association with the leaders of the movement must have formed in him a strong moral sense, based on a deep personal devotion to the Bible as the Word of God and source of authority. Dodsworth would have been familiar with such figures as Thomas Dikes, whilst regular social contact with the Wilberforces and many other figures of the Evangelical world, placed him in a natural position for a career within the world of the Clapham Sect. That said, it is important not to underestimate the tension in the young Dodsworth's life between very different characters and forces. Against his Evangelical upbringing must be set the influence of William's guardian, Daniel Sykes, his teacher Tate, and not least the figure of his father John. The political and religious liberalism of these figures must have exerted a counter pressure to that of the strict religious and political orthodoxy of so much of his formative environment. Yet Dodsworth's whole life seems to be a reaction against those very rationalist and liberal principles.

This raises the question of how far William's convictions are a revolt against the male authority figures of his youth. Politically Daniel Sykes represents just that viewpoint that Dodsworth would eventually come to see as the expression of the Antichrist in the contemporary world. The constitutional and ideological changes of the 1820s and 1830s which William so heartily opposed, and which led him deeper into the new reactionary religious movements of the time, were the very causes that Sykes did so much to promote. On the surface Sykes seems close to the humanitarian aims of the Clapham Sect, yet in truth his motivating beliefs were deeply radical, far closer to the ideals of the American Revolutionaries than the cautious reformism of Wilberforce. Likewise his religious beliefs were individualistic, rationalist and quietly sceptical of all outward forms, or ecclesiastical institutions. For him freedom in religion was just one important element in the wider context of human liberty. Dodsworth's attachment to doctrinal Evangelicalism, Tractarian sacramentalism, and finally submission to Roman Catholic authority, would fly directly in the face of Sykes and all that he stood for.

This brings us back to the enigmatic figure of John Dodsworth himself. The evidence is too slight to be sure whether he identified himself with Evangelicalism in any formal sense. Indeed it may be significant that his daughter Jane was married by Thomas Dikes into the Haydon family only after John's death. The picture is therefore inconclusive. Perhaps religion as such was not central to John's mercantile mind. At heart a 'practical' man, raised in the rationalism of the eighteenth century, he may have sat lightly to the new and growing movement in religion that was so earnestly espoused by his wife and her family. Having exposed his son William to the broad sweep of educational, religious and political ideas, he may well have felt that his duty was done and largely left William to the Evangelical influence of his mother.

What is certain is that the young man, whether through reaction to his father, or under the deeper influences of his mother, came not only to embrace Evangelicalism, but to base his life's work on a foundation of explicit rejection of liberal, radical and even reformist notions of church and state as the very solvent of true religion. Perhaps the tension between these two fundamentally opposed 'world views', the liberal and the conservative, was too much for the young unformed mind. In the end, it was impossible for William to face the stress and demands of adulthood without an identification with one or other of these two camps. He chose the orthodox certainty of the newly emerging radical Evangelicalism, thus combining something of the revolutionary fervour of both his teacher, and his guardian, within the safe confines of an authoritarian creed. Such a view seems to square with the available evidence, and provides a starting point for understanding Dodsworth's future development.

2. Cambridge, 1815-20

Dodsworth's Cambridge career is even less well documented than his childhood. Its significance lies in the extent to which he came into contact with Charles Simeon, and more especially the Jews Society. The evidence is circumstantial, but nevertheless important, since it provides a likely setting for his first contact with the Prophecy Movement. This lifelong interest in the eschatological claims of Christianity will be seen as the connecting thread that can interpret his total development from Evangelical to Roman Catholic.

Dodsworth was admitted as a pensioner (a normal fee paying student without a scholarship) at Trinity College, Cambridge, on 16 October 1815, matriculating in the Michaelmas Term the following year.⁴³ He remained at the university until 1820. At this time his family life was undergoing a series of disruptive changes. His father made his final will in 1816.⁴⁴ It is likely that ill health had prompted this action. His death two years

later must have had its on effect on William. Meanwhile William came to Cambridge during the mature years of Charles Simeon's (1759-1836) celebrated ministry. His immense influence bore fruit in the setting up of the Simeon Trust (1817), and the auxiliary branches of the Bible Society and Church Missionary Society (C.M.S.) in Cambridge. This was a time of intense Evangelical activity. Simeon's preaching and personal influence, not least through his conversation parties, had inspired and prepared many to offer themselves for ordination. Unfortunately it is not possible to know how far William came into direct contact with Simeon, but is reasonable to assume he was not unaware or unaffected by such a towering personality.⁴⁵

Ecclesiastical practice in the colleges was at that time largely formal and frequently lifeless.⁴⁶ Simeon and such of his disciples as William Carus did much to rekindle the spirit of devotional Christianity, if not in the institutions, at least in the lives of many undergraduates. Thus they heightened the contrast between 'godly religion', and the official institutions of the establishment. William's arrival coincided with the university careers of a number of future Evangelical 'saints'. These included Francis Close (1797-1882) who went up to St. John's College in 1816. He had studied under John Scott in Hull, and before embarking on his celebrated ministry in Cheltenham, had been deeply influenced by Simeon's ministry at the University. Others at the University during this period were Henry Venn, and Isaac Milner, both of whom would play significant parts in the development of Evangelicalism in the following years

New forces were at work amongst the Evangelical community during these years. The relatively stable theological consensus, sometimes referred to as Moderate Calvinism, was beginning to be challenged. The 'study of Prophecy' which had a long history, mainly on the sidelines of English Protestantism, was reviving as a concern of some of the latest generation of Evangelicals. Furthermore, political developments, such as the American and

French Revolutions, together with the rise and dissemination of radical ideology, seem to have played a leading part in the growth of interest in prophetic speculation. A mood of reaction by the younger men of Dodsworth's generation against the Clapham-led 'establishment' within Evangelicalism, focused on the biblical prophecies and their fulfillment. Even Simeon himself was giving his attention to this formerly neglected aspect of the Gospel message by 1820.⁴⁷ The 'study of Prophecy' was characterised by an urgent consideration of the biblical predications regarding the 'end times'. Based mainly on the Books of Daniel and Revelation, it ran counter to many of the pre-suppositions of the older type of Evangelicalism. It was in some ways a reaction to the 'practical' concern for individual salvation, and was opposed to the often tacit acceptance of a Lockean progressive view of history that lay behind the Moderate Calvinism of prevailing orthodoxy.

His early exposure to the Evangelical conviction of the centrality of the Bible in the scheme of salvation, would have predisposed him to a sympathetic hearing of the claims of this new movement within those 'godly' circles that surrounded him at home, and at the university. Whatever the political and social background for the rise of prophetic studies in the opening decades of the nineteenth century, this was at least in part a return to pre-Augustinian eschatology. The pre-millennialism espoused by many of the Ante-Nicene fathers had been superseded by a post-millennial eschatological framework which had remained the dominant orthodoxy throughout the Middle Ages and beyond. Surfacing among radical groups at the Reformation, this 'Chiliasm' had become identified with radical Puritanism, and was thus marginal to the historical and biblical perspective of most Evangelicals during the eighteenth century.⁴⁸ The disruptive political and social events of the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries seem to have brought about a changed situation in which an increasing number of Evangelicals were prepared to give this

message a new hearing. The Scriptures were once more to be viewed as a key to the interpretation of the contemporary events – ‘the signs of the times’.⁴⁹

Various schools of prophetic interpretation were emerging, including a broad division into ‘historicist’ and ‘futurist’ schema. Common elements included a non-progressive, cataclysmic historical perspective, in which the Second Coming of Christ intervenes after a period of widespread apostasy under the direction of the Antichrist. The millennial age of blessedness follows the resurrection of the Elect, and the millennium is consummated by the ultimate victory of Christ and his Kingdom. There was wide variation in detail and the ‘signs’ that precede the Second Advent were the real focus of interest for most commentators. During the first two decades of the nineteenth century a general consensus was emerging which focused on a series of ‘judgements’, and included the key elements of the destruction of the existing world order, the restoration of the Jews and the return of Christ.⁵⁰ Since such a view stood in contrast with the widely accepted understanding of the present world passing gradually into a millennial state through the preaching of the Gospel and conversion of mankind, confrontation with current orthodoxy was inevitable. Such a collision would occur in the early 1830s, and Dodsworth’s experience as both a participant in, and a casualty of that disruption in British Evangelicalism was a significant element in his propulsion towards the Tractarians.⁵¹

An indication of how far the climate of religious thinking was affected by this change, may be gleaned by reference to the progress of the Jews Society in Cambridge during this period. It is quite likely that Dodsworth’s first serious contact with ‘Prophecy’ came about through the Cambridge branch of this society. S.C. Orchard has investigated the role of the Jews Society, founded by Joseph Fry in 1808, in the spread of pre-millennial speculations. Events in the Middle East had drawn attention to the question of the ‘restoration of the Jews’ to their ancient homeland. Evangelicals had become increasingly interested in the

prospects for conversion of the Jewish community in Britain. By 1810 both Simeon and James Haldane Stewart were among the growing membership of this society. Lewis Way and Joseph Wolff were playing an increasing part in promoting the society at home and abroad.⁵² There would certainly have been a strong body of opinion in sympathy with the society's aims and beliefs in Cambridge at this time, as is shown by the establishment of an active auxiliary branch of the Jews Society in Cambridge by 1821.

Significantly, the Dodsworth family were involved, as can be seen from a letter read to the General Committee of the Society in London from Mr. John Dodsworth on 21 July 1821. This requested 'as many expositors for their association as they are entitled to'. As a result, the Society agreed to send some sixteen copies monthly for the undergraduates of the Cambridge Students Association.⁵³ John Dodsworth was the son of Benjamin, brother of William's father, and this raises the possibility that William may have been involved with the Society at a slightly earlier date. Certainly he would have been aware of it. Thus a Society, well known for its 'prophetic study' of the Scriptures, was in existence at Cambridge at least from William's final year, and possibly before. This may have been his first contact with a concern that would come to dominate so much of his life and exercise such a driving influence upon it.

3. Guildford, Ordination and Saxby, 1820-1823

The years 1818-1820 were crucial for the future of the Dodsworth family. The events of those two years led to William's immediate family becoming resident in Guildford from 1820. This relocation of his significant kinsmen is relevant both to his religious development and to the future locus of his sphere of activity. The two events that seem to have brought about this move were the death of his father in April 1818⁵⁴ and the marriage of his sister Jane on 28 December 1819.⁵⁵ Between these two events the death of his youngest brother, the seventeen year-old Benjamin in December 1818,⁵⁶ may well have

had its impact upon the family's considerations of its own future. Both John and his son Benjamin were buried in the former family parish churchyard at Kirk Ella, rather than in the parish where they lived at Aldeburgh.

John Dodsworth's financial legacy was substantial and most of his wealth was in property, which would be sold off by his eldest son John during the next decade. Whatever the effect on the family, moves were afoot, and William's sister Jane married Thomas Haydon (of Holy Trinity Parish, Guildford) in Aldeburgh Church. The marriage was followed by the move of Harriet, William and his youngest sister Sarah to live with the newly married couple in Guildford. Thus within a year of John Dodsworth's death, the family had divided, leaving the elder son⁵⁷ in charge of the Yorkshire property, whilst the younger children accompanied their mother back to her southern relatives. It is not unlikely that had his father survived, William, like many of his contemporaries, might have returned to Yorkshire after completing his studies at Cambridge. The Evangelical social scene in Hull would have provided a network for seeking a promising career in the provinces. His first curacy at nearby Saxby in Lincolnshire suggests that these links were maintained for some years after the move south.

However, the move to Guildford changed the locus of his life in that he was now living amongst his mother's relatives, who were 'serious' Evangelical bankers. Thus he was drawn into a less provincial world with strong London contacts. The Haydons would establish themselves as a successful commercial family on the national banking scene, as well as being leading citizens of Guildford. At least one branch of the family originated in Devonshire,⁵⁸ and this connection may have played some part in William's eventual marriage into the Yarde-Buller family who likewise had Devonshire origins.

Jane and Thomas Haydon settled in St. Nicholas parish where Thomas had bought property prior to the marriage.⁵⁹ This large parish, partly urban, partly rural, lay on the west side of Guildford, and was popular for the new houses of rising 'gentry'. This was William's home until his ordination in 1821. The Haydon family was strongly involved in the Evangelical movement, taking an active role in the west Surrey auxiliary branch of the Church Missionary Society, attending its meetings in the Town Hall and surrounding parishes. They were present at anniversary sermons including those preached at Stoke and Albury by William 'Millennial' Marsh, and the Rector of Albury, The Revd. Hugh McNeile.⁶⁰ Both these men would play leading roles in the radical wing of the Evangelical movement, and, during the later years of the decade, were prime movers in the events surrounding the Albury conferences and their aftermath. Both men and their associates used the widespread auxiliary branches of the main Evangelical societies to disseminate their millennial ideas.

A further connection between the young Dodsworth and the resurgent Evangelicalism of the period, though this time a more mainstream variety, is provided by Hugh Nicholas Pearson (1776-1856), Dean of Salisbury from 1823, and 'one of the first Evangelical clergymen to reach high office in the Church of England'.⁶¹ He had been a curate of John Venn at Clapham.⁶² As Dean of Salisbury he was patron of St. Nicholas and presented himself as Rector in 1832. Pearson also held nearby Chiddingfold, and it seems likely that he knew Dodsworth prior to appointing him curate at Chiddingfold in 1826. Such a nexus of 'godly' connections suggests that Dodsworth was well placed for a successful career at the heart of the Evangelical community at just that time when the Prophecy Movement was beginning to make an impact.

R.H.Martin⁶³ has shown that the progress of the Evangelical Movement in the 1820s was closely allied to the main religious societies effectively using the auxiliary system to

extend their ideology and build together their wide membership. Membership of these societies has been used as a yardstick for definition of Evangelical allegiance. There were a large number of such societies, but the leaders in numbers and influence were the Church Missionary Society (C.M.S.), the British & Foreign Bible Society (B.F.B.S.), the Jews Society, and the Continental Society. All employed the auxiliary system to great advantage, providing a network of local societies through which the parent body could propagate its ideas and exercise a measure of control throughout the provinces. They also furnished a valuable meeting ground for those sympathetic to Evangelicalism within the established Church. More importantly from the point of view of the prophecy movement, they offered a ready made channel of communication for the propagation of its views throughout Britain and beyond.

This early period of Dodsworth's career corresponds closely to the extension of these societies through the founding of auxiliary branches.

Hull C.M.S. auxiliary	1814
Gainsborough auxiliary	1817
Lincoln auxiliary	1818
Guildford auxiliary	1823
Colchester auxiliary	1817
Cambridge Jews Society auxiliary	before 1821
Gainsborough Bible Society auxiliary	1822 ⁶⁴

Thus by the mid 1820s, all these areas where Dodsworth had lived were well established within this network.

Marsh and McNeile used this system to their advantage. Each auxiliary held an annual local meeting, usually in May, whilst the parent body provided a national meeting in London. These were essentially unofficial synods of Evangelicalism, and from the mid 1820s the Prophecy party became increasingly assertive in presenting its views and concerns through these important meetings. Marsh and McNeile with Henry Drummond, the West Surrey M.P. and Protestant champion, used the societies to establish a power base from which they would launch an assault on what they saw as the complacent 'establishment' of Moderate Calvinist Evangelicals. The later Albury conferences were in effect an 'alternative' gathering very much after the model of the Evangelical Society meetings.

It was against this background, as a committed Evangelical, that Dodsworth was ordained Deacon on Sunday 31 March 1821 by George Pelham, Bishop of Lincoln (1766-1827)⁶⁵ in the Quebec Chapel, St. Marylebone, London. Ordination by a provincial bishop in a non-parochial chapel in London was not unusual in a period when bishops spent much time in the capital attending to their parliamentary or court duties.⁶⁶ The venue is significant as typical of the growing number of chapels of ease and proprietary chapels constructed to serve the rapidly expanding population of West London. Their independence from parochial control enabled both Evangelical and Tractarians to use them to extend their influence before the parochial system was open to them. Dodsworth's later role in establishing Tractarian principles in London would be enacted through a nearby chapel of similar type.⁶⁷

Dodsworth was ordained in London to the 'title' of Saxby in Lincolnshire, to which he was licensed as assistant curate the next day.⁶⁸ This was a sparsely populated agricultural parish north of Lincoln and east of Gainsborough. The small classical parish church building also served as a mortuary chapel for the Earls of Scarborough, patrons of the living. The

incumbent Henry Bassett (vicar since 1805) held the living with nearby Glentworth and North Thoresby. He belonged to a leading local family with Evangelical connections.⁶⁹ J. Obelkevich has demonstrated from diocesan records that few churches in this area had more than one Sunday service, with a quarterly Communion. Weekday services were almost unknown.⁷⁰ A letter of 1822 from Dodsworth, written from Gainsborough⁷¹ rather than his parish of Saxby, may suggest that he like many contemporary clergy in the area, did not reside in his parish.⁷² It is likely that such a small parish made few demands on Dodsworth's time, which enabled him to devote himself to the work of the newly established auxiliary branches of the main Evangelical societies. Gainsborough and Lincoln were the focus for this activity. It is likely that Dodsworth's first curacy was intended as a temporary and insubstantial appointment, a mere canonical requirement for ordination. Methodism had grasped the opportunities afforded by Anglican neglect.⁷³ The Gainsborough area was 'a rural stronghold of revivalism'.⁷⁴ Primitive Methodist activity had made the village of Scotter, near to Saxby, an almost continuous centre of revivalist activity during the 1820s.⁷⁵ Accordingly, even if the Saxby interlude in Dodsworth's career was from an ecclesiastical viewpoint of little significance, his experience in this area may have had important consequences on his theological and ideological development. It is difficult to see how Dodsworth could have been unaware of Scotterite activity and its implications for the established Church. Yet the clergy of this part of Lincolnshire had included a greater predominance of Cambridge men than was average throughout England, and this might account for a general sympathy toward Evangelicalism within the local Established Church.⁷⁶ Indeed some were not unfriendly to this New Dissent, going as far as cooperation with them through the Bible Society. Overall relations between the Church and dissenters was usually cool, even antagonistic. W.H. Oliver has argued that the break up of the old rural order and rise of a class stratified society, gave sectarianism an opportunity to supply a 'values' framework in which individuals and local communities might conserve traditional habits of belief and behaviour. What Chartism was doing in the

city, Methodism could do for the rural poor, supplying the labouring class with social solidarity and a locus in which spirituality and open expression of a fast vanishing culture could be valued.⁷⁷ Paradoxically, Dodsworth's later development towards Catholicism, based on a strong eschatological perspective, can be understood as a variety of religious response to those deep and widespread social and ideological changes that were also responsible for revivalism among radical dissenters.

During May 1821 Dodsworth attended meetings of the third anniversary of the Lincolnshire C.M.S.⁷⁸ He proposed a motion that was seconded by R.W. Sibthorp, who had been curate to John Scott at St. Mary, Hull. Sibthorp was then incumbent at Tattershall in Lincolnshire. From 1825 to 1829 Sibthorp was minister at the London Percy Chapel, and combined this post with an evening lectureship at St. John's Chapel, Bedford Row, where Baptist Noel was minister in charge.⁷⁹ Later, Dodsworth would engage with Sibthorp in published correspondence regarding his conversion to Roman Catholicism. Significantly he would then accuse him of former sympathy to dissenters, and this may be a reflection not only of Sibthorp's attitude from the 1820s, but suggests that Dodsworth's own attitude at this early point in his career was not friendly to Dissent. However at the very least it seems that in the 1820s they shared a common Evangelical faith and mission. Dodsworth's letter of 28 October 1822 to the Bible Society 'parent institution' in London requested details of the forthcoming deputation to the Gainsborough auxiliary association of which he was secretary.⁸⁰ This, together with his other involvements, demonstrates the extent to which he was becoming integrated into the structures of Evangelicalism at the local level.

He was ordained priest by Pelham on Sunday 14 April 1822⁸¹ in the newly erected Marylebone Parish Church, coincidentally close to the very part of London where he would exercise the most significant years of his ministry. In October 1822,⁸² a mere

eighteen months after his licensing, Dodsworth conducted his last service in Saxby. His next move south to Essex suggests a desire to be closer to his mother's family, but also perhaps to the centre of Evangelical activity in London and the Southeast. He had, in fact, relocated his life, from 1820 at least, with the move to Guildford; therefore his short time in Saxby may best be seen as a conscientious fulfilment of a canonical requirement for ordination before returning to his preferred location in the south. Even so, it is clear that he did not remain inactive during this time, and used it to further his involvement with the structures and personalities of the Evangelical Movement. Furthermore his brush with radical Dissent of the Scotterist type may have made a deeper impression on him than we are able to judge.

¹ St. Mary, Bishopshill Senior, York, Baptism Register, PR Y/MBP S2, Borthwick Institute of Historical Research, University of York.

² Shipping Index, 1808,1809, Hull City Record Office, lists several references to Dodsworth family.

³ Holy Trinity Parish Church Marriage Register, Hull, 20 January 1791, PE158, 123, East Riding of Yorkshire County Archives Office. The witnesses were Charlotte Haydon, Caroline Haydon, Ra. Dodsworth, Joshua Dodsworth.

⁴ *Battles Directory of Hull*, Hull, 1791,1792.

⁵ L. Stone, *The Family, Sex and Marriage in England 1500-1800*, 1977.

⁶ For much of this section I am indebted to G. Jackson, *Hull in the Eighteenth Century*, Oxford, 1972.

⁷ IGI has numerous references to Haydons in Surrey.

⁸ IGI, Harriet Haydon, 7 July 1762, Chertsey Old Presbyterian Meeting House, Baptism Register. The identification with WD's mother is not certain. Died, Guildford, 1837.

⁹ See records of Haydon, Smallpiece and Co. Lloyds Bank Archives, Lombard Street, London.

¹⁰ Holy Trinity Hull, Marriage Register, 20 January 1791.

¹¹ I am indebted to G.W. Oxley, Archivist, Hull City Record Office, for much of this information on the Sykes.

¹² J. Greenwood, *Picture of Hull*, 1835, pp.176-185.

¹³ John Dodsworth, Prerogative Court of York Wills, October 1818. Borthwick Institute, University of York. Sykes was joint guardian with John's brother Benjamin.

¹⁴ Deed of Sale, Reg 9/10 October 1806 CL 330/522, East Riding of Yorkshire County Archives Office records conveyance of land between John Dodsworth, Joseph Sykes and another leading merchant William Williamson.

¹⁵ Deed of Sale, CH 330/522, 9/10 October 1806, East Riding of Yorkshire County Archives Office.

¹⁶ G. Jackson, *op. cit.*, pp.288-299.

¹⁷ *Ibid*, p.292.

¹⁸ J. King, *Memoir of the Rev. Thomas Dikes*. 1849.

¹⁹ G. Jackson, *op. cit.*, p.291.

²⁰ *Ibid*, p.297.

²¹ See P. Stubley, *A House Divided: Evangelicals and the Establishment in Hull 1770-1914*, Hull, 1995.

²² J. King, *op. cit.*, pp.60,61.

²³ The Deed of Sale for Kirk Ella Hall mentions two pews in the parish church belonging to John Dodsworth.

²⁴ Kirk Ella Poor Rate Book 1745-1806, entry for 1804,1805, East Riding of Yorkshire County Archives Office.

- ²⁵ John, the eldest, Jane, Ralph, William, Sarah, Elizabeth and Benjamin. Kirk Ella Parish Church Baptism Register 1799-1800, PE174/4, East Riding of Yorkshire County Archives Office.
- ²⁶ St. Mary's Roman Catholic Cemetery, Harrow Road, London No7295, Register 1861.
- ²⁷ Land Tax Returns, 1807-1819. Fosham and Carlton. QDE 1/6/13 East Riding of Yorkshire County Archives Office.
- ²⁸ J.A. Venn, *Alumni Cantabrigienses*, part 2, vol.2, Cambridge, 1944, p.315.
- ²⁹ G. Poulson, *The History and Antiquities of the Seignory of Holderness etc*, 1841, vol 2, pp. 24.25.
- ³⁰ John Dodsworth, Prerogative Court of York Wills, October 1818, Borthwick Institute of Historical Research, University of York.
- ³¹ See L.P. Wenham, *James Tate*, Northallerton, North Yorkshire County Records Office, 1991.
- ³² *DNB*, vol.19, p.378.
- ³³ *DNB*, vol.2, p.583.
- ³⁴ L.P. Wenham, *op. cit.*, p.311.
- ³⁵ *Ibid*, p.34.
- ³⁶ *Ibid*, p.311.
- ³⁷ *Ibid*, p.92.
- ³⁸ *Ibid*, p.129.
- ³⁹ *Ibid*, p.446.
- ⁴⁰ *Ibid*, p.94.
- ⁴¹ *Ibid*, p.128.
- ⁴² *Ibid*, pp.127,128.
- ⁴³ Venn, *op. cit.*, p.315.
- ⁴⁴ John Dodsworth, Prerogative Court of York Wills, Oct 1818, Borthwick Institute of Historical Research, University of York.
- ⁴⁵ A.W. Brown, *Recollections of the Conversation Parties of the Rev. Charles Simeon etc*, 1863.
- ⁴⁶ C. Smyth, *Simeon and Church Order*, Cambridge, 1940, chapter 3.
- ⁴⁷ S.C. Orchard, *English Evangelical Eschatology*, chapter 4.
- ⁴⁸ *Ibid*, chapters 1,2.
- ⁴⁹ *Ibid*, chapter 3.
- ⁵⁰ J. Wolffe, *Evangelicals, Women and Community in Nineteenth Century Britain*, Milton Keynes Open University, 1994, p. 36, for a comparative chart of prophetic schemes.
- ⁵¹ W.J.C. Ervine, 'Doctrine and Diplomacy', chapter 6.
- ⁵² S.C. Orchard, *op. cit.*, chapter 4.
- ⁵³ CMJ Dep, CMJ/C10 p. 23, Bodleian Library, University of Oxford.
- ⁵⁴ Kirk Ella Parish Church Burial Register, 1818, PE174/11, East Riding of Yorkshire County Archives Office.
- ⁵⁵ Aldburgh Parish Church, Marriage Register 1819, East Riding of Yorkshire County Archives Office.
- ⁵⁶ Kirk Ella Parish Church Burial Register, 1818, PE174/11, East Riding of Yorkshire County Archives Office.
- ⁵⁷ Records of several sales of land by William's, elder Brother John occur in the Register of Deeds throughout the following decades. Register of Deeds 1818-1825, East Riding Register of Deeds.
- ⁵⁸ J. Foster, *Alumni Oxoniensis 1715-1886*, Oxford, 1888, vol.2, p.633.
- ⁵⁹ Mortgage deed, BR/T/2029/16, Surrey County Records Office, Guildford.
- ⁶⁰ CMS, *The Missionary Register 1820-25*, 1824, p.221.
- ⁶¹ *DNB*, vol.15, p.611.
- ⁶² B. Taylor, *The Lower Church, A History of St. Nicholas' Guildford*, Guildford, 1980, p.14.
- ⁶³ R.H. Martin, *Evangelicals United*.
- ⁶⁴ CMS, *The Missionary Register*, 1814-1822.
- ⁶⁵ Subscription Book, 1815-1824, Sub XIII and Ordination Register entry for 31 March 1821, Ordination Reg I P3 LA, Lincoln Cathedral Library.
- ⁶⁶ Pelham was a latitudinarian and worldly figure, 'renowned for his greed for lucrative office', and was a frequent guest of the Prince Regent at Brighton. *DNB*, vol.15, p.688.
- ⁶⁷ E. Walford, *Old and New London etc*, 1876, vol.4, p.409.
- ⁶⁸ Subscription Book, 1815-1824, Sub XIII entry for 1 April, 1821, Lincoln Cathedral Library.
- ⁶⁹ J.S. Reynolds, *The Evangelicals of Oxford 1735-1871*, Oxford, 1953, p.28.
- ⁷⁰ J. Obelkevich, *Religion and Rural Society*, pp.138,151.
- ⁷¹ British and Foreign Bible Society Archive, Home Correspondence, 1822, D-K, BSA/D1/1 35.
- ⁷² J. Obelkevich, *op. cit.*, pp.116,117.
- ⁷³ *Ibid*, p.183.
- ⁷⁴ *Ibid*, p.237.
- ⁷⁵ *Ibid*, p.237, footnote.
- ⁷⁶ *Ibid*, p.121.
- ⁷⁷ W.H. Oliver, *Prophets and Millennialists*, chapter 9.

⁷⁸ CMS, *The Missionary Register*, 1821, p.230.

⁷⁹ R.H. Martin, *op. cit.*, p.215.

⁸⁰ British and Foreign Bible Society Archive, Home Correspondence, 1822, D-K, BSA/D1/1 35.

⁸¹ Ordination Register entry for 14 April 1822, Ordination Reg. P4 LA, Lincoln Cathedral Library.

⁸² Saxby Parish Church Registers, Saxby Par 1/2 (baptisms 1813-1989), Saxby Par 1/4 (burials 1813-1980), LA, Lincoln Cathedral Library. WD's signature occurs between 6 May 1821, and 2 October 1822.

CHAPTER TWO: DODSWORTH AMONGST THE PROPHETS? 1823-1829

During the period 1823-1829 Dodsworth's ministries brought him into increasingly closer contact with the main characters in the growing prophecy movement. The move from Lincolnshire to Essex was significant not only because it brought him to the south eastern heartland of the movement, but because Stisted is close to Colchester, where 'Millennial' Marsh was organising gatherings that prefigured the Albury conferences in terms of their importance to the expanding influence of prophetic studies. The archives of some of the main Evangelical societies demonstrate the extent to which Dodsworth himself was mixing with such figures as Marsh, McNeile, Drummond, and others. His move to Chiddingfold in 1826 with its proximity to Albury and Guildford brought him full circle to the homes and society of his Evangelical relatives where he had spent some of the years immediately before his ordination. He was now firmly within a network of clerical and lay enthusiasts for the prophetic cause and was thus set to play a central role in the Albury conferences.

Underlying these career moves, Dodsworth's theological formation was entering a definitive period. His eschatological schema of belief was being forged not least by his contact with Edward Irving and his radical theological ideas. An examination of Dodsworth's Albury sermon suggests that the foundation of his later development through an atypical Evangelical understanding of the centrality of the doctrine of the Incarnation viewed in a strongly eschatological context, was not only his legacy from Irving himself, but provides the key to our interpretation of his later development through Tractarian sacramentalism to Roman Catholicism.

The interplay between his ministerial career and theological development is the subject of this chapter. This was Dodsworth's Irvingite period, and its importance in his development cannot be overestimated.

1. Stisted and Chiddingfold, 1823-1829

By late 1823, Dodsworth was officiating as curate in the parish church at Stisted, a small village in north Essex.¹ The Rector of Stisted, John Barlow Seale, was a distinguished Cambridge man, having been chaplain to Archbishop Cornwallis, and held Stisted with Anstey in Hertfordshire where he resided.² He was known to Dodsworth's mentor James Tate,³ and was something of a classical scholar. This last connection may provide a hint as to how Dodsworth came to minister in Stisted. The years 1823-1829 saw him living in close proximity to the scene and characters of that radical group within Evangelicalism that would eventually coalesce in the 'Albury circle' around Irving and Drummond. Now he was part of the network of 'Irvingism'.

A key figure was William 'Millennial' Marsh, whose parish in nearby Colchester was a rallying point for Evangelicals throughout the county of Essex and beyond. His interest in prophetic studies had gained him a formidable reputation. He used the anniversary meetings of the main Evangelical societies as opportunities to gather together not only the local clergy but also the leading names in the movement.

The anniversaries of his favorite Societies were made great occasions at the vicarage, where the deputations were always welcomed with more than friendly hospitality. Hugh McNeile of Liverpool (then rector of Albury), Legh Richmond, Edward Irving, Edward Bickersteth, Haldane Stewart, Basil Woodd, Lewis Way, Simons of Paul's Cray, Hawtrey, Simeon of Cambridge, Archdeacon Hodson, Hughes of the Bible Society, Gerard and Baptist Noel, with others whose names are still revered in the Church of God, were amongst the loved and honoured guests.⁴

Neither Dodsworth nor Sibthorp appear in this list despite a catchall reference to ‘many of the clergy and laity who... came in from the country’.⁵ This is not surprising in view of their later careers, and the hagiographical nature of the partisan biography from which this list is drawn. That Dodsworth attended these Colchester meetings is likely from the record of the May meeting of the Eighth Anniversary of the Colchester and East Essex C.M.S.⁶ Dodsworth was already playing an active part in the public meetings, so it is possible that he attended the informal meetings in the vicarage, and was in contact with the national leaders of the Movement.

By 1823 many new developments were becoming apparent both within and outside of the Evangelical societies. Not only had the ‘new study’ stood out against the post-millennialism of the Clapham generation, but even within the ranks of this new generation a more radical emphasis was forming, although it would be some time before the effects of this viewpoint would be apparent. As yet both pre and post millennialists within the younger generation could use the prophecies of Daniel and the Apocalypse to point to an imminent return of Christ, however much they might disagree on detail. The Colchester gatherings included men of widely differing views, yet they were united in proclaiming the ‘signs of the times’. James Haldane Stewart⁷ from his base at the Percy Chapel in West London was perhaps representative of this new group and the urgency of their message. After a meeting in his home in March 1821, he issued a national call for prayer to bring down a special outpouring of the Holy Spirit.⁸ His tours of the country that followed did much to alert Evangelicals to the new message.

During the early 1820s the chiliastic or pre-millennialist view of Christ’s return was beginning to gain a wider hearing in mainstream Protestantism. This radical view co-existed alongside the more orthodox beliefs of the majority of Evangelicals. At this stage there was still room for diversity, since the primary concern was an agreed purpose in

bringing about a national consciousness of the prophetic message itself, whatever the details of that proclamation might be. Dodsworth's publications of the 1830s⁹ still reflect or maybe hark back to this more comprehensive period and, despite his temporary association with Irving and Drummond, it could be argued that he did not develop beyond a broad-based position.

A sidelight on Dodsworth's development is shown by his association with John James, Lord Rayleigh (1796-1873), of Terling Place, Witham, Essex, about five miles south of Stisted. Having been something of a Regency libertine, he underwent a conversion to serious religion in 1822. Despite a colourful private life, he set about supporting and furthering the main Evangelical religious societies, especially in the Essex area.¹⁰ His interest in the 'study of Prophecy' led him to the Albury Conference and for a while he became identified with Irving and his circle.¹¹ Later, like so many others, he was to distance himself from this group.¹²

Tragedy struck the Dodsworth family in 1825, when William's youngest sister Sarah Elizabeth, aged twenty-six, died in his house at Stisted.¹³ To add to their misfortune, a serious financial crisis shook the nation in the December of that year. The Haydons with their banking concerns were certainly affected, and doubtless the Dodsworths did not go unscathed. Boyd Hilton has drawn out some of the implications that this crisis had on the Evangelical community.¹⁴ Dodsworth and his colleagues may well have drawn typical conclusions from this event, and interpreted it as evidence of prophecy fulfilled, even a pointer to the judgement to come, and the imminent intervention of the Divine Will.

Other events were also quickening the tempo of this trend. The Church of Scotland divine Edward Irving (1792-1834), had been minister of the Caledonian Chapel in Hatton Garden, London since 1822, and by virtue of his personality and preaching was attracting a large

and fashionable congregation including, among other celebrities, George Canning.¹⁵ In May 1824 Irving had preached the anniversary sermon for the London Missionary Society (an interdenominational society founded in 1795).¹⁶ His three hour homily advanced the view that missionary activity, since it was a human effort, could not bring about the necessary growth of the Christian faith that 'moderates' believed would precede the advent of the Kingdom of God. He followed this in 1825 with an anniversary sermon to the Continental Society¹⁷ (a society formed to spread Evangelical principles in mainland Europe). In this he set out a full-blown pre-millennial eschatology in the context of a prophetic interpretation of history. The moral and spiritual anarchy consequent upon the decline of the old European order, together with demands for Catholic Emancipation at home, were coupled with the current attempts at the restoration and conversion of the Jews to be evident signs of an imminent divine judgement and the advent of Christ. Central to this theme was the rejection of the 'traditional' Evangelical view that mankind would be progressively converted to Christianity, and thus the Kingdom would come on earth. The progressive nature of this gradual improvement of the human race was the prime target of Irving's objection. He would eventually extend condemnation of this apostasy to include not only secular infidelity and Roman error, but also the main Protestant Churches because they showed little enthusiasm for his interventionist pre-millennial schema. The later 'manifestations' of charismatic gifts in his congregation should be understood in this context of authenticating the true believers whilst also demonstrating the closeness of the Parousia. Irving moved to the new National Scotch Church building in Regent Square in 1827, and it was there that significant events took place in the following few years.

Although it is not possible to know when Dodsworth first met Irving, it is clear that by the mid-1820s he was entering into his circle of influence. Dodsworth was influenced by Irving's translation of *Venida del Mesias en Gloria Megestad* ('The Coming of the Messiah in Glory and Majesty' by Manuel Lacunza 1731-1801). Irving's *Preliminary*

*Discourse*¹⁸ was an extensive preface to Lacunza's work, in which he expounds his own eschatology. Lacunza was an ex-Jesuit who wrote under the name 'Juan Josafat Ben-Ezra, a converted Jew'. Irving's book would have considerable impact upon Dodsworth's own beliefs.

Another significant character was Henry Drummond (1786-1860). Boyd Hilton has argued for a complex inter-dependency of Drummond's political, economic, and eschatological views.¹⁹ From a wealthy banking family, during 1810-1813 he represented Plympton Earls as a Tory Member of Parliament. His religious views were much influenced by Swiss Calvinism, and his zeal for the Protestant religion involved him in the founding of the Continental Society. His close association with Lewis Way in the Jews Society was a natural alliance, since both the Society and Drummond shared the view that biblical prophecy pointed to the restoration of the Jews to Palestine, and their conversion would be a sure sign of the imminent Parousia. Drummond was to become a leading figure in the creation of the Catholic Apostolic Church (CAC), and the series of prophetic conferences that he hosted in his country seat at Albury, Surrey, have generally been regarded as the seed from which the CAC grew.²⁰ Drummond had bought Albury Park from Samuel Thornton in 1819. The significance of the conferences is underlined by Sandeen's comment that, 'The Albury conferences, more than any other event, gave structure to the British millenarian revival, consolidating both the theology and the group of men who were to defend it'.²¹

Whilst the prophecy movement gathered pace, Dodsworth made preparations for a new appointment in 1826. By December of that year he was resident and active in the village of Chiddingfold close to the Surrey/Sussex border.²² Dodsworth's Guildford connections²³ and Evangelical credentials would have made him an obvious choice as stipendary curate for the absentee Rector, Nicholas Pearson, Dean of Salisbury.²⁴ However, his duties cannot

have been extensive, given the size and nature of this rural parish. He would have lived a gentleman's life, since he was hardly a penniless curate. There would be adequate time for the extensive reading that is evident from his later sermons, as well as opportunity to visit the growing network of Evangelical friends in the West Surrey area.²⁵

Chiddingfold's proximity to Guildford and Albury enabled Dodsworth to play a direct role in the important events of the next few years. He was already acquainted²⁶ with Hugh McNeile²⁷ who was Drummond's choice as Rector at Albury from 1822. Drummond had been impressed by McNeile in the Percy Chapel, and had been much taken by his Calvinism and preaching. In many ways, McNeile was typical of the new generation of Evangelicals.²⁸ His fervent style of preaching and systematic Calvinism stood in contrast to the reserved and often sceptical attitudes towards dogma held by many of the older generation of moderate Calvinists. Ervine²⁹ has shown how significant was McNeile's role in opening up the Evangelical movement to new directions. His fanatical anti-Catholicism and support of the Jews Society made him a natural ally of Drummond.³⁰ From the early 1820s he was a regular participant at the religious societies' annual meetings across the South East of England,³¹ as well as attending Marsh's prophetic gatherings in Colchester. His impatience with what he saw as outworn tepid 'Clapham' religion suited the trend of Drummond and Irving's protest against establishment Evangelicalism. Perhaps for this reason as much as for his position as Rector of the parish, McNeile was honoured with the 'chair' at the Albury Conferences.

McNeile had a high opinion of Dodsworth and seems to have known him prior to the Conferences.³² His recommendation of Dodsworth to Drummond as the minister of the Margaret Street Chapel in London suggests high professional regard, maybe even friendship. Dodsworth was making his mark amongst the radical party within contemporary Evangelical society.

2. The Albury Conferences – Dodsworth's role.

The first Albury Conference took place in November 1826. It had been preceded at Easter by a meeting of Stewart, Irving, Frere and Hawtreys at the home of Lewis Way, minister of the Percy Chapel. Frere saw this as a more significant and fundamental meeting than the Albury Conferences themselves.³³ Despite the prevailing view that the Conferences were of central importance to what follows, it might be better to see them in the context of numerous other contemporary gatherings of this type for prophetic studies. Their importance lies in the extent and diversity of the attendants. Dodsworth himself sought to put the Conferences in this broader perspective in his sermon at the 1829 meeting.³⁴

Documentary evidence given by Orchard³⁵ together with Dodsworth's timely arrival at Chiddingfold makes it probable that he attended all of their annual meetings,³⁶ yet the only firm evidence is for his attendance and contribution to the 1829 meeting.³⁷ The purpose of the Conferences was to study scripture, in particular the prophetic passages in the light of current political and social events and concerns.³⁸ They focused on the extent to which the prophecies had already been fulfilled, thus enabling identification of those prophecies which had yet to be consummated. The perceived concessions to liberal ideas in Canning's moderate Tory administration in 1827 was regarded along with the repeal of the Test and Corporation Acts in 1828, Catholic Emancipation in 1829, and agitation for reform of the parliamentary system by the Whigs, as indications of the onslaught of Anti-Christ, a national apostasy which could only be a sign of the 'end times'. Drummond's political agenda fitted well with Irving's religious one.³⁹ The younger men who shared McNeile's frame of mind embraced much of this doctrinal programme with enthusiasm.

As Flegg has shown, the attendance at the Conference was interdenominational, including Presbyterians, Methodists, Independents and Moravians, although the majority were Anglican.⁴⁰ The clergy predominated but there was a sizeable minority of laity. No women

were admitted to this circle. A survey of the list suggests a diversity of opinion, pre- and post- millennialists, moderate Calvinists as well as the more doctrinally orientated radicals. The regular fixed pattern began with an address on the chosen subject of the day.⁴¹ After breakfast the company 'searched the scriptures', during the first half of the morning. Later in the earlier part of the afternoon a discussion of the subject matter took place, and finally after dinner, the results of the day's work were brought together in some form of agreed conclusion. The topics at the first Conference covered 'the times of the Gentiles', the present and future condition of the Jews, the future advent of Christ, and the system of prophetic numbers in Daniel and the Apocalypse.⁴² This was very much the staple diet of contemporary prophetic studies. Later in 1828-9, Drummond would publish his version of the Conferences' conclusions in *Dialogues on Prophecy*.⁴³ It is clear that this work implies a much greater degree of unanimity than seems possible given the known views of such a diverse group of attendants.⁴⁴ Indeed Dodsworth's sermon at the meeting supports the conclusion that Drummond is not giving a mere record of the actual events and discussions at the Conferences.

In consideration of Dodsworth's role at the 1829 Albury Conferences, we are fortunate to have a letter of Irving to his wife written during the Conference (30 November 1829), and published later in his biography. The following passages are relevant:

This morning I have been alone, being minded to partake the Lord's Supper with the rest of the brethren.... We are not without some diversities of opinion upon most subjects, especially as to the Millennial blessedness, which was handled yesterday. Lord Mandeville and Mr. Dodsworth take a view of it different from me, rating the condition of men in flesh higher than I do, and excluding death... Mr. Drummond says that if I and Dodsworth had been joined together we would have made a Pope Gregory the Great – he to furnish the popish quality, not me. I do not know what I should furnish – but the church bell is now ringing. ... We have just returned from a

most delightful service... Mr. Dodsworth preached from Psalm viii. 4,5,6.... Our subject to-morrow is the parables and words of our Lord as casting light upon His kingdom, opened by Dodsworth.⁴⁵

In view of Dodsworth's later ecclesiological development it is interesting to note both the 'popish' reference and that he apparently received Holy Communion at the same service as Irving – a Scottish Presbyterian. Soon after, in the *Morning Watch*, Dodsworth's views would again be associated with the term 'popish'.⁴⁶ More importantly, the fact that Holy Communion played an integral part in the Conferences demonstrates the regard for the Eucharist held by the Albury 'prophets'. Both Irving and Drummond were impressed by Dodsworth's input at this, and presumably earlier, Conferences. That he should be invited to preach the Sunday sermon, and lead the group with his opening paper demonstrates the regard with which Dodsworth was held in the Irving-Drummond circle.

The picture of Dodsworth that emerges at this time is of a young clergyman with considerable biblical and patristic knowledge, whose learning and preaching had attracted the notice of some of the leading figures of the Prophecy Movement, thus drawing Dodsworth into further involvement. He would appear a very suitable candidate for promotion amongst this group. Yet reading between the lines of Irving's letter, and listening to Dodsworth's own words in his Albury sermon, it seems there was much greater diversity of opinion and outlook than perhaps any of the characters fully realised at the time. It is this underlying difference on quite fundamental principles that took Dodsworth and the Irving circle into ultimately very different camps. Thus it is revealing to examine both the text of this sermon, and the preface that was added for publication.

The sermon was delivered by Dodsworth in Albury Parish Church on Sunday morning, 29 November 1829 and is clearly that referred to by Irving in his letter to his wife. In the

(later) preface, Dodsworth protests that the ‘...improperly termed... “Albury Meeting”’ is misrepresented by ‘ignorant or malicious persons’, for it is merely a ‘*private party*’ in which:

We assume no authority; we look for no combined result of our deliberations: ...we decline coming to any conclusions, each one freely delivering his sentiments, and each one forming his own opinions as to the result of the discussion. ...hoping that by the collision of sentiment, and by free inquiry, (always however, bounded by the recognised doctrines of the Orthodox Church,)...the truth may be elicited, and that we may be mutually benefited by each other’s researches.⁴⁷

Such an understanding in the clarity of its expression suggests that Dodsworth was already aware not only of criticism of these meetings, but felt it necessary to affirm his doctrinal orthodoxy and canonical obedience to church authority.

As will be seen, it is very difficult to reconcile Dodsworth’s Albury sermon with Drummond’s conclusions in the *Dialogues*. Despite Drummond’s appointment of Dodsworth to his London chapel in Margaret Street where he had presumably expected to hear a sympathetic voice from that pulpit,⁴⁸ it would seem that his chosen candidate had less radical views than his patron, and was not afraid to express his loyalty to the establishment.

When analysing this sermon and its preface, it is vital to remember the wider context of Dodsworth’s licensing to perform the office of Minister at the Margaret Chapel in St. Marylebone on 6 March 1829.⁴⁹ The Chapel was the property of Henry Drummond.⁵⁰ This was Dodsworth’s first incumbency – if such it can be called, and is perhaps indicative of the relative difficulty that Evangelicals had in gaining ‘livings’ in London at this time. He was thirty-one years of age and had been in orders for eight years.

His role at the Conference later in that year may well have proved a turning point in his relations with Drummond. For despite the apparently approving tone of Irving's comments in his letter, Dodsworth is portrayed as a man of strong character and not inclined to toe a party line – even that of his patron. Thus established in a West End chapel, he was careful to profess his understanding of canonical orthodoxy even at the possible expense of his patron's feelings which were increasingly critical of that establishment. This is characteristic of Dodsworth's later career and may even explain something of his unhappy life as a Roman Catholic convert. There is no direct evidence of bad feeling between Dodsworth and Drummond, who eventually (by 1837) relinquished his ownership of the Margaret Chapel. Yet the differences were increasingly obvious.

This is demonstrated in the preface to the Albury sermon in which he refutes the representation of the Albury group as acting 'inconsistently with the strictest discipline of the Church, which we most earnestly wish to uphold; or with any disregard to the authority of those above us, to whom we are not only willing, but desirous to render unlimited canonical obedience.'⁵¹ However close to the Irving-Drummond axis Dodsworth may have been, or whatever the extent of their agreement on prophetic studies, he was by this time careful to dissociate himself from their increasingly critical attitude to the belief and institution of the Established Church.

The text of the sermon itself shows the ambivalent attitude of Dodsworth to his colleagues at Albury. It is an insight into his doctrinal position at a most important stage in his ministry. Dodsworth owed much to, and shared a great deal of common ground with, this group who had encouraged and promoted him. Yet he was becoming aware that differences existed and he did not ignore them, whatever their implications for his listeners, who included Drummond, Irving and McNeile. The sermon was repeated by Dodsworth the following Sunday at the Margaret Chapel (Advent 2) and was published

together with a preface and with another sermon preached at the Chapel, and a short appendix on the doctrine of Christ. The subject title to the whole work is *'Jesus Christ, in his threefold state of sub-angelic humiliation, heavenly glory, and earthly dominion'*. Significantly this preface, written by Dodsworth in London on 14 December 1829, is more circumspect than the sermon preached at Albury, referring to the 'Albury Meeting' as a *'private party'* by *'special invitation'* from our hospitable friend' for the purpose of studying prophecy regarding the Second Coming, 'a subject which has often and deeply occupied the mind of the preacher.'

In the sermon Dodsworth at once set out the grounds of his faith in salvation: not as based on 'certain insulated facts, or of certain doctrines - of a set of propositions which may be proved by a quotation of texts; but salvation is the result of an acquaintance with the grand harmonious scheme, AS A WHOLE...'.⁵² This is a theme he would frequently return to throughout his public ministry. For Dodsworth, the unity of God's scheme of salvation as a unfolding revelation was fundamental to his religious outlook.⁵³ In a passage that perhaps holds the key to his later development and indicates his conversion to the Incarnation-centred Evangelicalism of Irving, he illustrates this point by giving the example of what he terms '... a certain class of preachers', who set forth the doctrine of the cross '...as the sum and substance of salvation'.⁵⁴ In an important and lengthy footnote to this he commends 'the wisdom of the Church in the appointment of Festivals for the commemoration of the leading facts of redemption'. (Keble's *Christian Year* had recently been published in 1827 and was already exercising considerable influence.) Dodsworth reflects that were it not for these festivals the central doctrines, including the Second Advent, would be neglected or even die away. He continues his attack on the preaching of the day by maintaining that these great doctrines have been neglected in sermons 'for many years', but now by 'these excellent institutions', the remedy is at hand.⁵⁵ Much of the distinctiveness and atypical

nature of Dodsworth's theology during the later part of his Evangelical period is explained by these passages.

A further characteristic theme is Dodsworth's great emphasis on the role of the clergy as preachers, pastors, and guardians of the faith. He uses the Prayer Book Ordination Service as the ground of his argument and quotes extensively from it. In prophetic style Dodsworth's reputation as Evangelical and Tractarian pastor is foreshadowed in this passage.

The importance of this sermon lies in the argument that the death of Christ can only be understood in the wider context of the whole doctrinal schema of the Christian Faith. In a passage sexist to modern eyes, but a significant one, he condemned false emphasis on the Atonement as mere emotionalism suitable for the 'softer sex'. This elaboration of his attack on mainline Evangelical theology occurs in the footnote to the published texts, not in the body of the sermon as preached at Albury. It is an indication of where his thoughts were leading him, although as yet he held back from publicly expressing them.

The sermon itself continues with the assertion that the death of Christ is 'one single link in the chain of God's redeeming work.'⁵⁶ This looks like an attack on the older generation of Evangelical preachers whose Atonement-centred preaching was seen by the new radicals of the Irving circle as emotional, undogmatic and thus unbalanced and heterodox. Irving and Drummond were launching what might seem at first sight similar but were in fact far more sweeping attacks on contemporary Evangelicalism in their sermons and published works at just this period.⁵⁷ Dodsworth's implied criticism of unbalanced 'drawing room' religion is a pale reflection of Irving's increasingly hysterical condemnation of the institutional churches as a body. It may well be that the cautious and ecclesiastically loyal

statements in Dodsworth's preface to this sermon are among the first signs of his distancing himself from his Albury colleagues.

Despite his outspoken critical appraisal of contemporary Evangelicalism – music to the ears of many in that Albury congregation – he was not afraid to extend that criticism to his hearers themselves. If the Atonement could be misunderstood, so could the Second Advent. Some, he claimed, isolate 'the doctrine of Christ crucified and the doctrine of the Second Advent and the study of prophecy as distinct and separable things';⁵⁸ and do so because they ignore 'the UNITY OF FAITH in the church'.⁵⁹

In view of Irving's comments to his wife that he found the service in which Dodsworth preached 'delightful', we can only assume he either appreciated the warning in the sermon or felt that it did not apply to himself. In the light of later developments it might appear that Dodsworth had a deeper understanding of the situation than Irving. Dodsworth may well have been more aware of the extent to which the trends towards separation and sectarianism were already apparent at the conference.

In the light of this, the question arises as to what extent Dodsworth can be termed an Irvingite at all. Oakeley certainly regarded him as linked to that group.⁶⁰ Furthermore his own later silence regarding any detail of his ministry prior to his Tractarian period suggests embarrassment regarding this association with Irving. As we have seen he was much appreciated by Irving, Drummond and McNeile. If any could claim to be an 'Albury prophet', Dodsworth had such a claim given his central contribution to the 1829 conference. Irving spoke of him with affection, McNeile recommended him to Drummond as minister of his 'spearhead' chapel in the fashionable west end of London. He was a promising protege of Drummond and Irving who were to play leading roles in the events that led to the founding of the Catholic Apostolic Church in the early years of the

following decade. His valuable gifts as preacher, theologian and pastor, his social standing, Evangelical connections, and warm sociable manner did much to commend him to the other 'Albury prophets'. Yet much depends on the extent to which the group around Irving can be identified by the term 'Irvingites'. If this term applies exclusively to members of the Catholic Apostolic Church then clearly it is misleading to apply it to Dodsworth. On the other hand as a general term applied to the Irving-Drummond circle it certainly stuck to Dodsworth. Dodsworth was identified by many of his contemporaries as part of that movement, albeit in a vague sense. Against this must be weighed his own disclaimers and reservations which we have already examined in his Albury sermon. Assuming that Irving and Drummond did not – at this point – intend a formal separation from the mainline Protestant churches, then Dodsworth was doubtless viewed by them as a zealous, learned and capable young minister whose dogmatic schema of belief broadly concurred with theirs, and thus he could play a valuable part as both proclaiming and affecting the necessary purification and preparation required throughout the 'churches' as the Parousia approached.⁶¹ The pan-Protestant character of the Albury Conferences suggests that at this stage there were no explicit plans to form a separate ecclesial body, but rather to alert all Christians to the vital nature of prophetic study. Dodsworth was appointed to the Margaret Chapel in order to call the members of the established church to the saving knowledge of the Lord's imminent return. That events were to overtake Drummond's original hopes for his chapel does not obscure the fact that Dodsworth was appointed to Margaret Street with an Irvingite mandate.

It is, then, in this loose sense that Dodsworth was part of a movement that would, after 1832, give birth to the Catholic Apostolic Church, by which time Dodsworth had safely distanced himself from this development. Oakeley, in Dodsworth's obituary in the *Tablet* in 1861, recalled that, 'he was in a course of transition from Evangelicalism to Tractarianism, through the natural stage of 'Irvingism'.⁶² Yet it is clear that, like several

others who attended the Albury Conferences, he retained a loyalty to the Established Church and an independence of view that gave emphasis to 'canonical regularity', thus requiring him to part company with many of his former colleagues who left the main Protestant churches to found the new sect.

Dodsworth never quite shook off the stigma of this former association. Indeed it was in certain ways to influence the course of his entire career. As noted above, sources of information regarding Dodsworth's career prior to 1829 are extant yet none of the published information familiar to historians of the period makes reference to such material. His *Dictionary of National Biography* entry is completely silent regarding ordination and ministry prior to the Margaret Street appointment in 1829. The authoritative and recently published *A Dictionary of Evangelical Biography*⁶³ makes the usual and mistaken assumption that Dodsworth was ordained in 1829. His 'prophetic' career and 'radical' Evangelical connections were either overlooked or more likely suppressed by himself and his contemporaries. Were it not for Newman's aside regarding him in the *Apologia*, this seminal period in his life might have remained totally obscure and thus a significant aspect of Tractarian origins would have been unexplored.

3. Irving's Influence on Dodsworth

In Dodsworth's obituary, Oakeley referring to Irvingism says it was 'the Catholic elements in this latter form of belief which presented the greatest attraction to him'.⁶⁴ It is important to remember that Oakeley was writing in 1861 when the battle lines between church parties had become defined. Most recent scholarship concludes that such easy classification could not apply in the 1820s. Indeed Gilley says of Irving, 'We may undoubtedly call him in certain respects a high churchman'.⁶⁵

To gauge the extent of Irvingite influence on Dodsworth, it is necessary to return to the Albury Sermon. The theme was the twin subjects of Christ's nature and return. It is a scholarly publication with many Hebrew and Greek biblical and Patristic texts as well as some fine classical allusions. It is a detailed exposition of Chalcedonian Christology with a strong and uncontemporary emphasis on the Resurrection as the central point of the redemptive process. 'Here then we learn...that great truth that lies at the root of all sound theology...We learn that the Christ was from eternity set up in his perfect resurrection form as the Base of all things; the foundation upon which creation rests; in whom the church was contemplated as accepted before time.'⁶⁶ Dodsworth regards this as the 'CENTRAL FACT of revelation'. Furthermore mankind has a real union with the Risen Christ by his taking of our nature. 'In order to suffer, he must take a nature capable of suffering'.⁶⁷ Adam created in the image of God is not created in the image of an incomprehensible Godhead, but in the image of Christ's Risen form. So Adam is the type of the One to come. Dodsworth has developed this theme to show the progressive nature of Redemption. 'It implies his coming into the condition of man in his lowest and most abased state; in his nature not in its original perfection, but when impaired and degraded by the fall; sustaining as he ever did, by the power and the energy of the Holy Ghost that nature SINLESS'.⁶⁸

This is a most important passage, as it demonstrates the extent of Dodsworth's dependency on Irving in a vital theological matter. Irving's trial and deposition at Annan by the Church of Scotland in 1833 revolved around this question of the state of that human nature which the Son took at the Incarnation. Irving had published *The Orthodox and Catholic Doctrine of Our Lord's Human Nature*⁶⁹ in 1830, in which he sets out the same position stated by Dodsworth above. The characteristic emphasis is on the Incarnation and Resurrection, with the work of the Holy Ghost, as the proper and only setting for the 'orthodox' interpretation of Scriptural teaching.

Dodsworth shares with Irving the view that the purpose of Christ's redemptive work is making available to the human race a real union with its creator. This is very far away from the contemporary Evangelical Atonement-centred theology and its substitutionary theories of redemption. The work of the Holy Spirit is vital to this process, since it is the indwelling of the same Spirit who preserved Christ from sin, who likewise sanctifies the elect, keeping them from sin and its contamination. In the second sermon published with his Albury homily preached in the evening of Advent 3, 1829 at the Margaret Chapel.⁷⁰ Dodsworth further developed the theme of the progressive plan of God's Salvation insisting that the Fall was required, for '...creation was but a step to redemption.'⁷¹ Dodsworth is struggling here with the question of election. He concludes that a portion of humanity is left to suffer everlasting woe, not by God's decree of reprobation but by being left in that condition into which their own sin and their own folly have brought them.⁷² He was to return to this subject in his next publication.⁷³ This particular viewpoint is closer to the moderate Calvinism of the Clapham School and Simeon in particular than to the hyper-Calvinism of some of his Albury colleagues. Dodsworth gained much from his Irvingite association, an independence and readiness to differ from his colleagues and mentors. Thus whilst remaining close to Irving's theology, he could state his own independent view.

Yet it was the implications of Irving's Incarnational theology which were to have the most enduring consequences for Dodsworth. In the same Advent sermon he puts emphasis on St. Paul's statement that 'We are now baptised into the risen Christ, and partake of that Spirit which flows from him'.⁷⁴ He warns against the 'modern' error that the Church will receive an increasing measure of the Spirit; this is a pointed criticism of the prevalent post-millennial view that the Kingdom will come by means of a progressive improvement in mankind's spiritual and material state. He contends that the text 'I will pour out my Spirit on *all flesh*'⁷⁵ referred to the period *after* the Second Advent of Christ, and not to the current or future preaching of the Gospel. 'We affirm then on good scriptural ground, that

the reign of righteousness and peace is only to be brought in by the manifestation of Christ as the Head of all.' Thus instead of an improvement in mankind's condition, the Second Coming will be preceded by a rapid decline in social and political morality. Christ's return will, 'consume out of the earth that Wicked One...'. The millennial reign of God's righteousness follows. The 'unveiling of Christ in his kingdom',⁷⁶ will enable the elect to see the Trinity, and thus exhibit God as the true object of worship.

