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Abstract

Philip Doddridge (1702-51) was pastor of the Independent congregation meeting at Castle Hill, Northampton, and tutor of the Northampton academy from 1729 to his death in 1751. He is regarded as a leader of moderate Dissent during that period and the heir, theologically and pastorally, of Richard Baxter. He has been seen as forming a bridge between the more rational Dissenters, on the one hand, and the more conservative and orthodox wing of Dissent on the other. His thought has not, however, been the subject of a detailed analysis in the context of his time. This thesis sets out to conduct such an analysis in order to examine more closely his position within early eighteenth-century Dissent.

Doddridge’s philosophical and theological views are considered in chapters two to five. Chapter two assesses the extent of his indebtedness to the philosophy of John Locke, examining also the views of Isaac Watts and showing how Doddridge and Watts modified Locke’s thought in some areas in order to accommodate Christian beliefs. In chapter three, Doddridge’s views on natural theology, natural law and reason are considered and the influence on him of Samuel Clarke, in particular, is examined. Turning to theology, chapter four looks at the use in early eighteenth-century Dissent of terms such as ‘Baxterian’ and ‘moderate Calvinist’ and then considers Doddridge’s doctrinal positions on a range of subjects which are generally considered to represent Baxterian theology. Chapter five examines Doddridge’s views on the key interconnected areas of confessional subscription, scripture and the doctrine of the Trinity.

Practical subjects are then considered in chapters six to eight. Doddridge’s views on Christian piety are examined in chapter six. Chapter seven considers ways in
which Doddridge sought to communicate, examining the audiences whom he aimed to
reach, the ways in which he attempted to reach them and the content of what he wanted
to say. The eighth chapter looks at the subject of identity and argues that Doddridge is
to be viewed, not so much as a bridge between different wings of Dissent, but as a
leader amongst moderate Calvinists. In conclusion, this thesis argues that Philip
Doddridge sought to expound a Calvinist theology in the context of the philosophical
and theological debates of his day and to promote an ordered Dissent focused on central
evangelical truths and united around the language of scripture.
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Chapter 1

Introduction

‘Dum vivimus, vivamus’ is the motto which is said to belong to the coat of arms of the Doddridge family: ‘While we live, let’s live!’ It accurately captures the spirit of the early eighteenth-century Dissenting minister bearing that name, Philip Doddridge, who believed that life, as the gift of God, is given to be enjoyed (and that it is most enjoyed when lived for him who gave it). Much has consequently been written, rightly, about Doddridge’s generosity of spirit and freedom from partiality (or, in eighteenth-century terms, his ‘candour’), his humanity and kind-heartedness, his love for Christian unity and distaste for contention and division amongst those who profess faith in Jesus Christ and the breadth of the relationships that he maintained with contemporaries of often diverse views. Doddridge has proven to be an attractive figure for biographers and historians. He was held in high respect by his contemporaries, but did not entirely escape criticism from them: all his candour was not enough to ward off attacks from theological opponents both to the right and to the left and, perhaps more painfully, even some of his closest associates in the Dissenting ministry were unsettled by the friendly nature of his correspondence with leaders of the evangelical revival, in particular George Whitefield. The life-loving Philip Doddridge was not, then, a completely uncontroversial figure in his own time.

Philip Doddridge’s life spans the first half of the eighteenth century: he was born in London on 26 June 1702 and died in Lisbon on 26 October 1751. His forebears knew what it was to suffer for the Christian faith: his paternal grandfather, John Doddridge, lost his living as a Church of England clergyman at the Restoration, and his

2 Edmund Calamy, An Abridgment of Mr Baxter’s History of His Life and Times. With an Account of Many Others of Those Worthy Ministers Who Were Ejected, after the Restauration of King Charles the
mother’s father, John Bauman, a Hussite from Prague, was forced to flee his homeland in 1636, after Habsburg forces had regained control of Bohemia. Doddridge apparently valued highly his descent from those ‘who had made such Sacrifices to Conscience and Liberty’.³ Philip’s father was ‘brought up to Trade’ and is described as ‘an Oil-man in London’; he died when Philip was thirteen. His mother, so it is said, gave him biblical instruction when he was very young, ‘by the Assistance of some Dutch Tiles in the Chimney’.⁴ She also died before her son reached adulthood: ‘I know the Heart of an Orphan’, Doddridge commented later, ‘having myself been deprived of both my Parents, at an Age, in which it might reasonably be supposed a Child should be most sensible of such a Loss’.⁵ Doddridge was educated at Dissenting schools, first in Kingston-upon-Thames and then in St Albans where he came under the care of the minister of the Independent meeting, Samuel Clark, who was to be a life-long mentor and friend to him.⁶ Dissenting influences in Doddridge’s early life were strong.

These influences no doubt contributed to Doddridge’s refusal, as a teenager, of a generous offer of financial support from the Duchess of Bedford, to whom Philip was known as his uncle had been steward to the Earl (later Duke). The offer was conditional on Doddridge’s being educated for ministry in the Church of England, which he was not prepared to consider.⁷ Undaunted by the advice of the venerable Edmund Calamy, who discouraged Doddridge from considering pastoral ministry, the young man went,

---

³ [Orton], Memoirs, p. 6.
⁴ Ibid., pp. 4, 7.
⁵ Philip Doddridge, Sermons to Young Persons, on the Following Subjects: Viz. ... (London: Printed for J. Fowler, in Northampton, 1735), p. 158. The sermon is entitled, ‘The Orphan’s Hope’ and was preached ‘to some young Persons, whose Father, Mother and Sister had all died of the Small-pox a few Days before’, p. 157.
on Samuel Clark’s advice, to study with John Jennings (1687/8-1723), Independent
minister and tutor of a Dissenting academy in Kibworth, Leicestershire, beginning the
four year course there in October 1719.8 In July 1723, Jennings died of smallpox, not
long after he had been called to the pastorate of a congregation in Hinckley.9 Doddridge
had meanwhile accepted an invitation to pastor his tutor’s former congregation at
Kibworth, although a neighbouring minister, David Some in Market Harborough,
visited to preside at the Lord’s supper, Doddridge not yet having been ordained.10 In
December 1729, Doddridge accepted a call to the pastorate of the Independent meeting
at Castle Hill, Northampton, and moved there.11 A year later, he married Mercy Maris,
a young lady whom he had met in Coventry. Northampton was to be his base for the
remainder of his life.12

By the time of the Northampton move, Doddridge had begun to teach a few
students, but it was only after that move that his educational work began to develop, so
that, by his death, Doddridge had taught about 200 students, of whom about 120 entered
pastoral ministry.13 From 1734, he was assisted in his academy at Northampton by a
succession of younger men, the first of whom was Job Orton (1717-83),14 who also
assisted Doddridge in the pastorate at Castle Hill. Doddridge’s ministry at Northampton

8 Ibid., pp. 12-14.
9 Philip Doddridge to Samuel Clark, 6 July 1723, Humphreys, Correspondence, Vol. 1, p. 253 (Nuttall,
Calendar, Letter no. 69); Doddridge to Mrs Nettleton, 18 April 1722, Humphreys, Correspondence, Vol.
1, p. 117 (Nuttall, Calendar, Letter no. 24).
10 Philip Doddridge to Samuel Clark, 25 May 1723, Humphreys, Correspondence, Vol. 1, pp. 234-35
(Nuttall, Calendar, Letter no. 63); [Orton], Memoirs, p. 37. Doddridge’s ordination occurred on 19
March 1730, in Northampton: [Orton], Memoirs, p. 63.
11 Philip Doddridge to the Congregation at Northampton, 6 December 1729, Humphreys,
Correspondence, Vol. 2, pp. 516-18 (Nuttall, Calendar, Letter no. 333); Doddridge to Samuel Clark, 23
December 1729, Humphreys, Correspondence, Vol. 2, p. 518 (Nuttall, Calendar, Letter no. 334).
12 Philip Doddridge to Mercy Maris, 6 December 1730, Humphreys, Correspondence, Vol. 3, pp. 62-63
(Nuttall, Calendar, Letter no. 355).
13 Philip Doddridge to Samuel Clark, [7 August 1729], DWL, New College Library MSS L/10/18
(Nuttall, Calendar, Letter no. 319); [Orton], Memoirs, p. 120; ‘Northampton Academy’, n.d., DWL MS
L54/3/16; ‘Names, Residences, etc., of Gentlemen Who Finished Their Education under the Care of the
Rev. Philip Doddridge, D. D.’, Humphreys, Correspondence, Vol. 5, pp. 546-52; Dissenting Academies
Online, http://www.english.qmul.ac.uk/drwilliams/portal.html, last accessed 18th November 2011, lists
205 students.
14 [Orton], Memoirs, p. 86.
was thus divided between the pastorate, the work at the academy and, beginning with
the publication in 1730 of a treatise on the problems facing Dissent, his writing. In
1750, he fell ill after travelling to take the funeral service of his mentor, Samuel Clark,
in St Albans; unable fully to recover his health, he was advised in the summer of 1751
to travel to Lisbon in the hope that the warmer climate there would help him. It was wet
in Lisbon, however, and, despite his wife’s best efforts, he died shortly after their
arrival there.16

Philip Doddridge has been the subject of biography since soon after his death.
Job Orton’s Memoirs of Doddridge, published in 1766, are the principal biographical
source for the Northampton minister, on which all his later biographers have relied. In
1792, another former student, Andrew Kippis, prefaced the seventh edition of
Doddridge’s work on the New Testament, the Family Expositor, with a biographical
account which Kippis reprinted the following year in the fifth volume of his unfinished
second edition of Biographia Britannica.17 The centenary of Doddridge’s death saw the
publication of a Memorial of his life by John Stoughton; another nineteenth-century
tribute, by Charles Stanford, was published in 1880.18 Alexander Gordon, Principal of
the Unitarian Home Missionary College, Manchester, published an influential article on
Doddridge in his Addresses Biographical and Historical and contributed the article on

---

16 [Orton], Memoirs, pp. 317-52.
the Northampton pastor to the *Dictionary of National Biography*. More recently, Malcolm Deacon, a former pastor of Doddridge’s church in Northampton, published a biography of his predecessor in 1980 and a more popular work by Alan Clifford appeared in 2002 to mark the tercentenary of its subject’s birth. These various accounts have presented Doddridge as an attractive character, energetic, learned, pious, an open-hearted tutor and pastor and a prominent leader amongst the Dissenters of his day.

Scholarly study of the Northampton pastor and tutor was, in the twentieth century, led by Geoffrey Nuttall, to whom all who now work on Doddridge are deeply indebted. Nuttall’s seminal lecture at Dr Williams’s Library on the Puritan minister Richard Baxter and Doddridge in 1951, two hundred years after the latter’s death, expounded the thesis that a tradition could be discerned in the similarities between his two subjects, a view which has found ready acceptance by scholars of eighteenth-century Dissent. In the same year, Nuttall edited a volume of essays on different aspects of Doddridge’s work. Several of these essays pursue a similar line to that expounded in Nuttall’s lecture on Baxter and Doddridge, highlighting the latter’s piety, liberality of spirit and desire for unity amongst Christians. The work represented by these essays has served to draw attention particularly to Doddridge’s contribution to the areas of education, personal religion and the advancement of a tolerant Christianity.

Philip Doddridge’s contribution to Dissent has been addressed in general histories of eighteenth-century Dissent. In the nineteenth century, David Bogue and

---

James Bennett, from an evangelical orthodox standpoint, and John James Tayler, from a more liberal, rationalist perspective, included in their work significant sections on the contribution of the Northampton minister. This latter perspective is reflected, in the twentieth century, in the work of Jeremy Goring, who, like Tayler, saw Doddridge as a herald of a liberal, open-hearted Christianity. R. Tudur Jones and Michael Watts, by contrast, have tended to present Doddridge as a more conservative and theologically orthodox figure in the context of early eighteenth-century Dissent. More recently, Isabel Rivers has argued that Doddridge, with Isaac Watts, sought to balance the rational and evangelical elements within early eighteenth-century Dissent, as champions of a religion of the affections. Doddridge’s significance to English church history of the time may be seen by the fact that he earned a chapter to himself in Gordon Rupp’s *Religion in England, 1688-1791.* More specialised studies have examined literary aspects of Doddridge’s work, his preaching, his hymns, elements of his theology.

---

30 Donald Macleod, ‘God or god?: Arianism, Ancient and Modern’, *Evangelical Quarterly* 67 (1996), pp. 121-38; Richard A. Muller, ‘Philip Doddridge and the Formulation of Calvinistic Theology in an Era of
his links with the Netherlands and his contribution to Dissenting education. In addition to published work on Doddridge, a number of postgraduate studies have been carried out on different aspects of his work, mostly recently a thesis by Tessa Whitehouse on the posthumous publishing of Doddridge’s works. These works evidence a continuing tension in scholarly assessments of Philip Doddridge, between those who see him as essentially orthodox and evangelical in his theological beliefs and those who perceive him to be a more liberal figure open to rational influences.

Doddridge’s posthumous reputation and his interest for historians have rested partly on his work as tutor of a Dissenting academy, especially on the lectures which he delivered to his ministerial students and which were published after his death in accordance with his wishes. Doddridge’s Course of Lectures enjoyed an unusual longevity, being widely used in Dissenting academies during the second half of the eighteenth and the first half of the nineteenth centuries. By the end of the eighteenth century, the work had reached its fourth edition: successive editors treated the lectures...
as a kind of working manual, each in turn adding a considerable number of lengthy
notes to Doddridge’s text, commenting on the content, adding references to works
published after his death and often pointing out where his reasoning was deficient or his
views not quite in line with their own.35 The time and labour thereby expended
demonstrate the importance of Doddridge’s work for Dissenting education in the
eighteenth century. This importance is recognised in the histories of the Dissenting
academies,36 which give considerable space to Doddridge’s educational contribution.
Dissenting education is thus one field in which Doddridge has proven to be of historical
significance.

Doddridge is of interest to historians also because of the large amount of his
correspondence which has survived. Two significant editions of his letters have been
produced, the first by Thomas Stedman, published in 1790, and the second forty years
later by Doddridge’s great-grandson John Doddridge Humphreys, in five volumes.37
The letters reveal a great deal about Doddridge’s relationships with fellow-ministers,
Dissenting and establishment, and with students, former students and parents of
students, political, literary and scientific figures and family members and personal

35 After the first edition, edited by Doddridge’s pupil Samuel Clark, son of the St Albans minister,
successive editions are: 2nd edn., ed. Clark, London: Printed by Assignment from the Author’s Widow,
Kippis, London: Printed for G. G. & J. Robinson et al., 1799; further notes were added by the editors in
the version printed in E. Williams & E. Parsons, eds., The Works of the Revd. P. Doddridge, D. D., 10
5-420.
36 Parker, Dissenting Academies; McLachlan, English Education; Ashley Smith, Birth. A comprehensive
and up-to-date study of the Dissenting academies is currently being carried out by The Dissenting
Academies Project, a collaboration between the Dr Williams’s Centre for Dissenting Studies and the
Sussex Centre for Intellectual History, which is due to publish its work as A History of the Dissenting
Academies in the British Isles, 1660-1860 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, forthcoming); see
also its website, Dissenting Academies Online, which provides supporting material,
http://www.english.qmul.ac.uk/drwilliams/portal.html, last accessed 18th November 2011.
37 Thomas Stedman, ed., Letters to and from the Rev. Philip Doddridge, D. D. Late of Northampton:
Published from the Originals: with Notes Explanatory and Biographical (Shrewsbury: Printed and Sold
by J. and W. Eddowes, 1790); John Doddridge Humphreys, The Correspondence and Diary of Philip
Doddridge, D. D. Illustrative of Various Particulars in His Life hitherto Unknown: With Notices of Many
of His Contemporaries; and a Sketch of the Ecclesiastical History of the Times in Which He Lived, 5
acquaintances. The intention of the editors of the published editions was to hold Doddridge up as an example of true Christian ‘virtue, piety, and moderation’ and of his ‘candour’ even ‘towards persons of a different persuasion’ from himself. In 1979, Geoffrey Nuttall’s calendar of Doddridge’s published and unpublished correspondence, so far as had then been located, was published; a supplement appeared in 2001 with some additional letters that had since come to light. Historians have used the letters to demonstrate the breadth of the contacts which Doddridge maintained across a range of theological and ecclesiastical positions and as a source of information about religious, social and political opinions and conditions in early eighteenth-century Dissent. The nature and extent of Doddridge’s surviving correspondence has ensured his enduring interest to historians.

Doddridge’s position in Dissenting history is, finally, supported by his publications. His Course of Lectures has been mentioned already, as has his Family Expositor, a six-volume paraphrase and commentary on the entire New Testament which Doddridge considered to be one of his most significant works. Much of his other published output consists of sermons, either singly or collected, as, for example, the series of sermons to young persons, the series on the power and grace of Christ and the series on regeneration. Other works include his popular devotional treatise, written at the instigation of Isaac Watts, The Rise and Progress of Religion in the Soul (1745),

39 Geoffrey F. Nuttall, Calendar of the Correspondence of Philip Doddridge DD (1702-1751) (London: Her Majesty’s Stationery Office, 1979); Nuttall, Philip Doddridge: Additional Letters. A Supplement to ‘Calendar of the Correspondence of Philip Doddridge (1777)’ (London: Dr Williams’s Trust, 2001).
and his account of the life and conversion of his friend, Colonel James Gardiner, who
died at the battle of Prestonpans, following the surrender of Edinburgh to the Jacobite
rebels in September 1745. Translations of several of Doddridge’s works were
published during his lifetime, in French, Dutch, German and Welsh, the *Rise and
Progress* and the sermons on regeneration being amongst the most popular in that
respect. Doddridge’s first published work was a reply to a disguised attack on certain
characteristics of Dissent, in the form of an analysis of the reasons for its supposed
decline. In a later rare foray into polemics, Doddridge published three letters in reply
to a work by the Deist, Henry Dodwell. Doddridge edited some works by Robert
Leighton, Archbishop of Glasgow, and, with David Jennings, the works of Isaac
Watts. Following his tutor’s death, Job Orton published a collection of Doddridge’s
hymns, many of which had been written for the use of the Castle Hill congregation.
Doddridge had wanted published after his death the lectures on preaching which he
used to deliver to his ministerial students at the academy, a wish which was not fulfilled

---

42 Philip Doddridge, *The Rise and Progress of Religion in the Soul: Illustrated in a Course of Serious and
Practical Addresses, Suited to Persons of Every Character and Circumstance: With a Devout Meditation
or Prayer Added to Each Chapter* (London: Printed and Sold by J. Waugh, 1745); *Some Remarkable
Passages in the Life of the Honourable Col. James Gardiner, Who Was Slain at the Battle of Preston-
Pans, September 21, 1745, with an Appendix Relating to the Antient Family of the Munro’s of Fowlis.*

43 [Philip Doddridge], *Free Thoughts on the Most Probable Means of Reviving the Dissenting Interest.
Occasion’d by the Late Enquiry into the Causes of Its Decay. Address’d to the Author of That Enquiry.
By a Minister in the Country.* (London: Printed for Richard Hett, 1730);

44 Philip Doddridge, *An Answer to a Late Pamphlet, Intitled, ‘Christianity Not Founded on Argument’,

45 [Philip] Doddridge, ed., *The Expository Works and Other Remains of Archbishop Leighton, Some of
Which Were Never Before Printed, 2 vols.* (Edinburgh: Printed for David Wilson, 1748); David Jennings
& Philip Doddridge, eds., *The Works of the Late Reverend and Learned Isaac Watts, D. D. Published by
Himself, and Now Collected into Six Volumes. In Which Are also Inserted the Second Part of the
Improvement of the Mind, an Essay on Education, and Some Additions to His Miscellaneous Thoughts in
Prose and Verse. Now First Published from His Manuscripts, and, by the Direction of His Will, Revised

46 Job Orton, ed., *Hymns Founded on Various Texts in the Holy Scriptures. By the Late Reverend Philip
Doddridge, D. D. Published from the Author’s Manuscript* (Salop: Printed by J. Eddowes & J. Cotton,
1755).
until the following century.\textsuperscript{47} This body of published work has provided historians with a rich source for the study of Doddridge across a variety of topics.

The significant amount of attention given to Philip Doddridge in Dissenting history raises the question of the need for further academic work on Philip Doddridge. The major lacuna in Doddridge scholarship currently is in the area of his thought: there has to date been no full-length analysis of his philosophical and theological beliefs as a whole. Doddridge, who believed that all of life, including the intellectual, was to be lived for God and therefore that a full appreciation of life cannot exclude the life of the mind, would have questioned such neglect. Without a more detailed analysis of his thought and that of his contemporaries in Dissent, attempts to situate Doddridge within that movement or to identify connections with individuals from former generations are likely to rest on insecure foundations. Richard Muller has recently called for a ‘fully contextualized study of Doddridge’s theology as a whole’,\textsuperscript{48} a call which this thesis seeks to answer by examining the principal areas of Doddridge’s thought in the context of the intellectual trends and influences of his own day. In doing so, it will interact with four related fields of academic study: socio-political and cultural issues in early eighteenth-century England, the general history of ideas in the seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries, Puritan theology and the history of Dissent.

Firstly, some attention needs to be given to the political, social and cultural aspects of early eighteenth-century England. Doddridge’s period of pastoral ministry began four years prior to the accession of George II and continued for the first twenty-four years of that monarch’s reign. Despite occasional outbursts of anti-Dissenting feeling on the part of the authorities or the populace, this period was a time of relative


\textsuperscript{48} Muller, ‘Philip Doddridge’, p. 84.
peace for Dissenters in England: the Hanoverian succession and the Whig government of that time, whilst not minded to relieve Dissent of the disabilities under which the settlement of 1689 had left it, had reversed the Tory inroads on that settlement made during the reign of Anne. Politically, the main events impinging on Doddridge’s life were the Jacobite threat, particularly the events surrounding the invasion of 1745, and, on the international scene, the War of the Austrian Succession (1739-48), especially the siege of Bergen-op-Zoom in 1747 which sparked the first of two tracts, published in Dutch, which Doddridge addressed to the Protestants in the Netherlands. Culturally, this was an age of ‘politeness’ and ‘sensibility’, of elegance and a plainness in literary style. It was also the era of scientific and geographic enquiry, when advances made by the natural philosophers Robert Boyle (1627-91) and Isaac Newton (1642-1727), as well as others, in the later part of the previous century led to a surge of interest amongst the educated class more generally. Northampton was no exception to the general trend, with the establishment in 1743 of its philosophical society, in which Philip Doddridge played an active part. Although it is not suggested that social, cultural and political factors were to the forefront of Doddridge’s thought on philosophical and theological matters, any account of that thought needs to take into consideration those aspects of the age in which he lived.

49 Philip Doddridge, *Aenspraak aen de Protestantsche Ingezetenen der Vereenigde Nederlanden ...* (Te Amsterdam: Bij Isaak Tirion, 1747); Doddridge, *Tweede Aenspraak aen de Protestantsche Ingezetenen der Vereenigde Nederlanden ...* (Te Amsterdam: Bij Isaak Tirion & Gerardus Borstius, 1748).

Secondly, and more fully, any analysis of the thought of Philip Doddridge must be placed within the context of the broad intellectual trends operative during the seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries. One of the most significant areas in which shifts in thinking took place over that period was the epistemological: the question of how humans acquire reliable knowledge about the world around them. Under the influence of thinkers such as Francis Bacon (1561-1626) in England and Pierre Gassendi (1592-1655) in France, the traditional categories and modes of reasoning of Aristotelian scholasticism began to give way to a more empirical approach. Towards the end of the seventeenth century, this approach was becoming increasingly dominant as a result of the work, in particular, of Robert Boyle and Isaac Newton and of the philosopher John Locke (1632-1704). The authority of tradition was giving way before the appeal to reason.

At the same time, questions were raised about the essential nature of things: the traditional distinction between the material and the immaterial was examined and different conclusions reached about the fundamental nature of and the relationship between matter and spirit. Thomas Hobbes (1588-1679) denied that spirit had any existence separate from matter, so that even when scripture speaks of spirits, it should...
be understood to mean by that term corporeal, extended beings. Baruch de Spinoza (1632-77) considered that there is only one fundamental substance: ‘Except God, no substance can be or be conceived.’ The German philosopher Gottfried Wilhelm Leibniz (1646-1716) postulated a system of monads, entities by which all matter is united and which are the ‘true atoms of nature, and, in a word, the elements of things’. The theologian Samuel Clarke (1675-1729), by contrast, defended what he believed to be the Newtonian view that spirit was fundamentally different from matter and that the latter was ultimately dependent upon God, who is a spirit. The Aristotelian concepts of substance and accidents were questioned and new modes for understanding the essence of things were put forward. In the concern to explain why things are the way they are, attention was turned to the nature of humanity, raising questions about the place of the human will, the basis of action, the origin of human feelings and the issue of individual identity. Questions about the grounds of human morality were also raised.

Inevitably, enquiry focused on the nature of the deity and his relationship to the material world: in what ways was he separate from the material world, to what extent was that world dependent upon God and how did he bring about effects within the observable universe? The seventeenth century, then, was a period of significant philosophical questioning in relation to some of the fundamental questions of knowledge and existence.

By the early eighteenth century, these developments had resulted, in Britain at least, in a philosophical atmosphere which evinced a tendency to question tradition and authority as the foundation of knowledge and substitute for it an approach based on human observation and reason. The predominant philosopher whose views seemed to encapsulate this approach was John Locke and it is his epistemology which is generally seen as paradigmatic for the early eighteenth century. Roger Thomas has given some attention to Locke’s influence on the philosophical views of Doddridge, but discussions of Philip Doddridge’s philosophical stance have otherwise tended to assume the primacy of Locke in the Northampton minister’s thinking. However, there has been little detailed analysis in the secondary literature of Doddridge’s philosophy, despite the existence of his lectures in that area. His understanding of the workings of the human mind, his natural theology arguments for the existence and attributes of God and his moral philosophy, as evidenced by those lectures, have not to date been subjected to any sustained analysis in the context of contemporary thought on those topics. The reasons for his holding the positions which he held have not been explored in any detail and the question of the impact that his philosophical beliefs made on his theology, and

---

vice versa, remains at the level of assumption rather than analysis. In the absence of more detailed work, a Lockean verdict on Doddridge’s philosophy remains unproven.56

The decay of antiquity and tradition as authoritative sources of knowledge had inevitable consequences for the authority of divine revelation in questions of religion. Attacks on the historical reliability of the events recorded in the Bible grew through the course of the seventeenth century, as did questions over the genuineness of the documents making up the scriptures. More fundamentally, the view that the teachings of a supposed divine revelation could not be accepted unless they passed the test of reasonableness began to win acceptance. An emphasis upon the use of natural theology to establish the existence and attributes of God, as well, if possible, as other spiritual truths, gave rise at the end of the seventeenth century to the establishment of the Boyle lectures, under the will of the scientist and philosopher Robert Boyle (1627-91).

Richard Bentley (1662-1742) and Samuel Clarke, amongst the early lecturers on this scheme, set out arguments of natural theology which were to be the subject of much discussion in the first half of the new century. The reasonableness of religion was thus a central issue in the early eighteenth century.57


Alongside these developments a related movement was promoting the cause of toleration in matters of religion. The argument that religion was a matter of the conscience and that attempts should not be made, by civil or ecclesiastical authorities, to compel individuals to profess beliefs that they did not in fact hold began to gain ground through the course of the seventeenth century. In England, these principles were worked out politically through the Toleration Act of 1689, which allowed those dissenting from the established church to worship in their own congregations: though the requirement to subscribe to certain articles of faith and the various disabilities imposed on Dissenters by the law in the area, for example, of university education and qualifications for public office demonstrate, as J. C. D. Clark argues, that the idea of the confessional state was far from dead in eighteenth-century England.\(^{58}\) Within the church, the heightened role of reason in forming opinions and the debate about liberty of conscience came together to promote the idea that tests of belief, in the form of subscription to creeds and confessions, were an illegitimate and unnecessary constraint on the individual believer’s profession. The view that the language of the Bible rather than that of confessions was sufficient began to take hold: each person should be free to hold whatever beliefs reason dictated, within the constraints of scripture alone. The divine language of the Bible, as understood by the individual, rather than the opinion of civil or ecclesiastical authority or the human words of confessions, should alone dictate the believer’s opinions on religious questions.\(^{59}\)

---

\(^{58}\) Clark, *English Society*.

These various ideas about reason, tolerance and liberty have all been rightly identified as important for Philip Doddridge. His concern for the place of reason in theological thought is demonstrated by the prominence devoted to natural religion and natural law in the lectures which he gave to his ministerial students at the Northampton academy, where they occupy nearly half the course. His Dissenting convictions, confirmed by his rejection of the early opportunity offered to him to train for ministry in the established church, together with his consistent stance against the imposition of creeds and confessions by enforced subscription, show something of the strength of his views on tolerance and liberty. The question of the precise relationship of his view of reason to his philosophical and theological ideas is one, however, which deserves exploration. Similarly, his tolerant spirit has often been noted, along with his ‘candour’ and dislike of controversy, but some examination of the limits, if any, of his tolerance, so far as doctrinal matters are concerned, may be merited. The attitudes which he adopted to different parties within Dissent may also repay attention, in order to discern the contours of the beliefs and practices with which he most closely identified.

The third area of scholarship which intersects with the study of Doddridge’s thought is that of seventeenth-century Puritanism with particular reference to the life and work of Richard Baxter. It is Geoffrey Nuttall who has articulated most clearly

---


60 See p. 2, above.

the thesis that Doddridge was Baxter’s heir, with the result that Dissenting scholarship has tended to take for granted that the two men have in common a similar theology and piety. Remarkably, this consensus has developed without any detailed attempt to analyse and compare Doddridge’s theological views with those of Baxter. Similarly, although the terms ‘Baxterian’, ‘moderate Calvinist’, ‘middle-way man’ and others like them are used freely in the secondary literature with reference to Doddridge, there has been no detailed attempt to assess how these terms were used in Doddridge’s day and the sense, if any, in which they are in fact applicable to him. A re-assessment of the extent of Baxter’s influence on Doddridge, in the light of these factors, would seem appropriate. The emphasis upon the influence of Baxter has also cast into the shadows any sustained analysis of the impact of the wider Puritan movement upon Philip Doddridge. Without some understanding of Baxter’s own place within that movement, it is not possible to distinguish influences upon Doddridge that are specifically Baxterian from those which are more broadly Puritan. Furthermore, recent scholarship has come to recognise the variety which existed within the Puritan movement of the seventeenth century. Some understanding of the various different theological positions within Puritanism and their relationship to one another is of importance for assessing the shape of Dissent in Doddridge’s day and, specifically, for understanding Doddridge’s position within that movement.

The final area of scholarship connected with a study of Doddridge’s thought, and that which is most immediately relevant, is that of the history of Dissent.


Doddridge’s life has been of interest to historians in part because of the leading role which he played in Dissent in the second quarter of the eighteenth century. With the English throne occupied by Hanoverians from 1714, the outlook for Dissent in Doddridge’s day seemed settled, George II apparently pronouncing that there would be no persecution for conscience’ sake during his reign.63 This did not mean that Dissenters were never troubled: Doddridge was prosecuted (ultimately unsuccessfully) by a local clergyman for running a Dissenting academy and, on another occasion, was forced to persuade reluctant Tory magistrates to take action against the perpetrators of an assault on some of his students at a village meeting at which they were officiating.64 Nevertheless, for the most part, Dissent had entered into a more settled age in which it was able to pursue its activities relatively unhindered. It was during this period that Philip Doddridge carried out his ministry so that, with the Independent minister and hymn-writer Isaac Watts (1674-1748), he is recognised as one of the leaders of Dissent in that period.

Doddridge’s ministry thus spanned a relatively settled period for Dissent. The troubled times of persecution, between the Restoration of the monarchy and the Toleration Act, were long passed. The neonomian controversy, the break-up of the Happy Union and the disturbances over the ministry of Richard Davis were the concerns of a previous generation of Dissenters. Doddridge was too young to have been involved in the Salters’ Hall controversy in 1719, though the effects of that dispute continued to be felt in his day. On the whole, Dissent for the entire period of Doddridge’s ministry experienced no defining event: no grand uniting scheme or shattering divisive controversy.65 Dissent was not untouched by the evangelical revival

63 [Orton], Memoirs, p. 251.
64 Ibid., pp. 249-52; Philip Doddridge to Samuel Clark, 1 January 1737, DWL, New College Library MSS L1/10/20 (Nuttall, Calendar, Letter no. 450).
65 See, for Dissent over this period, Watts, Dissenters, pp. 263-393.
which broke out in the middle of the fourth decade of the century, a number of ministers, Doddridge among them, showing considerable interest in what was occurring. At the same time, Dissenting ministers regularly expressed concern over their perception that Dissent was decaying: indeed, Doddridge’s first publication, in 1730, addressed that topic. Nevertheless, compared with the history of Dissent over the previous fifty years or so, the second quarter of the eighteenth century was comparatively quiet.

This, of course, poses a problem for an assessment of a man whose ministry almost precisely spanned the period in question. The temptation to read his life either in the light of subsequent, apparently more significant, developments or as itself simply a development of earlier trends from a previous age is strong. There has been a marked tendency amongst historians of Dissent to give way to this temptation, casting Doddridge either as the lineal descendant of Richard Baxter or as the forerunner of a rational Dissent which, in the later eighteenth century, finally carried through the supposed victory of reason over the allegedly irrational aspects of the Christian faith. Thus Joseph Priestley becomes the most significant pupil whom Doddridge almost had. There is lacking a thorough analysis of Doddridge in the context of his own day. A more detailed assessment of Doddridge’s beliefs in comparison with those of his contemporaries is likely to shed light on his position within Dissent as well as on the identity of the influences upon him and the effects which he had on those who followed him.

66 [Doddridge], *Free Thoughts.*
67 Priestley had wanted to study under Doddridge, but was prevented by the latter’s death, going instead to the successor academy at Daventry under the tutorship of Caleb Ashworth.: see John Towill Rutt, ed., *The Theological and Miscellaneous Works of Joseph Priestley, LL. D., F. R. S., &c.,* Vol. 1, Part 1, *Life and Correspondence (1733-1787)* (Hackney: Printed by George Smallfield, n.d.), p. 23.
A sub-set of Dissenting history which particularly concerns Doddridge is that which relates to the Dissenting academies.68 The significance of Doddridge’s academy for Dissenting education in the early eighteenth century, coupled with the wide use made of his academy lectures after his death and the availability of those lectures in a series of editions from their first publication in 1763, have meant that Doddridge’s role as a tutor could not be ignored by historians of the academies. Nevertheless, the work done on his Northampton academy has tended to suffer from the difficulties highlighted above. His academic contribution has been seen primarily in terms of the promotion of ‘freedom of enquiry’ as an acceptable pedagogical approach, the advancement of a Lockean philosophy and a natural theology based on reason and the exposition of a Baxterian theology.69 Again, hindsight has afflicted the historiography to some degree, as the practices of his successor tutors have been assumed to be in a direct line of development from his own.70 A fresh examination of Doddridge’s academy teaching is needed to situate it within the context of his own day.71

The advent of the evangelical revival, with John Wesley’s heart-warming experience on 24 May 1738 in Aldersgate Street and George Whitefield’s taking to the fields to preach in February 1739, is, again in the light of later history, perhaps the most significant event in the history of the evangelical wing of the Christian church in Britain during the period of Doddridge’s ministry.72 The ambiguous nature of his relationship

68 See footnote 32, above, for works on Dissenting academies.
70 See, for example, Ashley Smith, *Birth*, p. 148; McLachlan, *English Education*, p. 152; Victor Murray, ‘Doddridge’, p. 120.
71 The Dissenting Academies Project, referred to above, footnote 36, whose work will, when published, undoubtedly go a considerable way towards providing such an examination for the academies generally.
with its English and German leaders has been noted in the secondary literature, but further exploration in this area may prove fruitful. Historians of Dissent have tended to see the revival as coinciding with a general decline in the three denominations making up the Old Dissent, with the rational wing developing over the century into unqualified rationalism and, ultimately, unitarianism and the evangelical wing subsumed or superseded by the new Methodist movements. The revival began when Doddridge’s ministry in Northampton was less than half-way through its course; he followed its progress both at home and abroad and corresponded with its leaders. Doddridge’s attitude to the revival is thus likely to shed light upon his thought and should form part of any analysis of his theological views. Thus in these four areas – early eighteenth-century British political, social and cultural history, general philosophical developments in the seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries, Puritan thought with particular reference to Richard Baxter and the history of Dissent in the early eighteenth century a close study of the thought of Philip Doddridge may be expected to bear significant fruit.