It is clear that not only had Dodsworth followed the outline of Irving's pre-millennial eschatology⁷⁷ but he had imbibed the Incarnational schema of salvation. The extent to which Dodsworth had taken over many distinctive views from Irving is demonstrated by his acceptance of Irving's 'heresy' regarding the fallen state of Christ's assumed humanity. '...to *deny* that he took a *fallen* nature is a palpable heresy',⁷⁸ even going so far as to suggest excommunication for those who did not agree with him.

It is most significant for Dodsworth's Tractarian and later development that he saw the role of the Holy Spirit as central to this theological scheme. Thus Dodsworth placed the sacramental nature of Baptism as the instrument of the Spirit's incorporation of redeemed mankind into the Church in the centre stage of his theological position. Likewise the rediscovery of the role of the Resurrection in this schema with its place in the Parousia ties Dodsworth's fascination with prophetic studies to his incipient sacramentalism and doctrine of the Church. Dodsworth's use of Irving's incarnational theology led him to concentrate on areas of Scripture that were marginalised by the moderate Evangelicals, in particular, Pauline sacramental teaching. Dodsworth's dissatisfaction with Atonement-centred Evangelicalism was probably the starting point from which his theological development moved towards Catholicism.

It may seem strange that this emergence of a Catholic systematic theology should be so closely tied in with pre-millennialism. Yet close study of Irving's preaching and published work exhibits a passionate desire to go beyond the Evangelical 'orthodoxies' of the day to allow scripture to speak for itself rather than impose customary interpretation upon it. The unexpected evolution of the Drummond-Irving axis into the sacramentalism and ritualism of the Catholic Apostolic Church is perhaps best explained in terms of these radical treatments of Scripture in the late 1820s. Eventually Dodsworth would take a different path, yet his independence of mind, patristic study and knowledge of the Reformers predisposed him towards Irving's radical questioning of contemporary Evangelicalism.

The picture that emerges of Dodsworth at the time of his appointment to the Margaret Chapel in 1829 is of an already experienced pastor and theologian. He began his London ministry as a convinced though atypical Evangelical, basing his theological position and notable preaching firmly on the then almost universally accepted pre-critical understanding of the authority of Scripture.⁷⁹ He was a powerful, emotive and persuasive preacher but, in contrast to many of his 'West End' colleagues, he was regarded as more doctrinally orientated than his contemporaries. S.F. Wood recommended him to Manning in 1832, 'When you come to town you must go to William Dodsworth's church...I have not heard such sound doctrine for some time'.⁸⁰ He was well informed in his textual knowledge both of Scripture and the Fathers, with a firm grasp of the patristics and Christological controversies of the early church, as well as classical Anglican authors. He was assertive in his loyalty to the Established Church and its canonical norms. He was appreciative of its liturgical provisions.⁸¹ In all this he was not untypical of many contemporary Evangelical clergy. He still shared much in common with the semi-Calvinism of his upbringing.⁸² During his early ministry, his interest in prophetic study had drawn him into the fellowship of leading proponents of this school: McNeile, Irving, and the layman Drummond. In this circle he had seemed a popular and promising young champion of their pre-millennialism.

and Drummond rewarded him with the cure of his West End chapel in Margaret Street, London. If Drummond had intended his chapel to be a centre for the spread of Irvingite ideas, he was disappointed. In time many of the sacramental and millennial ideas that characterised Irving's theology were disseminated by Dodsworth, but not as part of the Catholic Apostolic Church.

Alongside the pre-millennialism of this radical fringe, a revolutionary understanding of Scripture had enabled Irving to break new ground in developing an Incarnation-based theory of Salvation, smashing the mould of much mainline Evangelical thinking. It was both a result and a catalyst of the 'study of Prophecy'. Thus Dodsworth's debt to Irvingism goes far beyond his understanding of the Second Advent. Amongst these men he developed a strong sense of the New Testament emphasis on the Church as the body of the elect, sanctified by the action of the Holy Spirit in the sacramental life of the household of faith. The eschatological dimensions of the Resurrection life, and the Christological basis for that doctrine are the context for his developed understanding of the Christian faith as a progressive revealing of God's plan for mankind in the Gospel. So it is that his preaching has a systematic completeness about it that is parallel and probably dependent upon Irving's. This dogmatic unity will be noted again and again in his ministry at Margaret Street and drew the attention of S.F. Wood, Manning,⁸³ J.H. Newman⁸⁴ and the young Gladstone.⁸⁵

Dodsworth's eloquence, warmth of nature and strong pastoral sense, together with his social grace and excellent connections ensured him success at the Margaret Chapel. Yet it was not the success that Drummond had expected or McNeile could have looked for. Dodsworth's independence of character and loyalty to the establishment would very soon distance him from the Albury School altogether. Here we have a strange paradox. Drummond and McNeile had intended Dodsworth to propagate many of the principles that

would later form the basis of the Catholic Apostolic Church. Dodsworth did just that, but by remaining firmly within the Established Church, he took those very elements of Irvingism into a wholly new and unexpected movement that made the unlikely venue of the Margaret Chapel the centre of an altogether different form of Catholic Christianity.

¹ Stisted Parish Church, Burial Register, D/P/49/11, Essex County Record Office. Dodsworth's name occurs as officiant between 1823 and 1826.

² Christ's College, Cambridge, *Biographical Register*, pp.297, 298.

³ L.P. Wenham, *James Tate*, p.59.

⁴ C. Marsh, *The Life of the Rev William Marsh*, 1868, p.99.

⁵ *Ibid*, p.100.

⁶ CMS, *The Missionary Register*, 1824, p.231. Dodsworth seconder for motion by Rev. Joseph Raban. W. Marsh in the Chair. R.W. Sibthorp had preached at St. Peter's, Colchester, on the previous Sunday; also CMS subscription list, 1824. WD contribution £1-1-0.

⁷ S.C. Orchard, 'English Evangelical Eschatology', chapter 3.

⁸ J.H. Stewart, *The Importance of Special Prayer for the General Outpouring of the Holy Spirit*, Religious Tract Society, 1826.

⁹ WD, *Advent Lectures*, 1837.

¹⁰ R.J. Strutt, *John William Strutt, Third Baron Rayleigh*, 1924, pp.5,6.

¹¹ C. Strutt, *The Strutt Family of Terling*, n.p., n.d., p.76.

¹² However Dodsworth and Strutt were joint patrons of Yealand Conyers, Lancashire, in 1838. Nomination of a perpetual curate at Leyland Conyers, 1838, EDA 1/12F/107v, Cheshire CRO, Chester.

¹³ *Hull Advertiser*, Obituary, 30 October 1825.

¹⁴ This has been compared to the Wall Street collapse of 1929. B. Hilton, *The Age of Atonement*, Oxford, 1988, p.131.

¹⁵ M.O.W. Oliphant, *The Life of Edward Irving*, 2 vols, 1862. See vol. 1.

¹⁶ E. Irving, *For Missionaries after the Apostolic School, A Series of Orations*, 1825.

¹⁷ E. Irving, *Babylon and Infidelity Foredoomed of God*, 1826.

¹⁸ E. Irving, *Preliminary Discourse to Ben Ezra*, 1827.

¹⁹ B. Hilton, *The Age of Atonement*, pp.130,131.

²⁰ D.N. Hempton, Evangelicalism and Eschatology, *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, vol. 31, no.2, April 1980, pp.179,186.

²¹ E.R. Sandeen, *The Roots of Fundamentalism*, pp. 18,19.

²² Chiddingfold Parish Church Marriage Register, 14 December 1826, Surrey CRO.

²³ B. Taylor, *The Lower Church*, p.14.

²⁴ Nomination of W.Dodsworth as stipendary curate, 28 December 1826. Licensed 9 January 1827. Winchester Clergy Index, 21M65/E3. Hampshire County Record Office.

²⁵ Harriet Dodsworth (WD's sister) married Joseph Haydon on 7 April 1828, Chiddingfold Parish Church Marriage Register, CHID/2/2, Surrey CRO.

²⁶ CMS, *The Missionary Register*, 1824, pp.220,221.

²⁷ CMJ Dep. CMJ/C11.

²⁸ J.A. Wardle, *The Life and Times of the Rev'd Dr. Hugh McNeile*, MA thesis, Manchester University, 1981.

²⁹ W.J.C. Ervine, 'Doctrine and Diplomacy', p.273.

³⁰ J. Wolffe, *The Protestant Crusade*, p.116.

³¹ CMS, *The Missionary Register*, 1824, p.220.

³² H.W. Burrows, *The Half Century of Christ Church, St. Pancras Albany Street*, 1887, p.10.

³³ S.C. Orchard, *op. cit.*, p.76.

³⁴ WD, *Jesus Christ, in his threefold state of sub angelic humiliation, heavenly glory and earthly dominion. Two Sermons; the former preached on Advent Sunday, November 29, 1829 in the parish church of Albury, Surrey; and both, preached on the two succeeding Sundays in Margaret Chapel in the parish of St Mary-le-Bone, London. With a short appendix on the doctrine of the person of Christ*, 1830, preface.

³⁵ S.C. Orchard, *op. cit.*, p.97.

³⁶ C.G. Flegg, *op. cit.*, pp.36-38.

³⁷ M.O.W. Oliphant, *op. cit.*, vol 2, p.100.

³⁸ C.G. Flegg, *op. cit.*, pp.36-41.

- ³⁹ W.H. Oliver, *Prophets and Millennialists*, chapters, 5, 6.
- ⁴⁰ C.G. Flegg, *op. cit.*, pp.37,38.
- ⁴¹ *Ibid*, p.36.
- ⁴² *Ibid*, p.38.
- ⁴³ H. Drummond, *Dialogues on Prophecy*, 3 vols., 1828-1829.
- ⁴⁴ WD, *Jesus Christ in his threefold state etc.*, preface.
- ⁴⁵ M.O.W. Oliphant, *op. cit.*, vol.2, pp.100,101.
- ⁴⁶ *The Morning Watch or Quarterly Journal on Prophecy and Theological Review*, vol. I, 1829, pp.733, 734. Per. 1093 e. 251, Bodleian Library Oxford.
- ⁴⁷ WD, *op. cit.*, preface.
- ⁴⁸ W.A. Whitworth, *Quam Dilecta*, p.36.
- ⁴⁹ Guildhall Library, London Bishops Act book 1828-42, MS 9532A/3, p.12.
- ⁵⁰ Drummond had bought the chapel's lease (site and building) from the Crown.
- ⁵¹ WD, *op. cit.*, preface.
- ⁵² *Ibid*, p.8.
- ⁵³ *Ibid*, p.7,8.
- ⁵⁴ *Ibid*, p.8.
- ⁵⁵ *Ibid*, p.9, footnote.
- ⁵⁶ *Ibid*, p.10.
- ⁵⁷ See E. Irving, *Babylon and Infidelity Foredoomed of God*, 1828. *The Last Days: A Discourse on the Evil Character of these our Times*, 1828; H. Drummond, *The Second Coming of the Lord Jesus Christ*, 1829.
- ⁵⁸ WD, *op. cit.*, p.11.
- ⁵⁹ *Ibid*, p.12.
- ⁶⁰ *The Tablet*, F. Oakeley, WD Obituary, 21 December 1861, p.810.
- ⁶¹ S.W. Gilley, 'Edward Irving: Prophet of the Millennium' in *Revival and Religion since 1700*, eds., J Garnett, and C. Matthew, 1993, p.105.
- ⁶² *The Tablet*, F. Oakeley, *op.cit.*
- ⁶³ D.M. Lewis, ed., *A Dictionary of Evangelical Biography*, Oxford, 1995.
- ⁶⁴ *Ibid. The Tablet*, F. Oakeley, *op.cit.*
- ⁶⁵ S.W. Gilley, *op.cit.*, p.102.
- ⁶⁶ WD, *op. cit.*, pp.16,17.
- ⁶⁷ *Ibid*, p.17.
- ⁶⁸ *Ibid*, p.21.
- ⁶⁹ E. Irving, *The Orthodox and Catholic Doctrine of our Lord's Human Nature*, 1830.
- ⁷⁰ WD, *op.cit.*, pp.37-52.
- ⁷¹ *Ibid*, p.42.
- ⁷² *Ibid*, pp.44,45.
- ⁷³ WD, *General Redemption and Limited Salvation*, 1831.
- ⁷⁴ WD, *Jesus Christ in his threefold state etc.* p.47. See also E. Irving, *Homilies on the Sacraments: On Baptism*, 1828.
- ⁷⁵ *Ibid*, p.47.
- ⁷⁶ *Ibid*, pp.48,50.
- ⁷⁷ *The Morning Watch*, vol.1, pp.62-71. In this article on the resurrection WD shows his debt to 'Ben Ezra', and thus to Irving.
- ⁷⁸ WD, *Jesus Christ in his threefold state etc.*, Appendix, p.53.
- ⁷⁹ *Ibid*, p.8.
- ⁸⁰ E.S. Purcell, *Life of Cardinal Manning*, 2 vols, 1895, vol.1, p.92.
- ⁸¹ WD, *op.cit.*, p.9, footnote.
- ⁸² *Ibid*, p.44.
- ⁸³ E.S. Purcell, *Life of Cardinal Manning*, vol.1, p.92
- ⁸⁴ *LDJHN*, vol.14, pp.187,188. S.F. Wood had heard WD in 1832.
- ⁸⁵ *GD*, vol.1, Sunday 18 April 1830, 'St. Margarets' (?) in Evg – Mr. Dodsworth, very good.'

CHAPTER THREE: THE MARGARET CHAPEL PART ONE 1829-1832

The period of Dodsworth's early London career was characterised by his distancing of himself from his former association with the Albury group. The disruption in Evangelical circles following Irving's deposition, and the charismatic phenomena that had become associated with 'Prophecy' led many, including Dodsworth, to move back to a more recognisably main-line Evangelicalism. With Dodsworth this was a somewhat ambiguous move. Whilst he kept the Margaret Chapel from following Drummond's separatism, his contact with 'Irvingism' had profoundly affected his theological outlook. In these years 1829-32 Dodsworth appears as an atypical, yet definitely Evangelical, West End preacher. His distinctiveness was nevertheless becoming apparent, firstly in the markedly 'doctrinal' tone of his preaching, secondly in his notable sacramental practice and thirdly in the eschatological thread that ran through his teaching. Central to this was his legacy from Irving's Incarnational and sacramental ideas. It is this latter aspect that is the key to the rest, as indeed it is to his future attraction to the Tractarian movement. Related subsidiary but significant factors were his marriage and involvement with the SPCK. Analysis of these aspects of Dodsworth's ministry at the Margaret Chapel reveals a fascinating picture of a brief but highly unusual period of English religious history. Dodsworth's post-Albury mix of Catholic and Evangelical thought and practice throws valuable light on pre-Tractarian religious experience that did not fit either category of High Churchmanship or Catholic Apostolic sectarianism, yet clearly had affinities with both. Dodsworth's sacramental teaching and practice make a forceful case against the still widely received view that his successor Oakeley's Ritualism was the beginning of Tractarianism in London.

1. Dodsworth's Early London Ministry

Before examining Dodsworth's early ministry in London, it is necessary to understand the context and setting to which he came. Frederick Oakeley describes the early history of the Margaret Chapel thus:

'Old Margaret Chapel had passed through a series of remarkable vicissitudes, and its history was a kind of type of the variations of Protestantism, ranging as it did between a form of that system which was only just removed from atheism, and one which was only just short of Catholicity.....it settled, at least for a time, in some of the milder forms of the religious system which is connected with the name of Mr. Irving. About this period it was administered by the late excellent Mr. Dodsworth, who, by weight of his amiable character and by a mode of preaching far more solid and earnest than that which prevailed in London at the time, succeeded in attracting and attaching a large and highly respectable congregation...'.¹

The Chapel was built about 1760 as a centre for deist preaching by a Dr. Disney. It remained under deist influence until it closed in the 1780s. By 1789 it was reopened as a proprietary chapel of the Church of England within the parish of St. Marylebone. Details from this period are scanty. The identity of Dodsworth's immediate predecessor is uncertain, although a J.D. Hazelwood was minister from at least 1804 and was still resident in 1823.²

The Margaret Chapel was one of a crop of 'proprietary' chapels, built by subscription, and maintained by private individuals, that sprang up in the rapidly expanding 'respectable' suburbs of west London during the eighteenth century. The conservative nature of the parochial system left the provision of places of worship very much to private enterprise. Margaret Street, laid out in 1734,³ was named after Lady Margaret Cavendish, the wife of the second Duke of Portland. These proprietary chapels would play a significant part in the

establishment of Tractarianism in London since they were largely free of episcopal interference, and tended to reflect the beliefs and tastes of the 'respectable' folk who subscribed to them. It is through this ecclesial loophole that the influence and practices both of Evangelicals and the Oxford Movement would find their first footholds in the metropolis.

The roughly rectangular area bounded on the north by the Marylebone Road, on the south by St. James' Park and to the east and west by Tottenham Court Road and Park Lane respectively, was peppered with these chapels. Mostly nondescript 'preaching boxes' they nevertheless initiated many new trends and movements in the religious life of 18th and early nineteenth century London.⁴

The role of these West End preaching centres should not be underestimated both as a spur to Evangelicalism and later to the Tractarians.⁵ The difficulty of many Evangelicals in obtaining benefices before the 1830s is one element in this picture. This period of significance for the proprietary chapel ends with the setting up of the Metropolitan Church Building Fund in the late 1830s, and the spate of parish divisions and church building that occurred from 1840 onwards. Ironically Dodsworth's first 'benefice', Christ Church, Albany Street (built 1837), was the beginning of this new wave of building that would effectively put an end to the independence of the proprietary chapel and re-establish the primacy of the parish church as the normal ecclesiastical unit in West London. Thus from its beginnings outside the parochial system, Tractarianism quickly found its strength and stability within the very system that had at first eschewed it. Other early Tractarians had begun their ministries in these West London proprietary chapels. The Vicar of St. Paul's Knightsbridge, William Bennett, had been minister at Portman Chapel,⁶ and before that at the Oxford Chapel,⁷ now St. Peter's, Vere Street. The successor to Dodsworth at Christ Church, Albany Street, Henry Burrows, had ministered at Archbishop Tennison's Chapel

in Regent Street.⁸ The Quebec Chapel, where Dodsworth was ordained deacon, would later be transformed into the Annunciation, Bryanston Street, a well known Anglo-Catholic parish church.⁹

The building was described by Oakeley as being ‘a complete paragon of ugliness... low, dark and stuffy.’¹⁰ The exterior had the look of an eighteenth century Dissenting Meeting House.¹¹ The interior was filled with pews, and overshadowed by a gallery for the school children. As was not uncommon at the time, there was no central aisle. The focus was the huge three-decker pulpit, commanding the attention of all. This included the clerk’s desk, minister’s ‘reading pew’ and the pulpit proper at the summit. The Communion table ‘filled the space behind the reading-desk and under the pulpit’.¹² Such a description reflected common eighteenth century practice and Oakeley’s later views as to ‘proper’ liturgical arrangements for worship influenced his description.

The lack of a central aisle is not surprising once it is realised that the *Book of Common Prayer* makes no provision for a procession other than at the Burial of the Dead. Galleries were normal methods of providing extra seating. The centrality of the tripartite pulpit met the requirements of the Sunday liturgy of the Church of England including the Ante-Communion and was near universal in the pre-Tractarian Church. Oakeley’s description of the Communion Table as ‘behind’ the reading desk may well only mean that it was placed in the ‘chancel’ area, where communicants could literally ‘draw near’ to receive the Communion on sacrament Sundays. Once again this was normal practice throughout the Church of England at the time. Far from implying a disrespectful or negligent attitude to the Eucharist, this arrangement was simply the normal two chamber ordering of Anglican churches that had been the norm for worship according to the *Book of Common Prayer* since the Reformation period. The ‘nave’ area was auditory, a space designed to enable a maximum number of people to hear the reading of the prayers, Scripture and the sermon.

Minister and communicants would use the 'chancel' area to assemble around the holy table, after Morning Prayer, the Litany and Ante-Communion had been completed in the auditory space. Wren's churches were also mostly designed on this simple 'dual purpose' principle. Dodsworth's sacramental practice at the Margaret Chapel could hardly be described as negligent, yet he clearly saw no reason to change the liturgical arrangements that had been normative in the Established Church for more than two centuries. Nigel Yates has demonstrated the integrity of liturgical arrangements in the pre-Tractarian Church of England, and he shows that views such as Oakeley's have distorted the real picture by imposing a pre-Reformation model or even contemporary Roman Catholic continental ideal on the long standing Anglican tradition.¹³ It must be remembered that Oakeley was writing, from memory, as a Roman Catholic convert priest in the 1860s. It has remained a *sine qua non* of Anglo-Catholic tradition that Oakeley was transforming the Margaret Chapel into 'a model church of the Oxford Movement, and establishing the tradition of the church as it remains to this day'.¹⁴ The implication of this statement is that Dodsworth did not conduct the liturgy according to Catholic principles, a view which helps the case for making Oakeley the first Tractarian at Margaret Street. This is to ignore the evidence that not only were many Evangelicals encouraging frequent communion, but that even before 1833 Dodsworth had restored the centrality of the Eucharist to Sunday worship in his Chapel.¹⁵ Furthermore he was teaching Catholicism before 1839 within the framework of the Anglican liturgy and its traditional post-Reformation setting. His first contacts with the Tractarian movement did not lead him to a re-ordering of the Margaret Chapel since he understood the requirements of the Prayer Book to be adequately fulfilled in the liturgical setting that already existed.

2. Dodsworth as Preacher: the Break with the Irvingites

Within a year of his arrival at the chapel, Dodsworth had begun the publication of his sermons which show Dodsworth propagating at least some of the Irvingite ideas that would be expected by his patron Henry Drummond. Yet it was not so much the themes of Dodsworth's sermons that were attracting attention as their 'soundness' and doctrinal tone.¹⁶ On 18 April 1830 Gladstone described 'Mr. Dodsworth' as 'very good'¹⁷ and in 1833 as 'good, and hard-headed, on the Fall'.¹⁸ During this period Gladstone 'dabbled in the edges of the Irvingite Movement',¹⁹ recording a visit to Irving's evening service in January 1833.²⁰

Throughout the years 1829 to 1833, Dodsworth was building on his reputation as a preacher and thus attracting a large and wealthy congregation. The 'doctrinal' tone, frequently concentrating on the dogmas of the Christian faith, was seen as contrasting with much Evangelical preaching in West London by some of those who would support the coming Oxford Movement. The Irvingite legacy seems to be at the heart of this more systematic method of preaching. Dodsworth would exemplify the Tractarian emphasis on preaching, yet it is to his radical Evangelical roots that we can attribute the importance and form that he gave to it. This Evangelical context was touched upon by Gladstone, writing in 1893, when he remarked in a letter to the author of *Quam Dilecta*, W.A. Whitworth, 'There is one noteworthy point that I do not recollect to have found in the volumes, that is to say the close connection of the Chapel with the Evangelical party in the Church'.²¹ Not only does Gladstone unconsciously put his finger on the Tractarian memory loss that characterises *Quam Dilecta* and much of the subsequent history of the movement, but he also draws attention to the Evangelical content of Dodsworth's sermons at this point. This Evangelical heritage is a vital link in the chain of events that occurred in Dodsworth's life and career during these crucial years, for this was the very point at which he broke with his 'Irvingite' colleagues and returned to an apparently more orthodox position. An

examination of Dodsworth's publications during this period confirms this conclusion and follows in section three of this chapter.

So when and how did Dodsworth break with his former Albury colleagues? In the absence of hard documentary evidence, 'break' is perhaps too strong a word for what was more probably a process of distancing. This process may have already begun at Albury, and accelerated as events began to 'hot-up' at Irving's Chapel. The context is important. Since the 1829 Albury Conference, Irving and Drummond had become increasingly critical of the main Protestant Churches; their publications, sermons and statements became ever more denunciatory in tone. An hysterical atmosphere had crept into Irving's services at his Caledonian Chapel in Regent Square. By October 1831 the 'Gift of Tongues' was reported at Hatton Garden, and many including Thomas Carlyle went to witness these exciting and alarming events. These 'manifestations' of the 'end time' not only proved detrimental to the prophetic movement, but caused a serious crisis in the early nineteenth century Evangelical Movement. Irving, deposed by the Church of Scotland for heresy, died in Scotland in 1834. The other consequence of these events in Regent Square was the confrontation between Drummond and the majority of the Evangelical party in England. The story is well told by W.H. Oliver in *Prophets and Millennialists*.²² The majority of the Evangelical press and societies had already begun to take fright. After an attempt to take over the British and Foreign Bible Society in 1831, Drummond and Irving formed the break-away Trinitarian Bible Society. Tension within led to a further split and the Irvingites were expelled. Drummond began to hold services in his Albury Park Chapel. By 1831 McNeile had declared himself opposed not only to the 'manifestations' at Regent Square but also to the secession of Drummond. The split between these two men was bitter and final. In 1834 McNeile set out his position in a pamphlet: *Letters to a friend, who has felt it his duty to secede from the Church of England, and who imagines that the miraculous gifts of the Holy Ghost are revived among the seceders*.²³

The formation of the Catholic Apostolic Church came about during the years 1832-1835. Drummond taking the lead, as Irving sank into decline. Gradually the germ of a ministerial and sacramental system had come into operation as part of a newly evolving ecclesiology.²⁴ In many ways the experiences and reactions of Dodsworth and McNeile are curiously parallel, yet with ultimately contrasting careers. The two men had come to prominence as likely young clerics through the prophecy movement in the 1820s. Both owed their opening to preferment in the Church of England to Henry Drummond, McNeile at Albury, Dodsworth at Margaret Street. Both became well known and distinguished preachers. Both appeared destined to high ecclesiastical positions; McNeile belatedly became Dean of Ripon, whilst Dodsworth might well have become a Scottish Episcopalian bishop but for his conversion to Rome. Neither of these men lost their interest in prophecy; indeed both continued to propagate various forms of millenarianism long after the Irvingite debacle. For both men, the crucial year was 1830 and, like most of their fellow Evangelicals, the 'manifestations' at Regent Square seem to have constituted the point of their dissociation with Irving and his circle.

McNeile would remain firmly within the newly emerging identity of the Evangelicals, whilst Dodsworth was drawn into the Tractarian Movement, yet their reaction to Irving and Drummond was the same. W.H. Oliver²⁵ argues that it was the professionalism of men such as Bickersteth and McNeile that led them to distance themselves from the Albury group. Dodsworth also fits this mould, hence the strong protestations of loyalty to the establishment that occur in his early Margaret Chapel publications. As early as 1829 Dodsworth was already becoming guarded about his Albury associations before the approaching storm within Evangelicalism had broken.²⁶

W.H. Oliver states that 'In its early years the Tractarian Movement had a prophetic fervour and an apocalyptic flavour'.²⁷ He supports this with the observation that despite their lack

of special interest or knowledge of prophecy in the limited sense, there was a practical and pastoral apocalyptic in their preaching. We see a similar note in Dodsworth's Advent Sermons and other publications during the 1830s and 1840s. It is important to emphasise at this stage that the overlap between Tractarian, Evangelical and Irvingite was substantially greater than has usually been recognised.

Unlike McNeile, Dodsworth has left us no explicit refutation of the Irvingites. Yet an analysis of his publications and movements during these three years 1830-33 leaves little doubt as to the direction in which he was moving. Such is clear from Drummond's periodical *The Morning Watch; or Quarterly Journal on Prophecy and Theological Review*. Featured in the first issue, March 1829, is an article entitled 'On the First Resurrection' signed W.D. This article deserves attention for it is a closely argued exposition of scriptural passages showing knowledge of Ben Ezra, Newton and Joseph Mede,²⁸ all significant names in the prophetic pantheon. The attention given to the parables of Christ relating to the Second Coming, together with the argument supporting the literal accomplishment of those prophecies which indicate Christ's personal reign on earth, and the distinction between the general resurrection and the resurrection of the wicked, seem to anticipate the contribution of Dodsworth at the Albury Conference later in the year. The editor had received several letters critical of Dodsworth including one signed Philanastsius.²⁹ In issue three W.D. replied to Philanastsius, using strong language in an accompanying criticism of the *Christian Observer's* editing of a reply of W.D. to his correspondent.³⁰ By issue number four, the controversy was becoming more heated. It transpired that his critic in the *Observer* had said of W.D. 'Surely the Church of Rome will thank W.D. for giving honour to one to whom they think honour is due'.³¹ W.D. replies that truth is more important than merely criticising Rome for being Rome! He asserts that 'abhorring.... the Popish Doctrine of the infallibility of the church, I believe to be not a whit further from the truth... than the unbridled license of private judgement in the

interpretation of Scripture, which is the idol of the present day, and the favourite theme of platform oratory'. He rejects the accusation that he is 'setting up the Church above the Scripture'.³² He is nevertheless in agreement with his opponent in 'setting out on the very wise and unquestionable axiom that whatever is further from the Church of Rome must of necessity be nearest to the truth'.³³ Dodsworth is perhaps paying the usual lipservice of the time to anti-Roman polemics. Yet he sounds a distinctive note when he asserts that truth is above whatever Rome may or may not believe. Here there may be more than a hint of the theological starting point which enabled Dodsworth's later developments.

After this W.D., once so earnestly supported by his Editor, disappeared from the pages of the *Morning Watch*. From the beginning of 1830, not only do we hear no more of Dodsworth, but by the end of the year the tone of the periodical was becoming more combative, as it launched attack after attack on the *Record*.³⁴ This war of words between the main-line Evangelical periodical, the *Record*, and the increasingly aggressive *Watch* soon became a reflection of the struggle between the Albury group and the rest of the Evangelical establishment. Whereas before December 1830 such moderates as S.R. Maitland³⁵ could pen articles for the *Watch*, after this date the pages are increasingly filled with accounts and defences of the Scottish and London 'manifestations'. By 1831 an article attacking the clergy asserts: 'Thus the first drop of the seventh vial has fallen on the Protestant Church of England, which has disgracefully slept at its post for a long time past'.³⁶ McNeile is bitterly criticised not only for 'false reasoning',³⁷ but also for his publication 'Miracles and Spiritual Gifts' in which he refuses to recognise the authenticity of the miracles and tongues. Once again the evidence points to 1830 as the year when Dodsworth distanced himself from his Albury friends.

Yet a further element in this process was his marriage. In 1830 William Dodsworth was thirty-two years of age. Even in an age when clergymen tended to marry late, it was

somewhat exceptional to remain single for quite so long. However the reasons for this become clear when set in the context of his ministerial career. The lack of 'benefice' prior to his Margaret Street appointment may have been a reason for this. On the other hand Dodsworth was a wealthy man, and it is unlikely that he could not have afforded to marry before his appointment to the Margaret Chapel. More plausible perhaps was the lack of a suitable partner. Given the tendency of his family to aspire to progressively higher social standing, a process begun by his father and typical of his generation, it may simply be that Dodsworth waited until he had arrived in London, and thus gained the opportunity to mix amongst the eligible daughters of the aristocracy.

Whatever his motivation, after 1829 Dodsworth had the status and reputation, as well as the inherited wealth, to make him an attractive prospect for a socially advantageous marriage. On 28 October 1830 William Dodsworth married Elizabeth Buller in Marylebone Parish Church.³⁸ The Buller family played a small but not unimportant role in the social and political life of the period. They produced judges, a bishop, clergymen and politicians, both Tory and Liberal. Originating in Cornwall, through marriage and rising social fortunes, they spread to various parts of the country, including Devon, Staffordshire and eventually London.

During the later part of the eighteenth century William Buller managed to hold the Deanery of Canterbury at the same time as the See of Exeter. During this period Sir Francis Buller rose to prominence as a distinguished judge. Indeed by the 1830s the fashionable squares and terraces of Bloomsbury and West London housed members of several branches of the family, often widely differing in social position or political outlook yet all playing a significant role in the life of the metropolis. Charles Buller, a liberal politician, keen supporter of reform and friend of J.S. Mill, represented one extreme of the family spectrum, whilst Sir John Yarde Buller as Tory MP in Devon, friend of the young

Gladstone and future brother in law of William Dodsworth, was perhaps more typical of the family.³⁹ Thus Dodsworth became allied to the Buller family through his marriage to Elizabeth Yarde Buller (1799-1856), the youngest daughter of Sir Francis Yarde Buller (1767-1833) and Elizabeth Lydia Halliday. Lady Buller took considerable interest in religious matters, being a member of the SPCK and doubtless many of the other religious societies.⁴⁰ In 1833 their son John succeeded as third baronet and was created Baron Churston in 1858. Gladstone was a regular visitor at their London house, frequently referring to the family in his diaries.⁴¹

Dodsworth's first contacts with the family are not clear, but may have been through the Irvingite circle. Many fashionable and 'serious' church people were on close terms with the leading Evangelical figures of the capital, and some members of the Buller family were known to Edward Irving during the 1820s.⁴² Thus Dodsworth's entrée into the Albury set brought him into the ranks of the rising families that found a natural home in the proprietary chapels of West London. These residents of the newly constructed squares and terraces stretching out from Bloomsbury towards Regent's Park were a fascinating microcosm of British society, often demonstrating an interface between conservative minds closely allied to the Establishment status quo, and those liberal individuals and families ready for reform and utilitarian social and religious views. As B. Hilton has argued, it was this class that was especially susceptible to this blend of politics and religion that the radical views of the prophetic movement offered to its adherents.⁴³

3. Dodsworth and the Irvingite Legacy – Publications 1829-1832

Two publications by Dodsworth throw light on his development during this time and do much to support the view that his move away from the Irvingites led him back to a distinctive and atypical position within the broadly Evangelical world of West London.

The first is a work published in 1831, but preached in the second half of 1830, to which he added a preface dated 25 January 1831. From this preface it is clear that he is now living in Clarence Terrace by Regent's Park. This seems likely to have been his address prior to his marriage since he and his wife moved to York Terrace by 1834, possibly to live with her mother Lady Buller. The publication, entitled *General Redemption and Limited Salvation*, claimed to be 'the true scriptural doctrine of redemption', and 'a seasonable antidote to the prevailing errors on the subject' and is in fact two sermons plus a reprint of Archbishop Usher's, *Treatise on the True Intent and Extent of Christ's Death and Satisfaction on the Cross*, added as an appendix.⁴⁴ The doctrinal position taken in these works is a moderate and unexceptional one, so much so as to suggest that this publication is an exposition of moderate Evangelical orthodoxy, a moderate Calvinism not unlike the position of Simeon⁴⁵ and the Clapham Sect. What is significant is the emphasis placed on doctrinal belief, the sense of scriptural orthodoxy and unity of Christian doctrine seen as a 'machine of exquisite workmanship,'⁴⁶ for 'all the truths of the Bible hang upon each other;'⁴⁷ and there is repeated condemnation of the 'many strange fruits of the superficial theology of our own day'.⁴⁸ He complains of individualism, as a result of lack of proper teaching, which results in divisions and harm to the 'symmetry in the body of Christ.' There is considerable emphasis on the Church as the guide to truth, as well as the role of Baptism as the outward sign of the 'MUTUAL IMPUTATION' of Christ's merits flowing from the 'MYSTICAL UNION' that comes from faith in Christ.⁴⁹ There is nothing in this work that could be said to be untypical of many a 'Church Evangelical' of the day. Yet a phrase at the beginning of the first sermon is significant:

Having now arrived at the conclusion of that period of the year, which brings before us in succession the main facts in the work of Jesus Christ upon which our salvation is founded, and from a right apprehension of which all sound doctrine flows:.⁵⁰

It is not just the sense of the liturgical year so closely tied in with 'our salvation', but the concern for 'right appreciation', and 'sound doctrine' that draw attention to Dodsworth's strong concern for orthodoxy, a concern that had made him a fellow traveller with Drummond and Irving in their crusade against what they perceived as lax and unfocused Evangelicalism. Despite his break with the Albury set, this passion for orthodoxy constituted a major aspect of Dodsworth's reputation as a sound and compelling preacher.

With this in mind we turn to his second publication in 1831, *Selections of the Psalms to which are added Hymns adapted to the festivals of the Church, and some paraphrases of Holy Scripture for the use of Margaret Chapel, St. Marylebone*. Evangelical and High Churchmen alike had been in the habit of producing such useful handbooks for the use of their congregations for some time. Indeed the effort at improvements in habits of piety at both individual and congregational level was a hallmark of many Evangelicals and played a vital part in the Evangelical revival.⁵¹ In this, as in so many other ways, Dodsworth was acting in just that mode, the good 'Church' Evangelical pastor. The emphasis on 'Church' is important here. At the beginning of the Preface he remarked, 'It is much to be regretted that, human compositions should be preferred to them' (Scriptural texts). In keeping with this he shared a definite preference for the Prayer Book Psalms rather than the 'New Versions' of metrical psalms. Yet he does allow some hymns such as 'Jesus Christ is Risen Today' added as 'suitable to the festivals,...but...they are not intended for *general* adoption in the Psalmody of the Church'.⁵² Hymns were still regarded by many as a recent innovation into Anglican worship and, whilst Dodsworth seems aware of the taint of 'enthusiasm', or even Nonconformity that adhered to them, it is significant that he is promoting them as a liturgical and spiritual 'aid' for his congregation. There follows a very comprehensive scheme for psalm singing based on the Prayer Book 'Church Year'.

It is clear from this publication that the worship at the Margaret Chapel was firmly based on the Prayer Book seasonal scheme and its offices. Especially significant is the Sunday pattern which makes provision for psalmody: 'In the morning before the Communion Service'.⁵³ From its context this appears to have been a regular occurrence, indeed the implication, taken with other evidence yet to be examined, suggests that a weekly communion service as an integral part of each Sunday's worship as allowed by the *Book of Common Prayer* may have been taking place at Dodsworth's Chapel as early as 1831. Dodsworth's legacy from prophecy is never far below the surface, and in the opening words of the preface he extols the delight of public worship and its role in the church 'until the consummation of all things.'⁵⁴ It is this eschatological imperative that was the impetus for the introduction of the weekly Eucharist at Margaret Street. Thus whilst considering Dodsworth's publications, it is possible to begin to draw out the elements in his Eucharistic theology and practice which were part of his debt to Irving.

The normal pattern of Sunday morning worship consisted of Morning Prayer, Litany, Ante-Communion including the sermon, after which the service ended unless there was a celebration of the Holy Communion to follow. Whilst most churches celebrated the Eucharist regularly but infrequently, the Evangelical revival, as well as the practice of many High Churchmen, had led to a more frequent celebration of the Communion during the hundred years or so prior to Dodsworth's ministry.⁵⁵ Weekly 'early' celebrations were not unknown. Thus it can be argued that Dodsworth was only doing what many good Evangelicals were already engaged in, attempting to improve the spiritual calibre of their congregations by encouraging more frequent attendance at the Lord's Supper.

That said, the concept of the Eucharist as *the* Sunday service of the Church was almost unknown at this time in the Established Church. Despite the good intentions of the Reformers, it was only in some cathedrals that this ideal had been maintained beyond the

Reformation. Evidence for Sunday Communion as the *main* service in parish churches in the early nineteenth century is scarce indeed, and many years later in 1851 John Henry Newman would say in a letter to Dodsworth (on the day of his conversion), ‘...how it was to you that members of the Anglican Church were indebted for the call to weekly communion.’⁵⁶

Whatever we may make of this claim, and exactly what it meant, it does appear that Newman credited Dodsworth with the main role in restoring weekly Communion as a norm in Anglican worship. This has certainly been overlooked in the ‘official’ lore and histories of the Tractarian revival. If anyone gets the credit, it tends to be Oakeley, on account of his setting up the infamous ‘mass’ with music at the Margaret Chapel after 1837. Because this was part of his re-ordering of the chapel for ‘Catholic worship’ which brought him into conflict with his bishop and his subsequent resignation, the evidence that the Sunday Eucharist was in reality begun by Oakeley’s predecessor (and mentor?) Dodsworth some several years earlier has been entirely overlooked, and thus an important stage in the ‘pre-history’ of the Tractarian movement has been misrepresented.

Perhaps of even greater significance is that there are very strong reasons to suggest that the weekly Communion at the Margaret Chapel was not begun as a result of the Oxford Movement at all. Since such a claim must have an impact on our understanding of the Tractarian and Evangelical Movements it is vital to examine the available evidence contained in an influential publication of 1835, namely *Discourses on the Lord’s Supper, preached in Margaret Chapel, St. Marylebone*. Dodsworth does indeed give the call to weekly Communion that Newman refers to. Gladstone⁵⁷ and others read the pamphlet and it seems to have made an impression at the time.

In this work, consisting of six discourses, which were preached to justify and recommend revival of 'the holy Eucharist, at least every Lord's Day' as in the 'purest ages of the Church',⁵⁸ the first discourse states that the Sunday Eucharist had been celebrated at the Margaret Chapel for three years previously.⁵⁹ This would place the revival of a regular Sunday Communion at the Chapel firmly in 1832 and thus before the publication of *Tracts for the Times*. This gives substance to Newman's remark, and allows us to see that not only was the revival of the Sunday Eucharist undertaken well before Oakeley's time, but its revival was not undertaken as a result of the Oxford *Tracts* at all. What then were the reasons for its revival? Dodsworth's explanation as given in 1835 is scriptural warrant and apostolic practice. He assembles an array of New Testament texts which he supplements with quotations from the pre-Nicene Fathers. Having condemned the abuses of the medieval Church and infrequent Communion, he then argues that the Reformers intended to restore weekly general Communion and indeed did so during Edward VI's short reign. He musters the *Articles of Religion*, Andrews, Hooker, Luther and Calvin to support his call to weekly Communion.⁶⁰

Whatever the 'evidences' he puts forward for his case, there is an underlying doctrine of the church which may well be the true impetus for his actual revival of weekly Communion in 1832. Throughout several discourses, underpinning his quotations from the various authors is the Pauline doctrine of the church as the Body of Christ which he describes as a 'beautiful theory of the Church',⁶¹ alongside which he develops the Pauline doctrine of Baptism as incorporation into that body. Indeed he sees the Eucharist as an extension and perpetual renewal of Baptism. The 'new life' of the Church is nourished by the sacrament, and 'regeneration' continues through this mystery. The whole work climaxes in the words of St. Paul that the Eucharist shows forth the Lord's death until he is revealed at the Parousia and which Dodsworth ties in with the general Resurrection, thus linking the Sacrament to the Christian's own resurrection. The Eucharist is the sacrament

of new life. Such language as well as the whole tenor of the argument bears close comparison with Irving's own sacramental theology, as well as finding many parallels with Catholic Apostolic understanding of the sacraments.⁶²

David Allen makes a convincing case for Irving's high regard for the Lord's Table and its connection with the Holy Spirit's work in Baptism as a central part of his Incarnational theology, the Eucharist being seen as the means by which the Spirit sanctifies the elect.⁶³

The sacraments are the means of access to the Spirit.

Much of Dodsworth's reputation as an 'original' preacher was due to Irving's influence on his theology. Indeed Dodsworth seems to have been an exception to Columba Flegg's observation on the CAC and Tractarians that 'The two movements were also widely separated in the matter of millennialist beliefs'.⁶⁴ Not only did he maintain a pre-millennialist position until his conversion to Roman Catholicism in 1851; it will be seen that Dodsworth was also influenced by Irving's sacramental theology as indeed he was by his Incarnational theology and eschatology. It is clearly not coincidence that both the Catholic Apostolic Church and the Brethren Movement in their different ways went on to develop strong weekly Eucharistic practice. Likewise Dodsworth's own concern for the Eucharist and his underlying Incarnational and eschatological understanding of it as shown in the *Discourses* and other later works seem to owe much more to his early contact with Irving and his circle than to any direct influence from the old High Church party or Tractarians.⁶⁵

4. Dodsworth 1831-1832 – An Atypical Evangelical?

It would be tempting to see the years 1831-1832 as a 'wilderness' period for Dodsworth. Having left the Irvingite circle and with the Tractarian movement still in the future, it is possible to seize on those elements in his thought and ministry that might be interpreted in

a 'High Church' direction, thus leading to the conclusion that his attraction to the Tractarians was based on prior contact with the old High Churchmen. However to do this would be to read back his later development into earlier years. It seems better to argue for an independent doctrinal and ministerial evolution that would predispose Dodsworth to sympathy with the Oxford Movement. This requires careful examination. The break with Irving was a clean one. This is perhaps best seen in Dodsworth's absence from the Powerscourt (Co. Wicklow) conference in 1831 and in successive years. Lady Powerscourt was in close contact with Irving and Drummond and may have attended one or more of the Albury Conferences. In one sense Powerscourt was the successor to the Albury Conferences and was attended by some four hundred of the 'Evangelical elite' including J.N. Darby soon to form 'The Brethren'.⁶⁶ That Dodsworth did not attend can be known from a conversation in 1858 between him and Mr. Serjeant Bellasis, in which Dodsworth said that he 'had long had a wish to visit Ireland', a wish that appears not to have been fulfilled.⁶⁷ Furthermore, Dodsworth's name does not appear in the very comprehensive lists of officers of the Trinitarian Bible Society.⁶⁸ The importance of this schism from the Bible Society has been noted above and Dodsworth stayed well clear. Although Dodsworth distanced himself from the Irvingites, he remained firmly within the Evangelical orbit. Nevertheless in view of that Catholic if Irvingite element in his theology it is reasonable to ask if he was influenced by his High Church colleagues in London.

The SPCK seems an obvious place to look for an answer. Peter Nockles has stressed the relationships of the old High Church movement, especially the role of the 'Hackney Phalanx' and Joshua Watson, to the Oxford Movement. The SPCK emerges as a vital player in this relationship.⁶⁹ It is clear from an investigation of earlier histories of the Society,⁷⁰ as well as from the minutes of its meetings, that the SPCK was at this time both a meeting ground of churchmen of widely differing ecclesial views, and had undergone

something of a revival in popularity due to the effect of the Irvingite debacle on the Evangelical world.⁷¹

The picture that emerges is of a society in need of stabilisation after the unsettling effects of the upheavals brought about by the extremism of the prophecy movement. The SPCK was perhaps the ideal of stable ‘church’ religious affiliation and aspirations. Its loyalty to the ‘orthodoxy’ of the national religion is well illustrated by a sermon preached by H.J. Rose in 1821 in Brighton Parish Church for the Society. He lists the objects of the Society as being:

1. Diffusion of Scriptures.
2. Exploration and illustration of Scripture.
3. Promoting the use of the *Book of Common Prayer*.
4. Providing books for Christian Education.⁷²

This was moderate and uncontroversial fare. Especially important was the emphasis on the Prayer Book, setting its educational role well within the Anglican framework. Even so, the Society was not to be left in peace for very long. Given the sheer breadth of its members’ doctrinal outlooks, it is not surprising that by the early 1830s a struggle for control of the Society had become apparent. At the general meeting on 5 July 1831 there was a controversy regarding ‘the First Catechism of Dr. Watts’ which was the subject of a motion put forward by Daniel Wilson that the catechism be withdrawn because it was ‘in some respects defective and obscure’.⁷³ Such minor skirmishes were not untypical of the Society but the influx of ‘many new members’⁷⁴ in 1831 does seem to have heralded a period of much more serious confrontation.

Dodsworth’s first recorded attendance was at the Lincoln’s Inn Fields general meeting on Tuesday 4 October 1831.⁷⁵ In the minutes of a meeting he attended early in the following

year, an example of the type of Christian educational publication sponsored by the Society is recorded. These include:

On the duty of Public Worship

On the Doctrine of the Sacraments

On the Divine Obligation of the Christian Sabbath.⁷⁶

Dodsworth was a frequent and regular attendant at the meetings of the Society throughout the 1830s, and although his name never occurs on any Committee lists, he was active in the meetings. From the lists of names of those present, it is obvious that he came into contact with such figures as Joshua Watson,⁷⁷ Ward,⁷⁸ Gladstone⁷⁹ and Rose⁸⁰ and perhaps most important of all H.E. Manning.⁸¹ Membership of the Society was not a sign of specific churchmanship, as is shown by the immense spectrum of its subscription lists. Indeed the earlier lists include members of the Drummond family, the Haydons, Bullers, Lord Rayleigh, as well as Simeon, Marsh, Newman, Oakeley and the Clapham Thorntons. Mrs. Pusey also is recorded as having made a considerable financial contribution to the Society.⁸²

Dodsworth's attendance and growing interest in the Society was a natural stage in his movement away from the extremes of his previous Irvingite involvement towards a much more 'church' orientated position. Although his allegiance to the orthodoxies and canonical requirements of the establishment had never been seriously in doubt, we can conclude that Dodsworth's attendance at the SPCK did bring him into contact with some figures who would play a role in the Tractarian Movement. Indeed from 1830-31 he entered a world of ecclesiastical contacts that exposed him to the older High Church tradition mediated through the SPCK. yet we have already seen in his publications that it was the patristic, historical and classical Anglican elements present even in his earlier 'prophetic' works that led him on towards the Tractarians. He did not abandon his pre-

millennial position or indeed his overall interest in prophecy, but they did receive a new context in his developing thought.

Ervine has remarked that the years 1829-33 were a period when Evangelicals and High Churchmen were united against reform in Church and State because they identified reform with apostasy.⁸³ This is certainly a useful way of understanding Dodsworth's position during these years after his break with Irving and before he threw in his lot with the Tractarians. Apostasy is a frequent theme in his publications from now onwards. The link with eschatology is no less clear despite his earlier experiences. This becomes apparent in his publications in the mid 1830s.

Ervine makes a case⁸⁴ for the division of the ranks of Evangelicals after the disillusionment with Irving that led to a loosening up of older certainties, with a consequent 'reading for themselves' by the clergy. Certainly this could explain something of the success of the Tracts when they appeared after 1833. Yet it might also go some way towards demonstrating the various influences on Dodsworth at this time. He was never a party man (and frequently assured his readers/listeners of this in his sermons). His openness not only to Irving, but to an unprejudiced reading of the New Testament, as well as a wide use of the Fathers and the Reformers, are all elements that not only impacted upon his sermons, but also made him ready and open to the views of High Churchmen in the SPCK and to the Tracts in their turn. Yet there was nothing inevitable about this, nor did he identify with the older High Churchmen in any party sense.

The years 1831-1832 were 'crucible' years for Dodsworth, and we cannot know what the extent of such influence was upon him. What we can be sure of is that the year of the Great Reform Act, and Irving's condemnation, mark a hidden turning point in the development of English religion. Furthermore, his ministry at the Margaret Chapel was the catalyst for a

new understanding and practice of the Eucharist as central to the life of the believing community. The sacramental revolution unleashed upon the Church by the Tractarians in the later part of the decade should be viewed in this broader context of radical Evangelical thinking and not least in Dodsworth's unique contribution to it. Though distanced from the Irvingite movement and re-established in the Evangelical fold, the marks of his former association, in particular eschatological marks, were to remain with and indeed compel him towards an unexpected future course.

¹ F. Oakeley, *Historical Notes on the Tractarian Movement*, 1865, p.60.

² W.A. Whitworth, *Quam Dilecta*, pp.31-35.

³ B. Weinreb and C. Hibbert, *The London Encyclopaedia*, 1983, p.497.

⁴ E. Walford, *London Old and New etc*, vol.4, 1876, p.208.

⁵ The Percy Chapel was a typical example, but there were many others.

⁶ A chapel of ease to Marylebone Parish Church, situated between Baker Street and Adam Street.

⁷ E. Walford, *op. cit.*, pp. 442, 762.

⁸ *Ibid*, p.251. A chapel of ease to St. James, opened 1702, closed about 1860.

⁹ *Ibid*, p.158.

¹⁰ F. Oakeley, *op. cit.*, p.62.

¹¹ P. Galloway and C. Rawll, *Good and Faithful Servants: All Saints Margaret Street and Its Incumbents*, Worthing, 1988, p.7.

¹² F. Oakeley, *op. cit.*, p.62.

¹³ N. Yates, *Buildings, Faith, and Worship*, p.4.

¹⁴ P. Galloway and C. Rawll, *op. cit.*, p.6.

¹⁵ See below and following chapter.

¹⁶ F. Oakeley, *op. cit.*, p.60.

¹⁷ *GD*, vol. 1, p.294.

¹⁸ *Ibid*, vol. 2, p.10.

¹⁹ *Ibid*, vol. 1, p.xliii.

²⁰ *Ibid*, vol. 2, p.6.

²¹ *Ibid*, vol. 13, p.287, Gladstone to W.A. Whitworth, 3 September 1893.

²² W.H. Oliver, *Prophets and Millennialists*, Auckland and London, 1978, chapters v,vi.

²³ H. McNeile, *Letters to a Friend who has felt it his duty to secede from the Church of England and who imagines that the miraculous gifts of the Holy Spirit are received among the seceders*. 1834. It was addressed to Spencer Perceval.

²⁴ C.G. Flegg, *Gathered under Apostles*, p.57.

²⁵ W.H. Oliver, *op. cit.*, p.141.

²⁶ *WD*, *Jesus Christ in his threefold state etc*. The preface was penned in London on 14 December 1829, and publication followed in the New Year.

²⁷ W.H. Oliver, *op. cit.*, p.142.

²⁸ *The Morning Watch*, vol.1, pp. 62-71.

²⁹ *Ibid*, p.267.

³⁰ *Ibid*, pp.518-524.

³¹ *Ibid*, p.733.

³² *Ibid*, p.734.

³³ *Ibid*, p.733.

³⁴ *Ibid*, vol.2, p.629.

³⁵ *Ibid*, p.448.

³⁶ *Ibid*, vol.3, p.201.

³⁷ *Ibid*, vol.4, p.430. Review of McNeile on 'Miracles and Spiritual Gifts'.

- ³⁸ Marriage Register, Marylebone Parish Church, P89/MRY1/280, Greater London Record Office.
- ³⁹ I am indebted for information on the Buller family to R. Meyrick of Peter Tavy, Devon.
- ⁴⁰ Subscription List, Reports, MS B1 1829, SPCK Archive Cambridge University Library.
- ⁴¹ *GD*, vol. 2, pp. 174,236.
- ⁴² *DNB*, *Charles Buller*, vol.3, p.246.
- ⁴³ B.Hilton,*The Age of Atonement*, chapter 1.
- ⁴⁴ WD, *General Redemption and Limited Salvation*, 1831.
- ⁴⁵ H. Clegg, *Evangelicals and Tractarians*, p.24.
- ⁴⁶ WD, *op. cit.*, p.iii, preface.
- ⁴⁷ *Ibid*, p.iv.
- ⁴⁸ *Ibid*, p.xi.
- ⁴⁹ *Ibid*, pp.3,12 footnote, quoting *Bishop Hopkins on the Doctrine of the Two Covenants*.
- ⁵⁰ *Ibid*, p.1.
- ⁵¹ N. Yates, *op. cit.*, pp.63-65.
- ⁵² WD, *Selections of the Psalms*, 1831, preface, pp. v, viii.
- ⁵³ *Ibid*, p.97.
- ⁵⁴ *Ibid*, preface, p.v.
- ⁵⁵ N. Yates, *op. cit.*, p.55.
- ⁵⁶ *LDJHN*, vol. 14, p.187.
- ⁵⁷ *GD*, vol.2, p.359.
- ⁵⁸ WD, *Discourses on the Lord's Supper preached in Margaret Chapel, St. Marylebone*, 1835, preface, p.iii.
- ⁵⁹ *Ibid*, p.1.
- ⁶⁰ *Ibid*, preface.
- ⁶¹ *Ibid*, p.27.
- ⁶² C.G. Flegg, *op. cit.*, pp.260,261.
- ⁶³ D. Allen, A paper given at the Irving bi-centenary; Research Institute of Systematic Theology, K.C.L., 26 September 1992.
- ⁶⁴ C.G. Flegg, *Gathered under Apostles*, p.449.
- ⁶⁵ WD, *Holy Baptism; the Grafting into our Risen Lord. An Easter Sermon*, 1850.
- ⁶⁶ E.R. Sandeen, *The Roots of Fundamentalism*, 1970, pp.34,35.
- ⁶⁷ E. Bellasis, *Memorials of Mr. Serjeant Bellasis 1800-1873*, Third Edition,1923, p.81.
- ⁶⁸ A.J. Brown, *The Word of God Among All Nations, A Brief History of the Trinitarian Bible Society 1831-1981*,1981, pp.142-147.
- ⁶⁹ P.B. Nockles, *The Oxford Movement in Context*, 1994, pp.19,271.
- ⁷⁰ Allen and McClure, *History of the SPCK 1698-1898*, 1898, and W.K. Lowther-Clark, *The History of the SPCK*, 1959.
- ⁷¹ Subscription List, Reports, MS B1 1829-1834, SPCK Archive.
- ⁷² W.K. Lowther-Clark, *op. cit.*, p.150.
- ⁷³ Minutes 1829-1834, p.182, MS A1/40, SPCK Archive.
- ⁷⁴ *Ibid*, p.209.
- ⁷⁵ *Ibid*, p.203.
- ⁷⁶ *Ibid*, pp.244,257.
- ⁷⁷ Joshua Watson was treasurer of SPCK.
- ⁷⁸ Minutes 1829-1834, p.445, SPCK Archive.
- ⁷⁹ *Ibid*, p.463.
- ⁸⁰ *Ibid*, p.466.
- ⁸¹ Subscription List, Reports, MS B1 1833, SPCK Archive.
- ⁸² Subscription List, Reports, MS B1 1829, SPCK Archive.
- ⁸³ W.J.C. Ervine, *Doctrine and Diplomacy*, p.311.
- ⁸⁴ *Ibid*, p.269.

CHAPTER FOUR: THE MARGARET CHAPEL PART TWO 1833-36

This chapter seeks to set out the network of contacts that enabled Dodsworth during this period to move from an atypical Evangelical position to that of a convinced defender of Oxford Movement principles. Related to this are the questions of through whose influence and at what date did he become a Tractarian. Correspondence between himself and the Oxford leaders plays an important part in this study, but equally a detailed review of his publications leads to firm conclusions as to the influences in his theological development during the mid 1830s. Allied to this is the question of the place and significance of Dodsworth's Eucharistic practice at the Margaret Chapel, and its wider influence on the Movement in general.

It is clear that Dodsworth's development towards Tractarianism owes a fundamental debt to his eschatological convictions as moulded by Irving's Incarnational or sacramental views. Perhaps the true point of contact with the Oxford Movement was Dodsworth's anti-rationalist position which had underpinned his interest in prophetic studies, and coloured all his subsequent development. His devotion to Patristics, and the Irvingite sacramental legacy expressed in a strongly 'doctrinal' reputation as a preacher, lead to a mutual attraction between himself and the Oxford leaders, as well as Cambridge figures such as Hugh James Rose (1795-1838). These were the men who drew him into the new Movement. Finally, consideration is given to Dodsworth's role both as a leader of Tractarian opinion, lay as well as clerical in London and his place as the pioneer of Catholic teaching and practice at the Margaret Chapel.

1. Dodsworth's First Contacts with the Oxford Movement and its Leaders

It seems likely that Dodsworth's first contact with the ideas of the Oxford Movement was, as in the case of most other clergy, through the circulation of the *Tracts for the Times*. Yet this did not occur in a vacuum, for Dodsworth was becoming known to several leading figures within the Movement. By December 1833, Haldane's *Record* had noticed the *Tracts*,¹ (unlike its more moderate sister periodical the *Christian Observer* which did not even mention them until August 1834 and reserved its first attack until December 1836) when it was critical of those members of the 'Society at Oxford' who were responsible for them.²

Yet as Herbert Clegg has demonstrated from a close examination of the Evangelical press for these years the reaction of the *Record* was not at all representative of most Evangelical or indeed 'Church' opinion in general.³ The Tracts were generally read as a call to resist not just Erastian 'spoliation' of the Church, but as a more general call to withstand liberalising tendencies. Party reactions were slow to form, and indeed Evangelical criticism does not seem to have gathered momentum until well into the decade.⁴ It could be argued that perhaps as late as Newman's publication of Tract 90 there was still a wide spectrum of opinion regarding the Tractarian Movement amongst those who would call themselves Evangelicals. The divisions and boundaries of differentiation so familiar from the mid-century onwards were very much in an evolutionary state during the first years of the Movement.

However this may be, it seems unlikely that Dodsworth would have reacted with the negativity of such an organ as the *Record*. The early Tracts' tone of resistance to apostasy, as identified in the current 'reforms' of the Church and the spread of utilitarian ideas in society, would have struck a chord in the soul of one whose involvement in prophetic studies had alerted him to the identification of anti-Christ with just such liberalism. Despite

the persistence of strong anti-Roman feeling, many factors. not least Maitland's explosion of the Year/Day theory, and Horsley's re-identification of Anti-Christ with the 'apostasy' of contemporary society⁵ had led to a shift in understanding of the prophetic texts that were a key element in Dodsworth's growing insistence on 'doctrinal' religion as constantly reiterated in his preaching. It was this that S.F. Wood and later Newman fixed upon when they heard him preach.⁶ In these Tracts there was much that echoed the sentiments of the Albury 'prophets', but in what may now have seemed to Dodsworth a less threatening and more familiar context.

But if the early Tracts did have such a wide appeal, it was not long before the Catholic elements within them came into view, and the patristic element in these early Tracts is another point of contact with Dodsworth's outlook. It has been remarked that the period 1833-36 are neglected years in the study of the Movement; therefore⁷ from the perspective of this thesis, examination of them is vital, since Dodsworth's identification with the Movement occurs at this point. Much in his formation and experience predisposed him to this course. It now remains to trace as far as possible the steps by which it was taken. Although we may assume that Dodsworth was reading the Tracts as they appeared, it is equally important to try to form a clear idea of the extent to which he was already coming into contact with the leading characters of the Movement.

It is not surprising that the first recorded contact between Dodsworth and the Oxford leaders came about through S.F. Wood who was a close friend of both Dodsworth and Newman. Newman himself refers to this connection in a letter to Dodsworth in 1851. 'I recollect how my and your dear friend Wood first mentioned your name to me, and took me with him to hear you preach at the Margaret Chapel about the year 1834.'⁸ Yet it was not until Thursday 21 January 1836 that Newman informed Pusey: 'I have this morning been introduced to Mr. Dodsworth, who is very full of a plan in which he wishes me and

others to co-operate, and I suppose I shall. He means to get the Bishop of London's leave to have a series of weekday lectures the ensuing spring on apostolical ministry, unity etc. – and he wishes various persons from Oxford, Cambridge etc. to undertake them. He hopes to get Rose, Evans a Mr. Smith etc. from Cambridge, and begs me to look out in Oxford. I thought of Copeland, Oakeley, myself and poor Palmer...Sam Wilberforce. Woodgate. Manning and (if by very good luck) Keble. Hook, too, I reckon on'.⁹

There was then a gap of some two or so years between Newman's first hearing Dodsworth preach, and a formal introduction. By this time Dodsworth was committed to the Movement, and was perhaps already in contact with Hugh James Rose and others sympathetic to the cause from Cambridge. Both Dodsworth and Rose were Trinity men of the same generation, and their involvement with the SPCK may explain Dodsworth's first contacts with Rose. Wood and Rose were probably amongst the first to draw him into the movement. Likewise Manning had known of Dodsworth since at least 1832, when he had been advised by S.F. Wood to hear him preach.¹⁰ By 1837 they were in regular correspondence and had already developed a close and mutually supportive friendship, which would become even closer in the years to come.¹¹

The SPCK link is important. The meeting at 23 Lincoln's Inn Fields on 4 March 1834 was essentially a fight between Evangelicals and High Churchmen over the composition of the Standing committee. It appears that Manning had come to London to defend the Evangelical cause. Dodsworth was certainly at this meeting of the SPCK and it is tantalising not to know which side he supported!¹² It may therefore be to this period that we can date his first acquaintance with Manning. Furthermore correspondence between Dodsworth and Pusey exists from 1836 establishing Pusey's acquaintance with Dodsworth from at least that date.¹³ A letter of 29 June quoted by Liddon from Philip Pusey to his brother Edward, refers to Tractarian views thus: 'Their practical effect on the mind is

shown, I think, excellently in Mr. Dodsworth, whose chapel I have for some time constantly attended.’¹⁴ It may be that Philip Pusey played a role in introducing Dodsworth to his brother. Such a survey of Dodsworth’s contacts suggests that by the mid 1830s he was part of a loose network of laity and clergy whose theological opinions were drawing them together and were already marking them out from their fellow Anglicans.

The first signs of the distinctiveness of this emerging group causing tension between Dodsworth and ‘fellow’ Evangelicals can be observed at this time. In a letter to J.W. Bowden from Oriel on 10 January 1836, Newman remarked that *The Record* ‘laments the growth of High Church principles amongst those who might have known (or who did know) better things. Does this allude to such men as Mr. Dodsworth?’¹⁵ By August of the same year *The Record* openly attacked Dodsworth in three issues.¹⁶ It was part of editor Haldane’s concerted onslaught on Tractarian principles, and was aimed at Dodsworth’s recent publications which were now clearly allied to the Oxford cause, and thus portrayed by *The Record* as a renegade to the Evangelical cause. By the mid-1830s opposition to Dodsworth’s views was spreading amongst more ‘main line’ Evangelicals. ‘Bickersteth protested against SPCK Tracts that seemed to have caught the infection (of the Oxford Movement), and which were in fact written by Dodsworth, one of the Oxford party who afterwards seceded to Rome’.¹⁷ Oakeley in his *Tablet* obituary for Dodsworth in 1861 implies that the break with Evangelicalism came in 1836,¹⁸ but the tone of his article is vague to say the least. Liddon states that Dodsworth had written concerning a meeting of Islington clergy in January 1837 at which an attack was launched ‘on us’,¹⁹ and this is confirmed by a letter to Pusey on 9 January 1837 from Newman.²⁰

It is not easy therefore to pinpoint Dodsworth’s move into the ranks of the Tractarians. In fact it is not necessary to do so, since the process took a number of years, although by 1836 the outcome was clear and relations with his former Evangelical brethren had become

strained as a result. Once again it is important to stress the lack of any real party boundaries as later developed. Yet an examination of Dodsworth's publications throws light on just how far from his former theological position he travelled during the years 1833-36, and the extent to which the *Tracts for the Times* had influenced his thinking.

2. Publications 1833-36. Advance into Tractarianism

The development of Dodsworth's thought during this time is illustrated by a comparison of his *Questions on Christian Doctrine and Practice answered by references to Scripture*, the fifth edition of which was published in 1833, with his *The Church of England a Protester against Romanism and Dissent* of 1836.

The first is a simple catechism for children and adults. By means of questions, answered by Scripture quotations regarding salvation and other matters, a moderate Calvinism is established. Plenty of space (at least four questions and some six Scriptural passages in answer) is given to the 'Return of Jesus Christ'. At the end three questions on the two sacraments are answered by five Scriptural passages. Overall it is a comprehensive exposition of the Christian faith firmly within the moderate Evangelical tradition. Although the form of the Catechism and the questions asked set the agenda, this does give the impression of a genuine attempt to let Scripture speak for itself.

The 1836 publication is very different. It constitutes a series of lectures given by Dodsworth and was to be strongly condemned by the *Record*.²¹ It is true that the two types of theological writing are not properly comparable, since the object of these eight discourses is 'to shew in a brief and popular way, the true standing of the Church of England towards Romanism and towards Dissent.'²² Yet it does reveal the extent to which Dodsworth had worked out a detailed middle position in the intervening years. The influence of the Tracts and their 'Oxford' teaching is clear from the opening remarks of the

Preface that the Protestant character of the Church of England is incidental, and not essential to its nature. It is 'primitive' and 'apostolic', and Dodsworth makes it very plain that the Protestant aspects of the Church are *unhappy* incidentals! The Church of Rome is part of the Catholic Church, but corrupted. Although Hooker is quoted, and the Reformers appealed to, he also uses the decrees of the Council of Trent in his argument and shows a knowledge of Counter Reformation authors.²³

The first discourse 'On the Unity of the Church' begins with a refutation of the Dissenting Protestant idea of an 'invisible' church. Furthermore the Church of England is 'a distinct Church, because it is the Church of Christ planted in this island -not, as some erroneously suppose, because it is in connexion with the State'.²⁴ The Church of England is that part of the Catholic Church in this place, Rome is a usurper. 'THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND NEVER SEPARATED FROM THE CHURCH OF ROME.' Indeed it is '*a reformed Apostolic Church*'.²⁵

In the second discourse, 'On the Mortification of the Flesh', he goes on to refute ultra-Protestant objection to the use of fasting and mortification of the flesh, by appealing to the Apostles. Pusey is quoted, especially his Tract eighteen.²⁶

By the third discourse 'On the Efficacy of an Apostolic Ministry' the full Tractarian agenda is evident, with a spirited defence of Apostolic succession and the efficacy of the sacraments administered by the ordained ministry, which by divine appointment is the assurance 'by which his Church is to be maintained in the world, and through which it is built up in its holy faith.'²⁷ Power and authority invested by Christ in the Apostles are passed on to their successors the bishops, a power which specifically includes pronouncing absolution to the penitent.²⁸ Throughout, appeal is made to a host of scriptural and patristic texts, and frequently to the *Articles* and *Book of Common Prayer*. He also holds a high

view of the Reformers whose 'object was the establishment of truth'.²⁹ Scripture retains its supremacy as the test of all truth in the Church. Roman authoritarianism and the 'judicial power of absolution' invested in her priests is rejected.³⁰

The fourth dissertation 'On the Scriptures, and the Respect due to Catholic Antiquity' opens with the assertion that 'Religion is not the discovery of man, but a revelation from God'. Christianity is not a science, in the sense of a set of conclusions drawn from human observation. Whilst Rome claims total authority to interpret the Scriptures for its adherents and the continental Reformed churches 'discard the appeal to antiquity altogether',³¹ allowing unbounded licence to private judgement, the Church of England takes the middle way by holding to the liberty of the individual to interpret Scripture with reverence for, and in the light of Catholic antiquity.

The dependency on the Oxford theologians is very obvious, following the 'Via Media' position of Pusey and Newman. In a significant passage given his later conversion, Dodsworth claims that the Spirit was at work in forming the canon of Scripture, and thus he concludes that the primary source of teaching authority is the Church, which produced Scripture but is now under the authority of that same Scripture. Thus the Church has full authority to order its own traditions in matters not explicitly enjoined by Scripture. This pertains especially to 'the eucharist', (this is the first time he prefers this term to 'Holy Communion' or the 'Lord's Supper') and to the weekly practice of celebrating the Eucharist.³² Despite no such Scriptural warrant, the obligation is required by Catholic antiquity, and so the members of the Church should submit to the authority of the Church so long as it is submitting to the authority of Scripture as understood by Catholic antiquity.

The fifth discourse 'On the State of the Dead, and the Resurrection' refutes the Roman doctrine of purgatory, and the invocation of saints. The direct language of Article Twenty-

two is much approved. Dodsworth's use of Pearson's commentary on the creed shows how much of his Evangelical education is still in place. On the other hand dissenters and many members of the Church of England have 'lost sight of the second advent of our Lord, and the resurrection of the body'.³³ Once again the Prayer Book's modest provisions for commemoration of the departed is the model for sound doctrine. This section is important as a gauge for Dodsworth's eschatological views. Whatever impact the Tracts had made upon Dodsworth's ecclesiology and sacramental theology, his pre-millennialism remains substantially intact. In fact he blames ultra-Protestant reaction to the Roman doctrine of Purgatory for the neglect of the scriptural doctrines regarding the Parousia.³⁴ He laments that the doctrine of the re-union of body and spirit and the Second Advent of Christ is not preached at funerals. He regards the faithful departed's intermediate state as conscious and joyful as they wait to be perfected with us at the resurrection of the body.

In the sixth discourse 'On the Efficacy of the Sacrament of Baptism', he rejects the view of this sacrament as a mere outward sign of an inward and spiritual grace that has no absolute or necessary connection with that grace conferred. He argues from the Pauline texts, that Baptism is no mere initiation ceremony, but it is God's designated and revealed channel of grace. There is very close dependency on Pusey's tract on Baptism. Regeneration does not accompany Baptism in all cases, 'but only where, in the case of adults, there is the presence of actual repentance and faith; and in the case of infants, where there is the promise of them.'³⁵ The Church regards such Baptism 'as *efficacious* to the cleansing away of sin, to justification, to the implanting of a new life, to the illumination of the Spirit, to adoption into God's family, to heirship of the kingdom of heaven'.³⁶ Dodsworth argues for more serious use of Baptism by the Church especially from a pastoral and liturgical angle. 'Let the Church...RESTORE BAPTISM TO ITS PROPER PLACE IN THE CONGREGATION'.³⁷ Such a view was doubtless reflected in his own practice at the Margaret Chapel. The strong 'Evangelical' emphasis on grace found in his earlier works is

powerfully reflected in his portrayal of Baptism as the sacramental illustration and outworking of that doctrine of grace so fundamental to his belief.

The seventh discourse is about 'The Holy Eucharist', regarding which he says, 'The doctrine of the atonement and vicarious satisfaction, and, *implicitly*, the doctrine of the resurrection, may be discovered by the eye of faith in this ordinance'.³⁸ The context of his argument is reminiscent of Irving, that the Eucharist is best understood in the context of the 'new man' made in Baptism into the Risen body and life of Christ. This is one of Dodsworth's clearest statements of the connection between his eschatological beliefs and the role of the Eucharist in the Church. It confirms the conclusion that his introduction of a weekly Communion as the central service at the Margaret Chapel was not as a result of Tractarian or old High Church influence but entirely independent.

Whilst rejecting Transubstantiation, he wishes to follow the primitive Church in avoiding speculation on *how* we eat and drink Christ in this sacrament.³⁹ He also rejects Lutheran Consubstantiation because it maintains a 'natural' presence of Christ in the elements '*considered apart from the receiver of them*'.⁴⁰ Thus he agrees with Hooker that 'the Church of England doctrine is this-that the real presence of Christ's most blessed body and blood is not to be sought for in the sacrament apart from the recipient, but in the worthy receiver of the sacrament'.⁴¹ The impetus for maintaining what he regards as classical Reformed, even Calvinistic,⁴² receptionism is that it is helpful, 'to the belief of a supernatural operation of the Holy Ghost on the soul of man, as essentially connected with vital Christianity;- and this I conceive to be of immense importance to us in the present day'.⁴³

The true value of the Eucharist is 'to keep alive this truth in the naturally sceptical mind of man', and it works 'not through our intellectual powers, but by a secret, invisible grace

conveyed to us through consecrated elements'. It conveys directly God's blessings to man 'without intervention of any of the faculties of man', so it must be administered frequently, each Sunday at the least, and has an objectivity that preaching and prayer lack; it is, therefore, a superior channel of God's grace. For Dodsworth maintains, 'I must express my own solemn conviction, that the doctrine of the Christian sacraments, as the vehicles by which God conveys grace, is THE GREATEST BARRIER OF THE CHURCH AGAINST THE PHILOSOPHY (falsely so called) OF RATIONALISM, which has made such havoc in the continental Churches, and which is now the peculiar temptation of our own. Once overthrow that barrier, and the most destructive and desolating infidelity will be the result'.⁴⁴

Thus we see that Dodsworth had come to throw in his lot with the followers of the Oxford Movement because of his deep-rooted opposition to rationalism, both in its theory and in its perceived effects on contemporary belief and society. The very motives that led Newman to begin his crusade can be seen throughout these publications as broadly similar to Dodsworth's own. However the extent to which Dodsworth had digested the theological tenor of the Tracts remains an open question. On Baptism he clearly follows Pusey. Yet his Eucharistic views remain firmly within a Reformed framework.

The eighth and final discourse is a stout defence of the Church of England's Catholic nature and original independence of Rome. Dodsworth claims that there is now 'a gulf between us and the Roman Church which *we* can never pass'.⁴⁵ Socinians receive special mention as their declension from the truth arises from the fact that Dissent has 'no fixed standard of doctrine to fall back upon'.⁴⁶ Their emphasis on reasonableness of faith leads to the abandonment of Christian dogma, and ends in 'a sort of rationalising theology, in effect little removed from Deism.'⁴⁷ Yet such systems as Deism at least attacked the Church from without; now it is within the Church. He concludes by quoting from Pusey's

Tract on Baptism of the previous year. 'The blessed sacraments are a peculiar obstacle to its inroads; for their effects come directly from God, and their mode of operation is as little cognisable to reason as their Author; they flow to us from an unseen world'.⁴⁸

If this whole work is essentially derivative, it nevertheless tells us several things about Dodsworth, namely that he was well versed in Tractarian theology by 1836, thus suggesting a period of gestation of the Tracts and Tractarian literature between 1833 and 1836. It also suggests that his communication and pastoral skills popularised the teaching of the Oxford leaders in the metropolis, not only in his preaching at the Margaret Chapel, but by the publication and dissemination of his work. That this was already having effect is shown by the *Record's* condemnation of him. These publications, taken together, demonstrate the evolution of Dodsworth's thought from an Evangelical-Irvingite position towards a recognisably Tractarian stance. Starting from the basis of biblical authority, his contact with Irving gave him a new interpretation and understanding of that authority embodied in the sacramental life of the church. Thus Dodsworth's theological position in the mid 1830s enabled him to join the Tractarian enterprise. He did so, however, very much as a distinctive, perhaps even theologically eccentric Evangelical. This distinctiveness was centred around the twin aspects of his prophetic studies and his Irvingite sacramental theology.

The year 1835 saw several significant publications that not only show the effects of the Tracts on Dodsworth, but also demonstrate his continued commitment to eschatological and prophetic studies. We consider the former first. 1835 saw three editions of *Discourses on the Lord's Supper*, a sure indication of the popularity of this work, and its role in what Newman called Dodsworth's call to weekly Communion. It was widely read, including by Gladstone, but it incurred the suspicion of many unsympathetic Evangelicals.⁴⁹ Another of Dodsworth's publications of 1835, *Confirmation or Laying on of Hands, Scriptural in its*

origin and needful to be observed seems to have impressed Newman to the extent that in 1837 he strongly recommended it to his sister Jemima, wife of John Mozley.⁵⁰ This sermon commends Confirmation on scriptural grounds, quoting Article VI, and asserting: 'Such is the grand Protestant principle, to which we must attribute our deliverance from the vain and superstitious inventions imposed upon us by human authority'.⁵¹ 'The Bible is the touchstone of truth,- the only infallible test of every doctrine and sentiment propounded by men.'⁵² Confirmation is however justified on the grounds that, 'a well-established tradition where it exists though not at all to be put on a footing with the authority of scripture, is to be used as a help. Now certainly the voice of antiquity is one of these helps.'⁵³ To demonstrate this he briefly discusses from 'our view as Protestants' the attitude of the early Fathers, including a footnote reference to Palmer's *Origines Liturgicae*⁵⁴ and the Reformers showing how the voice of antiquity enables the contemporary church to discern what is in keeping with Scripture. He concludes that this rite has apostolical authority, and in 'the judgement of the primitive fathers' links baptismal 'grafting into Christ'⁵⁵ to the role of Confirmation in Christian life as the conveyor of the spirit of power and strength. Confirmation is 'so solemn a rite',⁵⁶ a real gift of the Holy Spirit, and should be given profound emphasis in the life of the Church.

Before we turn to Dodsworth's eschatological views, we may note that 1835 shows us something of the movement in his theological position towards that found in the *Tracts for the Times*. Dodsworth the popular preacher is giving his hearers an apologetic for a 'high' view of the rite of Confirmation, but does so from a Scripture-based starting point, and avoiding terminology that might alarm his hearers. Yet all the building blocks of a Catholic position are present at this stage. The appeal to antiquity and implicit baptismal regeneration are the substance of the argument despite the 'Protestant' terminology. It is of this period that Oakeley spoke in his obituary for Dodsworth in the *Tablet* in 1861. He said he was then 'already growing into a high estimate of Sacraments and Church authority'.

Oakeley recognised the foundation that had already been laid even before the *Tracts* appeared.⁵⁷

Peter Nockles, following Sheridan Gilley, has thrown light on the close relationship between Newman's eschatology and his conversion. 'The significance of eschatology in Newman's secession to Rome lay in his reinterpretation, rather than outright rejection, of the prophetic theories propounded by Mede and others'.⁵⁸ He identifies Newman's rejection of the theory of Rome as Anti-Christ in the late 1830s as an enabling factor in bringing about the major shift in his ecclesiological perspective. Likewise Dodsworth's move, not at this stage to Rome, but to a position of openness to the Catholic teaching of the *Tracts* in the mid-1830s is related to his developing eschatological viewpoint. Oakeley's linking of Dodsworth's passion for prophecy with his attraction to the Catholic elements in Irvingism is imprecise, yet points to a central factor in Dodsworth's move towards Tractarianism and beyond.

It is important to stress that, as will be demonstrated through an examination of his 'prophetic' publications, Dodsworth's eschatological preoccupations were a positive imperative in his continuing theological development. In contrast contemporary Evangelicalism foundered, if only for a short time in the early 1830s, upon just this rock. Once again, the reason for Dodsworth's positive use of this experience may be sought in his successful exploitation of the Patristic and sacramental elements in the Irvingite schema, and an instinctive avoidance of the more extreme elements in millennialist studies.

Oakeley said 'it was the doctrine of the "Second Advent", which seemed principally to engross his interest when I first knew him'. (1836).⁵⁹ To this we now turn in the form of his tract entitled *The Second Advent of Our Lord Jesus Christ; with an appendix, on Jesus Christ as the Destroyer of Antichrist; by a clergyman of the Church of England*. This

publication began life as a series of articles for 'a periodical Magazine and was inserted in some successive numbers', and was subsequently enlarged by Dodsworth to form this tract.⁶⁰

Dodsworth begins with the 'practical' influence of the doctrine of the Second Advent. Time and again Dodsworth emphasises the pastoral and devotional value of this doctrine, and by implication of all prophetic studies. This was perhaps a reflection on the low state of the prophecy movement that followed on the Irvingite debacle and its impact on the Evangelical world. The author is aware of this stigma when he admits that the subject of the Second Advent has been 'employed by mistaken, or by evil-minded persons' as a way of injuring the Church.⁶¹ This whole area has been discredited by speculations and calculations on times and seasons which has given the 'study of Prophecy' a bad reputation. Dodsworth is keen to avoid any hint of this type of speculation, but he is also anxious to 'clear the name' of prophetic studies rightly understood. 'There is something so animating and so exciting in the expectation of Christ's speedy Advent, something so attractive and engrossing in the subject...'⁶² Evidence of such enthusiasm helps us to visualise the impact of Dodsworth's enthusiastic 'prophetic' preaching that was noted by Oakeley, Newman and others as distinctive of his contribution to the Tractarian Movement in its earliest days.

Dodsworth sets out the usual first premise of such prophetic studies, that Scripture foretells the increase of wickedness until the coming of the Lord with divine judgement and chastisement. Thus he aligns himself with the pre-millennialist interpretation familiarised by the works of Lacunza, as taken up by Irving, but there are already signs of significant deviation from the detail of this position. The work is a firm rejection of the moderate Evangelical progressive school of post-millennialists who looked for a steady improvement in society leading to the Kingdom of God on earth. To this extent Dodsworth still stood

within this 'radical' school of interpretation, as he had done at Albury, and indeed as many other Anglican clergy continued to do during this period. Something of a recovery was beginning to occur amongst Evangelicals which would gather considerable momentum in the 1840s around the work of the Prophecy Investigation Society (founded 1842).⁶³ Dodsworth is perhaps giving a warning to students of the Oxford Movement who assumed that the Augustinian post-millennial position was universally held by its adherents. Even so, by the 1840s Dodsworth's Tractarian identification excluded him from involvement with the Bloomsbury gatherings.

In the second chapter he sets out his 'schema' of the Second Coming and the Judgement. The Second Advent is not a single event, nor an annihilation of the existing physical world, but a transformation in judgement. When the Judge comes he will immediately hold the great assize, re-establish his authority, punish the wicked and reward the righteous, after which, 'a virtuous rule would then succeed.'⁶⁴ Regarding the nature of the Great Assize, Dodsworth adopts the position that it is for *all Christians*. This much-debated point was one of the many contentious issues raised within the pre-millennial camp. Dodsworth says that the faithful and unfaithful are rewarded or punished separately, and that this judgement does not involve non-Christians. The relevant gospel parables are used to support this view, and we may recall that these particular gospel passages were Dodsworth's special topic in the series of discussions at the 1829 Albury Conference.⁶⁵ It is in the detail that follows that we see a shift from the more usual 'Irvingite' view that Dodsworth had defended in an article in the first issue of the *Morning Watch* in March 1829. In that article 'On the First Resurrection' he maintained a distinction between the two resurrections as a matter of crucial importance, because the millennial rule of Christ separates these two events.⁶⁶ Yet by 1835 he explicitly denies such a distinction and separation as erroneous and non-Scriptural claiming that Daniel 12:2 implies a general resurrection to reward or condemnation at the coming of Christ, and not a separate resurrection of the wicked after a

thousand year interval (as he formerly maintained). He is well aware of opposition as he states that many who have studied this subject would disagree with him, but their view rests on one Scripture alone: Revelation 20, and thus he attacks this position claiming that Revelation 19:11-20 and 20:11-end, are symbolic language and not to be understood in the narrative sense of 20:4-10. So he maintains that 'For *us* there is no intervening period of a thousand years'. In fact it is 'a very pernicious error' to enable 'wicked men' to think judgement is far off.⁶⁷

What then can be said of Dodsworth's position in 1835? He takes the view that the Second Advent is followed immediately by the general resurrection of all Christians. The judgement follows, after which the righteous will 'reign with Christ', and the wicked will suffer the 'second death'. 'Of the rest of the dead we know little; nor is it needful that we should' yet 'they shall live again after a thousand years', although we cannot know what their fate will be, maybe 'a new dispensation, in which salvation through Christ may be presented to them'.⁶⁸ So Dodsworth preserved a pre-millennialist position but revised his former view of the order and nature of the events involved.

In the third chapter he argues that the 'prophetic word of God' is the only counter to 'popular notions' of an individualistic and erroneous type regarding eschatological realities. The world will be 'regenerated', as this is the actual purpose of the Second Advent.⁶⁹ After judgement this material world will be immediately cleansed and renewed by fire, then all creation and people and animals will live 'in the flesh' but in a state of sinless immortality. The restoration of the Jews will then occur. He condemns the view that the destruction of the world by fire will take place after the millennium.⁷⁰ He appeals to the creed to show that the millennial reign of Christ continues unbroken into eternity: 'too exclusive prominence seems to have been given to the millennial period by interpreters of prophecy.'⁷¹

In the final two chapters strong condemnation is reserved for those who try to give specific detail and times for the millennial programme. Christ will hand over the kingdom to his Father at the Second Advent and not as many maintain after the millennium. Christ is surrendering his Messiahship, but not his rule or Godhead.

Finally in an appendix Dodsworth rejects the view that Rome is the Anti-Christ. He thinks that this figure will be a person, but claims that 'the spirit of Anti-Christ' is already abroad in the contemporary world, and that the figure of Anti-Christ will emerge out of this apostasy.⁷² It seems clear that he has been influenced by Horsley and S.R. Maitland in this rethinking of his eschatological scheme.

Before leaving this subject we should look at a published sermon of 1836 which fills out some of the points we have already examined. *Christ the Resurrection and the Life. An Easter Sermon on St. John xi:25,26* was presumably preached by Dodsworth during Eastertide 1836 and was published to accompany 'On the state of the Dead and the Resurrection' in *The Church of England a Protester against Romanism and Dissent* (see above). Beginning from the Prayer Book Burial Service Dodsworth demonstrates the place of the resurrection of the dead in God's progressive plan of redemption. By incorporation into Christ through Baptism we are united with Christ, 'in a heavenly and ineffable manner', our dying and rising with Him in a 'spiritual and mystical sense', that is nevertheless 'real', because 'baptism is the real and sacramental entrance, it is no imaginary thing - no mere figure, but a reality - as real a fact as that the hand is a member of the body'.⁷³ The working of the Spirit gives the baptised new birth and thus resurrection. The departed are therefore mystically united-at-one-with Christ, they are alive, because so united. This is a great 'mystery' which the primitive church expressed in the greeting, 'The Lord is Risen! The Lord is risen indeed!'. He finishes by asserting that all this Resurrection joy 'throws into shade all the false splendour of a perishing world'.⁷⁴

In this sermon we see the close inter-connection between Dodsworth's eschatological, incarnational, and sacramental theology. His systematic and doctrinal understanding of the nature of Redemption brings together elements from his Evangelical 'Irvingite' experience, with the theology of the *Tracts*, and is expressed in a powerful apologia that again demonstrates the basis for his reputation as a pastor and preacher. This role will now come into focus as we consider Dodsworth's position as the leading exponent of Tractarian ideals in the capital.⁷⁵

3. The Oxford Movement Comes to London

Oakeley claimed that Dodsworth was 'almost the only Clergyman of weight with whom I was well acquainted in London'.⁷⁶ This was during Oakeley's time at the Margaret Chapel and it certainly suggests that Dodsworth played a leading, if not *the* leading, role in the establishment of Tractarian ideals in the metropolis. Newman's expectations were high. In a letter of 23 January 1836 to Thomas Mozley he writes: 'I have as yet done little in this neighbourhood', (he was staying at J.W. Bowden's house in Richmond), 'except been introduced to Mr. Dodsworth, which I trust will be of service.'⁷⁷ The very next day he wrote to Pusey lamenting that 'London is overrun with peculiarism' (Evangelicals), and he considered how to counter their influence in the building of new churches in the metropolis. He says 'I shall get the subject mentioned to Dodsworth who has influence with many,'. Already he had grasped the value of Dodsworth for promoting the Movement's cause in London, and that only three days after their first meeting.⁷⁸

Late in the year (1836) Dodsworth preached and published *A sermon occasioned by the appeal of the Bishop of London for the building of additional churches in the Metropolis*. With typical enthusiasm Dodsworth had immediately involved himself as a direct result of Newman's mentioning of the matter to him. Correspondence between the two men shows Newman supporting and directing Dodsworth who had for some time been in

communication with the Bishop. He was already playing a very active role in the plans to provide more churches for a very inadequately served capital. It was in this practical way that Dodsworth came to play a key role in the Movement.⁷⁹

But if Newman thought he had an obedient mouthpiece for his own ideas he was soon disillusioned as can be seen from a remark to R.H. Froude. Newman had shown Dodsworth the 'Memorandum for Friends' and says 'when I called on him in this January.... he was coolish about it'.⁸⁰ This was a circular regarding publishing, printing and circulation of the Tracts to propagate their ideas and bring recruits into the party. Since Newman was to be informed of all developments, this could be viewed as an attempt to exercise control and monitoring of those involved. Dodsworth was not keen and made this plain to Newman. This is characteristic of his forthright Yorkshire manner, a virtue that would win him far more friends than enemies, and which contributed to his reputation for the highest integrity.

Dodsworth's continual disclaimer of party affiliation may well have played a part in this coolness toward Newman's scheme. Although from the mid 1830s Dodsworth was increasingly associated with the Tractarians by their opponents, he continued to resist complete identification until the forties. This suspicion of party allegiance seems to have been a key factor in his ability to ride the Irvingite storm in comparative calm, and to remain unaffiliated to the Evangelical camp in general, thus allowing his own 'reading' of Scripture, the Fathers and the Reformers to lead him in the direction of the *Tracts*.

By the end of January 1836 Dodsworth was engaged in a flurry of personal correspondence involving Pusey, Bloomfield and Newman regarding trustees and patronage of the proposed new metropolitan churches. Writing to Newman, he says that if the Government had been a 'Church Government' it could be trusted to appoint a trustworthy 'spiritual

father of the Diocese'. What if a 'Whig-radical' episcopal appointment was made who would then have forty or fifty new churches in his gift? Due to the '...painful situation of our national establishment',⁸¹ tactical and careful decisions were to be made, suggesting shared patronage with the bishop and trustees nominated by the subscribers. This is an early example of the Tractarian dilemma of holding the episcopal office in high esteem, yet in practice remaining sceptical of its erastian constraints. Dodsworth remained firmly wedded to the ideal of episcopal obedience to the very end of his Anglican journey. This seems to have won him the respect and even trust of Blomfield with whom he felt he had much in common

During the first months of 1836 Newman had written to Pusey, Mozley, Henry Wilberforce, Froude and T.D. Acland, expressing considerable excitement with the role of Dodsworth in furthering the cause.⁸² From the beginning their friendship began to grow. Newman began to consult Dodsworth on a regular basis. By the end of April, Pusey and Newman were discussing with Dodsworth his draft for 'a protest against the extinction of the See of Sodor & Man'.⁸³ Dodsworth was also taking an active role in the Oxford cause at the SPCK. A letter of 3 May from S.F. Wood to Newman states, 'Bowden, Dodsworth and myself have had some conversation this morning at the Christian Knowledge Society',⁸⁴ and on 2 July, 'Dodsworth tells me he sent you an answer to Sodor & Man. You will be glad to hear that they are contemplating the putting of his tracts on the list of the Society'.⁸⁵ These included the controversial *The Church of England a Protester against Romanism and Dissent* and had already been referred to a committee to consider publication or rejection.⁸⁶ The tracts were heartily opposed by the growing anti-Tractarian group in the SPCK.

Relations between Dodsworth and Newman became closer with more visits in the summer of 1836. On Sunday 31 July Newman received the Sacrament at the Margaret Chapel, and

visited Dodsworth 'at home' after dinner.⁸⁷ Light is briefly thrown on Dodsworth's liturgical development in a letter from Newman in reply to Dodsworth's enquiry regarding baptismal immersion and whether immersion of the candidate is obligatory or merely desirable.⁸⁸ Since this letter is dated 23 August 1836, it would suggest that Dodsworth was already considering the effect of the new teaching on the liturgical orderings of his Chapel. This is an important point, in view of later historians of the Movement giving his successor (after 1837) Oakeley the sole credit for the introduction of Catholic ceremonial at the Margaret Chapel.⁸⁹

Events were moving at a fast pace. Newman told Keble in October how Dodsworth, Harrison and Bowden were busy with the setting up of 'a family newspaper on good principles'. At the same time Dodsworth was consulting Newman on the choice of a certain Mr. Eyre as a prospective curate.⁹⁰ By the end of the year Newman was making a regular habit of attending services at the Margaret Chapel when visiting London,⁹¹ and his attendance at both morning and evening service on the third Sunday in Advent⁹² is indicative of his interest in Dodsworth's eschatological sermons preached during this season which were published in the new year. Geoffrey Faber in *Oxford Apostles* gives some consideration of the evolution of Newman's eschatological position, which suggests that he was proceeding along similar lines to what we have already seen of Dodsworth's own development, in particular the shifting of the identification of the Anti-Christ away from Rome to contemporary rationalist philosophy's subversion of Church and State.⁹³ Newman appears to have set considerable store on Dodsworth as a promising and well-placed convert to Tractarian ideals. His standing within the influential and substantial world of West London religious life could be of immense value to the incipient Movement.

There is the further question of what, if any, influence the Hackney Phalanx and therefore the older High Church movement had on Dodsworth. Peter Nockles has argued for an

essentially different theological agenda between the Oxford leaders and the Hackney group with the emergence of serious rifts between them during the middle of the decade. Newman's rapid utilization of Dodsworth's position in London to propagate Tractarian teaching may thus be explained by Dodsworth's Evangelical origins and non-alignment with the Hackney elders.⁹⁴ Although we have seen that Dodsworth came into contact with the Hackney group as early as 1831 at the SPCK, the evidence of his own publications from this period show nothing specifically distinctive of their theological position. Such Catholic elements as his Patristic knowledge, weekly Eucharist and liturgical provisions were compatible with his Evangelical piety and need not be explained in terms of High Church influences.

Dodsworth's theological development is demonstrably dependent on the Tracts from 1835 at least, and it is towards Oxford rather than Hackney that he inclined in his search for Catholicity, readily adopting Newman's Via Media position by 1836. By 1837, just that time when Nockles pinpoints the split between Hackney and Oxford, Dodsworth was fully identified with the Tractarian position and his new church in Albany Street is the first example in London of Tractarian church 'planting'.⁹⁵

However, if any 'High Church' legacy came to Dodsworth, it was most probably through the influence of E.B. Pusey, and therefore was mediated through the Tractarian Movement. R.W. Franklin says 'Pusey looked to Dodsworth as the clerical leader of his party in London, the responsible spokesman who could be counted on to marshal London forces'.⁹⁶ Franklin points out that Dodsworth regarded Pusey as his spiritual mentor. Dodsworth wrote after his conversion, 'He had been amongst the foremost to promote in the Church of England these doctrines and practices which, whether rightly or wrongly, are by the generality of persons identified with the Church of Rome'.⁹⁷ Also with regard to the revival of certain liturgical practices, he said, 'He was the first Anglican clergyman who

spoke to me of its revival in the established Church, and I know of many persons whom he has led into the practice'.⁹⁸

By 1837 Pusey was becoming associated with the Chapel and Dodsworth's ministry. A letter referred to by Liddon from Pusey to Mrs. Pusey on 10 April 1837 states that he preached for an hour at 'Mr. Dodsworth's chapel' in the morning. Then he administered Communion to 'above a hundred people'. He preached again for an hour in the evening.⁹⁹ During this time, it is clear from their frequent correspondence that Dodsworth was heavily dependent on Pusey's advice and direction. This extended not only to liturgical matters, but to policy and new projects to further the Catholic cause in the metropolis.¹⁰⁰ The relationship with Pusey was in this sense closer and more direct than that with Newman, although it would not be as enduring. As will be seen in the next chapter, Pusey's use of Dodsworth in the new church of Christ Church, Albany Street after 1837 shows plainly enough that Pusey not Newman was the main Oxford influence behind this crucial Tractarian parish.

Franklin's model of 'New Catholicism' is right to make much of the Pusey connection. Whilst it is correct to see in Albany Street the beginning of a new parochial model, the role of Pusey in Dodsworth's life had its beginnings during the second phase of his Margaret Chapel ministry. It is as much to him as to Newman that Dodsworth owed his leadership role.

4. The Propagation of the Faith: Dodsworth as Pioneer

The roles of clergy and laity, preaching and personnel, are interconnected and need to be stressed as elements in the success of the Chapel which, under Dodsworth's leadership became the main centre for the dissemination of Oxford ideas, including the beginnings of liturgical renewal. Raymond Chapman in *Faith and Revolt: Studies in the literary*

influence of the Oxford Movement points out: 'It must be remembered that one of the gifts of the Tractarians to the church was their preaching; although they emphasized the sacramental and sacerdotal aspect of religion they also attached great importance to the sermon as a mode of teaching.'¹⁰¹ It is especially true of Dodsworth who as a popular and eloquent preacher is time and again noted by those who heard him, including the Oxford leaders themselves. This legacy of his Evangelical formation was the reason why Drummond appointed him to the Margaret Chapel in order to propagate 'Albury' teachings.

In Dodsworth the Oxford leaders had a gifted, popular and enthusiastic exponent of their teachings in the very heart of the fashionable West End of London. Dodsworth's published sermons demonstrate the winning combination of popular apologetic, pastoral sensitivity and doctrinal substance. These were just the requirements that Newman and Pusey needed to win over the influential laity in this key residential area of the capital. Dodsworth's versatility of mind and originality of theological view that had predisposed him to Catholic ideas enabled him to use Evangelical and Irvingite elements of his previous experience in the planting of the Oxford Movement's aims in London.

So who were the people that underwent this movement of religious awareness as a result of Dodsworth's preaching? Most of them were ardent 'serious' Evangelicals, many of whom had opened their drawing rooms to Irving some ten years previously. Dodsworth was ideally placed both in terms of social standing, religious connection, and geographical location, to exercise that influence which Newman was so quick to spot. It is unfortunate that the records (if any existed) of the Margaret Chapel have not survived.¹⁰² Gladstone's remarks may though help to fill out the social picture of the Chapel at this time: 'I do not recollect ever to have seen in the Church any persons belonging to the 'aristocracy' except Lady G. Fullerton (then Leveson Gower) and Mr. Ponsonby afterwards Lord Bessborough.

Nor was it visited I think by any politician except myself.' Unfortunately Gladstone's recollections were inaccurate, as T.D. Acland, J.W. Monsell and other political figures did attend.¹⁰³

The social makeup of the Margaret Chapel can be also gauged by those close associates and supporters of Dodsworth who promoted 'a meeting held in 1836 in the home in Cumberland Place of the Rt. Hon. Thomas Erskine (1788-1864) to raise money and organise support for an Albany Street Church'. Erskine had played a prominent part in the Bible Society during the controversies in the early 1830s,¹⁰⁴ and was identified as a moderate counter-balance to the Irvingite faction within the new society. Accordingly he was elected President in 1832 and guided the society during the remaining years of the decade.¹⁰⁵ Erskine remained an active supporter of Dodsworth's ministry at Christ Church, serving as his Churchwarden 1837-38. This was in the early years and it is doubtful if he 'went along' with Dodsworth's later developments. The support of Lord John Manners, another leading layman was integral to his promotion of the Catholic cause in London, and he remained a benefactor and supporter for many years to come. Mr. Serjeant (Edward) Bellasis became a close friend of Dodsworth from 1842 but had much earlier attended the daily 8.00am morning service at the Margaret Chapel, 'an exceptional thing at that time' while he was living in Bedford Square.¹⁰⁶ He was received into the Roman Church on 27 December 1850, a few days before Dodsworth.

Because of this strong lay support, Dodsworth's position can be seen as very advantageous for the Movement and helps us to set Newman's hopes for him in context. The Tractarian Movement has been portrayed as an essentially clerical movement. Whatever the validity of such a claim the lay 'foundation' to Dodsworth's ministry goes some way to enabling a new evaluation.

Furthermore Dodsworth's reputation as a warm and genial family man doubtless endeared him to his West London public, but it also contrasts him with the Newman/Froude ascetic tradition within the Oxford movement. It is reasonable to suggest that this family dimension assisted the acceptance of his views amongst the laity. Much of later London Tractarianism would develop along a different line. Indeed the rebuilt 'All Saints' Margaret Street and its long tradition of celibate parish clergy shows the extent to which 'Oakeley Tractarianism' differed from Dodsworth's original model.

Consideration must now be given to the question of how far Dodsworth was preaching Catholicism before the arrival of Oakeley. The authoritative history of the church *Quam Dilecta* by W.A. Whitworth 1890 (and much approved by W.E. Gladstone)¹⁰⁷ already regarded Oakeley's licensing as minister at the Margaret Chapel on 5 July 1839 as the 'inauguration of the system which has been logically developed and of the principles which have consistently prevailed from that time to the present, in Margaret Chapel and All Saints Church'. It further claims that this date, later kept as an 'anniversary of the establishment of this centre of Catholic life and worship...marks the first attempt to exhibit in London the practical application in worship of the principles of the Oxford Movement' and thus 'entitles the church in Margaret Street to its peculiar glory as the pioneer in London of the Catholic revival in worship and work'.¹⁰⁸ This claim¹⁰⁹ seems to have obscured the role of Dodsworth as having already established the Catholic revival at Margaret Street before Oakeley's arrival. Such confusion may have arisen for the following reasons: first, the brief interval between Dodsworth's ministry and Oakeley's during which Charles Thornton was minister from 4 August 1837, has been viewed by some later Tractarians as a break in Catholic continuity.¹¹⁰ Second, a distinction evolved between those men 'advanced' in Catholic ritual practices and that group, to which Dodsworth belonged, who did not generally place emphasis on innovations in ceremonial. Dodsworth's use and emphasis on sacramental practice did not involve the introduction of

new or obvious ceremonial practices at this stage. Third, Oakeley's well known theological views, his re-ordering of the Chapel and introduction of ritualistic practices and final reception as a Roman Catholic overshadowed the gradual and less 'extreme' introduction of Catholic teaching and spirituality during Dodsworth's ministry. Fourth, Dodsworth's move to Christ Church, Albany Street in 1837 and subsequent establishment of the Catholic tradition there drew attention away from his work in laying the foundations of Tractarianism at the Margaret Chapel. Finally, Dodsworth's conversion to Rome, and his 'reconstruction' as a Roman Catholic convert writer (as portrayed in his *DNB* entry) seem to have obscured his role as a 'pre-Oakeley' Tractarian.

The case for Dodsworth as the pioneer of Tractarian principles at the Margaret Chapel seems to be evidenced not so much by his introduction of the Eucharist as the main Sunday service before 1833, but rather by his teaching and preaching in the mid 1830s of clearly Catholic ideas directly influenced by the Tracts. Newman's interest and hopes for Dodsworth are also a substantial indication of his role as an exponent of Oxford principles at the Chapel before Oakeley. Oakeley's own testimony in his obituary to Dodsworth in the *Tablet* makes clear the extent to which teaching and (in a pre-ritualistic sense) worship had become identifiably Catholic during Dodsworth's ministry at Margaret Chapel.

Dodsworth's Catholicism like that of the High Church 'Hackney Phalanx' did not involve any significant change in the furnishing, ornaments or ceremonial that was normative throughout the Church of England during this period. It involved a Catholic understanding and fuller use of the Prayer Book daily services and administration of Sacraments and ordinances, together with a heightening of spirituality¹¹¹ amongst the congregation through preaching, teaching and pastoral care. The innovations introduced by Oakeley were probably only made possible because of this earlier preparation.

Some extracts from Samuel Wilberforce's journal for January 1837 show the extent of this 'Prayer-Book Catholicism' in its non-ritualistic and pre-Oakeley form:

Friday, 6. ...Feast of Epiphany. At Dodsworth's Chapel. Assisted in ye administration of ye Eucharist.'

'Wednesday 25. Conversion of St. Paul. Morg to Dodsworth's and helped him to administer Eucharist.'

'Sunday, 29 - Morning to Dodsworth's; Preached and assisted at the Eucharist. Home afternoon, read some of 'Tracts for the Times'. Evening, read prayers for Dodsworth. Long talk, evening, with ____ about rite of administering Eucharist.¹¹²

It is clear from these extracts alone that not only were Wilberforce and Dodsworth close associates, but also that the Eucharist was celebrated at the Chapel, not only on Sundays, but on the 'Red Letter Days' as well, thus we see the Prayer Book pattern of worship as interpreted by the Oxford leaders already in place before Oakeley's arrival.

Peter Galloway's strongly argued case for Oakeley as Tractarian pioneer in *A Passionate Humility. Frederick Oakeley and the Oxford Movement*, (1999), seems to rest on the identification of Tractarianism with Oakeley's Ritualism rather than with Dodsworth's prior preaching, teaching and sacramental innovations. Galloway acknowledges that Dodsworth 'predisposed the chapel for Oakeley' but underestimates the impact of Dodsworth's ministry because of his Anglo-Catholic preoccupation with 'liturgical innovation'. He admits that Dodsworth's work probably allowed for the congregational support necessary for Oakeley's Ritualism, but in so doing he ignores the implication that this in itself demonstrates the extent to which Dodsworth had already introduced 'Oxford' ideals to West London some years before Oakeley arrived in 1839.

- ¹ H.Clegg, *Evangelicals and Tractarians*, p.260.
- ² *Ibid*, p.255
- ³ *Ibid*, pp.254-267.
- ⁴ P. Toon, *Evangelical Theology 1833-56*, 1979, p.16.
- ⁵ WD, *The Second Advent of Jesus Christ*, 1835, Appendix.
- ⁶ E.S. Purcell, *Life of Cardinal Manning*, vol.1, pp.91,92.
- ⁷ Clegg, *Evangelicals and Tractarians*, p.7.
- ⁸ *LDJHN*, vol.14, p.187, JHN to WD, 1 January 1851.
- ⁹ *Ibid*, vol.5, p.208, JHN to EBP, 21 January 1836.
- ¹⁰ E.S. Purcell, *op. cit.*, vol.1, pp.91,92.
- ¹¹ E.S. Purcell, *op. cit.*, vol.1, p.188.
- ¹² Minutes, 1822-1829, p.463, MS A1/40, SPCK Archive.
- ¹³ PP, WD to EBP, 17 August 1836.
- ¹⁴ H.P. Liddon, *Life of Pusey*, vol.1, p.392.
- ¹⁵ *LDJHN*, vol.5, p.196, JHN to J.W. Bowden, 10 January 1836.
- ¹⁶ H. Clegg, *op. cit.*, pp. 264,265.
- ¹⁷ E.Stock, *The History of the Church Missionary Society*, (3 vols) vol. 1, 1899, p.289.
- ¹⁸ *The Tablet*, F..Oakeley, WD Obituary. 21 December 1861, p.810.
- ¹⁹ H.P. Liddon, *op. cit.*, vol.2, p.12.
- ²⁰ *LDJHN*, vol.6, p.10, JHN to EBP, 9 January 1837.
- ²¹ *Ibid*, vol.5, p.361, JHN to EBP, 25 September 1836.
- ²² WD, *The Church of England a Protester against Romanism and Dissent*, 1836, p.v. preface.
- ²³ *Ibid*, pp.vi,vii.
- ²⁴ *Ibid*, p.13.
- ²⁵ *Ibid*, p.16.
- ²⁶ *Ibid*, Second Discourse, pp.16,19.
- ²⁷ *Ibid*, Third Discourse, p.4.
- ²⁸ *Ibid*, pp.7,8.
- ²⁹ *Ibid*, p.9.
- ³⁰ *Ibid*, p.11.
- ³¹ *Ibid*, Fourth Discourse, pp.2,4.
- ³² *Ibid*, pp.10-12,15.
- ³³ *Ibid*, Fifth Discourse, p.8.
- ³⁴ *Ibid*, p.10.
- ³⁵ *Ibid*, p.15.
- ³⁶ *Ibid*, pp.16,17.
- ³⁷ *Ibid*, p.19.
- ³⁸ *Ibid*, Seventh Discourse, p.1.
- ³⁹ *Ibid*, p.6.
- ⁴⁰ *Ibid*, p.15.
- ⁴¹ *Ibid*, p.15.
- ⁴² *Ibid*, p.12.
- ⁴³ *Ibid*, p.17.
- ⁴⁴ *Ibid*, pp.13,18,19.
- ⁴⁵ *Ibid*, Eighth Discourse, p.4.
- ⁴⁶ *Ibid*, p.11.
- ⁴⁷ *Ibid*, p.13.
- ⁴⁸ *Ibid*, p.13, quoted from E.B. Pusey, 'Scriptural Views of Holy Baptism', *Tracts for the Times*, 67, 1835.
- ⁴⁹ *GD*, vol.2, p.359.
- ⁵⁰ *LDJHN*, vol.6, p.80, JHN to Mrs J. Mozley, 4 June 1837.
- ⁵¹ WD, *Confirmation or Laying on of hands, scriptural in its origin and needful to be observed*, 1835, p.4.
- ⁵² *Ibid*, p.3.
- ⁵³ *Ibid*, p.5.
- ⁵⁴ *Ibid*, pp.12,13.
- ⁵⁵ *Ibid*, p.15.
- ⁵⁶ *Ibid*, p.21.
- ⁵⁷ *The Tablet*, F. Oakeley, *op.cit.*
- ⁵⁸ P.B. Nockles, *The Oxford Movement in Context*, p.178. See also, S. Gilley, *Newman and His Age*, 1990, p.190.
- ⁵⁹ *The Tablet*, F. Oakeley, *op.cit.*
- ⁶⁰ WD, *The Second Advent of Our Lord Jesus Christ: with an appendix on Jesus Christ as the Destroyer of Antichrist; by a clergyman of the Church of England, 1835, Advertisement*. The periodical remains unidentified.

- ⁶¹ *Ibid*, p.20.
- ⁶² *Ibid*, p.8.
- ⁶³ E.R. Sandeen, *The Roots of Fundamentalism*, pp.24,25.
- ⁶⁴ WD, *The Second Advent*, p.25.
- ⁶⁵ M.O.W. Oliphant, *The Life of Edward Irving*, 1862, vol.1, p.101.
- ⁶⁶ *The Morning Watch*, vol.1, p.62.
- ⁶⁷ WD, *The Second Advent*, p.46.
- ⁶⁸ *Ibid*, p.47.
- ⁶⁹ *Ibid*, pp.54,55.
- ⁷⁰ *Ibid*, pp.58,61.
- ⁷¹ *Ibid*, p.63.
- ⁷² *Ibid*, Appendix, p.134.
- ⁷³ WD, *Christ the Resurrection and the Life. An Easter Sermon on St John xi:25,26*. 1836, pp. 11,12.
- ⁷⁴ *Ibid*, p.15.
- ⁷⁵ During 1835 WD published a sermon, *Christ Preaching to the Spirits in Prison*. This does not occur in the British Library catalogue.
- ⁷⁶ *The Tablet*, F. Oakeley, *op.cit.*
- ⁷⁷ *LDJHN*, vol.5, pp.210, JHN to T. Mozley, 23 January 1836.
- ⁷⁸ *Ibid*, p.215. JHN to EBP, 24 January 1836.
- ⁷⁹ *Ibid*, p.230, WD to JHN, 29 January 1836.
- ⁸⁰ *Ibid*, p.220 note, R.H. Froude to JHN, 31 January 1836.
- ⁸¹ *Ibid*, pp.230,231, WD to JHN, 29 January 1836.
- ⁸² *Ibid*, p.290, JHN to T.D. Acland, 27 April 1836.
- ⁸³ *Ibid*, p.284, JHN to A.P. Perceval, 25 April 1836.
- ⁸⁴ *Ibid*, p.293, S.F. Wood to JHN, 3 May 1836.
- ⁸⁵ *Ibid*, p.317 footnote, S.F. Wood to JHN 2 July 1836.
- ⁸⁶ *Ibid*, p.361, JHN to EBP, 25 September 1836.
- ⁸⁷ *Ibid*, pp.329,330.
- ⁸⁸ *Ibid*, p.342, JHN to WD, 23 August 1836.
- ⁸⁹ P.Galloway and C.Rawll, *Good and Faithful Servants*, p.6.
- ⁹⁰ *LDJHN*, vol.5, p.365, JHN to J. Keble, 7 October 1836.
- ⁹¹ *Ibid*, see Summary of Events, p.xv.
- ⁹² *Ibid*, p.391.
- ⁹³ G. Faber, *Oxford Apostles. A Character Story of the Oxford Movement*, New York, 1933, p.24.
- ⁹⁴ P.B. Nockles, *op. cit.*, chapter 6.
- ⁹⁵ *Ibid*, pp.274,275.
- ⁹⁶ R.W. Franklin, *Nineteenth Century Churches*, p.289. I am indebted to R.W. Franklin for his help on this section.
- ⁹⁷ WD, *A Few Comments on Dr. Pusey's Letter to the Bishop of London*, 1851, p.1.
- ⁹⁸ *Ibid*, p.5.
- ⁹⁹ H.P. Liddon, *Life of Pusey*, vol.2, p.22.
- ¹⁰⁰ PP, WD to EBP, 2 February 1837.
- ¹⁰¹ R. Chapman, *Faith & Revolt*, 1970, p.172.
- ¹⁰² C.C.G. Rawll, Archivist at All Saints, Margaret Street, informs me that there is no material prior to 1850.
- ¹⁰³ *GD*, vol.13, pp.287,288, and footnote.
- ¹⁰⁴ A.J. Brown, *The Word of God Among all Nations. A Brief History of the Trinitarian Bible Society, 1831-1981*, 1981, p.21, footnote.
- ¹⁰⁵ *Ibid*, pp.31,34.
- ¹⁰⁶ E. Bellasis, *Memorials of Mr. Serjeant Bellasis*, p.39. See also, R.W.Franklin, *op. cit.*, p.287.
- ¹⁰⁷ *GD*, vol 13, p.287.
- ¹⁰⁸ W.A. Whitworth, *op. cit.*, p.37.
- ¹⁰⁹ See Whitworth's sermon at the time of William Butterfield's death, which claims that Oakeley in order to 'carry out his experiment (bringing the Oxford Movement to London) hired a small proprietary chapel'. *Church Times*, 11 March, 1890, p.288.
- ¹¹⁰ P. Galloway, *A Passionate Humility. Frederick Oakeley and the Oxford Movement*, Leominster, 1999, p.44.
- ¹¹¹ *GD*, vol.13, p.287.
- ¹¹² A.R. Ashwell, *Life of the Right Reverend Samuel Wilberforce, D.D.*, vol.1, pp.102,103. 1880.

CHAPTER FIVE: CHRIST CHURCH ALBANY STREET 1837-1844

PART ONE: THE PARISH & DODSWORTH'S MINISTRY

This chapter examines the nature and implications of Dodsworth's career at Christ Church, Albany Street between 1837 and 1844. Central to this is the question of how far this church and ministry constituted the first model of London Tractarian parish life. Such a claim raises a further enquiry into the relationship between Christ Church and the Margaret Chapel, hitherto regarded as the pioneer London parish of the Oxford Movement. The role of Dodsworth vis-a-vis Oakeley as pioneers of ritualism are part of this picture. Once a case can be made for Dodsworth as a significant figure in establishing the pattern of Tractarian practice in London, there emerges an important relationship between his pastoral practice and his theological development as expressed in his publications, especially his *Advent Lectures*. The relationship between these two aspects of his ministry is a vital clue to his overall development and his contribution to the Movement as a whole. After a review of the foundation of the parish and description of the Church, we examine Dodsworth's own manifesto sermon, using his stated aims as criteria for assessing the success of his ministry at Albany Street. Examination of pastoral institutions, liturgical practice and sacramental statistics as well as the role of the laity enable us to make an assessment of the most active and successful period of Dodsworth's career.

1. A Model Tractarian Parish

In Christ Church we see in embryo the typical mid-Victorian parish with its many organisations attempting to attract the residents and encompass the needs of the locality. This pattern was not exclusively Tractarian since Evangelical and other parishes were involved in similar enterprises. However the particular models that originated in Albany Street were reproduced throughout London during the next generation of rapid Anglo-

Catholic expansion. Pusey's interest and involvement in the parish suggests an attempt at providing the capital with a model parish embracing many of the pastoral ideals of the Oxford Movement.¹ Pusey's relation to the Margaret Chapel during Oakeley's and Upton Richard's ministries was also important. Christ Church, however, was a more obvious 'parish' unit comprising educational and social structures for the surrounding district. This was probably why Pusey chose it as the location for his experiment in revived monasticism and as the centre of his projected 'college of curates'. In the event this latter plan was not realised, but it remained an important element in the Tractarian blueprint for the conversion to its ideas, not only of the Church itself but also the wider population.² Such concerns were closely linked to the Tractarians' preoccupation with education. Manning, S.F. Wood, T.Acland, Matheson and Gladstone were working from about this time to establish diocesan boards in connection with the High Church 'National Society', whilst Wilberforce would do the same in Oxford.³

S.F. Wood, writing to Manning on St. Mark's Day 1838, talks of 'Diocesan seminaries and a central college...' for diocesan teachers, connected with St. Paul's Cathedral and King's College.⁴ He notes that Rose favoured such a scheme. Wood further proposed that the students live a 'monastic mode of life', or even form a permanent diaconate. He continued 'How much better it would be, e.g. at Christ Church (Dodsworth's) for him to have an older man stationary, acting, in fact, as the curate, and supervising the school, than smart young prigs from Oxford, who are going off continually as soon as they have vented their inexperience on the district',⁵ a clear indication of Dodsworth's role within the vital interplay of education, pastoral care and manpower in this early showpiece of the Oxford Movement in London. S.F. Wood's lay status, Rose's Cambridge and High Church origins, together with Newman and especially Pusey's backing suggest that Dodsworth and the Christ Church project were a matrix for the formative and diverse influences that moulded the Tractarian movement. They were much more than the mere transplanting of Oxford

teaching to London that tends to be associated with Oakeley's ministry at the Margaret Chapel. Christ Church was seen by a diverse group of contemporaries as an 'ideal' parish in which ritual was only a small concern. To this extent its influence, though later overlooked in favour of Margaret Street and other centres of advanced Ritualism, was initially more significant than those others and until Dodsworth's conversion to Rome it was looked to by leaders and followers of the Tractarian Movement as a model for parochial life and organisation in the revived Catholic tradition.

Dodsworth's move to Christ Church, Albany Street was a deliberate and initially successful attempt to extend his influence and the principles that had inspired his Margaret Chapel ministry. Thus Franklin calls Christ Church 'the first place of worship to be built in the city by the adherents of Oxford Catholic views'.⁶

The records of the pastoral activity at Christ Church present a very useful and clear picture of the development of religious belief and practice in London during the first years of the Tractarian impact on the capital. Unlike the Margaret Chapel, the parish registers are available to us and give information on preachers, communicant members, Sunday and daily services, occasional services and sacraments, as well as the demographic patterns to be found amongst those who used the Church.