The primary sources available for the analysis which this thesis sets out to provide consist principally of Doddridge’s published works and his unpublished correspondence. Evidence of his thought is supplied particularly in the Course of Lectures, where his detailed views on philosophical and theological topics are given, and in the Family Expositor, which contains his comments on the entire New

---


See, for example, Watts, Dissenters, pp. 434-45, 464-71.

See, for example, Count Zinzendorf to Philip Doddridge, 5 December 1739, Humphreys, Correspondence, Vol. 3, pp. 265-68 (Nuttall, Calendar, Letter no. 574), providing information in response to Doddridge’s request about the progress of evangelistic work; Doddridge to Daniel Wadsworth, 6 March 1741, Connecticut Historical Society MSS (Nuttall, Calendar, Letter no. 663), responding to Wadsworth with a detailed account of the state of religion in England; George Whitefield to Doddridge, 21 December 1748, The Works of the Reverend George Whitefield, M. A. ..., Vol. 2 (London: Printed for Edward & Charles Dilly, et al., 1771), pp. 214-16 (Nuttall, Calendar, Letter no. 1428); Doddridge to John Wesley, 18 June 1746, Humphreys, Correspondence, Vol. 4, pp. 484-95 (Nuttall, Calendar, Letter no. 1166).
Testament. His sermons and other published works provide information on his doctrinal position across a range of Christian beliefs. In addition, some sets of manuscript notes of his lectures survive, almost all of which are in shorthand. Doddridge taught his students, on their arrival at his academy, a form of shorthand which he adopted from that of Jeremiah Rich, which they were to use for taking down verbatim the lectures which he gave them and for noting extracts from authors in their times of private study. Some attempt has been made to transcribe small portions of the extant notes, with the help of shorthand experts familiar with eighteenth-century shorthand. However, it has proven difficult, even with the benefit of that help, to obtain a complete transcription of even a small section of the notes. No attempt has been made, therefore, to transcribe larger extracts, let alone the entirety, of the notes, which run to several hundred pages in total. Instead, the approach adopted has been to compare each set of notes with the others and with the published version of the lectures: because section numbers and references in the notes were recorded in longhand, such a comparison makes it possible to observe where sections have been added to or, more rarely, omitted from a previous version of the lectures. This exercise, coupled with the limited transcription already referred to, has enabled some tentative conclusions to be reached about the development of Doddridge’s lectures over the course of his life and about the extent to which the posthumously published version of the lectures represents the content of what Doddridge in fact taught.

Doddridge’s correspondence, published and unpublished, supplies information about his relationships with others within and outside Dissent and thus helps provide a rounded picture of his position within Dissent and within the wider community.

However, the edition of the correspondence published by John Doddridge Humphreys in 1829-31\textsuperscript{78} presents some challenges to the researcher. Geoffrey Nuttall has shown how different Humphreys’s editing methods were from more recent scholarly standards: Humphreys silently omitted sections of letters, altered words and phrases and sometimes even changed dates and merged letters.\textsuperscript{79} Accordingly, manuscript originals of letters have been consulted where they are extant and accessible. The largest collection of original letters of Doddridge is at Dr Williams’s Library in London and extensive use has been made of those holdings. Other significant collections exist at Castle Hill United Reformed Church, Northampton, John Rylands University Library, Manchester, and Northampton Public Library. Letters of Doddridge also exist at over forty further libraries, including some in North America and some on the European continent. It has not been possible to visit overseas collections. Decisions about which of these libraries to visit have been made on the basis of Geoffrey Nuttall’s Calendar, as supplemented by the Additional Correspondence:\textsuperscript{80} where a letter appears from those sources to be likely to make some significant contribution to an understanding of Doddridge’s thought, particularly in the areas of his theology or philosophy, his relationship with other ministers or his perceptions of contemporary religious issues, an attempt has been made to gain access to it. Hence, in addition to the collections noted above, correspondence at Bedford Record Office, the Bodleian Library, Oxford, Lambeth Palace Library and the Moravian Archives in London has been seen. In addition, a digital copy of a significant letter which Doddridge wrote to Daniel Wadsworth in Boston, Massachusetts, was supplied electronically by the Connecticut


\textsuperscript{79} Nuttall, Calendar, pp. xxxvii, 369-71.

\textsuperscript{80} Geoffrey F. Nuttall, Philip Doddridge: Additional Letters. A Supplement to ‘Calendar of the Correspondence of Philip Doddridge’ (1977) [sic] (London: Dr Williams’s Trust, 2001).
Historical Society.\(^{81}\) Where it has not been possible, within these constraints, to obtain access to an original letter, or where the original is no longer extant, the published version has been used with appropriate caution.

In assessing Philip Doddridge’s thought, this thesis seeks to adopt the principles outlined by Quentin Skinner in relation to, principally, political thought, summarised by the well-known phrase which he uses, ‘Seeing things their way’.\(^ {82}\) Skinner urges historians of ideas that ‘we need to situate the texts we study within such intellectual contexts and frameworks of discourse as enable us to recognise what their authors were doing in writing them’. The aim should be ‘to grasp their concepts, to follow their distinctions, to recover their beliefs and, so far as possible, to see things their way’.\(^{83}\) What Skinner applied to the history of political thought, others more recently have sought to articulate for the history of religious ideas, warning of the danger that a modern secularist mindset may pose when writing the intellectual history of a more religiously minded age: that ‘secular ideas and ideologies are just as capable of distorting the study of religion as are particular religious commitments’.\(^{84}\) In that particular respect, Doddridge has been happier in his commentators than many other religious figures in history: historians who have sought to assess Doddridge have generally treated his ideas with great sympathy. Yet the danger is still present: indeed, with Doddridge, it tends to lie precisely in that last-mentioned area. It has often been sympathy with, rather than scepticism of, Doddridge which has led some to give prominence in their accounts of his thought to ideas about, for example, ecumenism and

\(^{81}\) Doddridge to Wadsworth, 6 March 1741, Connecticut Historical Society MSS (Nuttall, Calendar, Letter no. 663).


liberalism in religion which may have more to do with the history of the church in the
nineteenth or twentieth centuries than with her experience in the eighteenth. This thesis
seeks to address Doddridge’s thought in the context of his own times: to understand his
ideas, the influences which formed them and the manner in which he expressed them in
a way which makes sense in the context of early eighteenth-century Dissent, even if it
risks looking odd in the more secular-minded twenty-first century Western world.

Consequently, this thesis does not attempt to find in Doddridge’s work answers
to questions that did not concern him, whether of the future (from his perspective) or
the past. Nineteenth-century liberal religion and twentieth-century ecumenism were not,
by definition, concerns of the early eighteenth-century Dissenter. Equally, the questions
which Puritan divines faced during the Civil War and then after the Restoration were
not those which faced Doddridge in the far more settled conditions of the early
eighteenth century. Although this thesis will seek to assess the influence of earlier
figures within and outside Dissent upon Doddridge’s thinking, it will seek to do so in
the context of the questions facing Dissent in Doddridge’s day, rather than those of an
earlier time. Rather than narrowing the usefulness of the analysis, such an approach, by
clarifying the nature of Doddridge’s ideas in his own day, should assist a more accurate
and therefore fruitful application of Doddridge’s analysis of the issues which he faced
to the questions of another age.

The thesis will also attempt, where possible, to address the question of
influences on Doddridge’s thinking. This raises the questions of the nature of influence
and of what, for the historian, constitutes adequate evidence of influence. In his
examination of the influence of the church fathers on John Calvin, Anthony Lane sets
out the methodology which he adopted in his careful analysis of Calvin’s writings in an
attempt to establish the extent, if any, to which Calvin was influenced by any particular
ancient theologian. Lane emphasises the need for a critical approach to this question: mere citation does not establish that Calvin even read a particular source, let alone was influenced by it. Furthermore, parallels and similarities of language between Calvin and a particular source do not establish that Calvin was influenced by that source, even where the source is extensively cited by Calvin. Lane is more content to acknowledge influence on Calvin by a school of thought rather than by particular individuals, because of the difficulties attendant upon establishing the far more precise claims of the latter.85 These comments are particularly appropriate in the case of Doddridge, whose Course of Lectures and, to a lesser extent, Family Expositor, are peppered with references to the works of other authors. These references are relevant to the question of influence, but cannot be taken to be definitive evidence of it.

The need for a critical approach to the question of influence is underlined by Quentin Skinner, who proposed an approach according to which, in order to establish that B came to a particular view as a result of the influence of A, evidence is required demonstrating three elements: that B studied A, that B could not have acquired the view in question from someone other than A and that B could not have arrived at that view independently.86 Skinner’s caution is justified, but his use of the phrase ‘could not have’ in the second and third elements of his test seems unnecessarily restrictive, rendering them, it would seem, almost impossible to satisfy (as he himself appears to acknowledge at least in respect of the third element).87 Rather than requiring proof of an impossibility, a more realistic approach, it can be suggested, which retains the necessary degree of critical engagement, would demand evidence that B is more likely, on balance, to have come to the view under examination by the influence of A rather

85 Anthony N. S. Lane, John Calvin: Student of the Church Fathers (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1999), pp. 8-9, 24-25.
86 Skinner, Visions, pp. 75-76.
87 Skinner, Visions, p. 76.
than of anyone else or from B’s own reflection. This is the approach to the question of influence which will be adopted in this thesis, an approach which is somewhat less rigorous than that propounded by Skinner, but which, it is argued, is more practical while remaining sufficiently critical to avoid attributing influence where the evidence does not justify such a conclusion.

It is hoped that an analysis of this kind, focused on the thought of Philip Doddridge, may open up fresh areas of research and lines of enquiry which are not central to this thesis and which therefore have not been pursued in detail. In particular, the relationship between theological and philosophical shifts in thinking from the Puritan era to early eighteenth-century Dissent is an area in which there remains ample scope for further investigation. This thesis attempts a detailed analysis of Doddridge’s philosophical and theological views; similar studies have recently been undertaken for other significant seventeenth-century figures, such as John Preston and John Howe.88 However, other individuals prominent in Dissent in this period, for example Isaac Watts, remain to be addressed in this way. Finally, this thesis argues that Philip Doddridge’s place within the Dissent of his day needs to be studied in its own right: if this is correct, some reconfiguration of the shape of Dissent in the second quarter of the eighteenth century may be required and further work could be done to examine more closely its internal relationships as well as its connections with the evangelical revival and with Protestant groupings in other parts of Europe and America.

The following four chapters of this thesis seek to expound Doddridge’s thinking in matters of philosophy and theology, taking as their starting-point the relevant sections of the Course of Lectures, in which Doddridge discusses these areas of knowledge in a systematic manner. Chapter two discusses some of the principal

philosophical questions addressed in the *Course of Lectures*. Doddridge’s position in the shift away from an Aristotelian mode of thought will be considered. In epistemological questions, the extent of the influence of John Locke will be examined and the position of Isaac Watts, who wrote on many of the topics addressed in this chapter, will also be considered and compared with that of Locke and of Doddridge. This chapter will thus contribute to an understanding of Doddridge’s position on these questions of philosophy as they were debated in his time.

Chapter three continues the discussion of philosophical topics, turning to the relationship between reason and revelation. It will examine Doddridge’s position in the debates about the usefulness of natural theology and the best approach to it, as well as the question of the right basis for a sound moral philosophy. His understanding of these issues will be examined with the aim of supplying a more precise picture of his position on the relationship between reason and revelation and on the place of natural theology and natural law. Together, it is hoped that these two chapters will contribute to a clearer understanding of Doddridge’s philosophy on issues that were of vital importance in his day.

Turning to theology, chapter four will discuss the term ‘Baxterian’ and the influence of Richard Baxter in relation to Doddridge’s doctrinal views. The ‘middle way’ which Baxter sought to follow in theology particularly affected questions concerning the decree of God, soteriology, the atonement and the place of morality in the Christian faith. This chapter will focus on Doddridge’s position on these matters, seeking not only to understand it in relation to Baxter’s views but also in relation to the way in which terms such as ‘Baxterian’ and ‘moderate Calvinist’ were used in Dissent in the first half of the eighteenth century. Attention will be given to the importance which Doddridge attached to different aspects of these doctrines. Chapter five will then
consider other theological issues which are central to an understanding of Doddridge’s thinking, beginning with the place of creeds and confessions in his thought and his attitude to subscribing such documents. His view of scripture will be examined as well as his understanding of trinitarian doctrine and of the person of Christ. These two chapters will thus seek to position Doddridge more precisely within the key theological debates of his day.

Having established Doddridge’s thinking on central questions of philosophy and theology, the thesis will turn to consider the outworking of that thought in piety, communication and identity. Chapter six examines Doddridge’s views on piety: the principal characteristics of Christian piety, as Doddridge understood it, are examined in the context of Puritan piety, in an attempt to assess the extent to which similarities between Doddridge and Baxter, in matters of piety, may in fact be reflective of a broader tradition. Chapter seven considers Doddridge’s communication strategies: what were the main messages which he sought to communicate, to whom were they addressed and what means did he employ to do so? Again, the attempt will be made to relate these issues to the Puritan tradition of the previous century as well as to ideas about communication in Doddridge’s own age. General trends in rhetorical approaches in the late seventeenth and early eighteenth century are considered, with continental influences being taken into account. Together, chapters six and seven aim to contribute to a better understanding of Doddridge’s place in relation to the Puritan tradition generally and to Richard Baxter in particular, as well as to Dissenting practice in his own day.

In chapter eight, attention is turned finally to the question of Dissenting identity: how did Doddridge see himself in relation to the Dissenting movement in his day? The secondary literature has fairly consistently represented Dissent in the early eighteenth
century as divided into two wings, rational and evangelical, and Philip Doddridge as playing, with Isaac Watts, a bridging role between them, evidencing attributes of both wings of the movement.\textsuperscript{89} This analysis will be examined closely in the light of the conclusions of the previous chapters about Doddridge’s philosophical and theological positions and his views on Christian practice. Some attempt is made to identify the individuals with whom Doddridge considered himself to be closely associated, with the aim of arriving at a more precise definition of the tendency within Dissent which Doddridge represented. The conclusions which are reached may require some reconsideration of the way in which Dissenting historians have traditionally drawn the dividing lines within Dissent in this period.

Philip Doddridge was without doubt one of the leading figures in Dissent in the second quarter of the eighteenth century. His work as tutor of an important Dissenting academy and the success of his publications ensured that he was a well known figure in his own day; the work of some of his devoted students in writing his life and in continuing the publication of his work after his death has secured his posthumous reputation. This thesis attempts a re-examination of the thought of Philip Doddridge in the context of the Dissent of his day. It argues, in the light of that analysis, for a significant repositioning of how Philip Doddridge is viewed, in relation both to his predecessors, particularly Richard Baxter and the Puritan tradition more broadly, and to his contemporaries within early eighteenth-century Dissent.

\textsuperscript{89} See, for example, Rivers, \textit{Reason}, pp. 165-73.
Chapter 2

The Influence of John Locke

The backbone of the course which Philip Doddridge’s ministerial students followed at his academy in Northampton consisted of a series of 230 lectures, covering the ‘Principal Subjects in Pneumatology, Ethics and Divinity’.\(^1\) These lectures were normally delivered in the final three years of the five years’ study which students intending to pursue a ministerial calling were expected to take.\(^2\) The *Course of Lectures* is divided into ten parts; the lectures were delivered at the rate of two or three lectures a week.\(^3\) The title of the lectures indicates the three major topics into which they were divided. Pneumatology addressed questions of the spirit, both human and divine. Its subjects included the human soul, human acquisition of knowledge, the human will and the passions, as well as the existence and nature of God. Ethics dealt with moral philosophy, including the nature and foundation of virtue, the basis for civil government and the duties imposed upon individuals as members of society. Doddridge’s lectures then turn to the question of the ‘evidences’ of Christianity: the reasons why it is reasonable to expect a divine revelation and the evidence which would be needed to establish that such a revelation had been given, as well as arguments for the genuineness and credibility of the Old and New Testaments as such a revelation. Finally, the lectures turn to an exposition of the principal doctrines of the Christian faith. These lectures thus constituted a compendium of Doddridge’s views on a broad range of philosophical and theological subjects.

\(^{1}\) Philip Doddridge, *A Course of Lectures on the Principal Subjects in Pneumatology, Ethics, and Divinity: With References to the Most Considerable Authors on Each Subject*, ed. Samuel Clark (London: Printed by Assignment from the Author’s Widow, for J. Buckland et al., 1763).


\(^{3}\) Doddridge, ‘Life of Steffe’, p. xvii.
Structurally, the *Course of Lectures* is based on 168 ‘propositions’, which form the course’s skeleton, together with seventeen ‘axioms’ and ninety-six ‘definitions’, each of which is numbered. Propositions are frequently, and definitions are occasionally, supported by ‘corollaries’, which comment upon the main topic under discussion. Secondary propositions, named ‘lemmas’, and further notes, headed ‘scholia’ are sometimes also supplied. The text itself consists of fairly concise statements, expounding the particular points being addressed, with frequent references to pertinent verses and passages from the Bible. In addition, Doddridge inserted references to works of other authors, complete with page numbers and paragraph citations, which students were expected to look up and note down in private study.\(^4\)

This structure mirrors that used by Doddridge’s own tutor, John Jennings, the second volume of whose theology lectures survives in manuscript.\(^5\)

The *Course of Lectures* was published in 1763, edited by Samuel Clark, Doddridge’s former pupil and the son of Doddridge’s mentor of the same name. Given that twelve years elapsed between the tutor’s death and the publication of his lectures, the question arises as to the extent to which the printed edition corresponds with the lectures as delivered to the students in the academy at Northampton. Clark states in his ‘Advertisement’ to the work that it was Doddridge’s wish, expressed in his will, that the lectures should be published. Clark claims to have ‘carefully compared’ the transcript from which the volume was printed with ‘the original short-hand copy’.\(^6\) It is not clear to which ‘original’ copy Clark here refers, nor, given the difficulties mentioned above of deciphering this form of shorthand, would the identification of that copy have helped greatly in verifying the fidelity of the published version. However, two factors indicate that Clark discharged his responsibilities with a reasonable degree of faithfulness.

---


Firstly, quite a number of Doddridge’s former students would have been alive when the lectures were published and might be expected to have complained had that published version significantly misrepresented their tutor; there is little evidence of any such protest. This suggests that Clark’s edition is reliable.

Secondly, however, some sets of students’ shorthand notes of the lectures survive, in particular a set taken by Job Orton when he was a student under Doddridge, between 1735 and 1739, a set under the name of another student, Daniel Baker, which covers only the first six parts of the course and is dated 1743, and a set dated 1746 under the hand of yet another student, Thomas Watson. A comparison of these notes with each other and with the published lectures reveals a remarkable degree of consistency between the headings and numbering of the successive sections of the lectures (which are in longhand) and between the references to other authors which appear throughout (also in longhand). Thus, for example, the numbering of the definitions throughout each of these sets of notes differs consistently only by one from that of the 1763 edition, because that edition added a new definition of ‘idea’ as Definition I. This also points in favour of the reliability of the printed version.

A comparison of the sets of notes demonstrates that Doddridge added to the lectures over the years to refer to new material being published and to amplify points. This process can be traced through the sets of notes: Proposition XCV, concerning the internal evidence for a divine revelation, has a lemma in the 1763 edition which appears in the 1743 and 1746 notes but not in Orton’s 1736 notes. The corollary to Proposition CXIV, on the veracity and authority of New Testament doctrine, appears in the 1746

---

8 Doddridge, Course of Lectures, p. 1.
9 As noted by Isabel Rivers, The Defence of Truth through the Knowledge of Error: Philip Doddridge’s Academy Lectures (London: Dr Williams’s Trust, 2003), pp. 14-15.
notes and in the 1763 edition but not in the 1736 or 1743 notes. A further set of notes, in longhand, covering only Parts V and VI of the lectures (on the ‘evidences’), appears to represent a version of the lectures later than Watson’s 1746 notes yet earlier than the 1763 edition, as it records a scholium to Proposition CIX, on heathen testimonies to the Old Testament, which seems to equate to one of the two scholia to this proposition which are in the 1763 edition, whereas none of the previous sets of notes referred to includes any scholium at that point. This comparison thus reveals development in the lectures, but no indication (in the absence of full transcription) of a change of view on significant points of substance.\(^\text{10}\) Accordingly, the 1763 edition of the *Course of Lectures* will be taken to represent the views which Doddridge delivered to his students and which he himself held.

The study of philosophy formed an important part of the syllabus for ministerial students at Philip Doddridge’s academy in Northampton. Questions of philosophy are addressed in the first four parts of the *Course of Lectures*, consisting of the first one hundred lectures in that course and representing nearly one-half of the entire course. Philosophical topics commonly formed part of the syllabus of the earliest Dissenting academies; in this respect, they were simply following the lead of the universities, where the study of logic, metaphysics, moral philosophy and related topics was well established.\(^\text{11}\) The term ‘philosophy’ was used broadly and tended to encompass a wide

---

\(^\text{10}\) One point of difference, concerning a reference to David Hume’s *Philosophical Essays* (1748) is discussed by Rivers, *Defence*, pp. 19-20.

range of topics: the study of logic taught the student how to reason, physics (that is, the study of physical things, or natural philosophy) addressed the material world, while pneumatology examined the world of spirits (human, angelic and divine) and ethics enquired into the principles of right conduct, both for individuals and for societies (and hence models of government were often considered under this head). Information about the teaching of philosophy in the earliest Dissenting academies is incomplete, but the material that is extant suggests that, in the later part of the seventeenth century, Ramist and Cartesian principles were taught alongside and were beginning to displace traditional Aristotelianism. John Woodhouse (c. 1627-1700) in the academy which he established in Sheriffhales, Shropshire, took his students through the work of Franco Burgersdijk (1590-1635), professor of philosophy at the University of Leiden from 1620. Burgersdijk’s book on logic followed a traditional Aristotelian method and was a popular text in England in the seventeenth and the first half of the eighteenth

---

12 Jacques Rohault (c. 1618-72), whose work on ‘Physicks’ was used in several academies, used the term ‘to signify the Knowledge of natural Things, that is, that Knowledge which leads us to the Reasons and Causes of every Effect which Nature produces’: [Jacques Rohault], Rohault’s System of Natural Philosophy, Illustrated with Dr Samuel Clarke’s notes. Taken Mostly Out of Sir Isaac Newton’s Philosophy. With Additions, Vol. 1, Done into English by John Clarke, D. D., Prebendary of Canterbury, and Chaplain in Ordinary to His Majesty. (London: Printed for James Knapton, 1723), p. 1.

centuries. Having used Burgersdijk’s work once, however, Woodhouse took his students through it ‘a second time with Heereboord’s Commentary’. Adriaan Heereboord (1614-61), who had studied under Burgersdijk and who himself taught at the University of Leiden, represented a shift away from the traditional Aristotelianism of his tutor in the direction of Cartesian principles. At Sheriffhales, Ramus was also studied, with a commentary by George Downname. At the academy of Richard Frankland (1630-98), James Clegg studied Aristotle and Ramus: ‘One Tutor was a Ramist but we read ye Logick both of Aristotle and Ramus’. Heereboord and Burgersdijk seem to have been studied at Frankland’s academy. Thus by the end of the seventeenth century, Dissenting academies were supplementing and beginning to replace traditional Aristotelian methodology with more contemporary approaches.

By the turn of the century, Burgersdijk’s text-book was still in use in England, but it seems that it was beginning to be used as an introductory text, for the purpose of acquainting students with the boundaries and terminology of the subject, and with a

---

19 McLachlan, English Education, pp. 68-69; Stewart, Independency, p. 25; Wykes, ‘Dissenting Academy, p. 113.
summary of the older approach, before moving on to more modern authors, in particular John Locke. Thomas Rowe (1656/7-1705), who in 1678 succeeded Theophilus Gale (1628-79) as tutor of the academy established by Gale in Newington Green, at which Rowe had himself studied, seems to have used Heereboord and Burgersdijk: Thomas Gibbons in his memoirs of Isaac Watts (1674-1748), who studied under Rowe from 1690 to 1693, recounts that he has a notebook of Watts ‘still in my hands’, evidently consisting of Watts’s summaries, made during his studies, of works of the two Dutch philosophers. However, Rowe is claimed by Alexander Gordon to have been one of the first Dissenting tutors to have used the works of Locke. In Taunton, the academy established by Matthew Warren (d. 1706) used Burgersdijk as a text-book, but allowed students to use Locke in their personal study. By 1730, at the universities, Daniel Waterland (1683-1740) at Magdalene College, Cambridge, was using Burgersdijk merely as a preparatory text for Locke, recommending that the former’s work on logic be read in the first year of philosophical studies and Locke’s *Essay Concerning Humane Understanding* in the second year. Waterland instructs his readers not to trouble themselves with Burgersdijk if the tutor does not use it: ‘The Use of it chiefly lies in explaining *Words* and *Terms of Art*, especially to young Beginners. As to the true Art of *Reasoning*, it will be better learnt afterwards by other Books, or come by Use,

---


21 ‘Rowe was a Cartesian at a time when the Aristotelic philosophy was dominant in the older schools of learning; and while in physics he adhered to Descartes against the rising influence of Newton, in mental science he became one of the earliest exponents of Locke’, Alexander Gordon, *Addresses Biographical and Historical* (London: Lindsey Press, 1922), p. 204. Against Gordon’s claim that Rowe was ‘the first to desert the traditional text-books, introducing his pupils, about 1680, to what was known as “free philosophy”’ (Gordon, *Addresses*, pp. 203-204), see Stewart, *Independency*, p. 28, arguing that Rowe learned this from Gale. For Thomas Rowe and the academy at Newington Green, see McLachlan, *English Education*, pp. 49-52.


and Imitation’, though particularly, he says, by the works of Locke.24 Joseph Smith (1670-1756), Provost of Queen’s College, Oxford, prescribed Burgersdijk and Locke for student reading also in about 1730.25 At both academy and university, then, John Locke was, by the early eighteenth century, beginning to displace more traditional texts for the study of philosophical subjects.

One of the most common objections to the approach taken by texts like that of Burgersdijk was their supposed sophistry. John Clarke (d. 1734), grammar-school master in Hull, speaks in his work on methods of study of

that idle insignificant Art of multiplying Words without Knowledge, first invented by Aristotle, and taught in these latter Times by Ramus, Burgersdicius, Hereboord, and others; with which our Schools were long pestered, to the intolerable Impediment of Youth in their Studies.26

This would appear to have been Doddridge’s view of the matter. He was introduced to Burgersdijk during his studies under Jennings, but did not relish the experience:

describing the books used in different subjects, Doddridge says that in logic, Jennings’s

---

24 [Waterland], Advice, pp. 19-20.
25 J. Yolton, ‘Schoolmen, Logic and Philosophy’, in L. S. Sutherland & L. G. Mitchell, eds., The History of the University of Oxford, Vol. 5, The Eighteenth Century (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1986), p. 582. P. Quarrie, ‘The Christ Church Collection Books’, in Sutherland & Mitchell, eds., Oxford, p. 493, states that Burgersdijk’s work was ‘specified from 1717’ in set books lists and its use ‘climbed steadily, reaching a peak in the years 1730-50; in the 1760s it is no longer mentioned’; Burgersdijk’s work on logic was more popular in Cambridge, but, ‘Locke’s Essay flourished at Cambridge from shortly after its publication until well into the nineteenth century, but did not meet with approval at Oxford’, Quarrie, ‘Christ Church’, p. 504. There is some confusion as to the status of Locke’s works in Oxford at the start of the eighteenth century: A. Victor Murray, ‘Doddridge and Education’, in G. F. Nuttall, Philip Doddridge, 1702-51: His Contribution to English Religion (London: Independent Press, 1951), p. 114, states, ‘Locke’s works were banned at Oxford’ when Doddridge was using them in his studies; more recent scholarship suggests, however, that, while Locke was more acceptable at Cambridge than at Oxford in the first half of the eighteenth century, his work was not entirely proscribed at the latter institution, his Essay, for example, being included in some book lists in Oxford as early as 1704, although some heads of houses had attempted to suppress the work in 1703: see Quarrie, ‘Christ Church Collection Books’, p. 504; Yolton, ‘Schoolmen’, pp. 584, 586; see also Alan P. F. Sell, John Locke and the Eighteenth-Century Divines (Cardiff: University of Wales Press, 1997), pp. 5, 279; John Gascoigne, ‘The Teaching of Philosophy within the British Universities and Learned Societies of the Eighteenth Century’, in Gascoigne, Science, Philosophy and Religion in the Age of Enlightenment: British and Global Contexts (Farnham: Ashgate, 2010), pp. 2-12.
students ‘first skimm’d over Burgendicius’ but this was ‘unmeaning Jargon’.

Following his brief and unpleasant encounter with traditional Aristotelianism, Doddridge moved on in logic to study a system ‘of quite a different nature’ drawn up by Jennings himself, which was ‘built upon Mr Lock’s Scheme and enrich’d with frequent References to him and other celebrated Writers’. In an earlier letter to his mentor, Samuel Clark, Doddridge clarified that ‘the greatest part of our logic is built’ upon Locke’s *Essay*, ‘particularly the third book’; he said that he had frequently consulted the work while studying pneumatology, but was now reading it through. It seems, then, that Doddridge’s experience as a student under Jennings was similar to that of other contemporary Dissenting students: Burgersdijk was used as an introduction to the study of logic, before turning to concentrate on more modern authors, especially Locke.

When Doddridge came to construct his own course, however, he dropped Burgersdijk altogether, preferring to have his students study Watts for logic and his own scheme (based on that of Jennings, which he so admired) for pneumatology and ethics. This move was no doubt driven in part by the distaste he felt as a student for the Aristotelian methodology, particularly for its obscure terminology, and the strong attraction which he experienced for the newer approach of John Locke. He was encouraged in this direction not only by his tutor but by Samuel Clark, who wrote to his student friend to urge upon him how necessary it was, in the study of pneumatology, to

---


have ‘clear ideas of all the terms we use’, to take ‘nothing for granted without sufficient evidence’ and not to ‘reason upon things about which we have no ideas’, following this advice with an express recommendation of ‘Mr Locke’s Essay’. The counsel which Doddridge received from two of the most influential people in his student life corresponded with the conclusions which the young man drew from his own experience and led to his abandonment of the older Aristotelian methodology for the study of logic.

Previous generations of Dissenting tutors had introduced Locke alongside an Aristotelian approach; Doddridge appears to be amongst the first, if not the first, Dissenting tutor to dispense entirely with Aristotelian instruction in favour of an approach based on Locke. Doddridge’s academy was also one of the first to use English as the principal language of instruction, rather than Latin (the language in which he had studied under Jennings). The adoption of the vernacular tongue for instruction and the abandonment of the ‘obscure’ language of Aristotle can both be understood as the result of the Northampton tutor’s desire for clarity in thought and in communication. In these respects, Doddridge’s approach represents a significant development of the innovations in educational methodology introduced by earlier academies.

If Doddridge abandoned the traditional philosophy, what did he put in its place? The judgment of the secondary literature to date on this question is clear. A. Victor Murray, in his discussion of Doddridge’s educational system, states simply, ‘Doddridge was a follower of John Locke’. In a more nuanced discussion, Roger Thomas finds that, whereas Watts had doubts about some of Locke’s views on Christian theology, Doddridge ‘was almost certainly more liberal in his reception of Locke’s work’, making reference in this connection to favourable comments by Doddridge on Locke’s

---

30 Samuel Clark to Philip Doddridge, 3 October 1721, Humphreys Correspondence, Vol. 1, p. 39 (Nuttall, Calendar, Letter no. 2).
Paraphrase on the Epistles and his Reasonableness of Christianity. Thomas also considers Doddridge to have been in Locke’s debt ‘in his whole-hearted acceptance of a rational basis for Christian faith’, Locke having, in Thomas’s view, made ‘a rational bridge from natural religion, where reason reigned supreme, to revealed religion’. Alan Sell has conducted a detailed and thorough-going review of the influence of Locke on Dissent in the eighteenth century, reaching similar conclusions to Thomas on Doddridge’s appreciation of Locke’s work on the New Testament epistles of Paul and of the view that Christianity’s foundations can be defended on a rational basis. Sell however adds that Doddridge was ‘no slavish follower of Locke’, citing the questions of personal identity and the freedom of the will as topics, among others, on which the eighteenth-century tutor dissented from his seventeenth-century forerunner. The secondary literature, then, has taken the view that, in matters of philosophy and subject to some exceptions on particular issues, Doddridge was Lockean.

The validity of this assessment of Doddridge’s philosophical position may be diluted somewhat by the evidence, referred to above, that by the early eighteenth century the study of Locke had become fairly common at Dissenting academies in England. Doddridge was preparing lectures for instructing students, not attempting a ground-breaking work of philosophy, and so it should be no surprise to find that he taught them what was becoming, or had already become, the accepted ways of thinking.

---

32 Roger Thomas, ‘Philip Doddridge and Liberalism in Religion’, in Nuttall, ed., Doddridge, p. 127; Locke’s paraphrases and notes on various of the New Testament epistles of Paul were initially published independently but were then collected together in a single edition, [John Locke], A Paraphrase and Notes on the Epistles of St. Paul to the Galatians, I & II Corinthians, Romans, Ephesians. To Which Is Prefix’d, an Essay for the Understanding of St. Paul’s Epistles, by Consulting St. Paul Himself (London: Printed by J. H. for Awnsham and John Churchill, 1707); [John Locke], The Reasonableness of Christianity, as Delivered in the Scriptures (London: Printed for Awnsham and John Churchill [sic], 1695).
34 Sell, Philosophy, p. 51; see also Sell, Locke, p. 68 (on the reasonableness of Christianity), p. 103 (on biblical exegesis).
35 Sell, Locke, notes Doddridge’s departures from Locke in the following areas: miracles (p. 76), the will (p. 137), toleration (pp. 163-64), Jesus the Messiah as the fundamental Christian belief (p. 200) and personal identity (p. 246).
36 pp. 38-40; see also Wykes, ‘Dissenting Academy’, pp. 111-21; Sell, Philosophy, pp. 29-54.
on the issues concerned. Furthermore, when Doddridge opened his academy in
Northampton, Locke had been dead for over a quarter of a century and it is likely that
the reception of the philosopher’s work amongst Dissenters would have changed in
cracter somewhat over that time. It may therefore be illuminating to examine in some
detail how Locke’s work was viewed by Doddridge, by conducting a more focused
consideration of the areas in which the latter followed the former and those in which he
departed from him: the remainder of this chapter seeks to explore these questions.

Doddridge’s *Course of Lectures* has 115 citations of Locke’s *Essay*, more than
any other by a considerable margin: the next most cited work is Hugo Grotius’s *De Jure
Belli et Pacis* (1625), to which there are fifty-eight references. The great majority of
the references to the *Essay*, however, occur in Part I of the *Course of Lectures*, which is
entitled ‘Of the Powers and Faculties of the Human Mind, and the Instinct of Brutes’.
This has ninety-two separate references to Locke’s work, accounting for over one-
quarter of all the citations in that Part. The next most cited work in Part I is Watts’s
*Philosophical Essays*, which is mentioned only twenty-two times. Doddridge had
drank deeply of Locke’s philosophy and the results are evident throughout Part I of the
*Course of Lectures*.

Proposition V of the *Course of Lectures* states, ‘There are no innate ideas in the
human mind’: ideas are not ‘implanted in the mind from its original, as to be common
to the whole species, independent upon any circumstances in which individuals may be
placed’. Rather, Doddridge argues, the mind acquires ideas by two means, working

---

37 Hugo Grotius, *De Iure Belli ac Pacis Libri Tres: In Quibus Ius Naturae & Gentium, item Iuris Publici
38 There are about 334 citations in all in Part I.
39 I[saac] W[atts], *Philosophical Essays on Various Subjects ...* (London: Printed for Richard Ford and
Richard Hett, 1733). For some discussion of Watts’s philosophy, see John Hoyles, *The Waning of the
Renaissance, 1640-1740: Studies in the Thought and Poetry of Henry More, John Norris and Isaac Watts*
40 Doddridge, *Course of Lectures*, p. 12.
either singly or in combination: ‘sensation’, that is, through the operation of the senses, and ‘reflection’, that is, by the operation of the mind. For similar reasons, he continues, ‘There are no innate propositions in the human mind.’ These statements appear to affirm what may be regarded as among the principal and well known contentions of Locke’s Essay, which seeks to overturn that ‘established Opinion amongst some Men, That there are in the Understanding certain *innate Principles*’ and to demonstrate that ‘External, Material Things, as the Objects of SENSATION; and the Operations of our own Minds within, as the Objects of REFLECTION, are, to me, the only Originals, from whence all our *Idea’s [sic]* take their beginnings’. In using the phrase ‘innate ideas’, Doddridge does not seem to intend anything different from his understanding of Locke’s ‘innate Principles’ – indeed, Locke uses an alternative term, ‘primary Notions’, and indicates that he regards ‘Notion’ and ‘Idea’ as synonymous for his purposes. On these foundational questions, Doddridge follows Locke.

Doddridge’s definition of the key concept of ‘idea’ in the *Course of Lectures* is, ‘Whatever our thoughts are immediately employed about, whether as simply perceiving it, or as asserting or denying any thing concerning it’. This is similar in substance to, and even reflective of some of the wording of, Locke’s definitions of the term: ‘whatsoever is the Object of the Understanding when a man thinks ... or whatever it is, which the Mind can be employ’d about in thinking’, and, ‘Whatever the Mind perceives in it self, or is the immediate object of Perception, Thought, or Understanding’. Like Locke, Doddridge divides ideas into simple and compound: simple ideas, he says, result from sensation or reflection or both and compound ideas are made up of simple ideas, a

---

41 Ibid., pp. 12-13.
43 [Locke], Essay, I.i.1; II.i.4; pp. 4, 38.
44 Ibid., I.i.1, p. 4; I.i.8, pp. 3-4.
46 [Locke], Essay, I.i.8, p. 4; II.viii.8, p. 55.
scheme which follows Locke save that the latter refers to ‘complex’ rather than ‘compound’ ideas.\(^47\) Doddridge considered that propositions, while not innate (for the same reasons that ideas are not innate), may be ‘intuitively discerned’, that is ‘assented to as soon as proposed’ but ‘not known before such proposal’.\(^48\) In the same way, Locke accepted that some ideas receive assent directly on their being propounded, but, like Doddridge after him, argued that it does not follow that such ideas are innate.\(^49\) It was the intuitive nature of some ideas which enabled Doddridge, like his tutor before him, to include in his lectures axioms, presented as propositions which do not require demonstration. ‘General propositions which can be intuitively discerned are called axioms’, taught Jennings.\(^50\) On these fundamental concepts about ideas and the ways in which they are appropriated by the human mind, Doddridge also clearly learned from Locke.

Yet there are significant differences between Doddridge’s approach and that of John Locke. The seventeenth-century philosopher is scathing about the concept, fundamental to Aristotelianism, of ‘substance’ as the substratum in which all the qualities of a thing inhere, without itself inhering in anything else. Locke states, ‘of Substance, we have no Idea of what it is, but only a confused obscure one of what it does’.\(^51\) He does not, however, appear to dismiss the concept altogether. There has been much debate about what Locke’s view of substance was,\(^52\) something which clearly perplexed Isaac Watts who, having noted that Locke ‘has happily refuted that unreasonable Notion of Substance in general’ and ‘has exposed it to just Ridicule’,

\(^{47}\) Doddridge, Course of Lectures, pp. 12-13; Locke, Essay, II.ii.1-2, pp. 45-46.
\(^{48}\) Doddridge, Course of Lectures, p. 14.
\(^{49}\) [Locke], Essay, I.ii.17-24, pp. 9-12.
\(^{51}\) [Locke], Essay, II.xiii.19, p. 80; cp. Liv.18, p. 33; II.xxiii.2, p. 136.
laments that Locke nevertheless so insisted upon that idea ‘as to lead his Readers into a Belief, that there is such a sort of unknown real Being call’d *Substance in general*, which supports all the Properties that we observe in particular different Beings’. 53 Watts was unhappy with the idea of ‘substance in general’, because it would seem to risk confusing body and spirit and thus blur the distinction between God and his creation. 54

Watts seems content to accept the traditional definition of substance, provided that it is not taken in a general, all-embracing sense, but then argues that the term is unnecessary, at least with respect to body and spirit -- the two most general terms into which beings can be divided -- proposing instead that it is sufficient to speak of body as solid extension and spirit as the power of thought. 55 Watts, then, does not dispute the idea of substance, provided that body and spirit are not confused, but proposes that different terms be used. Doddridge, while referring to both Locke and Watts, appears to go a little further than both, by denying, not just that the term is necessary, but also that it makes any meaningful contribution to the understanding of a thing: ‘We can have no conception of any substance distinct from all the properties of the being in which they inhere’. 56 Doddridge does not quite dismiss the term altogether: he reintroduces it later in the *Course of Lectures* in his treatment of the nature of space. 57 However, he is there discussing, not the properties of space, but the more fundamental question of whether space has any real existence at all and in that context appears to find it difficult to avoid use of the traditional terminology of substance and mode. Thus he finds that he cannot quite do without these categories. Nevertheless, he generally avoids the term, preferring the term ‘being’: ‘Body is an extended solid being’. 58 In this respect, as has already

54 Ibid., pp. 49-50.
55 Ibid., p. 51.
56 Doddridge, *Course of Lectures*, p. 2.
57 Ibid., p. 90.
58 Doddridge, *Course of Lectures*, p. 2.
been noted, Doddridge seems to move a little further than his predecessors away from the use of traditional Aristotelian concepts.

Alongside these differing approaches to the concept of substance lie differences in the understanding of the fundamental categories into which being is divided: matter (or body) and spirit. Locke holds the ‘Idea of Body’ to be ‘an extended solid Substance, capable of communicating Motion by impulse; the ‘Idea of our Souls, is of a Substance that thinks, and has a power of exciting Motion in Body, by Will, or Thought’. For the reasons already discussed, neither Watts nor Doddridge uses the term ‘substance’ in defining body and spirit. Furthermore, both argue, by contrast with Locke, that the power to communicate or excite motion is not part of the very being of body or spirit. Watts insists on the absolute difference between body and spirit and the inability of one, by nature, to affect the other. He wants to reserve to God alone the power to enable spirit to cause motion in body. Doddridge, for his part, does not explain his disagreement with Locke on this point, but it seems likely that he considers Locke’s view to undermine the argument that motion, not being essential to matter, must be attributable to ‘some first mover’, an argument which helps to demonstrate the existence of God. Thus for both Watts and Doddridge, refutation of Locke on this point seemed vital for the defence of fundamental Christian beliefs.

John Locke did not consider it ‘any more necessary for the Soul always to think, than for the Body always to move’. Watts, by contrast, insisted that, as the essence of spirit is thought, so it must always be thinking, for otherwise it would cease to exist. Watts’s concern here is to defend the immortality of the soul: if it cannot cease to think,

59 pp. 46-48, above.
60 [Locke], Essay, II.xxiii.22, p. 143.
61 Doddridge, Course of Lectures, p. 3.
62 W[atts], Philosophical Essays, pp. 132-35.
63 Doddridge, Course of Lectures, p. 52; cp. [Locke], Essay, IV.x.10, pp. 314-15.
64 [Locke], Essay, II.i.10, p. 39.
then it cannot be brought to an end by the death of the body or by any other spirit except, says Watts, by God; it will therefore continue for ever in a state of joy or misery.65 Doddridge presents the issue, apparently impartially, as a simple discussion of the positive and negative sides of the argument. However, he gives answers to each argument which make clear that his own sympathies lie with Watts rather than with Locke, though he appears less persuaded than Watts is as to the argument for the soul’s immortality based on its always thinking.66 Watts and Doddridge are thus prepared to differ from Locke where fundamental issues of Christian belief -- the distinction between body and spirit or the immortality of the soul -- are concerned.

A similar principle lies behind the opposition which Watts and Doddridge evince towards Locke’s suggestion that God could, were he to wish so to do, confer on matter the power of thought. Locke had asserted, in the course of an argument about the limitation of human knowledge, that we ‘possibly shall never be able to know, whether Matter thinks or no’, for we cannot discover ‘whether Omnipotency has given to Matter fitly disposed, a power to perceive and think’.67 For Watts, however, it was essential to maintain an absolute distinction between matter and spirit: ‘I can have no possible Conception what Extension or Solidity can do towards thinking ... The ideas are so entirely different, that they seem to be Things as utterly distinct as any two Things we can name or mention’.68 For Doddridge, Locke’s speculation on this point undermines the argument for the immateriality of the soul: if God could confer the power of thought on matter, then the soul may be material; the idea, however, is ‘unintelligible’ - the only explanation for the ability of the soul to think is that it is immaterial.69 Watts and

65 W[atts], Philosophical Essays, p. 131.
66 Doddridge, Course of Lectures, p. 207.
67 [Locke], Essay, IV.iii.6, p. 270.
68 W[atts], Philosophical Essays, p. 115.
69 Doddridge, Course of Lectures, p. 205.
Doddridge, again, take issue with Locke on a point which they, along with many others, believed to threaten central Christian doctrines.

In a similar manner, Watts opposes the proposition that spirit may be extended, an idea floated by Locke in the context of a discussion of duration as it applies to spirits as well as to bodies. Locke speculates, ‘‘tis near as hard to conceive any Existence, or to have an Idea of any real Being, with a perfect Negation of all manner of Expansion; as it is, to have the Idea of any real Existence, with a perfect Negation of all manner of Duration’.70 Watts takes the matter up in a discussion of the question whether a spirit has a location, in the course of which he seeks to demonstrate the absurdities which follow from supposing spirit to have extension.71 Doddridge also opposes the idea of an extended spirit, as part of his discussion of the immateriality of the soul: ‘There is no reason to believe, that if the soul be immaterial, it is extended.’72 Doddridge does, though, on the related question of the location of the soul, state, ‘The Soul is seated in the Brain.’73 Watts admits that such a statement may be made in a popular sense, but is much more doubtful whether, strictly speaking, it is possible to understand in fact how a spirit, being unextended, can be said to have a particular location.74 Thus, again, despite some difference between themselves, Watts and Doddridge took issue with Locke in order to maintain the absolute distinction between body and spirit which they believed to be essential to Christian belief.

Doddridge (and Watts) also did not follow Locke on the questions of personal identity and the freedom of the will. Locke tied his idea of personal identity to that of consciousness: ‘For since consciousness always accompanies thinking, and ’tis that, that makes every one be, what he calls self; and thereby distinguishes himself from all

70 [Locke], Essay, II.xv.11, p. 97.
71 W[atts], Philosophical Essays, pp. 119-20, 147-52.
72 Doddridge, Course of Lectures, p. 209.
73 Ibid., p. 11.
74 W[atts], Philosophical Essays, pp. 166-67, 169-70.
other thinking beings, in this alone consists personal Identity’.75 Doddridge’s refutation of this position draws expressly on Watts, arguing that, on this basis, ‘fancied memory might make two men born in the most distant places and times the same person, or real forgetfulness might make the same man different persons’.76 Watts had argued, in response to Locke, that the word ‘person’ implies ‘one thinking being ... which is always the same, whether it be or be not conscious’.77 Similarly, Doddridge argued that personal identity consists in ‘the same soul united to the same body’, a definition which he, like Watts, considered important for the safeguarding of the Christian doctrine of the resurrection of the body: the soul, after death, must be capable of being identified as the same soul as that which was united to a particular body on earth; furthermore, whatever the precise physical make-up of the resurrected body compared with its former earthly counterpart, there should be some kind of material continuity between them such that ‘it may properly be called the same body’.78 Once more, Watts and Doddridge modify Locke’s philosophical views in order to ensure compatibility with their understanding of essential Christian doctrines.

Doddridge has a substantial discussion, over four lectures, of the question of ‘liberty’, in particular as it affects the human will.79 Following Locke, Doddridge taught that human faculties, such as the will, are not ‘distinct principles of action’ but are simply the different actions of the human soul: ‘the understanding is the soul understanding, the will is the soul willing’.80 However, Doddridge, like Watts, did not agree with Locke’s argument that, because the will was thus a power and not, strictly
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76 Doddridge, *Course of Lectures*, p. 23.
77 W[atts], *Philosophical Essays*, p. 293.
79 Doddridge, *Course of Lectures*, pp. 34-41.
speaking, an agent, liberty could not be attributed to it. It is, for Locke, the person, not
the will, that has liberty: ‘That which has the power, or not the power to operate [i.e.,
the person], is that alone, which is, or is not free’.81 Thus Locke deemed the question,
‘Is the will free?’, nonsense, equivalent to asking whether a person’s ‘Sleep be Swift,
or his Vertue square’.82 Watts retorted with a down-to-earth approach, ‘I can see no
Necessity that a Philosopher should change the common Forms of Speech’ and so saw
‘no Impropriety in asking, whether the Will be free or no, or in attributing Liberty to the
Will’.83 Doddridge is equally trenchant, asserting that Locke’s ‘notion of liberty’ is
‘much debated’, that ‘he changes his idea of it’ and that generally he means freedom
from external physical constraint, which is not how the question is normally
discussed.84 Thus both Watts and Doddridge evince dissatisfaction with the terms in
which Locke discusses the subject.

On the substantive question, what determines the will, Locke answered, ‘the
greatest present uneasiness ... for the most part determines the will in its choice of the
next action’.85 That to which people generally refer, wrongly in Locke’s view, as free
will is simply the suspension of decision pending a review of the various uneasinesses
with which the mind is currently afflicted, so as to judge which is greatest, thereby
determining the will to action.86 Doddridge dissents from this: ‘The will is not
determined (as some have asserted) by ... a prevailing uneasiness’. Nor, indeed, is it
determined ‘by the last dictate, or rather assent of the understanding, nor the greatest
apparent good’, but rather, ‘The mind of man is possessed of natural liberty’, which

81 [Locke], Essay, II.xxi.19, p. 121.
82 Ibid., II.xxi.14, p. 119.
83 W[atts], Philosophical Essays, p. 282; see also Isaac Watts, An Essay on the Freedom of the Will in
God and in Creatures, and on Various Subjects Connected Therewith ... (London: Printed for J. Roberts,
1732).
84 Doddridge, Course of Lectures, pp. 34, 39.
86 Ibid., II.xxi.47, p. 141.
means that it is not ‘invincibly determined by any foreign cause or consideration whatever offered to it, but by its own sovereign pleasure’. Doddridge is not addressing the question here of the relationship between the human will and the decree of God, a matter that arises later in the *Course of Lectures* and which is discussed in chapter 3, below. Doddridge’s desire here to uphold the ability of the human will to choose freely appears to be not inconsistent with the Calvinist orthodoxy of an earlier generation, as Richard Muller has argued. Thus the seventeenth-century dogmatician Frances Turretin (1623-87) stated,

> We do not deny that the will of itself is so prepared that it can either elicit or suspend the act (which is the liberty of exercise and of contradiction) or be carried to both of opposite things (which is the liberty of contrariety and of specification).

Doddridge held this view, in part, because he believed it necessary in order to justify rewards and punishments for human actions, ‘for which there could be no foundation at all, if we were invincibly determined in every volition’. Thus for Doddridge, it was vital that the human will be held to be entirely free of all constraint.

Doddridge uses the term, ‘The philosophical liberty of the mind’, to mean a ‘prevailing disposition to act according to the dictates of reason’ so as ‘most effectually [to] promote our happiness’. This liberty, believed Doddridge, is ‘much impaired’, as can be seen from the mismatch between our reason and our passions: the former does not control the latter as it ought, but reason often finds itself controlled, distorted or silenced by the passions. As a result, ‘the symmetry of the soul and subordination of its
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87 Doddridge, *Course of Lectures*, pp. 36, 34.
88 At pp. 65-67.
91 Doddridge, *Course of Lectures*, p. 36.
faculties ... is in a great measure violated in the human soul’.93 Locke, by contrast, discusses the question, why people do not always choose what will bring the greatest happiness, in terms primarily of human ignorance and misjudgment, resulting in a failure properly to weigh immediate with more remote consequences. Thus the implications of the final day of judgment do not sufficiently deter people from evil actions which bring immediate pleasure.94 Locke also has quite a high estimate of the human ability to remedy this problem through the inculcation of good habits together with the application of right reason, so that ‘Morality, established upon its true Foundations, cannot but determine the Choice in any one that will but consider’, for, ‘The Rewards and Punishments of another Life ... are of weight enough to determine the Choice, against whatever Pleasure or Pain this Life can shew’.95 Doddridge also argues for human liberty of choice and the power of habit as means whereby ‘we may stop ourselves in the career [to evil]; and enter upon a contrary course: so that upon the whole, the way to happiness is rather difficult than impossible’. However, the overall thrust of the eighteenth-century minister’s exposition concerns the extent to which the passions distort human choices, so that ‘we are obnoxious to a lamentable degree of servitude’.96 By contrast, the tendency of Locke’s argument is optimistic: by the right use of knowledge, reason and habit, much moral progress can be made. It is difficult to resist the conclusion that Doddridge’s views were shaped, silently at this point, by a firm commitment to the significance of the effects of sin on the human constitution, as orthodox Christian doctrine would hold, in a way that Locke’s views were not.97

93 Ibid., pp. 39-40.
95 Ibid., II.xxi.70, p. 150.
96 Doddridge, Course of Lectures, pp. 40, 39; cf. idem, pp. 33, 36.
In several of the areas discussed above, where Doddridge departed from Locke’s views, the Northampton divine has been seen to take a similar view to that of Isaac Watts. The question thus arises as to whether Watts was the principal influence upon Doddridge on these issues. Watts’s philosophical views were published in his *Philosophical Essays* in 1733, though he states in the preface to that work that much of the material which he there published had been in existence in manuscript for some time.\(^9^8\) Although Doddridge’s *Course of Lectures* cites Watts’s treatise frequently, its date is too late to have influenced Doddridge when he began to teach his course. It is possible that the two men had discussed the issues concerned and that Watts had influenced Doddridge in that way, but there is little evidence for this proposition. John Jennings’s lectures on these topics are no longer extant, so it is not possible to know whether Doddridge is simply following his tutor’s lines of argument. A further possible explanation is that both men were influenced by orthodox Christian thinking in these areas, particularly by a desire to maintain a clear distinction between matter and spirit, a theme which has been seen to underlie many of the points in question. Thus Samuel Clarke, the Boyle lecturer, argued strongly for the maintenance of a clear distinction between matter and spirit, on the ground that ‘If the Mind of Man, were nothing but a certain System of Matter’, then humans would be ‘mere Clocks and Watches’ and of no use at all for the ‘Ends and Purposes of Religion’.\(^9^9\) One of the principal reasons which Clarke gives for this view is the need, as he sees it, to preserve the liberty of the human will, a concern shared by Doddridge. Clarke argued that if mind were material, then ‘every Thought in a Man’s Mind must likewise be necessary, and depending wholly upon external Causes; And there could be no such thing in Us, as Liberty, or a Power of

---

\(^9^8\) W[atts], *Philosophical Essays*, p. iii.

Self-determination’. The similarity of these views with those of Doddridge and the fact that the work of Clarke’s just quoted is cited in the relevant section of the Course of Lectures indicates that Clarke, possibly mediated through Jennings, may be the principal source of Doddridge’s views on these questions.

The philosophy taught in Philip Doddridge’s Northampton academy thus represented a sharp break from the Aristotelianism which had dominated the educational system in both Dissent and the universities until the early part of the eighteenth century. In dispensing entirely with an Aristotelian approach to teaching logic, as well as in his adoption of the vernacular as the normal language of instruction, Doddridge went somewhat further in this direction than had earlier academies. The Northampton tutor substituted a system, based on that taught him by his own tutor John Jennings, which took its rise primarily from the thought of John Locke, in particular the latter’s Essay Concerning Humane Understanding. Doddridge’s view of how humans obtain knowledge and ideas was drawn directly from John Locke. Equally, Doddridge follows Locke in his understanding of the definition and categorisation of ideas. To that extent, historians have been right to categorise Doddridge as Lockean.

Yet in several significant areas of Locke’s thought, Doddridge, along with Isaac Watts, found it necessary to disagree with the philosopher in order to avoid conflict with important aspects of Christian doctrine. On the fundamental Aristotelian idea of substance, Doddridge, developing the trend already established in early eighteenth-century Dissent, seems to go further than Watts by denying that the term makes any meaningful contribution to understanding things. In other areas, Doddridge and Watts are agreed in their differences from Locke. Their concerns focus particularly on the need, as they saw it, to maintain an absolute distinction between matter and spirit, on

[100 Clarke, Third Defense, p. 87.]
which question Doddridge’s thinking may be traced back to Samuel Clarke: thus on questions connected with the fundamental issues of motion, thought and extension, the two Dissenters, in line with orthodox Christian belief, reached quite different conclusions from the seventeenth-century philosopher. Similarly, because of their views on the resurrection, Doddridge and Watts disagreed with Locke’s idea about personal identity. Finally, Doddridge, again in line with Clarke, insisted on maintaining a notion of the will which enabled him to hold that it is free, yet that it is corrupt (not merely, as Locke suggests, suffering from the effects of ignorance or bad habits). Thus Doddridge leaves himself room for later arguments about the effects of sin on humanity’s ability to obey God, in a manner which seems not to concern Locke in the same way. In all these areas, Doddridge significantly modifies the thought of John Locke in order to maintain important points of Christian doctrine. The philosophy taught at the Northampton academy was Lockean, but, under Philip Doddridge, it was a specifically Christian form of that philosophy.
Chapter 3

Natural Theology, Natural Law and Reason

A considerable amount of anxiety was felt, in the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries, by both establishment and Dissenting theologians, about the threat to Christian teaching which was thought to be posed by Deist and Socinian writers, as well as by the philosophical writings of Thomas Hobbes (1588-1679) and Baruch de Spinoza (1632-77). Edward Stillingfleet (1635-99), bishop of Worcester, wrote his Letter to a Deist, published in 1677, to respond to Deist arguments about the truth of the Christian revelation.¹ In 1655, the Independent theologian John Owen (1616-83) had published his Vindiciae Evangelicae, in part to respond to the Socinian John Biddle’s (1615/16-1662) arguments about the teaching of scripture on the nature of God.² Hobbes and Spinoza are the two opponents named on the title page of the theologian Samuel Clarke’s (1675-1729) influential Boyle lectures, given in 1704, on the existence and attributes of God.³ Although the thought of those who were attacking orthodox Christian principles differed greatly amongst themselves, there was a tendency amongst those who sought to defend those principles to consider them together as propounding a number of themes calculated to undermine fundamental principles of the Christian faith: they threatened Christians’ confidence in divine revelation, they gave to human reason too high a place, they blurred the essential distinction between spirit and body and some even sought to obliterate the notion of spirit altogether. Views such as these could, it was thought, have severe consequences for the legitimacy of natural theology.

¹ Edward Stillingfleet, A Letter to a Deist, in Answer to Several Objections against the Truth and Authority of the Scriptures (London: Printed by W. G., 1677).
² John Owen, Vindiciae Evangelicae or, the Mystery of the Gospel Vindicated, and Socinianism Examined ... (Oxford: Printed by Leon. Lichfield, 1655).
³ Samuel Clark [sic], A Demonstration of the Being and Attributes of God: More Particularly in Answer to Mr. Hobbs, Spinoza, and Their Followers. Wherein the Notion of Liberty Is Stated, and the Possibility and Certainty of It Proved, in Opposition to Necessity and Fate. Being the Substance of Eight Sermons Preach’d at the Cathedral-Church of St. Paul, in the Year 1704, at the Lecture Founded by the Honourable Robert Boyle Esq (London: Printed by Will. Botham, for James Knapton, 1705).
and natural law: the ability for Christians to demonstrate the existence and attributes of God, as well as the ability to establish a Christian morality, on the basis of reasoning which is not dependent upon divine revelation. How much could be known about the existence and nature of God and about morality from reason alone, without the benefit of divine revelation? Thus questions of natural theology, natural law and the role of reason were of great moment amongst philosophers and theologians in the early eighteenth century.

These issues underlie Philip Doddridge’s treatment of the philosophical questions addressed in Parts II to V of the *Course of Lectures*. Historians have tended to emphasise the importance of the role attributed to reason in these sections of the lectures. Thus Roger Thomas speaks of Doddridge’s ‘whole-hearted acceptance of a rational basis for Christian faith’. In a similar manner, R. K. Webb writes of Doddridge’s ‘rationality’ as a phenomenon that is in tension with the tutor’s Calvinism and piety. However, Doddridge’s contribution to these issues has not been the subject of sustained and detailed investigation in the secondary literature to date. Alan Sell surveys Doddridge’s views in the context of a wider examination of the philosophy taught in the Dissenting academies through to the early part of the twentieth century. He comments on Doddridge’s lectures that, ‘there is always a place for the journeyman in philosophy, who will present and digest a variety of views in an [sic] balanced manner’. Isabel Rivers singles out ‘Doddridge’s interest in contemporary moral philosophy’ in the philosophy lectures as ‘striking’, but does not otherwise discuss them.
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4 Philip Doddridge, *A Course of Lectures on the Principal Subjects in Pneumatology, Ethics, and Divinity: With References to the Most Considerable Authors on Each Subject*, ed. Samuel Clark (London: Printed by Assignment from the Author’s Widow, for J. Buckland et al., 1763).
at any length. Richard Muller, in a recent essay, gives attention to the philosophical aspects of Doddridge’s lectures, characterising Doddridge’s approach as essentially ‘rationalist’ with a ‘fully developed natural theology’, yet standing ‘apart from Rational Dissent’. In his relatively brief treatment, however, Muller does not supply a detailed appraisal of Doddridge’s views. This chapter will therefore examine Doddridge’s approach to questions of natural theology, natural law and the relationship between reason and revelation: his views on natural theology will be addressed by reference to Part II of the *Course of Lectures*, which deals with the existence and attributes of God; Parts III and IV of those lectures, dealing with questions of moral philosophy, will then be examined; finally, Part V of the lectures, on the relationship between reason and revelation, will be addressed.

A variety of arguments for the existence of God was deployed in the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries. Arguments from design were frequently made, though they took several different forms. Towards the end of his life, the naturalist John Ray (1627-1705) published his *Wisdom of God Manifested in the Works of Creation* (1691), arguing for the existence of God from the harmony and design which he saw evidenced in the natural world. His objective was ‘to take a view of the Works of the Creation, and to observe something of the Wisdom of God discernable [sic] in the Formation of them, in their Order and Harmony, and in their Ends and

---

Uses’. The same themes of harmony and fitness for purpose were taken up by the scholar Richard Bentley (1662-1742), master of Trinity College, Cambridge, from 1699 to his death, and the clergyman William Derham (1657-1735) in their respective Boyle lectures, which had been set up by Robert Boyle (1627-91) ‘for proving the Christian Religion against notorious Infidels, viz. Atheists, Deists, Pagans, Jews and Mahometans’.

Bentley delivered the first such lectures, in 1692, and then again in 1694; Derham delivered his in 1711 and 1712. Bentley argued for the existence of a creator from the fitness of the various parts of the human anatomy for the functions which they perform, as well as from the beauty and order of the inanimate natural world. Derham’s Boyle lectures were an enormous labour of detailed examination of the physical characteristics of the earth and its animate and inanimate inhabitants, in order to show that the glory and intricacy of the world lead inevitably to the conclusion that there is a creator who is God. These arguments, generally categorised as *a posteriori*, took their rise from the human perception of the universe as manifesting order, harmony, beauty and purpose, arguing from effect to a creator God as first cause.

---

Some writers, however, considered it necessary also to demonstrate the existence of God by arguments of a more metaphysical nature and on the basis of a stricter logic. For the early eighteenth century, the most significant expositor of such arguments was Samuel Clarke (1675-1729), who from 1709 held the living of St James’s, Westminster. Clarke delivered the Boyle lectures for 1704 and devoted them to what he considered a rigorous proof, *a priori*, for the existence of God. His central claim, and the one which provoked a great deal of controversy, was that a self-existent being has necessarily existed from eternity: ‘That Immutable and Independent Being, which has existed from Eternity, without any External Cause of its Existence, must be Self-existent, that is, Necessarily-Existing.’16 Having established this case, at least to his own satisfaction, Clarke proceeded to a demonstration that this being is infinite, omnipresent, one, intelligent, endued with liberty and choice and of infinite power, wisdom, goodness, justice, truth and all other moral perfections. Clarke’s arguments shaped the debate on the issues which they addressed for the first half of the eighteenth century.17

Philip Doddridge believed firmly in the importance of the place of arguments for the existence of God and a discussion of his attributes. Simple arguments could be addressed to a child, who

will easily apprehend that as *every House is builded by some Man*, and there can be no Work without an Author; *so he that built all things is GOD*. And from this obvious idea of GOD, as the Maker of all, we may naturally represent him as very great and very good, that they may be taught at once to reverence and love him.18

17 Clarke’s arguments and those who responded to them are considered in James P. Ferguson, *The Philosophy of Dr. Samuel Clarke and Its Critics* (New York: Vantage Press, 1974); see also Ezio Vailati, ed., *Samuel Clarke, A Demonstration of the Being and Attributes of God and Other Writings* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998).
Doddridge believed that such arguments were suitable also for the proclamation of the gospel to the heathen, in accordance with the example of the apostle Paul and his colleagues, who ‘when they came amongst Gentile and idolatrous Nations, ... began with asserting the Being and Attributes of the only true God’.\textsuperscript{19} For the ministerial students at his academy, twenty-nine lectures in the \textit{Course of Lectures} are devoted to this subject, enabling him to cover the principal arguments used in his day to establish God’s existence and to discuss what may be learned from natural religion about God’s attributes. Natural theology was thus of great importance for Doddridge.

At the same time, Doddridge warned that the student was not to come to these questions ‘as if nothing were known of God and Christ’. The aim of dealing with these subjects in the lecture room was not so much to persuade the students of their truth as to ensure that they, as men preparing for ministerial office, understood the arguments: ‘those who are to be the teachers and guardians of these truths ... should be acquainted with their evidence in a larger extent’ than others may be.\textsuperscript{20} As Isabel Rivers has pointed out, the order of the \textit{Course of Lectures}, in which philosophical issues precede theological topics, is in this respect ‘somewhat artificial. The conclusion is foreknown.’\textsuperscript{21} These were not subjects which Doddridge believed should often be addressed publicly. He warned his students against preaching the ‘doctrines of natural religion, such as the Being and Providence of God’, on the grounds that these (and other) subjects were ‘less necessary, because they are generally believed’; also because they ‘have been so fondly and repeatedly insisted upon by those who had but little

\textsuperscript{19} Philip Doddridge, \textit{The Temper and Conduct of the Primitive Ministers of the Gospel Illustrated and Recommended: In a Sermon Preach’d at Wisbeach, June 8. 1737. At the Ordination of the Rev. Mr. William Johnston. Published, with Some Enlargements, at the Request of the Ministers That Heard It. To Which Are Added, Mr. Johnston’s Confession of His Faith, and the Charge Given Him at That Time by the Reverend Mr. Stewart} (London: Printed for Richard Hett, and John Oswald, 1737), p. 14.


\textsuperscript{21} Isabel Rivers, \textit{The Defence of Truth through the Knowledge of Error: Philip Doddridge’s Academy Lectures} (London: Dr Williams’s Trust, 2003), p. 18.
relish for the doctrines of the gospel, that enlarging upon them would bring a man’s reputation into question with many’. The subject required careful handling, lest the preacher be taken to be not evangelical, or perhaps even a Deist, and was not to form any significant proportion of his public ministry.

In Part II of his _Course of Lectures_, entitled ‘Of the Being of a GOD and his Natural Perfections’, Doddridge sets out arguments both _a priori_ and _a posteriori_, beginning with the existence of God, before moving on to consider his attributes. The tutor outlines four chief ways in which the existence of God may be demonstrated: the argument which he places first and to which he devotes the most space is the cosmological, which seeks to show that there is a self-existent and eternal immaterial being who is God; he then adduces more briefly arguments based on universal consent, on the works of nature and on providence. He then recounts, still more briefly, four varieties of the ontological argument, two drawn from Descartes, one from Epicurus and one from Tillotson. Doddridge gives a short rebuttal of each of these: plainly, it is his first four arguments, rather than these others, which he finds persuasive. There follows a brief discussion of the definition of and difference between _a priori_ and _a posteriori_ arguments for the existence of God and a summary of the arguments of certain of the atheists of ancient Greece.

Doddridge’s treatment of the cosmological argument draws heavily on that propounded by Samuel Clarke in his Boyle lectures, though he does not follow Clarke at every point. Clarke’s formulation of the argument from self-existence was criticised, notably by Daniel Waterland (1683-1740), as defective on the basis that Clarke had
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23 Doddridge, _Course of Lectures_, pp. 43-64.
24 Ibid., pp. 64-65.
25 Ibid., pp. 65-68.
defined his key term, self-existence, in part, as ‘that which has necessity for the cause of its existence’. It was pointed out, however, that this undermines the argument that the self-existent being has no cause. Doddridge, citing Waterland, expressly dissents from Clarke’s definition, positing one of his own which does not state necessity, or anything else, to be the cause of self-existence. Nevertheless, the main substance of Doddridge’s lectures on the existence of God is reflective of Clarke’s Boyle lectures.

Having considered arguments for the existence of God, the remainder of Part II of Doddridge’s Course of Lectures is given over to a discussion of the attributes of God: that he is eternal, omnipotent, that all creatures owe their ability to produce effects to his power, that he has perfect knowledge, that he is omnipresent, that he knows future contingencies, that he is most wise, that he has, at least in some sense, natural liberty, that he is infinitely happy, that there is none like him and that he is incorporeal or immaterial, in preparation for which last proposition Doddridge examines the ideas of space and time; the final sections discuss the arguments for and against God’s absolute infinity. In an appendix to Part II, Doddridge discusses the ideas of George Berkeley (1685-1753), Bishop of Cloyne, ‘That there is no material World’. Of the topics covered in this part of the lectures, those dealing with God’s foreknowledge of future contingencies and with the nature of space raise a number of points which help further to elucidate Doddridge’s approach to questions of natural theology in his day.