The church was the result of the general impetus associated with Bishop Blomfield to provide for the inadequately served parishes of London. It became the first church financed by the Bishops' 'Metropolis Churches' Fund' set up from 1836, as well as being financed by the 'Incorporated Church Building Society'.⁷ The parent parish of St. Pancras with its new church of some 3,000 sittings could not provide adequate seating let alone spiritual care for a population swollen to 103,548 in 1831. Even with an additional five chapels of ease, the situation in the mid-1830s was a serious one.⁸

Although Christ Church was intended to house Dodsworth's ministry in much the same spirit that proprietary chapels were the 'platform' for various ministries, there is more than a hint that Dodsworth's appointment may not have been unchallenged. H. Burrows (incumbent after Dodsworth's conversion 1851-1878) writing in 1887. *The Half-Century of Christ Church, St. Pancras, Albany Street*, mentions 'a clergyman who offered to contribute £2,000 on condition that he should be appointed'.⁹

The building committee were behind Dodsworth and the Bishop concurred since 'Mr. Dodsworth's was the most powerful spiritual influence in that part of London'.¹⁰ So Dodsworth was selected as Perpetual Curate and the Church was consecrated by the Bishop of London on Thursday 13 July 1837. Dodsworth was 'read in' on Sunday 6 August of the same year, and the new incumbent appointed Thomas Erskine as his warden the following day.¹¹ John Henry Newman noted the event in a letter to S.F. Wood on 2 June, in which he considered coming to the consecration 'on St. Peter's Day'.¹² 'I rejoiced to hear his plans about the new church – it will be a new era indeed.' In the event, though, he did not attend. Henceforth it was Pusey who would become 'general Oxford consultant to the project'.¹³

The new church in Albany Street initially had little about it to cause concern to Evangelicals, although it was clearly of significance in the mind of Newman. Whilst Dodsworth made no important changes to the ritual furnishings of the Margaret Chapel, the original provisions and their subsequent changes at Christ Church illuminate a very early stage of ritual development in Tractarian history.

The church, which still stands, was designed by Sir James Pennethorne (1801-1871), who had also worked on 'Park Village' to the north of the church. The style chosen was a late example of the then popular neo-classical style. It was not a graceful building, its rather

technical look incorporating Egypto-Grecian elements, and was as far as possible from the medieval models of church building favoured by Pugin and the rising generation. It was a traditional auditory preaching box, more or less in the tradition of Wren's city churches, but lacking his originality.¹⁴

Inside the building, the very features so deplored by Oakeley at Margaret Street were reproduced. The liturgical layout was that of almost any new Anglican church after the sixteenth century. There was no chancel, but the organ stood above the Holy Table at the liturgical 'east end'. On the same level as the Table, and filling the rectangular space, were the rented pews, together with some rows of free seats. Around the 'altar area' charity children sat in mob caps, white toppets and yellow mittens, apparently obscuring the congregation's view of the Communion Table. Boy singers inhabited the organ loft during services, and the 'beadle' did his best to keep order. The clerk, in traditional black gown, sat beneath the reading desk on the opposite side to the pulpit and there were pew-openers in neat caps.¹⁵ Three balconies on the remaining sides of the church completed this 'preaching hall' arrangement. Without doubt the intention of the proponents of the scheme for Christ Church was to display Dodsworth's reputation as an exceptional preacher.

Dodsworth's understanding of the ceremonial requirements of the Prayer Book were such that his developing 'Catholicism' does not seem to have conflicted with the traditional arrangements either at the Margaret Chapel or in his new church, otherwise we might have expected something more 'advanced' in the furnishings of Christ Church.. However, during the planning of the exterior ornament of the new building 'Some figures of angels outside were sacrificed to the excitement which arose'. The 'excitement' seems to have been from 'A section of the religious world... alarmed by the first tokens of the approach of that which had not then taken the name of Ritualism, but was voted downright Romanism'.¹⁶

At the outset of his ministry at Christ Church Dodsworth delivered a manifesto of his purposes and parochial policy in *Correlative claims of the church and her members, a sermon preached in Christ Church, St. Pancras, on Sunday, July 16th, 1837, being the First Sunday after the Consecration of the Church*. It is dedicated ‘to the inhabitants of the district of Christ Church St. Pancras’ and is ‘respectfully inscribed by their faithful friend and pastor.’¹⁷ It is a useful gauge of his intentions and can be used as a set of criteria for assessing the success of his Tractarian ministry.

Beginning with a biblical introduction (Romans 15:7) he makes very clear that the basis of his new ministry was the doctrine and teaching of the Church, and not his own opinions. This basis is the ‘pure word of God’, sound and scriptural doctrine, as well as the formularies of the Church, the *Articles*, the dogmas of the Trinity, Incarnation and Person of Jesus Christ. He places alongside these the doctrine of Justification in Christ and the Second Coming ‘our great and blessed hope’, and stresses Baptism, ‘the laver of regeneration’, as the way to God, through Jesus Christ by the Spirit. Scripture as taught by the Church is the ‘unerring standard’ and is accessible to the faithful on the basis of belief in that which is agreeable to the Old and New Testaments as taught by ‘catholic Fathers and ancient Bishops’, quoting from a document of 1571. He firmly excludes private opinion as a way of interpreting Scripture. That task belongs to the Church.¹⁸

Moving on to the sacramental ministry of Christ Church, he invites the congregation to a ‘*weekly* communion’ and a ‘*daily* service’ that he is establishing in accordance with the requirements and intentions of the Church of England. He extols the ‘holy eucharist’ and the eating and drinking of Christ in that service. He places this in the context of the ‘catholicity’ of the Church, which does not require of the laity full consent to the Articles.

but certainly demands unreserved belief in the tenets of the Apostles' Creed. The whole structure of Christian life and belief is laid on the foundation of Baptism.¹⁹

He continues with a warning against party divisions and distinctions and then outlines his future ministry at Christ Church. The Holy Ghost had made him 'overseer' of this parish. His mandate of pastoral care includes all parishioners including Dissenters, and to care especially for the sick as well as the healthy. This task requires the building of schools for boys, girls, and infants and work will start immediately on a plot of land granted by the Crown next to the church. Money will be needed for this. Already a schoolmistress has been engaged in temporary rooms to begin teaching the poor of the district.²⁰

He now sets out his scheme for a 'district visiting society', the purpose of which is twofold: firstly to carry the truths of the Faith to poor homes and rooms in 'this densely populated district' and secondly to administer temporal relief to the poor. In a swift liturgical manoeuvre he links the presentation of the alms at the Eucharist to these schemes for the care of the poor.²¹ This is to exhibit 'the Church amongst us', so that the population may see 'How gracious is Christ in having instituted such a communion and fellowship of his people'. Ending in his familiar style, he declared that Christ Church, 'may be a type of what the Great Head of the Church Catholic designed it should be'.²²

The sermon is a blueprint of Dodsworth's understanding of the practical implications of his doctrine of the Church. Founded on the Catholic teaching of antiquity drawn from and validated by Holy Scripture, the sacramental life of the Church is the expression of this faith in daily and weekly worship and Communion and enfolded as it radiates out into the teaching and caring for the total population of the parish, regardless of religion, class or any other distinctions. Here is Pusey's model parish in action. Many of the elements of the 'Christian Socialism' that are usually associated with the Anglo-Catholic priests of the

mid- century working in the slum parishes of the East End were expressed in Dodsworth's 'manifesto' for his parish at its inauguration in 1837. He was well aware that this was the first Tractarian attempt in London to implement the Movement's teachings, and shows how conscious he is of that vocation and responsibility. He exhibited a confidence and sense of destiny in those early years that contrasts with his growing uncertainties in the 1840s. The *Via Media* theology that underpinned his practical scheme in this sermon carried over from his early development and publications at the Margaret Chapel. In those first years at Christ Church there was no break in that development, nor any change of sacramental or devotional practice; rather, he now had the long looked-for opportunity of demonstrating to the full his Incarnational and Catholic understanding of the Christian faith. With this exhilarating prospect he shows a new confidence that is perhaps noticeable in his more frequent and unapologetic use of the word 'Catholic' and its derivations. The pastoral initiatives and schema of worship now to be described faithfully reproduced the aims set out in this key sermon.

2. The Church and Parish as an Expression of Dodsworth's Theological Development. Ritual, Pastoral and Social Concerns

At this point in his ministry Dodsworth was not concentrating on ceremonial to any great degree. The move to Christ Church was a continuation of his teaching and practice at the Margaret Chapel. Burrows tells us that at Christ Church 'from the very first, there was a Daily Service and Celebration of Holy Communion on every Saint's Day, as well as on every Sunday'.²³ This pattern, developed by Dodsworth at the Margaret Chapel, would have been defended by him as merely carrying out the full measure of worship as required by the rubric of the Prayer Book. Many 'High Church' clergy including Hook at Leeds Parish Church had long been doing as much.²⁴ He continued his preaching, teaching and practice of Tractarian ideals amidst a liturgical setting that owed little if anything at this stage to the Ecclesiological Movement.

In fact the first clear signs of ‘advance’ in ceremonial practice and liturgical setting appeared as late as the autumn of 1843. By then well established in his ministry, Dodsworth was able to close the Church for repair and alterations between 13 August and 21 October.²⁵ These alterations were liturgically motivated. Dodsworth’s choice of architect was the Tractarian R.C. Carpenter. The organ gallery was removed from the ritual east end, with the vestry below, the space being used to construct a small chancel. Choir stalls were erected.²⁶

By this time the ideals of the Camden Society had begun to make a lasting impact on fashions in church architecture. The setting for worship according to the Prayer Book rites was being reinvented along medieval and therefore ‘Catholic’ lines, and Dodsworth was himself influenced by these new ideas.²⁷ But the changes at Christ Church were not merely antiquarian. Oakeley had already taken the prior step in refitting the Margaret Chapel along ‘correct’ liturgical lines, to accommodate his ritual advances. The dating of this is important. Oakeley states that he went to the Chapel with the desire of trying to put Tractarian principles into practice.²⁸ He explains that most of the congregation responded well to his project because they ‘had been somewhat acclimatised to their new position (the remodelling of the interior) by the efforts of the two preceding ministers (Dodsworth and Thornton)’. The effect of Oakeley’s changes was the removal of the three-decker pulpit, and the creation of a sanctuary area in which ‘The communion table was placed in its proper situation’, and given dignity by ‘some little stained glass and... altar rails’.²⁹

Oakeley describes his demolition of the hated pulpit as ‘The first act of the new minister was to demolish this three-headed monster’.³⁰ We may date his remodelling of the chapel to some time soon after 5 July 1839, the date of his licensing. So it would appear that Oakeley undertook the liturgical arrangements of the chapel well in advance of Dodsworth’s similar ‘alterations’ at Christ Church. It was just this priority of action by

Oakeley that gained him Pusey's accolade as *liturgical* pioneer in London 'Oakeley went to Margaret Street... and began Ritualism'.³¹ Dodsworth was content for a little longer to conduct 'Catholic' worship within the post-Reformation liturgical structures that he had inherited as the natural setting for the Prayer Book..

Dodsworth's close association with Oakeley was real enough if difficult to define, for as Oakeley himself states, '...I succeeded him (after the brief ministry of Mr. Thornton) at Margaret Chapel; and, while I was there, he was almost the only Clergyman of weight with whom I was well acquainted in London. We saw a great deal of one another from that time till the period of my happy conversion in 1845...'.³² However, it seems that in view of Dodsworth's own conservative practice both at Margaret Street and Christ Church, and the interval between Oakeley's 'advances' at the Chapel and Dodsworth's 'alterations' in Christ Church, we can conclude it was the older man who was influenced by the younger in the matter of Ritualism.

The question arises as to how far Dodsworth's ceremonial practices at Christ Church can be seen as Ritualistic, and how he compares to other figures in this arena. The best evidence of the actual nature of the worship at Christ Church during this period is a letter to the Rev E.J. Richards of Farlington from his wife. M. Trench, who quotes this letter in 1900 describes it as 'showing the standard of services, etc, in the most 'advanced' churches in London at this time.'³³

The letter dated 21 March 1844 (or 1845) is an enthusiastic account of the morning service, described as 'solemn and earnest', at which six clergy officiated and Dr. Pusey preached. After the Sermon and the 'Grace', the clergy remained kneeling whilst the non-communicants left the building. The 'Altar', pulpit and reading desk were covered with black cloth presumably for the season of Lent.³⁴ There is much attention to the collection

of the alms in 'richly embroidered black velvet bags' and their presentation on a gold plate. At the end of the service the writer notes that the congregation waited until the clergy left the altar and 'every Priest carried ...one of the Sacramental vessels'. The letter also describes Dodsworth giving notice of services during Lent. These included daily prayers, 'the proper service for the day'. On the Annunciation and on every Thursday in Lent there would be the Sacrament administered on its own at 8.00am. Morning Prayer was at 11.00am. The writer understood the Thursday celebration to be a commemoration of the Lord's Supper. Dodsworth also gave notice of the 'Fast-day', the purpose of which he explained in some detail and noted the recitation of the Litany at 6.00am. For Sunday, Morning Prayer at 8.00am, 'the full service and a sermon' at 11.00am, Evening Prayer and catechising at 3.00pm, and 'Evening Service and a sermon' at 7.00pm. The church would be kept open the whole day. The absence of any mention of choral music at the Eucharist is a likely indication that the singing was congregational, although such arguments from silence are at best speculative. Dodsworth certainly had flowers 'in moderation' on his altar by 1843 despite Blomfield's general expression of disapproval at such a practice.³⁵ There is no mention of altar cross and candles such as Oakeley had introduced at Margaret Street.³⁶

Interestingly F. Bennett, the author of the *The Story of W.J.E. Bennett* credits Oakeley and Dodsworth with attempts on a smaller scale to begin the ritual advances that soon came to characterise Tractarianism.³⁷ The same author states that by 1850, the Bishop had 'conceded' the Eastward position to Upton Richards, Murray, Dodsworth, and others.³⁸ However W.J.E. Bennett had probably been using the Eastward position for some five years before that date. As minister of the Portman Chapel he had from about 1837 been moving towards Tractarianism and made small advances in the ritual in his Chapel.³⁹ After his appointment by Blomfield to St. Paul's Knightsbridge in 1843, he began initiating more serious ritualistic practises, thus placing St.Paul's alongside the Margaret Chapel and

Christ Church in the forefront of the Movement in London. However it is clear from this that St. Paul's was not a Tractarian parish until some six years after Dodsworth had gone to Albany Street.

This examination of the ritual state of the Margaret Chapel and Christ Church is necessary to establish the priority of these two churches as the precursors of all other ritualistic churches in London. In face of the frequent imputation of such priority to churches like St. Paul's Knightsbridge and St. Barnabas Pimlico among others, it is important to base the argument on the available evidence, rather than Anglo-Catholic local tradition.⁴⁰ J. Bentley in *Ritual and Politics in Victorian Britain* quotes the *Edinburgh Review* of 1867 as maintaining that 'ritualism...was of sudden growth – the work almost of the last three years'.⁴¹ He cites Gladstone in 1874 as informing 'the House of Commons that ritualism then was quite different from the ritualism he had known twenty years before'.⁴² Furthermore he quotes Pusey as saying that in the early days of Tractarianism there was 'a contemporary movement as to a very moderate ritual in a London congregation. We were united in friendship, but the movements were unconnected with each other'.⁴³

Whatever we make of this, the ritualism of the Margaret Chapel and Christ Church was not regarded by a later generation of Tractarians as being of the same kind as that found from 1860 onwards. Such a position seems difficult to sustain without a great deal of qualification, since despite the 'moderate' (in later terms) nature of the ceremonial described at Christ Church in 1844, there had been a clear break with the liturgical past, both in the new 'ordering' of the interior and furniture of Christ Church in 1843, and in the cautious introduction of ceremonial during this decade. Certainly, there was nothing to compare with the use of 'Roman' or 'Sarum uses' with incense, vestments etc., that would be introduced by Dodsworth's successors. Yet, the process had begun partly because of aesthetic factors, but more importantly because the 'Catholic' principles were already in

place, so that throughout the years before his Roman Catholic conversion Dodsworth showed a cautious but steady evolution both in theology and practice towards the justification of usages later associated with Oakeley and the second generation of Tractarians.

John Shelton Reed in *Glorious Battle* has argued strongly against any fundamental division between the first two generations, as a widely held misconception that Oakeley and his generation had turned the original Movement in a new direction.⁴⁴ The liturgical 'progress' of Dodsworth and his curates in the late 1840s demonstrates that although Oakeley may well have influenced Dodsworth's liturgical arrangements at Christ Church, the principles preached and taught by Dodsworth prior to Oakeley's arrival in London gave adequate ground for the ceremonial evolution that occurred at Albany Street in the 1840s, as well as at Margaret Street. Dodsworth's own theological development during this period is central to the working out of the practical implications of his Catholic belief. Oakeley and Dodsworth seem to have been in close alliance sharing in a similar theological and spiritual development. To drive a notional wedge between the older and the younger, or to suggest that Oakeley somehow subverted Dodsworth (and his generation) into an alien ritualism is to over-simplify the interaction between the two men and their place in the Movement.

Such divisions seem untenable in view of Dodsworth's complaint to Pusey in 1836, of the unsuitable nature of his chapel for Catholic worship. Had it not been for his move to Christ Church in 1837, he might well have pre-empted Oakeley's reordering of the interior of the chapel. Having noted 'the miserably defective supply of churches and clergymen for our people', he continues, 'It was never intended that our churches should be fitted up like theatres for holding and hearing, and that one shepherd should have more sheep than he can count. Is it not the theory of our church that all confirmed should partake of the Eucharist at least every Lord's Day?'

Similarly in a sidelight on early Ritualism, he noted that the ornaments rubrick of the Prayer Book requires the use of 'the albs copes etc.' and that the Bishop ought to administer the Holy Communion with 'his pastoral staff in his hand' whilst priests and deacons should wear 'alb and tunicle', articles that have fallen out of use in this 'time of miserable insufficiency of all things'.⁴⁶ Dodsworth exclusively refers to the Holy Table as 'the altar' in this correspondence. This terminology suggests that Dodsworth was no liturgical innocent, nor that he belonged to a conservative pre-ritualistic generation overtaken by the new radicals such as Oakeley.

Thus the debate on Ritualism must be set in the context of the parish as a whole. A helpful contribution comes from F. Knight and J. Morris (1996) both arguing for a blunting of what they see as an over-sharp distinction between Tractarianism and Ritualism.⁴⁷ A.R. Vidler's remark that 'It was not until after 1845 that the Anglo-Catholic revival reached out to the poor and got a footing in the slums', appears to be the type of generalisation that has obscured the reality of Tractarian pastoral concern and practice from the very earliest years of the movement in London.⁴⁸ His argument that the Oxford Movement was 'academic, clerical, and conservative', should be tempered with the evidence of Dodsworth's intentions as set out in his first sermon in the new church, and the evidence of the parish records.⁴⁹ Although Christ Church was not a 'slum parish' of the East End type, the pastoral dimensions of Christ Church's mission to the poor within its boundaries were central to his understanding of 'Catholicism' and do not at all support the view that an easy distinction can be made between a pre-1845 'theoretical' Tractarianism and a later 'practical' Anglo-Catholicism. Like the supposed division of pre-Ritualistic and Ritualistic phases of the movement, such a distinction is neither supported by the empirical evidence, nor open to rational demonstration from the writings of the Oxford or London leaders.

We have already noted Dodsworth's plans for the social and educational work of the parish, but in addition to this the registers of Christ Church reveal the dimensions of his model of pastoral work among the surrounding population. Here can be seen something of the impact of the Tractarian sacramental theory worked out in pastoral practice. Communicant numbers indicate the quite remarkable change in habits of Eucharistic practice. Communion per annum rose from 3,392 in 1837 to 10,927 in 1845, indicating either a growth in the number of communicants, or a relatively static number of communicants receiving Communion more frequently.⁵⁰ The period of greatest change seems to have been between 1842 and 1845, the very time (as noted by Franklin) of Pusey's condemnation for preaching the doctrine of the Real Presence, and also the time when Pusey began to preach more frequently at Christ Church.⁵¹

Baptism was another effective pastoral tool, and much in Dodsworth's mind at this time with his publication *On Baptism*.⁵² The total number from 1837 to 1850 was 2,382, maintaining a steady growth from year to year.⁵³ The demographic cross-section is a reflection of the wide social status of the parishioners.⁵⁴ There was also a steady rise in the number of Confirmations. Like Communion, it was always regarded by Dodsworth as a neglected ordinance and he set about using it as the pastoral instrument he believed it should be. Numbers rose from 40 in 1830 to 140 in 1850. By the late 1840s there was an average of some 80 or 90 candidates each year. The average age was in the late teens.⁵⁵

Pusey's influence is apparent in the correspondence between the two men. During this period he advised Dodsworth on such matters as administration of Holy Communion to the sick, and the correct method of baptising, including that of his own daughter Emma. Dodsworth's own pastoral experience led him to publish *The Priest's Companion to the Visitation of the Sick* in 1845. On 12 November 1846, the Bishop gave his authority for marriages to be solemnized at Christ Church, thus giving the church the effective scope of

a parish church though without legal status.⁵⁶ It would seem that Dodsworth's pastoral scheme was socially inclusive at least within the paternalistic parameters of the period. This would appear to give the lie to an attempt to brand the Oxford Movement socially sterile or incapable of outreach to the urban poor.

Burrows tells us that, 'The zeal of the congregation was very properly first shown in providing elementary schools'. From the very first Dodsworth was determined to open a subscription for building three large school-rooms for 230 boys, 210 girls and 250 infants, together with apartments for the master and mistresses.⁵⁷ As with the church, a site was obtained from the Crown, and funds from a Parliamentary grant and the National Society. The schools were completed by January 1838, and a year later had 871 children attending. The committee included Erskine, Upton Richards from Margaret Chapel, J.S. Brewer, a well known historical writer, and S.F. Wood who was also involved in Keble's plans for nationwide educational renewal.⁵⁸ Burrows claims that the later widely adopted 'pupil-teacher system' began here in 1839.⁵⁹

Closely linked to educational provision was the care of the poor, as Burrows makes clear: 'Of course the temporal relief of the poor was from the first earnestly taken in hand.' Provision included a Provident Society, Clothing Club, Almshouse, Lying-in Charity, Shoe Club and much else. He also claims that it was thought that the 'District visitors' system was first used here. The new work seems to have been effective and the result was 'the poor, by flocking into the district, caused a rise in the rent of tenements'.⁶⁰

The role of women in this early experiment in social welfare is linked to the later formation of the first Anglican sisterhood and will be examined in a later chapter. Burrows says that Pusey 'was induced to select Christ Church for the scene of his experiment, by his opinion of Mr. Dodsworth, his sense of the exceptional zeal of some members of the congregation

(e.g. Lady Feilding), and his knowledge of the needs of the many poor in this populous district'.⁶¹

Broadly speaking the northern and western parts of the parish were inhabited by the wealthy, whilst the southern and eastern sections were areas of considerable social deprivation. The congregation at Christ Church were anxious to provide not only for the temporal needs of the disadvantaged but also their spiritual requirements. The system of pew renting in Christ Church ensured that the seats were mainly filled by the 'higher classes', but 'their hearts yearned to draw in the estranged poor of their over-large district which then extended to the Euston Road'.⁶² Such zeal resulted in the raising of funds, and the essential purchase of a site in what was then York Square, now Munster Square. On this site, surrounded by an area of small industries, lowgrade housing and unsavoury reputation, would rise the daughter church of St. Mary Magdalene.⁶³

Dodsworth depended on lay support.⁶⁴ Oakeley said: 'Mr. Dodsworth's attracted friends and disciples, who numbered among them several lawyers of name, besides other distinguished persons.'⁶⁵ The projected construction of Christ Church, Albany Street perhaps owes as much to the vision and financial resources of these supporters as to Dodsworth himself. The subscription list together with the composition of the building committee reveal a largely upper (middle) class rather than aristocratic involvement.⁶⁶

Amongst the most notable members of the congregation was Christina Rossetti. Her family lived in 50 Charlotte Street, and Christina was confirmed at the age of 14 in Christ Church in 1845.⁶⁷ With her mother and her aunt she had been attending the church since 1843, and was impressed by the aesthetic nature of its worship. Raymond Chapman in *Faith and Revolt* makes a strong case for Dodsworth's preaching as a significant influence on the young girl. 'The Church gave to Christina Rossetti what it gave to many, but she made the

gift particularly her own.' And 'Christina Rossetti received the impact of this kind of preaching (Tractarian) at an early age. She was introduced to Tractarian ideas by men who were themselves close to the authors of the Tracts.' Chapman places great emphasis on Dodsworth's 'eloquent and prophetic' preaching. In 1850 Christina wrote a study reflecting both her own state of health and her devotion which concerns the spiritual conflicts involved in receiving Holy Communion.⁶⁸ Dodsworth's successor, J.G. Burrows, taught Christina the practice of private confession and she became a regular penitent. It was during the years of her adolescence that she experienced the force of a sacramentalism that was to have formative effect upon her work. J.O. Waller in an analysis of Christina's Adventist poems and Dodsworth's eschatological sermons draws out the atypical nature of his Tractarian preaching and its impact upon her.⁶⁹

We have seen in this survey of the parochial institutions as well as the demographic make up of the parish the extent to which Christ Church was a concrete expression of Dodsworth's understanding of the nature of 'Catholic' Christianity at this point in his development within Tractarianism. Ritual, sacramental and pastoral ministries are to be seen in the wider context of an earnest concern for the educational and social plight of the poorer classes within the parish. The role of the laity in this enterprise, not least that of women parishioners has often been overlooked. J. Shelton Reed has gone some way to identifying the significance of the laity in West London as a 'breeding ground for Anglo-Catholicism', but much work remains to be done.⁷⁰

3. Theological Development : Sacramental and Pastoral Publications 1837-44

The pastoral nature of Dodsworth's publications during this period was a direct consequence of his new role as 'parish priest'. Even so he retained the breadth of concern and interest in wider questions that characterised his earlier work. His interest in Prophecy had not lessened, although it may seem less central to his theological understanding. The

issues at the forefront of his mind became very clear in his increasing focus on the nature of the church, and erupted into open controversy in 1842 when he engaged Sibthorp in debate over his conversion to Roman Catholicism. The first rumbles of the coming storm made themselves felt during this period. We review his works on Baptism, the Eucharist and the Visitation of the Sick.

Despite this new assurance and indeed because of it, Dodsworth was still engaged in 'apologia' for the Movement. Baptism and the doctrine of baptismal regeneration has long been perceived as perhaps *the* point of tension between High and Low churchmen. Dodsworth's contact with Irving and his writings had prepared the ground for his acceptance of Pusey's Tract on Baptism. The central, indeed foundational, place accorded to this sacrament in his preaching and practice at Christ Church is well expressed in his 1837 publication *On Baptism, an earnest exhortation addressed to members of the Church of England on the Desecration of that Holy Sacrament*. The extent to which Baptism played a central role in his theology and its development is shown not only by its pivotal role and place in his published teaching from the early 1830s but also by the impact on Dodsworth of the gathering storm of the Gorham judgement, expressed in his published responses to this impending crisis in 1849-50.⁷¹ It is essential to an understanding both of his ministry in Christ Church and to the process of his eventual conversion for this question of 'right belief' concerning the sacrament of Baptism to be examined.

This 'exhortation' begins with observations on the nature and extent of the neglect of this sacrament in the contemporary Church. Such neglect amounts to a denial of the sacramental nature of this ordinance. The Catechism and the Prayer Book liturgy themselves assert the sacramental character of Baptism. Scripture itself proves it. In an interesting passage he deplores the administration of the sacrament in 'empty churches'.⁷² Since the Lord's Supper is a communal occasion, why is Baptism isolated in this way? The

answer is, of course, inadequate doctrine. This sacrament is no mere initiation ceremony, but the forgiveness of sins, entrance into the Kingdom of Heaven, and the creation of 'A NEW CREATURE.'⁷³ Furthermore this washing of sins is connected by Divine ordinance to the outward washing with water. Such outward signs are the means by which the candidate is washed in the blood of Christ and, participating in His death and burial, rises to new life with Christ. This new life is a higher spiritual state. In a telling phrase he claims that 'Received rightly, it is the plenary remission of sin'.⁷⁴ Origen, Chrysostom and Augustine are quoted to support various Scriptural texts that he uses to underpin his assertion. Scripture shows the baptised are justified in this 'laver of regeneration', and it was fitting that the early church clothed this baptismal innocence in white garments.⁷⁵

Post baptismal sin is then considered. This can be forgiven as Article sixteen makes plain. Yet although Baptism cannot be repeated, we may call to mind 'the tokens of God's favour conferred upon us at that time' for the sacrament is once and for all the 'efficacy of baptismal grace applying the blood of sprinkling'.⁷⁶ In a footnote he condemns 'Romanists' for holding to their '(so called) sacrament of penance'. Infant Baptism has been the usual practice of the Church from earliest times, and is not to be denied because, 'Who can trace how far the seed of regeneration sown in the holy font may have influenced his future course...' The fault is not in bringing infants to the font but in neglecting their future training in the faith.⁷⁷

This theological exposition now leads into the liturgical and pastoral consequences of such doctrine. The *Book of Common Prayer* sets the standard, and expects the sacrament to be administered on Sundays or Holy Days during public worship in church. Dodsworth's wish and intention is to see this practice restored and the afternoon service at Christ Church with its combination of Evening Prayer, Catechism and Holy Baptism is the proper liturgy as envisaged by the Prayer Book provisions for this sacrament. He holds that the public

nature of the rite and its setting within the visible community of the church was the intention of the official liturgy of the Church of England, and should not be subverted by excuses or pleas of inconvenience especially from the educated who should be giving a lead to the poor. In a waspish footnote he dismissed objections that town parishes are too big to make this possible by answering that more churches must be built – a passionate concern of his own! Instruction and education of the laity before bringing their children to Baptism is a vital part of this new ‘policy’, and the role of sponsors as communicant members of the church links Baptism to Holy Communion.

A comparison between this tract and his earlier expositions of baptismal theology (see above) show the dependency on Pusey’s Tract, but by 1837 the pastoral setting and application is much more pronounced. The note is more confident, as the language is less apologetic, because this publication is the result not only of theological reading, but of pastoral involvement and experiment. The anti-Roman element is not absent, but muted, and the repudiation of ‘Confession’ is clear enough. Yet it is the liturgical setting of the baptismal rite that seems to grow out of Dodsworth’s pastoral experience. Rooted in the Prayer Book provision and requiring as yet no new alterations in the traditional post-reformation ordering of either the Margaret Chapel or Christ Church as constructed by Pennethorne, Dodsworth shows a fully ‘Catholic’ understanding of the meaning and place of the sacrament in the life of the worshipping community. Although a new and more ecclesiologically correct font did not grace his Church until the late 1840s, Dodsworth demonstrated the independent ‘rediscovery’ and development of the Catholic dimension of Anglican liturgy before the Gothic and Romantic revivals stamped Tractarianism with their mark in the following decade. The tributaries of Irving’s theology, old High Church faith and practice, and the writings of the Oxford leaders converge in this manifestation of the idea of the Tractarian parish in London.

It has already been made clear how vital to his ministry was Dodsworth's valuation of the Eucharist, both as a theological requirement, but also as a devotional and pastoral instrument within the life of the parish. This perception grew as his ministry unfolded at Christ Church. A late but significant witness to this is his sermon preached in Scotland at the opening of St. John's Church, Jedburgh in 1844. This important event in the spread of Tractarianism was the occasion of several sermons preached by leading figures of the Movement. It is likely that Dodsworth's contribution led to his later being offered preferment in the Scottish Episcopal Church. He preached the morning sermon at the Eucharist on 18 August 1844, the first Sunday after the consecration of the church. It is entitled 'Frequent Communion', and is a sermon on St. John 6:53-54.⁷⁸

Dodsworth begins his argument from the practice of the early church in the Acts of the Apostles, arguing that the first Christians received 'the Holy Communion of the Body and Blood of Christ at least every Sunday, and many, as we know, received it every day'.⁷⁹ Not only is the Eucharist central to Christian life and worship but it is integral to Christian identity. Since 'religion is unchangeable', not altering 'with men's notions of it'; that same duty must be incumbent on Christians today as then. Neglect of it is common enough today, yet the Prayer Book requires a minimum threefold yearly attendance. The purpose of the Church now consecrated is to witness to the necessity of far more than a minimal observance of the Church's requirements, for the Eucharist is, '*the great mean of grace*'.⁸⁰

So valuable is this means of grace that he suggests excommunication for those who neglect the minimal requirement 'if discipline were duly enforced'. Even such minimalism is 'not beyond all hope', but nevertheless produces 'negligent Christians'. However 'the Church is either too weak, or too unfaithful, or too indulgent, to pronounce the sentence of excommunication as would be in keeping with its dormant power 'to bind or to loose'. Such a position is justified by 'the infallible test of truth, the written Word of God.'⁸¹ The

plain meaning of Christ's words in St. John 6, 53-54, is that 'if Christians do not receive the Holy Communion,...they are in the way to everlasting death.'⁸²

He continues with a condemnation of figurative interpretations of the text as relating to faith. He rejects any notion of 'carnal' eating and drinking of Christ's Body and Blood in the sacrament but asserts a '*literal spiritual* eating', which he contends is the meaning and teaching of both the English and Scottish Communion offices.⁸³ The footnote here quotes and commends the invocation of the Holy Spirit on the elements in the Prayer Book of 1549. The lack of it in the *Book of Common Prayer* (1662) 'will be supplied internally by most persons of a truly Catholic spirit'.⁸⁴

The link with Baptism now follows '... the Body and Blood of Christ are the true spiritual food of that new and spiritual life which is imparted to us by the Spirit of God in Holy Baptism. We were then, as we know, new-created, born again of God-then we received a spiritual being and existence.'⁸⁵ Since our spiritual lives must be nourished, then 'our eating His flesh and drinking His blood are real and literal, and yet not in any way carnal.'⁸⁶ 'Our blessed Lord's union to the Father is through His divinity; our union to Christ is through His humanity. As His union with the Father was sustained by the ineffable communion of the Divine essence, so our union to Christ is sustained by the spiritual communication of His very true human nature.'⁸⁷ Finally he stresses the objective nature of the reception of the Sacrament over against subjective religious experience, and calls his hearers to overcome scruples and doubts to approach the Real Presence of Christ.

Dodsworth has come a long way since his original call to Communion in the early 1830s. His language and terminology is more confident and developed than *Discourses on the Lord's Supper*. This 1844 Sermon was preached in the shadow of Pusey's condemnation for teaching just these doctrines and is full of defiance and even contempt for a church that

Dodsworth sees as defending those Christians who neglect or undervalue the sacrament whilst condemning his mentor for upholding the Catholic doctrine of the Real Presence as plainly taught in Scripture, the Fathers, and the Prayer Book.

Despite his insistence on Scriptural authority,⁸⁸ there is an anxiousness in his almost pleading and over-assertive style of argument. He is defensive in a way that differs from his earlier preaching and teaching. Always a crusader, ever the apologist, yet here there is a distinct flavour of over-protestation; he seems to be preaching as much to himself as to his hearers. The Church of the *Via Media* has begun to let him down, and his disappointment has a tinge of anger about it. The events of 1845 are foreshadowed in this sermon, and because of this, it tells us less of his pastoral understanding of the Eucharist at Christ Church than one might hope for.

Given the steady increase in communicant attendance leading up to this year, it is clear that Dodsworth had succeeded in his attempt not only to restore the Eucharist to the centre of worship and life in his parish, but also to integrate it theologically as well as practically into the total understanding and experience of Tractarian practice, thus ensuring that it would remain as a principal identifying factor at the heart of the Catholic revival not only in Albany Street but throughout the movement. It is this wider aspect of Dodsworth's success that Newman recognised in his commendation of him as having restored the principle of weekly Communion to contemporary Anglicanism. Given the weight of opposition or apathy to such an objective, it was no mean achievement. Old High Churchmen and many Evangelicals had already done much in more limited ways and the Oxford leaders had consolidated this remarkable revival within a Church that had since its Reformation failed to fulfil the Prayer Book's ideals. Dodsworth demonstrated that these ideals could be realised after all and he brought this about by a combination of teaching.

pastoral care and devotional worship that formed the cohesive whole – the Tractarian parish.

Further insight into these ideals is seen in Dodsworth's combination of practical pastoral care and sacramental ministry to the sick. The precarious state of health due to the largely unsanitary conditions prevailing in London during this period ensured regular visitations of communal sickness, not least the devastating effects of a cholera epidemic. The district visitors that would form the precursors of the revived scheme of religious sisterhood played a valuable role in enabling Dodsworth and his curates to bring spiritual support to the sick and dying of the parish. Such experience resulted in Dodsworth's 1843 publication of *The Priest's Companion in the Visitation of the Sick*.

In the preface Dodsworth claims that the book was produced to meet the need felt by 'several clergymen'. He believes that so far there has been no similar volume with the offices of Private Baptism and Communion of the Sick for use of clergymen in private houses. The use of bold type would assist the reading of these offices in the 'cottages and rooms of the poor. To these liturgical services are added selections from Bishop Andrewes and Jeremy Taylor.⁸⁹

The book opens with prayers from these authors in preparation for the visits to be made. The inclusion of the Communion Office for the Sick makes it clear that there is no reservation of the sacrament. The seven Penitential Psalms are included, various versicles and responses, and psalms with antiphons. A Litany for the sick in danger of death is included from the works of Bishop Andrewes. A commendation of the soul to God, also by Andrewes, is mainly Scriptural, but includes prayers for the soul to be received into light and peace and placed amongst the angels and saints. 'Arguments to move the sick man to confession of sins' are taken from Bishop Jeremy Taylor including 'That what is necessary

to be done in one case, and convenient in all cases, is fit to be done by all persons'. and 'That the ministers of the Gospel are...the ministers of reconciliation...commanded to restore such persons as are overtaken in a fault'.⁹⁰

There is much emphasis in this book on the fear of Hell and seriousness of acceptance or rejection of the free gift of salvation through Christ. The sacramental way of life leads to the Resurrection of the body, judgement and future glory for the repentant. Such repentance is the basis for confession to a 'pastor', the word priest being avoided. The clergyman is instructed to question the sick man in a detailed examination of conscience that includes questions on attendance at the Lord's Supper resembling the Confession lists of later Anglo-Catholic practice. The whole book is full of Scriptural passages and quotations. There is no provision for anointing of the sick.

Whilst the practice of Confession is clearly commended in this book, the work is obviously pastorally inspired and cast in a form that would commend itself to clergy at least sympathetic to the Movement. The prayer for the dead, though not very explicit, went far beyond the practice of most Anglicans at that time. It is a practical instrument, not a liturgical or ritualistic 'luxury'. Yet the tone suggests that Dodsworth was already feeling the need to move beyond the provisions of the Prayer Book, however much he wished to keep faithful to its spirit. His work amongst the poor, in a situation very far removed from the sixteenth century, was leading him into a new situation where the need to express his sacramental and pastoral theology must find adequate forms not envisaged by the provisions of the *Book of Common Prayer*. He endeavoured to use the High Church tradition of the seventeenth century, yet eventually even this did not provide for his needs. and in the following years he would make the first tentative moves towards the adaptation or use of Roman Catholic or at least medieval forms of devotion. It was not just

Dodsworth's personal spiritual development that brought this about; but the unfolding of his pastoral and sacramental regime at Christ Church.

4. Theological Development: Dodsworth's Eschatology in a Tractarian Context

Undergirding Dodsworth's developing Catholicism expressed in pastoral activity was his Irvingite inheritance. Set within the new context of Tractarian ministry, his *Advent Lectures* (1837) reveal the extent to which his eschatological framework of belief underpinned and drove his Catholic development.

Dodsworth was no longer in any real dialogue or contact with the majority of those clergy who were increasingly aware of their own Evangelical identity and the differences between themselves and the Puseyites. These lectures should be seen against the background of his isolation from such meetings of his former colleagues as were taking place at St. George's, Bloomsbury, and Trinity Church, Marylebone to promote the study of Prophecy. Even so, this did not dampen his own deeply held eschatological interest and beliefs. An examination of his publications shows the important role these beliefs still held for him at Christ Church.⁹¹

The *Advent Lectures* of 1837 were advertised as being by the author of *Discourses on the Lord's Supper*, which had gained a wide readership at this time.⁹² They represent an attempt to show that this 'practical' subject was not the preserve of the neighbouring Evangelical churches. Dodsworth was trying to establish a place for the study of Prophecy within the Catholic tradition and more especially within the Tractarian Movement. However, J.O. Waller quotes the *British Critic* as seeing in them 'something of *peculiarity*, something of fancifulness, and something of mysticism'. Waller argues that the *British Critic's* review of these lectures demonstrates the unease with which most Tractarians viewed Dodsworth's pre-millennialism.⁹³ Dodsworth's publication in 1835 of a similar

nature *The Second Advent of Jesus Christ* had demonstrated that this subject need not be linked to any particular party allegiance and showed the continuity of his interest in eschatology from his 'Albury' period into his Margaret Street ministry. It is probably significant that he did not publish any specific work on this subject again until 1849 when his Advent sermons of the previous year seem motivated by more of a direct political concern than these earlier more theoretical works. Dodsworth's involvement in this study did not diminish during the 1840s, although he was more preoccupied by other concerns.

Dodsworth begins the lectures by asking the question as to the Church's expectation in the matter of the Second Coming of Christ, and what detail can be known about this through prophetic interpretation. The starting point of his argument in the Preface is scriptural but almost at once he states that concerning these eschatological teachings, 'the doctrine of the Catholic Church has ever been one and the same'. Despite 'great and perhaps insuperable difficulties',⁹⁴ and through 'diligently and laboriously comparing' texts it is possible to put 'the detail of predicted events in their true order and relative bearings to each other'.⁹⁵ He does not want to disparage the detailed and difficult task of prophetic study, yet recognises that many of the faithful find it too absurd or difficult to comprehend. Yet he must commend it because '*the time is at hand*', and therefore understanding of the prophetic word of God is a vital part of the truth of the 'Catholic faith'.⁹⁶ Such a phrase suggests Dodsworth still regarded the events leading to the Parousia as imminent.

Dodsworth had not substantially changed his position or teaching on Prophecy, but there is a clear shift of emphasis towards a Catholic expression of his eschatological perspectives. He gives a firm liturgical basis for his preaching the Parousia, delivering all seven lectures in the context of the Sundays of Advent. Compared with his earlier writings he quotes extensively from Patristic sources, especially the pre-Nicene Fathers as 'Appeal to Antiquity'. This blend of his long-held 'prophetic' views with a developing Catholicism is

demonstrated in the second lecture in which he considers the Second Advent of Christ. Rejecting both the post-millennialist position of a distant (and therefore irrelevant) Parousia, and restating the moderate pre-millennialist position of his 1835 treatise, he shows a new interest and emphasis on the question of the state of the departed saints, a clear example of the way in which his Catholicism developed from his eschatological starting points.⁹⁷

Yet Dodsworth retained his Evangelical conviction that theology must be firmly based on Biblical evidence. In the third lecture he considers the timing of the Second Coming and firmly rejects any attempt to calculate the date of the Lord's return.⁹⁸ The 'day-year' theory is rejected as having been disproved by the Rev. S.R. Maitland of Gloucester.⁹⁹ However Dodsworth is more concerned that the greater danger in the contemporary Church is the non-expectation of Christ and the moral and spiritual dangers of mankind being ignorant or unbelieving of Christ's imminent return. Only Christ's mercy constrains his return at a moment unknown; thus vigilance is essential if we are to sit down at the marriage supper of the Lamb.¹⁰⁰

Dodsworth now sees the role of the Church and in particular the teaching authority of its ministry as a consequence of his eschatology. The Christian minister is a forerunner of the coming Christ. In his fourth lecture, the social and political implications of this teaching are developed: 'A further means of preparing the way of the Lord is by the enforcement of a due subordination to the powers that be, and the fulfilment of the relative and social duties of life.'¹⁰¹ The political and social resonances in this passage would be more explicitly drawn out in his 1848 sermons, but these are the same ideas that probably attracted him to the early *Tracts for the Times*. 'Systems of education' based on a purely human construct may be well intentioned but those who support them undermine Divine Law as portrayed in the existing social order of Christendom.¹⁰² The minister's task is

‘bringing back men to subordination’.¹⁰³ Obedience within the social hierarchy as well as within the patriarchal structure of the family is to be reflected in obedience to the commands and ordinances of the Church. Dissenters are especially sinful in this matter for obedience is the principle of unity, in society as in the Church.

This line of argument is developed in the fifth and sixth lectures where rationalism and the spirit of Antichrist are identified as subverting all God-given authority culminating in the ‘Revelation of the Man of Sin, the immediate precursor of the Advent of Christ’.¹⁰⁴ Apostasy is *not* to be identified with the Roman Church. Popery is corrupt yet retains ‘almost all truth’ and is certainly not a fulfilment of the prophecies of Antichrist.¹⁰⁵ The Antichrist will arise out of apostasy which is ‘the entire casting off of all restraints, unbounded license, the overturning of the very foundations of order and of all God’s ordinances both in Church and State’.¹⁰⁶ The spread of diversity and freedom of religious opinion has destroyed Catholicity, the unity and authority of orthodox belief.¹⁰⁷

Catholicity is very much at the centre of his understanding of the Parousia and its moral implications. He now regards correct prophetic study as right belief and involvement in sacramental life. In these lectures we see Dodsworth’s integration of his Tractarian position with his eschatological convictions. The political and social implications of his study of the Anti-Christ as identified with apostasy in church and state is reinforced by demonstrating disobedience to the ‘status quo’ as the sin that the Christian ministry must combat in winning church and society back to the Divine order. Dodsworth thus ‘magnifies his office’ in the context of this cosmic drama and struggle with evil.

As the internal tensions increased within Dodsworth during the 1840s, this identification of Anti-Christ with unorthodoxy and disobedience both within the Church of England and on the wider political stage increased as an important strand in his psychology of conversion and were given vent in the Advent Sermons of 1848, a prelude to the period that

immediately preceded his conversion on 1 January 1851. Much of the framework for that step was already in place in 1837. Dodsworth's prophetic understanding of the state of Church and society played a central role in his movement towards conversion to Roman Catholicism.

Dodsworth's combination of preacher and pastor lay at the heart of his Tractarian ministry. His theological publications, largely comprising sermons preached to his congregation, demonstrate the interaction between his spiritual development and his day-to-day pastoral care of the people in his charge. At this stage of his ministry, liturgical expression kept apace with his exploration of Catholic theology. From this position he successfully developed the didactic, sacramental and pastoral aspects of his work. Yet we cannot overestimate the extent to which this position rested on a continuity with his Evangelical past, Irvingite experience and above all his eschatological beliefs. Even so, his evolution, both theological and pastoral, was distancing him from his former colleagues in the Evangelical ranks. In the events which occurred in the 1837-45 period, it is possible to discern the first indications of the coming storms that clouded his later years at Christ Church. That said, during this period Christ Church was a model Tractarian parish exhibiting those features and characteristics of ritual, sacramental, pastoral and social concern that mark it out as a pioneer of its distinctive churchmanship in London. As will be seen in the following chapter, this distinctiveness was not only the result of Dodsworth's own particular theological vision but also arose from interaction with the leaders of the Oxford Movement and in particular Pusey.

¹ R.W. Franklin, *Nineteenth Century Churches*, pp.294,295.

² *Ibid*, p.289.

³ E.S. Purcell, *Life of Cardinal Manning*, p.149.

⁴ *Ibid*.

⁵ *Ibid*.

- ⁶ R.W. Franklin, *op. cit.*, p.287.
- ⁷ H.W. Burrows, *Half Century of Christ Church*, pp.8-10,.See also, R.W.Franklin, *op. cit.*, p.287. The patronage was invested in the See of London, and both Blomfield and Pusey made significant donations.
- ⁸ R.W. Franklin, *op. cit.*, p.287.
- ⁹ H.W. Burrows, *op. cit.*, p.10.
- ¹⁰ *Ibid.*
- ¹¹ CCAS, Preachers' Book 1837-1878, P.90/CTC2/26, Greater London Record Office.
- ¹² *LDJHN*, vol.6, p.78, JHN to S. F. Wood, 2 June 1837.
- ¹³ R.W. Franklin, *op. cit.*, p.287.
- ¹⁴ Victorian Society, Unpublished report on Christ Church, Albany St. n.d.
- ¹⁵ H.W. Burrows, *op. cit.*, p.11.
- ¹⁶ *Ibid*, pp.10,11.
- ¹⁷ WD, *Correlative Claims of the Church and her Members. A Sermon on Romans 15:7*, 1837, title pages.
- ¹⁸ *Ibid*, pp.9-11.
- ¹⁹ *Ibid*, pp.12-15.
- ²⁰ *Ibid*, pp.17,19.
- ²¹ *Ibid*, pp.19,20.
- ²² *Ibid*, pp.21,22.
- ²³ H.W. Burrows, *op. cit.*, p.12.
- ²⁴ N. Yates, *Buildings, Faith and Worship*, pp.2,3.
- ²⁵ During this time services were held in the school room. Blomfield preached at the reopening of the church. CCAS, Preachers' Book.
- ²⁶ H.W. Burrows, *op. cit.*, p.21.
- ²⁷ J. Coombs, *One Aim: Edward Stuart 1820-1877*, 1975, p.9.
- ²⁸ F. Oakeley, *Historical Notes on the Tractarian Movement*, p.65.
- ²⁹ W.A. Whitworth, *Quam Dilecta*, p.43.
- ³⁰ F. Oakeley, *op. cit.*, p.62.
- ³¹ R.W. Franklin, *op. cit.*, p.279.
- ³² *The Tablet*, F. Oakeley, WD Obituary.
- ³³ M. Trench, *The Story of Dr. Pusey's Life*, 1900, pp.264,265.
- ³⁴ This was prior to the Ritualists' adoption of Roman Catholic liturgical colours. See also J.Shelton Reed, *Glorious Battle*, p.39.
- ³⁵ F. Bennett, *The Story of W.J.E. Bennett*, 1909, p.190.
- ³⁶ P. Galloway & C. Rawll, *Good and Faithful Servants*, p.6.
- ³⁷ F. Bennett, *op. cit.*, p.81.
- ³⁸ *Ibid*, pp.89,195.
- ³⁹ *Ibid*, pp.193,195,196.
- ⁴⁰ K. Carter, *St. Paul's Church, Knightsbridge*, 1993, p.3, asserts St. Paul's was the first parish church in London to follow Tractarian teaching. Both All Saints, Margaret Street and Christ Church did not have parish status until much later.
- ⁴¹ J. Bentley, *Ritualism and Politics in Victorian Britain*, 1978, p.20.
- ⁴² *Ibid.*
- ⁴³ *Ibid*, p.25.
- ⁴⁴ J. Shelton Reed, *op. cit.*, pp 14-16.
- ⁴⁵ PP. WD to EBP, 17 August 1836.
- ⁴⁶ *Ibid.*
- ⁴⁷ P. Vaiss, ed., *From Oxford to the People*, F. Knight, 'The Influence of the Oxford Movement in the Parishes c. 1833-1860: A Reassessment', p.128, and, J. Morris, 'The Regional Growth of Tractarianism: Some Reflections', p.144.
- ⁴⁸ A.R. Vidler, *The Church in an Age of Revolution*, 1972, p.52.
- ⁴⁹ WD, *Correlative Claims of the Church and Her Members. A Sermon on Romans 15:7*.
- ⁵⁰ R.W. Franklin, *op. cit.*, p.293.
- ⁵¹ CCAS, Preachers' Book.
- ⁵² WD, *On Baptism. An earnest expostulation addressed to Members of the Church of England on the Desecration of that Holy Sacrament*, 1837.
- ⁵³ CCAS, Baptism Register, 1837-1851, P90/CTC2/1.
- ⁵⁴ R.W. Franklin, *op. cit.*, p.293.
- ⁵⁵ CCAS, Confirmation Register 1839-1890, P90/CTC2/19.
- ⁵⁶ CCAS, Non Register Material, P90/CTC2/60.
- ⁵⁷ H.W. Burrows, *op. cit.*, p.12.
- ⁵⁸ P. Vaiss, ed., *op.cit.*, S. Prickett, 'The Social Conscience of the Oxford Movement, A Reappraisal', pp.89.
- ⁹⁰.
- ⁵⁹ H.W. Burrows, *op.cit.*, p.13.

- ⁶⁰ *Ibid*, p.13.
- ⁶¹ *Ibid*, p.16.
- ⁶² *Ibid*, p.19.
- ⁶³ *Ibid*, p.20.
- ⁶⁴ P. Vaiss, ed., *op.cit.*, pp.149,152,155.
- ⁶⁵ *The Tablet*, F. Oakeley, *op. cit.*.
- ⁶⁶ CCAS, Subscription List, P90/CTC2/106.
- ⁶⁷ CCAS, Confirmation Register, 1839-1890. See also, H.W. Burrows, *op. cit.* p.67.
- ⁶⁸ R. Chapman, *Faith and Revolt*, p.173.
- ⁶⁹ J.O.Waller, 'Christ's Second Coming: Christina Rossetti and the Premillennialist William Dodsworth', *Bulletin of the New York Public Library*, 73, 1969, p. 469-482.
- ⁷⁰ P. Vaiss, ed., *op. cit.*, p.151. J. Morris in his article 'The Regional Growth of Tractarianism: Some Reflections', draws attention to the role of the laity in the spread of Tractarianism and challenges the view that it was an exclusively clerical movement.
- ⁷¹ WD, *Baptism, Regeneration and the Kingdom of God*, 1849, and, *Holy Baptism; the Grafting into our Risen Lord. An Easter Sermon*, 1850.
- ⁷² WD, *On Baptism*, p.3.
- ⁷³ *Ibid*, p.4.
- ⁷⁴ *Ibid*, p.6.
- ⁷⁵ *Ibid*, p.7.
- ⁷⁶ *Ibid*, p.11.
- ⁷⁷ *Ibid*, pp.11, footnote 13.
- ⁷⁸ WD, 'Frequent Communion. A Sermon on St. John vi. 53,54', sermon iv from *Sermons preached at the Consecration of St. John the Evangelist, Jedburgh*, collected by W.H. Teale, Edinburgh, 1845, pp. 73-94.
- ⁷⁹ *Ibid*, p.73.
- ⁸⁰ *Ibid*, pp.74-76.
- ⁸¹ *Ibid*, pp.78,79.
- ⁸² *Ibid*, p.80.
- ⁸³ *Ibid*, pp.84,85.
- ⁸⁴ *Ibid*, p.85, footnote.
- ⁸⁵ *Ibid*, p.86.
- ⁸⁶ *Ibid*, pp.86,87.
- ⁸⁷ *Ibid*, p.88.
- ⁸⁸ *Ibid*, p.79.
- ⁸⁹ WD, *The Priest's Companion in the Visitation to the Sick*, 1843, Preface.
- ⁹⁰ *Ibid*, pp.50-53.
- ⁹¹ E.R.Sandeen, *The Roots of Fundamentalism*, p.25.
- ⁹² WD, *Advent Lectures*, 1837, title page.
- ⁹³ J.O.Waller, *op. cit.*, p.481, and footnote.
- ⁹⁴ WD, *Advent Lectures*, preface, p.v.
- ⁹⁵ *Ibid*, p.vi.
- ⁹⁶ *Ibid*, p.viii.
- ⁹⁷ *Ibid*, p.33.
- ⁹⁸ *Ibid*, p.49.
- ⁹⁹ *Ibid*. p.49, footnote.
- ¹⁰⁰ *Ibid*, pp.53-55.
- ¹⁰¹ *Ibid*, p.67.
- ¹⁰² *Ibid*, p.68.
- ¹⁰³ *Ibid*, p.69.
- ¹⁰⁴ *Ibid*, p.91.
- ¹⁰⁵ *Ibid*, p.140.
- ¹⁰⁶ *Ibid*, pp.120,121.
- ¹⁰⁷ *Ibid*, p.126.

CHAPTER SIX: CHRIST CHURCH, ALBANY STREET 1837-1844

PART TWO: DODSWORTH'S IMPACT ON THE TRACTARIAN MOVEMENT

Given the role of Christ Church as a model Tractarian parish and the significance of the interaction of Dodsworth's theological development with his pastoral experience, this chapter examines the wider implications of that ministry for the Movement at large. Basic to this process was Dodsworth's network of clerical contacts. Whilst the leading figures of Newman and Pusey played particular roles in relation to Albany Street, other figures, including the old High Churchmen of the SPCK and the first generation of Tractarians, are of paramount importance in this story. Integral to the working of such a wide network was the role of preaching and it is through an analysis of the importance and variety of preachers at Christ Church that we can make an assessment of their contribution to the impact of this parish on the initial stages of London Tractarianism, as well as an understanding of Dodsworth's influence beyond his own parish.

This influence was wide, and included prominent laymen, such as Gladstone, as well as the new crop of colonial bishops. Furthermore many of Dodsworth's curates would play significant roles among the next generation of Anglo-Catholics. His concern for education and church building was an expression of his larger vision for the renewal of the English Church and people. Yet there is another side to this 'success story'. A review of Dodsworth's more polemical publications reveals the extent to which this developing Catholicism can be seen as an expression of the inner tensions he experienced at this time. Even at the high point of his Tractarian ministry it is possible to discern in him the roots of change that would determine his future career.

1. Pusey and Newman

Franklin has investigated the relationship of Pusey to Dodsworth's ministry at Christ Church, largely through their MSS correspondence now at Pusey House.¹ Of the seventy-six letters in the Pusey House collection some twenty-seven belong to the period 1836 to 1844, portraying the developing friendship and ministerial partnership of the two men, as well as providing much detailed information relevant to the history of the Movement.

There is little doubt that Dodsworth viewed his position in London in 'political' terms, as is revealed by his recommendation to Pusey regarding the 'Pastoral Aid Society' that 'we ought to join it, if it have the sanction of our Diocesan, and endeavour to prevent its application to party purposes'. Yet he was fearful of the wrong sort of success. 'Church principles are indeed spreading most rapidly. I dread them becoming popular: it will call for much watchfulness in those who maintain them. It must, however, I trust be regarded as proof that there is much sound principle left in the country notwithstanding the shock it has received from the liberalism of the day.'²

From 1838 there is a marked sense of comradeship in adversity pervading these letters, together with a growing intensity of friendship.³ This evidence of the much remarked warmth of Dodsworth's character explains the intensity of his friendships with the leaders of the Oxford Movement, as well as his popularity and influence amongst the clergy and laity in London. Characteristic of this closeness was the presentation by Pusey of his wife's jewels to form part of a chalice for use at Christ Church.⁴

Dodsworth's warm comradeship and fighting spirit is exemplified in his support for Pusey during the crisis that followed the latter's sermon on the Eucharist.⁵ On 3 June 1843, the day after Pusey's condemnation and suspension from preaching within the university for two years, Dodsworth wrote to him offering not only condolences but a desire that the

offending sermon should be printed and, 'Since they have silenced you in Oxford, I hope London will benefit by your more frequently preaching here. The sentence not being of the church, I trust you will feel no scruple in taking my pulpit where I shall ever delight to see you'.⁶ In fact Pusey did not accept Dodsworth's invitation to preach until after the suspension.⁷

During the summer and autumn months of 1843 while Christ Church was closed for reordering and refurbishment, Pusey and Dodsworth met in Dover and in Tunbridge Wells, and on 28th September Dodsworth wrote to thank Pusey for the account of 'the last day at Littlemore'. 'It is a dark cloud which has come over us, but God can cause it even to pour down blessings upon us.'⁸ There was still much for Dodsworth to do. On Whitsunday Eve 1844 he made his first mention to Pusey of the need for a 'competent head' for the projected Sisterhood. He asked Pusey to be spiritual advisor and 'confessor' and thus began a correspondence that preoccupied them throughout most of the remaining years of their friendship. It would appear that Pusey and Dodsworth forged a professional partnership whilst Newman remained distant if sympathetic. Furthermore Newman's effect on Dodsworth was to feed doubts about his position in the Church of England that were beginning to surface even at this time. Paradoxically the most enduring influence on Dodsworth was Newman's, and it is this that we now examine.

An analysis of Dodsworth's correspondence with Newman reveals not only the nature of his admiration and dependency on his mentor, but also the beginnings of the process by which Dodsworth's faith in the *Via Media* was undermined. Despite Newman's progressive withdrawal from active leadership in the Movement during the early 1840s, the two men remained in regular contact, even though Pusey had effectively taken over the role of Oxford co-ordinator of the Movement in London. Regular correspondence, active interest in the SPCK controversies,⁹ the Evangelical reaction at Islington¹⁰ and visits to

Christ Church, Albany Street¹¹ demonstrated Newman's continued interest in Dodsworth's work in the first few years of his ministry in Albany Street.

Yet the friendship may not have been especially close. Newman for whatever reason was never to accept an invitation to preach at Christ Church.¹² Whilst Newman could be critical of Dodsworth: 'Poor D. must learn to act before speaking, at all events to choose his confidants better.' (to S.F.Wood),¹³ he would also defend him at any hint of attack. 'You must not speak against Dodsworth' (to J.B. Mozley).¹⁴

A frequently examined episode in the early history of the Movement and one that features in most Newman biographies is the well-known 'Bloxam escapade'. Dodsworth's role in this episode is almost universally overlooked, but rewards examination as it reveals much about both men during this critical period. John Rouse Bloxam, curate and a close friend of Newman, became the central character in this 'storm' after being accused of attending a Roman Catholic Mass in the private chapel at Alton Towers. This was in the autumn of 1839, and the Tractarian movement and Newman in particular were increasingly sensitive to the rising tide of suspicion regarding the true motives of the Movement and its leaders. Dodsworth had been in Staffordshire in the autumn, probably visiting his wife's relatives¹⁵, and had come to hear that Newman's curate Bloxam 'had attended service at the Romish chapel in which like other worshippers (he) had bowed down at the Elevation of the Host'. He felt bound to report this to Newman and did so in a letter of 18 November 1839 in which he wishes to discover from Bloxam himself (through Newman?) that this was not the case since such behaviour if accurately reported would have been a great departure from what is 'Catholic' and 'honourable' in a clergyman of the Church of England.¹⁶ He expressed alarm at how many young men seemed in favour of Romanism and equated it with Low Church clergy favouring dissenting methods. At this point Dodsworth assured Newman that it was a matter between them alone.

Newman replied the very next day. Bloxam had given account of himself and had admitted being present, having stayed on after privately reciting (Prayer Book) Morning Prayer in the gallery of the chapel. He claimed to have taken no part in the Mass. Newman wrote to the Bishop of Oxford, repeating Dodsworth's words but without mentioning his name.¹⁷ The rest of the tale is well known, and eventually the business blew over. A small matter to today's reader, yet the episode has found a place in the history of the Oxford Movement if only as illustrating Newman's attitude to Rome during this important period of his development. Obviously these events also reveal something of Dodsworth's character and parallel development.

Perhaps only with hindsight can we recognise the first steps towards Newman's actual conversion even at this time; thus it would seem unlikely that Dodsworth had any ulterior motive in bringing this event to Newman's notice. He was merely doing his duty and acting according to his *Via Media* principles. His view is clear. Ministers of the Catholic church in England, that is, the established Church of England, could no more attend Roman schismatic worship, (thus associating themselves with 'host-worship') than adopt the methods of Dissenters. Both groups were uncatholic, and any alliance with them was 'dishonourable'. To argue that Dodsworth was 'testing' Newman would appear to have no basis in the available evidence.

However by the end of 1841 Dodsworth seemed much more aware of Newman's mind, and was sharing in his misgivings regarding 'the Jerusalem matter.' Newman congratulated Dodsworth on his 'protests', for speaking out, and lamented the danger of doubt regarding the Catholicity of their position, which he compared to a seed, seemingly dead, but germinating in the mind. Newman blamed the authorities of the church which by 1841 had more or less declared themselves against Catholic truth, for the serious growth of defections to Rome.¹⁸ Newman regarded the Jerusalem bishopric project as an Erastian

compromise between Anglican and Lutheran churches and caused him to complain to Dodsworth that Dr. Wiseman may sit still and the bishops will do the work.¹⁹

Dodsworth's own questionings of the *Via Media* position were becoming observable in the concerns and tone of his *Allegiance to the Church* and the reissue of his earlier *The Church, the House of God and Pillar of the Church*. Characteristically the quietening of his inner doubts took the form of an aggressive reassertion of his earlier principles, combined with renewed attacks on his enemies. Nowhere is this more clear than in the Sibthorp controversy. In a letter to Dodsworth on 1 February 1842, Newman wrote: 'Your pamphlet pleased me very much, and promises to be useful, though you have not been led to dwell upon Sibthorp's main argument. You have rightly expressed my own meaning in Tract 90, as far as you have had occasion to bring it out – and I thank you for the kindness which led you to do so'.²⁰ Clearly Dodsworth had sought Newman's approval of his pamphlet attack on Sibthorp, and revealed himself as a loyal follower of Newman's interpretation of the Articles. By 14 March 1842 Newman wrote from Littlemore to congratulate Dodsworth on his 'moderation' in speaking about the Church of Rome in his latest Sibthorp pamphlet. But his tone was not optimistic, and despite commending Dodsworth's 'sympathy towards those who are perplexed', he could not give him much reassurance about the future of 'Catholic principles' in the Church of England.²¹

Dodsworth had been in correspondence with Blomfield apparently over the Jerusalem Bishopric, and showed his characteristic deference to episcopal authority in prompting this answer from Newman: '...it does not seem to me that you have gone too far at all – and I really so little see what the Bishop can reply, that I cannot anticipate new arguments for you'.²² Increasingly Dodsworth was to find himself in what would become the classic Anglo-Catholic dilemma. His high doctrine of episcopacy would conflict with the apparently uncatholic teaching of the actual bishop. Blomfield has generally been regarded

as broadly in sympathy with many of the principles and ethos of the Tractarian Movement in its earliest years, but Dodsworth's fairly close association with his Bishop during the 1830s came under strain as his ideology progressed in the early 1840s. This letter of Newman bears the marks of that strain as his sympathy is with the Oxford leaders, but his Catholic duty is to his Bishop, who increasingly diverged from Dodsworth's developing understanding of the meaning of Catholicism. This must have been especially painful for a man like Dodsworth who put ultimate trust in the concept of authority both in Church and state. His struggles with Blomfield are indicative of his own inner confusion. His search for a resolution ended with his conversion to Rome. At this stage Dodsworth was seeking reassurance from Newman that Blomfield did not measure up to the *Via Media* appeal to antiquity, thus laying the blame on the individual's infidelity rather than any shortcomings in the Church of England's Catholic credentials. Yet Newman could not by now conceal his own doubts as to the latter possibility, and his replies to Dodsworth are a curious mixture of support with pessimism regarding the future. They could not but lead Dodsworth further along the same road.

Education was a further area in which Dodsworth could not see eye to eye with his 'Father in God'. This time the Bishop was on the attack. He censured Dodsworth for preaching an unpublished sermon denouncing Blomfield's own plan to 'bring a neglected population within the Church's teaching, and under the ministry of the clergy'. The Bishop accused Dodsworth of attributing bad motives to him and having charged him 'with not having weighed the fearful responsibility' involved.²³ The Bishop regarded such a 'presumptuous' criticism in a sermon on education as intolerable. Dodsworth's unqualified opposition to the education clauses of the 1843 Factory Bill forms the background to the offending sermon. It reveals Dodsworth as once again outspoken and on a collision course with the prevailing policy of the bench of bishops. Blomfield's measured support of the Tractarians especially in their concern for national education would of necessity founder on the rock of

Dodsworth's intractability. For him there could be no compromise with Dissent in any shape or form.

The controversy surrounding Pusey's sermon on the Eucharist (24 May 1843) drew a letter from Newman to Dodsworth on 4 June 1843 requesting 'some demonstration in favour of Pusey' in order to show that 'Catholic doctrines' are held by the Church of England and to prevent conversions to Rome.²⁴ Newman recognised that it would be difficult for Dodsworth to do anything in London without provoking even stronger reactions from opponents. Nevertheless he asked Dodsworth if Blomfield could 'be induced' to ask or allow Pusey to preach in the London diocese.²⁵

Later in the month Newman wrote from Littlemore in confidential tones of Pusey's 'low fever' and his psychosomatic state during his self-imposed exile to his country home. There is a new tone of warmth and affection in this letter that seems to signal a certain bonding in adversity between them and a deepening of friendship that would play a part in Dodsworth's conversion. Newman's retreat to Littlemore and the events of the next two years are well enough documented, but during this time he was in contact with Dodsworth who continued to seek his direction, and not least in the matter of religious communities, a concern now in the forefront of Dodsworth's mind as the plans for the revival of monasticism began to get under way in Christ Church parish.²⁶ In March 1844, however, in a well-known letter, Newman despairingly confessed himself unable to answer Dodsworth's request for advice.²⁷

During the summer of 1844 Dodsworth, accompanied by his one-time curate T.W.Allies, visited Newman, and as he later wrote 'asked me what was going to become of me'.²⁸ The final act in Newman's Anglican drama provoked a sympathetic response from the man who only a few years before had so aggressively attacked Sibthorp's apostasy. Newman

puts it well, ‘... and how lastly, when I was on the eve of reception with the Catholic Church I wrote to you among others to tell it, and how you wrote me a kind answer – and then there was a long silence...’. Both the personal bond of friendship, and Dodsworth’s own development in those few intervening years had enabled him to pen such a ‘kind answer’ in which he told Newman ‘you carry with you the undiminished esteem and affection of your friends.’²⁹ The ‘long silence’ would be broken on the day of Dodsworth’s own reception into the Roman Catholic Church some five years later. It is difficult to avoid the conclusion that Dodsworth’s friendship and admiration for Newman played a significant part in the process of his own conversion to Roman Catholicism.

2. The SPCK

During the years 1837-45 Dodsworth’s attitude to, and role within the SPCK underwent considerable change reflecting his advance in Catholic views, his hardening of attitude to the Evangelicals, and his distancing from the older High Church group.

Up until the late 1830s, his attitude towards the Society had been positive and reflects the extent to which he found himself allied and aided by the High Churchmen of the older type from the time of his move towards Catholic principles in the early part of the decade. His role had been active but not especially involved at least in terms of sitting on any committee or holding an official post. During the late 1830’s, however, his role became more prominent, reflecting his growing sense of himself as a marshal of London forces for the Oxford Movement.

In a series of meetings in April and May 1837 concerning the all-important control of the ‘Tract Committee’, Dodsworth moved a motion to amend the composition of the Standing Committee to include Rose and Robert Wilberforce. In proposing the son of William Wilberforce, Dodsworth was supporting one of the most able converts to the Oxford

Movement.³⁰ After a tussle, Dodsworth withdrew his motion and the Standing Committee's original list was carried, despite a last minute attempt at amendment by Dodsworth.³¹

The other area of contention was the nature of the Tracts adopted by the Committee. Dodsworth had enlisted the Oxford leaders in producing a recommendation for the inclusion on the Society's approved list of St. Cyprian *On the Unity of the Church*. The signatories were E.B. Pusey, J. Marriott, Dodsworth, J.H. Newman, M.J. Routh, Benjamin Harrison, W. Palmer, J.G. Stafford, C. Marriott, J.R. Bloxam - a formidable array of Oxford Tractarians.³² There followed further lists of Oxford signatories for works by Bishop Beveridge, and Jeremy Taylor, Waterland, and Bishop Patrick. Dodsworth earnestly followed their passage through the Tract Committee, expressing in his correspondence to Pusey the various victories and defeats that followed.

Despite a growing sense of failure, Dodsworth was still capable of action as late as 1843/44 when he put a resolution to tighten up episcopal sanction regarding the Society's tracts. William Scott was a strong ally in this skirmish.³³ Dodsworth's last recorded attendance was 7 October 1845, although his name occurred in the subscription lists until 1848 at least.³⁴ As early as June 1838 he had reported to Pusey that 'The Xtian K. Society yesterday bad as usual',³⁵ indeed 'the proceedings of the SPCK are very sad', and 'I can do no good at those meetings.'³⁶ He was finding it difficult to attend the meetings, feeling unsupported and unfairly treated. 'Having protested against this recent introduction of false doctrine I feel inclined to withdraw; only I think we had better do so, in a body and at the same time establish a shop (Burn's perhaps) where we might buy them at a cheap rate, for this is one reason for the country clergy continuing to support the SPCK',³⁷

Dodsworth's sense of personal injury and failure resulted from his own attachment to the society which had been a powerful force in his introduction to a wider churchmanship than he had previously known. His conversion to 'church principles' as developed in the Oxford *Tracts for the Times* had convinced him of the power of the printed word and the vital necessity of capturing the SPCK for the propagation of Catholic views. Indeed he had not totally given up on the Society, for in 1848 he sent a letter requesting the help of the Society in establishing a lending library for the use of the police station in his 'pastoral district' and supply of Prayer Books for the 'church services which he holds weekly at the station'.³⁸ Even as Dodsworth's confidence in the Established Church and its attendant societies began to drain away, his pastoral vision and energy remained to carry him through to the last crisis.

3. Education and the Church

The Church, the House of God and Pillar and Ground of the Truth. A Sermon. though published in 1841 was preached about 1837 according to Dodsworth in the Preface.³⁹ The subject is national education and is an indication of his passionate interest and involvement in this area from the time of his appointment to Christ Church. It provides insight into his perception of the close connection between religion and education. Dodsworth was well aware of the context of the struggle for control of national education. This debate gripped Newman and most of the Tractarians. From this starting point he set out the case for the contemporary 'mighty struggle' between two opposed sets of principles. He states that Catholic principles maintain that God is the source of all authority, and the civil government, Church, and education are instruments of God's laws and will. Religion enables society to use knowledge as God intended. Furthermore rationalistic principles are those preferred by separatists from the Church.⁴⁰ In this individualistic system there is no Divine ordinance or authority, thus religion is a personal matter, individual conscience is

the only authority, all else is tyranny. Education is merely a neutral importation of knowledge.

In a detailed elucidation of the Catholic principles, Dodsworth explains that the church and family follow a directly appointed hierarchical pattern, bound by an historically given revelation, a sacred deposit entrusted to the Apostles and passed on to the Christian community of today, 'the living voice of the church'. The Scriptures are perceived as integral to this, but interdependent with the church for the church cannot dispense with the Scriptures, so the Scriptures are no adequate guide without the church.⁴¹ Truths are not to be 'sought out by independent study of scripture; but are fixed and determined, embodied in the creeds and formularies of the church, and are enshrined in her sacraments.' They have been handed down from generation to generation from the days of the Apostles, by a ministry of Apostolic descent.⁴²

Such a doctrine of transmission of truth through tradition seems an advance on his earlier unqualified view of the supreme authority of Scripture. He criticises Evangelicals for not seeing Christians as a holy community. They are misguided in their emphasis on adult conversion. They should be 'training the regenerated infant'.⁴³ In a criticism of modern schemes of education he says that the church does not merely convey information to the mind, but imbues 'the mind itself with the spirit of truth, and with the love of truth'.⁴⁴ Dissenters are the clear target for this criticism of 'miserable schemes of comprehension'.⁴⁵ and the growing indifference to all religious distinctions. The Church must keep the control of education firmly in its hands, and resist all attempts by sects, Romanist or Dissenting to subvert the apostolic faith being brought to all the children of the nation.

The sermon was published during a period of increased tension between the church and Dissenters over the role of Anglican teaching in national schools, but its early date of 1837

shows that Dodsworth was already aware of the implications of Tractarian teaching in regard to educational policy. His provision of schools at Christ Church in the same year brought this to practical effect. The basis of his thinking was the anti-liberal understanding of truth and its communication to men in church and state. It is the same thesis displayed in the early Tracts, and running through Dodsworth's 'eschatological thinking' inherited from the prophecy movements of the 1820s. His 'Platonic' view of education as perception by the mind of Truth as a Form, rather than a set of informational propositions, is an integral part of his understanding not only of education, but of the fundamentals of religious belief, and goes some way towards explaining his attraction to sacramental and ceremonial symbolism as a fruitful method of communication of Divine truth.

Allied to Dodsworth's preoccupation with education was his concern for a well-trained or rather 'well formed' pool of assistant ministers for the emerging Tractarian urban parishes. This 'formation' was essential if the spiritual and educational needs of the metropolitan laity were to be met. Thus a further aspect of Dodsworth's wider plan for London was the scheme associated with S .F. Wood to form a college of curates. Wood had talked to Dodsworth about this, but now Pusey brought the idea forward. The scheme should be a college of new priests under the direction of an incumbent. The Metropolitan Church Building Fund might be harnessed to this end, although Dodsworth felt this would be unlikely. Even so with 'three churches now building' which might be suitable for such an experiment, there was scope for the venture.⁴⁶ Dodsworth's own plans were part of a wider scheme of Tractarian church planting, thus the three churches included one in Chelsea about to be consecrated, one in Southwark, and one in Northampton. The first was possibly Christ Church, Christ Church Street, SW3,⁴⁷ or St. Saviour's, Walton Street. The Southwark church remains to be identified, and the third was in the parish of All Saints, Northampton, possibly St. Katherine's, now demolished. Dodsworth was sceptical of how

the scheme would be received, 'which of our Bishops would stand against the outcry of a revival of monkery, which the 'Record' etc. would raise?'⁴⁸

Education, ministerial formation, and church planting would soon characterise the revolution in nineteenth century Anglicanism that was much more broadly based than the Tractarian Movement. Yet it is fair to say that some of the earliest examples of these concerns being put into practical effect were the results of Oxford Movement ideas finding an outlet in urban parishes of which Christ Church, Albany Street is one of the first in London. Dodsworth's personal contribution to this wider vision cannot be overlooked.

4. Preachers at Christ Church

We turn now to the role of preaching and the extent to which it both reflected and influenced the dissemination of Tractarian ideas. Burrows writing in 1887 refers to these years. '...it is not too much to say that Christ Church became the leading church in the movement.'⁴⁹ The Preachers' Book during Dodsworth's ministry reads like a 'Who's Who' of the Tractarian Movement. That Pennethorne's building was in essence a preaching box, far from inhibiting the progress of the Movement was in fact suited to it. This point was soon forgotten by the Movement as it became progressively more centred on ritual during the following decade. Preaching was at the heart of early Tractarian ministry alongside and in no way in conflict with the reinstatement of Eucharistic practice and Catholic understanding of the Prayer Book liturgy. Dodsworth's publications suggest that he hoped that a laity deeply appreciative of the value and power of the spoken word would find in Christ Church a unique platform from which they could hear and receive the message of the Tractarian leadership.

The *Edinburgh Review* puts it thus: 'Dodsworth was a fine preacher. His church services were impressive. There was a flavour of combined learning and piety, and of literary and

artistic refinement, in the representatives of Tractarianism, which enlisted floating sympathies; and hence, besides the thoroughgoing 'Puseyites', there existed an eclectic following in and around Albany Street, composed of various elements. In some cases it was the old wine of Evangelicalism settling itself into new High Church bottles; in others literary affinities fastening on congenial forms of historic or aesthetic sentiment'.⁵⁰

The preachers themselves constituted a wide spectrum of Catholic thought. Within the first year the burden of the three Sunday sermons, morning, afternoon, and evening, was shared between Dodsworth and his assistant curate E. Price.⁵¹ Thornton from the Margaret Chapel and Upton Richards appeared and Oakeley (still at Oxford until July 1839), who often came to Christ Church in the year prior to his licensing at the Margaret Chapel in 1839, delivering a course of evening sermons during the autumn of 1838. Manning was the most frequent visitor from the start, often standing in for Dodsworth during his holidays.

From Easter 1840 Pusey appears in the register, after which he was a regular if not frequent preacher. These trusted 'Oxford' men formed the Tractarian core of Dodsworth's enterprise at Christ Church. However, the Preacher's Book reveals a broader perspective, including old High Churchmen and some non-party figures.⁵²

Bearing in mind Manning's criticism of the old High Church party for 'its stiff formalistic, sectarian, intolerant temper'⁵³ in a letter to Dodsworth in 1844, it is significant that several leaders of that school of thought shared Dodsworth's pulpit. Most notable was W.F. Hook who made frequent visits during the first five years of Dodsworth's ministry.⁵⁴ Benjamin Harrison (1808-1887), who preached on 8 October 1837 was amongst the first of Dodsworth's visitors.⁵⁵ Nockles notes that this brilliant author of Tracts 16, 24, and 49 was co-founder with Joshua Watson of the Additional Curates Society who, having taken up the 'orthodox' cause against Hampden, nevertheless began to distance himself from the

Oxford Movement.⁵⁶ He did not preach again at Christ Church after this first visit. William Gresley (1801-1876) was 'a thorough going High Churchman, of what may be called the sensible school', and Nockles calls him a 'prolific populariser of High Church teaching'.⁵⁷ Here again the link with the old High Church party is clear. Gresley preached on three occasions between 1840 and 1843.⁵⁸ Also in the old High Church tradition was Henry Christmas (1811-1868), a Cambridge man ordained in 1837 and invited to preach at Christ Church early in Dodsworth's ministry.⁵⁹ A good scholar, he edited several ecclesiastical journals, and demonstrated the calibre of preacher that made Albany Street such an attraction to erudite sermon tasters. John Sinclair (1797-1875) who preached for Dodsworth in 1840,⁶⁰ was a respected colleague of Blomfield, who rewarded him with the Archdeaconry of Middlesex in 1844. He shared much of both the Bishop's and Dodsworth's zeal for Church building, as well as a passion for the extension of elementary education, being Secretary of the National Society from 1839. He also worked with the S.P.G. He is a good example of the type of 'High Churchman' with whom Dodsworth had much in common. As Vicar of Kensington after 1843, he rebuilt St. Mary Abbots. Yet Sinclair was no friend to Anglo-Catholicism as it developed from the mid-1840s, and was critical of the partisanship that he considered to be the cause of the parting of the ways between his older brand of High Churchmanship and the Tractarians.⁶¹

This group of men clearly shared much with Dodsworth, and he trusted their influence on his congregation yet, as we have seen, his own religious evolution does not seem to have enabled him to remain in any close or long term alliance with these 'old High Churchmen'. Welcome though they were at Christ Church, the total mix of preachers also included clergy of no pronounced church opinions or party allegiance as well as men who would later convert to Rome, or remain to play a role in the mainstream of Tractarianism as it advanced through the 1840s and 1850s. Some examples suffice.

The first visiting preacher after the consecration of the church was Charles Seager (1808-1878), a distinguished Oxford man who submitted to the Church of Rome in 1843, and for a time held a chair at the abortive Catholic university college in Kensington.⁶² Alexander Chirol,⁶³ a Cambridge man who was a curate at St. Paul's Knightsbridge, preached during 1844; and became a Roman Catholic in 1847.⁶⁴ Carew Anthony St. John Mildmay was a very different type of churchman. Preaching at Christ Church in Eastertide, 1840, this baronet's son had been at Oriel from 1818-1822, and was eventually made Rector of Chelmsford in 1826, becoming archdeacon of Essex in 1861. Dodsworth's invitation demonstrates the breadth of his contacts as well as his choice of preachers during this period.⁶⁵

Geoffrey Rowell in his *The Vision Glorious* notes the growing contact between Dodsworth and 'colonial bishops'.⁶⁶ He tells us that Robert Gray, Bishop of Capetown and sympathetic to the Tractarian movement, shortly before leaving for his new appointment 'embarked on a preaching tour to raise funds for the church he was to serve and also met with a number of the leading High Churchmen of the day – Benjamin Harrison, W.H. Mill, William Dodsworth, Pusey and Charles Marriott'. In fact Dodsworth had already established contact with other colonials well before this time (1847). On Trinity 21, 1841 (14 November) the newly consecrated George Augustus Selwyn, 1809-1878, preached the morning sermon in Christ Church and a collection was taken for the recently constituted colonial church in New Zealand.⁶⁷ Dodsworth's interest and involvement in the support or provision of overseas bishops included a Lenten collection for the Colonial Bishops' Fund in March 1842.⁶⁸ The fund had been set up on the advice of Blomfield in 1841. An interesting side light on this concern for the church overseas is the visit on Easter Day 1844 of Samuel Jarman Jarvis, the son of Abraham Jarvis, Bishop of Connecticut. Such links continued throughout the decade with an entry for Easter 3 (14 May) 1848 when the morning sermon was preached by John Medley (1804-92), first Bishop of Fredericton,

New Brunswick (1845-92). Medley had been at Oxford and contributed to the *Library of the Fathers* and his early clerical career in the West Devon countryside may have brought him into contact with Dodsworth's inlaws. He later became Metropolitan of Canada (1879-92). His visit to Dodsworth in the summer of 1848 was part of his return to England to raise funds for his new Cathedral.⁶⁹

Thus it emerges that from 1834-1844 Dodsworth invited a range of preachers to his 'model' parish, including old High Churchmen, colonial bishops, promising young Tractarians, the unaligned, as well as a solid core of Oxford leaders. Many of these were enlisted to promote those causes and societies such as education and church building that were central to his understanding of Christian missions and ministry at home and abroad. Some were, like Manning, close friends. Pusey, of course, was a mentor. However it would be easy to gain an unbalanced view of the pattern of preaching from a simple concentration on the visitors.

Dodsworth and his curates always preached the great majority of sermons throughout the year. Visitors' contributions never averaged even 10% of the total of sermons preached throughout the period 1838-1844; the spread of visitors over the weeks of the year remains fairly constant, with the exception of the short period of closure of the church for remodelling in 1843. Significantly, despite a wide variety of preachers, the regularity with which Dodsworth called upon the inner circle of his most trusted friends and colleagues suggests that he was very careful as to whom the ears of his congregation should be attuned!⁷⁰

There are two obvious omissions from the Preachers' Book. Allowing for the circumstance that Dodsworth did not meet Keble until 1844,⁷¹ it is not surprising that his name first occurs when he preached at the laying of the foundation stone of St. Mary Magdalene

Church, Munster Square.⁷² Yet why does Newman never appear? This is perhaps best answered in terms of the new direction of Newman's thought in the late 1830s and his progressive withdrawal from active involvement in the Oxford Movement. Although Newman and Dodsworth remained good friends until Newman's conversion, by the time Christ Church had been built, Newman was no longer able sincerely to foster Dodsworth's project, and so it remained to Pusey to bring to fruition those plans that had once filled Newman with so much hope.

A final but significant point arises from a remark by Oakeley when referring to this period: 'There were perhaps not more than two or three of the London clergy, if so many, whom we could invite to preach in our chapel without almost a certainty of having the whole fabric of our religious teaching smashed in its very stronghold by some anti-Catholic protest'.⁷³ Such a statement explains Oakeley's remark in Dodsworth's obituary that he was virtually his only significant local clerical associate at this time.⁷⁴ The Preachers' Book bears this out, and demonstrates that, apart from the Margaret Street clergy (Oakeley and Upton Richards), one or two local curates and his own staff, Dodsworth operated a cautious policy as regards his fellow London clergy, whilst being less narrow with his provincial choices.

Thus we can say from this analysis that preaching and the choice of preacher were central to Dodsworth's vision not only for Albany Street but also the wider church. The exclusion of most of his London colleagues and his choice of a variety of 'Catholic' shades of opinion from the provinces give some idea of how he understood his own ministry as well as the reach of that ministry beyond the confines of his parish.

5. Assistant Curates 1837-1844

A similar analysis can be usefully applied to the assistant curates at Christ Church.⁷⁵ The Preachers' Book demonstrates both something of Dodsworth's contemporary influence and conversely the influences upon him and his congregation, but it is his choice of curates that gives the best idea of his contribution to the formation of the next generation of Tractarians, and convert Roman Catholics.

Burrows gives the following list of names with dates:⁷⁶

Edward Price	1837
H. W. Bellairs	1838
William Scott	1839
H. Foster	1839
H. Carey	1839
T. W. Allies	1840
F. T. New	1840
G. S. Woodgate	1840
John Gordon	1842
C. B. Garside	1844

Dodsworth seems to have chosen his curates with a definite preference for Oxford; seven were Oxford men, and only three were from Cambridge. From the registers, it appears that curates tended to stay for at least a year or so, and would often overlap with the next candidate. Some like Bellairs and Carey stayed only a few months, others like Allies, Gordon and Garside remained for much longer. As can be seen from the following brief survey, Dodsworth's curates either converted to Rome, or went on to pursue fairly moderate 'Catholic' careers in the Church of England.

George Stephen Woodgate later became vicar of Pembury, Kent. Henry Walford Bellairs went to be vicar of Nuneaton and an honorary canon of Worcester. Henry Carey was

eventually made vicar of All Saints, Southampton. Henry Foster, a London boy, who went to Cambridge after Kings College London, served his title at the Margaret Chapel, but moved on to Albany Street in 1839. He was appointed principal of Chichester Diocesan Training College in 1840.

T.W. Allies, John Gordon and Charles Brierley Garside became converts to Rome, playing well-known roles in the events of the next decade. Garside was a close friend of Serjeant Bellasis, a friend and supporter of Dodsworth at Christ Church and, like Dodsworth, left the national church over the Gorham Judgement. He was curate in Albany Street from 1844 until 1847 when he transferred to the Margaret Chapel, being received into the Roman obedience in 1850. Like Dodsworth he gained something of a reputation as a Roman Catholic writer. John Gordon's career is well known, and his time as curate to Dodsworth from 1842 to 1846 immediately preceded his reception into the Roman Church in 1847. He became a Birmingham Oratorian and one of Newman's closest friends and is buried beside him.

Thomas William Allies is likewise a well-known figure, not least because of the part he played in the events surrounding the Gorham Judgement. Dodsworth and he were obviously well suited given both the length of ministry at Christ Church and the interaction between the two men at the time of the Gorham crisis. Dodsworth's influence upon Allies' formation is noted by G. Donald in *Men who left the Movement*. 'As a mark of the episcopal displeasure, Allies was very shortly given a small country living; whereby his ambition "to have a large and influential congregation such as Dodsworth's" and to become a force among London preachers, was completely shelved.'⁷⁷

Allies had been directed to attend Christ Church by a remark from his Eton tutor Edward Coleridge;⁷⁸ this he did from 1838. Allies himself said that in Dodsworth's church he heard

‘what was destined to lead me on to what were called Church principles. One after another I took in the higher views of Anglicanism as to the Church, the Episcopate, the Sacraments’.⁷⁹ Allies learnt his ‘Newmanism’ through Dodsworth and came to admire his convictions, influence and impressive congregation. He certainly sought to emulate him, and during his curacy began to move in the same theological direction as his hero. The result was very different from his fellow curate William Scott; indeed the contrast between the later careers of Allies and Scott illustrate the ambiguity of Dodsworth’s influence on his curates.

William Scott (1813-1872) is perhaps the clearest example of Dodsworth’s direct influence on the next generation. Nockles asserts that Scott cannot be easily categorised as either ‘old High Church’ or ‘Tractarian’; his ‘mature churchmanship contained elements or a mixture of both.’⁸⁰ Whilst not allowing Scott full identification with the Tractarians in ‘a party sense’,⁸¹ nevertheless Nockles says that he recognised in the Oxford Movement ‘something greater than one more manifestation of a long tradition of High Church resistance to the “Church in danger”’.⁸²

Such a synthesis, if it is accepted as Scott’s standpoint, may well owe much to his time of close association as curate to Dodsworth. As we have already seen, Dodsworth was never part of the old High Church tradition, but he was sympathetic to much of what they stood for, and sometimes cautiously invited them to preach from his pulpit. During Scott’s curacy, Christ Church was a successful experiment in putting flesh on the ideals of the Oxford teachings. It remained so after Dodsworth’s conversion, thus proving that this particular model of church life did not necessarily founder on Roman claims nor develop into the advanced Ritualism of later Anglo-Catholicism.

Perhaps the ambiguity of Dodsworth's influence on his curates is best understood in terms of his own complex development. In the years when Scott worked with him, his theology and practice was closer to that synthesis that Nockles identified in Scott's later work at Christ Church, Hoxton (1839), St. Olave's Jewry (1860), and as president of Sion College (1858). However, Dodsworth's own theological dynamic was essentially different from Scott's and this explains both his own impetus towards Roman Catholicism and his effect on men like Allies. Scott remained within the established church and developed what seemed to many a native Catholicism. Whilst Dodsworth's effect on Scott and Allies led to very different 'ends', nevertheless both were influenced and formed by him, the one by what Dodsworth had believed and done, the other by what he would come to believe. Such is the ambiguity of Dodsworth's role. However, it is clear that his influence was a significant contribution to the formation of the next generation of Tractarian clergy.

6. Gladstone

A particular and important example of Dodsworth's wider influence on the laity is his connection with Gladstone. As Perry Butler⁸³ and R.W. Franklin⁸⁴ have acknowledged, Gladstone attended the Margaret Chapel and Christ Church, Albany Street during Dodsworth's ministry, but neither have done more than generalise the connection, with the result that some inaccuracy seems to have arisen regarding the precise nature of Dodsworth's role and relation to Gladstone's development.

Gladstone was attending the Margaret Chapel from at least 1833, during his period of interest in Irving, and had formed a high opinion of Dodsworth.⁸⁵ This was during Gladstone's Evangelical period and such admiration led him to read Dodsworth's publications during the mid-1830s. This reading, especially *Discourses on the Lord's Supper*⁸⁶ alongside the seventeenth century Anglican divines, shows the course of his thought during his conversion to Tractarianism. His close connection with Dodsworth is

further shown by regular visits to the Yarde-Bullers, Dodsworth's in-laws,⁸⁷ where theology and church matters were much debated. As the decade progressed the two men were working alongside each other at the SPCK⁸⁸ In 1838 Gladstone was reading Dodsworth's *The Church of England a Protester against Romanism and Dissent*,⁸⁹ as well as 'Dodsworth on Weekly Communion',⁹⁰ one of the sections from *Discourses on the Lord's Supper*. He regarded '...Mr. Dodsworth's serm. for new Ch'. as 'excellent',⁹¹ this being published as *Correlative Claims of the Church of England and Her Members*, and was in fact Dodsworth's blueprint for his model Tractarian parish at Christ Church.

Gladstone's diary confirms a regular pattern of attendance, especially at the Sunday evening service and weekday services in the Margaret Chapel during this period. However, there seems no certain evidence that he followed Dodsworth after his move to Christ Church in 1837. Indeed the opposite seems the case, and his loyalty to the Margaret Chapel during Oakeley's troubled ministry was solid enough. An explicit reference to 'Ch Ch St Pancras' occurs on Sunday 24 November 1844, when he attended the 11.00am service.⁹² Indeed his attachment to the Margaret Chapel led him to write on 10 April 1842, 'Certainly an atmosphere of devotion, a reality of earnest concurrence in the work of holy worship pervades the place, which I know not where else to look for.'⁹³ This was hardly a compliment to Christ Church, Albany Street.

Yet Dodsworth was still on his reading list, and he followed the Sibthorp controversy through Dodsworth's pamphlet warfare in 1842.⁹⁴ He was also in contact with him by correspondence and they shared ecclesiastical concerns.⁹⁵ Correspondence passed between the two men whilst Dodsworth was secretary to Blomfield's Metropolitan Church Building Fund during the years 1843-1849.⁹⁶ They were very much in tandem regarding the absolute necessity of promoting places of worship, sacramental life and Catholic teaching, especially amongst the poor. This shared evangelistic zeal runs counter to the frequently

repeated argument that the Tractarian movement was a largely academic, clerical and Oxford-based phenomenon until after Newman's conversion.

Gladstone's debt to Dodsworth is clear through his reading and likewise Dodsworth does seem to have shared much in common with Gladstone, working alongside him in various societies, keeping up frequent contact at a private as well as more public level. Yet the closeness of this acquaintance is less easy to evaluate. Certainly Gladstone had not included Dodsworth on his prayer lists at this time,⁹⁷ despite the names of Manning, Hook, Oakeley, the Wilberforces, Acland and many others in Dodsworth's orbit. So it may be that his loyalty was rather to the Margaret Chapel, and its changes of minister during this period were less important to him than the continuity of teaching and sacramental worship that nourished his incipient Anglo-Catholicism.

7. Theological Development: Polemical Publications

As noted in the previous chapter, the early 1840s saw a growing tension between Dodsworth's Catholicism and the progress of the Tractarian Movement in the Church of England. His eschatology provided the key for his understanding of this, as indeed it would eventually resolve it. The following review of his polemical publications demonstrates the extent to which he was already wrestling with the inner conflict that would take him to the Roman Catholic Church.

The period 1837-44, during which Dodsworth implemented the project of Christ Church as a model Tractarian parish, saw the last stage of the Oxford Movement proper. The series of events is familiar enough and analysis of Newman's mind has produced a vast output of literature. Dodsworth played a very small part in that process, yet he nevertheless interacted with it. It is for his role during this period of crisis that Dodsworth has received some attention from scholars of the Movement. His main claim in recent studies to any role

in the history of Tractarianism is usually limited to the events that led to Newman's conversion, and the defections to Rome after the Gorham judgement. Since most studies seem unconsciously to tend towards a lineal view of the Movement, with the Oxford phase ending with Newman's conversion and the wider spread of Tractarianism carrying on from that date, it is possible to see why Dodsworth has been given a minor and unbalanced place in the whole picture. A study of his published works leads to a very different evaluation. We are fortunate to have five discourses by Dodsworth from this period, which deal directly with the subject of the Church. They reveal his mind and, taken together with his correspondence with the Oxford leaders, throw light on the course of his thinking prior to Newman's defection.

The first publication *Romanism successfully opposed only on Catholic principles. A Sermon.* was evidently preached in a parochial context, and begins with a reference to many new questions being asked during this 'time of peculiar trial to many Christians'.⁹⁸ The cause of this concern soon becomes apparent and Dodsworth offered his hearers an analysis of the post-Reformation Christian communities. It is very much the familiar *Via Media* position, with the 'Romanists' separated from the 'Catholic communion in this country', the Church of England 'having emancipated herself from the tyranny and corruption of Rome', and returned to the doctrine and practice of the early church. The other Christian communities are portrayed as 'sects'. Thus the Established Church is 'the ancient Catholic Church' in this land.⁹⁹

The real enemy however is the 'March of the Mind', the apparently unstoppable spread of enquiry leading to unavoidable religious questioning and controversy. Under this cover Popery is spreading. 'We cannot dread the revival of Popery too much' with its religion of superstition and idolatry.¹⁰⁰ Its demand of 'unqualified submission to the Church' is to be

rejected. The truth is to be ‘By at once holding the supremacy of Scripture, and admitting the value of Catholic antiquity as an interpreter of Scripture’.¹⁰¹

The emphasis is on the ‘sole supremacy of the written word of God’ as understood by the ‘concurrent voice of the whole universal Church’.¹⁰² ‘Popish priestcraft’ is rejected whilst Apostolical succession is upheld. The ‘modern error of transubstantiation’ as well as a mere symbolical interpretation of the Eucharist are both repudiated.¹⁰³ Baptismal regeneration is clearly explained. The Prayer Book is strongly emphasised as containing primitive doctrine. This reaffirmation of the *Via Media* position which Dodsworth had formulated under the influence of the Tracts in the mid 1830s is much more openly defensive than his early publications. It is also more aggressive in its attack on Rome and seems largely to balance this with condemnation of Dissenters only as a secondary consideration.

The real motivation for the sermon becomes clear in a final footnote that refers to Dr. Wiseman’s lectures, much of which Dodsworth admits he finds ‘very plausible’, but considers to be a misrepresentation of the Church of England. The very lectures that gave Newman his spiritual indigestion led Dodsworth to a typical aggressive apologetic in his familiar pastoral context. From now on this became his normal reaction to the threat that was growing stronger within his own mind. By 1841 the threat was becoming more real, and his *Allegiance to the Church* was preached in view of popular fear of ‘an extensive defection to the communion of the Romish Church’ and the recent events that had given rise to this.¹⁰⁴ Once again the growth of the Roman Church is the target of Dodsworth’s warnings to his congregation. In the context of the growth of anti-Roman feeling he is more than ever aware of the popular perception of certain sections of the Church of England being sympathetic to Romish doctrine and practise. Furthermore the ‘recent conversion of a clergyman of well-known popular talents, and of unquestioned piety and

devotedness' had given substance to such fears.¹⁰⁵ This almost certainly refers to Sibthorp. Dodsworth examines some of the possible reasons for such reactions. The Established Church is 'frigid and worldly', in the grip of 'reason, and form' yet God is renewing it especially through 'her life-giving and life-sustaining sacraments'.¹⁰⁶ Rome is no answer because it is 'schismatic... in this country'.¹⁰⁷ Only those who misunderstand the Catholic nature of the Church of England leave it for 'Popery'. Such people are disillusioned followers of Calvin and Luther or dissent. From those who were schooled in 'Andrewes, and Hooker, and Ken, such conversion has never once occurred'.¹⁰⁸

The second part of the sermon instructs the faithful in guarding against defections to Rome. Dodsworth argued against changing one's religious allegiance since it is fixed by God's destiny for us. Yet the Church of England's perceived faults are listed at considerable length including want of unity and discipline, lack of reverence in worship, and abuse of sacraments especially Baptism.¹⁰⁹ Dodsworth also dwelt on Roman abuses, not least the cult of Virgin worship although he thought that only the popular practice was at fault, rather than the official teaching. He held that Transubstantiation is a mutilation of the Eucharist.¹¹⁰

A final list of Roman advantages and attractions includes frequent mass, open churches, authority of ministers and a devotional atmosphere in services. The Church of England is able to do all these things, and it is everyone's duty to resist conversion and work to bring them about. 'Let us fill the forms of this branch of the church to which we belong with their own spirit, and then we shall lose none who are truly Catholic. The fault is not in our Church, but in ourselves'.¹¹¹

Further light is thrown on Dodsworth's theological position prior to 1845 by the published sermon *The Church itself the true "Church Union Society"*,¹¹² preached in 1843 at a

meeting of the local 'Church Union' in St. John's, Stratford.¹¹³ This daughter church of All Saints, West Ham, was then in rural Essex and did not go on to develop a Tractarian tradition. Indeed it seems to have remained 'Evangelical' to the present day.¹¹⁴ Church unions of this local type had become a feature of the 1840s and owed something to the widespread fear of further erosion of the traditional status and privilege of the Established Church since the ecclesiastical reforms of the 1830s. These were only in part precursors of the later English Church Union, that became a central organ of Anglo-Catholicism later in the century. Gladstone recalls that 'Church Union Societies associated the well-to-do laity in a parish to support the main church societies SPCK, SPG, National Church Building Society, and the Additional Curates Society'.¹¹⁵ At this period such societies would include many laity who owed no party allegiance, and although the tenor of the five societies they supported was broadly old High Church, many people who might have called themselves Evangelicals belonged to such organisations. Dodsworth's sermon reveals both the lack of party distinctions within such societies at the time, as well as the extent to which his clearly defined Tractarian views could be tolerated by such a diverse audience.

The sermon places emphasis on the power of unity in the efficient growth and working of the Church. It condemns 'tendencies of our modern religion' towards individualism.¹¹⁶ The apostolic origins and basis of the Church should lead us to value the Church as body of Christ, and the vehicle through which the Christian community brings charitable, missionary and educational benefits to society. The SPG and CMS are specifically mentioned. Church Union societies 'having sprung up in the days of the Church's inertness, they will be discarded in the days of her vigour'.¹¹⁷ Hence the need of the moment is for sound theology, charity and peace in the unity of sacramental and ministerial authority.

It is clear that Dodsworth's audience did not all share his views: the tone is moderate, apologetic, avoiding contentious or 'advanced' terminology. Even so he did not avoid putting his familiar case for an authoritarian church based on sacramental and hierarchical structures, teaching 'apostolic' doctrine. He avoided the detailed spelling out of the full Tractarian message seen in his sermons produced for home consumption or individual reading. Whilst such men as Dodsworth and Strutt could still both adhere to the Church Union Societies in 1843, the time was not far distant when such cooperation or even toleration would be impossible. This sermon probably represents one of the last occasions when Dodsworth could preach such a message without compromising his Tractarian beliefs. None of his publications after Newman's conversion has this tone, and as such represent the breakdown in confidence in his *Via Media* position that had enabled him to preach with the generosity and tolerance seen in this homily.

R.W. Sibthorp's conversion from an ultra-Evangelical position as clergyman in the Church of England to Roman Catholicism is well known and had made an especially strong impression on Dodsworth. Like others he may have feared it as 'the first swallow of the flight', seeing it as a threat to the understanding of the Church as exemplified in the Tracts and taught by him to his Christ Church congregation. Sibthorp's spiritual journey caused scandal at the time, not least because of his inability to remain permanently in the communion of his choice.¹¹⁸ In 1841 Dodsworth could only see the implications for himself, his ministry, and his beliefs. Sibthorp had been a sturdy Evangelical of Dodsworth's generation, pursuing an almost parallel career, and would have been personally known to him, probably from Hull days when he was curate to John Scott. They both served curacies in Lincolnshire, Sibthorp at Tattershall whilst Dodsworth was serving his title at Saxby. Both were involved in the Evangelical societies and both played their part in the prophecy movement of the late 1820s. Sibthorp's attachment to the Evangelicals gave Dodsworth the opportunity to put the case against 'ultra-Protestants' as being the

weak point in the national church's resistance to Popery. This was a nice twist to the usual Protestant complaint that the Tractarians were breaching Reformation defences. In view of his obvious hurt at the loss of a former colleague to whom he afforded much respect, the event seemed to mark a further stage in his reconsideration of the *Via Media*. The doctrine is strongly asserted by Dodsworth but the list of 'attractions' to Rome may seem to us ironical in that it shows the extent to which Dodsworth was not only more aware of Roman 'advantages' but openly covetous of them. Comparison is made between the 'corrupt' and the 'reformed' churches as they now stand, yet there is little of the force of Dodsworth's former appeal to antiquity so characteristic of the late 1830s. There seems to be a shift away from purely theoretical argument to a consideration of the merits of each church as they exist in the present time.

Dodsworth enjoyed the pamphlet war of this period and in the following year 1842 made a contribution to the Sibthorp affair in two publications firstly *Why have you become a Romanist? etc.*¹¹⁹ The use of the word 'Romanist' is deliberate, as Dodsworth put the case for 'Catholic' as applying to members of the Church of England. Dodsworth recalled both Sibthorp's ministry as first curate to the Calvinist John Scott at St. Mary's, Hull and his work with the Bible Societies. He remembered having known Sibthorp associating with and praying with Dissenters at such meetings.¹²⁰ During this time Sibthorp held an ultra-Protestant theology of the 'invisible' church and without reading the 17th century Anglican divines moved to the Roman position.

Dodsworth then set out the classic 'branch theory' and a detailed 'appeal to antiquity' in terms of Scripture, Creeds, first four General Councils, and the Fathers for the first six centuries as the basis for reunion with the Roman Church. The Vincentian Canon 'Quod ubique, quod semper, quod ab omnibus' is invoked as a basis for ending division.¹²¹ Reunion with Rome is certainly to be welcomed, but the English Church 'can NEVER

sacrifice' the truth that such reunion can only take place when Rome has given up its abuses including Trent, Purgatory, Mariolatry.¹²² Even so 'We appreciate, we trust, the value of unity'. For the 'younger Church of England should reverence the elder and apostolically founded Church of Rome, and acknowledge the centre of unity for the Christian world to be in Rome, and not in Canterbury'.¹²³ In a telling interpretation of the Henrican settlement he states, 'Not that the act of separation was the act of the English Church'.¹²⁴

Dodsworth ended by admitting that he is stung by Sibthorp's claim that the Anglican establishment in reality denies Catholic belief and that Tract 90 was upholding an impossible position. He quoted Newman's letter to Jelf at some length.¹²⁵ A rather personal attack on Sibthorp's integrity is accompanied by Dodsworth's admission from the heart that 'the position of a member of the Church of England in this day who aims in all things...to be a Catholic is one of peculiar trial'.¹²⁶ Here again he seems to be more realistic about the actual status of those holding Catholic views within the Established Church than he had been previously.

Sibthorp replied to some of these criticisms in his *A further answer to the enquiry "Why have you become a Catholic?"* In this he felt that Dodsworth was stretching Anglican doctrinal statements far beyond what they could stand.¹²⁷ Dodsworth could not leave this alone and replied with *Remarks on the Second Letter of Rev. Richard Waldo Sibthorp, B.D.; etc* in the same year. As one might expect nothing new was added to the exchange of views.¹²⁸

It is fair to conclude that Dodsworth was profoundly affected by the action and arguments of Sibthorp. It was a challenge to his presuppositions about the nature of the church and demonstrates the underlying evolutionary nature of his views throughout this period.

Similar signs of uncertainty and agitation reveal themselves in Dodsworth's correspondence with Pusey. He was increasingly aware of opposition by what he called for the first time 'Anti-Tractarian' forces.¹²⁹ He complained of those who represent the 'high and dry' school as being unsupportive in the SPCK and darkly warned that 'sifting times are coming'.¹³⁰ He smarted under an attack from Hook who accused him of 'Romanising' in 1844. Dodsworth told Pusey that this was because he would no longer 'speak any more hard words against Rome, and maintain that we might greatly mend ourselves by imitating much that we find there'.¹³¹ By 1844 Dodsworth was increasingly isolated from many who had been friends and allies in 1837. Even as he achieved so much, both within and beyond this model parish, it is possible to discern that behind his assertion of the Catholic nature of the Church of England, Dodsworth was wrestling with the theological tensions that such a position increasingly imposed on its adherents as the year of Newman's conversion approached.

¹ R.W. Franklin, *Nineteenth Century Churches*, chapter 6.

² PP, WD to EBP, 1837? Fragment.

³ PP, WD to EBP, 19 October 1838.

⁴ PP, O. Phillips (WD's daughter) to Liddon, 8 August 1887.

⁵ R.W. Church, *The Oxford Movement*, 1897, p.328.

⁶ PP, WD to EBP, 3 June 1843.

⁷ CCAS, Preachers' Book.

⁸ PP, WD to EBP, 28 September 1843.

⁹ *LDJHN*, vol. 6, p.255, JHN to HEM, 6 June 1838.

¹⁰ *Ibid*, p.10, JHN to EBP, 10 January 1837.

¹¹ *Ibid*, p.264, JHN to H.J.Rose, 8 July 1838.

¹² *Ibid*, pp.265, JHN to H. Wilberforce, 11 July 1838.

¹³ *Ibid*, p.78, JHN to S.F.Wood, 2 June 1837.

¹⁴ *Ibid*, p.276, JHN to J.B.Mozley, 2 August 1838.

¹⁵ The Yarde Bulls had family connections with Dilhorn in Staffordshire.

¹⁶ *Ibid*, vol.7, p.184, WD to JHN, 18 November 1839.

¹⁷ *Ibid*, pp.185,186, JHN to WD, 19 November 1839.

¹⁸ *Ibid*, vol.8, p.391, JHN to WD, 27 December 1841.

¹⁹ Birmingham Oratory, ed., *Correspondence of J.H. Newman with John Keble and others. 1839-1845*. 1917, p.164, JHN to WD, 10 October 1841.

²⁰ *LDJHN*, vol.8, p.448, JHN to WD, 1 February 1842.

²¹ *Ibid*, p.484, JHN to WD, 14 March 1842.

²² *Ibid*, p.486, JHN to WD, 17 March 1842.

²³ Fulham Papers, Blomfield to WD, 13 June 1844, Blomfield Letters, vol.41, pp.29-30. Lambeth Palace.

²⁴ *Correspondence of JHN with John Keble*, p.233, JHN to WD, 4 June 1843.

²⁵ CCAS. Preachers' Book, Trinity 3, Morning, 1845.

²⁶ P.F. Anson, *The Call of the Cloister*, 1955, p.41.

- ²⁷ *LDJHN*, vol.8, p.486,487, JHN to WD, 17 March 1842.
- ²⁸ *Ibid*, vol 14, p.188. JHN to WD, 1 January 1851.
- ²⁹ *Ibid*, vol 11, p.13, footnote. WD to JHN, 11 October 1845.
- ³⁰ Robert Isaac Wilberforce, 1800-1857. Fellow of Oriel College, Oxford, Prebendary of York and Archdeacon. A leading Tractarian theologian, he converted to Roman Catholicism, 1854.
- ³¹ Minutes, 1835-1838, p.326, MS A1/40, SPCK Archive.
- ³² *Ibid*, p.342.
- ³³ Minutes, 1843-1847, p.58.
- ³⁴ *Ibid*, p.351.
- ³⁵ PP, WD to EBP, 8 June 1838.
- ³⁶ PP, WD to EBP, n.d.
- ³⁷ *Ibid*.
- ³⁸ Minutes 1847-1850, p.180, MS A1/40, SPCK Archive.
- ³⁹ WD, *The Church, the House of God and Pillar and Ground of the Truth. A Sermon*, 1841, preface. This publication is not listed in the British Library catalogue.
- ⁴⁰ *Ibid*, p.7.
- ⁴¹ *Ibid*, p.9.
- ⁴² *Ibid*, p11.
- ⁴³ *Ibid*, p.16.
- ⁴⁴ *Ibid*, p.18.
- ⁴⁵ *Ibid*, p.20.
- ⁴⁶ PP, WD to EBP, 19 October 1838.
- ⁴⁷ B. Weinred and C. Hibbert, *The London Encyclopedia*, p.156.
- ⁴⁸ PP, WD to EBP, 19 October 1838.
- ⁴⁹ H.W. Burrows, *Half Century of Christ Church*, p.14.
- ⁵⁰ *Edinburgh Review*, January 1874, p.63, as quoted by R.W. Franklin, *op.cit.*, p.288.
- ⁵¹ Of eightyeight sermons preached between July and the end of 1836, WD and Price preached seventyfive, visiting clergy preached thirteen.
- ⁵² CCAS Preachers' Book.
- ⁵³ MP, HEM to WD, 13 June 1844.
- ⁵⁴ CCAS Preachers' Book.
- ⁵⁵ *Ibid*, 8 October 1837.
- ⁵⁶ P.B. Nockles, *The Oxford Movement in Context*, p.21, footnote.
- ⁵⁷ *Ibid*.
- ⁵⁸ CCAS Preachers' Book, Trinity I, 1840; Trinity I, 1841; Easter 5, 1843.
- ⁵⁹ *Ibid*, Trinity 2, 1838.
- ⁶⁰ *Ibid*, Sexagesima, 1840.
- ⁶¹ P.B. Nockles, *op. cit.* p.277.
- ⁶² B.C.A. Windle, *Who's Who of the Oxford Movement*, New York & London, 1926, p.213.
- ⁶³ CCAS Preachers' Book, Easter 2, Easter 5, 1844.
- ⁶⁴ K. Carter, *St. Paul's Knightsbridge*, p.10.
- ⁶⁵ J. Foster, *Alumni Oxoniensis 1715-1886*, vol.3, Oxford, 1968, p.953.
- ⁶⁶ G. Rowell, *The Vision Glorious*, p.167.
- ⁶⁷ CCAS Preachers' Book, Trinity 23, 1841.
- ⁶⁸ *Ibid*, 26 March, 1842.
- ⁶⁹ See B.L. Craig, 'Bishop John Medley: Missionary and Reformer', PhD. Thesis, University of Wales, Lampeter, 2001.
- ⁷⁰ During 1837-1844 Manning preached on thirteen occasions; Oakeley on ten (mainly 1837-38); Hook on six; Pusey on five.
- ⁷¹ *The Correspondence of John Henry Newman with John Keble*, p.331.
- ⁷² CCAS Preachers' Book, 10 July 1849.
- ⁷³ F. Oakeley, *Historical Notes on the Tractarian Movement*, p.71.
- ⁷⁴ *The Tablet* F. Oakeley, WD Obituary.
- ⁷⁵ Much of the information in this section is from J.A. Venn, *Alumni Cantabrigiensis*, and J. Foster, *Alumni Oxoniensis*.
- ⁷⁶ H.W. Burrows, *op. cit.*, p.73.
- ⁷⁷ G. Donald, *Men who Left the Movement*, 1933, p.77.
- ⁷⁸ *Ibid*, p.78.
- ⁷⁹ *Ibid*.
- ⁸⁰ P.B. Nockles, *op. cit.*, p.39.
- ⁸¹ *Ibid*, p.293.
- ⁸² *Ibid*, p.316.

- ⁸³ P. Butler, *Gladstone: Church, State, and Tractarianism. A study of his religious ideas and attitudes. 1809-1859*, Oxford, 1982, p.159.
- ⁸⁴ R.W. Franklin, *op. cit.*, p.287.
- ⁸⁵ *GD*, vol.1, p.249.
- ⁸⁶ *Ibid*, vol.2, p.226.
- ⁸⁷ *Ibid*, p.174.
- ⁸⁸ *Ibid*, p.293.
- ⁸⁹ *Ibid*, p.349.
- ⁹⁰ *Ibid*, p.359.
- ⁹¹ *Ibid*, p.370.
- ⁹² *Ibid*, vol.3, p.414.
- ⁹³ *Ibid*, p.192.
- ⁹⁴ *Ibid*, p.194.
- ⁹⁵ *Ibid*, p.392.
- ⁹⁶ *Ibid*, p.446, also British Library, Gladstone Papers MSS, 44360, f.217, 443362, ff.131,139, 44366. ff.189,190.
- ⁹⁷ *GD*, vol. 3, p.352, and vol.4, pp.24-26.
- ⁹⁸ WD, *Romanism successfully opposed only on Catholic principles. A Sermon*, 1839, p.3.
- ⁹⁹ *Ibid*, p.5.
- ¹⁰⁰ *Ibid*, p.9.
- ¹⁰¹ *Ibid*, p.13.
- ¹⁰² *Ibid*, pp.16,17.
- ¹⁰³ *Ibid*, pp.18,19.
- ¹⁰⁴ WD, *Allegiance to the Church. A Sermon*, 1841, p.3.
- ¹⁰⁵ *Ibid*, p.3.
- ¹⁰⁶ *Ibid*, pp.4,5.
- ¹⁰⁷ *Ibid*, p.6.
- ¹⁰⁸ *Ibid*, p.8.
- ¹⁰⁹ *Ibid*, pp.11,12.
- ¹¹⁰ *Ibid*, p.13.
- ¹¹¹ *Ibid*, p.21.
- ¹¹² WD, *The Church itself the true 'Church Union Society:' A Sermon preached in the Church of St. John, Stratford, Essex, before the 'Barking District Church Union Society' on Thursday, June 15th 1843*, 1843. The title page credits Dodsworth as 'Domestic Chaplain to the Rt. Hon. The Lord Rayleigh.'
- ¹¹³ The incumbent was Charles Nicholl.
- ¹¹⁴ I am informed by the present minister.
- ¹¹⁵ *GD*, vol 4, p.76.
- ¹¹⁶ WD, *op. cit.*, p.7.
- ¹¹⁷ *Ibid*, p.17.
- ¹¹⁸ Sibthorp became an RC in October 1841, returned to the C of E in 1843, and became an RC again in 1865.
- ¹¹⁹ WD, *Why have you become a Romanist? A letter to the Rev Richard Waldo Sibthorp, B.D.; occasioned by his letter entitled 'Some answer to the inquiry, Why are you become a Catholic?'*, 1842.
- ¹²⁰ *Ibid*, pp.6,7.
- ¹²¹ *Ibid*, p.13.
- ¹²² *Ibid*, pp.16-19.
- ¹²³ *Ibid*, p.18.
- ¹²⁴ *Ibid*, p.19 footnote.
- ¹²⁵ *Ibid*, pp.21-24.
- ¹²⁶ *Ibid*, p.31.
- ¹²⁷ R.W. Sibthorp, *A further answer to the enquiry 'Why have you become a Catholic?' in a second letter to a friend containing a notice of strictures by the Revs Messrs, Palmer and Dodsworth upon a former letter.*, 1842.
- ¹²⁸ WD, *Remarks on the Second Letter of Rev. Richard Waldo Sibthorp, B.D.; entitled 'A further answer to the inquiry, why have you become a Catholic?'*, 1842.
- ¹²⁹ PP, WD to EBP, 20 October 1843.
- ¹³⁰ PP, WD to EBP, uncertain 1843, or 1844.
- ¹³¹ PP, WD to EBP, 14 October 1844.

CHAPTER SEVEN: CHRIST CHURCH, ALBANY STREET 1845-1850

1. Overview

These years mark significant further advance in Dodsworth's doctrinal viewpoint. This is primarily reflected in his preaching and it is vital therefore to examine this in relation to his eventual conversion and to note the extent to which his developing convictions lay within an evolutionary process of working out his pre-Tractarian frame of reference, not least his eschatological perspective.

Three factors have ensured that this period 1845-1850 is the best documented part of Dodsworth's life, firstly, the abundance of source material, secondly, his role in the founding of the first Anglican Sisterhood and lastly, the part he played in the Gorham Judgement crisis. The primary focus in this chapter is Dodsworth's personal journey from the church of his Baptism into the very different life he experienced in the Roman Catholic Church. The journey was not undertaken alone, but it was nevertheless a very lonely experience for him. The role of his friends and colleagues, especially Manning and Bellasis, feature strongly in this story and are a key to understanding his motivation and action. His break with Pusey is of similar importance, albeit with a less happy conclusion. The detail of travel, especially abroad, has a significance that should not be overlooked.