Dealing with the relationship between the foreknowledge and decree of God, on the one hand, and the human will, on the other, Doddridge asserted, ‘Future
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27 Doddridge, Course of Lectures, p. 43; the reference at this point of the Course of Lectures is to a section of ‘Law’s Enquiry’, which itself refers to and summarises an argument in the relevant passage in Waterland’s work: Law, Enquiry, pp. 147-50.
28 Doddridge, Course of Lectures, pp. 68-100.
29 Ibid., pp. 101-103.
contingencies are known to God’. However, he admitted that the method by which God attains this knowledge is unknown, particularly in the case of human decisions. Doddridge does not concede that the human mind necessarily chooses ‘according to the preponderancy of the motive offered to it’; even if that were the case, it would nevertheless ‘subject the divine being to a possibility of error’. However, neither does he look to God’s decree in order to resolve the dilemma: he does not seek to explain God’s foreknowledge of human decisions by saying that those decisions are ultimately rooted in the determining will of God. His insistence, already noted, that the human will must be entirely unconstrained will not allow him to use that argument. Doddridge thus concludes that, on this issue, God’s understanding is too far beyond that of humans to postulate any explanation.

In taking this position, Doddridge refused to engage with the difficulty with his position which was raised by Samuel Colliber (about whom almost nothing is known beyond his few published works). Colliber held that the kind of liberty for which Doddridge argued for the human will was incompatible with foreknowledge on the part of God. There is no such thing, according to Colliber, as an absolute foreknowledge of contingencies: ‘to say that an Event in it’s [sic] very Nature Indetermin’d and, by consequence, in it’s self Uncertain, is Certainly Foreknown, is it’s humbly conceiv’d, to affirm Certainty and Uncertainty of the Same Subject at once and in the Same sense’. However, John Howe (1630-1705) had held that God knows future contingencies and, like Doddridge after him, had also admitted ignorance as to how this can be so: ‘for the
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30 Ibid., p. 79.
31 pp. 52-53, above.
32 Doddridge, Course of Lectures, p. 80.
manner of his knowing them [sc. future contingencies], it is better to profess ignorance about it, than attempt the explication thereof’.  

Samuel Clarke, similarly, denied that there could be any objection to God’s foreknowing future events, although ‘the Manner how God can foresee Future Things, without a Chain of Necessary Causes; is impossible for us to explain’.  

The moral philosopher William Wollaston (1659-1724) took the same position: ‘it involves no contradiction to assert, that God certainly knows what any man will choose’.  

Doddridge’s conclusion was that humans must simply worship the God whom, in this area, they cannot understand:

Let us firmly believe the Wisdom of the Divine Counsels, and humbly adore the Depths of them; according to which, without the least Violation of that Human Freedom on which the Morality of our Actions depends, those Events happen, which the Wickedness of Men as really effects, as if Providence were wholly unconcerned in them.

Doddridge’s position on this question thus echoed that of earlier theologians such as Samuel Clarke and John Howe.

Part II of the Course of Lectures also addresses the nature of space, a question of considerable moment in early eighteenth-century debate about the consequences of natural theology for an understanding of God. If space has real existence, then, it would seem, it is infinite and eternal; but how can there be something infinite and eternal in existence other than God? The difficulty can be seen in the correspondence between the German philosopher Gottfried Leibniz (1646-1716) and Samuel Clarke: Leibniz argued

---


35 Clark, Demonstration, p. 168.

36 [William Wollaston], The Religion of Nature Delineated (n.p.: Printed in the Year 1722), p. 75. The references to this work in the Course of Lectures appear to be to the fifth edition, 1731.

that, if space is real, it must be a property of some substance, but how can that be if (as
his opponents argued) space is void? Clarke’s response was to affirm that space is a
property, ‘And if it be a *Property* of That which is necessary, it will consequently ...
exist *more necessarily* ... than those *Substances Themselves* which are *not necessary*’.
In a footnote, he adds that God ‘*by existing always and every where, constitutes*
Duration and Space, *Eternity and Infinity*’. Though he was careful to make clear that
space is not to be equated with God, he appears to argue that space is a property of
God.38

Taking up the terms of this debate in his *Course of Lectures*, in the
Demonstration to Proposition XL, Doddridge argued that space has no real,
independent existence, but ‘is a mere abstract idea’.39 He reaches this conclusion by
following a similar line of argument to that of Leibniz: space can be neither a mode,
because it is not clear of what substance space could be a mode, nor a substance, as then
it would be God.40 Doddridge’s view here is also in line with that of Isaac Watts, who
sought to prove that ‘*Space ... be nothing real without us*’.41 Watts’s language appears
to be echoed by Doddridge’s statement that ‘*Space ... does not signify any thing which*
has a real and positive existence without us’. Watts’s work was published only in 1733, a few years after Doddridge had started to lecture in Northampton. The extant notes of the latter’s lectures provide no evidence as to what Doddridge taught on this subject before 1733, as they post-date Watts’s treatise. Given the absence of substantial development in Doddridge’s lectures generally, noted above, it seems on balance more likely that Doddridge’s views on this issue did not result from his having read Watts on the subject. Doddridge here, however, with Watts, departs from Clarke’s view in order to maintain the essential Christian distinction, noted already in the discussion of Locke’s views above, between matter and spirit.

On the issues discussed from Part II of the Course of Lectures, therefore, Doddridge can be seen to be addressing questions of natural theology in the light of the issues current in his day. In each case -- on the existence of God, on the relationship between human will and God’s foreknowledge and on the nature of space -- Doddridge argues for positions which are consonant with his understanding of orthodox Christian beliefs. In doing so, he draws significantly on the thought of Samuel Clarke, but is prepared to modify the latter’s views where they appear to lead to conflict with Christian truth. Doddridge generally finds that, on these points, his views coincide with those of Isaac Watts. Doddridge here is not simply arguing his case up from a rational foundation as if he did not know where his reasoning would lead. As stated above, he has made clear that the Course of Lectures does not presuppose ignorance of the truths of Christianity. While he is undoubtedly engaging in an exercise in natural theology, his overriding concern, it would seem, is not so much to construct truth on a purely rational foundation, as if revelation were unavailable or unnecessary, but rather to
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42 Doddridge, Course of Lectures, p. 89.
43 pp. 35-36.
44 pp. 48-50.
45 As Richard Muller argues: Muller, ‘Doddridge’, pp. 71, 73-76.
46 Above, p. 63.
demonstrate the reasonableness of Christian truth. Doddridge wants his students to understand the contemporary debates and to be able, if necessary, to present a defence of Christian truth in terms of the philosophical arguments of their day.

Issues of natural law are raised in Part III of the *Course of Lectures*, which addresses questions concerning ‘Moral Virtue’, or moral philosophy: the nature of good and evil, the moral attributes of God and the nature of human virtue. Little attention, again, has been paid in the secondary literature to Doddridge’s views on these issues. This is understandable, in part, as Doddridge’s views are not in any sense ground-breaking and, for the most part, he summarises the views of others. Nevertheless, an examination of his views in this area and of the influences which played a role in his formation of those views will assist an understanding of Doddridge’s views on the larger question of the relationship between reason and revelation.

There was a debate in the early eighteenth century, firstly, about the fundamental nature of morality: was morality founded in the very nature of things or was it a human construct based on self-interest or upbringing? This question was taken up in the second set of Boyle lectures delivered by Samuel Clarke in 1705, in which one of the author’s principal concerns was to establish a sound basis for moral good and evil without recourse to revelation.47 To do this, he used the terminology of relations and differences, fitness and unfitness:

*That* from the Eternal and Necessary Differences of Things, there naturally and necessarily arise certain Moral Obligations, which are of themselves incumbent on all Rational Creatures, antecedent to all positive Institution, and to all Expectation of Reward or Punishment.48

---

Clarke extends this principle even to God, so that, in his view, ‘the Will of God always and necessarily does determine it self, to choose to act only what is agreeable to Justice, Equity, Goodness and Truth, in order to the Welfare of the whole Universe’. Clarke thus makes out his case for natural law: that moral good and evil are founded in the nature of things, that God’s will is always determined in accordance with them and that men are obliged by them even in the absence of any positive command.

Knud Haakonssen describes Doddridge’s moral philosophy as ‘based on a straightforward Christian utilitarianism’, by which he means a natural law approach which sees individual morality as a contribution to the overall good which God intended for all as part of his universe. It is true that Doddridge introduces the issue of happiness into his discussion in Part III, when he comes to address the goodness of God. He states, ‘That being may be said to be perfectly GOOD or BENEVOLENT, who promotes the happiness of others so far as it is fit to be promoted.’ Thus Doddridge maintained a connection between goodness and the pursuit of happiness. However, Haakonssen’s characterisation of Doddridge’s view perhaps underplays the more objective view of morality which is evident earlier in Part III. Almost at the start of his discussion, Doddridge states, ‘There is really and necessarily a moral fitness in some actions, and a moral unfitness in others.’ Doddridge uses very similar language to Clarke’s: he equates ‘moral fitness’ (or virtue) with the agreement of the actions of intelligent beings to the ‘nature, circumstances and relations of things’; moral unfitness (or vice) is defined in opposite terms. Like Clarke, Doddridge refers to the ‘essences of things’. As with other philosophical topics discussed so far, Doddridge is framing his

49 Ibid., pp. 45-46.
51 Doddridge, Course of Lectures, p. 111.
52 Ibid., p. 104.
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discussion of the issue in terms of the language of his day, modelled closely on the work of Samuel Clarke, and, just as the Northampton lecturer had earlier propounded arguments for a natural theology, so he here mounts a case for natural law.

On many questions, Doddridge has been shown to be close to Watts as well as to Locke and Clarke, but in the area of moral philosophy Doddridge appears to be rather closer to Clarke than to Watts. The older Dissenter seemed unhappy with a morality based entirely on reason, rather than divine revelation. Using language which perhaps refers to Clarke’s rational approach, Watts argues that the moral law

\[
\text{does not arise meerly from the abstracted Nature of things, but also includes in it the Existence of God and his Will manifested some way or other, or at least put within the reach of our Knowledge; it includes also his Authority, which obliges us to walk by the Rule he gives us.}^{54}
\]

By the ‘rule’, just referred to, Watts appears to have meant the ten commandments. Perhaps closer to Doddridge’s position amongst the Dissenting community was the approach of Henry Grove (1684-1738), tutor in ethics and pneumatology at the Dissenting academy at Taunton. Grove’s work on moral philosophy was published posthumously, in two volumes, in 1749, so it seems unlikely that his views would have influenced Doddridge directly.\(^55\) Though Grove admitted the clarity of revelation in defining the moral law, he wanted to defend the natural law as sufficient in this realm. Doddridge shared this view: ‘all the most considerable particulars mentioned above in our ethical lectures, as branches of the law of nature, are recommended in the old and

---


\(^{55}\) Henry Grove, A System of Moral Philosophy, 2 vols. (London: Printed by J. Waugh, 1749). There are a few references to this work in the Course of Lectures; it is not possible to say whether these are attributable to Doddridge or to the editor; cf. Sell, Philosophy, pp. 61-67.
new testament’. Doddridge thus evinces a high degree of confidence in the sufficiency of natural law as a basis for morality.

A significant debate of the day in the area of moral philosophy concerned the relationship between God - particularly the will of God -- and moral good and evil. As seen above, Samuel Clarke argued that God always determined his will in accordance with moral good and evil. By contrast, the Baptist pastor and writer John Gill (1697-1771) took a strongly voluntarist position, arguing that the will of God is strictly prior to and the source of good and evil: ‘The fitness and unfitness of things were eternally present to his all-comprehensive mind, because he willed they should be, either by his efficacious or permissive will.’ (It is notable that, despite their disagreement on this issue, the language of fitness and unfitness is common to both parties.) Doddridge’s own position was more nuanced. On the one hand, he wanted to affirm clearly that things were good or evil because of their very nature, not simply because someone, even the Almighty, willed them to be so: ‘There is really and necessarily a moral fitness in some actions, and a moral unfitness in others ... The foundation of virtue and vice cannot depend upon the mere will of any being whatsoever.’ At the same time, he recognised the difficulty of arguing that anything is prior to or independent of the will of God. After discussion of the arguments, he concludes:

that [God’s] unerring judgment is the rule of his actions, and his will as directed by it ... the rule of ours; and the foundation of moral good and evil should be asserted, not to be previous to, or merely consequent upon, but inseparably connected with the immutable will of God.
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He thus distances himself from both voluntarist and anti-voluntarist views - moral good
and evil are not ‘merely consequent upon’ God’s will, but ‘inseparably connected with’
it. He has ‘perfectly discerned ... the moral fitness of some, and unfitness of other
actions’, but can no more ‘alter his own sense of some moral fitness’ than he can
‘change his nature, or destroy his being’. In Doddridge’s view, then, moral good and
evil were such because of their very nature, as Clarke had argued, but not because they
are in some way independent of God: rather, they are so integral to the nature of God
that he cannot but form his judgments in accordance with them, or he would cease to be
God.

It was debated in Doddridge’s day whether a person was obliged to pursue
virtue because reason says that that is the right thing to do or because self-interest and
the pursuit of happiness dictate it. Doddridge, following Watts, argued that these two
views are reconciled only in religion, which teaches that God is perfectly virtuous and
therefore requires virtue in humans: because of this, ran the argument, it is in one’s best
interest to pursue what reason says is right. Doddridge seeks to address the problem of
evil in a world governed by a good God who is omnipotent. His clear inclination is to
assert the mystery inherent in the question: he does not want to deny that God had the
‘natural power’ to create a world in which there were free agents and from which all
evil was excluded; the fact is that that is not the world which God has created and the
reasons for this ‘are entirely unknown to us’. He discusses the views of a variety of
authors on the subject, but concludes with a characteristic charity and humility, ‘It
seems therefore on the whole best to keep to that in which we all agree, and freely
acknowledge, there are depths in the divine councils unfathomable to us’. He follows

---
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this immediately with the proposition, ‘God is incomprehensible.’ Then comes an assertion of the impassibility of God: ‘The passions and affections of human nature are not in any degree to be ascribed to God.’ Doddridge thus, not for the first time, when faced with an apparently intractable philosophical conundrum, takes refuge in the transcendence of God.

Thus, as with his discussion of natural theology, Doddridge can be seen to be arguing for a natural law in the context of the debates of his day. As he did in his discussion of natural theology, he draws significantly on the work of Samuel Clarke but also seeks to ensure that the conclusions reached are consonant with Christian beliefs. Whereas Doddridge’s discussion of natural theology coincided for the most part with the views of Isaac Watts, however, the younger man’s approach to natural law shows more affinity, in the Dissenting community, with the thought of Henry Grove than of Watts. Like Grove and, from an establishment viewpoint, Samuel Clarke, Doddridge favoured a position in which morality could be defined and justified to all, believer and unbeliever alike, without recourse to divine revelation.

What, then, was the relationship, in Doddridge’s thinking, between the roles of reason and of divine revelation in addressing theological issues? There can be no doubt that Doddridge was a firm believer in the legitimacy and value of natural theology: reason was essential to the Christian faith. The teachings of Christianity were rational, in the sense that it was reasonable to hold them, and they could be demonstrated and defended by the use of reason. When Doddridge preached three sermons to young people on the evidences of Christianity, he explained his desire that they should be ready ‘to give a Reason of the Hope that is in you’ and that they be thereby ‘conscious to your selves that you are not Christians merely by Education or Example ...; but that
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you are so upon rational Evidence’. He therefore sets out to give ‘a summary View of the most considerable Arguments’ in ‘the Proof of Christianity’. Arguments drawn from reason are to be regarded as God’s ‘Provision for the Honour and Support of his Gospel’ and, indeed, as a ‘Variety of Proof’ which, if neglected, evinces a lack of ‘charitable Concern for the Conversion of those who reject the Gospel, as well as the Edification of those who imbrace it’. As they read the arguments of natural theology, or hear them preached, the members of Doddridge’s audience are addressed as ‘rational Creatures’ and exhorted to ‘Judge of the Reasonableness’ of what he has to say. In other words, natural theology is of use both for evangelism among unbelievers and for the spiritual edification of believers.

However, there were for Doddridge clear limits to the usefulness of natural theology. For Doddridge, natural theology is not generally the effective means by which a person is brought to the Christian faith, purely by the persuasive effects of arguments upon the mind. Rather, it is the ‘plain lively Preaching of the Gospel, or perhaps some afflictive Providence [which] rouzes them from their Lethargy’ and so they ‘are awakened to think deeply and seriously of Religion’. As a result, they will feel a Load of Guilt pressing on their Minds, of which they were before utterly insensible. Under this Anxiety, they hear of the Remedy which the Gospel has provided; and they hear of it with another Kind of Regard than formerly. These effects are wrought, says Doddridge, ultimately by ‘the Finger of GOD, and the Agency of his Spirit’. Rational evidences are useful in provoking an unbeliever to examine the Christian faith more closely and for confirming the faith of a Christian
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68 Doddridge, Power and Grace, p. 196.
69 Ibid., pp. 199-200.
70 Ibid., p. 25.
71 Idem.
professor, but they will not, in Doddridge’s view, achieve these effects without the supernatural work of the Holy Spirit.

Natural theology is also deficient in the sense that it does not provide as much information about Christian truth as does divine revelation. The latter ‘discovers a rich variety of truths, relating both to Christ and the Holy Spirit, which by the light of nature alone we could not possibly have found out’. Thus the Christian revelation is far more than ‘merely a republication of the religion of nature’. Reason can help to establish that a revelation is in fact divine, by testing the evidence both internal (as to the substantive content of the revelation) and external (as to the circumstances attending it, for example the reliability of its witnesses). Doddridge accordingly devotes Part V of the Course of Lectures to describing the kind of evidence which might be expected to accompany a genuinely divine revelation. Miracles, for Doddridge, form an important element in this evidence: ‘When a man performs evident and uncontroled [sic] miracles as proof of any doctrine, virtue requires those who have sufficient evidence of the reality of such miracles, to admit of the doctrine as true.’ Nevertheless, Doddridge consistently points out, again, the necessity of the work of the Spirit, ‘those Communications of the Spirit, which are absolutely necessary’ for the effectiveness of gospel work. Thus the reasonings of natural theology are not sufficient to achieve genuine spiritual good.

The reason, at least in part, for the work of the Spirit in this connection lies in Doddridge’s understanding of the effects of sin on the human mind: ‘Mankind is at present in a degenerate state ... Our own observation on ourselves, and those adult persons with whom we are conversant may convince us, that the philosophical liberty of

72 Doddridge, Course of Lectures, p. 593.
73 Ibid., p. 594.
74 Ibid., p. 231.
our minds and theirs is in some considerable degree impaired.’ That is to say, argues Doddridge:

The passions and prejudices of our minds insensibly mingle themselves with the whole process of reasoning when it is undertaken, leading into many embarrassments and inconsistencies, obscuring truth and gilding error; so that frequently the judgment is formed upon a very unfair hearing, agreeable to the bias the mind is under, and contrary to the evidence that might have been obtained.

The human mind, thus affected by sin, is incapable of grasping and accepting spiritual truth, without the supernatural assistance of the Holy Spirit. Richard Muller has argued that Doddridge had a rather attenuated sense of the harmful effects of sin on human reasoning capability in spiritual matters. However, as just shown, Doddridge expressly states that arguments drawn from reason alone will not convert: what is required is divine truth applied by the Spirit of God. Thus, he says, ‘there is no Proof in the World so satisfactory to the true Christian, as to have felt the transforming Power of the Gospel on his own Soul.’ The effect of sin on the fallen human mind has rendered it incapable of responding rightly to reason, without the illuminating work of the Holy Spirit.

According to an earlier historiography, the Enlightenment represented the triumph of reason over revelation; reason was understood necessarily to undermine orthodox, revealed religion. More recently, it has been recognised that reason and revealed theology were not necessarily considered to be in conflict in the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries and that an emphasis upon the importance of reason did not necessarily mean that it displaced revelation as the final authority on
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questions of truth. This was Doddridge’s position. He believed firmly in the usefulness of natural theology, drawing heavily upon Samuel Clarke in particular for his arguments for the existence and attributes of God. Doddridge also held clearly to a natural law which could establish a morality along Christian lines without resorting to divine revelation, a subject on which Doddridge again followed a Clarkean line and seems to have been prepared to go further than Isaac Watts. In his discussions of these topics, Doddridge engages with the arguments and debates of his day. While his arguments do not expressly make use of revelation, he is careful to ensure that his conclusions are consonant with Christian truth.

There were however clear limits, in Doddridge’s view, to the extent to which reason alone is able to effect true spiritual good. For Doddridge, natural theology on its own did not go far enough: there were important spiritual truths which were accessible only as a result of divine revelation. Furthermore, the adverse effects of sin on the human mind meant that the supernatural assistance of the Holy Spirit was necessary in order for a genuine spiritual change to be wrought in a person. Philip Doddridge was thus a convinced natural theologian who believed nevertheless in the necessity of divine assistance and divine revelation for true spiritual good to be done. His objective was not so much to demonstrate that the Christian system of belief can be wholly argued from reason alone, without the assistance of revelation, but rather to show that the truths of the Christian religion are reasonable and that they are capable of being defended by sound argument in the context of the philosophical debates of the day.

---

Chapter 4

Baxterianism and Moderate Calvinism

‘Baxterian’ is the adjective which historians have tended to associate with Philip Doddridge’s theology. Geoffrey Nuttall, in his work on Richard Baxter and Philip Doddridge, describes the latter as standing within a “‘Baxterian” tradition in theology’, defining ‘Baxterianism’ as ‘a “middle way” ... between Calvinism and Arminianism’.¹ Roger Thomas represents Doddridge as leader of the ‘Middle Way Men’, in succession to the Presbyterian minister and historian Edmund Calamy, who had died in 1732. Doddridge, says Thomas, ‘tried with varying degrees of success to steer a middle course between the strict orthodoxy of most Baptists and Independents and the heterodoxy which was claiming an ever increasing number of the Presbyterians’. His death ‘deprived English Dissent of the most influential advocate and practitioner of Baxterian principles’.² More recently, Isabel Rivers, in her entry on Doddridge in the Oxford Dictionary of National Biography, describes him as ‘a moderate Baxterian Calvinist’,³ a term which seems satisfactorily to bring together the general sense of the secondary literature, that Doddridge in his theology sought to follow Baxter in espousing a ‘middle way’ between Arminianism and Calvinism.⁴

The substantive content of this ‘middle way’ has been discussed in the secondary literature. Geoffrey Nuttall relates Baxterianism to ‘Baxter’s judgment on the

---

perseverance of believers, on the relation of grace to the moral law, and on the place of
the moral law in the scheme of salvation'.\(^5\) Roger Thomas’s understanding of
Baxterianism is governed by five points which he identifies as characterising Baxter’s
stand against certain ‘extreme positions’: the rejection of absolute reprobation, the place
of moral conduct in the scheme of salvation, a minimal view of the fundamentals of the
faith, the importance of reason as the criterion of faith and the principle of mutual
tolerance.\(^6\) Neil Keeble likewise views Baxter’s emphasis upon the ‘fundamentals’ as
one of his characteristic beliefs.\(^7\) In Isabel Rivers’s summary, the ‘Baxterian
compromise’ involved ‘rejecting reprobation, distinguishing special from general grace,
and assuming active co-operation with grace on the part of the believer’.\(^8\) Whilst these
descriptions and definitions contain common threads, particularly concerning the
relative roles of human and divine activity in salvation, there is in many of them some
brevity of discussion of the contours of the beliefs encompassed by ‘Baxterian’
thology which justifies a further examination of it.

There has also been a tendency to assume, rather than to demonstrate, the
‘Baxterian’ nature of Doddridge’s theology. Much is made of his undeniable esteem for
Baxter’s writings, which the younger man, in his own words, ‘cannot sufficiently
admire’; ‘Baxter is my particular favourite’; ‘I continue to spend an hour a day on
Baxter, whom I admire more and more.’\(^9\) There has, however, been little attempt to
explore the details of Doddridge’s doctrinal views, despite the significant amount of
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\(^5\) Nuttall, *Baxter and Doddridge*, p. 3; cp. J. Van Den Berg & G. F. Nuttall, *Philip Doddridge (1702-
\(^8\) Isabel Rivers, *Reason, Grace and Sentiment: A Study of the Language of Religion and Ethics in
167.
\(^9\) Philip Doddridge to Samuel Clark, 22 October 1724, Humphreys, *Correspondence*, Vol. 1, p. 426
(Nuttall, *Calendar*, Letter no. 149); Doddridge to John Nettleton, 8 December 1724, Humphreys,
*Correspondence*, Vol. 1, p. 460 (Nuttall, *Calendar*, Letter no. 155); Doddridge to Nettleton, 5 August
evidence available for those views, not only in the *Course of Lectures*, but also in his sermons, especially those published as *The Power and Grace of Christ* (1736), *Salvation by Grace* (1741), and *Regeneration* (1742), and in the six-volume work on the New Testament, the *Family Expositor* (1739-56). Roger Thomas has discussed theological aspects of the *Course of Lectures* as part of an extended argument for Doddridge’s ‘liberalism’, whilst in contrast Erik Routley has found a ‘virile and salty’ Calvinism in Doddridge’s hymns. On the whole, however, Richard Muller’s recent call for an examination of Doddridge’s theology as a whole, referred to above, seems justified on the basis that recent studies have not engaged with ‘his theology, its antecedents, backgrounds and contents, in much depth’. The absence of such a study renders any detailed comparison of Doddridge’s views with those of Richard Baxter open to question.

There has furthermore been a tendency in any discussion of Doddridge’s theology, to focus on his earlier correspondence, particularly that of his student days and soon after. An example is his youthful expression of dislike for the Puritan theologian John Owen (1616-83), whose frequent theological disagreements with Baxter are well-known: ‘I am not very fond of such mysterious men’, wrote Doddridge

---
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about Owen and his fellow-Puritan Thomas Goodwin (1600-80) in 1722, while still a
student. What has been less often noted is Doddridge’s more appreciative comments
in later years about Owen: in his Lectures on Preaching, delivered to his students as
part of their ministerial training, he commends Owen as ‘highly evangelical’ (although
‘very obscure’); ‘There is great zeal and much knowledge of human life discovered in
all his works’; ‘His Exposition of the 130th Psalm is most excellent’; Doddridge
commends three of Owen’s works as showing ‘great improvement in practical religion’;
and in his sermons on regeneration, published in 1742, the Northampton preacher is
moved to refer to the seventeenth-century divine as ‘good Dr. Owen, whose Candour
was, in many respects, very remarkable’. Suggestive also is the comment made by his
former student, Andrew Kippis, who in his memoir of Doddridge’s life opines that the
sermons which the tutor preached in his early years at Kibworth had ‘less of the
Calvinistical dress of expression than was adopted by him after his settlement at
Northampton’. In Kippis’s view, his tutor’s beliefs were ‘in a considerable degree ...
Calvinistical’. It is thus possible that too much attention has been paid to Doddridge’s
early views at the expense of his more mature theological reflection.

In the light of these various considerations, a detailed exploration of
Doddridge’s views on the theological issues involved in the use of the term ‘Baxterian’
seems justified. This chapter will accordingly look first at the way in which that and
related terms were used by Doddridge and others in his day, in order to understand more
clearly what (if any) theological implications those terms carried in early eighteenth-
century Dissent. The chapter will then discuss Doddridge’s views on the doctrinal
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Paraphrase and Version of the New Testament ... Volume the First ... The Seventh Edition (London:
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points raised by a ‘Baxterian’ theology, comparing them as appropriate with the views of Baxter himself. Some conclusions will then be reached about Doddridge’s theology, in particular as they relate to Baxterianism.

How, then, did Doddridge and those in his circle use terms such as ‘Baxterian’? An early reference in Doddridge’s extant correspondence to the term ‘Baxterian’ appears in his oft-quoted letter to his St Albans mentor, Samuel Clark, in 1722, in which he describes his tutor, John Jennings, as one who ‘does not follow the doctrines or phrases of any particular party; but is sometimes a Calvinist, sometimes an Arminian, and sometimes a Baxterian, as truth and evidence determine him’.17 This indicates that ‘Baxterian’ could mean something distinctive, theologically, from ‘Calvinist’ and ‘Arminian’. In a letter of 1724 to his friend John Mason (1706-63), Doddridge links heterodox views on the salvability of the heathen with the term ‘Baxterianism’.18 Again, the contrast would seem to be with the normal Calvinist view that the heathen cannot (apart from an express acceptance of the gospel) be saved. However, towards the end of his life, Doddridge refers to a former student, Andrew Kippis (1725-95), as ‘a Baxterian Calvinist’, commenting that he regards this as ‘a very proper Expression’.19 It would seem, at least here, that the term does not indicate someone who is not a Calvinist, but rather a particular variety of Calvinist. By contrast, the phrase ‘Baxterian Arminian’ was not commonly found. In 1749, Samuel Bates (1706-61), Dissenting minister in Warminster, wrote to Doddridge to convey ‘the Request of a Vacant Congregation in a neighbouring Country Village’ for a minister, adding, ‘A moderate Calvinist alias

17 Philip Doddridge to Samuel Clark, 22 September 1722, Humphreys, Correspondence, Vol. 1, p. 156 (Nuttall, Calendar, Letter no. 35).
18 Philip Doddridge to John Mason, 4 November 1724, Humphreys, Correspondence, Vol. 1, p. 438-39 (Nuttall, Calendar, Letter no. 150).
Baxterian will be most acceptable.’

What was sought was not a non-Calvinist, but a certain kind of Calvinist. These uses of the term suggest that a ‘Baxterian’ theological position, though distinguishable from strict Calvinism on certain points, is nevertheless a form of Calvinism.

The final quotation, above, equates the term ‘Baxterian’ with that of ‘moderate Calvinist’. This latter term is found several times in Doddridge’s correspondence, as a term of approbation. It is also the term that he uses to describe himself. In a lengthy report of the state of Dissent which Doddridge provided to Daniel Wadsworth, minister in Hartford, Connecticut, in 1741, the Englishman states, ‘We are generally moderate Calvinists.’

In the 1748 letter to Samuel Wood, just referred to, in which Doddridge describes Kippis as a ‘Baxterian Calvinist’, Doddridge says that he finds it ‘extreamly [sic] difficult to direct vacant Churches in the Calvinistical I mean moderately Calvinistical way (as most that apply to me are)’ to suitable ministers; later he commends John Affleck who, whilst ‘a Scotchman, tho really in his Pronunciation much mended’ is described as ‘a thorough calvinist but of great Moderation’.

That there was no necessary opposition between ‘moderation’ and ‘Calvinism’ is demonstrated by another self-description of Doddridge, that he was ‘in all the most important points a Calvinist’. Thus, again, the terminology of ‘moderation’, like ‘Baxterian’, is used within a generally Calvinist context: it describes a variety of Calvinist, rather than distinguishing a position separate from Calvinism.
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The use of the term, ‘Moderation’, of the ‘thorough Calvinist’ John Affleck appears to indicate that that former word could also be used to indicate, not so much a theological position, as an attitude or aspect of character. So in 1723, Doddridge’s mentor Samuel Clark, writing to Doddridge, describes John Foxon, minister of the Dissenting congregation at Girdlers’ Hall, London, who had recently died, as having been a ‘moderate man’.

In 1751, John Barker, Presbyterian minister and friend of Doddridge, exclaimed to his friend, then in dangerous ill health, ‘Who shall … diffuse a spirit of piety, Moderation, Candour & Charity’. The term here seems to be used to speak of an openness towards and acceptance of others coupled with a dislike of polemics, rather than of a precise position on theological issues. In the letter just quoted, Barker goes on to ask who will ‘rescue us from the bondage of systems -- party Opinions -- empty & useless speculations -- & fashionable forms and phrases’. He is here contrasting ‘moderation’ with an attachment to confessional language or the favoured expressions of cliques. As the next chapter will explore, Doddridge maintained throughout his life an intense dislike of the imposition of confessions by means of subscription. His mentor, Samuel Clark, refers to an insistence on confessional language as ‘bigotry’, as does Doddridge himself in speaking of the likelihood that the Calvinist benefactor William Coward (1647/8-1738) will endow the academy of Abraham Taylor (fl. 1726-40), a strict Calvinist and a subscriptionist: Doddridge prophesies that the result will be ‘Bigotry intailed on the rising Generation’.
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sometimes refer to an anti-subscriptionist position, or more generally to an attitude of
candour and charity, rather than to a precise set of doctrinal beliefs.27

The final term of relevance is ‘orthodox’, which in Doddridge’s correspondence
is usually not a favourable expression. In 1727, Doddridge informed Samuel Clark that
he would not accept an invitation to Bradfield in Norfolk, as ‘the people are so
orthodox’.28 As Doddridge did not think of himself as doctrinally heterodox, he is
probably referring here, not so much to a doctrinal position as to an attachment to the
language of confessions, a point which had dissuaded him more than once from
pursuing a pastoral position.29 A similar use seems to lie behind his comment, while
writing his *Family Expositor*, ‘My chief Difficulty at pres. lies in some Texts often but
injudiciously made a Test of Orthodoxy’,30 and, perhaps more ironically, his fear that, in
his *Family Expositor*, ‘all my Orthodoxy will be little enough’.31 The term in this
context, then, is linked to Doddridge’s opposition to subscription and the imposition of
confessional language.

A more theological use of the term is also evident, however. In 1727, Doddridge
preached at Kettering for his friend Thomas Saunders; the clerk absented himself, for
which Saunders apologised, commenting, ‘I suppose it was to give a specimen of his
high orthodoxy, and for fear his tender conscience should be defiled with some of good

27 So Roger Thomas, ‘Doddridge and Liberalism’, p. 134, referring to the expression ‘moderate
orthodoxy’: ‘where the moderation consists not so much in a reduced orthodoxy as in a reduced
dogmatism’. See also John Coffey, ‘A Ticklish Business: Defining Heresy and Orthodoxy in the Puritan
Revolution’, and N. H. Keeble, ‘“Take Heed of Being Too Forward in Imposinge on Others”: Orthodoxy
and Heresy in the Baxterian Tradition’, in David Loewenstein and John Marshall, eds., *Heresy,
Literature, and Politics in Early Modern English Culture* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press,
320 (Nuttall, *Calendar*, Letter no. 271).
29 For example, at Girdlers’ Hall, London: Philip Doddridge to Samuel Clark, 4 February 1724,
30 Philip Doddridge to Samuel Clark, 22 January 1737, DWL, New College Library MSS L1/10/21
(Nuttall, *Calendar*, Letter no. 452).
31 Philip Doddridge to Samuel Clark, 17 April 1737, DWL, New College Library MSS L1/10/22 (Nuttall,
*Calendar*, Letter no. 456).
old Mr Baxter’s divinity’. Thus ‘high orthodoxy’ is contrasted, seemingly on theological grounds, with a Baxterian position. Six years later, Doddridge complained to his wife, ‘The Tide of Orthodoxy beats strongly upon me’, adding, ‘These Struggles are the last Convulsions of a Dying Cause.’ This letter appears to have been followed shortly by one to John Barker (1682-1762), then minister of Matthew Henry’s old congregation at Mare Street, Hackney, in which Doddridge enlarges on the identity of his orthodox opponents. They were, it seems, ‘high orthodox people. The chief instruments of it [the attack on him] were some tall pupils of Dr. Ridgley’s; I have, however, reason to believe that it sprung from a party of Antinomians in this town.’ Thus sometimes, at least, Doddridge means by ‘orthodox’ the ‘high orthodox’ or antinomian, who emphasised God’s decrees over against human responsibility and opposed indiscriminate gospel offers and exhortations to faith in Christ as a duty. This understanding is confirmed by a letter in 1734 to Mercy, informing his wife that, preaching in London, ‘I had several orthodox spies to hear me this morning’, who ‘observed, with great amazement, that I urged my hearers to endeavour to get an interest in Christ. This, it seems, is Arminianism.’ Clearly, these were more antinomians, whose theological position could be denominated by the terms ‘orthodox’ or ‘high orthodox’.