Dodsworth's clerical career was moving towards a climax. His considerable reputation within the movement showed signs of recognition in terms of preferment at just the time when he felt compelled to leave the Church of England. In view of this, it is important to keep in balance two conflicting tendencies. On the one hand it is clear that disillusionment with the Church was undermining his confidence, yet those years 1845-1850 represent some of his best and most mature achievements within that institution which he was

coming reluctantly to distrust. His training of curates, contribution to church building, reputation as an outstanding preacher well beyond the metropolis together with his record of proactive defence of the faith, made him an obvious candidate for a position of leadership among that growing body of men sympathetic to the Tractarian cause who were beginning to take positions of influence within the Anglican Communion.

2. Christ Church 1845-1850 – A Backwater?

During the period 1837-1844 Christ Church under Dodsworth's leadership was one of the primary expressions of London Tractarianism. But was this role maintained during the years 1845-1850? Since the future 'London Shrines' of Anglo-Catholic worship had not yet been built, and the ritual questions of the 1840s largely centred around relatively 'moderate' questions of choirs, intoning and seasonal decoration rather than the more 'advanced' usages such as incense, vestments and explicit iconography in the following decade,¹ Christ Church was not overtaken in this sense until the period of Dodsworth's successor H.W. Burrows' incumbency.² As a result of the congregation's reaction to Dodsworth's defection to Rome, the church never graduated into the ranks of advanced Ritualism. Consequently Dodsworth's model parish and its pioneering role was obscured and eventually forgotten. In the late 1840s, the ritual riots connected with St. Barnabas, Pimlico, and St. George in the East, were still in the future, albeit an immediate one. Even the Margaret Chapel had after Oakeley's departure settled into a period of relative moderation under William Upton Richards.

Nevertheless signs of change were apparent, not least within Dodsworth's own pastoral area. The ceremonial connected with laying the foundation stone of the daughter church of St. Mary Magdalene in 1849, pointed towards the future with a liturgical procession and use of Gregorian chant.³ An eyewitness later wrote, 'after a preliminary service held in Christ Church, a procession was formed of the clergy and choir in surplices, followed by

the congregation, to the site of the new church, a novelty in those days not likely to be forgotten'.⁴

Dodsworth had made similar contentions for ancient usages in his correspondence with Pusey, yet the evidence is that he never put them into practice. Liturgical knowledge had advanced apace at least since Palmer's *Origines Liturgicae* in the previous decade (1831), aided by the Camden Society's efforts to popularise the medieval setting for contemporary worship.⁵ But knowledge largely remained in advance of practice until the 1850s. The well known anonymous painting in Pusey House, Oxford, in which a Communion Service at the Margaret Chapel on the Feast of the Epiphany 1850 is depicted, bears out the ambiguous nature of ritual development at this stage. The picture is essentially a liturgical statement in which the Eastward position is adopted, the three ministers are clad in choir dress, not eucharistic vestments, and the 'altar' is dressed in coloured frontal, two 'lights' and cross. There is a 'credence table' at the side with two cruets, suggesting a mixed chalice. There is no incense. At Albany Street Dodsworth had certainly adopted some, if not all, of these usages. His correspondence with Pusey suggests that he, like Upton Richards, regarded the ceremonial state of the Church of England as in a state of evolution towards a Catholic objective.

Dodsworth's caution in ceremonial matters as exemplified in his letters to Pusey on the ceremonial and liturgical requirements of the new Sisterhood and his desire to have episcopal approval for his actions may point to a certain slowing down of ritual advance at Albany Street in the period 1845-50, at least in comparison to what was happening elsewhere at this time. Yet this should not be over-emphasised, as the degree of advance was still small throughout London prior to the quickening pace in the early 1850s. Dodsworth's attitude to authority did not allow him to risk either his Bishop's or his people's opposition in the way that Oakeley at Margaret Street and W.J.E. Bennett at St.

Paul's Knightsbridge did. Bennett's use of prayer for the departed during a cholera epidemic may be compared to the cautious usages of Dodsworth's *Priest's Companion*. Bennett's alleged placing of the consecrated bread on the tongues of communicants and the placing of a plain wooden cross on the Holy Table were among some of the accusations leading to his resignation in 1851.⁶ Dodsworth's agonised questioning of Pusey about even the smallest ritual innovations, show a very different mentality and perhaps explain why Christ Church was not regarded as a centre of advanced ritualism despite the evidence that Dodsworth was providing services along very similar lines to those found at more notorious centres of Tractarian worship.

On the basis of his modest reordering of the Church in 1843, Dodsworth had introduced and then followed those fairly moderate practices such as intoning the fully choral service sung by a surpliced choir, use of flowers, coloured hangings and so on. These were approved by the Camden Society in its general medievalisation of worship and would quickly commend themselves to general Anglican usage far beyond their Tractarian origins. He had also cautiously and with reluctant episcopal approval moved into more controversial and doctrinally-charged areas of eucharistic theology by his adoption of the Eastward position. Such a practice would eventually become the focus for the Tractarian assault on the legal establishment of Anglican worship later in the century, as well as a bitter contention with Evangelicals. In view of his espousal of this 'advance', it may be that, had he not taken the path to Rome in 1851, he would have moved Christ Church on to ritual battles not dissimilar to those found at St. Barnabas, Pimlico and elsewhere. This, however, is speculation but in view of his apparent approval of Edward Stuart's project of St. Mary Magdalene, it is difficult not to conclude that Dodsworth's reticence in ritual matters owed more to tactical necessity than real conviction.

A.M. Allchin in *The Silent Rebellion* draws attention to Dodsworth's disagreement with Pusey on the question of the new Sisterhood reading 'unadapted' Roman Catholic devotional works. He suggests that this disagreement sprang from their 'fundamentally different attitude towards the Church of England'.⁷ While Dodsworth demanded loyalty to the Church of England 'as she then was', Allchin maintains that Pusey held a more dynamic view in which the national church could uncover its shared Catholicity with the Roman obedience. Certainly Dodsworth did hold loyalty to the institution at a premium but an analysis of his preaching and other writings, not least his letters to Pusey, suggest that to attribute such a static view to Dodsworth is to overlook his increasingly painful awareness of the tension between what he saw as the present inadequate state of the established church and its future (and past) Catholic fullness - a tension held together by the potential of the present to bring about that desired object through his and other Tractarian ministry.

It seems unlikely that Dodsworth's ritual practice at Christ Church was significantly less advanced than other Tractarian churches in London. Yet even if it might appear otherwise, the reasons for such reticence lie not in any underestimation by him of the role and value of ritual in Catholic devotion, still less in an imagined older/younger generation split that supposedly enabled such men as Dodsworth to hold the 'substance of the faith' without giving it ritual expression. Dodsworth's Patristic understanding of the role of the Bishop, his practical, pastoral awareness, together with a tactical, perhaps political, sensitivity go a long way in explaining his desire to move forward cautiously and within the limits of constituted authority as he understood it. Allchin's conclusions may seem plausible in view of Dodsworth's final disagreement with Pusey at the Gorham crisis. By that time, Dodsworth had indeed reached a very different conclusion regarding the nature of the Church of England from that held by Pusey. By 1850 he had arrived at a position of rejection of the Church of England, as it then was, and thus abandoned any cherished hopes of 'uncovering' its Catholicity. Yet to see his views and actions prior to that crisis in

the light of the Gorham Judgement and its impact on him, would be to interpret earlier events in the light of later history.

The range of preachers at Christ Church is indicative of Dodsworth's theological development. During the period 1845-1850 Dodsworth invited a more selective range of preachers compared with the previous period.⁸ It is notable that in 1845 Pusey made four visits. In 1846 Hook visited on two occasions, Pusey, and Upton Richards once. In 1847 Pusey preached on four occasions, Hook once, Upton Richards once, and John Mason Neale also once. Another preacher was Charles James Laprimaudaye, Manning's curate at Lavington, who would convert to Rome in 1850,⁹ also Robert Gray, Bishop of Capetown.¹⁰ In the following year 1848, Pusey preached twice, Upton Richards once. The overseas connection continued with several sermons from William Hodge Mill, first principal of Bishop's College Calcutta and friend of J.M. Neale, Benjamin Webb and member of the Cambridge Camden Society. John Medley, first bishop of Fredericton, New Brunswick 1845-92, preached after Easter as he continued his fund-raising tour.¹¹

Dodsworth's mounting inner tensions during 1849 may explain why outside preachers were few. There were only six visitors, including one visit from each of the following: Pusey, Manning, Robert Wilberforce, and John Keble. As Dodsworth's confidence in the Church of England waned, he restricted his choice of preachers to the trusted inner circle of friends and colleagues. At the beginning of 1849 John William Burgon (Dean of Chichester) preached at Christ Church. He was to be the author of *Lives of Twelve Good Men* (1888).¹² Nockles regards him as a witness to the life and work of pre-Tractarian High Churchmen in the later eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries. Burgon did not fight shy of the tensions between the old High Church tradition and the new Tractarianism and thus it is significant that Dodsworth welcomed him to his church. Nockles draws attention to Burgon's argument in 1888 that the 'partial miscarriage of the Tractarian Movement' was

‘to be attributed, in no slight degree,’ to, ‘that miserable lawlessness on the part of a section of the Clergy which is among the heaviest calamities of these last days’.¹³ Burgon regarded Newman and the Tractarians as having destroyed Hugh James Rose’s ‘inclusive vision’.¹⁴ Nockles concludes with Newman that ‘a sect was all that Anglo-Catholicism could ever hope to become’.¹⁵ Perhaps Dodsworth’s own understanding and experience of the Tractarian movement was by this time not far from such a view and it is in that light that we may interpret his move towards Rome. Thus a trend discernible from the mid-forties reached its conclusion in 1850 with a mere two visitors, and Dodsworth himself absent from the pulpit between 4 August and 20 October. Dodsworth came to rely more upon his curates, two of whom were to play very significant roles in carrying Dodsworth’s mantle after his succession to Rome. Burrows gives the list as follows:

1846	C.W. Cavendish
1847	John W.H. Molyneux
1847	Benjamin Webb
1848	Edward Sleaf
1848	Morton Shaw
1849	Edward Stuart
1850	W.H. Milman ¹⁶

Dodsworth’s curates were mainly Oxford men at this time. Webb and Stuart stand out as examples of men who played important roles in Tractarianism as it developed into the Anglo-Catholicism of mid-Victorian Britain. They illustrated something of Dodsworth’s legacy to that Movement.

Benjamin Webb (1819-1885) attended St. Paul’s School, London, and then Trinity, Cambridge where he was a co-founder of the Camden Society. Ordained deacon in 1842, he then served curacies including Christ Church and in 1862 became incumbent of the ‘advanced’ Anglo-Catholic parish of St. Andrews, Wells Street. His promotion of the

architectural, ritual and doctrinal views of the Camden Society had an impact on the Church of England far exceeding the party boundaries of the Tractarians.¹⁷

Also of significance to the history of the Movement is Edward Stuart (1820-1877). An Etonian from a line of distinguished Episcopalian Stuarts, he attended Christ Church Albany Street from its opening.¹⁸ A Balliol man, he was ordained in 1844 by Bishop Edward Maltby, Pusey's tutor. After various curacies he worked with Edward Monro at St. Andrew's College, Harrow Weald, where Dodsworth was a frequent visitor, and it was Dodsworth who 'put the claims of the establishment in front of Stuart'.¹⁹ With Pusey's encouragement, he joined Dodsworth as curate at Christ Church from 1849.²⁰ This was familiar and congenial territory, as he was amongst members of his circle such as J.T. Coleridge. His share in his recently deceased (1846) father's estate enabled Stuart to plan with Dodsworth the new church of St. Mary Magdalene at the southern end of the district, one of the first church buildings to express the beliefs and practice of the Tractarian Movement.

This church's role in the forefront of the Movement in its early years sheds further light on Dodsworth's contribution to the future of Tractarianism. It is not easy to assess the extent to which this new project was the 'brain-child' of both Stuart and Dodsworth. The earlier planning was doubtless done together but the state of Dodsworth's mind in the period between the laying of the foundation stone on 15 July 1849, and the consecration by Blomfield of the completed church on 22 April 1852 makes it unlikely that he was involved in the practical detail of its construction. This, together with the pastoral work in the district, was left to Edward Stuart.

On 15 July 1849, John Keble preached the sermon at the usual Christ Church morning service, choral Matins, Litany and Holy Communion. The subject was St. Mary

Magdalene, appropriately enough as the site had been chosen in the infamous York Square (Munster Square) close to the brothels adjacent to the nearby Cumberland Barracks. Keble's sermon suggested that the procession to the site might encounter opposition as it would 'pass through the streets of Babylon'.²¹ The choirmen's surplices and the use of Gregorian Chant would be an easy target for anti-Tractarian feeling. Yet there is no record of any such opposition having occurred, perhaps a tribute to Dodsworth's pastoral sensitivity over the years. Baron Alderson laid the foundation stone and Dodsworth seems to have offered the prayers. A banquet followed.

The completed building was significant in itself, not least for the choice of architect. R.C. Carpenter was one of the first to build 'scientifically' correct Gothic churches. He was also one of the first to build for specifically Tractarian worship. St. Paul's, Brighton, the chapel of Lancing College, Nathaniel Woodard's central minster for his network of schools, and of course the re-ordering at Christ Church itself in 1843 all demonstrate the place of this architect in the first phases of the Tractarian movement. Dodsworth was himself well acquainted with the progress of the Gothic Revival through his membership of the Cambridge Camden Society. At the 8th Anniversary Meeting of the Society, 18 May 1847 (the Society had been in London since 1845), Dodsworth held his own in a debate on the proper restoration and treatment of ancient churches. He differed from J.M. Neale who advocated heavy restoration and even replacement 'in middle pointed' of ancient but dilapidated features. Dodsworth's outlook, labelled as conservative by *The Ecclesiologist*, concurred with the then minority view that 'Churches were not only temples of God, but historical monuments and such ought to be preserved'.²²

St. Mary Magdalene is an architecturally successful and attractive building, but its significance lay both with its extension of Dodsworth's pastoral ideals, and its place at the forefront of Tractarian liturgical principles. It was, after St. Barnabas, Pimlico (1847), one

of the earliest churches in London designed and built specifically to enshrine Catholic worship within the Church of England. Stuart later introduced a programme of ritual advances that went far beyond anything at Christ Church,²³ yet Stuart was in some sense the heir to Dodsworth's work in a way that differed from Burrows, his actual successor at Christ Church.²⁴ Dodsworth's enthusiasm for Gothic, the outward reflection of his Romanticism, the cautious but progressive Ritualism, all these things suggest that although Burrows faithfully continued the Dodsworth tradition of worship and pastoral care at Albany Street, his 'spiritual' heir was indeed Edward Stuart, who had long imbibed the teachings of the Tractarians from Dodsworth himself.

3. The Sisterhood – Dodsworth's Role

T.J. Williams and A.W. Campbell's *The Park Village Sisterhood*, (1965) is a comprehensive account of the first revival of 'religious life' in the Anglican Communion. P.F. Anson's *The Call of the Cloister*, (1958) had already laid the groundwork for Williams' researches, with A.M. Allchin's 'interpretative study', *The Silent Rebellion*, (1958) also throwing new light on the early days of monastic revival. More recently S. Mumm in *Stolen Daughters, Virgin Mothers, Anglican Sisterhoods in Victorian Britain*, (1999) has explored the impact of this revival on women's identity and role in nineteenth century society.

The primary sources behind most of these works are examined in the preface to Williams and Campbell's book and acknowledgement is made of the Pusey House correspondence. It is clear from an analysis of this body of letters that most of the information regarding Dodsworth's role in the foundation and earliest days of the Sisterhood is derived from them. Therefore it seems wise to view Dodsworth's role from this vantage point, since it not only reveals his relationship to Pusey but sets it within the parochial and pastoral

context in which it most naturally belongs. So this is in no way an exhaustive account of the Sisterhood but endeavours to examine Dodsworth's role in relation to it.

Anson tells us that Lord John Manners had related how at the first meeting (date unrecorded) at 'The Albany' to consider the foundation of a revived Sisterhood. Dodsworth accepted the post of 'spiritual head' since he had volunteered his parish for the location of the project.²⁵ The second meeting on 27 April 1844 saw more planning, and in June 1844 Dodsworth wrote to Pusey asking him to be both spiritual adviser and 'confessor' to the sisters and committing himself to act under Pusey's directions.²⁶ Writing in September, Dodsworth clearly regarded himself as led by Pusey: 'In all the interior work you must consider me only, as being on the spot, your assistant.' He pressed the need for 'a very strict rule' and would 'strive to give it a Catholic shape'.²⁷ Indeed from the start Dodsworth relied heavily on Pusey's advice. Thus throughout the autumn of 1844 he was expressing his doubts about the right moment to open the Sisterhood, and felt he could not decide alone on such a great responsibility, asking Pusey if he should start with Miss Moore, Miss Ellacombe, and Miss 'D'.²⁸ Correspondence was now regular and frequent and by the following Lent Dodsworth was pressing Pusey on a range of questions including medical aspects of the Sisters' diet, as well as asking to see Pusey's work on the Rule in view of the likely reaction from the Church authorities, since both men had agreed that confession should not be required, but would be practised all the same.²⁹ Dodsworth told Pusey that Dr. Wiseman had sent Lord John Manners a copy of the rule of an 'institute at Birmingham'.³⁰

The house for the sisters was finally opened on 26 March 1845. By this time, the detail of the sisters' life could be given shape, and Dodsworth outlined some of his plans to Pusey at the beginning of March 1845. 'The Oratory', times of prayer, meals, hours of rising were covered but Dodsworth disagreed with Pusey's preference for the rule of St. Augustine, as

he regarded the 'Birmingham' rules as 'framed for modern English people' and thus more suitable.³¹ The balance between the canonical hours of prayer, and the apostolic work of visiting the poor exercised his mind as the 'pastor' of the community. But the sacramental and spiritual health of the sisters was his primary concern. Although he could not consider changing the time of the main 11am Sunday celebration he did note that, 'we have early communion the first Sunday in every month, and on the great festivals and their octaves.' Yet this was not enough and he contemplated a weekly early celebration for the Sisterhood. But the effect of such frequent devotional practices on the population at large was a recurring worry to him. 'We certainly do mean to set up what most people will consider popish, and so we must not take pains to persuade them otherwise.' Was this an interesting insight into his honesty and resolve despite his natural caution, or was it his pugnacious nature asserting itself?³²

A sharp frost slowed down the work on the sisters' home in mid-March, and between April and December the correspondence between Dodsworth and Pusey was almost wholly concerned with the Sisterhood.³³ In April Dodsworth was discussing the Revd. John Alexander's (of Old St. Paul's, Edinburgh) enterprise of a Sisterhood noting that they would be essentially a parish visiting team and thus fell short of 'religious' ideals. He had been in correspondence with Alexander and one of his 'sisters', Miss Colt.³⁴ Dodsworth counselled reserve with the sisters and the importance of keeping the work of visiting in the parish a priority but in proportion to the 'religious' nature of the enterprise.³⁵

In September Dodsworth, on holiday at Ryde on the Isle of Wight, was considering extra work for the Sisterhood at the 'new Church' (St. Mary Magdalene) then in the earliest stages of its planning. The sisters' work amongst the poor at the southern end of the parish would help to revive their attendance at church.³⁶ Other new projects could include a refuge for distressed women. The use of the Breviary, or adaptations from it, such as non-

Prayer Book feasts, which Dodsworth objected to, and the sister's dress, reveal his perception of what this whole experiment meant to him.³⁷ He maintained to Pusey 'Nothing has ever been simply restored, and so we never can have Nuns again; though we may have something resembling them: We cannot bring back medieval religion'.³⁸ Despite his membership of the Camden Society, Dodsworth was not in love with the Middle Ages and perhaps this explains why he seemed content enough with his own very un-medieval Christ Church, altering its interior only insofar as it would accommodate Catholic worship according to the Prayer Book requirement. The dress of the sisters, their housing and to an extent their devotional life, were not to be a revival of something in the past but like their Rule to be a living 'modern' expression of the religious life. Hence his preference for the contemporary 'Sisters of Mercy' model, and the 'Birmingham Rule'. He regrets 'that they think of themselves very much as nuns', and fears that he had all along thought this a possible temptation. 'I wish they could think less of what they seem to be and let this gradually grow out of reality.' In a slip of the pen, to Pusey, he refers to them as 'your Sisters'.³⁹

The question of what use could be allowed for books of Roman Catholic origin seems to have caused increasing stress to Dodsworth during the following years. On a visit in 1848 to the additional new premises (for orphans and some sisters) at 46 Albany Street in company with Upton Richards a copy of 'Liguori' as well as other similar works were discovered. Dodsworth feared 'romanising' and its effects in turning the 'character of a sisterhood into a nunnery'.⁴⁰ This was a period of involvement with Upton Richards which was to end with a difference of opinion over a projected second house of sisters at Margaret Street, and also the beginnings of a distancing from Pusey with whom he sharply disagreed on the question of the books. From this period the tension between Dodsworth and Pusey marginalised their cooperation over the Sisterhood, and there is no further extant correspondence regarding them. It is perhaps significant that Dodsworth only occasionally

discussed the Sisterhood with his close friend Manning and then often in relatively general terms.⁴¹ Clearly Dodsworth regarded Pusey as his mentor and, when the estrangement separated them, his concern for the Sisterhood was overshadowed by larger questions in his correspondence with Manning, his other close associate.

This brief view of Dodsworth's role in the earliest stages of revival of 'monastic' life in the Church of England sheds light on several aspects of his wider role in the Tractarian movement. Firstly, his pastoral vision of 'the model parish' included the Sisterhood as an integral part of his understanding of the social and missionary involvement with the local community. In this he set a pattern that was widely followed in Anglo-Catholic parishes in inner cities during the next hundred years or more. Secondly we can view his developing relationship with the Sisterhood as to some extent a reflection of his movement towards Roman Catholic spirituality. The tension between his loyalty to Anglican authority (both episcopal and liturgical) and a growing awareness of the constraint such loyalty imposed became acute as he realised that monastic life inevitably demanded expressions of spirituality that could not be satisfied by the *Book of Common Prayer* alone. It is important to bear this in mind when we consider his public criticism of Pusey after the Gorham Judgement. Some of the vehemence of that clash can be explained in the context of Dodsworth's frustration during those years, as he wrestled with the profound questions raised by this pioneering attempt to revive a Catholic community in a Protestant church. Many individuals in Anglican religious orders, as well as whole monastic communities, would later find the resolution of this tension by converting to the Roman Church.

4. Theological Development – Publications 1846-1849, Catholicism and Eschatology

To understand the nature and direction of Dodsworth's move towards Roman Catholicism we turn to an analysis of his publications during this period. Dodsworth's steady flow of publications began to slow after 1845. During the years 1846-49, his still vibrant preaching

and teaching ministry was represented by only five known works. These comprised two devotional/liturgical works, one theological treatise, and a further two which were a response along adventist lines to the current political situation. To some extent this may be explained in terms of his occupation in practical pursuits. As will be seen below, this period represents a time when Dodsworth embarked on travel, both at home and abroad. The overseas journeys will be examined for their impact on his theological development, whilst at home his journeys are mainly connected with his growing role as a spokesman and disseminator of Tractarian principles. A process begun in the early 1840s was coming to fruition. Allied to his reputation as a Tractarian leader it culminated at the end of the decade in the offer of preferment within the Scottish Episcopal Church.

Examination of his devotional and liturgical publications gives ample evidence that by the mid-1840s Dodsworth had advanced well beyond the cautious positions he had held even a few years earlier. Furthermore Dodsworth took advantage of the newly established railway system for the dissemination of Tractarian ideas. His sermon of 1847 in the parish church of New Shoreham in what had been a relatively remote rural area of Sussex is significant both as to the theological ideas put forward and as an example of how far and how quickly the Tractarian 'network' was reaching out to remote corners of England.⁴²

The role of the two clergymen of this united parish is important. William Wheeler was a fellow of Magdalen College, Oxford from 1836-1843, afterwards being appointed by his college as vicar of these two united parishes of Old and New Shoreham. Wheeler's Tractarian connections saw him well placed for the introduction of such ideals into this small sea port. He invited J.M. Neale to carry out the first restoration undertaken by the ecclesiological society at Old Shoreham in 1840-1841.⁴³ Despite encountering opposition from 'anti-High Church agitation' in the town,⁴⁴ he nevertheless persevered and his sermons demonstrate a strong, scholarly yet moderate presentation of Catholic ideas.⁴⁵ He

was received by Manning into the Roman Catholic Church in 1855 and was ordained at Rome in 1857. His curate from 1847 was Nathaniel Woodard, a Magdalen Hall man and founder of the Woodard Schools. Woodard had been at St. Bartholomew's, Bethnal Green, London from where he had been moved to 'a neighbouring parish' (probably St. James', Clapton) as a result of his sermon on private confession. He probably knew Dodsworth during this time. Wheeler left the day to day running of New Shoreham to Woodard and it was from there that his well-known system of Tractarian education evolved.⁴⁶

Dodsworth fits well into this picture of pastoral, educational and architectural initiatives. If Albany Street was a model urban parish, then Shoreham was perhaps a rural counterpart. The New Shoreham sermon is pure Dodsworth. Beginning from the scriptural foundations of worship 'imbued with the spirit of evangelical devotion', the romantic and ecclesiological note is quickly sounded with praise of 'this beautiful sanctuary' (New Shoreham is an exceptional example of medieval building), and the newly dedicated organ as an acceptable offering.⁴⁷ He contends that outward forms of worship are natural to man. 'Here, holy rites are breathing words, and ceremonies are the signs of great and holy truths.' The dignity of worship, holy vestments, 'sweet-toned instruments, and solemn chants' are thus valid expressions of the majesty of God.⁴⁸ This is Dodsworth at his most expressive and contrasts to some degree with his restrained intellectual 'Albany Street' manner. It has a missionary tone seeking to persuade by moving the emotions rather than by appealing to the intellect alone. The argument is then extended to Baptism and Holy Communion, 'But regard these blessed sacraments as they really are, the shrines of the realities which they represent-the vehicles of the grace which they convey; the one of the regenerating, purifying Spirit; the other, of the blessed Communion of the Body and Blood of Christ'.⁴⁹ He meets possible objections to the use of 'a visible cross' as a sign of 'the soul-subduing doctrine of the cross'.⁵⁰

As the sermon draws to its climactic conclusion, we see Dodsworth's well known 'Evangelical' oratory deployed for 'Catholic' ideals. This section is also his most clearly expressed exposition of the Tractarian understanding of outward worship as a response to feelings of mystery within us, 'which yearn after that which the Church alone with her holy solemnities and manifold expressions of heavenly things can give us.' They cannot be repressed even by 'The stern spirit of Puritanism'.⁵¹

Yet is Dodsworth's triumphalism shadowed by lurking doubts? Although worship is being renewed, after 'a long and death-like torpor', he felt it necessary to warn that there was no need to go beyond the Church of England.⁵² For Catholic principles must be allowed to grow in the Church of England. If Catholic doctrines are repudiated by those whose duty it is to maintain them then it is not surprising if 'some mistaken but ardent-minded persons should be impressed with the feeling that the Church of England is herself not catholic, and should be tempted to seek elsewhere what seems to be denied to them in her fold.' Yet he does 'not speak in justification of such persons'.⁵³ The sermon concludes with a strongly Tractarian exhortation 'to engage in that highest, noblest, best work in which a rational creature can engage, the worship of Him who made you.'⁵⁴ Such a fusing of his skill in preaching with psychological and romantic insight demonstrates Dodsworth's special contribution to the Tractarian Movement. His understanding of the relationship between God and Man as above rational expression, reflects the thought of Newman and the Oxford Movement. It is difficult, however, to avoid the suspicion that the strident, even aggressive tone of this sermon, delivered in a less than sympathetic situation, has something of the desire for martyrdom about it.

A similar tone is found in his short but significant tract entitled *The Fast Day*.⁵⁵ This was occasioned by the proclamation of a general fast (in connection with the Irish Famine) on behalf of Queen Victoria for Wednesday 24 March 1847. Such occasions had been a

feature of Anglican practice since the sixteenth century but the changes in Church and State that did much to bring about the Tractarian Movement also made these Fast Days seem more untenable in a society decreasingly dominated by traditional ideology. To many of Dodsworth's contemporaries this proclamation appeared to be a relic of a bygone age. His tract was an attempt to answer those objections and was yet another element in his crusade against liberal and rationalistic changes in society. In the contemporary context of the Irish famine he attempts to explain what many would have held to be outmoded views of famine as divine punishment, relieved by national humiliation and repentance before God. This tract, perhaps more than any of his other publications, demonstrates the extent to which he was prepared to seek refuge in reactionary and conservative theology as a response to the rapid ideological changes taking place in church and society.

The same impetus is found in his 'adventist' publications. It is true that Dodsworth's mind seemed to be elsewhere during the years 1846 and 1847 at least as far as this favourite topic was concerned, since he published nothing during this time on the Second Advent. But the political upheavals at home and abroad led him back to his familiar theme in 1848. Yet there is a difference, not least in the general form of those works. Although his earlier work was always critical of too close an identification of prophetic detail with current politics, the generality of these later sermons is more marked, even though the motivation is a specific response to contemporary world events.

*A Sermon Preached on Passion Sunday, 9 April 1848. The Revelation of the Man of Sin, 2 Thessalonians 2:3-8*⁵⁶ is a patchwork of patristic references in which Dodsworth presents his earlier theory identifying the Anti-Christ with Apostasy, rather than a specific historical individual. Such a view had been his conviction throughout his ministry at least since the late 1820s. It is here given a particular context in the wave of European revolutions against divinely constituted authority in Church and State, as well as the social unrest and advance

of radical opinion in Britain. He sees a great confederacy against Christ and his Church in the manifestation of the Man of Sin identified with those forces of apostasy that endeavour to topple the headship of Christ in Church and State.

Similar concerns are expressed in Dodsworth's Advent course of sermons in the same year. It seems that until the end of his Anglican ministry he continued to use the Advent season as a vehicle for his teaching on prophecy. Indeed John Waller in his examination of these sermons says 'Dodsworth had demonstrated a sufficient capacity for Anglo-Catholic *action*; but in his *contemplation* he held tenaciously to a pre-millennialist zeal acquired years before in the heady company of... Edward Irving'.⁵⁷ Dodsworth begins: 'The stirring events which have been occurring throughout almost the whole of Christendom during the last year have naturally turned the minds of many thoughtful persons to the subject of Prophecy'.⁵⁸ In the first of those four sermons, he considers the political 'signs of the times'. As usual he outlines some principles of prophetic interpretation and sets these in the context of the war of opinion ravaging society. Dodsworth sees the certain signs of the Great Day approaching and he advises his listeners to prepare for trial. Despite its clear contemporary context, this sermon is more practical and pastoral in tone than his speculative and detailed scriptural expositions of the 1820s and 1830s.

The second sermon examines moral and religious 'signs of the times'. Revolution is a key theme. 'It is surely the lawless spirit which like an infectious disease, a moral plague has overspread the nations.'⁵⁹ There is more than an echo of his 1834 sermon 'Love God, Honour the King' in his use of biblical witnesses demanding subordination to higher powers. Traditional hierarchical, patriarchal structures must be maintained throughout Church and society from the humblest family to the sovereign. The same insubordination attacks religion, in that the creeds are ignored and private judgement leads to rampant

individualism. All this is an expression of the moral evil of self-will and love of self. The only remedy is a return to the 'faith once delivered to the saints'.⁶⁰

The same theme is pursued in the third sermon where ecclesiastical 'signs of the time' are considered in the context of growing apostasy. Thus Dodsworth's pre-millennialist scheme, as he had worked it out in the 1820s, remained substantially intact throughout his Tractarian period. He is strongly critical of the progressivist view that the whole world 'will be converted to true, hearty, evangelical obedience' before the Second Advent.⁶¹ Infidelity, not progress, will usher in the return of Christ. This is nothing less than the maintenance of his early pre-millennialist opposition to the moderate Calvinistic post-millennial optimism in which 'progress' and the spread of the Gospel would combine to bring in the Kingdom of God in a non-cataclysmic way. These are the same views that led him to identify with the Albury group in the 1820s and enabled him to assimilate the message of the early *Tracts*.

His opposition to what he now labels Evangelicalism reflects his Tractarian antagonism to the increasingly identifiable 'party' from which he was now well and truly estranged. It is difficult to give a systematic account of Dodsworth's attitude to Evangelicalism at this point in his life. He is critical of what he regards as party spirit and the individualism that ignores the role of Church and sacraments in the scheme of human salvation. Furthermore, although Dodsworth in the 1840s was concerned with the propagation and defence of Catholicism, this sermon reveals the extent to which that motivation was itself resting on the theological foundations of his early development. Dodsworth's concern and perhaps conviction regarding the detail of prophetic studies had to a degree waned during his Albany Street pastorate but these texts clearly demonstrate the extent to which the theological framework of his 'Irvingite' period remained intact. The emphasis was, however, changed. He continued to maintain that judgements would come upon the nations

before the Second Advent and included a footnote on the conversion of the Jews. The gospel will be preached and there can be no universal conversion. But a new note has emerged: 'In the nations of Christendom the vast majority of the population are without Church and without Sacraments in this great city, for instance, we see the masses practically without religion'.⁶² An important development has occurred within Dodsworth's eschatological schema for the focus is now on the Church. Whilst maintaining the traditional pre-millennial structure, the sacraments as the means to salvation have a pre-eminence which, although present even in his earliest works, are now combined with a pastoral programme firmly Tractarian. His complaint that even in his own parish a mere one in six attend public worship shows the change of focus in his millennialism. This is a new and distinctively Tractarian presentation of his adventism.

Overall, it is a familiar pre-millennialist picture that Dodsworth paints for his hearers. Only the coming of Christ as a world event can prevent the spread of such actions and ideas. It is difficult to separate the inherent pessimism of the pre-millennialist position from Dodsworth's own growing sense of disillusionment in the late 1840s. Certainly he took comfort in this reaffirmation of his deeply held convictions. Indeed as his position as a Tractarian was increasingly subject to self-scrutiny, the pre-millennialist schema that had played so central a role in his development facilitated his interpretation of the situation in which he now found himself. The new ecclesiological emphasis seen in these sermons impelled him towards the next and final stage in his spiritual journey.

The last of these Advent sermons on the Christian attitude to the 'signs of the times', Luke 21:28, rounds off the course with a firm emphasis on the need for sound doctrine and sacramental practice as the preparation for the coming Judgement. Here again we see the state of Dodsworth's mind revealed in his pessimism about the state of the contemporary

Church. The warnings about the role of Apostasy in the Advent of Christ that characterise all these homilies form the background for his actions during these crucial years.

5. Dodsworth and Manning 1835-1849 – Correspondence, Character and Travel

The role of friendship, correspondence and travel has been given considerable emphasis in the study of this first generation of converts to Rome.⁶³ Dodsworth is no exception in that these elements played an important part in the process that led to his conversion. At the same time they enable us to inquire into his personality and character. In a letter to Liddon from Dodsworth's daughter, written many years after his death, she refers to the strength of friendship between her father and Manning.⁶⁴ This celebrated friendship is 'set forth... in his intimate correspondence with ... Dodsworth...', and a review of this reveals the similar paths of both men as they moved towards Roman Catholicism in the 1840s.⁶⁵ It also throws light on Dodsworth's movements at home and abroad during this period.

There was clearly a deep respect between the two individuals. Manning gives us one of the few remaining word portraits of his friend. 'I knew him just about 1836, and soon became very intimate with him. He was a man of a strong clear but dry head, without imagination or fertility, but accurate and logical. His character was upright and truthful in a high degree and with a warmth of heart very rare. We travelled together in Normandy, in Scotland, and finally in Switzerland in 1847.'⁶⁶ It is significant to historians' perception of Dodsworth, or rather lack of it, that Manning's recent biographers, whilst drawing upon this correspondence, nevertheless give no consideration to their friendship. Yet it becomes apparent that Manning put considerable weight both on the very close interchange between them as well as upon their professional association. Dodsworth was one of a small group of intimates with whom Manning chose to bare his soul, especially in the years from 1845 until his conversion. In a letter of 1850 he says of Dodsworth: 'He has been hasty and rough, and I am grieved at it; but he has a manly and loving heart; and is true as day'.⁶⁷

Furthermore in another note he said: 'My chief correspondence with Dodsworth was from 1844 when I first knew that Newman was preparing to leave the Church of England. My letters show the waking and advance of my mind in 1847-1850, to the end.'⁶⁸

It seems likely that Manning and Dodsworth became acquainted during the initial period of their attraction to Tractarianism about 1835/36. Yet Manning had been made aware of Dodsworth during their Evangelical period, as is shown by a letter from S.F. Wood to Manning on 15 June 1832.⁶⁹ Purcell calls Dodsworth 'the outspoken' since he had 'warned Manning in bold but loving terms of the dangers of not listening to the dictates of conscience' (at the time of Dodsworth's conversion) and it is this forthright and fearless quality that seems to have attracted Manning to him, recognising him as a natural leader for the London forces of the Movement.⁷⁰ Manning's smooth and considered manner may well have found in Dodsworth an 'alter ego' that drew him on when his natural caution held him back. Dodsworth's Yorkshire bluntness seems to have elicited a deep affection and admiration from the future Cardinal. Their shared Evangelical formation enabled a depth of understanding to grow between them that is not evident in Dodsworth's correspondence with Pusey.

The earliest dated letter in the Bodleian collection of correspondence is 28 April 1837, from Dodsworth to Manning at Langton concerning events at the SPCK⁷¹ Already they were discussing questions of authority and, as the pace of correspondence quickened from December 1843,⁷² Dodsworth expressed his growing awareness of the difference between the Catholic teaching of the Church of England in her formularies and her members' ignorance of them. He lamented the growing toleration of atheism, deism and socialism, and felt that disestablishment might be inevitable, admitting 'I would not greatly deprecate such a result'.⁷³ An interesting throwback to the controversy that brought about Irving's condemnation surfaced in a letter at the end of 1843.⁷⁴ Manning affirms his agreement with

Dodsworth's sermon on the humanity of Christ, assuring Dodsworth of its orthodoxy. Yet, as Dodsworth does not seem to have published this sermon, it is tempting to conjecture that this was a sensitive subject that raised the spectre of his former association with Irving.

As the friendship deepened, Manning came to appreciate Dodsworth's often frank criticism of him, going so far as to write 'I pray of you to say all you can feel about me, and to believe that I count it a token of your brotherly love'.⁷⁵ It seems that Dodsworth's role as the more demonstrative character may have enabled Manning to explore suppressed aspects of his own character and spirituality. If this was the case it does much to explain Dodsworth's appeal as a preacher and spiritual director, to say nothing of his wide social popularity. Indeed it is mainly through Manning's notes and correspondence that we have access to Dodsworth's character. He appears forceful and dogmatic, an indication of his attachment to, and search for, authority in the ideological and moral sphere. Much of his appeal to the legal profession that characterised the congregations of the Margaret Chapel and Christ Church can be understood through Manning's descriptions. To Manning it was probably the upright and truthful nature of his character and thus the sincerity and convictions of his beliefs that made such a deep impression and this combined with the warmth and humanity of a family man accounts for the depth of friendship between them. It was also those qualities, contained in a gifted orator, that underlined his popularity as pastor and preacher. Many of these qualities played vital roles in the process of his conversion, not least his capacity for self-sacrifice that did much to heighten the admiration felt for him by his intimate friends and colleagues.

It is only during Dodsworth's last years as an Anglican that we get a real glimpse into his lifestyle. Even then it is an insight that has immediate bearing on his spirituality. The role of continental travel in the spiritual journeys of the first generation of Tractarians has already been mentioned. Dodsworth was Manning's companion not only on the continent

but also around Britain and the year 1844 saw the beginning of these important travels. On the 8 August Manning and Dodsworth attended the laying of the foundation stone of St. David's Church at Pantassa in Wales. Manning noted in his journal: 'long procession – banners, cross, stars, fleur de lis green and blue, vestments crimson, cross gold - ...clergy went first, with choir chanting the Te Deum in Welsh...very strange and striking to hear a priest in the open air and in a surplice ...speaking in an unknown tongue.' ⁷⁶ Such delight in Catholic worship is one indication of how these early Tractarian travels fed Dodsworth's growing need to express his developing theological position. For the rest of August they travelled in Scotland and in late summer they travelled to Normandy, including Rouen.⁷⁷

A further insight into Manning's influence on Dodsworth is provided in the following year (1845) when Newman's conversion led Manning to pen a 'confidential' letter lamenting that 'A storm is on us', and advising Dodsworth, that what is required is 'firmness, stillness, and sameness' for 'People are shaken, distressed and confounded' and ominously 'manyhave lost confidence in you'. Thus 'consolidate your own position' and, 'For this reason I would not suffer any change in worship or practice; nor be absent from your people'.⁷⁸ Manning was taking charge of the impulsive Dodsworth who had been shaken and felt beleaguered at Christ Church.

Dodsworth was especially supportive to Manning during 1847, the 10th anniversary of Caroline Manning's death and the year his mother died.⁷⁹ That summer, Manning embarked on one of the most significant journeys of his life, in which he would experience Roman Catholic faith and practice at first hand. He left for Italy via Germany on 5 July. Manning wrote in August asking Dodsworth to join him. The plan was for Manning to travel towards Switzerland and to meet Dodsworth at 'Mayance' (Mainz). From there they would travel together to Switzerland, the Italian Lakes and Milan 'within two months'.⁸⁰ However, as Manning fell ill,⁸¹ they returned to England, Dodsworth giving much

appreciated support to Manning.⁸² After a short stay in London Manning continued his continental trip, this time with his sister Caroline and her husband Colonel Austen: he was to be profoundly impressed by continental Catholicism and in Rome he would encounter Newman. Manning writing from Rome on 28 January 1848 mentions that Dodsworth had previously experienced some serious ill health unmentioned elsewhere, for Manning in recalling his own sickness says ‘I daresay you felt this when they sent you to Madeira’.⁸³

Questions of preferment in the Church had been troubling Dodsworth for some time. In July 1848 he again confided in Manning informing him that friends felt he should accept the newly proffered appointment as Bishop of Glasgow. At the same time Newman was writing to George Ryder, ‘They say that Dodsworth is the new Bishop of Glasgow’.⁸⁴ Dodsworth was too far gone in disillusionment with Anglicanism and told Manning, ‘What is the Ch of E. practically, but protestant and antagonistic to the rest of the Christian world?’⁸⁵. In August he was holidaying in Freshwater, on the Isle of Wight, but was unable to leave the discussion with Manning over the nature of the Church of England.⁸⁶ By December he felt the Church of England, ‘squeezed in all directions’, whilst he had just received a letter from one of his churchwardens (probably John Leslie) who ‘proclaims his adherence to Irvingism’.⁸⁷ This was a bitter irony for Dodsworth. Throughout 1849, Dodsworth and Manning continued to support each other as they became increasingly unsure of their position in the Church of England.⁸⁸ But the storm was about to break, and whatever temporary diversion this may have provided, it seems that overall Dodsworth’s travel, especially on the continent, by broadening his perspective on the nature and practice of Catholicism was far more of a contribution to his dissatisfaction with the Church of England than in any way a relief from it.

6. The Gorham Judgement – 1850 – Prelude to Conversion

Dodsworth's correspondence with Pusey, Manning and Newman during this period forms a regular and familiar source for historians concerned with the major figures involved in the Gorham crisis. Had this not been the case, it is doubtful if Dodsworth would have featured in the scholarship of the Movement even in his usual role of a very secondary character. To Dodsworth the crisis was the final resolution to the years of growing doubt regarding the Catholicity of the church of his baptism. His correspondence with Manning reveals the extent to which the crisis affected them in similar ways. His divergence from Pusey is likewise revealed in the letters to his respected colleague and friend. By following events through this correspondence and by examining his final sermons, we see the significance of the crisis for Dodsworth himself, rather than his usual portrayal as a minor player in somebody else's drama.

Briefly stated, the Gorham crisis broke upon the Church of England when Bishop Henry Phillpotts refused to install George Cornelius Gorham as incumbent of Brampford Speke near Exeter, being unsatisfied with his views on Baptism. Phillpotts maintained a 'high' understanding of the Prayer Book rites in regarding the sacramental action as instrumentally connected with regeneration of the candidate in Baptism. Gorham took a view common amongst Evangelicals that the Reformers did not intend this to be understood as conferring regeneration unconditionally. Having appealed against his Bishop's decision and lost in the first instance of the Court of Arches, Gorham's final appeal to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council was upheld. This judgement was announced on 9 March 1850. But the theological question was not a new one and the real issue for Dodsworth was clearly illustrated in his remark in a letter to Manning on 4 January 1850: 'If the church acquiesces, our path is plainer'.⁸⁹ It was not the question of right belief over Baptismal Regeneration that so much mattered, as the removal of the final decision regarding doctrine from the Church to a civil court. There was now almost daily

correspondence and on 9 January Dodsworth approved Manning's proposition regarding the oath of supremacy and declared that the time for talking was past.⁹⁰ His characteristic fighting spirit was being marshalled towards a last stand. This is clearly discernible in *The Things of Caesar, and the Things of God. A Discourse, preached in Christ Church, St Pancras, on Sunday, January 27th, 1850, with especial reference to the claim of the state to exercise power over the church in decisions of doctrine*. Dodsworth argues that doctrine is a supernatural revelation given through the Apostles to the church and therefore the recent intrusion of 'the civil power interfering in a matter which does not belong to it... is... giving unto Caesar the things which are God's.'⁹¹ He refutes a series of objections that understand the civil court to be dealing with the non-doctrinal aspects of the case, or merely interpreting the law of the land. For Dodsworth it is an inquiry into doctrine and the point at issue is whether the doctrine of baptismal regeneration is the authoritative teaching of the Church of England. Since this is 'a most vital doctrine' which 'lies at the foundation of all Christian teaching', he states it must be wrong for the state to decide about this for the Church.⁹² Dodsworth clearly did not accept the view that the Judgement was not the state deciding doctrine but adjudicating what was permissible within the doctrinal standards of the Church itself. So the basic objection is the temporal nature of the court. The result is irrelevant to him, the principle is at stake and he sees no way out of the difficulty other than 'the repeal of those laws which have thus, we may hope inadvertently, enslaved the Church to the State'. He admits 'I never was alive to the fact that by the law of this country a civil court could entertain and finally decide upon matters of the Church's doctrine...'.⁹³

J.M. Neale in a letter to B. Webb later that summer noted this naïve aspect in Dodsworth's reaction to the Gorham Case, in that he came to discover only very late what Neale claims both he and Webb had 'known ages ago...the reformers to be villains, and the Articles trash'.⁹⁴ Even so, Dodsworth had not at this point given up the struggle, urging his hearers

to take 'any measures, consistent with the laws of our country, and our loyalty as citizens to obtain redress',⁹⁵ including demands for 'A PROPER TRIBUNAL' to be set up for doctrine by '...the Church in Convocation or Synod'.⁹⁶ In the evening of the day on which the judgement of the Privy Council was announced (9 March) Dodsworth wrote jokingly upbraiding Manning for missing their (morning?) appointment. But it was laughter in the dark. 'Who could have suspected so much treachery to shelter itself under a Broad Brim... Did ever a Venerable Man conduct himself so before?',⁹⁷ a reference to Bishop Blomfield whom he had seen at 12 noon, when he had asked him to get 'a Synod to enact a more stringent Article', but the Bishop repudiated his idea and Dodsworth felt 'more than half a hypocrite in talking with him. Yet I can truly say I have never done one act inconsistent with the most devoted allegiance to the English Ch: But my heart now is wholly (almost) elsewhere'. Manning and Dodsworth both attended a meeting of clerics in the vestry of St. Paul's, Knightsbridge to discuss tactics and two days later it was decided to draft a declaration repudiating the Judgement. On 14 March in a letter to Manning marked 'private', Dodsworth confessed that the meeting's resolutions would need further qualification before he could sign them, for time was too short for him to wait for Parliamentary implementation. Yet he commended the plan to involve Keble. He also explained that he had not been told that the meeting to draft the resolutions had resumed the next night otherwise he would have attended even at great inconvenience.⁹⁸

On the day after the announcement of the Judgement, Dodsworth expressed his immediate public reaction in his sermon entitled, *A House Divided Against Itself*.⁹⁹ It is imbued with his disillusionment regarding the Church of England as unsound on matters of fundamental importance, especially a recent document signed by 'some hundreds of clergymen' stating that a Christian can only come to a right judgement on doctrine by reading Scripture for himself. Compared to his view of the verbal inspiration of the Bible even as late as the early forties, he has clearly travelled a very long way in his perception of the Scripture's

formation and role in the transmission of the Faith. ‘...the Christian rule of faith is that which was first delivered orally by our LORD Himself to the Apostles; which has been handed down to us by the Creeds of the Church, and which men are bound to believe on pain of GOD’S everlasting displeasure, whether *they can see it* in Scripture or not...’¹⁰⁰

However, according to Dodsworth, the greatest blame belongs to the hierarchy, not least the Archbishop of Canterbury, since a large number of persons deny the doctrine of baptismal regeneration, including, ‘...one, since promoted to the very highest position in this Church’.¹⁰¹ On the other hand Blomfield ‘has expressly taught us *ex cathedra* that it is “the plain doctrine of our Church that, Baptism is instrumentally connected with justification.”’¹⁰² Such episcopal disagreement is demonstration of the division of the Church, a fundamental division that is illustrated in the contradictory positions ‘Puritan’ and ‘Catholic’ parties have maintained since the Reformation. Dodsworth’s disillusionment is clear when he admits that whilst the ‘High Church movement’ has woken a dormant church, the authorities legalise and authorise division, a task made easy by the Articles and Formularies of the Church which were from the beginning designed to allow fundamental division on matters of faith.¹⁰³ The Gorham Judgement has merely revealed that truth and deadly error live alongside each other in a single communion. Both sides are placed in a new and impossible position where, in accordance with ‘the Gallio-like spirit of the times...all men may believe what they choose, and that all are equally right, who are equally sincere.’¹⁰⁴ Dodsworth calls for an immediate revival of the Church’s synods, ‘because where the wound is mortal without it, a remedy delayed is no remedy at all.’¹⁰⁵

It is clear from the tone of the sermon that Neale’s comment to Webb (above) was correct in observing that the Gorham crisis had brought Dodsworth to the realisation of the true nature of the Reformation settlement. Despite his advocacy of the ‘remedy’ of revived

synods, the logic of his position was untenable and indeed had probably been so for some time prior to the Judgement itself.

Dodsworth's inner struggle showed itself again when he wrote asking Manning's advice on the possibility of refusing to celebrate the Eucharist in his parish as a protest. Manning replied that to do so would contravene ecclesiastical law and warned his friend not to inflict 'our' problems on the laity. A better course of action would be either to resign or to cease either partially or totally personally to minister in the parish and to remove himself and his family from London. He begs him 'trouble not your Altar'.¹⁰⁶ On 20 March a declaration appeared in the *Times* requiring the Church of England to make an authoritative and orthodox doctrinal statement on baptismal regeneration. It was signed by Dodsworth, Manning, Pusey, and Keble, among other leading Tractarians.

By the end of March Dodsworth set out his own position in more detail in *The Gorham Case Briefly Considered*. The argument is substantially the same as his 10 March sermon, declaring that the Judgement endangers the Church of England's 'very existence as a Member of the Catholic Body'.¹⁰⁷ He attacks J.M. Neale's recent Tract with its 'imputation' of the personal motives of the judges as 'wholly unworthy of him'.¹⁰⁸ Blomfield is given better treatment and Dodsworth acquits him of any responsibility for the Judgement. The Archbishops are to blame. Dodsworth maintains that the underlying problem raised by the crisis is 'the repudiation of all dogma'.¹⁰⁹ If the situation cannot be altered either by the church authorities or parliament he should 'feel bound not to teach the doctrine of baptismal regeneration as her doctrine', other than as a private opinion.¹¹⁰ Such doctrinal confusion will result in the Church of England becoming 'destitute of the very semblance of those powers of grace and holiness for which our Divine Lord constituted His Church'.¹¹¹ In the second part of this treatise Dodsworth examines the historical, legal and constitutional aspects of the situation. He questions the Crown's jurisdiction in

spiritual matters, yet calls upon the monarch to summon a synod of bishops to settle the matter in an orthodox manner. He repeats the assertion from his earlier sermon that the Church of England is wounded 'in a most vital part'.¹¹²

Manning wrote from Lavington on 28 March (Maundy Thursday) of 'a sudden and sore affliction to us',¹¹³ and on 2 April (Easter Tuesday) in a letter marked 'secret' he laid bare his mind to Dodsworth and his resolve to 'stay awhile and see what others will do'. They intended to meet in London on 10 April.¹¹⁴ Meanwhile Dodsworth's sermons were causing concern, as they were increasingly perceived as unsettling the sisters and his congregation. Pusey told Keble that the sisters had considered not attending Christ Church under these circumstances.¹¹⁵ By this time Pusey's public stance on the Judgement was seen by Dodsworth as compromise. On 10 May Dodsworth wrote to Pusey, announcing a public letter against Pusey's understanding of the situation as set out in his recent publication *The Royal Supremacy*.¹¹⁶ He realised this would distress Pusey but he could not accept Pusey's views which sought to reconcile the Judgement with the orthodox doctrine of baptismal regeneration, so that 'I fear the result must be a separation between us on some things in which we have hitherto gone together. Wrong as we must each of us feel the other to be, I trust we shall never attribute to each other any but good motives and intentions'. He ends that he must follow 'faith whithersoever it shall lead me and at every sacrifice'. Dodsworth's apparently genuine generosity of heart and warmth of nature are here combined with a clear if indefinite declaration of his future course of action and the price that must be paid. The price would be higher than perhaps he realised. The letter signed 'Ever yours very affectionately' was to rupture one of the most harmonious and productive friendships of the early years of the Tractarian Movement.¹¹⁷ In fact the tone and content of the public letter was quite different from this private note.

In *A Letter to the Rev. E.B. Pusey, D.D. on the position he has taken in the present crisis*, 7 May 1850, Dodsworth claims that it is his 'painful' duty to answer Pusey's recent criticism of him. Pusey, in the postscript to *The Royal Supremacy* had censured Dodsworth's attack on his position regarding the Gorham crisis, an attack made by Dodsworth in his Eastertide sermon *Holy Baptism; the Grafting into Our Risen Lord* (see below). Dodsworth now endeavours to clarify the differences in their respective views of the implications of this judgement. It is clear that he regards Pusey as seriously underestimating the damage caused by taking a less than combative stance against the Judgement. Dodsworth accuses Pusey, 'you seem to shrink from the front rank. You seem ready to hide yourself under soft assertions of truths.'¹¹⁸ Dodsworth maintains that no matter how orthodox Pusey's own views on baptismal regeneration might be, the popular effect of his position can only undermine belief in the Catholic nature of the Established Church. He goes on to accuse Pusey not only of ignoring the pastoral needs of the Albany Street parishioners, but more significantly of endeavouring to maintain unity at the price of heterodox opinion. Furthermore, Dodsworth exposes Pusey to attack by opponents by listing his advocacy of Catholic practices including private confession, adoration of the Real Presence of Christ on the altar, the introduction of Roman Catholic books adapted for 'our Church' use and the encouraging of the use of rosaries and crucifixes. Thus the letter is much more than a criticism of Pusey's attempt at reconciling the Judgement with an orthodox understanding of Baptism. It can also be seen as an attempt to discredit Pusey's leadership of the Catholic party in the Church of England.

Liddon, noting the contrast between Dodsworth's private and public stance, accused Dodsworth of taunting Pusey for failing his friends at the critical moment, and believed that he intended by these comments to increase Pusey's difficulties. Liddon was at pains to defend Pusey's position against 'Mr. Dodsworth and his more impetuous friends', accusing Dodsworth of an 'exaggerated estimate of the error of the Judicial Committee.'¹¹⁹ It cannot

be denied that Dodsworth's words brought about immense mental suffering to Pusey in the welter of anti-Tractarian feeling and episcopal action that followed. Dodsworth could now lose nothing in his open admission of having used such controversial practices and it seems that his intention was to wound Pusey rather than heal the breach between them. It would be easy to excuse this as mere 'convert' behaviour but such a dismissal cannot obscure those aspects of Dodsworth's character that had already begun to emerge as the crisis gathered in strength, and now showed themselves in their full colours. The element of intolerance of alternative viewpoints had always been a central motivation in Dodsworth's psychology but had been balanced, even submerged, by the warmth of his character and perceived nobleness of spirit. The Gorham crisis seems to have so undermined his confidence in a system that he had genuinely accepted as 'Truth' that even the ties of long-standing friendship and the obligations of professionalism could not prevent him from quite deliberately using the very elements of that former shared belief and ministry publicly to shame and damage his 'opponent'. 'Spiteful' is too weak a word for his action, which rather suggests a pathological inability to tolerate close human contact with those whom he perceived as in fundamental disagreement or antipathetic to his belief system. Here is another key to the weakness and the strength of his faith.

Dodsworth was undoubtedly convinced of the rightness of his own position. In his pamphlet *The Gorham Case Briefly Considered*¹²⁰ and his Low Sunday sermon¹²¹ he stressed the inadequacy of the restatement of the doctrine of baptismal grace proposed by Pusey. Furthermore Dodsworth was stung by what he considered were Pusey's attempts at compromise with error. *A Letter to the Rev. E.B. Pusey D.D. on the position which he has taken in the present crisis* does suggest by its accusations that despite the warm sentiments of Dodsworth's private note, he had for some time been conscious of the need for such an attack. This is a view supported by a letter to Manning on Good Friday 7 April quoted by Purcell: 'Our late discussions have quite convinced me that if we mean to be faithful to our

Lord's Truth, we must break with Pusey and Keble.'¹²² Indeed as early as January he may have warned Manning against consultation with Pusey and Keble.¹²³

Perhaps the most valuable gauge of Dodsworth's theological position is his important sermon *Holy Baptism; the Grafting into our Risen Lord*. This is exceptionally valuable in demonstrating the close connection between Dodsworth's eschatological sacramentalism and his movement towards conversion. It is also the sermon to which Pusey referred in *The Royal Supremacy*. Liddon refers to it as showing Dodsworth's misunderstanding and mistaken criticism of Pusey for alleged compromise over baptismal regeneration.¹²⁴ The subtitle '...with especial reference to the proposal for the re-assertion of the doctrine of "the remission of original sin to infants in Baptism"', certainly refers by implication to Pusey.

The content of the sermon should be seen as a recapitulation of the whole theological process that led Dodsworth from radical Evangelicalism to his final conversion. Starting from the text Luke 24:5,6, he begins with the doctrine of the general resurrection of the dead, and there is an indication of his Irvingite heritage in the insistence upon the human nature of the resurrected Christ who 'still retained His hold upon the seed of Abraham, the faithful, the true Israel.'¹²⁵ Dodsworth argues that Baptism is the sacramental and mystical incorporation into the resurrection of Christ and the means of actual participation in the future general resurrection. It is '*a present entrance into the resurrection life of CHRIST*', 'the great principle of the Christian life'.¹²⁶ Thus the Risen Lord 'fills His sacred ordinances with His life and power',¹²⁷ so that 'If Holy Baptism does not convey regeneration, it is an un-christian thing. There is no consistent medium between the true Catholic view of the sacraments...and the view entertained by that Sect which repudiates them altogether.'¹²⁸

The sacrament is no mere form but both Baptism and the Eucharist convey what they signify, so that those who call baptismal regeneration ‘a soul-destroying doctrine’ have an inadequate understanding of the sacraments. For ‘you may see the total inadequacy of the remedy which has been proposed, - I deeply lament to say proposed by some who ought to know better, namely, - that as “the remission of original sin to infants in Baptism” has been denied; it would be sufficient if we could get that doctrine adequately asserted’.¹²⁹ Yet the vital point at issue, asserts Dodsworth, is that the Church must teach with its authority on this, the point of doctrine under attack. Whilst it is clear that Pusey’s position is under fire from the preacher, yet in so doing Dodsworth reveals his own theological presuppositions. Underlying his argument is the eschatological matrix of Dodsworth’s doctrinal formation with its divergence from mainline Evangelical teaching as a result of his Irvingite rediscovery of baptismal regeneration as the touchstone of sacramental and mystical understanding of the Christian faith. He asserts that all sacraments flow from Christ’s resurrection for ‘If the dead rise not in the Holy Font, by a spiritual resurrection, then is CHRIST not raised’. The doctrine is essential, central and ‘the very life of the Christian Church’ and the present crisis is ‘a blow which, if not averted, will destroy ITS LIFE’.¹³⁰ Most importantly we can identify the roots of this conversion process not just in his Tractarian ecclesiological development in the 1840s, but in the fundamental eschatological and sacramental reinterpretation of his Evangelicalism under Irving’s influence.

After Easter events developed quickly and the joint letter to Pusey from Allies, Maskell and Dodsworth regarding jurisdiction in which according to Liddon, ‘they argued-practically assuming the Papal theory’ against Pusey for giving absolution by virtue of Holy Order rather than by canonical jurisdiction.¹³¹ Liddon saw this as evidence for a deliberate and hurtful attempt to embarrass Pusey, as well as testimony to their near Roman Catholic doctrinal position. The split, foreseen by Dodsworth, possibly as early as January, was now a fact and Keble, upset and concerned for Pusey, counselled him to have

nothing further to do with them.¹³² Liddon's contempt for Dodsworth's action is expressed by his laying the blame on Dodsworth's 'invectives' for a widespread suspicion of Pusey and a consequent reinforcement of prejudice against the Movement. Indeed it seems clear that Pusey himself held such a view and expressed this to Keble.¹³³ The episcopal action that was to follow 'with the hope of destroying Pusey's influence' was in no small part due to Dodsworth and his friends.¹³⁴

Such perceived treachery, even hypocrisy on Dodsworth's part, justified or not, thus became an established tenet of Anglo-Catholic hagiography and historical perception through Liddon's analysis. It goes a long way to explaining the suppression of Dodsworth's reputation as a Tractarian and its treatment in his *DNB* entry (see next chapter). Purcell's positive treatment of Dodsworth as Manning's 'outspoken' friend and confidant must contrast with Liddon's portrayal of him as Pusey's failed colleague and spiteful opponent. While both are selective in the evidence they use to construct their portraits, it must be said that the contrast between Dodsworth's private note and his public letters opens up an aspect of his character that is not simply unattractive but reveals an ability to divorce personal affection from doctrinal conviction. This is not uncharacteristic of the man, either as Evangelical, Tractarian, or Roman Catholic, since for him dogmatic truth had always taken priority over personal feeling. It further explains his attraction and popularity as caring pastor, warm family man, yet an outspoken controversialist and preacher. It enabled him to make the personal sacrifices that were required by his conversion, not least his friendship with Pusey and doubtless many others. Even so, the unattractive nature of the attacks on his former mentor, their apparent premeditation and the seeming obsequious nature of his final correspondence with him were more than enough to throw the weight of historical opinion behind Liddon's condemnation of Dodsworth's action in this episode. Yet against this must be weighed Dodsworth's regret at the rift that had occurred between himself and Pusey and his attempts at repairing it.

Dodsworth did not remain in London to see the immediate effects of his 'action'. During May and early June he was in Paris, and then probably Tunbridge Wells, acting upon Manning's advice to distance himself at least temporarily from the parish, where his position was virtually untenable.¹³⁵ The consecration of St. Barnabas, Pimlico on Tuesday 11 June was the occasion of a display of Tractarian solidarity. Keble, Pusey, Neale, Upton Richards, Henry Wilberforce, Greasley and even Manning were involved. Dodsworth was not. Whilst it is entirely plausible that his trip to Paris entailed the refusal of an invitation, his action does seem to prefigure the process by which this Tractarian pioneer speedily marginalised himself and was soon officially forgotten by the Movement.

By 15 June he was back at his home in Gloucester Gate and advising Manning that they 'must not hesitate, if need be, to cut ourselves off from these persons who will not face the matter'.¹³⁶ Correspondence from Manning was now marked 'Most Private' and involved the theological outpourings of Manning's state of mind.¹³⁷ Perhaps it is a sign of the extent to which both men had misgivings over the Pusey affair that Dodsworth was not a little hurt by Manning's accusation that he had been 'violent and impatient' in the matter. However the discussion now tended to range over such considerations as the repeal of the Henrician Supremacy statutes, even though Dodsworth admits 'No, it can never be'.¹³⁸

The forces of protest against the Gorham Judgement consolidated in a meeting on 23 July at the concert hall of St. Martin's in Long Acre. Dodsworth wrote to Manning on 24 July saying 'I must soon act',¹³⁹ indicating that he did not hold out much hope for this gathering. Indeed Manning's letter of the same day concentrates on Pusey's reaction to Dodsworth's letter and reveals Manning's role as arbiter and peacemaker who now confessed that it would be a great consolation to bring 'two friends so dear to me', to an adjustment of their differences.¹⁴⁰ The following day he enclosed a fair copy of a letter they had talked over at 'your club', which included Dodsworth's acceptance of Pusey's

explanation.¹⁴¹ On 26 July Dodsworth could inform Manning of a reconciliation and that all was fully agreed.¹⁴² Yet such a reconciliation, if indeed this is the meaning of Dodsworth's words in these letters, does not seem to be substantiated in any other sources. It is difficult to make sense of them in view of later published controversy between the two men. During the night after the 23 July meeting, Manning had drafted a declaration that they considered the royal supremacy to apply to temporal accidents of spiritual things, and that they could not recognise the power recently exercised, a declaration that Purcell says Dodsworth may have influenced by advising Manning not to consult Pusey and Keble over its drafting.¹⁴³

Before leaving to holiday in Freshwater early in August, Dodsworth had received a call from his friend Bellasis on 26 July, to whom he confided that the only solution to his predicament was 'submission to the Catholic Church sooner or later', not that he had ever consulted with Catholic priests on the subject, nor attended a Catholic service in England.¹⁴⁴ Yet his procrastination continued throughout the summer and on 7 September he wrote from Freshwater to Manning stating his intention to resign by the end of the month.¹⁴⁵ About this time Dodsworth's wife had returned to London to stay with her mother, Lady Buller, due to 'alarming accounts' of his wife's niece who was to die in childbirth soon after. Dodsworth had discussed his future plans with his wife, although he did not think he would tell her mother.¹⁴⁶ By now it is clear that Dodsworth's mind was made up but he was unable to decide how and when to submit to Rome. During the summer Dodsworth had frequently expressed his growing aversion to returning to active ministry at Albany Street, yet on 18 October after four days of 'intense suffering' he told Manning he would resume his duties 'pro tempore'. Even so if Manning was considering a continental trip he would wish to accompany him. He had been 'really ill, and unfit for anything'.¹⁴⁷ At the end of October he resumed his duties at Christ Church where he remained until his last sermon on 8 December.¹⁴⁸ Manning left Lavington on 3 December

and stayed in London with his sister, thus enabling more frequent meetings with Dodsworth.¹⁴⁹ Manning's move seems to have pushed Dodsworth into action after his long procrastination. On Christmas Eve he told Manning 'I feel more and more the claim of the Catholic Church. It is the Voice of our Lord, how may we for one moment resist it?'¹⁵⁰ Their proposed plan to travel again was cancelled as Dodsworth felt it better to be with his wife at this crucial moment. Nevertheless Christmas was a miserable time as even spiritual comfort was denied him, since he had for 'so long' debarred himself from Holy Communion.¹⁵¹

The Manning correspondence is perhaps the best mirror of Dodsworth's inner struggle following the Gorham judgement. It was by his own admission a year of great turmoil and pain, marked by his final struggle with the Church of England, in which his fighting spirit flashed out almost for the last time. Despite his increasing awareness of the impossibility of his position, he nevertheless tried to 'buy time' in a last ditch attempt to remain – at least for a while – in the Established Church. Indications of Dodsworth's inner dilemma had been evident earlier in the year, when in April Blomfield entered into correspondence with Dodsworth about his views on the Gorham case.¹⁵² Yet the Bishop later told William Palmer that Dodsworth had asked him for six months leave of absence from his parish in early November and that Dodsworth's intention had been to take 'a calm and considerate view of our present difficulties'.¹⁵³ However Dodsworth subsequently changed his mind and on 7 December had visited the Bishop to inform him of his doubts about remaining in the Church of England in view of the question of the exercise of the royal supremacy. The Bishop had told Dodsworth that if he had the very opinions he charged Pusey with holding he could not consistently continue to officiate as an Anglican cleric. A few days later Dodsworth informed the Bishop of his continued intention to resign. So Dodsworth's resignation followed in the week after his last sermon on the morning of Sunday 8 December. It is clear from Blomfield's account that Dodsworth was not concrete about his

plans even as late as November and resignation prior to his move towards Rome seems to have been influenced by Manning's in early December. Yet the Manning correspondence makes clear that Dodsworth's doubts were well established in the first half of the year, as is borne out by his attitude to preferment. When asked during May to be Dean of the new Episcopalian Cathedral in Perth he refused.¹⁵⁴ He had shown no previous negativity towards the Scottish Episcopalians, so such a refusal may have been a consequence of his failing confidence in the claims of Anglicanism. Furthermore as the year progressed he had withdrawn from the London Church Union,¹⁵⁵ and his general disengagement as from the time of the Judgement announcement is obvious enough.

The publications and correspondence of 1850 give a clear picture of Dodsworth's move towards conversion. Yet this process must be set in the context of his earlier ministry. The issue of authority that lay at the heart of his personal struggle in the last months of his Anglican life, rested on the deeper issues of his own journey from Evangelicalism through its radical rethinking under eschatological and incarnational Irvingism to Tractarian sacramentalism. That the Gorham Judgement revolved around the issue of Baptismal Regeneration was therefore no coincidence since this was an aspect of Irving's radicalism and central to Dodsworth's own theological development. As these tensions surfaced, Dodsworth's frustration and procrastination in the second half of 1850 not only reveal much about his character but also the inevitability of his conversion.

¹ J. S. Reed, *Glorious Battle*, p.39.

² H.W. Burrows, *Half Century of Christ Church*, pp.24,25.

³ J. Coombes, *One Aim, Edward Stuart*, 1975, p.17.

⁴ William Elsworthy, quoted by Burrows, *op.cit.*, pp.20,21.

⁵ J.F. White, *The Cambridge Movement*, 1962, chapter two.

⁶ K. Carter, *St. Paul's Knightsbridge*, p.10. See also F. Bennett, *The Story of W.J.E. Bennett*, 1909, pp. 81,193.

⁷ A.M. Allchin, *The Silent Rebellion*, 1958, p.64. See also, T. J. Williams and A.W. Campbell, *The Park Village Sisterhood*, 1965, p.49 footnote.

⁸ CCAS Preachers' Book, Christ Church.

- ⁹ B.C.A. Windle, *Who's Who of the Oxford Movement*, 1926, p.156.
- ¹⁰ G. Rowell, *The Vision Glorious*, Oxford 1983, p.167.
- ¹¹ CCAS Preachers' Book.
- ¹² P.B. Nockles, *The Oxford Movement*, p.11.
- ¹³ *Ibid*, p.310.
- ¹⁴ *Ibid*, p.314.
- ¹⁵ *Ibid*, p.326.
- ¹⁶ H.W. Burrows, *op.cit.*, pp.73,74.
- ¹⁷ F.L. Cross, ed., *The Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church*, Oxford 1958, p.1442.
- ¹⁸ J. Coombes, *op. cit.*, p.8.
- ¹⁹ *Ibid*, p.10.
- ²⁰ *Ibid*, p.11.
- ²¹ *Ibid*, p.13.
- ²² J.F. White, *op. cit.*, p.168.
- ²³ J. Coombes, *op. cit.*, pp.16,17.
- ²⁴ *Ibid*, p.27. Stuart adopted Eucharistic vestments in 1864 and the use of incense in 1866.
- ²⁵ P.F. Anson, *The Call of the Cloister*, p.226.
- ²⁶ PP, WD to EBP, Whitsunday Eve, 1844.
- ²⁷ PP, WD to EBP, Fragment, 1844.
- ²⁸ PP, WD to EBP, 20 October, 1844.
- ²⁹ PP, WD to EBP, 21 February 1845.
- ³⁰ PP, WD to EBP, Date uncertain.
- ³¹ PP, WD to EBP, 3 March 1845.
- ³² PP, WD to EBP, 5 March 1845.
- ³³ PP, WD to EBP, 14 March 1845.
- ³⁴ PP, WD to EBP, 9 April 1845.
- ³⁵ PP, WD to EBP, 15 and 24 April 1845.
- ³⁶ PP, WD to EBP, 3 September 1845.
- ³⁷ PP, WD to EBP, 28 November 1845.
- ³⁸ PP, WD to EBP, 23 November 1845.
- ³⁹ PP, WD to EBP, 28 November 1845.
- ⁴⁰ T.J. Williams and A.W. Campbell, *op. cit.*, pp.50,51., also PP.WD to EBP, 24 October 1848.
- ⁴¹ MP. HEM to WD, 25 June 1845, and 28 January 1848.
- ⁴² WD *The connection between outward and inward worship, A sermon preached in the parish church of New Shoreham on Thursday January 21st, 1847, on the occasion of offering a New Organ for the Service of Almighty God*, Brighton, 1847.
- ⁴³ H. Cheal, *The Story of Shoreham*, Hove, 1921, p.167.
- ⁴⁴ *Ibid*, p.205.
- ⁴⁵ W. Wheeler, *Sermons preached in the Parish Churches of Old and New Shoreham, Sussex*, Brighton 1847.
- ⁴⁶ H.Cheal, *op. cit.*, pp.198,202.
- ⁴⁷ WD, *The connection between outward and inward worship etc.*, pp.3,5.
- ⁴⁸ *Ibid*, p.12.
- ⁴⁹ *Ibid*, p.13.
- ⁵⁰ *Ibid*, p.14.
- ⁵¹ *Ibid*, pp.14,15.
- ⁵² *Ibid*, p.15.
- ⁵³ *Ibid*, p.16.
- ⁵⁴ *Ibid*, pp.19,20.
- ⁵⁵ An unbound tract in the Scott Collection formerly in Sion College Library. This publication is not listed in the British Library Catalogue. See *GD*, vol.3, p.611, 4 April 1847.
- ⁵⁶ This publication is also not listed in the British Library Catalogue, but is included in WD, *The Signs of the Times*, see below note 58.
- ⁵⁷ J.O. Waller, 'Christ's Second Coming: Christina Rossetti and the Pre-Millennialist William Dodsworth', *Bulletin of the New York Public Library*, vol.73,1969, p.481.
- ⁵⁸ WD, *The Signs of the Times, Sermons Preached in Advent 1848*, 1849, preface.
- ⁵⁹ *Ibid*, p.25.
- ⁶⁰ *Ibid*, p.30.
- ⁶¹ *Ibid*, pp.35,36.
- ⁶² *Ibid*, p.49.
- ⁶³ D. Newsome, *The Parting of Friends, A Study of the Wilberforces and Henry Manning*, 1966.
- ⁶⁴ PP, O. Philips to Liddon, 8 August 1887.
- ⁶⁵ E.S. Purcell, *Life of Cardinal Manning*, vol.1, p.217.

- ⁶⁶ *Ibid*, p.547, footnote.
- ⁶⁷ *Ibid*, p.548.
- ⁶⁸ *Ibid*, p.548, footnote.
- ⁶⁹ *Ibid*, p.92.
- ⁷⁰ *Ibid*, p.595.
- ⁷¹ MP, HEM to WD, 28 April 1837.
- ⁷² MP, HEM to WD, 6 December 1843.
- ⁷³ MP, WD to HEM, 7 December 1843.
- ⁷⁴ MP, HEM to WD, 30 December 1843.
- ⁷⁵ MP, HEM to WD, 13 June 1844.
- ⁷⁶ E.S. Purcell, *op. cit.*, p.287.
- ⁷⁷ MP, HEM to WD, 13 September 1850.
- ⁷⁸ MP, HEM to WD, 27 October 1845.
- ⁷⁹ MP, HEM to WD, 22 June 1847.
- ⁸⁰ MP, HEM to WD, 8,14 August 1847.
- ⁸¹ E.S. Purcell, *op. cit.*, p.547, footnote.
- ⁸² MP, HEM to WD, 24 September 1847.
- ⁸³ MP, HEM to WD, 28 January 1848.
- ⁸⁴ *LDJHN*, vol 12, p.242, 12 July 1848.
- ⁸⁵ MP, WD to HEM, 18 July 1848.
- ⁸⁶ MP, WD to HEM, 17 August 1848.
- ⁸⁷ MP, WD to HEM, 5 December 1848.
- ⁸⁸ MP, HEM to WD, 5 September 1849.
- ⁸⁹ MP, WD to HEM, 4 January 1850.
- ⁹⁰ MP, WD to HEM, 9 January 1850.
- ⁹¹ WD, *The Things of Caesar and the Things of God. A Discourse preached at Christ Church, S. Pancras, on Sunday, January 27th, 1850.* p.12, 1850.
- ⁹² *Ibid*, p.14.
- ⁹³ *Ibid*, p.17.
- ⁹⁴ K.E. Mason Neale, ed., *Letters of John Mason Neale*, 1910, p.144.
- ⁹⁵ WD, *op. cit.*, p.18.
- ⁹⁶ *Ibid*, p.22.
- ⁹⁷ MP, WD to HEM, 9 March 1850.
- ⁹⁸ MP, WD to HEM, 14 March 1850.
- ⁹⁹ WD, *A House Divided Against Itself, a Sermon Preached on Sunday, March 10th, 1850*, 1850.
- ¹⁰⁰ *Ibid*, pp.6,7.
- ¹⁰¹ *Ibid*, p.7.
- ¹⁰² *Ibid*.
- ¹⁰³ *Ibid*, pp.10,13.
- ¹⁰⁴ *Ibid*, p.14.
- ¹⁰⁵ *Ibid*, p.17.
- ¹⁰⁶ MP, HEM to WD, 16 March 1850.
- ¹⁰⁷ WD, *The Gorham Case briefly considered in reference to the judgement which has been given, and to the jurisdiction of the court*, 1850, p.3.
- ¹⁰⁸ *Ibid*, p.7, footnote.
- ¹⁰⁹ *Ibid*, p.21.
- ¹¹⁰ *Ibid*, p.16.
- ¹¹¹ *Ibid*, p.25.
- ¹¹² *Ibid*, p.33.
- ¹¹³ MP, HEM to WD, 28 March 1850.
- ¹¹⁴ MP, HEM to WD, 2 April 1850.
- ¹¹⁵ H.P. Liddon, *op. cit.*, vol.3, p.261.
- ¹¹⁶ E.B. Pusey, *The Royal Supremacy not an Arbitrary Authority but Limited by the Laws of the Church, of which Kings are Members*, Oxford, 1850. See also P. Nockles, 'Pusey and the Question of Church and State', in *Pusey Rediscovered*, ed. Butler, P., 1983, p.288.
- ¹¹⁷ PP, WD to EBP, 10 May 1850.
- ¹¹⁸ WD, *A Letter to the Rev. E.B. Pusey, D.D. on the position which he has taken in the present crisis*, 1850, p.17.
- ¹¹⁹ H.P. Liddon, *op. cit.*, vol.3, p.264.
- ¹²⁰ WD, *The Gorham Case briefly considered in reference to the judgement which has been given, and to the jurisdiction of the court*, 1850.

-
- ¹²¹ WD, *Holy Baptism, the Grafting onto our Risen Lord, an Easter Sermon for 1850, with especial reference to the proposal for the reassertion of the doctrine of the 'Redemption of Original Sin to Infants in Baptism.'* 1850.
- ¹²² E.S. Purcell, *op. cit.*, vol.1, p.540.
- ¹²³ MP, WD to HEM, 4 January 1850.
- ¹²⁴ H.P. Liddon, *op. cit.*, vol.3, p.265.
- ¹²⁵ WD, *Holy Baptism; the Grafting into Our Risen Lord. An Easter Sermon for 1850*, 1850, p.5.
- ¹²⁶ *Ibid*, pp.6,8.
- ¹²⁷ *Ibid*, p.10.
- ¹²⁸ *Ibid*, p.12.
- ¹²⁹ *Ibid*, pp.14,15.
- ¹³⁰ *Ibid*, p.16.
- ¹³¹ H.P. Liddon, *op. cit.*, vol.3, p.265.
- ¹³² *Ibid*, p.266.
- ¹³³ *Ibid*, pp.279, 292.
- ¹³⁴ *Ibid*, p.270.
- ¹³⁵ MP, HEM to WD, 14 June 1850.
- ¹³⁶ MP, WD to HEM, 15 June 1850.
- ¹³⁷ MP, HEM to WD, 11 July 1850.
- ¹³⁸ MP, WD to HEM, 20 July 1850.
- ¹³⁹ MP, WD to HEM, 24 July 1850.
- ¹⁴⁰ MP, HEM to WD, 24 July 1850.
- ¹⁴¹ MP, HEM to WD, 25 July 1850.
- ¹⁴² MP, WD to HEM, 26 July 1850.
- ¹⁴³ E.S. Purcell, *op. cit.*, p.541.
- ¹⁴⁴ E. Bellasis, *Memorials of Mr. Serjeant Bellasis, 1800-1873*, p.81.
- ¹⁴⁵ MP, WD to HEM, 7 September 1850.
- ¹⁴⁶ MP, WD to HEM, 21 September 1850.
- ¹⁴⁷ MP, WD to HEM, 18 October 1850.
- ¹⁴⁸ CCAS Preachers' Book.
- ¹⁴⁹ R. Gray, *Cardinal Manning*, p.137.
- ¹⁵⁰ MP, WD to HEM, 24 December 1850.
- ¹⁵¹ MP, WD to HEM, 30 December 1850.
- ¹⁵² Fulham Papers, Blomfield Correspondence, Lambeth Palace Library, vol.49, pp 251,252, Blomfield to WD.
- ¹⁵³ *Ibid*, vol.51, pp.164,165, Blomfield to W. Palmer, 2 May 1851.
- ¹⁵⁴ E.A. Towle, *John Mason Neale D.D, A Memoir*, 1906, p.182.
- ¹⁵⁵ PP, EBP to J. Keble, 23 September 1850.

CHAPTER EIGHT: ROMAN CATHOLIC PERIOD 1850-1861

1. Context and Criteria

Although this period was of considerable significance in Dodsworth's life, it is possible to construct little more than an outline of his career and home life. This is due to the scarcity of surviving sources. There are good reasons for this paucity of evidence, not least the relative obscurity into which he passed as a result of the required renunciation of his clerical orders on becoming a Roman Catholic. The results of this were far reaching indeed, especially to him personally. From the historian's perspective, the effect is not only to obscure his early career and contribution but to give an overestimation of his contribution to contemporary Roman Catholicism. The years 1852-1856 when he retired into a quiet and very private life are virtually inaccessible.

The question of his literary activity is central to any assessment of his role within Roman Catholic life, yet even here there are problems, primarily in the lack of material. A search through contemporary periodicals produces a small, if significant, yield. Adding this to a very slim set of free-standing published works, this raises the question of the extent to which we can make accurate judgements about his contribution. Nevertheless this has to be attempted and consequently it seems useful to divide Dodsworth's activity into four roughly discernible chronological periods, each defined by his progressive self-understanding as a Roman Catholic.

The first period corresponds with the year 1850-51. This is defined by Dodsworth's conversion and reception into the Roman Catholic Church, and the short period of self-

explanation or perhaps affirmation expressed in his 'apologia' to his former congregation as well as his aggressive engagement with his former colleague Pusey.

The second period is less easy to define but corresponds with a period of inactivity, emotional suffering and retirement abroad. These 'silent' years 1852-56 were marked not only by personal tragedy, but also seem to have been a time in which Dodsworth was searching for a new identity in the very changed circumstances of being a Roman Catholic layman.

The third period, 1857-1858, was short but significant and marked a turning point in Dodsworth's life. Perhaps in an attempt to recover from his wife's death in 1856 Dodsworth resumed his dormant literary activity. This period requires special attention as much of his later reputation as a 'Catholic writer' seems to rest upon it. The death of his wife opened at least the theoretical possibility of ordination. This may have been a period of resolution of inner personal conflict and integration.

Finally, the years 1859 to his death in 1861, constitute a period of physical decline, during which Dodsworth's attempts to contribute to the Roman Catholic Church and to find recognition within it were cut short in further personal tragedy.

If the sparse nature of available evidence is a hindrance to our evaluation of Dodsworth's Roman Catholic period, one particular aspect of his life stands out. It is clear from his publications and correspondence that his distinctive eschatological perspective was the theological driving force behind his conversion and life as a Roman Catholic. This perspective was in continuity with his earlier convictions. It is paradoxical that this theological evolution which brought about so much disruption in his ecclesiastical life and career was also the thread of continuity that bound together his whole life.

In this detailed review of his life and achievements during this period we will view Dodsworth and his family within the context of converts to Roman Catholicism in general. Pauline Adams has provided some useful criteria for this and these have been adapted to assess the nature of Dodsworth's Roman Catholic experience.¹ These are the extent, composition and impact of the convert community; patterns of reception: the role of the convert's family; and the plight and life-style of convert clergymen.

It will become clear that despite some important atypical features, overall Dodsworth fitted a very widespread pattern. He was one of some three hundred and fifty Anglican priests who were received into the Roman Catholic Church between 1833 and 1860.² J. Bossy has done much to fill in the picture of the composition of the English Roman Catholic population, but it still remains difficult to estimate the proportion of converts in relation to the total Catholic community.³ This is partly due to the clergy's unwillingness to keep a detailed record of conversions. Oakeley himself expressed strong opinions against such a practice, with the result that even at the time exact figures were unobtainable.⁴

Pauline Adams points out that the Oxford Movement converts provided a university-educated professional middle class which could have helped the English Catholics meet the Anglican establishment on its own ground, not least in terms of apologetics or even polemics. In practice the hierarchy did not utilise the converts as a resource. Dodsworth is an interesting case, in that despite his considerable theological output as an Anglican, he seems to have published comparatively little as a Roman Catholic. Yet the fact that he published theological works at all may be an indication of the exceptional nature of such activity on the part of a Roman Catholic layman at this time. Indeed the later classification of him by his co-religionists, as a 'Catholic writer' on so little ground bears out Adams' arguments that the English hierarchy did not encourage or utilise the talents of their new converts.

The question of the impact of the converts on the English Roman Catholic community is therefore a complex one. Adams argues against them having had any strong effect, since the church was growing at this time quite independently of the relatively small number of conversions from Anglicanism.

Certainly Dodsworth's Roman Catholic career as interpreted by a later generation has successfully masked the limited contribution he was able to make at the time. It is difficult to see how he could have had a significant impact given the paucity of his theological output and the circumstances under which he lived out his life as a Roman Catholic. Given what we have seen of his ability, influence and considerable contribution to the Church of England during the previous thirty years, Adams' assertion that, 'Statistically their effect was indirect and largely illusory... they gave a spurious credibility to assertions of Catholic progress in the nation at large',⁵ seems credible.

2. Conversion and Reception : December 1850 - January 1851

As we have seen Dodsworth's conversion had been a long process, parallel to Manning's in many respects, but his reception took place some months earlier than his. It is best documented in his own words through his correspondence with Manning, and also with Newman with whom he had not been in contact since the latter's reception in 1845.

On 28 December 1850 Dodsworth finally told Manning in an emotional letter, 'The darkness lasts still, but not without some short-lived gleams of light, when I seem to see my way so clearly as to dispel all doubts and hesitations.' Even so his mind was clearer, and he would 'call on Dr. W. on Monday'. He feared dying unabsolved since he was now sure that the Church of England denied the reality of penance as a sacrament. His thoughts dwelt on the Incarnation, 'if we really believe the Incarnation, can we doubt the truth of

Transubstantiation?'. He ended with the plea. 'Whatever I do – you will not forsake me, or love me less'.⁶

This matches a letter written to Manning at the end of his first month as a Roman Catholic when Dodsworth wrote that '...the reality of the Incarnation is so overpowering in Catholic worship'.⁷ Both before and after his reception he gives this doctrine a central place in his conversion process. This bears out the vital role that his belief in the Incarnation had played throughout his theological development. It was the uncharacteristic attention he gave to this doctrine in the late 1820s and early 1830s that marked him out as a very atypical Evangelical. His absorption of Irving's incarnational theology was given expression in his incipient sacramentalism at the Margaret Chapel and drew him into the Tractarian Movement. The same understanding of the Incarnation as the Christian doctrine par excellence mediated through the sacramental system of the Church was at the heart of his reasons for becoming a Roman Catholic.

By 30 December he had seen Cardinal Wiseman and knew that he was to be received at 12 o'clock on the last day of the old year. Even then he told Manning 'Pray don't let this separate us'.⁸ The question of who received Dodsworth remains uncertain. Adams notes that Dodsworth's former parishioner and friend Serjeant Bellasis was 'sent to Father Brownbill with a letter of introduction from Cardinal Wiseman'.⁹ The Jesuits were certainly amongst the foremost of the religious orders in receiving wealthy converts and Fr. Brownbill had a reputation for receiving large numbers of them. No records exist today of Dodsworth's reception but his attachment to Farm Street points in that direction.¹⁰ It is unlikely that Dodsworth would have undergone a long period of catechesis, although practice varied. Wiseman and Brownbill both took the view that this was unnecessary in the case of most educated converts from Tractarianism.¹¹

Newman had already sent a letter to Dodsworth through Allies and Dodsworth wrote to him a 'kind letter' and 'that his outward trials were great'. Now Newman wrote from the Birmingham Oratory on the first day of the New Year. 'Indeed I do not undervalue the great sacrifice you are making from obeying the divine call made to you, and it has long seemed to me that these were as great as have been exacted of anyone, if not greater.'

Whilst this problem refers to Dodsworth giving up Anglican ministry and preferment, it is also more significantly the first reference to a recurrent theme in the Roman Catholic experience of Dodsworth. His married status would prove to be a cause of intense frustration as an automatic bar to ordination and the exercise of any effective ministry in the Roman Church. It is in this warm letter that Newman recalled their earlier friendship and regretted, 'having had so few opportunities ever of personal intercourse with you', yet recalled his estimation of him as a preacher and his role in giving 'the call to weekly communion' in the Church of England. He recalled the 'kind answer' Dodsworth had made when Newman had informed him of his conversion and, '... then there was a long silence, and now you are returning the letter of announcement I once sent to you, and after an interval which to all but the God of Grace and Searcher of Hearts seemed to be barren and uneventful, at length are called to obey a voice which at an earlier time had spoken to me.'¹²

Newman was himself both aware and sensitive to the position of men such as Dodsworth. Writing to Mrs. William Froude many years later he remarked, 'Again, when I think of the grievousness of such men as Dodsworth and H. Wilberforce being cast out as useless into idleness and hopeless obscurity in the prime of life and in the midst of work, I cannot help longing for some plan, which would obviate so great a loss of power, and, what I must call, a scandal'.¹³

Newman seems to have embodied such sympathy in an increasingly warm friendship and correspondence as well as lending what support he could to Dodsworth's inclusion in such of his enterprises and activities as a layman could usefully contribute. His little flatteries and endearments belie a genuine but telling concern for the self esteem of his distinguished friend.¹⁴

Dodsworth meanwhile wrote to Manning on 1 January, thanking him for his 'few kind words' and that 'my outward trials are softened', yet, 'they perhaps touch even more than before'.¹⁵ Dodsworth was not exceptional in finding his conversion a bittersweet experience. So widespread was this, that various books such as E.G.K. Brown's *Trials of Faith, or the Sufferings of Converts to Catholicism*, 1860, chronicled these 'confessors' for the faith.¹⁶ Pauline Adams has suggested a number of reasons why the married, convert clergymen experienced such acute suffering. They shared the general social disabilities of the converts as a group, loss of status, professional occupation, and social isolation in a society that placed immense value on religious unanimity. To these in Dodsworth's case were frequently added the pains of division within the family. In 1854 he reported to Newman that 'with the exception of my two boys, who are hearty Catholics, all are still held in the meshes of Protestantism', and he felt that such indifference to Catholic truth was 'a just visitation for the slow dull ear which I so long turned to His truth'.¹⁷ A further source of tension was the isolation of converts from their new co-religionists. Newman's experience is well known, but Adams points out that this was an almost universal pattern amongst the ex-Anglicans who were seen as a threatening force from an alien world. Consequently the ex-Tractarians were forming themselves into a distinct and cohesive group within English Roman Catholicism.¹⁸ Dodsworth was not untypical of this group when he wrote to Manning, 'I think almost the only drawback which I find is in Catholics themselves', and despite blaming himself for not making new friends, he still longed to see

old friends like Manning whom he pleadingly asked, 'I will see you anywhere when you will it...'.¹⁹

In addition to all these difficulties the married convert clergymen faced the trauma of becoming a layman. Many ex-clergy did not seek ordination for a variety of reasons.²⁰ Henry Oxenham remained convinced of the validity of his Anglican orders, whilst George Ryder even following his wife's death chose to remain a layman, to care for his young family.²¹ Dodsworth was like so many debarred because of his married status.

In view of the Roman hierarchy's inability to act despite their awareness of the problem, various converts did attempt self-help. The main outlets were writing, lecturing, charitable work and semi-pastoral work. Henry Wilberforce proposed a scheme to enable former Anglican clergy to be licensed to preach and conduct missions in their former parishes. It got nowhere. Others proposed schemes to raise money for the building of a grand cathedral in England.²² Wilberforce spent two years editing the *Catholic Standard*, and the *Rambler* was a convert-dominated periodical. Newman had planned to take over the *Dublin Review* in 1850 as a vehicle for the married converts.²³ Dodsworth seems to have been very much on the edge of such enterprises, making a small contribution to the periodicals and publishing four known works (see below). Even so, this demonstrates an awareness and interest in such convert activity and he maintained a lively correspondence on such matters with Newman.

3. 1851 – Reaction and Apologia

Whatever Dodsworth's personal inner suffering, he occupied the first year as a Roman Catholic in the continuation of his contest with Pusey, and supplemented his pamphlet 'warfare' with his own indictment of the church he had now left. If this was the beginning of his reputation as a 'Catholic author', then it was certainly in the controversialist mould.

Liddon traces the course of this 'warfare' noting how Blomfield in his charge to the diocesan clergy on Saturday, 21 November 1850 in St. Paul's Cathedral used the material contained in Dodsworth's public letter earlier in the year to upbraid Pusey.²⁴ Blomfield wrote to Pusey on 3 December concerning Dodsworth's allegations regarding Pusey's private teaching. The Bishop requested an explanation for such views as he considered to be irreconcilable with the teaching of the Church of England. Pusey replied in mid January 1851 referring to points brought up 'ad invidiam' by Dodsworth.²⁵

Dodsworth published his reply at the end of May as *A few comments on Dr. Pusey's letter to the Bishop of London*. It went through three editions. The style is combative from the opening remark, 'Dr. Pusey has a peculiar style of writing: some may consider it an excellence, others a defect'.²⁶ Dodsworth further remarked to the effect that Pusey has to say everything that can be said on any topic he writes about, and thus he, Pusey, has found it necessary to expound himself further on a statement contained in a letter to Dodsworth published *eight* months ago. Furthermore Dodsworth affirmed that as an Anglican he had believed in baptismal regeneration as fundamental Anglican doctrine as well as having considered himself a priest ministering the sacrifice of the altar, 'But I never imitated Rome, nor adopted a language or phraseology peculiar to Rome'.²⁷

Such a reiteration of Dodsworth's position may well be interpreted as his own need to vindicate himself in an increasingly bitter atmosphere. Liddon²⁸ claimed that Pusey had to reply in his *Renewed Explanation*²⁹ in view of the bitter suspicions with which he was now regarded having been created by those men who had been associated with him as friends.

In *Further comments on Dr. Pusey's Renewed Explanation*, Dodsworth answered Pusey point by point on the eight beliefs and practices that now formed the raw material of the controversy. The first point, confession, enables Dodsworth to recall an incident involving

one of the 'lay sisters' at Park Village who could not accept Dr. Pusey's requirement of confession, and was thus required to leave, which she did. Dodsworth remarks 'Dr. Pusey tells me he does not remember this case'.³⁰ Yet Dodsworth suggests that despite both thinking each other wrong, could they not do so in charity? This passage is a vivid insight into Dodsworth's psychology for he goes on to venture that such an 'act of love' would in fact demonstrate the unsoundness of the other's position. For him there can be no reconciliation not built on Catholic truth, and Pusey's views are not that. Indeed, '...whatever may be said in favour of a downright bald protestantism, there is no system more untenable than the one which is so much identified with the name of Dr. Pusey.'³¹ Such a system endeavours to build up a Catholic superstructure on a Protestant foundation, a veritable house built on sand. Even so, he asks Dr. Pusey's forgiveness if he has pained him 'unnecessarily', and may God pardon both of their errors in this time of heavy trial for them both.

Something of the emotional torture that seems to have characterised much of the remainder of Dodsworth's life is here plain to see. Dodsworth's combative character, once aimed against the enemies of his Tractarianism, was redirected towards his former colleague and friend. This private engagement between the two men was by its very nature conducted in the public arena and the criticisms that lay at the heart of Dodsworth's attack on Pusey had already been given a wider context in: *Anglicanism considered in its Results*, to which we now turn.

The author describes himself 'late perpetual curate of Christ Church, St. Pancras', and the work is specifically dedicated 'to the Members of the Congregation of Christ Church, St. Pancras' whom he addresses as 'My dear Friends'.³² Although no date is given for this address to his former flock it seems to have been written soon, if not immediately after, his conversion as it is clearly intended to be an apologia, explaining his motives and actions.

As ever, their erstwhile pastor uses the 'explanation, objection, answer' method and this tract reads like one of his sermons.

The grounds of his conversion are established as Christocentric. He traced his change of mind from the 'branch theory', regarding the Church of England as 'the true Church of Christ in this country', teaching and holding 'all Catholic truth'. But 'by very slow degrees' after reading and consideration of recent events, he had been led to his present position.³³ The results of the Gorham case were the proximate cause.

He still places much weight on Scripture, claiming that the Evangelicals professed to regard the Bible as the rule of faith yet repudiated the Church which gave them the Bible. Thus he regards the Church of England as not scriptural, as he had once firmly believed. As we have seen, the period after Newman's conversion marked a definite shift in his convictions about this fundamental basis of belief. A positive note is struck by his contention that Anglicanism leads people to Catholicism because of the 'Church principles' it teaches, though it is doubtful if he included this remark for the comfort of his former colleagues.

It is clear that this work reflects the resolution of much of Dodsworth's thought during the later part of his Christ Church ministry. So many of the doubts that resonated in his last Anglican publications are here resolved in the rest of the work which consists of five theological contentions, on the heretical non-Catholic condition of the Church of England. The first on the unity of the church rejects any notion of the Church of England as part of the Catholic Church despite the wishes of some within it to believe that it should be so. Dodsworth firmly now rejects the 'branch theory' of the church, and the *Via Media* position as ignoring the practical and contemporary effects of Reformation error within the

established church. Appeals to Scripture and early tradition are 'uncertain and unsatisfactory'.³⁴

In the second section, he notes the 'feeble and even equivocable' nature of the Anglican formularies', which reject or distort baptismal regeneration, real presence and eucharistic sacrifice.³⁵ With his familiar concern for the practical reality of the situation, sections three and four reiterate his perception of the Erastian nature of the institution and the interference of the state in what he regards as purely spiritual matters. He concludes in the fourth section with a consideration of the doctrine of the Thirty-Nine Articles of Religion. Once the context of his previous five or more years of struggling with these questions is assumed, there is little in this treatise to surprise the reader, and most of his points are a clear statement of his theological position arrived at during the period before and following the Gorham Judgement. His motivation was that of a convert desiring both to justify his action and perhaps to bring as many as possible like minds to the position he now held. Implied criticism of the position held by Pusey is never far from the surface and the overall polemical nature of the work is obvious enough.

4. Convert Life Style 1852-1856

The year 1851 marks the end of Dodsworth's effective contact with Anglicanism. He never resumed his direct attack on his estranged friends and former colleagues, and when in 1857/58 he briefly returned to publication it was very much as the 'Catholic writer'.

This silence of some six years is significant, given that Dodsworth had published on a regular basis since the late 1820s. Yet it does not indicate any lessening of his interest in theological debate. Rather he was necessarily frustrated in any public expression of it.³⁶ In March 1851 he was corresponding with Newman on the question of Christ's human knowledge. There may be something of an echo here of Irving's heresy that cost him his ministry in the Scottish Kirk. Dodsworth had probably shared that heretical viewpoint

regarding Christ having assumed our fallen human nature at his Incarnation. His questioning of Newman does not directly touch upon this, but it seems that he had been reading J.B. Morris *Jesu the Son of Mary* (1851),³⁷ and Newman's reply firmly rules out the Irvingite position in the course of his answer to Dodsworth's question as to the extent of Christ's human knowledge.

Dodsworth spent the summer in Torquay, but by the latter part of the year circumstances seem to have led to his taking up residence in Italy on Lake Como.³⁸ The reasons for this are not hard to see. The strain of events had taken their toll on Dodsworth and the premature deaths of both his wife in 1856 and eldest son in 1859 suggest that ill health may have dogged the family throughout this period. It is not unreasonable to conjecture that the effects of emotional stress due to the disruption of these years took a heavy toll on Dodsworth, his wife and children.

Pauline Adams states that 'the family of William Dodsworth left their London vicarage for a peripatetic life on the continent, impoverished by a conversion which neither his wife nor any but two of his children shared'.³⁹ This is to paint a somewhat misleading picture, since there is no evidence to suggest that Dodsworth was impoverished by his conversion. Indeed he returned to his York Terrace house⁴⁰ and left a substantial sum of money at his death.⁴¹ However, Adams does draw attention to an important aspect of convert life and a further clue to Dodsworth's reasons for living abroad.

Many converts chose to live on the continent and communities of ex-Anglicans could be found in several parts of France and Italy. Such a choice had the advantages of avoiding the painful realities of social estrangement and exclusion that would have faced them at home. Dodsworth like many of his fellow converts had travelled on the continent during the period prior to his conversion and indeed, as with many others including Manning, it

must have played a part in that process. The Catholic cultures of the continent also reduced the day to day tensions of living in a Protestant society. The climate was kinder, especially to the ailing. Rome was especially attractive and was ‘crowded... with English converts from every rank in society’ according to a *Times* correspondent in 1851.⁴² Such a picture helps us understand the motives for Dodsworth’s time abroad and especially his attraction to Rome where he doubtless discovered the sense of solidarity amongst his fellow ex-Anglicans that attracted them to that city. Certainly they received attention from the Papal court and must have felt much more valued than by the English Catholics at home.⁴³ Dodsworth spent some time in that city and travelled in the south of Italy, in Naples and Ravello near Amalfi where he witnessed the miraculous blood of St. Pantaleone.⁴⁴

On 20 June 1854 Dodsworth had written from Como to Newman who was endeavouring to include Dodsworth’s sons in his project for a Catholic University. At that stage only his two boys had followed his example of becoming Catholics.⁴⁵ In fact despite Dodsworth’s intention of sending his sons to the projected university this hope was never realised. He had been in Como for two years and at some point after the summer of 1854 he returned to living in London. His son’s death certificate in 1859 states that the boy had suffered from ‘Hematuria, Disease of the Heart’, for four years, but it is not clear when, if at all, the boy, or the rest of the family including Dodsworth himself, returned to permanent residence in England.⁴⁶ Pauline Adams notes the role played by converts in the setting up of alternative education for this group whose children were now denied the advantages of Establishment education. Dodsworth was no exception. The question of where his sons were in fact educated remains open, although he may well have followed the practice of other wealthy converts and arranged for private tuition.⁴⁷

Elizabeth Dodsworth died from a long term chronic chest condition on 26 October 1856, just two days before their twenty-sixth wedding anniversary.⁴⁸ Although she had not

previously followed her husband into the Roman Church, a 'few weeks' before her death she made her submission. Newman speaks of this event in a letter of 30 November 1856: 'I heard yesterday for the first time the account of Mrs. Dodsworth's conversion – she was in her last illness – and, to Dodsworth's surprise, for I *conjecture* he had not (what he might think) uselessly teased her, she suddenly asked him whether he thought she could be saved out of the Roman church. *He said he would not pronounce upon it, in the case of individuals. And I think I heard the conversation ended without result – Presently, she got him to send for a Priest*'.⁴⁹ Curiously his wife was not buried where Dodsworth himself was to be buried five years later in St. Mary's Roman Catholic Cemetery at Kensal Green. The possible explanation is that her Protestant relatives insisted that, despite her death-bed conversion, she be buried other than in a Catholic cemetery, possibly in one of the family locations outside London.

5. Renewal 1857-58: Dodsworth as Catholic Writer

The emotional effect on Dodsworth must have been considerable, yet he was heartened and changed by her conversion and according to Oakeley, 'It is well known that the greatest sorrow which remained to Mr. Dodsworth after his conversion, was in, the course of time exchanged for a corresponding and proportionate joy. The excellent partner of his affections was happily received into the Church a few weeks before her death. This happiness was almost as unexpected as it was great. I have heard Mr. Dodsworth say that he had no idea of the change going on in his wife's mind till she announced to him, during her last illness, her resolution to become a Catholic'.⁵⁰

Oakeley in writing this passage in Dodsworth's obituary contrasts it with Dodsworth's post-conversion period when 'his gait of depression, and countenance of agony at this period' was 'a gait of crushing affliction; a countenance which was a speaking tablet of days and nights of anxiety' - the result in Oakeley's view of the willing sacrifices he had

made in submitting to the Faith. The implication is that his wife's conversion was in some sense a new beginning for Dodsworth, outweighing the human tragedy of her death.

Certainly the evidence does appear to point to a renewed sense of purpose and activity from 1857 given that the years abroad and the waiting upon the inevitable result of his wife's illness were past. This is reflected in his correspondence with Newman during 1857, in which Dodsworth unsuccessfully suggested to Newman that he might use the Authorised Version of the Bible as the basis of a new Catholic edition of Scripture. During this period they were meeting from time to time and Dodsworth was making financial contributions to various Catholic causes.⁵¹ He spent part of the summer of 1857 in Tunbridge Wells. Something of the old Dodsworth of pre-conversion days can be glimpsed during this time.⁵²

Pauline Adams suggests that the 'bonding' experiences of suffering, foreign travel and social isolation, gave a strong sense of community to ex-Tractarian converts.⁵³ It may be that Dodsworth's experiences had brought him to a new sense of adjustment and integration by the time he returned from several years abroad. Dodsworth, like other ex-clerics, and perhaps on the advice of Newman, now made a concerted effort to use his writing talents in the service of the Roman Catholic faith. As can be seen (below) from his first publication in 1857 (the second came in the following year) the 'dormant' years since his last work undertaken at the time of his conversion had not made such a task easy. There is a stiffness and lack of vitality about his work that contrasts with his earlier Anglican writing. Although his advancing years and failing health might explain this, it is also true to say that further explanation of the nature of these publications is due to their origin as a layman's work, in contrast to the pastoral or homiletic origins of his Tractarian publications. These had been scholarly but essentially preached works, exhibiting the vitality of his parish ministry and oratorical skill as a popular communicator. As a Catholic

layman such an avenue of creativity was closed to him and the quality of his writing suffered accordingly. Yet these two works do represent a genuine attempt to harness his former skills in the service of Roman Catholic apologia. If the first publication is a rather dry essay, his second of 1858 is a much more lively and engaging work forged in the heat of controversy carried on in the pages of the *Union* newspaper. It was typical of Dodsworth that he could best display his talents when facing an opponent. This was as true of the young 'Irvingite' as of the Catholic convert. The difference between these two works of 1857 and 1858 is an excellent demonstration of this lifelong characteristic.

Popular Delusions Concerning the Faith and Practice of Catholics was Dodsworth's first published work as a Catholic writer since 1851. It is properly understood in the wider context which John Wolffe has explored - namely the development of anti-Catholicism in Britain during this period.⁵⁴ Although the roots of the conflict lay with the Reformation, this force in British society and politics received new life from the 1820s onwards, not least through the energetic activity of the Reformation Society. Dodsworth's former colleague Hugh McNeile was prominent in these activities.⁵⁵ Whilst attributing much of this to factors within contemporary Evangelicalism, Wolffe maintains that militant anti-Catholic Evangelicals emerged in the 1820s as a 'product of theological questioning from within the movement, the intensification of religious conflict in Ireland, and the understandable, but still unexpectedly belligerent, response of Roman Catholics in England to Protestant attacks'.⁵⁶ From the period of Emancipation, Catholics had responded to organised attacks such as those that came from Reformation Society platforms. Figures like the Revd. Thomas Michael McDonnell (1792-1869) had both endeavoured to give a voice to the Catholic cause and also to meet Protestant polemicists as equals on the 'broad ground of religious liberty'.⁵⁷ The years that followed saw a developing polemical warfare, often populist but sometimes scholarly. Peter Toon has mapped some outlines of the Evangelical position in this interchange although, as Wolffe notes, this is largely within the

context of the Evangelical response to Tractarianism and further work on Roman Catholicism is needed.⁵⁸

Dodsworth's publications belong within this tradition and should be viewed as such, although his status and experience as an ex-Tractarian convert clergyman gives a specific slant to his use of this genre. The work, comprising some 59 pages of closely argued text, is a fairly substantial argument intended both to explain and defend the truth of Catholic belief. It is aimed at the educated Protestant laity, and Dodsworth's pen comes to life in those points where he is refuting perceived Protestant error. Although Dodsworth had clearly read Newman's *Lectures on the Present Position of Catholics in England* (1851), there is little dependency. The work consists of an extended Introduction, and nine points about which the writer believes Protestants are misinformed or hold erroneous opinions.

The Introduction begins by setting the tone thus: 'Of all the hindrances to the progress of Truth, perhaps PREJUDICE is the greatest.'⁵⁹ Protestants have a false set of preconceptions about Catholicism, but this is only partly due to ignorance, for many will not listen to the voice of the church but prefer to remain in their prejudices, many of which are 'of the most absurd and groundless character.'⁶⁰ A footnote recalls how in 1855 a University Sermon by the Bishop of Oxford, Samuel Wilberforce, on the anniversary of the Gunpowder Plot misrepresented Robert Wilberforce's (then still an Anglican) book on the Eucharist, and thereby the Catholic doctrine of the Eucharist as wafer worship and idolatry.⁶¹

By page nine, Dodsworth is refuting such accusations as Spooner's assertion that Newman had constructed 'dark cells' for murdering children at Edgbaston.⁶² Likewise Dodsworth tells of his former patron Henry Drummond who had apparently spoken in the House of Commons of Catholic gentry putting out their daughters to 'nurseries of vice and impurity.'

with no other motive than to save the cost of their maintenance.’⁶³ Dodsworth remarks that he had himself been the object of prejudice since his conversion and now wishes to demonstrate the falsity of such views.

He deals with eleven Protestant ‘Objections’ beginning with the cultus of the Blessed Virgin Mary. This is an unremarkable exposition of the Roman Catholic doctrine in which he incidentally refers to ‘high churchmen, who adapt Catholic books of devotion’ by omitting references to the Mother of God.⁶⁴ Perhaps he remembered his own practice with the Park Village Sisters.

Transubstantiation follows and in both this and his work of the following year he links this doctrine with the Incarnation as a ‘mystery revealed to our faith’.⁶⁵ Indulgences, then Scripture, come next. He goes out of his way to explain the value and importance Catholics place on the reading of Scripture as rightly translated and interpreted by the Church and is at pains to emphasise the role of education in Catholic circles. There is more than an echo here of his correspondence with Newman regarding the ‘King James’ Catholic version of the Bible.

There follows a section on Catholic morals, including the distinction between mortal and venial sin, in which he relies heavily on the moral theology of St. Alphonsus Liguori. A section on oaths and then the infallibility of the Pope are explained. This is very much a systematic response to the usual contemporary agenda of anti-Roman Catholic polemic.

In the next section ‘On Formality’ he remarks that there is ‘In the whole of London. I believe, there is to be found but one small chapel in which communion is administered every day’ according to Anglican rites.⁶⁶ This raises the question of the daily Eucharist in the Church of England at that time. Was Dodsworth accurately informed on this point, and

to which 'chapel' did he refer? At this point some important detail regarding Dodsworth's sojourn abroad during the previous years is revealed by a reference in this section to himself as assisting at early Mass in several churches in Rome. 'And in every church in Rome, in which I have assisted at early Mass, there have been always some communicants.'⁶⁷ But the real point of this section is to demonstrate the wider use of communion by Catholic laity compared to Protestants. A similar, though less credible, claim is put forward for preaching, which he asserts is more in use amongst Catholics than among Protestants.'⁶⁸

He finishes in autobiographical vein, 'I will conclude by expressing my own strong conviction, which many former years of pleasant intercourse, may entitle me to express, that there are hundreds, I believe I might safely say thousands of English Protestants who would joyfully sacrifice, what so many of their brethren have sacrificed - ties of relationship, sweet friendship, money, worldly position - nay, all that this world can give or promise, in order to embrace the Catholic religion, if they could once see it as it really is - full of TRUTH, HOLINESS and BEAUTY - the true Spouse of Christ, the depository of grace, and the sure and only way of everlasting salvation'.⁶⁹ However difficult it may be to evaluate the effectiveness of such ripostes to Protestant objections and attacks on Roman Catholicism, Dodsworth clearly believed he was engaged in a worthwhile and necessary enterprise.

In 1858 he published *Popular Objections to Catholic Faith and Practice Considered*. Dodsworth seemed to be growing in confidence and consequently this work, of some forty-five pages, is rather different in tone from his 1857 publication. The apparent inspiration for this work had begun with a controversy carried on by Dodsworth with an anonymous Protestant opponent in the columns of the *Union* newspaper.⁷⁰ This is more like Dodsworth at his best and much of the old fire which was first seen in a similar type of correspondence

in the pages of the *Morning Watch* some thirty years before. This is his last published work and the opening paragraph resounds with the theological theme that had dominated his life and underlies his whole career: 'We are all hastening onwards to the decisive day when our everlasting condition of happiness or misery will be assigned to each of us. There will be no party strife. There will be no arguing for victory... We are all hastening onwards to a tribunal at which a Judge presides unto whom all hearts are open, and by whom the test of Truth will be applied to every word and work of man.'⁷¹ With its echoes of the Prayer Book Communion Service, this makes a fitting start to his last publication and his best Catholic work.

The treatise is divided into five parts or 'complaints' frequently brought against Catholics. Despite a humble tone in which he admits that some Catholics may have a 'wrong spirit and a perverse mind', yet he unashamedly admits he intends to point out faults on the Protestant side.⁷² He complains that despite Wiseman's and Newman's writings on the Catholic faith, Protestants continue to ignore what they say. He instances Wiseman's second volume of 'Essays reprinted from the Dublin Review', and Newman's 'Difficulties of Anglicanism.'⁷³ He interprets this supposed silence as a deliberate Protestant tactic to avoid a fair discussion. This is further compounded by Protestants' refusal to acquaint themselves with the 'real tenets of Catholics'.⁷⁴ Dodsworth had clearly occupied himself by reading widely in the area of Protestant controversialism, although it is an indication of the depths to which both sides could sink that he seriously instances a story of a Protestant clergyman obtaining Roman Catholic hosts and examining them under a microscope for traces of Christ's body.⁷⁵ He calls for fair play and asks his opponent to remember 'that we have really all one interest' – to be judged by the one truth.⁷⁶

The first of the 'complaints' concerns the 'Catholic Rule of Faith', which is to be found 'in the Holy Scriptures, and in the Tradition of the Church'.⁷⁷ This is an interesting discussion

rejecting the Protestant view of the Bible as the sole rule of faith. Dodsworth argues that Protestants delude themselves by claiming that they have no 'living tradition' by which they interpret the Scriptures.⁷⁸ His views of the origin of the New Testament had come a long way from his early view of Scripture as he asserts that 'Even the first book of the New Testament was not written until long after Christianity had been taught and established, and even centuries elapsed before the Canon was finally fixed...'.⁷⁹ He is aware that 'a small section of the Church of England...' endeavours to interpret Scripture 'by the tradition of the first ages'.⁸⁰

Yet this is not a 'living tradition' and there is no agreement between those who hold this 'Anglican high-church theory' which 'rather aggravates than solves the difficulty'. He cites J.B. Sumner, S. Wilberforce and Pusey as well as Dr. Cumming, a Scotch Presbyterian, as holding very different understandings of the primitive church and its beliefs.⁸¹ Alas 'they practise as plain a deception upon themselves as the most violent ultra-Protestant who professes to take the Bible alone for his rule.'⁸² His former colleagues, by teaching this view that he had himself held for most of his ministry, merely add 'the Fathers' to the ultra-Protestant theory.

For Catholics there can only be one 'authoritative interpreter' and this rule of faith is consistent with 'Scripture, history and common sense'.⁸³ Dodsworth then discusses this in some detail, paying attention to the objection that such 'new doctrines' as the Immaculate Conception are additions to the original deposit of faith. Dodsworth asserts that this Marian doctrine 'is as old as the Gospel itself'.⁸⁴ In dealing with the formation of the canon, he exhibits a rudimentary knowledge of contemporary biblical criticism, relating successive periods of oral tradition, collections of writings, and finally an authoritative canon. The Bible Society receives a small jibe at this point along with his former colleagues whom he terms a 'comparatively small knot of men, however learned and excellent'.⁸⁵

The second 'complaint' concerns the authority on which the Catholic rule of faith rests. He rejects the low-church Anglican and Dissenting location of authority in individual interpretation.⁸⁶ It is fair to say that Dodsworth, at least from his so-called Irvingite period, had regarded such a view with suspicion and accepted the role of the church as having a special place in interpretation of Scripture. He then attacks the 'high-church' view that such authority became dormant due to the schisms in the undivided church after the first six centuries.

He admits that, whilst some clergy endeavour to teach something like the Catholic faith in one parish, the Anglican layman cannot hope to find necessarily such views in another. Compared to this confusing situation the Catholic faith is 'clear and simple'. 'All is plain and straight forward'.⁸⁷ He meets various objections, such as the existence of heresy and deals at some length with the location of the 'Voice of the church' in Pope or General Council. This objection 'from the atmosphere of ignorance'⁸⁸ seems to have been a special contention of 'this anonymous writer in the *Union* newspaper'.⁸⁹

The third section deals with 'the most popular argument against the Catholic Church', 'The improbability or unreasonableness of many of her doctrines.'⁹⁰ Again, an autobiographical note creeps into Dodsworth's wistful remarks that 'Catholics who enjoy the happiness of having been taught by the church from their earliest years, can scarcely imagine the force which such objections have upon the minds of those who have been educated as Protestants.'⁹¹ The argument then turns on the supposed Protestant rejection of the supernatural: 'Protestantism has so far ignored the supernatural in things present, that belief in them cannot be obtained without the greatest revulsion of mind.'⁹²

Perhaps Dodsworth reveals here his painful experience during those last years of his Anglican ministry. It was an experience apparent in his New Shoreham sermon of that

period in which he struggled to plant the sense of mystery and transcendence in the minds of his hearers and an end to which all his liturgical 'advances' at Christ Church had been aimed.⁹³ Even in his Albury period he had sought to reawaken a sense of the transcendent in the Church of England, not least by his early sacramentalism that led to his establishment of the Holy Communion as the main Sunday service in the early 1830s. This sense of mystery and the supernatural, the breaking in of the eternal into the temporal and physical, lies behind his emphasis on the Incarnation and his sacramentalism. It is not attributable merely to the Romanticism that accompanied the Gothic and Tractarian revivals but derives, in Dodsworth's case, from his attachment to the ultimate supernatural event, the second coming of Christ and the establishment of his Kingdom.

Given the vital role of the Incarnation in this dogmatic schema, it is not surprising that Dodsworth now accused Protestants of not believing in it. Although they 'profess to believe', in fact they have no real understanding of the 'very foundation of Christianity', thus 'No doubt they sincerely think that they believe it', yet in fact 'they have never *realised* the fact and doctrine of the Incarnation'.⁹⁴ Although this section tries to show the underlying roots of Protestant misunderstanding of specific Catholic beliefs, Dodsworth reveals his own presuppositions regarding the transcendent nature of religious belief, that brought him from the extreme wings of the Evangelical movement through Tractarianism into the Roman Catholic Church.

Section four deals with 'Alleged uncharitableness', because of the exclusive claims of the Catholic faith that outside of the Church there is no salvation.⁹⁵ He answers the charge by pointing out that the Church allows exceptions to the general rule.