It would thus seem that, at least amongst Doddridge’s circle of friends and colleagues, the term ‘Baxterian’ was used generally to indicate a form of Calvinism which may be distinguishable from other kinds of Calvinism on some theological grounds.

---

32 Thomas Saunders to Philip Doddridge, 1 June 1727, Humphreys, Correspondence, Vol. 2, p. 310 (Nuttall, Calendar, Letter no. 265).
33 Philip to Mercy Doddridge, 19 July 1733, John Rylands Library, English MSS 1209 (11) (Nuttall, Calendar, Letter no. 386).
34 Philip Doddridge to John Barker, n.d.; Humphreys, Correspondence, Vol. 3, p. 207 (Nuttall, Calendar, Letter no. 390). Although there is no date given by Humphreys, the event closely matches that referred to in the letter to Mercy, 19 July 1733, supra, and can on that basis be taken as soon following it; it is so treated by Nuttall.
35 Philip Doddridge to Mercy Doddridge, 21 June 1734; Humphreys, Correspondence, Vol. 3, p. 163 (Nuttall, Calendar, Letter no. 416).
points, such as the salvability of the heathen. An alternative term, which Doddridge preferred to use for his own position, was ‘moderate Calvinism’. The language of moderation was often used of someone who favoured a charitable outlook to others and who, particularly, disliked the imposition of creeds and confession by mandatory subscription and the enforced use of confessional language. So, amongst Doddridge’s Dissenting contemporaries, the moderate Calvinist stood over against the confessional Calvinist, such as Abraham Taylor, who might otherwise share a Calvinist theology. But the moderate Calvinist could also be distinguished theologically from the antinomian, or high orthodox. In all these uses of these terms, the theological context is clearly Calvinist. These conclusions raise questions about the extent to which Baxterian or moderate Calvinism should be understood, as it sometimes has been, as a kind of diluted Calvinism or half-way house towards Arminianism. A more detailed exploration of Doddridge’s own theological position, focusing on points which are thought to be distinctive of Baxterianism, is thus necessary to help to clarify the substantive content of moderate Calvinism in early eighteenth-century Dissent.

The brief survey of the secondary literature given above suggests that any examination of the doctrinal content of a Baxterian theology will need to address a nexus of theological issues. The salvability of the heathen has been seen to be a topic which is associated with Baxterianism. Secondly, the question of the definition of the fundamental beliefs of the Christian faith, mentioned by Roger Thomas as a characteristic Baxterian issue, was a matter on which Baxter differed from many of his Puritan contemporaries and should therefore be explored here. The secondary literature identifies as Baxterian issues, thirdly, the place of human moral conduct in the scheme of salvation and, fourthly, the relationship of human freedom to God’s decree in matters

---

36 pp. 80-81.
relating to salvation. Finally, aspects of the doctrine of the atonement were the focus of disagreement between Baxter and, in particular, the Calvinist theologian John Owen, and should therefore be considered. Each of these areas will be examined in turn, in order to clarify Doddridge’s views on them and to assess the extent, if any, to which he departed from traditional Calvinist views and how far the influences which led him to do so can be traced back to Baxter.

On the possibility, firstly, that the heathen might be saved, Thomas Ridgley, in his commentary on the sixtieth question of the *Westminster Larger Catechism* (1648), explains the view there expressed, that those who ‘having never heard the gospel, know not Jesus Christ, and believe not in him, cannot be saved, be they never so diligent to frame their lives according to the light of nature, or the law of that religion which they profess’. In the course of his exposition, Ridgley refers to those ‘who maintain the doctrine of universal redemption’ who assert that ‘the Heathen, as well as Christians, are put into a savable state by the death of Christ, so that they shall be saved if they live according to the dictates of the light of nature, though they know nothing of Christ and the gospel’. Of this latter view, Richard Baxter, commenting on some of the articles of the Church of England, said that he refused to ‘curse all that hope that some are saved, who never heard of the Name of Christ, and that his Spirit and Grace go farther than the knowledge of his Name’. Citing the statement of Baxter just quoted, Doddridge opines of the ‘Heathens’ that ‘if there be any of them in whom there is a prevailing love to the divine being, and care in the practice of virtue, there seems reason to believe, that for

---


the sake of Christ, though to them unknown, they may be accepted by God’. 39 Doddridge would have heard a similar view from his tutor, John Jennings, who taught that a virtuous heathen, ignorant of Christ, may experience the forgiveness of sins. 40 On this question, Doddridge stood in a clear Baxterian tradition.

Richard Baxter’s view of the fundamentals of the faith, the second topic to be considered, was also relatively straightforward: he considered ‘the Creed,’ by which he meant the Apostles’ Creed, ‘Lord’s Prayer, and Decalogue alone’ to be sufficient ‘as our Essentials or Fundamentals’, because these ‘at least contain all that is necessary to Salvation, and hath been by all the Ancient Churches taken for the Sum of their Religion’. 41 He made these comments as a member of a committee established during the Protectorate to define the limits of beliefs which could legitimately be recognised as Christian. In a strict sense, Baxter believed that no particular form of words was essential to the definition of a believer, as what mattered was the substance of a person’s belief, which could be expressed in a variety of ways: ‘it’s only the Sense that is primarily and properly our Fundamentals: and the Words no further than as they are needful to express that Sense [sic] to others, or represent it to our own Conception’. 42 However, he did accept that it was necessary, for defined purposes such as admittance to church membership and fellowship between churches, to attempt to express in words the fundamental Christian beliefs: hence his identifying the three formulations mentioned above (two of which, of course, are from the Bible). His colleagues on the

39 Philip Doddridge, A Course of Lectures on the Principal Subjects in Pneumatology, Ethics, and Divinity: With References to the Most Considerable Authors on Each Subject, ed. Samuel Clark (London: Printed by Assignment from the Author’s Widow, for J. Buckland et al., 1763), p. 431.
41 Matthew Sylvester, ed., Reliquiae Baxterianae: Or, Mr. Richard Baxters Narrative of the Most Memorable Passages of His Life and Times. Faithfully Publish’d from His Own Manuscript (London: Printed for T. Parkhurst et al., 1696), Part II, para. 52, p. 198.
42 Sylvester, ed., Reliquiae, Part II, para. 51, pp. 197-98. On the discussions of the committee on this matter, see further J. Coffey, ‘Ticklish’, and N. H. Keeble, ‘“Take Heed”’. 
committee disagreed and proposed a document containing twenty statements of
doctrine, going far beyond the minimalist approach advocated by Baxter.

By contrast, Philip Doddridge proposed no creed or confession of any kind as
the basis for Christian fellowship, but insisted rather upon resort to the language of
scripture alone: ‘There seems to be a peculiar Felicity in them [sc. ‘Scripture Phrases’]
to express Divine Truth; and they will undoubtedly be found the safest Vehicle of
Religious Knowledge, and the surest Band of Union among Christians’. Doddridge
deplored those who harboured an ‘unhappy attachment to human phrases’, desiring
instead that ‘all the party-names, and unscriptural phrases and forms, which have
divided the Christian world, were forgot’. In the Course of Lectures, Doddridge states
that the question of fundamentals is one ‘of the utmost difficulty’. He objects to the
idea that any form of words can be satisfactory for this purpose, ‘for the demand of
drawing up a list of fundamentals ... seems to be founded on a mistaken supposition,
that the same things are fundamental to all’. He appears here to be taking up a thought
of Jean-Alphonse Turretin, who held that ‘as it would be absurd to expect that one
common Garment should suit all Statures … so it is impossible to fix a certain Number
of Articles necessary to be known of all Men’. Doddridge questions Locke’s view,
that ‘the only fundamental of christianity is, that Christ is the Messiah’, on the grounds
of its imprecision, but then seems to adopt an enlarged version of it as follows,

that wherever there appeared to be such a persuasion of the dignity of
Christ’s person and the extent of his power, as should encourage men
to commit their souls to his care, and to subject them to his

43 Doddridge, Regeneration, p. xi.
44 [Philip Doddridge], Free Thoughts on the Most Probable Means of Reviving the Dissenting Interest.
Occasion’d by the Late Enquiry into the Causes of Its Decay. Address’d to the Author of That Enquiry. By
6, p. 13.
45 Doddridge, Course of Lectures, p. 430.
46 [Jean-Alphonse Turretin], A Discourse concerning Fundamental Articles in Religion. In Which a
Method Is Laid Down for the More Effectual Uniting of Protestants, and Promoting a More General
Toleration amongst Them ... (London: Printed by J. Darby, for A. Bell et al., 1720), p. 32.
government, those who professed such a persuasion were admitted to baptism by the apostles, and ought to be owned as Christians.\footnote{Doddridge, \textit{Course of Lectures}, p. 430.}

Doddridge, then, regarded any form of words whatever as inadequate to the task of defining fundamentals and so, on this point, appears even more Baxterian than Baxter.

The third area to be explored is the role that human moral conduct plays in the scheme of salvation, an issue which came into sharp focus in the debates concerning justification. The traditional Calvinist view held justification to be a forensic declaration by God of the sinner’s righteous status, based, not on anything that the sinner does or does not do, but solely upon the perfect righteousness of Jesus Christ imputed to him. Thus John Owen asserts the impossibility of justification ‘any other way, but by the \textit{Imputation of the Righteousness of Christ}'.\footnote{John Owen, \textit{The Doctrine of Justification by Faith through the Imputation of the Righteousness of Christ, Explained, Confirmed, & Vindicated} (London: Printed for R. Boulter, 1677), p. 228.} This justification occurs at the moment when the sinner comes to repentance and saving faith in Christ. There is no question then, for the Calvinist, of justification being dependent upon the believer’s future conduct. Owen expressed it in this way:

\begin{quote}
By our actual Believing with Justifying Faith, ... we do receive him [Christ]; ... Hereby we have a \textit{Right unto}, and an Interest in, all the Benefits of his Mediation; which is to be at once compleatly justified ... and therefore our Justification is at once compleat.\footnote{\textit{Ibid.}, p. 200.}
\end{quote}

For the Calvinist, acts of obedience to God necessarily follow, but do not form part of, justification. It was, for Owen, impossible ‘that justifying Faith should be without a \textit{sincere purpose of Heart} to obey God in all things’.\footnote{\textit{Ibid.}, p. 140.} Once justified, says Owen, ‘Believers are obliged \textit{unto universal Obedience} unto God’.\footnote{\textit{Ibid.}, p. 201.} The moral conduct of the Christian is thus a matter of vital importance for the Calvinist, but it must not be confused with the justification of a sinner, in which it has no role to play.
Richard Baxter had considerable concerns with this approach, as he feared that it led too easily to an antinomian disregard of law and thus to licentious behaviour.\textsuperscript{52} He therefore propounded his ‘neonomian’ scheme, which taught that God had, upon the introduction of the mediatorial kingdom of the Son, established a new law, the law of grace. God’s original law still needed to be fulfilled, but for the repentant sinner this was done on his behalf by the perfect obedience of Christ during his earthly life.

According to Baxter’s scheme, however, the sinner also required a second righteousness, an ‘Evangelical Righteousness’ under the new law of grace, which ‘consisteth in our own actions of Faith and Gospel Obedience’. Faith here is understood not simply as ‘the bare Act of beleeving \textit{sic]’ but as including ‘severall other duties’, including the duty ‘sincereley (though imperfectly) [to] obey [Christ] as their Lord’, which in turn involves ‘forgiving others, loving his people, bearing what sufferings are imposed, diligently using the means and Ordinances, and confessing and bewailing their sins against him, and praying for pardon; and all this sincerely and to the end’.\textsuperscript{53} Baxter’s scheme thus meant that justification was ‘not a momentaneous Act, begun and ended immediately upon our Believing; but a continued Act; which though it be in its kind compleate \textit{sic] from the first, yet is it still in doing, till the finall Iustification at the Judgement day’.\textsuperscript{54} The result of this formulation was to bring into the concept of saving faith the obedience of the believer, whose justification was not dependent wholly upon the righteousness of Christ but was also, in some sense, conditional upon the believer’s future good conduct.

Philip Doddridge gave a definition of saving faith in his \textit{Course of Lectures}:

\textsuperscript{52} Baxter’s concerns on this issue and their outworking in his writings are explored in Tim Cooper, \textit{Fear and Polemic in Seventeenth-Century England: Richard Baxter and Antinomianism} (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2001).
\textsuperscript{53} Richard Baxter, \textit{Aphorismes of Justification, with Their Explication Annexed. Wherein also Is Opened the Nature of the Covenants, Satisfaction, Righteousnesse, Faith, Works, &c. Published especially for the Use of the Church of Iederminster in Worcestershire} (London: Printed for Francis Tyton, 1649), pp. 74, 235, 280.
\textsuperscript{54} \textit{Ibid.}, p. 233.
Faith in Christ is in general, committing our souls to him for salvation in his appointed way: or more largely, such a persuasion that he is the Messiah, and such a desire and expectation of the blessings which he has in his gospel promised to his people, as engages the soul to fix its dependence upon him, and subject itself to him in all the ways of holy obedience.\footnote{Doddridge, \textit{Course of Lectures}, p. 423.}

The definition seems to reflect the usual Calvinist approach, save for the introduction in the final phrase of a reference to obedience. The Baxterian turn which those words suggest is confirmed in the following paragraph: ‘\textit{Faith in Christ} is a very extensive principle, and includes in its nature and inseparable effects the whole of moral virtue’.\footnote{Ibid., p. 424.}

That he intended to teach that saving faith in a clear sense includes obedience is further confirmed by a statement in his \textit{Family Expositor}: ‘the \textit{Faith,} to which the Promise of Life is annexed, includes sincere and unreserved \textit{Obedience;} and it is impossible to make one Part of Scripture consistent with another, unless this be taken into our Idea of \textit{Saving Faith}.’\footnote{Doddridge, \textit{The Family Expositor: Or, a Paraphrase and Version of the New Testament. With Critical Notes; and a Practical Improvement of Each Section, Vol. 1, Containing the Former Part of the History of Our Lord Jesus Christ, as Recorded by the Four Evangelists, Disposed in the Order of an Harmony} (London: Printed by John Wilson, 1739), p. 163.} Again, in a sermon on salvation by grace, Doddridge affirms that saving faith ‘includes in it our \textit{devoting ourselves to Christ} in the Way of Holy \textit{Obedience}, as an essential Part of it’.\footnote{Philip Doddridge, \textit{The Scripture-Doctrine of Salvation by Grace through Faith, Illustrated and Improved in Two Sermons: The Substance of Which Was Preached at Rowell in Northamptonshire. Published, with Some Enlargements, at the Earnest Request of the Congregation There} (London: Printed, and Sold by M. Fenner & James Hodges, 1741), p. 9. Earlier in the sermon, Doddridge gives a definition of saving faith which is strikingly similar to that supplied in the \textit{Course of Lectures}, quoted above: \textit{Salvation by Grace}, p. 4.} Like Baxter before him, Doddridge was clear that the inclusion of obedience in the definition of faith was deliberate so as to ward off accusations of antinomianism: ‘Those who assert, that under the gospel a man is \textit{justified by faith,} cannot justly be accused of subverting or injuring practical religion, if
faith be taken in the sense here defined. On this point, considered alone, Doddridge does indeed appear Baxterian.

Doddridge’s statements about justification and the bearing that saving faith has upon it appear, however, to leave little room for any idea, such as Baxter had, that justification was conditional on future good conduct. For Doddridge, the full benefit of Christ’s death, in the salvation of the soul, is appropriated only by faith. ‘Faith is absolutely necessary in Order to our Salvation, so that we cannot possibly be saved without it; - and also, that every one who hath this Faith, shall undoubtedly obtain Salvation.’

It is by faith that the believer receives justification: ‘Faith … must signify a firm Belief of the Promise of GOD, and acting according to it in a Dependance [sic] upon Christ for Righteousness; which is the Way of Justification that the Gospel has revealed.’ Moreover, ‘the Faith, to which the Promises of Salvation are made, is a Faith, which receives the Lord Jesus Christ in all his Offices; which trusts his Atonement, as well as admits his Revelation; and flies to him for Righteousness and Life’. There is no suggestion here that the ongoing obedience of the believer enters into the issue of justification, nor is there any thought of a new law, promulgated by God on the inauguration of the mediatorial kingdom of his Son, obedience to which, as Baxter argued, secures the ‘evangelical righteousness’ necessary for salvation.

Doddridge speaks of ‘our being justified by the Imputation of the Righteousness of Christ, that is, our being treated by GOD as righteous, for the Sake of what he has

59 Doddridge, Course of Lectures, p. 424.
60 Doddridge, Salvation by Grace, p. 6.
done and suffered’. 63 He links the imputation of Christ’s righteousness to the believer with the believer’s union with Christ: he may ‘thus be said to have put on Christ, and to be clothed with his Character and covered with his Righteousness; and by the Interest you have in him by Faith, are so united to him as to appear one with him in his State of Liberty and Felicity.’ 64 In his clearest and most succinct statement of a believer’s justification, there is no mention of obedience whatever:

[I]t appears, that on the one hand, our sins were imputed to Christ, and on the other, that we are justified by the imputation of Christ’s righteousness to us, i.e. we, though guilty, on complying with the gospel, are finally treated by God as righteous persons, (i.e. as if we had never offended him at all, or had ourselves satisfied the demands of his law for such offences,) out of regard to what Christ has done or suffered; whereas we should not otherwise have been so treated. 65

It is difficult to envisage Baxter making a statement as unequivocal as this, without worrying that it would be misunderstood and allow for licentious and antinomian interpretation. By contrast, Doddridge’s use of the language of imputation and the absolute way in which the believer is treated as righteous by God on the basis of faith is unqualified by such concerns.

The question arises, therefore, as to how precisely Doddridge’s understanding of the scheme of salvation should be characterised, particularly as regards the interplay between grace and morality. The sole Baxterian element, though an important one, appears to be the inclusion of obedience in the definition of faith. For the rest, Doddridge is clear that salvation is entirely by grace and that the believer’s works or obedience do not in any way contribute to it. Doddridge does not take on board the Baxterian neonomian scheme. His definition of faith does not lead him to ascribe any

65 Doddridge, Course of Lectures, p. 420.
significance, so far as justification goes, to ongoing obedience. He shares the concern of Baxter to guard against licence and antinomianism; to do so, he uses a definition of faith which looks akin to Baxter’s. Yet Doddridge, in his clear distancing of personal behaviour from justification, in his insistence that the full benefits of justification are appropriated directly upon the exercise of faith and in his use of the language of imputation, expresses himself quite differently from Baxter. Overall, therefore, Doddridge’s scheme of salvation and his view of the place of human morality in relation to it should not be classified as Baxterian.

Doddridge’s views on this issue appear to reflect those of his tutor, who taught his students that faith in Christ involves ‘such an expectation of obtaining blessings, by the imputation of the works and sufferings of Christ, as produces the volition to offer universal obedience to Christ’.66 Here, then, faith and obedience are certainly connected, but the former does not appear to include the latter; rather, it ‘produces’ it, or leads necessarily to it, a formula that does not correspond with Baxter’s. Later, Jennings adds, ‘The volition or intention of offering universal obedience to Christ is required under the name of faith.’67 Although, like Doddridge, Jennings here does appear to include obedience within faith, the older man does not, any more than his student, espouse a neonomian scheme, nor does he suggest that justification is dependent upon the believer’s future obedience. Rather, he bases salvation upon imputation:

‘Whosesoevert’s sins are remitted, they are remitted by the imputation of the works and

---

sufferings of Christ.\textsuperscript{68} Thus Jennings, like Doddridge, did not follow a Baxterian line in his understanding of faith and salvation.

The fourth area of doctrine to be explored focuses on questions concerning the relationship of human freedom to the decree of God. The particular theological issues around which these questions clustered were the following: was God’s decree of reprobation absolute and unconditional; was the Spirit’s influence calling a sinner to saving faith irresistible; and were true believers bound to persevere in their faith so as successfully to attain heaven? Doddridge’s position on each of these points will be examined in turn.

Roger Thomas and Isabel Rivers, among others, identify the rejection of an absolute decree of reprobation as one mark of a Baxterian theology.\textsuperscript{69} The view thus rejected would seem to be that described by Baxter himself in terms, ‘that God Positively decreed from eternity to glorifie his Justice in the damnation of the most, and to that end to occasion and permit their hardning and unbelief’, which he appears to attribute to the high Calvinist William Twisse (1578-1646). Baxter himself appears to favour the view which he says is that of John Davenant (1572-1641), one of the English representatives at the Synod of Dort in 1618, ‘that Reprobation is Gods Positive Decree not to give faith and repentance to the same men, and to damn them for impenitence and infidelity’.\textsuperscript{70} This view differs from that attributed to Twisse by laying the emphasis of the decree on a withholding of grace and by making sin, rather than the decree, the immediate cause of damnation. These same emphases, however, can be seen also in the \textit{Westminster Larger Catechism} (1648), the answer to thirteenth question of which states

\textsuperscript{69} See above, p. 81.
that God passed over those not chosen to life and condemned them on grounds of their sin.\footnote{The Humble Advice of the Assembly of Divines, Now by Authority of Parliament Sitting at Westminster, concerning I. A Confession of Faith. II. A Larger Catechism. III. A Shorter Catechism. Presented by Them Lately to Both Houses of Parliament (Printed at London and Reprinted at Edinbrough \[sic\], 1648), fiftieth and fifty-first pages [not numbered].} Commenting on this statement, Thomas Ridgley distanced himself from the view attributed to Twisse, above: ‘We are far from asserting ... that God, from all eternity, purposed to damn a great part of the world, as the result of his meer sovereign will, without the foresight of sin’.\footnote{Ridgley, \textit{Body of Divinity}, Vol. 1, p. 204.} Ridgley draws a distinction between the manner in which God chooses some for eternal life and the way in which he passes over others: he insists that the ‘immediate spring and cause’ of unbelief in the latter group is ‘the corruption and perverseness of human nature, which is chargeable on none else, but man himself’ and is not to be attributed to God’s ‘denying special grace’ to them.\footnote{Ridgley, \textit{Body of Divinity}, Vol. 1, p. 230.} Ridgley there is at pains to make clear that damnation, although indeed part of God’s decree of election, is the consequence of human sin. Thus the \textit{Westminster Larger Catechism} and Thomas Ridgley appear to be more in line with the view of Davenant and Baxter, rather than with that attributed to Twisse, in espousing a form of reprobation which differentiates it from election to life and insists on human sin, rather than God’s decree, as the immediate cause of final condemnation.

Philip Doddridge indeed found abhorrent any idea that God ‘should irresistibly determine millions to the commission of every sinful action of their lives, and then with all the pomp and pageantry of a universal judgment condemn them to eternal misery, on account of those actions’. Such an idea is, he says, ‘of all incredible things to me the most incredible’.\footnote{Doddridge, \textit{Course of Lectures}, p. 572.} This does not mean, however, that he rejected the idea of reprobation, as can be seen from his comments in the \textit{Family Expositor} on the ninth chapter of Romans, a favourite passage for those who espoused a decree of reprobation:
That the sovereign Choice of some Individuals to peculiar Privileges, to which none had any Claim, and the sovereign Appointment of some, from among many Criminals, to peculiar and exemplary Punishment, was perfectly consistent both with Reason and Scripture.75

Doddridge goes on to distinguish the decree to salvation from that to reprobation: commenting on Romans 9:22-23, Doddridge draws attention to the difference in the language that the apostle Paul used: ‘It being said simply of [the vessels of wrath] that they were fitted for Destruction, but of the [vessels of mercy] that GOD prepared them for Glory’.76 He comments: ‘A Distinction of so great Importance, that I heartily wish we may ever keep it in View, to guard us against Errors, on the Right-hand, or on the Left.’77 The distinction which Doddridge thus draws is similar to that made by the Westminster catechism and by Ridgley, referred to above. It is similar, too, to the teaching of Doddridge’s tutor, John Jennings, who also emphasised that ‘reprobation does not correspond to predestination to life’ and that God is not the author of unbelief.78 On the decree of reprobation, therefore, Doddridge’s views, though not extensively expressed, fall within commonly held Calvinistic bounds.

An important distinctive of Calvinist teaching was that a sinner will not come to Christ unless he is called by the Holy Spirit, a call which in the case of the elect sinner is irresistible. The Independent minister Daniel Neal (1678-1743) spoke of a ‘particular and personal Call, when the Holy Spirit shines into the Mind with such an irresistible Light, as convinces the Judgment, awakens the Conscience, and engages the Will to a Compliance with every part of its Duty’.79 Baxter appears to have had no difficulty with

76 Ibid., pp. 120-21.
77 Ibid., p. 121.
the idea that the ‘Elect of Christ’ are ‘infallibly drawn to believe’. Doddridge addresses this issue directly in the *Course of Lectures*, posing the question whether the operations of God in working saving faith in the heart of an individual ‘be in their own nature irresistible or not’. Doddridge does not expressly state what his own position on this question is. However, his mode of exposition here, in which he first sets out the principal reasons given by those who assert irresistible grace and then supplies answers to each point, leads the reader to identify those answers with Doddridge’s view. On irresistible grace, the answers provided admit a ‘powerful, but not therefore irresistible operation of God upon the mind’. In answer to the Calvinist argument, that if grace were not irresistible then there is no guarantee that anyone will in fact be saved, Doddridge supplies the response, ‘that the event may be certain where it is not necessary’, resorting to his belief, established in the philosophy section of the lectures, in a ‘certain foreknowledge of future contingencies’. In the section of the lectures discussing predestination, he states, ‘God determines by the influence of his grace to work such a change in the hearts of his elect, as that their salvation should on the whole be ascribed to him, and not unto themselves’. Thus Doddridge safeguards the doctrine of election: all whom God has elected to life will infallibly attain it, as a result of a change flowing from God’s work in their hearts. Doddridge is thus very close to the normal Calvinist view: it would seem that his objection may centre simply on the use of the word ‘irresistible’. His fear appears to be (again, he does not expressly state this view as his own) that the notion of irresistibility would ‘destroy the liberty of the mind’ and so ‘leave no room for the exercise of justice in conferring rewards and inflicting

---

81 Doddridge, *Course of Lectures*, pp. 440-41.
punishments’. Thus Doddridge does not, in the end, expressly endorse the doctrine of irresistible grace, because of his desire to avoid the conclusion that the will is determined by some external power.

Calvinists generally also held that the true believer in Christ would infallibly be saved and would not fall away irremediably. So the Independent minister John Hubbard (1692-1743) stated, ‘A constant and final Perseverance in Grace unto Glory, is expressly declared and absolutely promised in many passages of Scripture.’ Baxter was prepared to affirm the doctrine of perseverance with confidence only insofar as it applies to ‘all the Elect’. He says that he had ‘not arrived at [the same] certainty in the Doctrine of the Perseverance of all the Justified’, a view to which his understanding of the doctrine of justification would tend to lead. Jennings, by contrast, states by the marginal heading ‘Perseverance’ that, ‘Whoever are, in sum, godly and believing will remain, in sum, godly and believing always.’ Dodridge, who cites Baxter’s work amongst others on this point, sets out in his *Course of Lectures* the arguments for and against the doctrine of perseverance, before concluding ‘There is on the whole reason to believe, that the doctrine of perseverance, as stated and limited above, is indeed the scripture doctrine.’ Commenting in the *Family Expositor* on the sixth verse of the fifteenth chapter of John’s Gospel, he says, ‘It is strange, that any should think this Text a conclusive Argument against the Doctrine of Perseverance’. In a similar fashion, he comments on the nineteenth verse of the first chapter of the First Epistle to Timothy,
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'all Arguments drawn from hence, against the Doctrine of the Perseverance of the Saints, must be very inconclusive'.

Doddridge’s view thus reflects that of his tutor more than it does that of Baxter.

It may appear strange that Doddridge should hold to this expression of Calvinist doctrine having rejected the idea of irresistibility in grace. The answer seems to lie in Doddridge’s belief in the certainty of future contingent events foreknown by God: he establishes at the start of his discussion that, in his view, the doctrine of perseverance does not necessarily entail the impossibility ‘in the nature of things’ that a believer will apostatise, only ‘that they will not actually apostatize’. He then draws on this principle in the ensuing discussion, commenting that ‘continued holiness is absolutely necessary in order to [believers’] salvation, with which the certainty of their salvation ... is not by any means inconsistent’. Doddridge, like his tutor, is content to state the doctrine as applicable, not simply to the elect, but to all who have saving faith. Baxter, by contrast, is clearly unwilling to go this far without qualification: his discussion of the subject is extremely detailed and rather convoluted and, perhaps unsurprisingly, gave rise to controversy and (he claims) misunderstanding of his true position.

Doddridge’s difficulty with irresistibility was that it appears not to leave the human will free, a problem which he does not seem to believe arises with respect to perseverance. It would appear, then, that on the question of the perseverance of the saints Doddridge took a normal Calvinist position.


89 Doddridge, *Course of Lectures*, p. 445.

Fifthly and finally, the doctrine of the atonement was central to Doddridge’s understanding of Christian theology. He describes Christ’s death as ‘an expiatory Sacrifice’; it is ‘an infinitely valuable, and adequate Satisfaction’; it is the ‘Atonement of Jesus our great High Priest, who arose and stood in the Breach to turn away the Wrath of God from us’. Commenting on the announcement by John the Baptist, speaking of Christ, ‘Behold, the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world’, Doddridge deliberately distances himself from Grotius’s understanding of the verse as speaking simply of ‘that Reformation of the Lives of Men, to which Christ did not only press them by the Doctrine that he taught, but gave them an Example of it in his Death’; Christ’s death was not an example to sinful humans; rather, ‘there is not any thing more evident, than that the great Design for which he died, was to attone [sic] for Sin, and to exempt us from the Punishment that our Iniquities deserved’. By his death, Jesus ‘delivers us from the Wrath to come’ and ‘fully satisfied the Divine Justice for’ our offences. That Jesus did this in the place of sinners, so that his death had a substitutionary aspect to it, Doddridge makes plain in his comments on the third chapter of the Epistle to the Galatians, representing Christ as ‘being himself made a Curse for us, and enduring the Penalty which our Sins had deserved: For such was the Death which he bore in our Stead’. Christ’s death, then, as Doddridge understood it, was an atonement for sin, an expiation, a deliverance from wrath and substitutionary in nature.

Richard Baxter took issue with several aspects of the traditional Calvinist doctrine of the atonement. Amongst his concerns were two of particular relevance to Doddridge’s views: the precise nature of Christ’s satisfaction for sin and the extent of
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the benefits and beneficiaries of Christ’s death. Baxter entered into controversy with John Owen on both points. On the former, Owen argued that Christ had paid the ‘solutio ejusdem’, the payment of the very debt which was owed, and not merely a ‘solutio tantidem’, the payment of something else which is accepted in place of the debt. Baxter objected to this on the ground that solutio eiusdem would imply an immediate release of the debtor, ‘delivering the debtour, without the intervention of a new concession or contract of the creditour’, whereas in Baxter’s theology the benefits of Christ’s death are obtained only on fulfilment of a condition – that of faith and evangelical obedience -- introduced as part of the new covenant. This issue was thus basic to the conditional nature of the new covenant, as Baxter understood it.

Doddridge did not enter explicitly into this debate, but gives some clear indications of where he stood in relation to it. Thus in his discussion of atonement in the Course of Lectures, he defines ‘satisfaction’ as that which ‘being done or suffered either by an offending creature himself, or by another person for him, shall secure the honours of the divine government in bestowing upon the offender pardon and happiness’. That this is not a solutio eiusdem view is made clear when he admits that ‘[s]uch a sense of the word satisfaction’ does not ‘in strict propriety of speech [amount] to the payment of a debt’, but ‘is put for some valuable consideration, substituted instead of what is a proper payment, and consistent with a remission of that debt or offence, for which such supposed satisfaction is made’. On the other hand, Doddridge was not concerned, as Baxter was, about the language of conditionality. Doddridge accepted that the requirement for faith may legitimately be regarded as a condition, so long as it is understood that ‘nothing done by us can merit that title’. However, in his view the word
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had become such a bone of contention amongst theologians that ‘it may generally be matter of prudence to decline it’. Thus Doddridge took an essentially Baxterian line on the precise nature of Christ’s satisfaction for sin, but did not use that to insist upon a strictly conditional covenant of salvation in the way that Baxter did. This is, perhaps, a moderate Baxterianism.

The question of the nature of Christ’s satisfaction for sin was important to Baxter also because of its implications for the extent of the atonement: for whom did Christ die? If Owen were correct, then Christ’s death immediately releases sinners from the penalty due for their sin: it follows, then, that Christ must have died only for those who are in fact saved, that is, for the elect, which is the view that Owen defended in his Death of Death (1648). Baxter, however, wished to maintain that Christ’s death brought saving benefits, at least potentially, to everyone. He therefore taught that, in one sense, considering Christ’s will ‘Antecedent to Mans Obedience or Disobedience’, Christ died for all, so that ‘as Legislator and Promiser, he hath antecedently made an Universal Act of Oblivion or Deed of Gift Conditionally Pardoning, &c. all’. However, for Baxter it is also true to say that Christ saves, not all, but only true Christians ‘and in that Sence [sic] dyed for no other according to his consequent will’, so that ‘he will give Justification and Salvation to Believers and to no others; nor ever intended to do otherwise’. According to Baxter, then, Christ died conditionally for all, but definitively only for the elect.

Doddridge adopts a line similar to Baxter, though again without the detail which Baxter gives to the discussion. Doddridge says, ‘there is a sense, in which Christ may be said to have died for all, i.e. as he has procured an offer of pardon to all, provided they

99 Ibid., p. 427.
100 Richard Baxter, Universal Redemption of Mankind, by the Lord Jesus Christ ... (London: Printed for John Salusbury, 1694), p. 32.
sincerely embrace the gospel’. Expanding on this a little later, he argues that, in Christ’s death, ‘such provision is made for their salvation, as lays the blame of their ruin, if they miscarry entirely upon themselves’. This sounds Baxterian, as does the assertion that God ‘appointed Christ to bring those into a salvable state whom he certainly knew would never be saved’. However, Doddridge does not root his views, as Baxter does, in an analysis of the antecedent and consequent wills of Christ. Rather, he affirms that the salvation of the elect flows ultimately from the covenant of redemption between the Father and the Son, in eternity, whereby the Father covenanted that ‘besides all the advantages which others might receive, they who were predestinated to life, and were in a peculiar manner given to [Christ], should in fact be regenerated by divine grace’. Owen had insisted upon just such a covenant, which was for him an integral part of his view of the extent of Christ’s atonement. Baxter, by contrast, refused to countenance an eternal covenant of redemption within the Trinity, as he considered it unnecessary in view of his analysis of Christ’s antecedent and consequent wills. Thus Doddridge adopts a somewhat Baxterian line on the extent of the atonement, but his analysis of the underlying divine arrangements is not that of Baxter.

In his analysis of the theology of the Puritan divine John Preston (1587-1628), Jonathan Moore shows how Preston’s understanding of the atonement involved a hypothetical universalism. He demonstrates that there were various different ways in which such a theology were developed: Preston’s version, for example, suggests Moore, was aligned more with that of James Ussher (1581-1656), Archbishop of Armagh, than with that of the French theologian Moyse Amyraut (1596-1664). Moore also argues that, in the context of his own day, Preston’s theology was understood to be essentially

---

102 Doddridge, Course of Lectures, pp. 418, 420.
103 Ibid., p. 463.
104 Ibid., p. 461.
Reformed and that, again, there were variations of views on individual issues within Reformed theology. In his analysis of the theology of John Howe, David Field argues similarly that the moderate Presbyterianism of the late seventeenth century should be regarded as a form of Calvinism, even though, like Baxter, it rejected a strict doctrine of limited atonement. In the same way, it is argued, Doddridge’s understanding of the atonement, particularly of its extent and the manner of its effectiveness, needs to be taken on its own terms, rather than forced into a mould labelled either ‘Baxterian’ or ‘Calvinist’.