A strong concern of Catholics during this period seems to have been the accusation of 'Alleged laxity in morals' (fifth complaint).⁹⁶ Dodsworth answers this common slur with

an argument used by many controversialists of the time that comparative statistics show the morals of Ireland and England do not bear out such an accusation. Once again it seems he has been stung into argument by the 'objection of an opponent'.⁹⁷ He goes to further lengths to dismiss the offensive suggestion that convert clergymen are prone to moral laxity. He points out that such men 'had come to a conscientious conviction that they had long been...living under a deception; that the body which they mistook for the Church is in fact no Church at all, but a pretender to that which it is not'.⁹⁸ He argues that the pressures and deprivations of their new condition might well lead them into a moral decline. 'Anglicans seem often to forget that clerical converts can only regard themselves as laymen, and must consider it blameable affectation to conduct themselves otherwise than as laymen'.⁹⁹ Hence we find a recent Anglican writer¹⁰⁰ censuring the clerical converts for their 'dress, habits and amusements', forgetting that a Catholic cannot regard their former ministry as sacred and therefore cannot justify any distinctiveness in dress or manner of life. Adams points out that this question of clerical converts' moral decline was a serious issue, a concern still being voiced by Fr. Ryder of the Birmingham Oratory as late as 1879 in an article entitled 'Ritualism, Roman Catholicism and Converts'.¹⁰¹

Dodsworth's own painful experience of the previous few years is all too apparent, yet he is upheld by his conviction that 'Protestant *opinion*' is just that, whilst 'Catholic *faith*' is 'of God' and 'empowers me and authorises me so to speak' allowing him to draw this work to an end on an apocalyptic note looking forward to the day when such 'opinions' will be 'driven as chaff before the wind', whilst 'THE WORD OF OUR LORD ENDURETH FOREVER'.¹⁰²

From the opening paragraph of *Popular Objections* with its references to the Last Judgement, Dodsworth establishes the ground of his argument that the context of Catholic *apologia* is the ultimate question of human destiny. This had been the starting point for

many of his eschatological publications from his Albury period onwards. Throughout his Tractarian period his Advent sermons continued this theme and gave context to his ministry at Albany Street. In the end his conversion to Roman Catholicism turned on this same pivot of the 'End' to which his individual destiny as a Christian tended. Whilst this is obviously true of converts in general, Dodsworth's expression of his deepest motives continued to take this eschatological form as indeed it had done since his first involvement with 'Prophecy'.

1858 was certainly a year of renewed literary activity for him. In August he contributed to the *Dublin Review* on Woodgate's *Anomalies*,¹⁰³ and engaged in a public correspondence with Bagshawe in November that was continued until the spring of the following year,¹⁰⁴ Dodsworth's contention being that the Catholic Church was not hostile to scientific enquiry.¹⁰⁵ It is to this flourish of activity that Dodsworth's reputation as a Catholic writer seems to owe its origin. Yet is it justified? On what basis does it rest? The *Dictionary of National Biography* entitled him so and put much emphasis on this aspect of his life. Likewise in W.G. Gorman's *Converts to Rome, a Biographical List of the More Notable Converts to the Catholic Church in the United Kingdom During the Last Sixty Years*, published in 1910, Dodsworth is termed 'theological writer'.

Both these works have done much to set the tone of Dodsworth's 'memory' in the twentieth century, yet their assertions appear to rest on an insubstantial basis of evidence. Oakeley's obituary for Dodsworth is the earliest appraisal of his life and that from a Roman Catholic viewpoint.¹⁰⁶ It is a loyal, carefully worded piece, yet it provides perhaps the fullest and most intimate account of the man and his personality that we possess beyond the glimpses gained from the Manning correspondence. Despite Oakeley's clear intent to portray his old colleague as an exemplary Catholic layman, he does not, amongst all his attributes and good works, make even a passing reference to any literary

contribution to the Catholic cause. Indeed he stresses how the 'controversial' side of Dodsworth's Protestant ministry was replaced by a singularly acquiescent and disengaged attitude. The thrust of Oakeley's account of Dodsworth's Catholic life was one of retirement and distancing from public affairs or controversy.

The evidence of the *Dublin Review* and Newman's letters do something to counterbalance this impression, yet the list of published works in the British Library Catalogue speaks for itself, with nearly forty listed works as an Anglican between 1829 and 1850, (plus at least two other known works unlisted), compared with only five listed Catholic works between 1851 and 1861, his death.¹⁰⁷ Three of these were written as part of his controversy with Pusey and the immediate consequences of his conversion. Thus only two works, in 1857 and 1858, can be classed as Roman Catholic theological writings in any real sense. Furthermore, as we have seen, these two late works fall short of the quality displayed in most of his earlier productions, in as much as they tend to repeat the familiar and unoriginal arguments of most other contemporary controversialists. Oakeley's own words seem to confirm this when he writes of Dodsworth's post-conversion career as a layman: 'He had no views, but to act in the spirit of obedience; and he seemed to feel that the truest happiness, as well as the highest duty of a convert, is to leave "private judgement" behind him in its native home and congenial atmosphere.' And 'Like all conscientious and thoughtful men who are not under the dominion of the Church, he had, when a Protestant, many strong opinions upon practical questions, not always in the same direction with such as prevail among ourselves; but these he relinquished or modified... when he became a Catholic, out of an humble unwillingness to set up his own judgement against the consent of public Catholic opinion. Hence though what would be called a somewhat 'opinionated' Protestant, he was, as a Catholic, singularly uncrotchety'.¹⁰⁸ Pauline Adams suggests that as a group converts were often remarkably outspoken. If this was the case, Dodsworth was not typical.¹⁰⁹

How then did this small literary output earn the title of Catholic author? Possibly Dodsworth did publish extensively, and these works have escaped either notice or being listed in the normal way. Certainly a very small number of his shorter Anglican works are not in the British Library Catalogue. Similarly, further Catholic articles may come to light. Yet until fresh evidence is available it seems reasonable to look elsewhere for an explanation.

Gerald Parsons in an article in *Religion in Victorian Britain* argues that, 'The significance of these converts has frequently been both exaggerated and misunderstood.'¹¹⁰ He contends that an impression has been created of new vitality and revival brought by these converts to a 'staid English Catholicism'. This view has been encouraged by the notion of a 'Second Spring', Newman's phrase in his sermon to the first Provincial Synod of Westminster in 1852. Parsons considers this 'too simple a view'.¹¹¹ He would prefer to set their contribution to the supposed revival of English Catholicism within their public impact and emotional effect during the period of 'Papal Aggression'. This is not at all to play down their real gifts or activity for the Catholic cause, but is to endeavour to evaluate the actual content of that contribution and to set it alongside the need of contemporary Catholicism to understand and interpret to itself and outsiders 'that passionate atmosphere of activity, revival and expansion which was to be found in all the denominations in Victorian Britain'.¹¹² As we have seen at the start of this chapter, it is difficult to gain an accurate picture of the numbers and impact of the converts. Indeed Parsons considers 'The number of converts may have been, in reality, small to the point of insignificance'. John Bossy has endeavoured to show that the image of a declining English Catholic community suddenly revived by Anglican converts and strengthened by Irish immigration during the middle of the nineteenth century was the result of Newman's and Wiseman's ecclesiastical propaganda. The reality was a more gentle progression that was to exploit the favourable situation given to English Catholics in the mid-nineteenth century.¹¹³

Newman would have seen Dodsworth with all his organisational and theological experience as a natural candidate to express the stability and energy that exemplified his 'Second Spring' perception of contemporary Catholicism. His bewailing of the Church's indifference to such men as Dodsworth and the wastage of such talent becomes the more understandable in this context. Whilst an over-zealous revisionist view of the exaggerated role of the converts should be avoided, it seems that Dodsworth's reputation as a notable convert and Catholic author is as much to do with the 'Second Spring' self-understanding of mid-century Catholicism as to the real extent of his contribution. Newman's frustration in the 1870s at the Church's inability to use such converts at an earlier time perhaps reveals his own (barely conscious) reflection on the actual value of his 'Second Spring' sermon. Newman's own sense of isolation doubtless fed his identification with such men as Dodsworth and their treatment by the Church. Parsons seems near the mark when he remarks that 'the main significance of the English converts as a group remained, in the end, the *sense* of revival and the *hope* of further dramatic conversions to which they gave rise'.¹¹⁴

That the achievements of English Catholics were exceptional and that the converts did play a role in them must not be overlooked and Dodsworth's contribution is exemplified in his enthusiastic support of Newman's new Catholic school at the Birmingham Oratory. Dodsworth, with Bellasis, Allies, Ward and others had met on 29 January 1858 to further this scheme, looking to Newman as main conductor.¹¹⁵ From such hints as this we may speculate that Dodsworth seems to have put much of his energy into this scheme during these last active years of his life. Time was running out for him. And yet Oakeley may well have been right in seeing a new sense of 'lay' vocation and a period of relief from earlier suffering.

During 1858, on 15 June and 27 September respectively,¹¹⁶ his daughters Emma and Georgina Augusta were received by Fr. William Eyre S.J. (1823-1898). Both would enter the religious life before their father's death.¹¹⁷ This year may represent the apex of Dodsworth's Catholic career, both in terms of his personal happiness and his achievement and contribution to Catholic life.

With his deceased wife and two of his daughters now within the Roman Catholic church and both his two sons William and Cyril already received, there remained only his three daughters Elizabeth Jane, Olivia and Anna Harriet outside the Church.¹¹⁸ During this time he patronised the London Oratory and the Jesuits in Farm Street, being a generous benefactor to both churches.¹¹⁹ In his literary activity, charitable work and close association with other ex-Tractarian converts, Dodsworth exhibited a typical convert lifestyle.

6. Final Years – Death and Burial 1859-61

1859 marks a further turning point in Dodsworth's Catholic life and it was the final one. The death of his eldest son (sixteen years of age), William Edward, on 5 October 1859, at 7 York Terrace, doubtless weakened further Dodsworth's already failing health.¹²⁰ The previous year's promise of Dodsworth as a 'Catholic writer' was not to be fulfilled. He had suffered 'a sudden seizure of a paralytic nature' on Holy Saturday whilst attending the liturgy at 'his favourite church' of the Immaculate Conception, Farm Street.¹²¹ He made a short-lived recovery, but eventually became restricted to his bed. He made his will on 28 January 1860 leaving a substantial sum of money to his children, other than Emma and Georgina who were in religious orders.¹²² Manning and Bellasis were executors and guardians of those of his children still in their minority. His son Cyril was to be brought up a Roman Catholic. Dodsworth's death was described on his death certificate as 'Valvular Disease of the heart – general dropsy' and according to that document his death occurred

on 10 December 1861 at 7 York Terrace.¹²³ He was sixty-three years of age and is described on his death certificate as a 'Fundholder'. He was attended by Fr. Eyre.¹²⁴ Dodsworth was buried in the same grave as his son William Edward in the newly-opened St. Mary's Roman Catholic cemetery at Kensal Green.¹²⁵

Newman had written to Allies of Dodsworth's illness in the Autumn of 1861 inquiring after his health and partly to seek Dodsworth's decision on what to do with the money donated for the now deferred University scheme.¹²⁶ On Tuesday 17 December he noted in his diary 'went to Dodsworth's dead mass at Farm Street'.¹²⁷ Oakeley penned his obituary on the octave of the Immaculate Conception and it appeared in the *Tablet* on Saturday 21 December.

It is difficult not to feel a sense of epilogue in Dodsworth's years as a Roman Catholic. The initial combative phase of *apologia* and engagement with Pusey gave way to a period of readjustment to convert status. In this respect Dodsworth and his family exhibit the characteristics of ex-Tractarian converts. He fulfils the criteria of convert life-style that Pauline Adams has used as a yardstick for measuring convert experience and emerges as a fairly typical married convert clergyman. During the period of readjustment to loss of status, the suffering entailed was compensated for by the popular device of continental travel and expatriate life in Rome. Despite personal tragedy, the later years of the decade saw a short time of literary activity and perhaps a resolution to earlier conflict as he found a role for himself in the tightly knit convert community. Although the final years were marked by loss and sickness, there is a sense of completion albeit within the frustrations and limitations imposed upon him by his lay convert status.

That said, despite Newman's attempt to make Dodsworth a significant contributor to his 'Second Spring' interpretation of the role of converts to the English Catholic community,

the evidence leads to a different conclusion. Both the impact of the converts as a community and Dodsworth's role in particular have been overestimated. Dodsworth's creative period came to an end with his conversion and such further glimpses of it as are represented by his Roman Catholic publications are not of the same standard as his earlier pastorally inspired works. Whilst scarcely supporting his reinvention as 'Catholic writer', these controversialist works do however provide an interesting and valuable insight into his final phase of theological development.

One last point stands out and it is the most significant: his enduring belief in the centrality of eschatology in Christian theology. To this extent Dodsworth remained in touch with the underlying influences that had formed him and that had carried him into the Roman Catholic Church. Pauline Adams has noted how many converts 'remained recognisably Evangelical' in their language and Dodsworth is typical in as much as he remained firmly rooted and motivated by the eschatological perspective that had been the springboard of his spiritual journey.¹²⁸ This 'prophetic' thread runs unbroken throughout the various phases of Dodsworth's life and ministry and is the key to our understanding of him and his achievements.

¹ P. Adams, 'Converts to the Roman Catholic Church in England'.

² E.G.K. Browne, *Annals of the Tractarian Movement from 1842 to 1860*, 1861, appendix.

³ J. Bossy, *The English Catholic Community 1570-1850*, 1975, chapter 13.

⁴ P. Adams, *op. cit.*, pp.19,20, cites *The Tablet*, 21 April 1855, p.244; Also W.G. Gorman, *Converts to Rome. A biographical list of the more notable converts to the Catholic Church in the United Kingdom during the last sixty years*, 1910, p.87.

⁵ P. Adams, *op. cit.*, p.27.

⁶ MP, WD to HEM, 28 December 1850.

⁷ MP, WD to HEM, 27 January 1851.

⁸ MP, WD to HEM, 30 December 1850.

⁹ P. Adams, *op. cit.*, p.42.

¹⁰ I am indebted to the archivist of the English Province of the Society of Jesus, T.G. Holt, SJ, for this information.

¹¹ P. Adams, *op. cit.*, p.42.

¹² *LDJHN*, vol.14, pp.187,188, JHN to WD, 1 January 1851.

¹³ *Ibid*, vol.28, p.33. JHN to Mrs. William Froude, 26 February 1876.

¹⁴ *Ibid*, vol.31, p.24 of Supplement, JHN to WD, 22 September 1851.

¹⁵ MP, WD to HEM, 1 January 1851.

- ¹⁶ P. Adams, *op. cit.* p.51.
- ¹⁷ WD to JHN, 20 June, 1854 quoted by Adams, *op. cit.*, pp. 69,70.
- ¹⁸ LDJHN, vol.16, p.7. JHN to Capes, 4 January 1854, cited by Adams, *op. cit.*, pp.73,74. referring to a campaign of prayer amongst ex-Tractarians for the conversion of their former co-religionists.
- ¹⁹ MP, WD to HEM, 27 January 1851.
- ²⁰ P.Adams, *op. cit.*, p.101.
- ²¹ *Ibid*, p.102.
- ²² *Ibid*, pp.106,107.
- ²³ *Ibid*, pp.113,114.
- ²⁴ WD, *A letter to The Revd E.B. Pusey D.D. on the position which he has taken on the present crisis*, 1850.
- ²⁵ H.P. Liddon, *Life of Pusey*, vol.3, p.297.
- ²⁶ WD, *A Few Comments on Dr. Pusey's Letter to the Bishop of London*, 1851, p.3.
- ²⁷ WD, *Ibid*, p.14.
- ²⁸ H.P. Liddon, *op. cit.* p.301.
- ²⁹ E.B. Pusey, *Renewed Explanation in consequence of Rev. W. Dodsworth's Comments on Dr. Pusey's Letter to the Bishop of London*, 1851.
- ³⁰ WD, *Further comments on Dr. Pusey's Renewed Explanation*, 1851, p.5.
- ³¹ *Ibid*, p.14.
- ³² WD, *Anglicanism considered in its results*, 1851, p.1.
- ³³ *Ibid*, p.2.
- ³⁴ *Ibid*, p.34.
- ³⁵ *Ibid*, p.39.
- ³⁶ LDJHN, vol.15, p.56, JHN to WD 21 March 1852.
- ³⁷ *Ibid*, footnote.
- ³⁸ *Ibid*, vol 16, pp. 224,225, JHN to WD, 18 August 1854.
- ³⁹ P. Adams, *op. cit.*, p.154.
- ⁴⁰ PP, O.Phillips to Liddon, 8 August 1887. During his Anglican ministry, Dodsworth lived successively at Clarence Terrace, York Terrace and Gloucester Gate.
- ⁴¹ WD, Last Will and Testament, 28 January 1860, Wills and Probate Office, London.
- ⁴² P. Adams, *op. cit.*, p.159.
- ⁴³ *Ibid*, p.159, footnote.
- ⁴⁴ WD, *Popular Delusions Concerning the Faith and Practice of Catholics*, 1857, pp. 42,55,56.
- ⁴⁵ LDJHN, vol.16, p.224, footnote.
- ⁴⁶ Death Certificate, William Edward Dodsworth, 5 October 1859, General Register Office, London.
- ⁴⁷ P.Adams, *op.cit.*, pp.166,167,169.
- ⁴⁸ Death Certificate, Elizabeth Dodsworth, 26 October 1856, General Register Office, London. The medical details indicate a painful death after a lengthy illness.
- ⁴⁹ LDJHN, vol.17, pp.467,468, JHN to Mrs. W. Froude, 30 November 1856.
- ⁵⁰ *The Tablet*, F. Oakeley, WD Obituary.
- ⁵¹ LDJHN, vol.18, p.99, JHN to WD, 26 July 1857.
- ⁵² *Ibid*, p.132, WD to JHN, 27 September 1857.
- ⁵³ P. Adams, *op. cit.*, Abstract.
- ⁵⁴ J. Wolffe, *The Protestant Crusade in Great Britain 1829-1860*, chapter 2.
- ⁵⁵ *Ibid*, p.36.
- ⁵⁶ *Ibid*, p.64.
- ⁵⁷ *Ibid*, p.46.
- ⁵⁸ *Ibid*, p.109, footnote.
- ⁵⁹ WD, *Popular Delusions Concerning the Faith and Practice of Catholics*, *op.cit.*, p.3.
- ⁶⁰ *Ibid*, p.7.
- ⁶¹ *Ibid*, pp.7,8.
- ⁶² Spooner was a parliamentary advocate of the Anti-Maynooth movement in the 1850s (J. Wolffe, *The Protestant Crusade*, esp. p.198, footnote).
- ⁶³ WD, *Popular Delusions Concerning the Faith and Practice of Catholics*, *op.cit.*, p.9.
- ⁶⁴ *Ibid*, p.15.
- ⁶⁵ *Ibid*, p.20.
- ⁶⁶ *Ibid*, p.42.
- ⁶⁷ *Ibid*, p.42.
- ⁶⁸ *Ibid*, p.42.
- ⁶⁹ *Ibid*, p.59.
- ⁷⁰ WD, *Popular Objections to Catholic Faith and Practice Considered*, 1858, p.7. footnote.
- ⁷¹ *Ibid*, p.5.
- ⁷² *Ibid*, p.5.
- ⁷³ *Ibid*, p.6.

- ⁷⁴ *Ibid*, p.8.
- ⁷⁵ *Ibid*, p.8
- ⁷⁶ *Ibid*, p.10.
- ⁷⁷ *Ibid*, p.10
- ⁷⁸ *Ibid*, p.12.
- ⁷⁹ *Ibid*, p.13.
- ⁸⁰ *Ibid*, p.14.
- ⁸¹ *Ibid*, p.15. See J. Wolffe, *op. cit.*, pp.108,109. A dominant figure in the Reformation Society he was also a lecturer on prophecy.
- ⁸² WD, *op. cit.*, p.15.
- ⁸³ *Ibid*, p.16.
- ⁸⁴ *Ibid*, p.17, footnote.
- ⁸⁵ *Ibid*, p.19.
- ⁸⁶ *Ibid*, p.20.
- ⁸⁷ *Ibid*, pp.25, 27.
- ⁸⁸ *Ibid*, p.29.
- ⁸⁹ *Ibid*, p.30.
- ⁹⁰ *Ibid*, p.30.
- ⁹¹ *Ibid*, pp.30,31.
- ⁹² *Ibid*, p.31.
- ⁹³ WD, *The connection between outward and inward worship* etc.
- ⁹⁴ WD, *Popular Objections to Catholic Faith and Practice Considered*, *op.cit.*, p.33.
- ⁹⁵ *Ibid*, p.37.
- ⁹⁶ *Ibid*, p.40, also P. Adams, *op. cit.*, p.128.
- ⁹⁷ *Ibid*, p.42.
- ⁹⁸ *Ibid*, p.43.
- ⁹⁹ *Ibid*, p.44.
- ¹⁰⁰ H.A.Woodgate, *Anomalies in the English Church, no just Ground for Seceding*, 1857.
- ¹⁰¹ H.I.D. Ryder, 'Ritualism, Roman Catholicism and Converts', *Contemporary Review*, February 1879, p.484.
- ¹⁰² WD, *Popular Objections to Catholic Faith and Practice Considered*, *op.cit.*, pp.45,45.
- ¹⁰³ WD, *Dublin Review*, vol.43, 31 August 1857, p.287.
- ¹⁰⁴ *Ibid*, November 1857.
- ¹⁰⁵ *Ibid*, vol.44, 24 March 1898, pp.375-395.
- ¹⁰⁶ *The Tablet*, F. Oakeley, WD Obituary.
- ¹⁰⁷ *LDJHN*, vol,18, p.204, JHN to H. Wilberforce, 12 December 1857.
- ¹⁰⁸ *The Tablet*, F. Oakeley, WD Obituary.
- ¹⁰⁹ P.Adams, *op. cit.*, p.176.
- ¹¹⁰ G. Parsons, ed. *Religion in Victorian Britain*, Manchester, 1988, vol.1, p.150.
- ¹¹¹ G. Parsons, *op. cit.*, p.151, also J. Kent, *The Unacceptable Face*, p.158, footnote.
- ¹¹² G. Parsons, *op. cit.*, p.151.
- ¹¹³ J. Bossy, *op. cit.*, p.297. Also, E.Norman *The English Catholic Church in the Nineteenth Century*, Oxford 1984.
- ¹¹⁴ G. Parsons, *op. cit.*, p.163.
- ¹¹⁵ *LDJHN*, vol.18, pp. 242,251,319.
- ¹¹⁶ English Province of the Society of Jesus, Archives, Baptism Register.
- ¹¹⁷ WD, Last Will and Testament, 28 January 1860, Wills and Probate Office, London.
- ¹¹⁸ CCAS Baptism Register, 1837-1851, CSSR Archive (Redemptorists) St Mary Clapham, Marylebone Parish Church Baptism Register, 1833-1836. Dodsworth's children were: Elizabeth Jane, b.1833; Olivia, b.1834; Emma, b.1836; Georgina Augusta, b.1837; Anna Harriet, b.1841; William Edward, 1842-1859; Cyril, 1844-1907. Cyril became a Redemptorist priest working in the Americas.
- ¹¹⁹ Archives, London Oratory, MS Subscription list gives WD as a benefactor.
- ¹²⁰ Death Certificate, William Edward Dodsworth, 5 October 1859, General Register Office London.
- ¹²¹ *The Tablet*, F. Oakeley, WD Obituary.
- ¹²² WD, Probate, Last Will and Testament.
- ¹²³ WD Death Certificate, 10 December 1861, General Register Office, London.
- ¹²⁴ Oakeley in Dodsworth's obituary says he died 'on the morrow of the Immaculate Conception' (8 December)
- ¹²⁵ St. Mary's R.C. Cemetery Register, Grave No. 7295. His daughter Anna (Drummond) may be buried in the same grave.
- ¹²⁶ *LDJHN*, vol.20, p.43, JHN to T.W. Allies, 11 September 1861.
- ¹²⁷ *LDJHN*, vol.20, p.82, JHN to T.W. Allies, 17 December 1861.
- ¹²⁸ P. Adams, *op. cit.*, p.165.

CONCLUSION

The purpose of this thesis has been to present William Dodsworth as the key figure in the transmission of Oxford Movement ideas to London and their embodiment in a parochial system that constituted a model for later Anglo-Catholic structures of ministry. This study of Dodsworth's life and ministry argues for a re-examination of the relationship between the Tractarian and Evangelical Movements and in particular for a reappraisal of the initial phases of Tractarianism. Dodsworth's theological journey reveals a unique relationship between radical Evangelicalism and the first impact of the Oxford Movement on the religious life of London.

At the heart of this thesis is the conflict between religious authority and the growth of liberal ideas. Dodsworth's early formation and his successive changes of allegiance are viewed as resulting from this inner tension. The ideological dislocation consequent upon the French Revolution produced a variety of religious responses, including radical Evangelicalism and Tractarianism. Newman was quick to grasp how Dodsworth's attraction to radical conservatism which had already led him into the 'study of Prophecy' could be harnessed for the propagation of Oxford ideas.

Dodsworth's early experiences led him on a life-long quest for a secure and lasting foundation for his beliefs that would resist the encroachments of political and theological liberalism. His early enthusiasm for pre-millennialism remained the ruling element in his theological framework and is the key to understanding his religious development. At each stage in his life, it has been demonstrated that his eschatological perspective both reflected his self-understanding and motivated him to a reformulation of his theological position. His ministry was a practical working out of those inner tensions.

Dodsworth's attachment to the Irving circle is both the result of his formation in conservative Evangelicalism and the connective element in his transition to Tractarianism. This is the irony and paradox at the heart of Dodsworth's life. For the reactionary impetus that attracted him to Irving's pre-millennialist agenda also exposed him to a radical re-reading of the New Testament free of mainline Evangelical constraints. Irving's shift from an Atonement-based to an Incarnational-centred soteriology was absorbed by Dodsworth with far-reaching consequences for his theological development. As he distanced himself from the growing separatism of Irving and Drummond he was already displaying a new Catholic synthesis in his preaching and sacramental practice at the Margaret Chapel. As such he was predisposed to much that the Oxford Movement would espouse.

Dodsworth's identification with the emerging Oxford Movement in the mid 1830s highlights the common ground between Evangelicals and Tractarians. This has been obscured by generations of party historians not least by Anglo-Catholic writers who have effectively ensured that the origins of Tractarianism in London are solely identified with William Oakeley's ritualist enterprise at Margaret Street in the years following Dodsworth's ministry there. The historical evidence does not support such a view and it has been a major aim of this thesis to demonstrate the limitation of partisan approaches to the study of religious history. Viewed from a social-historical perspective, Dodsworth's ministries at the Margaret Chapel and Christ Church, Albany Street emerge as 'model' enterprises in which Newman and Pusey sought to harness Dodsworth's exceptional preaching and pastoral skills for the establishment and spread of Oxford teaching and practice. Thus the success of this strategy was dependent on Dodsworth's prior Evangelical formation and Irvingite experience. The irony that encapsulates this Evangelical-Tractarian symbiosis was Henry Drummond's appointment of Dodsworth to the Margaret Chapel for the purpose of disseminating Irvingite ideas amongst the influential laity of West London.

In fact, Dodsworth's move to Tractarianism would guarantee Margaret Street's role as the central shrine of Anglo-Catholicism.

Dodsworth's rehabilitation as the first link between the Oxford Movement and its establishment in London is vital if the significance of Tractarian origins in the capital is to be recovered. It is hoped that his reappraisal as a model of Tractarian ministry will refocus future students of Anglo-Catholic history on this initial period before the establishment of Ritualism as the defining aspect of Tractarianism. This is not to play down the role of ritual even at this seminal stage but it is vital that the period before 1850 is examined less in terms of later developments and much more in relation to other contemporary religious movements, especially Evangelicalism. By adopting this wider perspective, 'party' distortions can be put aside and important questions as to the nature of lay involvement, origins of sacramental practice and the degree of interdependence between Evangelicals and Tractarians in preaching and pastoral ministry can be impartially considered.

Anglo-Catholic origins need to be studied less in terms of what the Movement became after 1850 and more in terms of what it set out to achieve in the earliest years of its development. It is hoped that Dodsworth's unique contribution to Tractarianism in London will direct future students of the period to view the Movement as a 'New Catholicism' that owed less to the older High Church Movement and a great deal more to contemporary Evangelicalism than has hitherto been recognized. It is this identification of the roots of Anglo-Catholicism with the wider religious movements of the first half of the nineteenth century that will provide fertile ground for future study.

A final aspect of this thesis has been the place of Dodsworth as a Roman Catholic convert both in relation to the Church he had left and to his new allegiance. The impact of Tractarian converts on the Roman Catholic Church, their self-understanding and the

reaction of their former Anglican colleagues is an area that requires further study and evaluation. Dodsworth's 'reinvention' as a Catholic writer may provide a starting point since this not only contributed to his almost total exclusion from Anglo-Catholic history but is itself an insight into Rome's response to the Tractarian influx.

William Dodsworth is presented as a subject that both challenges and advances the study of Anglo-Catholic origins. His distinctive eschatology is the key not only to his religious evolution from Evangelical to Roman Catholic but demonstrates connective elements between Tractarianism and other contemporary religious movements. He is offered as a subject for future study, not least in his role as the forgotten apostle of Tractarian London.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

A. PRIMARY SOURCES (MANUSCRIPT AND ARCHIVE).

B PRIMARY SOURCES (PRINTED).

- (i) Works by W. Dodsworth.
- (ii) Works by Others.
- (iii) Newspapers and Periodicals.

C. SECONDARY SOURCES.

- (i) Books and Pamphlets.
- (ii) Articles.
- (iii) Unpublished theses.

Place of publication is London unless otherwise stated.

A. PRIMARY SOURCES (MANUSCRIPT AND ARCHIVE)

Beverley, East Riding of Yorkshire County Archives Office.

Aldeburgh, Parish Records, Marriage Register, 1819, PE 76/8.
Fosham and Carlton, Land Tax Returns, 1807-1819. QDE 1/6/13.
Hull, Holy Trinity, Marriage Register, 1791, PE 158/123.
Kirk Ella, Parish Records, Baptism Register, 1799-1800. PE 174/4.
Burial Register, 1818, PE 174/11.
Deed of Sale, 1896, CH 320/522.
Poor Rate Book, 1745-1806.

Cambridge University Library.

British and Foreign Bible Society Archive, Home Correspondence, 1822, D-K.
BSA/D1/1/35.
Society for the Propagation of Christian Knowledge Archive.
Minutes, 1829-1835.
Reports, 1829-1834.
Subscription Lists, 1816-1833. (in process of re-cataloguing)

Chelmsford, Essex County Records Office.

Stisted Parish Records, D/P/149/11.

Chester, Cheshire County Records Office.

Nomination Papers, EDA 1/12F/107V.

Guildford, Surrey County Records Office.

Chiddingfold Parish Records, Mortgage Deed BR/T 29/16.

International Genealogical Index.

Kingston Upon Hull City Records Office.

Accounts 1805-1807 (originals bound) DBX/1/1.
Shipping Index 1808-1809 DPC/1/1.

Lincoln Diocesan Records, Lincoln Cathedral Library.

Ordination Register, 1821, 1822, P4 LA.
Saxby Parish Records, 1822, Par 1/2 ; 1/4.
Subscription Book, 13, 1815-24, P3, LA.

London.

British Library.

Gladstone Papers.
MSS, 44360, f. 217.
44362, ff. 131,139.
44366, ff. 189,190.

C.S.S.R. (Redemptorists), Provincial Archive, St. Mary, Clapham.
Chronicles 1855-1860 and other MSS Material.

Greater London Record Office.

Christ Church, Albany Street, Parish Records.

Baptism Register P90/CTC/2/1.
Confirmation Register P90/CTC/2/19.
Preachers' Book P90/CTC/2/26.
Churchwardens' Accounts Book P90/CTC/2/88.
Non-Register Material P90/CTC/2/105-109.128-130.
St. Marylebone Parish Records.
Marriage Register P89/MRY/132.
Baptism Register P89/MRY/280.

General Register Office (The Family Records Centre, Islington).

Census Returns 1851. 40/107/1493. Entry 134.

Death Certificates:

Elizabeth Dodsworth, 26 October 1856.

William Edward Dodsworth, 5 October 1859.

William Dodsworth 10 December 1861.

Guildhall Library.

Bishops' Act Book 1828-42, MS95 32A/3.

Lambeth Palace Library.

Fulham Papers, Blomfield Correspondence.

Letters to WD, 1844-1850: vols.41, ff. 29-30; 47, ff. 37-38; 49, ff. 243-246,
251-252; 59, ff. 67v-69v; 60, ff. 97a-98a, 101a-102.

London Oratory Library.

Subscription List.

Society of Jesus Provincial Archive, Farm Street.

Baptism Register, 1858.

St. Mary's Roman Catholic Cemetery, Harrow Road.

Register of Burials, Grave no 7295.

Wills and Probate Office, High Holborn.

William Dodsworth, Last Will and Testament, 28 January 1860.

Oxford.

Bodleian Library.

Church's Ministry among the Jews Papers, Dep. CMJ C.5-14.

Manning Correspondence, MSS. Eng. Lett. C.654, fols. 332-3, C. 658, fols. 1-
229.

Pusey House.

Pusey Papers (originals, and Liddon Bound Volume, mainly transcripts).

Winchester, Hampshire County Records Office.

Winchester Clergy Index, Sim 65/E3.

York, Borthwick Institute of Historical Research.

St. Mary Bishopshill, York. Baptism Register, 1765, PR Y/MBP 52.

Probate Documents. John Dodsworth, Aldeburgh Prog. Oct. 1818.

B. PRIMARY SOURCES (PRINTED)

(i) Works by William Dodsworth

Advent Lectures, 1837.

Allegiance to the Church. A Sermon (on I Cor. xiii. 20), 1841.

Anglicanism considered in its results, 1851.

Baptism, Regeneration and the Kingdom of God, 1849.

A Call to Pray for Unity in the Truth. (Discourse on John xvii. 20-23), 1849.

Christ Preaching to the Spirits in Prison, 1835.

Christ the Resurrection and the Life. An Easter Sermon on John xi. 25, 26, 1836.

The Church itself the true 'Church Union Society.' A Sermon (on Romans xii. 4-8), 1843.

The Church of England a Protester Against Romanism and Dissent (in a series of discourses), 1836.

The Church, the House of God and Pillar and Ground of the Truth. A Sermon, 1841.

Confirmation, or Laying on of Hands. Scriptural in its Origins and Needful to be Observed, 1835.

The connection between outward and inward worship. A sermon (on Psalm c. 3), Brighton, 1847.

Correlative Claims of the Church and Her Members. A Sermon (on Romans xv. 7), 1837.

Discourses on the Lord's Supper preached at the Margaret Chapel, St Marylebone, 1835.

The Fast Day, 1847.

A Few Comments on Dr. Pusey's Letter to the Bishop of London, 1851.

'Frequent Communion. A Sermon (on John vi. 53, 54)', in Teale, W.H. ed.,

Sermons preached at the Consecration of St. John the Evangelist, Jedburgh, 1845.

Further Comments on Dr. Pusey's Renewed Explanation, 1851.

General Redemption and Limited Salvation. To which is added Archbishop Usher's Treatise on the true intent and extent of Christ's Death, 1831.

The Gorham Case briefly considered, 1850.

Holy Baptism; the Grafting into our Risen Lord. An Easter Sermon (on Luke xxii. 5, 6) for 1850. With especial reference to the proposal for reassertion of the doctrine of the 'Redemption of Original Sin to Infants in Baptism', 1850.

A House Divided Against Itself. A Sermon (on Mark iii. 24, 25), 1850.

Jesus Christ in his threefold state of subangelic humiliation, heavenly glory, and earthly dominion. Two sermons (on Psalm viii. 4-6, 9), 1830.

'The Kingdom of God. (Matthew vi. 10)' in Watson, *Sermons for Sundays, Festivals and Fasts*. Series 2, vol. 1, 1845.

A Letter to the Rev. E.B. Pusey D.D., on the position he has taken in the present crisis, 1850.

On Baptism. An earnest expostulation addressed to Members of the Church of England on the Desecration of that Holy Sacrament, 1837.

'On diligence in the Christian character. A sermon on St. Peter 1:10' in *The Church of England Preacher*, vol. 1, 1837.

'On the First Resurrection', in *The Morning Watch*, vol. 1, 1829, pp 62-71.

'On the Human Nature of Christ', in *The Morning Watch*, vol. 1, 1829, pp 75-99.

Popular Delusions Concerning the Faith and Practice of Catholics, 1857.

Popular Objections to Catholic Faith and Practice Considered, 1858.

The Priest's Companion in the Visitation of the Sick, 1843.

Questions on Christian Doctrine and Practice, answered by references to Scripture, 1833.

Remarks on the Second Letter to Rev. Richard Waldo Sibthorp, B.D.; entitled 'A further answer to the enquiry, Why have you become a Catholic?', 1842.

Romanism successfully opposed only on Catholic principles. A Sermon, 1839.

The Second Advent of Our Lord Jesus Christ; With an Appendix on Jesus Christ As the Destroyer of Antichrist, by a clergyman of the Church of England, 1835.

Selections of the Psalms to which are added hymns adapted to the festivals of the Church, and some paraphrases of Holy Scripture. For the use of Margaret chapel, St. Marylebone, 1831.

'A Sermon (on Col. i. 5,6)', in *Parochial Subdivision. Two Sermons, (the one on Acts viii. 31) by W.F. Hook, and the other by WD.*

A Sermon (on 1 John iii. 17, 18) occasioned by the appeal of the Bishop of London for the building of additional churches in the Metropolis, 1836.

A Sermon preached on Passion Sunday, 9 April 1848. The Revelation of the Man of Sin. 2 Thess. ii. 3-8, 1848.

'Sermon (on Romans vi. 3,4); Sermon 9' in Pusey, E.B. ed. *A Course of Sermons on Solemn Subjects, chiefly bearing on repentance and amendment of life, 1845.*

'Sermon (on Zechariah iv. 6)' in Teale, W.E., *The Seven Sermons Preached at the Consecration... of the Parish Church of Leeds, 1841.*

The Signs of the Times. Sermons preached in Advent, 1848.

The Things of Caesar, and the Things of God. A Discourse preached in Christ Church, St Pancras, on Sunday, January 27th, 1850, 1850.

Why have you become a Romanist? A Letter to the Rev. Richard Waldo Sibthorp, B.D.; occasioned by his letter entitled 'Some answer to the inquiry, Why are you become a Catholic?', 1842.

(ii) Works by Others

- Allies, T.W., *The Royal Supremacy Viewed in Reference to the Two Spiritual Powers of Order and Jurisdiction*, 1850.
- Anon, *The Importance of Special Prayer for the General Outpouring of the Holy Spirit*, Religious Tract Society, 1826.
- Birmingham Oratory, ed. *Correspondence of J.H. Newman with John Keble and others 1839-1845*, 1917.
- Blackburne, F., *The Confessional, or a full and Free Enquiry into the Right, Utility and Success of Establishing Confessions of Faith and Doctrine in Protestant churches*, 1766.
- Carlyle, G, ed., *The Prophetical Works of Edward Irving*, 2 vols. 1867-70.
- Dessain, C.S., *John Henry Newman*, 1966.
- Dessain, C.S. and Gornal, T. eds., *The Letters and Diaries of John Henry Newman*, vols 5-7,11-19,20,22,27,28,31, Oxford, 1961-1995.
- Drummond, H.,
A Candid Examination of the Controversy between Messrs Irving, A. Thompson and J. Haldane respecting Christ's Human Nature, 1829.
The Second Coming of the Lord Jesus Christ, 1829.
- Foot, M.R.D. and Matthew, H.G.C. eds., *Gladstone Diaries*, 14 vols, 1968-1994.
- Frere, J.H.,
A Combined View of the Prophecies of Daniel, Esdras and St. John etc., 1815.
The Great Continental Revoluton Marking the Expiration of the Times of the Gentiles, 1848.
- Irving, J.E.,
Babylon and Infidelity Foredoomed of God, 1828.
The Coming of the Messiah in Glory and Majesty, Juan Josafat Ben Ezra, a converted Jew. Translated from the Spanish, with a preliminary discourse by the Rev. Edward Irving, A.M., 1827. (Preliminary discourse on Ben Ezra).
The Doctrine of the Incarnation opened in Six Sermons etc., 1828.
For Missionaries After the Apostolic School etc., 1825.
Homilies on the Sacraments, i. On Baptism, 1828.
The Last Days: A Discourse on the Evil Character of these our Times, 1828
The Orthodox and Catholic Doctrine of our Lord's Human Nature, 1830.
- Maitland, S.R.,
An Enquiry into the Grounds on Which the Prophetic Period of Daniel and St. John has been supposed to consist of 1260 years, 1826 and 1829.
The Twelve Hundred and Sixty Days. In Reply to a Review in the Morning Watch, 1830.
- Mason Neale, K.E., *The Letters of J. Mason Neale D.D. edited by his Daughter, K.E. Mason Neale*, 1910.
- McNeile, H.,
Letters to a Friend who has felt it his duty to secede from the Church of England, 1834.
The Times of the Gentiles, 1828.
- Newman, J.H.,
Apologia Pro Vita Sua, 1864.
An Essay on the Development of Christian Doctrine, 1845.
Lectures on the present position of Catholics in England, 1851.
Lectures on the Prophetical Office of the church viewed relatively to Romanism and Popular Protestantism, 1837.
Loss and Gain: The Story of a Convert, 1848.
- Oakeley, F., *The Tablet, WD Obituary*, 21 December 1861, p.810.

Pusey, E.B.,

The Doctrine of the Real Presence, as contained in the Fathers... vindicated in Notes on a Sermon 'The Presence of Christ in the Holy Eucharist'. Preached in A.D. 1843 before the University of Oxford, 2nd ed.

A Letter to the Right Hon. and Right Rev. The Lord Bishop of London, in Explanation of Some Statements Contained in a Letter by the Rev. W. Dodsworth, Oxford 1851.

Renewed Explanation in Consequence of Rev. W. Dodsworth's Comments on Dr. Pusey's Letter to the Bishop of London, Oxford 1851.

The Royal Supremacy not an arbitrary Authority but Limited by the Laws of the Church, of which Kings are Members, Oxford, 1850.

Tracts for the Times, nos 67,68,69, Scriptural Views of Holy Baptism with an Appendix, 1836.

Sibthorp, R.W.

A Further Answer to the Enquiry, 'Why have you become a Catholic?' in a second letter to a friend containing a notice of strictures by the Rev. Messrs, Palmer and Dodsworth upon a former letter, 1842.

The Character of Prophecy, 1828.

Way, L., *The Latter Rain, with Observations on the Importance of General Prayer for the Special Outpouring of the Holy Spirit, 1821.*

Wood, B., *The Excellence of the Liturgy, 1820.*

Woodgate, H.A., *Anomalies in the English Church no just Ground for Seceding, 1857.*

(iii) Newspapers and Periodicals

The British Critic, Quarterly Theological Review and Ecclesiastical Record.

Edinburgh Review.

The Catholic Standard.

The Christian Observer.

The Christian Remembrancer.

The Churchman.

The Church Times.

The Dublin Review.

The Edinburgh Review.

The Hull Advertiser.

The Investigator.

The Missionary Register.

The Morning Watch; or Quarterly Journal on Prophecy and Theological Review.

The Rambler.

The Record.

The Tablet.

The Times.

C. SECONDARY SOURCES

(i) Books and Pamphlets

- Allchin, A.M., *The Silent Rebellion: Anglican Religious Communities, 1845-1900*, 1958.
- Allchin, A.M. and Coulson, J. eds., *The Rediscovery of Newman. An Oxford Symposium*, 1967.
- Allen and McClure, *History of the SPCK 1698-1898*, 1898.
- Anon, *Battles Directory of Hull, 1791-92*.
- Anson, P.F.,
The Call of the Cloister: Religious Communities and Kindred Bodies in the Anglican Communion, 1955.
Fashions in Church Furnishings, 1840-1940, 1960.
- Ashwell, A.R., *The Life of the Right Reverend Samuel Wilberforce D.D.*, 3 vols., 1880-82.
- Basset, B., *The English Jesuits*, 1967.
- Balleine, G.R., *A History of the Evangelical Party in The Church of England*, 1908.
- Bebbington, D.W., *Evangelicalism in Modern Britain: A History from the 1730's to the 1980's*, 1989.
- Bell, M., *Christina Rossetti: A Biographical and Critical Study*, 3rd edn., 1898.
- Bellasis, E., *Memorials of Mr. Serjeant Bellasis 1800-1873*, 3rd edn., 1923.
- Bennett, F., *The Story of W.J.E. Bennett*, 1909.
- Bentley, J., *Ritualism and Politics in Victorian Britain: The Attempt to Legislate for Belief*, Oxford, 1978.
- Bossy, J., *The English Catholic Community*, 1975.
- Bradley, I., *The Call to Seriousness: The Evangelical Impact on the Victorians*, 1976.
- Brilioth, Y.,
The Anglican Revival: Studies in the Oxford Movement, 1933.
Evangelicalism and the Oxford Movement, 1934.
- Brooks, J.W., *A Dictionary of Writers on the Prophecies*, 1835.
- Brown, A.J., *The Word of God Among All Nations: A Brief History of the Trinitarian Bible Society 1831-1981*, 1981.
- Brown, A.W., *Recollections of the Conversation Parties of the Rev. Charles Simeon etc.*, 1863.
- Browne, E.G.K.,
Annals of the Tractarian Movement from 1842 to 1860, 3rd edn., 1861.
Trials of Faith or the Sufferings of Converts to Catholicism, 1860.
- Brown, F.K., *Fathers of the Victorians: The Age of Wilberforce*, Cambridge, 1961.
- Butler, P.,
Gladstone. Church, State, and Tractarianism. A Study of his Religious Ideas and Attitudes, 1809-1859. Oxford, 1982.
ed., *Pusey Rediscovered*, 1983.
- Burgon, J.W., *Lives of Twelve Good Men*, 2 vols., 4th edn., 1880.
- Burrows, H.W., *The Half Century of Christ Church, St. Pancras, Albany Street*, 1887.
- Cameron, G.G., *The Scots Kirk in London*, Oxford, 1979.
- Canton, W., *A History of the British and Foreign Bible Society*, 2 vols., 1904.
- Carter, K., *St. Paul's Church, Knightsbridge*, 1993.
- Carus, W., *Memoirs of the Life of the Rev. Charles Simeon*, 2nd edn., 1847.
- Chadwick, O.,
Newman, 1983.

- The Secularization of the European Mind in the Nineteenth Century*, 1975.
ed., 'The Spirit of the Oxford Movement', *Tractarian Essays*. Cambridge, 1990.
- Chapman, R., *Faith and Revolt, Studies in the literary influence of the Oxford Movement*, 1970.
- Cheal, H., *The Story of Shoreham*, Hove, 1921.
- Church, R.W., *The Oxford Movement. Twelve Years. 1833-1845*, 1891.
- Churton, E., *Memoir of Joshua Watson*, 2 vols., 1861.
- Clark, G.K.,
Churchmen and the Condition of England, 1832-1885, 1973.
The Making of Victorian England, 1962.
- Clarke, C.P.S., *The Oxford Movement and After*, 1932.
- Cobb, P., *Doctor Pusey*, 1983.
- Cohn, N., *The Pursuit of the Millennium*, 1962.
- Conlay, I., and Anson, P.F., *The Art of the Church*, New Library of Catholic Knowledge 11, 1964.
- Coombs, J., *One Aim: Edward Stuart 1820-1877*, 1975.
- Cross, F.L., ed., *The Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church*. Oxford, 1958.
- Davenport, R.A., *Albury Apostles*, 1970.
- Donald, G., *Men who left the Movement*, 1933.
- Drummond, A.L., *Edward Irving and His Circle*, 1937.
- Edwards, D.L.,
Christian England, vol. 3. From the Eighteenth Century to the First World War, 1984.
Leaders of the Church of England 1828-1944, London and Oxford, 1971.
- Ellsworth, L.E., *Charles Lowder and the Ritualist Movement*, 1982.
- Faber, G., *Oxford Apostles, A Character Study of the Oxford Movement*, 1933.
- Flegg, C.F., *Gathered under Apostles. A Study of the Catholic Apostolic Church*, Oxford, 1992.
- Forrester, D., *Young Doctor Pusey*, 1989.
- Foster, J., *Alumni Oxoniensis 1715-1886*, 4 vols. Oxford.
- Franklin, R.W., *Nineteenth-Century Churches. The History of a New Catholicism in Württemberg, England and France*, New York and London, 1987.
- Froom, L.R.E., *The Prophetic Faith of our Fathers*, Washington, D.C., 1946.
- Galloway, P., *A Passionate Humility. Frederick Oakeley and the Oxford Movement*, Leominster, 1999.
- Galloway, P and Rawll, C., *Good and Faithful Servants. All Saints Margaret Street and its Incumbents*, Worthing, 1988.
- Gilley, S.W.,
'Edward Irving; Prophet of the Millennium', in *Revival and Religion since 1700. Essays for John Walsh*, eds. Garnett, J. and Matthew, C., 1993.
Newman and his Age, 1990.
- Gladstone, W.E., *Gleanings of Past Years 1843-78*, 1879.
- Gordon, J.M., *Evangelical Spirituality from the Wesleys to John Stott*, 1991.
- Gorman, W.G., *Converts to Rome, A biographical list of the more notable converts to the Catholic Church in the United Kingdom during the last sixty years*, 1910.
- Grantham, G.P., *A History of St. Saviour's Leeds*, 1872.
- Gray, R., *Cardinal Manning*, 1985.
- Greenwood, J., *Picture of Hull*, 1835.
- Griffin, J.R., *The Oxford Movement 1833-1983*, Edinburgh, 1984.
- Hammond, P.C., *The Parson and the Victorian Parish*, 1977.
- Hardelin, A., *The Tractarian Understanding of the Eucharist*. Uppsala, 1965.

- Harrison, J.F.C., *The Second Coming. Popular Millenarianism 1780-1850*, 1979.
- Hennell, M., *Sons of the Prophets. Evangelical Leaders of the Victorian Church* 1979.
- Hilton, B., *The Age of Atonement. The Influence of Evangelicalism on Social and Economic Thought 1795-1865*, Cambridge, 1988.
- Holmes, J.D., *More Roman than Rome: English Catholicism in the 19th Century*, 1978.
- Houghton, W.E. ed., *The Wellesley Index to Victorian Periodicals 1824-1900*, 3 vols., Toronto, 1966-79.
- Father Hugh, S.S.F., *Nineteenth Century Pamphlets at Pusey House: An Introduction for the Prospective User*, 1961.
- Huchedé, P., *History of Anti-Christ*, (trans), 1884.
- Hylson-Smith, K., *Evangelicals in the Church of England, 1734-1984*, Edinburgh, 1988.
- Inglis, K.S., *Churches and the Working Classes in Victorian England*, 1963.
- Jackson, G., *Hull in the Eighteenth Century*, Oxford, 1972.
- Jay, E., *The Evangelical and Oxford Movements*, Cambridge, 1983.
- Kent, J., *The Unacceptable Face. The Modern Church in the Eyes of the Historian*, 1987.
- King, J., *Memoir of the Rev. Thomas Dikes*, 1849.
- Knox, E.A., *The Tractarian Movement. 1833-1845*, 1933.
- Lewis, D., ed., *A Dictionary of Evangelical Biography*, Oxford, 1995.
- Liddon, H.P., *Life of Edward Bouverie Pusey*, 4 vols., 1893-94.
- Lough, A.J.,
The Influence of John Mason Neale, 1962.
John Mason Neale. Priest Extraordinary, Newton Abbot, 1975.
- Lowther Clark, W.K., *The History of the SPCK*, 1959.
- Marsh, C., *The Life of the Revd William Marsh, by his daughter*, 1867.
- Martin, B., *John Keble, Priest, Pastor, Poet*, 1976.
- Martin, R.H., *Evangelicals United, Evangelical Stirrings in Pre-Victorian Britain*, 1983.
- Miller, E., *The History and Doctrines of Irvingism*, 1878.
- Moore, J.R., ed., *Religion in Victorian Britain*, vol. 3, 1988.
- Mozley, T., *Reminiscences, Chiefly of Oriel College and the Oxford Movement*, 2 vols, 1882.
- Mumm, S., *Stolen Daughters, Virgin Mothers, Anglican Sisterhoods in Victorian Britain*, Leicester, 1999.
- Newsome, D.,
The Parting of Friends. A Study of the Wilberforces and Henry Manning, 1966.
The Convert Cardinals: Newman and Manning, 1993.
- Nockles, P.B., *The Oxford Movement in Context. Anglican High Churchmanship 1760-1857*, Cambridge, 1994.
- Norman, E.R.,
Anti-Catholicism in Victorian England, 1968.
Church and Society in England 1770-1970, Oxford, 1976.
- Oakeley, F.,
Historical Notes on the Tractarian Movement, 1865.
Popular Lectures, Personal Reminiscences of the Oxford Movement, 1865.
- Obelkevich, J., *Religion and Rural Society. South Lindsey 1825-1875*, Oxford, 1976.
- O'Connell, M.R., *The Oxford Conspirators. A History of the Oxford Movement 1833-1845*, New York, 1969.

- Ollard, S.L., *A Short History of the Oxford Movement*, 1915.
- Oliphant, M.O.W., *The Life of Edward Irving, Minister of the National Scotch Church*, London, 2 vols, 1862.
- Oliver, W.H., *Prophets and Millennialists. The Uses of Biblical Prophecy in England from the 1790s to the 1840s*, Auckland and Oxford, 1978.
- Packer, L.M., *Christina Rossetti*, Berkeley, 1964.
- Palmer, W., *Origines Liturgicae*, 2 vols, 1832.
- Parsons, G., ed., *Religion in Victorian Britain*, vols 1.2.4, Manchester, 1988.
- Penhale, F., *The Anglican Church Today: Catholics in Crisis*, 1986.
- Perry, W., *The Oxford Movement in Scotland*, Cambridge, 1933.
- Pickering, W.S.,
Anglo-Catholicism. A study in religious ambiguity, 1989.
 'Anglo-Catholicism: Some Sociological Observations', in *Tradition Renewed: The Oxford Movement Conference Papers*, ed. G. Rowell, 1986.
- Port, M.H., *Six Hundred New Churches: A Study of the Church Building Commission 1818-1856, and its Church Buiding Activities*, 1961.
- Poulson, G., *The History and Antiquities of the Seignory of Holderness etc.*, vol. 2, 1841.
- Purcell, E.S., *Life of Cardinal Manning, Archbishop of Westminster*, 2 vols., 1895.
- Reed, J.S., *Glorious Battle. The Cultural Politics of Victorian Anglo-Catholicism*, Nashville and London, 1996.
- Reynolds, J.S., *The Evangelicals of Oxford 1735-1871. Record of an Unchronicled Movement*, Oxford 1953.
- Rivington, W., *Church Extension in St. Pancras. A Comparative Statement of the Increase of Houses, Population and Church Accommodation in the Parish of St. Pancras, Middlesex, from 1801 to 1851*, 1862.
- Roberts, G.B., *The History of the English Church Union, 1859-1894*, 1895.
- Rowell, G., *The Vision Glorious. Themes and Personalities of the Catholic Revival in Anglicanism*, Oxford, 1983.
- Sandeen, E.R., *The Roots of Fundamentalism. British and American Millenarianism 1800-1930*, Chicago, 1970.
- Smyth, C., *Simeon and Church Order. A Study of the Origins of the Evangelical Revival in Cambridge in the Eighteenth Century*, Cambridge, 1940.
- Sparrow Simpson, W.J.,
The Contribution of Cambridge to the Anglo-Catholic Revival, 1933.
The History of the Anglo-Catholic Revival from 1845, 1932.
- Stephen, L. and Lee, S., eds., *Dictionary of National Biography*.
- Stevenson, K.W., *Eucharist and Offering*, New York, 1986.
- Stock, E., *The History of the Church Missionary Society*, 3 vols., 1899.
- Stone, L., *The Family, Sex and Marriage in England 1500-1800*, 1977.
- Strachan, C.G., *The Pentecostal Theology of Edward Irving*, 1973.
- Strutt, R.J., *John William Strutt, Third Baron Rayleigh*, 1924.
- Strutt, C., *The Strutt Family of Terling*, n.p., n.d..
- Stubley, P., *A House Divided: Evangelicals and the Establishment in Hull 1770-1914*, Hull, 1995.
- Symondson, A., ed., *The Victorian Crisis of Faith*, 1970.
- Taylor, B., *The Lower Church. A History of St. Nicholas, Guildford*. Guildford, 1980.
- Thureau-Dangin, P., *The English Catholic Revival in the Nineteenth Century*, 2 vols., New York, n.d..
- Toon, P., *Evangelical Theology 1833-1856. A Response to Tractarianism*, 1979.
- Towle, E.A., *John Mason Neale D.D. A Memoir*, 1902.

- Trench, M., *The Story of Dr. Pusey's Life*, 1900.
- Vaiss, P., ed., *From Oxford to the People. Reconsidering Newman and the Oxford Movement*, Leominster, 1996.
- Venn, J.A., *Alumni Cantabrigienses*, 6 vols., Part 2, 1752-1900. Cambridge.
- Victorian Society, *Report on Christ Church, Albany Street, London*, n.d.
- Vidler, A.R., *The Church in an Age of Revolution*, 1972.
- Walford, E., *Old and New London*, vol. 4, 1876.
- Watts, M.R., *The Dissenters*, Oxford, 1978.
- Weinreb, B. and Hibbert, C., *The London Encyclopaedia*, 1983.
- Wenham, L.P., *James Tate*, North Yorkshire, C.R.O., 1991.
- White, J.F., *The Cambridge Movement: the Ecclesiologists and the Gothic Revival*. Cambridge, 1962.
- Whitworth, W.A., *Quam Dilecta: A description of All Saints Church, Margaret Street, with historical notes of Margaret Chapel and All Saints Church*, 1891.
- Wilkinson, J., ed., *Catholic Anglicans Today*, 1968.
- Williams, T.J. and Campbell, A.W., *The Park Village Sisterhood*. 1965.
- Windle, B.C.A., *Who's Who of the Oxford Movement*, New York and London, 1926.
- Wolffe, J.,
Evangelicals, Women and Community in Nineteenth Century Britain, Open University, Milton Keynes, 1994.
The Protestant Crusade in Great Britain, Oxford, 1991.
- Yates, N.,
Anglican Ritualism in Victorian Britain 1830-1910, Oxford, 1999.
Buildings, Faith and Worship. The Liturgical Arrangement of Anglican Churches, 1600-1900, Oxford, 1991.
The Oxford Movement and Anglican Ritualism, General Series 105, Historical Association, 1983.
The Oxford Movement and Parish Life: St. Saviour's, Leeds 1839-1929, Borthwick Papers 48, University of York, Borthwick Institute of Historical Research, 1975.

(ii) Articles

Gilley, S.W., 'Newman and Prophecy, Evangelical and Catholic', *Journal of the United Reformed Church History Society* 3, 1985.

Hempton, D.N., 'Evangelicalism and Eschatology', *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, 31, 1980.

Ryder, H.I.D., 'Ritualism, Roman Catholicism and Converts', *Contemporary Review*, February 1879.

Stunt, T.C.F., 'John Henry Newman and the Evangelicals', *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, 21, 1970.

Waller J.O., 'Christ's Second Coming: Christina Rossetti and the Pre-Millennialist William Dodsworth', *Bulletin of the New York Public Library*, 73, 1969.

Williams, T.J., 'A Lost Treasure Retrieved', *Holy Cross Magazine*, 67, April 1956.

(iii) Unpublished Theses

- Adams, P.A., 'Converts to the Roman Catholic Church in England, circa 1830-1870', BLitt. Thesis, Oxford University, 1977.
- Clegg, H., 'Evangelicals and Tractarians', MA. Thesis, Bristol University, 1965.
- Craig, B.L., 'Bishop John Medley: Missionary and Reformer', PhD. Thesis, University of Wales, Lampeter, 2001.
- Ervine, W.J.C., 'Doctrine & Diplomacy, Some Aspects of the Life and Thought of the Anglican Evangelical Clergy, 1797-1837'. PhD. Thesis. Cambridge University, 1979.
- Herring, G.W., 'Tractarianism to Ritualism: A Study of Some Aspects of Tractarianism Outside Oxford, from the Time of Newman's Conversion in 1845, until the First Ritual Commission in 1867', DPhil. Thesis, Oxford University, 1984.
- Martin, R.H., 'The Pan-Evangelical Impulse in Britain 1795-1830, with special reference to Four London Societies', DPhil. Thesis, Oxford University, 1974.
- Murray, N.U., 'The Influence of the French Revolution on the Church of England and its Rivals, 1789-1802', DPhil. Thesis, Oxford University, 1975.
- Orchard, S.C., 'English Evangelical Eschatology 1790-1850', DPhil. Thesis, Cambridge University, 1968.
- Wardle, J.A., 'The Life and Times of the Rev'd Dr. Hugh McNeile', MA. Thesis, Manchester University, 1981.