An analysis of Doddridge’s theological views in comparison with those of Richard Baxter shows that the younger man followed a Baxterian line on the salvability of the heathen, on the question of the fundamentals of the faith (on this point going further than Baxter himself did), on the freedom of the will, on his understanding of the nature of Christ’s satisfaction and on the extent of the atonement (though with a non-Baxterian attachment to the concept of the covenant of redemption). Doddridge also, like Baxter, manifested a tendency to include obedience in his definition of saving faith. On reprobation, Baxter and Doddridge have been seen to share an approach favoured by Calvinists such as Thomas Ridgley. By contrast, however, Doddridge did not take a Baxterian line on the central doctrine of justification by faith alone: the Northampton pastor has no hint of the neonomian scheme of the seventeenth-century minister. Doddridge does not appear to have shared Baxter’s fear of antinomianism or his insistence on the conditional nature of the new covenant. Whereas Baxter disavowed the notion of a covenant of redemption, Doddridge affirmed it. On the perseverance of the
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saints (where, again, Doddridge shows none of Baxter’s nervousness about incipient antinomianism) the two men take differing positions. Unlike Baxter, Doddridge is cautious about admitting to the irresistible nature of special grace. The analysis shows, therefore, significant areas of difference as well as of similarity in the theological views of the two men, which would seem to undermine any designation of Doddridge’s theology as simply ‘Baxterian’.

The question arises whether there is any common factor in Doddridge’s thinking which connects the views that he held on the various points discussed above. Baxter’s opposition to divisions amongst Christians and his understanding of the relationship between words and beliefs, discussed above,\textsuperscript{107} seem to have led to his views on fundamentals and may also have inclined him to favour a universalist emphasis on the question of the extent of the atonement. It seems that similar influences were at work in Doddridge’s thinking on these issues. In the case of Richard Baxter, Tim Cooper has argued persuasively that the fear of antinomianism was a significant influence on his thinking, particularly, on the doctrine of justification;\textsuperscript{108} the same influence may have been at work in relation to Baxter’s understanding of perseverance, as suggested above.\textsuperscript{109} Doddridge’s inclusion of obedience in his definition of faith indicates that he, like Baxter, wished to guard against antinomian tendencies but the fact that Doddridge did not take up Baxter’s neonomian scheme and did not share the latter’s reservations about the doctrine of perseverance suggests that fear of antinomianism did not play a significant role in Doddridge’s theological thought. By contrast, Doddridge’s reticence to use the term ‘irresistible’ in relation to the work of grace in the heart is consonant with his desire to guard the freedom of the will against charges of determinism which might undermine human responsibility. Thus if distinctive features of Baxter’s theology

\textsuperscript{107} p. 91.
\textsuperscript{108} Cooper, \textit{Fear}, pp. 60-83.
\textsuperscript{109} p. 103.
were driven by a fear of antinomian influences, for Philip Doddridge the need to defend the freedom of the will and uphold the principle of human responsibility appears to have been significant for the shape of his thinking in these areas.

The way in which Philip Doddridge and his contemporaries used the term ‘Baxterian’ shows that they understood it to represent a form of Calvinism, distinct on some doctrinal points from stricter brands but nevertheless not an entirely separate theology. The term ‘moderate Calvinist’ was an alternative description, which could indicate a particular theological stance, often over against the antinomian, or an attitude to others, exemplified by a dislike of an insistence upon confessional language. This understanding of historic Calvinism as encompassing a number of variant positions which showed development over time is consonant with the conclusions of recent scholarship, referred to above.110 A similar line of argument calls into question the older view, referred to above,111 which saw Doddridge’s ‘Baxterianism’ as falling at some midpoint between true Calvinism and a more liberal Arminianism. A better approach is to understand early eighteenth-century Baxterianism or moderate Calvinism as, indeed, a valid form of genuine Calvinism and to see Philip Doddridge in the way that he preferred to describe himself: as ‘in all the most important points, a Calvinist’.112

111 p. 80.
112 p. 85, above.
Chapter 5

Subscription, Scripture and Trinitarianism

In December 1723, Philip Doddridge received an invitation to preach at Girdlers’ Hall, London, a congregation which was looking for a new minister. Samuel Clark urged his friend to go, but the younger man said that he had ‘some considerable scruples’ and, in the end, declined the invitation. Among his reasons for this decision was his belief that he probably ‘should have been required to Subscribe, which I was resolved never to do’.¹ This caution about subscribing articles of faith stayed with Doddridge all his life: in a description of ordination practices amongst ‘Protestant Dissenters’, published in 1745, he warned against ‘the Severity of demanding a Subscription to any Set of Articles’ from a man who was due to be ordained.² Prior to embarking on regular preaching ministry, Doddridge did subscribe ‘the articles’, that is, the articles of the Church of England (with the exception of those relating specifically to that institution), as required of Dissenting ministers under the terms of the Toleration Act 1689.³ In the Course of Lectures, however, he warns, ‘Great care ought to be taken, that we subscribe nothing that we do not firmly believe.’⁴ Later in the course, he opposes the idea that ‘some human form’ should be introduced ‘as a standard of orthodoxy’, as a means of dealing with error in the church.⁵ Thus Doddridge’s

¹ Philip Doddridge to John Nettleton, 7 December 1723, Humphreys, Correspondence, Vol. 1, p. 306 (Nuttall, Calendar, Letter no. 92); Doddridge to Samuel Clark, 4 February 1724, Humphreys, Correspondence, Vol. 1, p. 335 (Nuttall, Calendar, Letter no. 108).
³ Philip Doddridge to Samuel Clark, 1 December 1722, Humphreys, Correspondence, Vol. 1, p. 173 (Nuttall, Calendar, Letter no. 40).
⁴ Philip Doddridge, A Course of Lectures on the Principal Subjects in Pneumatology, Ethics, and Divinity: With References to the Most Considerable Authors on Each Subject, ed. Samuel Clark (London: Printed by Assignment from the Author’s Widow, for J. Buckland et al., 1763), p. 142.
⁵ Doddridge, Course of Lectures, p. 434.
consistent practice was not to subscribe (unless legally obliged to do so) and to dissuade others from the practice.

These views were far from unique to Doddridge. As a young man, Doddridge recounted an attempt to ‘introduce a subscription, but it was speedily overruled by the interposition of Mr. Some, of Harborough, Mr. Norris, of Welford, and Mr. [John] Jennings’, all respected ministers in the Northampton area. Writing to Samuel Clark, his St Albans patron, Doddridge praises his tutor for inculcating the principle ‘that the scriptures are the only genuine standard of faith’, clearly expecting his erstwhile mentor to approve. The issue had come to a head a few years before, in 1719, when London Dissenting ministers meeting at Salters’ Hall had voted by a small majority against a proposal to recommend a requirement for ministers to subscribe articles on the Trinity. The ‘Non-Subscribers’ objected to ‘a Declaration in other Words than those of Scripture’ on grounds, in part, that this would ‘rather be the Occasion of greater Confusions and Disorders’, as ‘the Words of Men appear to us more liable to different Interpretations, than the Words of Scripture’. By Doddridge’s day, then, a suspicion of requirements to subscribe articles of faith was widespread in Dissent.

This development has been regarded in earlier secondary literature as a movement for intellectual freedom. Roger Thomas views the Salters’ Hall events as a debate about reason: ‘the underlying difference lay between those who were willing to rely on the integrity of human reason and those who regarded it as corrupt’. It was ‘the
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movement to leave the mind free and unfettered in its search for truth’.\textsuperscript{9} While it may be that some thought of the debate in those broad, forward-looking terms, it was not generally so expressed at the time. As just mentioned, the non-subscribers at Salters’ Hall defended their actions by appealing to the authority and clarity of the language of scripture over against that of extra-biblical human words. They were also concerned that subscription had been ‘the great Engine of Division among Christians from the Beginning’ and that it tended to ‘narrow the Christian and Protestant Liberty of the People; and to divert them from attending to Practical Religion’.\textsuperscript{10} Theirs was an argument, not for unfettered intellectual liberty, but for the freedom to interpret scripture unconstrained by non-biblical terminology.

Philip Doddridge’s views on subscription were driven primarily by six considerations. Firstly, he had an ethical concern about the imposition of language, arising from the fact that the potential subscriber did not himself write the confession which he was being asked (or required) to sign. Doddridge commended the practice, common amongst the Independents of his day, whereby an ordinand would write a confession of faith, to be delivered at his ordination, ‘in such Words as he judges most convenient’\textsuperscript{11}. What Doddridge objected to was the requirement to subscribe articles written by someone else, ‘where if an honest Man, who believes all the rest, scruples any one Article, Phrase, or Word, he is as effectually excluded, as if he rejected the whole’.\textsuperscript{12} There is no difficulty, then, with a confession of faith written by the person intending to subscribe. The problem, for Doddridge, was the ethical one of seeking to compel people to sign words which they had not written and with which they therefore might not agree.

\textsuperscript{9} Thomas, ‘Non-Subscription Controversy’, p. 169.
\textsuperscript{10} \textit{Authentick Account}, pp. 25, 27, 31-32.
\textsuperscript{11} Doddridge, ‘Appendix’, p. 71.
\textsuperscript{12} \textit{Ibid.}, p. 72.
There was, secondly, a concern for liberty of conscience, a theme which is not as strong, however, in Doddridge’s writings on this subject as it had been in those of previous generations of Dissenters: perhaps the distance in time from the events of 1662 and its aftermath had reduced the significance of this argument in the minds of some Dissenters. It seems to be most significant for Doddridge in relation to Roman Catholicism, especially during the Jacobite rebellion of 1745. Thus Doddridge celebrates as ‘Martyrdom’ the death of his military friend, Colonel Gardiner, who died in the battle of Prestonpans in September of that year, as Roman Catholic success would have opened ‘an Inlet ... to the cruel Ravages of Arbitrary power’; ‘For what is Martyrdom’, he continued, ‘but voluntarily to meet Death, for the Honour of GOD, and the Testimony of a good Conscience?’¹³ In his sermons following the flight of the rebels from Stirling, earlier in the same year, Doddridge speaks vehemently against the errors of Rome: ‘to have merely some particular Forms of a Religion ... obtruded contrary to a Man’s Relish, and especially contrary to his Conscience, is an insufferable Evil’.¹⁴ Thus liberty of conscience, though not the most significant issue for Doddridge on the question of subscription, could become important when circumstances demanded.

Doddridge’s third consideration had to do with his understanding of language and its relationship to ideas. An idea could be expressed in a number of different ways, so that no single set of words, other than quotations from scripture, could be insisted on


as the sole means of expounding a particular proposition. Isaac Watts inveighed against what he regarded as the Aristotelian error of using ‘Words without Ideas’, just as John Locke had insisted that words should be used to stand for clear ideas, and not merely as sounds to cover our ignorance.\textsuperscript{15} So Watts taught, ‘Words (whether they are spoken or written) have no natural Connection with the Ideas they are designed to signify, nor with the things which are represented in those Ideas.’\textsuperscript{16} Doddridge was of the same view, praising his tutor John Jennings for having taught his students to avoid ‘controversies where both Parties are agreed in the Thing, and only Quarrel about the Manner of Expression’\textsuperscript{17}. Extra-biblical expressions, Doddridge wrote, ‘in the Mouth of one may be Truth and Propriety, and in the Mouth of another, Falsehood and Nonsense; according as any Idea, or none, a just, or a wrong Idea, may be affixed to them’.\textsuperscript{18} Because ideas were not ineluctably tied to particular words, it was wrong to require that beliefs should be expressed in the particular forms of words fixed in creeds and confessions.

Fourthly, Doddridge viewed the language of scripture as pre-eminently suited to the statement of Christian doctrine and much superior to any language of merely human manufacture. This preference for ‘Scripture Phrases’ is a frequent note in Doddridge’s writings: ‘There seems to be a peculiar Felicity in them to express Divine Truth; and

\textsuperscript{15} Isaac W[atts], \textit{Philosophical Essays on Various Subjects viz. Space, Substance, Body, Spirit, the Operations of the Soul in Union with the Body, Innate Ideas, Perpetual Consciousness, Place and Motion of Spirits, the Departing Soul, the Resurrection of the Body, the Production and Operations of Plants and Animals; With Some Remarks on Mr. Locke’s Essay on the Human Understanding. To Which Is Subjoined a Brief Scheme of Ontology, or the Science of Being in General with Its Affections.} (London: Printed for Richard Ford and Richard Hett, 1733), p. vi; [John Locke], \textit{An Essay concerning Humane Understanding. In Four Books} (London: Printed by Eliz. Holt, for Thomas Basset, 1690). II.xiii.18, p. 79.

\textsuperscript{16} Isaac Watts, \textit{Logick: Or, the Right Use of Reason in the Enquiry After Truth, with a Variety of Rules to Guard Against Error, in the Affairs of Religion and Human Life, as Well as in the Sciences} (London: Printed for John Clark et al., 1725), p. 69.

\textsuperscript{17} [Philip Doddridge], ‘An Account of Mr Jennings’s Method of Academical Education with some Reflections upon it. In a Letter to a Friend who had some Thoughts of Reviving it. Written in the Year 1728’, University of London Library, MS 609, p. 39.

\textsuperscript{18} Philip Doddridge, \textit{The Family Expositor: Or, a Paraphrase and Version of the New Testament: With Critical Notes; and a Practical Improvement of Each Section, Vol. 4, Containing the Epistle of Paul the Apostle to the Romans, and His First, and Second, Epistles to the Corinthians} (London: Printed for the Benefit of the Family, 1753), p. vi.
they will undoubtedly be found the safest Vehicle of Religious Knowledge’. It is the language of the Bible that is authoritative, rather than the ‘Technical Phrases, which Modern Divines have introduced; and which, how profitable soever many of them may be, cannot I suppose seem absolutely necessary, to any who regard the Scripture as a compleat Rule’. The privileging of scriptural over confessional language was common amongst Dissenters at that time: Isaac Watts warned that ‘Words which are not used in Scripture’ should ‘never be zealously maintained and insisted on as necessary to Salvation’, arguing rather for ‘a constant and sacred Reverence to the Language of Scripture’. Doddridge’s anti-subscriptionist stance has often been noted by historians; however, his views went further than this. He was not simply a non-subscriber, he was anti-confessional. Although the use of credal language was sometimes justified, for example in order to win over by the use of their ‘favourite phrases’ those who are ‘devoted to a particular sett of human phrases’, generally, the language of scripture is to be preferred as it is best fitted to the expression of truth. Thus, for Doddridge, all Christians should be able to unite around Bible language, as ‘however we may differ in other Matters, we so generally agree in acknowledging, that our Bibles contain the Oracles of GOD’. Objection may be taken to man-made phrases, but no true Christian can reject the language of scripture.

These points lead, finally, to what, it is argued, are the two principal considerations underlying Doddridge’s promotion of Bible language over creeds and
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confessions. Fifthly, then, is his great concern for Christian unity. As Geoffrey Nuttall states, ‘Doddridge’s anxiety to keep free from subscription to credal formulae was intimately connected with his desire for Christian unity’.24 In his first published work, printed in 1730, Doddridge laments those who ‘are so devoted to a peculiar sett of human phrases, which have been introduc’d into the explication of some important doctrines, that they will hardly entertain a favourable thought of any who scruple the use of them’.25 Towards the end of his life, in his Dissertation on the Inspiration of the New Testament, attached to the third volume of the Family Expositor (1748), he expressed his desire,

That dropping those unscriptural Forms which have so lamentably divided the Church, we might more generally content ourselves with the Simplicity of Divine Truths as they are here [sc. in the New Testament] taught, and agree to put the mildest and kindest Interpretation we can, upon the Language and Sentiments of each other.26

Where creeds and confessions divide, the language of scripture unites.

Tied to this, and sixthly, Doddridge’s caution over creeds and confessions can be understood as a desire simply to allow the Bible to speak for itself, without the overlay of merely human terminology. The danger of man-made systems of doctrine, in his view, was that they detracted from a straightforward interpretation of scripture. The person who came to the Bible with a predetermined view of its teaching would inevitably tend to impose that understanding on the text rather than allow the sacred writing to speak for itself. Doddridge was determined not to be caught in this trap. Thus

25 Doddridge, Free Thoughts, p. 25.
in the preface to the fourth volume of his *Family Expositor*, published posthumously, Doddridge explains the approach that he took: *‘I have been disposed to let Scripture carry me along with it, wherever it naturally leads, rather than resolve it should follow me.’* Scripture was to be his sole guide: his objective was to present the teaching of the Bible and no more. Orthodox Protestants, whatever their position on subscription, agreed that the Bible alone was authoritative for establishing doctrine; where the non-subscriber differed from the subscriber was in the belief in the superiority of the very language of scripture for expressing that doctrine. For Doddridge, the freedom to interpret scripture unconstrained by creeds, confessions or other merely human language was central.

These views meant that, for Philip Doddridge, the Bible inevitably held a place of peculiar importance. They help to explain the significant proportion of his published output which relates directly to scripture. Thus he expended a considerable amount of time and effort, over a period spanning much of his Northampton ministry, on his *Family Expositor*, a six-volume devotional work containing a paraphrase of, and commentary and notes on, the entirety of the New Testament. Only the first three volumes were published in his lifetime, the first in 1739, with the final three being published posthumously on the basis of a fairly complete manuscript, albeit partly in shorthand, left by the writer. Richard Frost, minister in Great Yarmouth and friend of Doddridge, stated in his funeral sermon for the Northampton author, ‘His Family
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Expositor was the work he most valued, and had greatly at heart.\textsuperscript{29} In addition, though, Doddridge devoted a great deal of space in his Course of Lectures, as well as three sermons in his series, The Power and Grace of Christ, published in 1736, to the question of the credibility and genuineness of the Old and New Testaments and, in 1748, he published, as part of an appendix to the third volume of the Family Expositor, a Dissertation on the Inspiration of the New Testament, together with a shorter work on the inspiration of the Old Testament.\textsuperscript{30} This sustained attention to establishing the integrity of the Bible is a remarkable feature of Doddridge’s published work which requires further investigation: issues related to the credibility and genuineness of scripture will first be considered, followed by an examination of the debate over the Bible’s inspiration.

The reliability of the Christian scriptures had come under considerable attack during the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries.\textsuperscript{31} Works critical of the Bible’s accuracy, particularly in historical details, and of the traditional attribution of authorship of some of its books were being published.\textsuperscript{32} Interest in linguistic and textual questions in the Bible was also developing, giving rise to works such as the six-volume London Polyglot Bible, edited by Brian Walton (1600-61), and the Lexicon Heptaglotton of Edmund Castell (1606-85), professor of Arabic at Cambridge University.\textsuperscript{33} These works sought to examine in minute detail the text and language of

\textsuperscript{32} For example, [Richard Simon], Histoire Critique du Vieux Testament [Paris, 1678].
\textsuperscript{33} Brianus Waltonus, ed., Bibliæ Sacrae Polyglotta, Completentia TextusOriginales, Hebraicum, cum Pentateucho Samaritano, Chaldaicum, Graecum. Versionumque Antiquarum, Samaritanæ, Graecæe
scripture, sometimes giving rise to conclusions which conflicted with commonly accepted notions about the precise wording of biblical passages. Publications such as these were tending, by the late seventeenth century, to undermine confidence in the divine authorship, and hence the reliability and authority, of scripture.

Doddridge responded to these various challenges in some detail in Part VI of the Course of Lectures (the longest of the ten parts) entitled: ‘The genuineness and credibility of the Old and New Testaments vindicated’. The tutor took great pains over this section of the Course of Lectures. By way of example, Proposition C1 is an extensive survey of the testimony of ancient writers to the various books of the New Testament, in which Doddridge discusses at some length New Testament quotations or citations found in the Epistle of Barnabas, Clement of Rome’s Epistle to the Corinthians, the Shepherd of Hermas, the letters of Ignatius and of Polycarp and the works of Justin Martyr. The author principally cited on these issues is Nathaniel Lardner (1684-1768), a Dissenting scholar whose Credibility of the Gospel History developed into a massive multi-volume work of scholarship giving a detailed examination of the evidence for the authenticity of the writings of the New Testament. In this part of his course, Doddridge vastly expanded and re-arranged the material which he had received as a student from Jennings, updating it and providing a very significant amount of additional detail. He sought, through this labour, to provide an

---


34 Doddridge, Course of Lectures, pp. 258, 256.

answer to the main contemporary objections to the genuineness and credibility of scripture, upon which he believed the credibility of the Christian faith itself rested.

The question of the divine inspiration of the Bible was also a subject of contemporary debate. In 1690, a work entitled *Five Letters Concerning the Inspiration of the Holy Scriptures Translated out of French* had been published anonymously.\(^{36}\) It was a translation of selections from two separate works by the theologian Jean Le Clerc (1657-1736), the aim of which was to reaffirm the reliability of the biblical record.\(^{37}\) Le Clerc considered that the best means of achieving this was to accept that scripture was not in its entirety divinely inspired. He argued that differences in the styles of the biblical authors and contradictions between their accounts of the same events undermined any claim to complete inspiration. Errors in the transmission of the text demonstrate that God was not concerned to preserve the words, but only the sense, of what was recorded. Thus Le Clerc’s work represented a serious, thoroughly worked-out challenge to those who held that the Bible was wholly divinely inspired.

Several responses to Le Clerc were forthcoming within the years following the publication of his work in English. John Williams, Bishop of Chichester, took up the subject in his Boyle lectures of 1695 and 1696, as did Gilbert Burnet in his *Four Discourses*, both men defending the divine inspiration of scripture.\(^{38}\) In 1710, the Dissenting minister Edmund Calamy responded to Le Clerc’s work with the publication of fourteen sermons which he had preached at Salters’ Hall. Calamy argued for the full inspiration of all parts of scripture: ‘the sacred Oracles both of the Old and New

---


\(^{38}\) Gilbert Burnet, *Four Discourses Delivered to the Clergy of the Diocess [sic] of Sarum ...* (London: Printed for Richard Chiswell, 1694); Williams’s sermons for the Boyle lectures were each published individually.
Testament were Divinely Inspir’d’. Le Clerc’s questions about the divine inspiration of the Bible thus met with robust responses in England, of which Calamy’s was one of the most weighty.

It was in this context that Philip Doddridge wrote his dissertation on the inspiration of the New Testament. He had promised in the first volume of his *Family Expositor* that he would do this, a promise of which he says that he had often been reminded. In the dissertation, he distinguishes a variety of kinds of inspiration, following the categorisation and use of terms given by Jennings in his lectures. Doddridge held that inspiration might be no more than an ‘inspiration of elevation’, which could operate upon heathen as well as Christian writers. At the other end of the scale there is an ‘inspiration of suggestion’, where the very words are given directly by God. Then there is an ‘inspiration of superintendency’, a miraculous work of God which so directs the mind of a speaker or a writer as ‘to keep him more secure from Error … than he could have been merely by the Natural Exercise of his Faculties’. This does not guarantee complete freedom from error, unless it is a ‘Plenary Superintending Inspiration’ when it is such ‘as absolutely to exclude all Mixture of Error’. This last, referred to by Jennings as ‘Inspiratio Superintendens plena’, does not necessarily equate to inspiration of suggestion, is not inconsistent with deficiencies of style and grammar and does not necessarily imply divine dictation. It is this plenary superintending inspiration which, Doddridge argued, covers the entirety of the writings which make up the New Testament, ‘without any Exception or Limitation, as they came out of the
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41 See Jennings, ‘Theologia’, pp. 204-205.
Hands of the *Apostles*. Doddridge would allow no inroads into the reliability or accuracy of the New Testament.

Doddridge held also to a high view of the inspiration of the Old Testament. In a ‘Postscript’ to the ‘Dissertation’ on the New Testament, he asserts ‘that the *Old Testament* was written by a *Superintendent Inspiration*’. He did not expressly assert, however, as he did for the New Testament, that this superintendent inspiration was ‘plenary’. Yet nor did he suggest in his published works that there are errors in the Old Testament. In the *Course of Lectures*, he repeats his assertion of a superintendant inspiration in relation to the Old Testament and adds in a scholium that the arguments used for the plenary inspiration of the New Testament ‘may in a great measure be applied to the old’. This statement contains a note of caution, which might be taken to mean that Doddridge had doubts about whether the inspiration of the Old Testament was entirely plenary. He continues, however, by asserting that ‘it is hard to imagine, that Christ and his apostles would have spoken of it [the Old Testament] in such high strains, if there had been a mixture of error and falseness [sic] with the great and important truths it contained’, before explaining that ‘there are so many arguments brought against the plenary inspiration of these books, from the supposed absurdities, immoralities, and contradictions to be found in them, that it will be necessary to give some of them a more particular consideration in the following propositions’. This he proceeds to do, at some length, devoting the following two propositions, extending over twenty pages of the *Course of Lectures*, to answering allegations that particular passages of the Old Testament are either absurd or immoral, and a further two
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43 Ibid., p. 40.
45 Doddridge, *Course of Lectures*, p. 344.
46 Ibid., pp. 340-44.
propositions over seven pages to deal with alleged contradictions between Old and New Testaments and with various other objections to the authority of the Old Testament. There is, however, no closing statement expressly asserting the plenary inspiration of the whole Old Testament. Whether this was simply an oversight or whether Doddridge wanted to leave ajar the possibility that there might be error in the Old Testament is difficult to judge. The fact that he did not repeat his tutor’s bald assertion, ‘The whole Scripture accepted by the Reformed was written with at least a plenary superintending inspiration’, 47 perhaps indicates, on balance, that the pupil, on the Old Testament, was not quite so sure.

It was essential for Doddridge to establish the authority and reliability of the scriptural testimony, as the Bible formed the bedrock for his theology and practice of the Christian life. The centrality of the scriptures for Doddridge’s life and work can be seen in his preface to the first volume of his *Family Expositor*, in the opening words of which he ascribes to the ‘attentive Study of the Word of GOD’, the ability, ‘if any Thing can’, to put a stop to the ‘Progress of Infidelity and Vice’, to ‘allay those Animosities’ which grieve the church and to ‘establish the Purity and Order, the Peace and Glory of the Church’ and ‘spread the Triumphs of Personal, and Domestick Religion among us’. 48 He had a very high view of what the Bible might be able to accomplish. His cautious attitude to creeds and confessions made it all the more important for him to establish the reliability and accuracy of the scriptures, as the sole source of doctrine and the sole document on which all Christians should be expected to agree.

The relationship between the Bible and human confessions of faith came to a head, in the early eighteenth century, on the doctrine of the Trinity. The 1719 Salters’ Hall debate had arisen because of doubts about the orthodoxy of two Dissenting ministers in Exeter, Joseph Hallet and James Peirce, who were suspected of denying the full deity of Christ. Difficulties were not confined to Dissent: in 1710, William Whiston had been deprived of his chair in mathematics at the University of Cambridge for heterodox views on Christ’s deity. He had derived these from his study of scripture which he believed to be contradicted, not supported, by orthodox trinitarianism as found in the Athanasian Creed. In 1712, the theologian Samuel Clarke, a friend of Whiston, had published his *Scripture-Doctrine of the Trinity*, a work which became influential in both Dissent and the established church, in which he also purported to examine trinitarianism from the scriptures alone, reaching the heterodox conclusion that Christ, though eternally existent, is subordinate to the Father and is to be worshipped as Mediator only, not as supreme deity. The question of the relationship of the scriptures to orthodox trinitarianism was still alive in Doddridge’s time: in 1727, his mentor Samuel Clark lamented to Doddridge the treatment meted out by the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland to one of its ministers, ‘Patrick [sic] Simson’, because he does not ‘conform to all the scholastic ways of speaking, concerning some things, about which the scripture is silent’. One of the ‘things’ of which Simson was suspected was a less than orthodox view of Christ, along the lines taught by Clarke. The St Albans Clark

49 For Salters’ Hall, see above, note 8.
51 Not Samuel Clark, Doddridge’s mentor and minister in St Albans.
considered the proceedings to be an exercise in ‘bigotry’ for the sake of ‘nice speculation against unrevealed or disputable points’. An examination of Doddridge’s views on the doctrine of the Trinity is thus likely to shed further light on his understanding of the interaction between confessions of faith and the Bible.

Philip Doddridge devoted most of Part VII of his Course of Lectures to a discussion of trinitarian doctrine. He articulates a largely orthodox trinitarianism which affirms God as existing in three ‘distinct persons’, Father, Son and Holy Spirit, each of whom is properly divine and worthy of divine worship. His treatment of the topic is replete with biblical citations and to that extent Doddridge lived up to his principles of seeking to derive his doctrine from scripture alone, rather than from creeds and confessions, without falling into any of the major trinitarian heterodoxies against which those documents are intended to guard. There are three aspects of Doddridge’s trinitarian views, as expressed in his discussion, however, which would have caused orthodox trinitarians concern. These were his views on the nature of the pre-existent Christ, his views of the nature of the distinction and relations between the three persons of the Godhead and his attitude to those who did not espouse an entirely orthodox formulation of the doctrine of the Trinity. Each of these three areas will be examined in turn, to explore the conclusions that Doddridge reached and his reasons for doing so.


55 Donald Macleod, ‘God or god? Arianism, Ancient and Modern’, *Evangelical Quarterly* 67 (1996), pp. 121-38, argues that Doddridge is ambivalent as to whether the Holy Spirit is a person or merely a power. However, Doddridge argues clearly for the orthodox proposition that ‘he is a person’ and, having set out in his normal way the arguments put forward for the Spirit’s being only a power, rebuts them: Doddridge, *Course of Lectures*, pp. 395-96.
Doddridge begins his exposition of the pre-existence of Christ by denying the Socinian claim that Christ had no existence prior to his human conception and birth, before dealing with his own views on the nature of that pre-existence:

Forasmuch as in several of the preceding scriptures [referring to Christ’s incarnation] there is such a change and humiliation asserted concerning Christ, as could not properly be asserted concerning an eternal and immutable being, as such, there is reason to believe that Christ had before his incarnation a created or derived nature, which would admit of such a change: though we are far from saying that he had no other nature, and that all the texts quoted above refer to this.

Doddridge gives a little more detail about his view of the nature of the pre-existent Christ in what follows: he describes it as ‘This glorious spirit or Logos’; it was ‘superangelic’; there is, he says, ‘no reason at all to call [it] human in its pre-existent state’; it was this Logos which was ‘united to human flesh’ at the incarnation. Yet, Doddridge held, Christ must still be regarded as fully God, on the ground of the nature of the union between the pre-existent Christ and God: ‘God is so united to the derived nature of Christ, and does so dwell in it, that by virtue of that union Christ may be properly called God, and such regards become due to him, as are not due to any created nature, or mere creature, be it in itself ever so excellent. So, for Doddridge, Christ in his pre-existent state must, in order to guard God against mutability, have had a created or derived nature, which united itself with human flesh at the incarnation, but which, on account of its union with God the Father, is itself to be recognised and worshipped as fully God.

The view which Doddridge here expounds appears to come very close to an Arian view that Christ was no more than a created being. Doddridge saves himself from
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56 Doddridge, Course of Lectures, p. 382.
57 Ibid., p. 383.
58 Ibid.
59 Ibid., p. 384.
60 Ibid.
61 Ibid., p. 392.
such a conclusion by the words, quoted above, indicating that the Logos, being Christ’s created or derived nature, was not necessarily his only nature: ‘we are far from saying that he had no other nature’. 62 He thereby leaves room for the orthodox view of Christ as being eternal. Nevertheless, the emphasis of Doddridge’s exposition at this point is on the idea, foreign to an orthodox conception of the second person of the Trinity, of possessing a created or derived nature which was mutable and thus capable of being united with humanity at the incarnation. On this point, Doddridge strays from orthodoxy and seems to approach, if not quite adopt, a heretical position. 63

However, Doddridge was not entirely alone in his views on this question: Isaac Watts also believed that Christ had a pre-existent, derived nature, but, unlike Doddridge, Watts unambiguously affirmed that nature’s humanity: ‘the Doctrine of the Pre-existence of Christ’s Human Soul ... seems to be the most obvious and natural Sense of many Scriptures’. 64 Also like Doddridge, Watts held that Christ is properly possessed of the full deity by virtue of ‘the Father’s uniting the Human Nature of Christ to his own Godhead, (or to some Divine Power represented personally;) or by God’s actual assuming the Man Christ Jesus his Son into a personal Union with himself. ’65

Doddridge did not, however, take his views from Isaac Watts: though he certainly read and knew Watts’s works on the subject, Watts did not begin to publish on it until 1722 and his exposition of the pre-existence of Christ’s human soul did not appear until 1724. Doddridge’s correspondence indicates that he read this latter work in 1725, finding Watts’s scheme ‘not always very clear’, but that he had studied the ‘doctrine of the

62 Ibid., p. 383.
65 Watts, Three Dissertations, p. 16.
divinity of Christ’ three years earlier, under Jennings, in 1722. It is in the course of those studies that Doddridge is almost certain first to have come across ideas such as these.

Jennings taught, ‘Before the beginning of the world, there was a created spirit which later became the soul of Jesus Christ.’ This he identifies as the Logos. He continues: ‘This Logos, which afterwards became the soul of Jesus, is in itself considered to be inferior to God and is dependent on him.’ He draws the necessary consequence: ‘Therefore it did not have a divine nature … Therefore it is a creature.’ He goes on to demonstrate, however, that scripture assigns to Christ divine names and attributes. The explanation for this is, he says: ‘God is present with and united with the Logos, or Christ, in such a way (truly beyond description) that Christ entirely properly can for that reason be called, most equally with God, God himself, even the supreme.’

The concepts that Jennings thus expounds are clearly similar to Doddridge’s. However, the younger man’s language in his *Course of Lectures* is more nuanced than that of his tutor, in that he does not use the term ‘inferior’ when speaking of the relation of the Logos or Son to God, he speaks of Christ’s nature as ‘created or derived’ and, most significantly, he makes clear that he is not asserting that Christ had ‘no other nature’. The importance of this last point, which leaves Doddridge free to deny that he considers Christ to be no more than a creature, can be seen from his comment in the final volume of the *Family Expositor*, on the verse in the eleventh
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71 Doddridge, *Course of Lectures*, p. 383.
chapter of Revelation where Christ describes himself as ‘Alpha & Omega’. Doddridge says, ‘this Text has done more than any other in the bible, towards preventing me from giving into that Scheme, which would make our Lord Jesus Christ no more than a deified Creature’. This would appear to be an implicit rejection of that aspect of Jennings’s teaching, just described, which views Christ’s nature only as created, being divine merely by virtue of union with God. With that important exception, however, it is clear that Doddridge’s teaching on the pre-incarnate nature of Christ is essentially that of his tutor.

Jennings in turn gathered his scheme from others, as is clear from his citation in his lectures of Edward Fowler (1631/2-1714), bishop of Gloucester from 1691, and the Scotsman Robert Fleming (c. 1660-1716), minister of the English Presbyterian congregation in Leiden. In 1706, Fleming had published a two-volume work on the person of Christ, in which he posited the creation, by the three persons of the Godhead, of a being who would be ‘so related to, and so united with the Person of the Son of God; as, by Virtue of this Union and Relation, to have the Name and Designation of the Son of God’; this being was the Logos, which became man by incarnation. Fowler had published a work in the same year, A Discourse of the Descent of the Man-Christ Jesus from Heaven, in which he argued that Christ’s soul was ‘created in
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72 Doddridge, Family Expositor, Vol. 6, p. 434.
75 Ibid., Vol. 2, p. 453.
Heaven (and that before the Creation of the Earth at least)\textsuperscript{77} and that ‘… at the Forming of his Body in the Womb of the blessed Virgin, his Soul came from Heaven and entered into it’.\textsuperscript{78} Fowler refers his readers to the Cambridge Platonist Henry More, who had asserted that the reference in the seventeenth chapter of John’s Gospel to Christ’s pre-incarnate glory must be ‘understood of the Humanity of Christ’. More speaks of the pre-incarnate Christ as ‘the Messiah Elect, … united also with the Λόγος’ and of ‘the Soul of the Messiah, who was yet truly God by a Physical union with the Godhead’.\textsuperscript{79} Although the various views cited do not coincide with each other in every detail, they share a common belief in the existence, before the incarnation, of a created being which, by virtue of union with the Deity, is to be treated as divine and which, at the incarnation, was united with a human body to become the man Jesus Christ. Doddridge’s espousal of this view, albeit in a more nuanced form than that of his tutor, based as it was on a desire to protect the immutability of the deity,\textsuperscript{80} indicates the platonic nature of the influences on Doddridge’s thought on this point.

Turning, then, secondly, to the distinction and relations between the Father, Son and Spirit, the orthodox spoke of God as existing in three persons having the same essence, the relation of the Father to the Son being one of eternal generation and the relation of the Father and (in the Western church) of the Son to the Spirit being that of procession. Doddridge manifests some discomfort with this language. He does accept the terminology of personhood: ‘The scripture represents the Divine Being as appearing in, and manifesting himself by the distinct persons of FATHER, SON, and HOLY

\textsuperscript{77} Ibid., p. 8.
\textsuperscript{78} Ibid., p. 6.
\textsuperscript{79} Henry More, An Explanation of the Grand Mystery of Godliness; Or, a True and Faithfull Representation of the Everlasting Gospel of Our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, the Onely Begotten Son of God and Sovereign over Men and Angels (London: Printed by J. Flesher, 1660), p. 23.
\textsuperscript{80} See above, p. 128.
He had previously defined ‘person’ to mean, in what he calls its ‘philosophical sense’, ‘one single, intelligent, voluntary agent, or conscious being’. He says that the word may also have ‘a political sense’, when it expresses ‘the different relations supported by the same philosophical person; v. g. [sic] the same man may be father, husband, son, &c.’. He also mentions a ‘theological sense of the word’, but makes no further reference to this. When he comes, however, to consider the meaning of personhood in relation to the Trinity, he draws a blank:

If it be asked, how these divine person are three, and how one; it must be acknowledged an inexplicable mystery: nor should we wonder that we are much confounded when enquiring into the curiosities of such questions, if we consider how little we know of our own nature and manner of existence.

He follows this statement with another which explains that, in his view, the personhood involved in the Trinity ‘must at least be true in a political sense, yet cannot amount to so much as a philosophical personality, unless we allow a plurality of Gods: and if there be any medium between these, (which we cannot certainly say there is not) we must confess it to be to us unsearchable.’ Thus Doddridge, though ready to use the language of personhood in relation to the deity, considers himself unable to say with any clarity what the nature of that personhood may be.

In a similar manner, Doddridge is prepared to use the traditional language of eternal generation, with regard to the Son, and of procession, with regard to the Spirit, but comes to no certain conclusion as to the meaning of that language. ‘It has been hotly debated’, he asserts, ‘whether Christ be called the only begotten Son of God, with regard merely to his being the promised Messiah, or to his extraordinary conception, and exaltation to his kingdom as mediator; or whether the expression refer to the eternal

81 Doddridge, Course of Lectures, p. 397.
82 Ibid., p. 391.
83 Ibid., p. 392.
84 Ibid., p. 398.
85 Ibid., p. 399.
generation of the divine nature.' He says that some have held one view and some the other, but advocates no view of his own. In relation to the Spirit's procession from Father and Son, he agrees that the scriptures speak of his coming or being sent from the Father and by the Son, but rejects the phrase ‘spiration’, introduced, he says, by ‘the Popish school-men’: he objects that the phrase ‘cannot be explained, and therefore cannot be defended’. The impression conveyed by Doddridge’s discussion of these points is of one distinctly unhappy with the traditional terminology.

This unhappiness comes to the fore, thirdly, in the two propositions which close this part of the Course of Lectures, in which Doddridge surveys the views of ancient and contemporary writers on the doctrine of the Trinity. The point of interest here is Doddridge’s definition of the limits of what is acceptable in trinitarian doctrine. He does not include in his overview here any scheme that denied the pre-existence of Christ and so could be called Socinian, nor any position which fitted his understanding of the view held by the Arians:

who held [Christ] to be only the first and most glorious creature of God, denying he had any thing which could properly be called a divine nature, any otherwise than as any thing very excellent may by a figure be called divine, or his delegated dominion over the system of nature might entitle him to the name of God.

So William Whiston goes unmentioned in Doddridge’s summary, the former having stated that Christ was a created being: ‘the first begotten of all Creatures, the beginning of the Creation of God, i.e. a Divine Being or Person created, or begotten by the Father before all Ages’. Samuel Clarke appears, despite his subordinationist view of Christ described below, with Doddridge making clear that Clarke ‘waves [sic] calling Christ a
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86 Ibid., p. 394.
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88 Ibid., p. 401.
89 William Whiston, Primitive Christianity Reviv’d. Part IV. An Account of the Faith of the Two First Centuries, Concerning the Ever-Blessed Trinity, and the Incarnation of Our Lord; in the Words of the Sacred and Primitive Writers Themselves; in English ... (London: Printed for the Author, 1712), pp. 46, 129.
creature, as the ancient Arians did, and principally on that foundation disclaims the charge of Arianism’.\(^9^0\) Thus those who held that Christ was not divine or not eternal, that he was a creature or that he lacked true personhood was, it would seem, for Doddridge outside the pale.

Doddridge’s overview, however, also displays the breadth of the Northampton tutor’s sympathies. It includes (among several others) Samuel Clarke’s scheme of ‘one supreme being’, the Father, ‘and two subordinate derived and dependent beings’, as well as the ‘Athanasians’, Daniel Waterland and Abraham Taylor, who ‘assert three proper distinct persons, entirely equal to and independent upon each other, yet making up one and the same being’.\(^ 9^1\) Waterland and Taylor were determined opponents of Clarke’s views on the Trinity. Doddridge includes both sides, without comment: he attempts no judgement on the veracity or otherwise of their respective views. His conclusion is revealing: ‘Considering the excellent character of many of the persons above-mentioned, whose opinions were most widely different, we may assure ourselves, that many things asserted on the one side and on the other relating to the trinity, are not fundamental in religion.’ He continues, in what is almost the closing statement of this part of the lectures, to advise his students ‘to be cautious, how we enter into unscriptural niceties’ in expressing trinitarian doctrine.\(^9^2\) Thus, Doddridge was content to accept as legitimate those views which upheld the eternity and the deity (even if only in a subordinate sense) of Christ, however they understood the precise nature of the distinctions and relations between the three persons of the Trinity.

\(^9^0\) Doddridge, Course of Lectures, p. 402. Nineteenth-century literature took the view that Clarke was an Arian. More recently, it has been argued that this was not, strictly speaking, the case, as Clarke believed that there was no time when the Son and the Spirit were not, thereby denying the characteristic Arian claim; Thomas Pfizenmaier argues that Clarke was not an Arian but a Eusebian, as he took the view that the three persons were of the same kind of substance, but did not share the identical substance: Pfizenmaier, Trinitarian Theology, p. 220.

\(^9^1\) Doddridge, Course of Lectures, pp. 402, 403.

\(^9^2\) Ibid., pp. 403-404.
In these three areas of trinitarian doctrine -- Christ’s pre-existent nature, the distinctions and relations between the persons of the Trinity and the limits of acceptable trinitarian views -- Philip Doddridge adopted positions which could be perceived to be at variance with an orthodox trinitarianism. In each case, he felt able to do so because he did not regard himself as constrained by the language of the orthodox creeds and confessions. On the pre-existent nature of Christ, he reached conclusions which were drawn principally from a platonic philosophy. On the distinctions and relations within the Trinity, he refused to be tied to confessional language. On the third point discussed, he insisted upon allowing a breadth of opinion which he believed to be consistent with scripture, even if not with the orthodox confessions. On all these points, in the controverted area of trinitarian theology, Philip Doddridge sought to implement his principles of scripture interpretation free from confessional constraint.

Philip Doddridge, then, opposed subscription to creeds and confessions for several reasons, including its ethical implications, a concern for liberty of conscience and his understanding of language. His primary reasons for this stance had to do with his view of scripture, particularly the suitability of scripture over against merely human language and the freedom to interpret scripture without any confessional constraint, and, perhaps supremely, his concern for Christian unity. His preference for the language of scripture over credal phrases means that he should be regarded, not simply as anti-subscriptionist, but as anti-confessional. His refusal to promote confessional divides amongst Christians vindicates the close link which Geoffrey Nuttall perceived in Doddridge, between his attitude to confessions and his desire for Christian unity.93 Doddridge was thereby led to a sustained and detailed defence of the reliability, genuineness and credibility of the Bible, in the face of the attacks levied against it.

93 Above, p. 118.
during the latter part of the seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries, arguing strongly for the divine inspiration of every word, in particular, of the New Testament.

This in turn led Doddridge, on the doctrine of the Trinity, to abandon a confessional approach, leaving him free to depart from strictly orthodox views where he thought this necessary in the light of his understanding of scripture. Three such areas have been identified and discussed. In two of those areas, Doddridge’s refusal to adopt the precise formulations espoused by the traditional confessions allowed him to broaden the ambit of acceptable views beyond that which those confessions would permit. In his view, the limits which he so defined were those set by scripture and Christian fellowship demanded that they be drawn no more narrowly than that. For Philip Doddridge, Christian unity was best preserved, not through the promotion of subscription to creeds and confessions, but on the basis of the language of the Bible alone.
Chapter 6

Piety

Important though he considered them to be, Philip Doddridge did not believe that the essence of true religion lay in either philosophical or theological convictions. In a series of addresses to young people, first published in 1735, Philip Doddridge took up the subject of what it is to be a true Christian. He warned his audience against five things which might give them a false confidence as to their spiritual condition:

the Privileges of your Birth, or the Rectitude of your Speculations in Matters of Religion, or the Purity and Frequency of your Forms of Worship, or the Warmth of your Passions, or the Morality of your Conduct.  

The only certain foundation for eternal hope, Doddridge goes on to argue, is the working in the soul by divine grace of ‘something of the Temper and Spirit of Christ’. In a sermon series on regeneration, published seven years later, Doddridge provides a very similar list of possible grounds of false spiritual confidence, before describing true believers as those who are ‘experimentally acquainted with the Work of GOD’s renewing Grace upon [their] Souls, curing the inward Distempers of [their] degenerate Hearts, and transforming [them] into the Image of his Holiness’. The verbs that Doddridge uses here - ‘renewing’, ‘curing’, ‘transforming’ - emphasise that what is required is unequivocal change; that change is necessitated by the dire nature of the disease (‘inward Distempers ... degenerate Hearts’); his audience must have personal experience of this change (‘experimentally acquainted’); and they must look to divine power to bring it about (‘GOD’s renewing Grace’). For Doddridge, the essence of what
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3 Philip Doddridge, *Practical Discourses on Regeneration, in Ten Sermons Preach’d at Northampton: To Which Are Added, Two Sermons on Salvation by Grace through Faith, Preach’d at Rowell* (London: Printed and Sold by M. Fenner and J. Hodges, 1742), pp. 4-5.
it meant to be truly a Christian believer lay in the personal, inward, transformational, divinely-originated experience of regeneration.

This change is required, according to Doddridge, because of the very nature of true religion. ‘Religion’, says Doddridge,

in its most general View, is such a Sense of God on the Soul, and such a Conviction of our Obligations to him, and of our Dependance [sic] upon him, as shall engage us to make it our great Care, to conduct ourselves in a Manner which we have reason to believe will be pleasing to Him.  

Right conduct, then, is only the end-point of true religion, for it must have at its root certain inward characteristics: a particular ‘Sense’, a ‘Conviction’ and a ‘Dependance’. Thus true religion does not consist merely in ‘a Freedom from any gross and scandalous Immoralities; an external Decency of Behaviour, an Attendance on the outward Forms of Worship in Publick, and here and there in the Family’. It is possible, continued Doddridge, for these to be evident where there is ‘nothing which looks like the genuine Actings of the Spiritual and Divine Life’. He delineates the features of the genuine article by describing its counterfeit:

There is no Appearance of Love to GOD, no Reverence for his Presence, no Desire of his Favour as the highest Good: There is no cordial Belief of the Gospel of Salvation, nor eager Solicitude to escape that Condemnation which we have incurred by Sin; no hearty Concern to secure that Eternal Life, which Christ has purchased and secured for his People, and which he freely promises to all who will receive him.

Of such it must be said, in summary, “‘Religion dwells not in its Breast.’” The difficulty which has to be addressed, held Doddridge, is that, on account of original sin, the heart is not inhabited by religion but is diseased and degenerate: ‘All our Soul is
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5 Ibid., pp. 2-3.
6 Ibid., p. 3.
infeebled, and all our Nature corrupted’. 7 It is regeneration alone, therefore, which supplies the remedy for this dire condition by renewing the heart and establishing there the ‘Sense of God’ which is true religion.

The true inward change of heart leads, taught Doddridge, to godly living. For this reason, inward emotion alone is insufficient, however deeply felt: it must be accompanied by ‘a Gratitude, that captivates the Soul into a willing Obedience, and engages you to yield yourselves as living Sacrifices to GOD’. 8 The required outworking of true religion in the life of the believer consists both of practical virtue, such as charity to one’s neighbour and the avoidance of immoral acts, and of spiritual duties, such as prayer and fasting. Doddridge used the term ‘piety’ in a somewhat elastic fashion, to refer sometimes to the fundamental principle from which religious practice and duties flowed and sometimes to the practice and duties themselves. So, commenting on the opening words of the twelfth chapter of Paul’s letter to the Romans, he says, ‘Wisely does the great Apostle lay the Foundation of all Virtue in a Principle of unfeigned Piety towards GOD; in presenting before him our Bodies, as living Sacrifices.’ 9 However, he also uses the term to refer to the ‘Acts of Charity and Piety’ which were so signally lacking in the life of the rich fool of Jesus’s parable or the ‘secret Acts of Piety and Benevolence’ which characterise those whose reward is from God ‘who sees in secret’. 10 The term, as Doddridge used it, was fluid, but the theological beliefs which underpinned its use are clear: godly living flows only from a renewed heart.

8 Doddridge, *Young Persons*, p. 58.
Doddridge’s emphasis upon the religion of the heart has been identified as one element connecting him especially with Richard Baxter. Geoffrey Nuttall has identified the two men’s common concern for ‘Heart-work and Heaven-work’ as one of the factors which characterise the distinctive form of piety which, he argues, they shared. Nuttall argues that Doddridge learned his piety ‘from Baxter more than from any other divine’ and that it ‘was carried over by the younger man into eighteenth-century Dissent’. A. T. S. James compares Doddridge’s devotional work, *The Rise and Progress of Religion in the Soul* (1745), with Baxter’s ‘Self-Review’ and concludes: ‘There are many reflections in the *Rise and Progress* which seem to trace back to Baxter’s influence; and in particular, its recurring thought of the future life.’ The importance of Baxter for the formation of Doddridge’s views in this area, as evidenced particularly by the younger man’s admiration for the practical works of the senior minister, cannot be denied: Doddridge received a gift of the four-volume set of Baxter’s *Practical Works* in April 1724 and began to read them through, so that by December of the same year they had become his ‘particular favourite’. The reading continued and at new year, 1732, he states his intention to complete his reading of ‘the rest of Baxter’s *Practical Works*’. It is difficult, therefore, to contest the significance of Baxter’s influence on Doddridge in the area of practical religion.


However, it is possible for the Baxterian note in Doddridge’s piety to be overemphasised. In his student years, before the gift of Baxter’s *Practical Works*, Doddridge mentions the Latitudinarian John Tillotson (1630-94), archbishop of Canterbury, as ‘my principal favourite’ in ‘practical divinity’ and, ‘next to him’, the theologian Isaac Barrow (1630-77), master of Trinity College, Cambridge, some of whose sermons were published posthumously by Tillotson, as well as the clergyman John Scott (1639-95), author of *The Christian Life*, an exposition of practical Christianity which by 1730 had reached its ninth edition. These authors remain among those described as ‘practical writers’ in Doddridge’s *Lectures on Preaching*, where Tillotson’s and Barrow’s sermons are recommended, as is Scott’s *Christian Life*. Many other names are listed in that section of the lectures, though much of Doddridge’s comment on them relates more to their style than to the content of what they write.

Nevertheless, he begins by recommending ‘some acquaintance’ with Puritan writers, ‘though they are too often despised’. Robert Bolton (1572-1631), rector of Broughton in Northamptonshire, is ‘excellent both for conviction and consolation’; Doddridge names *Some General Directions* (1625) as his ‘most useful’ work, emphasising its quality of inwardness: ‘There we see the traces of a soul most intimately acquainted with God.’

The *Contemplations* of Joseph Hall (1574-1656), bishop of Norwich, which were published in four volumes from 1612 to 1618, are recommended as ‘incomparably
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valuable for ... devotion’. Thus seventeenth-century clergymen of the established church, from the Latitudinarian as well as the Puritan tradition, are significant for Doddridge in the area of practical religion.

In the same lectures, the Independent theologian John Owen (1616-83), who in his strict Calvinist orthodoxy crossed swords with Baxter on a number of occasions, is commended for several of his works which ‘shew great improvement in practical religion’. A work of Thomas Goodwin (1600-80), an equally strict Calvinist theologian, is ‘very useful for afflicted consciences’. Baxter, of course, is praised, though not uncritically: ‘He is inaccurate, because he had no regular education’. The Presbyterian minister John Howe (1630-1705) has not only as good an understanding of the gospel as ‘any uninspired writer’, but seems ‘to have imbibed as much of its spirit’ as well. Another Presbyterian, John Flavel (d. 1691) is ‘[p]roper to address afflicted cases, and melt the soul into love’. The Christian Temper (1723) of John Evans, a Presbyterian minister in London, is ‘one of the best practical pieces in our language’. Other Dissenters recommended for their insight into the practical aspects of the Christian faith include Samuel Wright (1683-1746), Presbyterian minister in Blackfriars, the Independent minister Isaac Watts (1674-1748), Henry Grove (1684-1738), tutor at Taunton academy, and the Bible commentator Matthew Henry (1662-1714).

Doddridge’s views on practical religion thus appear to have been informed by a multiplicity of writers from a variety of traditions and times. The question therefore arises whether the prominence which has been given to the influence of Richard Baxter on the piety of Philip Doddridge is warranted, or whether the younger man’s piety is


18 Doddridge, Lectures on Preaching, p. 10.

19 Ibid., p. 13; John Evans, Practical Discourses Concerning the Christian Temper: Being Thirty Eight Sermons upon the Principal Heads of Practical Religion, especially Injoined and Inforced by Christianity. In Two Volumes (London: Printed for John and Barham Clark et al., 1723).

better understood within a wider context. To help elucidate this, different aspects of the
Northampton minister’s views on and practice of piety will be examined.

Philip Doddridge held firmly to the conviction that the essence of true piety did
not lie in human activity, a view which he shared with Puritan writers of the seventeenth
century. The fundamental matter, for the Puritans, concerned the heart. John
Downham (1571-1652), rector of St Margaret, Lothbury, from 1602 to 1618, put it in
this way: ‘the Lord, aboue all other parts, requireth the heart, as being the first mouer
and chiefe agent in this little world of man, which ordreth and disposeth of all the rest’.
Like Doddridge, Downham held that an understanding of doctrine was not in itself
sufficient:

in the Church, knowledge so far exceedeth our obedience … that we
more neede all good helpes to worke that we haue into our hearts, for
the inflaming of them with feruent zeale and true deuotion, then to
haue a greater measure of this light infused into our heads.

The heart was the central matter and concern: true piety began there. The Church of
England clergyman and lecturer at Wethersfield, Essex, Richard Rogers (1551–1618)
explained the role of teaching in his ministry as being ‘to helpe the frailtie of Gods
children … by setting before their eies as in a glasse, the infinite, secret, and deceiftfull
corruptions of the heart’. Thus such instruction is not an end in itself; rather, it enables
believers to

---

21 Recent scholarship recognises the breadth of different views encompassed by the term ‘Puritan’: see,
for example, John Coffey, ‘Puritanism, Evangelicalism and the Evangelical Protestant Tradition’, in
Michael A. G. Haykin & Kenneth J. Stewart, eds., The Emergence of Evangelicalism: Exploring
Historical Continuities (Nottingham: Apollos, 2008), pp. 261-64. Jerald Brauer has argued for four
distinct types of Puritan piety, which he denominates nomist, evangelical, rationalist and mystical: Jerald
definition of Puritan which includes even the Socinian John Biddle; as used in this chapter, ‘Puritanism’,
unless otherwise stated, refers principally to those in his ‘evangelical’ category, which includes, among

22 John Downham, A Gvide to Godlynesse. Or a Treatise of a Christian Life. Shewing the Duties Wherein
It Consisteth, the Helpes Inabiling & the Reasons Parswading unto It & Impediments Hindering the
Practise of It, and the Best Meanes to Remoue Them. Whereunto Are Added Divers Prayers and a
Treatise of Carnall Securitie (Printed at London by Felix Kingstone for Ed. Weuer & W. Bladen, [1622]),
Epistle Dedicatory, second page.
see their wants, their infirmities, their corruptions, rebellions, hindrances, & other discouragements, from that blessed estate wherinto they are entred: and how they may every day in the best manner, remedy, or at least wise weaken and diminish them, and that they may also behold their liberties and prerogatives, which they have by Christ: as the certaintie of Gods loue, deliuerance from the feare of the great and evill day, peace and comfort through faith, and the blessednes of such an estate, and daily injoy the same.23

It was an essential part of the Puritan tradition that the seat of true religion is the heart, a view emphatically shared by Doddridge.

The power to effect the inward change necessary to result in this kind of piety was commonly ascribed by Puritan writers to the Holy Spirit.24 The work of the Spirit in connection with the piety of the Christian believer was generally seen in two ways: initially, in regeneration, and subsequently, in sanctification. This is how John Owen treats the subject in his massive work on the Holy Spirit, published in 1674.

Regeneration is ‘the Effectual Communication of a New Principle of Spiritual Life unto the Souls of God’s Elect’ and this is ‘the proper and peculiar Work of the Holy Spirit’.25 Likewise, it is the Spirit who continues this work in the believer, once regenerate, ‘to preserve it, and to carry it on to perfection. And this he doth in our Sanctification’.26 Philip Doddridge too believed in the necessity of the work of the Spirit in regeneration, so that ‘no human Endeavours ... can ever be effectual to bring one Soul to the saving Knowledge of GOD in CHRIST, without the co-operating and transforming Influences

23 Richard Rogers, Seven Treatises, Containing Such Direction as Is Gathered out of the Holie Scriptvres, Leading and Guiding to True Happiness, Both in This Life, and in the Life to Come; and May Be Called the Practise of Christianitie. Profitable for All Such as Heartily Desire the Same: In the Which, More Particularly True Christians May Learne How to Leade a Godly and Comfortable Life Every Day (London: Imprinted by Felix Kyngston, for Thomas Man, and Robert Dexter, 1603), 'The Entrance into the Booke, or Preface to the Reader', first and second pages.
26 Owen, Pneumatologia, p. 321.
of the Blessed Spirit’. Similarly, in sanctification the work of the Spirit is indispensable: ‘the Production of Religion in the Soul is Matter of Divine Promise’, which, when effected, is attributed by scripture ‘to a Divine Agency’, as it is ‘the Office of the Blessed Spirit, to purify the Heart, and to invigorate holy Resolutions’. Thus, for Doddridge as for Puritan writers, piety was produced in the soul by the work of the Spirit.

Turning from the inward experience of piety to its outward expression, Puritan writers recognised that godly living, rooted in a true piety, required instruction and so devoted a significant amount of effort to teaching believers about it, covering both private devotions and the course of living generally. An early example of a work of this kind is by Richard Rogers, whose Seven Treatises, quoted above, was first published in 1603; the work went through several editions in the first half of the century as well as appearing in an abridged version, The Practice of Christianitie, in 1618, also republished a number of times. The fourth of Rogers’s seven treatises ‘directeth the belieuer vnto a daily practise of a Christian life’ and covers matters such as the benefits of ‘awaking with God’ and of ‘beginning the day with prayer’, as well as the duties of one’s calling, duties in company, in solitude, in prosperity, in affliction, in families, and the ‘last dutie, of viewing the day’. One of the most frequently reprinted works of Puritan piety in the seventeenth century was The Practise of Pietie by Lewis Bayly (c.
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29 Rogers, Seven Treatises; Richard Rogers, The Practice of Christianitie. Or, an Epitome of Seven Treatises, Penned and Published in the Yeare 1603 by That Reverend and Faithfull Pastor, Mr. R. R. Late Preacher of Wethersfield in Essex, Tending to That Ende. Contracted Long Since for Private Use, and now Published for the Benefit of Such, as Either Want Leisure to Reade, or Meanes to Provide Larger Volumes (London: Imprinted by F. K. for Thomas Man, 1618).
1575–1631), bishop of Bangor, first published in 1613; by 1711 it had reached its fiftieth edition.\footnote{Lewes Bayly, The Practise of Pietie. Directing a Christian How to Walke That Hee May Please GOD (London: Printed for Iohn Hodgets, 1613); [Lewis Baily] \textit{sic}, The Practice of Piety: Directing a Christian How to Walk, That He May Please God. Amplified by the Author (London: Printed for D. Midwinter, 1711).} Bayly’s work, like Rogers’s, gives detailed instruction for private morning devotions (prayer and Bible reading), the conduct of daily life (including thoughts, words and actions), evening devotions, family prayers (morning and evening), the right use of the sabbath, fasting, feasting, the Lord’s supper, conduct during sickness and dying. These works, and others like them, set down in detail how the godly Christian man or woman was to conduct himself or herself throughout the course of a normal day. For the seventeenth-century Puritan, piety was intensely practical.

The same pattern can be seen in Doddridge. His most famous work on Christian piety and devotion, \textit{The Rise and Progress of Religion in the Soul}, first published in 1745, saw five further editions prior to his death six years later, in 1745 (second and third editions), 1748, 1749 and 1750, as well as publication in Dutch and in French.\footnote{Philip Doddridge, \textit{The Rise and Progress of Religion in the Soul: Illustrated in a Course of Serious and Practical Addresses, Suited to Persons of Every Character and Circumstance: With a Devout Meditation or Prayer Added to Each Chapter} (London: Printed and Sold by J. Waugh, 1745); publication details for subsequent editions during Doddridge’s life are: 2nd edn., London: Printed for J. Brackstone and J. Waugh, 1745; 3rd edn., London: Printed for J. Brackstone and J. Waugh, 1745; 4th edn., London: Printed for J. Waugh and J. Buckland, 1748; 5th edn., London: Printed for J. Waugh and J. Buckland, 1749; 6th edn., London: Printed and Sold by J. Waugh, 1750; in Dutch, \textit{Oorsprong en Voortgang van Waaare Godsdiensstigheid in ’s Menschen Ziele ...} (Amsterdam: Van Gerrevink, I. Tirion, 1747), with a further edition, Amsterdam: Van Gerrevink, 1749; in French, \textit{Les Commencements et les Progrès de la Vraie Piété ...} (La Haye: P. Gosse, 1751).} In this work, Doddridge reproduces a letter which he had written several years previously to a young man, which was designed to encourage him in a life of true Christian devotion. Like his Puritan forebears, Doddridge urges prayer as the first activity of the day: ‘It should certainly be our Care, to \textit{lift up our Hearts to GOD}, as soon as we \textit{wake}, and while we are \textit{rising}’; he then gives detailed directions as to the subject-matter of the ‘\textit{secret Devotions of the Morning}’ – for those who have sufficient time in the morning, he recommends praise, prayerful consideration of the day ahead and meditation on a
few verses of scripture, closing with a psalm or hymn. Comments then follow on the
different kinds of activity which may make up the day: further times of devotion,
attitudes in ‘worldly Business’ (‘let us endeavour to dispatch as much as we can in a
little Time; considering, that it is but a little we have in all’) or in ‘Seasons of
Diversion’, observation ‘of Providences’, watchfulness against temptation, dependence
on divine grace, behaviour in solitude and in company and finally evening devotions at
the close of the day and the ‘Sentiments, with which we should lie down, and compose
ourselves to Sleep’.34 This was the pattern that Doddridge himself followed. In his
account of his former tutor’s life, Job Orton records how Doddridge ‘made Conscience
of presenting serious Addresses to GOD every Morning and Evening, whatever his
Business and Avocations were, and often employed some Moments in the middle of the
Day in the same Manner’. Doddridge was purposeful about this important aspect of
daily expression of piety:

That his Devotions might be more regular, copious and advantageous,
and his Mind be kept in a devout Frame thro’ the Day, he laid down a
Plan for this Purpose …; and from thence it appears what Pains he
took to keep up the Life and Ardour of Religion in his Soul.35

Orton states that this plan ‘always lay upon his Desk’ and gives a summary of its
contents,36 which are remarkably similar in substance to the plan recommended to his
young correspondent, already referred to.37 Doddridge’s idea of everyday piety, with its
emphasis upon private devotions at the start and close of the day and on the importance
of godliness in the everyday details of life, differs little from that of the Puritanism of
the previous century.

34 Doddridge, Rise & Progress, pp. 176-87.
35 [Job Orton], Memoirs of the Life, Character and Writings of the Late Reverend Philip Doddridge D. D.
of Northampton (Salop: Printed by J. Cotton & J. Eddowes, 1766), pp. 276-77.
36 [Orton], Memoirs, p. 277.
37 p. 147, above.
Yet there is a significant difference of approach between Philip Doddridge and Puritans of the seventeenth century. The ten commandments played an important part in Puritan teaching on practical Christian piety. The second of Rogers’s Seven Treatises contains sections describing duties to God and to man which flow from each of the commandments, although these sections form only a relatively minor part of the whole.38 The Larger and Shorter Catechisms of the Westminster Assembly have substantial sections devoted to a detailed exposition of human duty to God in terms of the ten commandments: fifty out of one hundred and ninety-six questions in the Larger Catechism are given over to this task.39 The moral law of God, as found especially in the decalogue, was thus of great significance to the Puritan conception of the godly life.

Doddridge also relates godly living to the doctrine of God, but the ten commandments themselves, as a basis for the definition of the Christian’s moral duty, are not prominent in Doddridge’s work. It has been shown in chapter 3, above, that in the early part of his Course of Lectures Doddridge traces moral duties back to natural law.40 Much later in the course, when he comes to consider the truths of revelation, Doddridge sets out to ‘enquire into the principal heads of christian duty, as they are laid down in scripture’ and finds that ‘all the most considerable particulars mentioned above in our ethical lectures, as branches of the law of nature, are recommended in the old and new testament’.41 Having affirmed that the conclusions of natural law are consonant with the teaching of scripture, Doddridge does not, however, go on to expound a system of Christian ethics grounded in the ten commandments, as might have been expected of

38 Rogers, Seven Treatises, pp. 160-91.
40 pp. 71-73.
41 Philip Doddridge, A Course of Lectures on the Principal Subjects in Pneumatology, Ethics, and Divinity, ed. Samuel Clark (London: Printed by Assignment from the Author’s Widow, for J. Buckland et al., 1763), p. 472.
a Puritan writer. Instead, he addresses various moral issues, such as divorce, oaths and polygamy, drawing on both Old and New Testament texts to support his arguments. Doddridge by no means dismisses the decalogue as irrelevant, but nor does he use it in the way that the Puritans did, as the principal basis from which the Christian’s moral duties are drawn.42

In the particular case of the treatment of the sabbath day, Doddridge’s approach can be seen to be different from that of many Puritans. Proposition CLI of the *Course of Lectures* lays down as the ‘duty of Christians to observe one day in seven, and the first of the week, as a day of religious rest, and public worship’.43 The common Puritan method of proving this duty was to argue that the fourth command in the decalogue, concerning the sabbath, continued to be binding, but that the day to be observed had been altered, by command of Christ and consonant with the practice of the apostles, from the seventh to the first day of the week.44 In his treatment of the subject, Doddridge acknowledges the ‘peculiar place which [the fourth command] had in the Mosaic law, as being a part of the ten commandments delivered by God’s own voice from mount Sinai, and written as with his own hand on tables of stone among moral precepts of the highest importance’, but concludes that this simply ‘may further recommend it to some distinguishing regard’.45 This is a very different emphasis from that of the *Westminster Confession*, which describes the command as ‘perpetuall’ [sic] and ‘binding all men in all ages’.46 For Doddridge, it would seem, the decalogue was predominantly a Jewish law. Many of its provisions may continue to be relevant, but the
Northampton pastor preferred to look primarily to the New Testament in order to discover the duties incumbent upon Christians. Although the practical outworking of godliness in the life of the believer may have differed little as between Doddridge and his seventeenth-century forebears, for the eighteenth-century minister that outworking was founded more in natural law and in the New Testament than in the Mosaic decalogue.

Philip Doddridge was a firm believer in the value of daily household worship. He practised it himself, gathering his family and any other members of his household together each day, in the morning and again in the evening, for Bible reading, exposition and prayer. Students living with him, as most did, were expected to be present and to participate, as well as those who were boarding elsewhere in the town.47

The Doctor began that Service with a short Prayer for the divine Presence and Blessing. Some of the Students read a Chapter of the Old Testament from Hebrew into English, which he expounded critically, and drew practical Inferences from it; a Psalm was then sung and he prayed.48

In this connection, Doddridge had a great concern for the Christian instruction and upbringing of children. ‘It is of great Importance that Children early imbibe an Awe of GOD, and an humble Veneration for his Perfections and Glories.’ It was important also for them to learn that God is merciful and loving: ‘We should represent him as the universal kind indulgent Parent, who loves his Creatures, and by all proper Methods provides for their Happiness.’ The subjects of death and what follows are not to be hidden from the young: they need to be taught ‘that in a very little while their Spirits are to return [to] this GOD’. And they should be taught to pray.49 In the Preface to his Family Expositor, first published in 1739, Doddridge explains that the main purpose of that substantial work was ‘to promote Family Religion’ and in the ‘Advertisement’ he

47 [Orton], Memoirs, pp. 87, 88.
48 Ibid., p. 88.
49 Doddridge, Religious Education, pp. 11-14.
sets out instructions, ‘As to the Manner of Reading this Book in Families’. In 1750, towards the end of his life, Doddridge published a pamphlet on the subject, *A Plain and Serious Address to the Master of a Family on the Important Subject of Family Religion*, in which he addressed his desire to his readers that they ‘would honour and acknowledge GOD in your Families, by calling them together every Day, to hear some Part of his Word read to them, and to offer, for a few Minutes at least, your united Confessions, Prayers, and Praises to him’. Family worship, in Doddridge’s view, was a vital element in true Christian piety.

In this, Doddridge differed little from his Puritan forebears, who were equally concerned that Christians should engage regularly in family worship. William Gouge (1575–1653), minister at St Ann Blackfriars, London, wrote at length on the subject of family duties: ‘The spirittuall good of children, and that in their childhood, is to be procured by parents as well as their temporall. Wherefore *Parents must traine up their children in true piety.*’ The parent is the family minister: ‘that which a Minister is to doe for matter of instruction in the Church, a parent must do at home’. This he is to do by regular teaching, catechising and correction. The family is the basic unit of society, a microcosm of the community which is the nation. So, argued the minister at Dry Drayton, Richard Greenham (c. 1540–1594),

if there be no practise at home, if fathers of families use not doctrine, and discipline in their houses ... they may indeede, but most uniuistlie, ... complaine that their children are corrupted abroad, when they were before, and are still corrupted at home.53

Nearer Doddridge’s own time, in the first decade of the eighteenth century, Thomas Beard, a young man who died at the age of eighteen, described life in his master’s household:

Here I have had the priviledge of Family-Worship, Thrice a Day have I heard the Word read; and Prayers offer’d. Once a Week have I heard, one or other Question in Religion examin’d and stated. Once a Week have I been Catechised, and Instructed. Once a Week have I had an opportunity of more publick Prayer. Twice a Week since I have had any Capacity, I and my Companions have privately engaged in Prayer together, and here I have met with God. Twice every Sabbath have I heard practick Preaching, and in the Evening Repetition. These unless any thing extraordinary hath interrupted, have been my constant Priviledges for many Years.54

The Puritan concern for the instruction of children and young people in true godliness and the practice of family worship thus continued through to early eighteenth-century Dissent, where it was taken up and echoed, with equal insistence, by Doddridge.

Private Bible-reading and prayer were also essential for the seventeenth-century Puritan. The ‘vertuous Young Person’ is one that ‘loves and delights indeed in his Bible. It is to him the Oracle of God; and he is willing it should be the man of his Counsel.’55

In his sketch of the typical ‘old English Puritan’, published in 1656, John Geree describes his private devotional life:

Hee made conscience of all Gods ordinances, though some hee esteemed of more consequence. Hee was much in prayer; with it he began, and closed the day. In it hee was exercised in his closet, family, and publike assembly. He esteemed that manner of prayer best, where by the gift of God, expressions were varied according to present wants and occasions; yet did he not account set formes unlawfull. … He esteemed reading of the word an ordinance of God both in private and publike.56

This might have been a description, not only of the old English Puritan, but of the eighteenth-century Dissenter, at least as Doddridge understood him. In his charge to the young John Jennings, son of his former tutor, Doddridge urges him not to neglect private prayer: ‘Be assured, that as Prayer is the Food and Breath of all practical Religion, if I may be allowed the Expression, so secret Prayer in particular is of vast Importance.’ Hand-in-hand with prayer was a due consideration of the Bible: ‘To furnish out Matter for Prayer, let Meditation be called in to your Assistance; and let the Word of God, above all, be the Subject of your Meditation.’ Orton, in his Memoirs of Doddridge, testifies that what Doddridge recommended to others he himself practised:

He esteemed devout Meditation an important Part of a Christian’s Duty, an excellent Means of fitting the Heart for Prayer, and an Exercise, which afforded great Pleasure … He reckoned a serious diligent Care in the Performance of secret Prayer, an Evidence and Support of real Religion; and strongly recommended it to others, as a most powerful Incentive to every Duty, and the best Relief under the Fatigues and Afflictions of Life.

Private prayer and Bible-reading, for Doddridge as much as for the Puritan, were essential elements of true piety.

The Puritan believed it to be his duty to observe providences: to mark those particular events and occurrences in his daily life which might signal some special mark of God’s favour or displeasure. Bartholomew Ashwood (1622–1678), minister in Axminster, put the matter in this way, in a work published in the year of his death:

Get all the good you can from Providences; from favourable Providences, and from frowning Providences … Providences, whether prosperous or afflicting, are to saved souls, but the fulfilling of Divine Purposes, and the accomplishment of precious promise [sic], which
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58 Ibid., p. 51.
59 [Orton], Memoirs, p. 279.
are designed for the good of Believers. Observe the Providences of God if you would get good from thence.\textsuperscript{60}

John Rowe (1626/7–1677), minister in Tiverton, attributed a fire which broke out at his premises, a few years before his death,

to the neglect of a duty in not putting away a servant (whom he had often admonished but was not reformed) …. but being \textit{slack} in performing his duty herein he conceived that this was the reason why the Lord so corrected him.

When on another occasion his property was in danger from fire, it prompted him to express thanks to God ‘\textit{for all mercies and deliverances, especially for that great deliverance from wrath to come, and for the hope of eternal life which God that cannot lye hath promised}.’ His biographer thus describes him as ‘a curious \textit{observer of every passage of Providence},’ a remark which would seem apposite for many seventeenth-century Puritans.\textsuperscript{61}

Similarly, Orton describes Doddridge: ‘He was a careful \textit{Observer of the Providences of GOD to himself, his Family, Friends, and Country. He kept a Register of the most remarkable Interpositions of Providence in his Favour}.’\textsuperscript{62} Like Rowe, Doddridge recognised the hand of Providence in deliverance from a fire ‘occupied by a Wax-Candle’ which swept through his study, destroying papers and books; ‘but the Light of the Fire being providentially discovered by an opposite Neighbour, who gave an immediate Alarm, it was speedily extinguished’. The good providence of God was then seen in that

the Part of this Volume, and that only, which was destroyed, had been transcribed, and the Transcript lay in another Place out of Danger, and


\textsuperscript{61} [Theophilus Gale], \textit{The Life and Death of Mr. John Rowe of Crediton in Devon} (London: Printed for Francis Tyton, 1673), pp. 65, 66.

\textsuperscript{62} [Orton], \textit{Memoirs}, p. 283.
all the untranscribed Pages were perfectly legible, and only the Edges of them singed.63

His register of providences served a spiritual end: it would be reviewed ‘on Days of extraordinary Devotion to preserve his Gratitude and increase his Activity in the Service of GOD’. Adverse providences were interpreted to mean that “‘My GOD is humbling me, and I need it; Oh, that it may quicken me likewise!’” The record of ‘any important and instructive Occurrence’ was supplemented by the ‘Lessons it was adapted to teach and he was desirous to learn from it’, so that no opportunity of spiritual improvement from everyday events should be lost.64 In this, too, Doddridge was emulating the Puritans of the previous century.

The keeping of a diary or journal was a favourite Puritan occupation; its aims were serious and spiritual – it was an important expression of Puritan piety. The Independent minister and sometime president of Magdalen College, Oxford, Thomas Goodwin (1600-1680) kept ‘a constant Diary’, wrote his son, ‘of Observations of the Case and Posture of his Mind, and Heart toward God, and suitable [sic], pious, and pathetical Meditations’.65 The content and purpose of a Puritan’s diary are summarised in the account which James Janeway gives of his older brother’s life: John Janeway (1633–1657), fellow of King's College, Cambridge, from 1654 until his death, kept a Diary, in which he did write down every evening what the frame of his spirit had been all the day long, especially in every duty. He took notice what incomes and profit he received; in his spiritual traffique; what returns from that far-country; what answers of prayer, what deadness and flatness, and what observable providences did present themselves, and the substance of what he had been doing; and

64 [Orton], Memoirs, p. 284.
any wandrings of thoughts, inordinancy in any pason [sic]; which, though the world could not discern he could. 66

The beneficial effects on Janeway’s spiritual life are then enumerated:

This, made him to retain a grateful remembrance of mercy, and to live in a constant admiring and adoring of divine goodness; this, brought him to a very intimate acquaintance with his own heart; this, kept his spirit low and fitted him for freer communications from God; this, made him more lively and active; this, helped him to walk humbly with God, this made him speak more affectionately and experimentally to others of the things of God: and, in a word, this left a sweet calm upon his spirits, because he every night made even his accounts; and if his sheets should prove his winding-sheet, it had been all one: for, he could say his work was done; so that death could not surprize him. 67

The Puritan journal, then, was a means to an end: spiritual struggles and experiences, temptations, failures and victories were recorded, as an aid to self-examination and improvement.

Again, Doddridge followed in the same path. Job Orton records in his memoirs of Doddridge how as a teenager, in 1716, the future tutor ‘began to keep a Diary of his Life’. Orton indicates that this diary contained accounts of ‘how he spent his Time’, the labour he undertook to ‘improve his Understanding’ and a record of his reading. It also recorded acts of charity: how he ‘would sometimes … call upon poor ignorant Persons at their Houses, give them a little Money out of his own small Allowance, converse seriously with them, read to them and lend them Books’. 68 Like a good Puritan, Doddridge, even at that early age, recorded the substance of sermons that he heard, ‘what Impression they made upon his Heart, what Resolutions he formed in Consequence of them, and what in the Preacher he was most desirous of imitating’.

Orton quotes from this account of youthful spirituality:

67 Ibid., p. 59.
68 [Orton], Memoirs, p. 9.
I rose early this Morning, read that Part of Mr. Henry’s Book on the Lord’s Supper, which treats of due Approach to it. I endeavoured to excite in myself those Dispositions and Affections, which he mentions as proper for that Ordinance. As I endeavoured to prepare my Heart, according to the Preparation of the Sanctuary, though with many Defects, GOD was pleased to meet me, and give me sweet Communion with himself, of which I desire always to retain a grateful Sense. I this Day, in the Strength of Christ, renewed my Covenant with GOD and renounced my Covenant with Sin. I vowed against every Sin, and resolved carefully to perform every Duty. 69

The account of the morning devotions, of the careful spiritual preparation for taking the Lord’s supper, the felt experience of communion with God and the covenanted renunciation of sin are typical elements of Puritan piety and diary-keeping. Other matters which Orton says he found in his subject’s diary include records of conversions under Doddridge’s preaching, of persons visited in his pastoral capacity, a monthly account of his success or failure in executing his plan, made annually and kept under review, and a note of his reading, writing and work amongst his congregation. In Puritan fashion, Doddridge would ‘look over’ the diary as a particular aid to spiritual devotion. The object of recording these details of spiritual experience, positive and negative, was ‘that they might guide, warn or encourage him for the future’. 70 In this, as in other areas, Doddridge’s practice of piety followed that of the Puritans.

Philip Doddridge not only entered into covenant himself with God, as just noted, but also recommended the making of covenants by believers, in order to reinforce the commitment of themselves to God and to a life of godliness, a practice which the Puritan Richard Mather, who emigrated to America in 1635, refers to in his consideration of the subject of covenant generally: ‘the Covenant may be considered, first as it is personall, private and particular, between God and one particular soule, making Covenant with God, and God with him, either at his first conversion, or at other

69 Ibid., pp. 10-11.
70 Ibid., pp. 24, 27, 36, 60, 281.
times’. So Doddridge suggests that, when people dedicate themselves to Christ, they should consider underlining the solemnity of the act by doing it in a ‘written Engagement’. Doddridge further recommends the use of written covenants, as an ‘express Act of Self-Dedication to the Service of God’, also advising the use of writing ‘as many pious Divines have recommended’. Geoffrey Nuttall has documented the prevalence of covenant-making in early eighteenth-century Dissent, showing that many of the covenants then made could be traced back to the form drawn up by the ejected minister Joseph Alleine, published by his father-in-law, Richard Alleine, in 1664. Doddridge was thus part of this covenant-making tradition which was rooted in Puritan piety.

A prominent part of the diary of Philip Doddridge, as reproduced by his descendant, John Doddridge Humphreys, editor of his correspondence, consists in meditations on the Lord’s supper. A typical example is the following, taken from the ‘Meditations on the Ninth Sacrament Day, November 1730’:

After taking the bread I observed, blessed are they who live in the Gospel day, and receive the common entertainments of life as subjects of the Redeemer’s kingdom. Blessed are they who are called to the table of the Lord to eat the flesh of the Son of God, and to drink his blood. Blessed above all are they that feed upon it above in another manner, and that dwell for ever with God there…. How many of our friends, once with us at this table, are now there. Let us rejoice in it, and be longing to follow them. Do this in remembrance of Christ.

Doddridge thus records the spirit in which he administered communion on that day as well as his own elevated view of the significance of that sacrament and the vital role

71 [Richard Mather], *An Apologie of the Churches in New-England for Church-Covenant. Or, a Discourse Touching the Covenant between God and Men, and especially Concerning Church-Covenant* ... (Printed by T. P. and M. S. for Benjamin Allen, 1643), p. 3.
that it plays in true Christian devotion and piety. In his comments in the *Family Expositor* on the apostle Paul’s account of the institution of the Lord’s supper, Doddridge urges his readers to ‘attend this blessed Institution; endeavouring by the lively Exercise of Faith and Love, to *discern*, and in a spiritual Sense, to *feed upon, the Lord’s Body*. The ordinance of the Lord’s supper was, in Doddridge’s view, ‘*a Seal of that Covenant which was ratified by his [sc. Christ’s] Blood*’. It should hold a high place in the practice of a believer’s piety.

Doddridge rejected, as a true Protestant, any idea that the elements in the Lord’s supper underwent a real transformation in the sacrament – it was only in ‘a spiritual Sense’ that believers received the Lord’s body. Yet he saw the sacrament (as he had no compunction in calling it) as more than simply a memorial of the death of Christ: believers were to ‘feed upon’ Christ in it. The Lord’s supper was a source of spiritual nourishment to the believer. Michael Haykin has shown that Calvinistic Baptists of the early eighteenth century took a similar view: for example, Anne Dutton (1692-1765), wife of the Benjamin Dutton (*d.* 1747) who was pastor of the Baptist meeting at Great Gransden, near Cambridge, wrote that, in the supper, Christ ‘therein and thereby doth actually communicate, or give Himself, his Body broken, and his Blood shed’. More than a mere memorial, then, the eucharistic rite in Doddridge’s view brought with it particular spiritual blessing to those who partook of it aright: ‘Thro’ that Blood alone, let us seek this invaluable Blessing, without which indeed, nothing can be a solid and
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77 Doddridge, *Rise and Progress*, p. 168.
lasting Blessing to us’. At the same time, believers, he held, must ensure that it is the reality which underlies the form that they are seeking:

let us never rest in the external Rites or Exercises of Worship, how decently and regularly soever performed; but look to our inward Temper, and to the Conduct of our Minds, if we desire to maintain this Peace, and that our coming together should be for the better, and not for the worse.\(^{79}\)

The right reception of the supper therefore, in Doddridge’s view, involved a genuine, albeit spiritual, participation in the body and blood of Christ, thereby conferring unique spiritual blessings upon the believer.

The language which Doddridge used in his communion hymns is extravagant: it is a ‘sacred Feast’, a ‘Rich Banquet of his Flesh and Blood’, where believers partake of ‘heav’nly Food’.\(^{80}\) Doddridge was not alone in his day in the use of such language. Joseph Stennett (1663-1713), pastor of the Calvinistic Baptist congregation meeting at Pinners’ Hall in London, used the language of feeding in one of his communion hymns, in which he wrote, ‘Thy Flesh is Meat indeed, / Thy Blood the richest Wine; / How blest are they whom thou dost feed / At this kind Feast of thine!’\(^{81}\) For Doddridge, the meal was to be approached with great expectation: ‘With Hearts inflam’d let all attend’; participation in it was a means for the very revival of religion for which believers longed: ‘Revive thy dying Churches, LORD, / And bid our drooping Graces live; / And more that Energy afford, / A Saviour’s Blood alone can give.’\(^{82}\) Vivid language is used to describe the view of Christ’s death which believers have in the Lord’s supper: ‘May Faith behold a smiling GOD / Thro’ Jesus’ bleeding Breast’, a view which causes the

soul to rise and that ‘shall compleat our Bliss’. The Lord’s supper was thus viewed as a joyful event through which great spiritual blessings are imparted to partaking believers.

The Puritans were of the same opinion. They also used the language of ‘seal’ in speaking of the Lord’s supper: Walter Marshall (1628–1679), ejected from his living at Hursley near Winchester in 1662, wrote that the believer’s union with Christ ‘is not only resembled but sealed in the Lords Supper’. The Church of England minister John Preston (1587–1628), who became master of Emmanuel College, Cambridge, opened his three sermons on the Lord’s supper with a statement of the immense significance of this ordinance:

Of all the actions wherein we are conversant throughout the whole Tract of life, none are of so great consequence as those wherein we have to doe with the mighty God of heaven and earth: And among all those none so weighty as that wherein wee draw nearest to him, as we doe in this holy Sacrament of the Lords Supper.

Thomas Doolittle (1630/1633?–1707), minister of St Alphege, London Wall, until his ejection in 1662, wrote a treatise on the Lord’s supper in which he gives detailed instructions as to the believer’s preparation for, participation in and subsequent reflection upon that sacrament. In this treatise, he refers in summary form to the sacrament’s benefits: ‘a Believer should eye the blood of Christ in the Lords Supper, in the several properties, vertue and efficacy of it, till suitable graces thereby are drawn forth into act and lively exercise’. Like Doddridge, Doolittle taught the necessity of careful preparation for participation: ‘whenever you are to partake of the Lords

---

83 Ibid., p. 251.
84 Walter Marshal [sic], The Gospel-Mystery of Sanctification Opened in Sundry Practical Directions, Suited Especially to the Case of Those who Labour under the Guilt and Power of Indwelling Sin. To which is Added a Sermon on Justification (London: Printed for T. Parkhurst, 1692), p. 44.
Supper, you are to be painful and serious in making preparation for it. In similar vein, Richard Baxter saw the supper as a time when ‘the Covenant of Christianity [is] mutually and solemnly renewed, and sealed, in which Christ with the benefits of his Covenant is given to the Faithful, and they give up themselves to Christ’. This high view of the supper was not confined in the seventeenth century to Puritans, but was held by others in the established church. Whilst eschewing transubstantiation, there was a widespread insistence on the reality of the presence, albeit spiritual, of Christ in the sacrament and of the believer’s genuine partaking of the saviour in the meal. So Archbishop Laud (1573-1645) could affirm that, in the sacrament, ‘the Worthy receiver is by his Faith, made spiritually partaker of the true and reall Body and Blood of Christ truly, and really, and of all the Benefits of his Passion’. Doddridge’s high view of the sacrament of the Lord’s supper thus followed in a broad tradition of English Protestantism, shared with but not confined to seventeenth-century Puritans.

In conclusion, then, it is argued that Doddridge in his view of piety stands firmly in the tradition of seventeenth-century Puritanism, as exemplified by men like Richard Greenham, William Gouge, Thomas Goodwin and John Preston. This tradition emphasised the inward nature of true Christian piety, worked in the human soul by the power of the Holy Spirit in regeneration and subsequently in sanctification. It taught also that this piety must be worked out in the actual performance of Christian duties,


88 William [Laud], *A Relation of the Conference, beteweene William Lawd, then, Lrd. Bishop of St. Davids; Now, Lord Arch-Bishop of Canterbury; and Mr Fisher the Jesuite, by the Command of King James of ever Blessed Memorie ...* 2nd edition revised (London: Printed by Richard Badger, 1639), p. 286. Laud’s first account of his conference with Fisher appears to have been published in 1624: R. B. [*sic*], *An Answere to Mr Fishers Relation of a Third Conference beteweene a Certaine B. (as He Stiles Him) and Himselfe ...* (London: Printed by Adam Islip, 1624); this first version however does not address questions relating to the Lord’s Supper.
including personal prayer, Bible-reading and family worship, assisted by the observing of providences, the keeping of journals and the making of covenants with God. This piety also, in common with a wider tradition in English Protestantism, held in high regard the sacrament of the Lord’s supper. Doddridge’s piety was part of a broad tradition which extended back into the previous century.

There is no doubt that Richard Baxter was, as Nuttall and others have shown, especially influential in transmitting that tradition to Doddridge (and others in early eighteenth-century Dissent): Doddridge found particular delight in Baxter’s practical works from the time of his studies under Jennings onwards. However, it is the contention of this chapter that the form of piety so handed down to the Northampton pastor was not peculiar to Baxter but was the shared heritage of a wider tradition. The single significant exception to this conclusion is the somewhat lower emphasis given by the eighteenth-century Dissenter to the place of the ten commandments, compared with the Puritan view, representing a tendency in Doddridge’s thought to argue for duties on the basis of natural law, coupled with an apparent preference for basing practical Christian instruction on the New rather than on the Old Testament. Although this difference is important, the consequence of that difference of view, in terms of the actual content of the duties required of the believer, was minimal. Thus the connections in this regard between Richard Baxter and Philip Doddridge must be seen, not as something peculiar to them, but as part of a broader tradition of seventeenth-century Puritan and Protestant piety.
Chapter 7

Communication

Philip Doddridge first preached when he was nineteen and was in pastoral charge of a congregation, with regular preaching responsibilities, from the age of twenty.1 As tutor of an academy, he lectured to his students and spoke to them from the Bible twice daily in family worship.2 On his travels, preaching formed an invariable part of his schedule, at special occasions such as ordinations and ministers’ meetings, as well as at regular services.3 Ian Green has noted how, in an age of print, the continued importance of oral communication can easily be overlooked.4 For Doddridge, the work of preaching constituted one of the principal means by which he sought to convey his thought to others. This oral output is mostly lost, but a significant proportion of Doddridge’s publications consists of sermons: the forty-six separate works which Doddridge saw through the press in his lifetime include fifty-five sermons in all, some published individually, others as part of a series.5 This considerable published output,
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1 Philip Doddridge to Elizabeth Nettleton, 30 July 1722, Humphreys, Correspondence, Vol. 1, p. 140 (Nuttall, Calendar, Letter no. 31); Doddridge to Samuel Clark, 25 May 1723, DWL, New College Library MSS L1/10/3 (Nuttall, Calendar, Letter no. 63).
3 See, for example, his charge to Abraham Tozer at the latter’s ordination in Norwich in 1745, in Richard Frost, The Importance of the Ministerial Office, and the Difficulty of Rightly Discharging It: Considered in a Discourse Delivered in Norwich, June 20, 1745. At the Ordination of the Reverend Mr. Abraham Tozer. To Which Is Added the Charge by P. Doddridge, D. D. (London: Printed and Sold by J. Waugh, 1745), pp. 37-68; his address to the ministers’ meeting in Denton in 1741, referred to in Philip Doddridge, The Evil and Danger of Neglecting the Souls of Men, Plainly and Seriously Represented in a Sermon Preach’d at a Meeting of Ministers at Kettering in Northamptonshire, October 15, 1741. And Publish’d at Their Request (London: Printed and Sold by M. Fenner, 1742), p. i; his preaching at Little St Helen’s, Bishopsgate Street, London, in 1742, Philip Doddridge to Mercy Doddridge, 9 August 1742, DWL, Congregational Library Reed MSS 47 (Nuttall, Calendar, Letter no. 781).
4 Ian M. Green, Continuity and Change in Protestant Preaching in Early Modern England (London: Dr Williams’s Library, 2009), pp. 4-5.
5 Philip Doddridge, Sermons on the Religious Education of Children. Preached at Northampton (London: Printed for R. Hett, 1732); Sermons to Young Persons, on the Following Subjects: Viz. ... (London: Printed for J. Fowler, in Northampton, 1735); The Care of the Soul Urged as the One Thing Needful. A Sermon Preached at Maidwell in Northamptonshire, June 22, 1735. (London: Printed for Richard Hett, 1735); The Absurdity and Iniquity of Persecution for Conscience-sake, in All Its Kinds and Degrees. Consider’d in a Sermon Preach’d at Northampton. Published with Some Enlargements. Recommended by the Reverend Mr. Some, as a Proper Appendix to the Late Lectures at Salters-Hall. (London: Printed for R. Hett, 1736); Ten Sermons on the Power and Grace of Christ and the Evidences of his Glorious [sic] Gospel, Preached at Northampton (London: Printed for R. Hett, 1736); Submission to Divine Providence
together with evidence from surviving correspondence, provides the source material for
an examination of Doddridge’s approach to the communication of what he believed.

Historians have not neglected this aspect of Doddridge’s work. Geoffrey Nuttall,
in his seminal work on Doddridge and Baxter, identifies the affectionate nature of the
writing and preaching of the two men as one of a number of characteristics linking them
in the same tradition.6 Isabel Rivers has shown how Philip Doddridge, together with
Isaac Watts, sought in their preaching and writing to address the reason with facts and
persuasive arguments and to stir the passions, believing the latter to be the principal
means whereby a person is motivated to action. Rivers argues that there was in
Doddridge some tension between a desire to instil in believers a heartfelt, spiritual
emotion and at the same time to present unbelievers with a reasoned argument in
defence of Christianity. This tension can be seen, Rivers argues, especially in
Doddridge’s Life of Colonel Gardiner (1747), in which Doddridge weakens his
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description of his subject’s extraordinary conversion experience by qualifications aimed at warding off accusations of enthusiasm. Françoise Deconinck-Brossard has written about the manner in which Doddridge and his contemporaries represented children in their preaching, highlighting their consciousness of the reality of infant death as well as the need to inculcate in children moral and religious principles from a young age. Different facets of Doddridge’s published output have thus been examined in the secondary literature. There is however no overall study of Doddridge’s published output, of a kind which would uncover something of his objectives in producing the works that he did during his lifetime.

This chapter accordingly seeks to examine the different genres which Doddridge chose for the communication of his ideas and the audiences which he sought to address, in order to ascertain the groups of people whom he wanted most to affect, his reasons for wanting to address those groups in particular and the kinds of communication which he considered would most effectively reach them. It also aims to identify prominent topics or themes in Doddridge’s published work and why he thought them so, in order to help ascertain which issues he considered to be significant for his day. The style and manner in which Doddridge sought to communicate his views is also examined, in order to understand how he was influenced in his communication strategies by the rhetorical approaches of his time. This analysis of the genres, audiences, themes and style of Doddridge’s published output will contribute to an understanding of his thought in the context of his day.

---

Isabel Rivers writes of Doddridge as a ‘highly influential contributor to the principal genres of eighteenth-century religious literature’, instancing ‘polemical essays, sermons, devotional works, biographies, hymns, and academic lectures’. While it is true that Doddridge made some contribution to each of those genres, it is significant that a large part of his published work was sermonic in nature. The high proportion of his output which was made up of sermons has already been noted. In his will, dated 11 June 1741, the Northampton preacher expressed the desire that, after his death, his congregation would read over ‘in their Families’ certain of his published sermons and so ‘hear me speaking in my Writings’: the oral address, which had been reduced to print, would again be spoken, albeit by different voices. This prioritising of the oral, in Doddridge’s mind, can be seen even in works which originated as written texts: the six-volume Family Expositor on which Doddridge spent so much time and energy was, he wrote, intended ‘chiefly to promote Family Religion’, that is, for reading aloud during household devotions. For Doddridge, oral communication was of the highest significance. Other works constituted a record of what had been spoken (the Course of Lectures) or were cast in the form of personal address (the controversial literature, which expressly takes the form of letters, and the ‘Address’ and the ‘Second Address’ to the ‘Protestant Inhabitants of the United Netherlands’). Even the Rise and
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10 Above, p. 165.
11 Humphreys, Correspondence, Vol. 5, p. 537.
13 [Philip Doddridge], Free Thoughts on the Most Probable Means of Reviving the Dissenting Interest. Occasion’d by the Late Enquiry into the Causes of Its Decay. Address’d to the Author of That Enquiry. By a Minister in the Country. (London: Printed for Richard Hett, 1730); An Answer to a Late Pamphlet, Intitled, Christianity Not Founded on Argument, &c. In Three Letters to the Author (London: Printed for M. Fenner and J. Hodges, 1743).
14 Philip Doddridge, Aenspraek aen de Protestantsche Ingezeten der Vereenigde Nederlanden, door Eenen Hunner Broederen in Groot Brittanje, Bedienaer van het Eeuwig Euangelium: Geschreven Kort
Progress, which begins in the manner of a more formal treatise (‘When we look round about us with an attentive Eye, and consider the Characters and Pursuits of Men, we plainly see ...’) very soon takes on the form of a personal address, so that the reader has, by the middle of the fourth page, become ‘you’; after a brief reversion to a more impersonal ‘Readers’, the author announces his intention to ‘suppose myself addressing ... one of the vast Number of thoughtless Creatures ...’ and to ‘speak ... as a Friend to a Friend’; thereafter, the tone of the entire work is that of the personal and familiar. Sermons and sermonic modes of address thus make up a large proportion of Doddridge’s published output.

The predominance of the register of personal address in Doddridge’s work may be reflected in the emphasis upon writing from the heart which Geoffrey Nuttall sees as part of the tradition linking Doddridge with Richard Baxter. Yet Baxter also published polemical works, which was not Doddridge’s habit, as well as works of theology of a more formal didactic nature, a genre which, again, is not represented in Doddridge’s output. Compared with his contemporaries, too, the range of genres represented in Doddridge’s published work is in fact rather narrow. The Northampton pastor produced nothing comparable to Isaac Watts’s Philosophical Essays or the latter’s controversial works on the Trinity, nor to Thomas Ridgley’s commentary on the Westminster

16 Nuttall, Baxter and Doddridge, p. 13.
17 See, for example, Richard Baxter, Aphorisms of Justification, with Their Explication Annexed. Wherein Also Is Opened the Nature of the Covenants, Satisfaction, Righteousness, Faith, Works, &c. Published Especially for the Use of the Church of Iederminter in Worcestershire (London: Printed for Francis Tyton, 1649); Baxter, Two Disputations of Original Sin. I. Of Original Sin, as from Adam. II. Of Original Sin, as from Our Neerer Parents (London: Printed for Robert Gibbs, 1675).
Confession of Faith. Doddridge’s *Course of Lectures* is dissimilar as it was designed
to instruct students in the lecture room, rather than to debate theological or
philosophical issues in a public forum, and was not published until after his death. The
predominant genre in which Doddridge published was the sermon and even those
publications which were not formally sermons tended to take on, in his hands,
something of a homiletic character.

The relative lack of polemical works amongst Doddridge’s publications has
already been noted. This requires further comment, as the desire for Christian unity,
together with the avoidance of division between believers, has been put forward as one
of the factors linking Doddridge with Baxter. It is true that Doddridge did not publish
more than a few overtly controversial works - the only publications of his which seek
directly to answer another author are those referred to above: his *Free Thoughts*,
replying to Strickland Gough on the decay of Dissent, and the three letters responding to
the Deist Henry Dodwell. The first, the reply to Gough, could be seen as a young
man’s zeal for the cause which he espouses, in Doddridge’s case, that of Dissent. His
tone is not polemical: there is no point-by-point rebuttal, no insinuations against his
opponent’s character and no display of anger. Doddridge makes his points subtly and
with gentle irony: it is the least polemical work of controversy imaginable. His three

19 Philip Doddridge, *A Course of Lectures on the Principal Subjects in Pneumatology, Ethics, and Divinity: With References to the Most Considerable Authors on Each Subject*, ed. Samuel Clark (London: Printed by Assignment from the Author’s Widow, for J. Buckland et al., 1763).
20 Above, p. 169.
21 See Nuttall, *Baxter and Doddridge*, pp. 5-12.
22 Above, note 13.
letters to Dodwell, in response to the latter’s *Christianity Not Founded on Argument*, are rather different in tone and take issue directly and clearly on matters that Doddridge obviously believed to be of the greatest importance: ‘You have evidently represented *Christianity*, if not *Religion* in general, as an *unreasonable Thing*’. This struck at the heart of one of Doddridge’s most central beliefs, that Christianity is, and can be shown to be, reasonable. It may be that, given the importance which he placed upon this principle, he felt that he simply could not allow Dodwell’s public challenge to it to go unanswered, for fear of the damage that might otherwise be done to the cause of Christ. Doddridge was thus generally very wary of overt, public controversy, but was willing to engage in it when he believed that issues of fundamental importance were at stake.

It would be wrong, however, to deduce from the lack of overtly controversial works amongst Doddridge’s publications that the Northampton minister took little notice of contemporary controversies or that he failed to respond to them. In 1740, controversy over the nature of regeneration broke out following the publication by John Taylor, Presbyterian minister in Norwich, of a treatise denying the doctrine of original sin. Published replies were forthcoming from David Jennings and from John Wesley, as well as from Samuel Hebden, who ministered in Wrentham, Suffolk; Isaac Watts
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26 David Jennings, *A Vindication of the Scripture-Doctrine of Original Sin, from Mr Taylor’s Free and Candid Examination of it* (London: Printed for R. Hett & J. Oswald, 1740); John Wesley, *The Doctrine of Original Sin: According to Scripture, Reason, and Experience* (Bristol: Printed by E. Farley, 1757); Samuel Hebden, *Baptismal Regeneration Disproved; The Scripture Account of the Nature of Regeneration Explained; And the Absolute Necessity of Such a Change Argued from the Native Corruption of Man Since the Fall; In a Discourse on John III.5,6. With Remarks on Some Passages in a Late Book Against Original Sin; And an Appendix Relating to Three Different False Descriptions of Regeneration Delivered in Some Modern Books* (London: Printed for R. Hett and J. Oswald, 1741). In response to Wesley, Taylor published *A Reply to the Reverend Mr. John Wesley’s Remarks on the Scripture-Doctrine of Original Sin. To which is Added, A Short Inquiry into the Scripture-Sense of the Word Grace.* (London: Printed and Sold by M. Waugh, 1767). For Taylor’s reply to Jennings, see next footnote.
had also written on the subject at that time and was drawn into the dispute.  

Taylor’s argument, so far as it related to regeneration, was that humanity had the power within itself to be regenerate, for ‘to be born again, or of God, is no other than to attain those Habits of Virtue and Religion, which give us the real Character of the Children of God’ and ‘God hath ... furnished us with all proper Means to enable us to gain a Character of Worth and Excellency’.  

According to Taylor, regeneration is necessary, not ‘because we are born wicked; or are by Nature corrupt’, but in order to test our fitness, through the ‘right Use and Application of our Powers’ for the kingdom of God. Consequently, he concluded, ‘REGENERATION, or our gaining the Habits of Virtue and Holiness, stands upon a firm and rational Bottom, without taking in any one Part or Particle of the common Doctrine of Original Sin’.  

Jennings, Wesley and Hebden argued in response for the orthodox doctrine that humanity is corrupt and sinful from birth and that regeneration is a supernatural act of God which renews human nature and instils eternal life. Their exchanges with Taylor fall clearly within the controversial genre.  

Doddridge responded differently to the controversy. In 1740, he decided to preach a series of sermons in Northampton on the subject of regeneration. He had come to ‘think it necessary last Year’, he wrote in the preface (dated November 1741), ‘to treat the Subject more largely, than I had ever done before’, not only because of its general importance, but ‘observing that several Controversies had about that Time been


28 Taylor, Original Sin, p. 239.  

29 Ibid., pp. 245-46.  

30 Ibid., p. 247.
raised concerning it’. He makes clear how important he believed it to be to deal with the subject in the light of these controversies, as they could have had ‘an ill Influence to unsettle Mens Minds, and either to lead them into some particular Errors, or into a general Apprehension that it was a mere Point of Speculation, about which it was not necessary to form any Judgment at all’.31 In order to reach beyond his own congregation, he says, he preached the series on a Sunday evening, thereby giving people from other congregations the opportunity to attend.32 Publication of the series, in 1742, enabled the message to spread even further. In these sermons, Doddridge strenuously opposes Taylor’s views, without however directing his attack personally at his adversary. Doddridge asserts the necessity of being born again precisely because of ‘our degenerate Hearts’, at the same time making clear that regeneration is ‘the Work of GOD’s renewing Grace’, not of human effort.33 Thus Doddridge does not remain silent in the case of an attack on a central point of Christian doctrine, where he considers that believers may be led into serious error or conclude that the point is of little significance. However, his strategy is not to publish a polemical work in response, but to preach to a wide audience on the subject, expounding the doctrinal question from scripture as well as answering the points that have been raised against it, and then to publish the sermons.

This aspect of Doddridge’s approach to communication may be contrasted with the practice of Richard Baxter, who did publish works of polemics as well as his more pastoral and practical treatises. Baxter would respond in detail to his opponents, as well as complaining more generally when he believed he had been misunderstood or

31 Doddridge, Regeneration, pp. vi-vii.
32 Ibid., p. vii.
33 Ibid., p. 5.
misrepresented.\textsuperscript{34} While it is true that, for the later part of his life, Baxter did not hold pastoral charge and so may not have had the opportunity to respond to controversy in the manner that Doddridge chose to do, the seventeenth-century divine’s controversial works are not confined to that period of his life: his first published work, \textit{Aphorismes of Justification}, which appeared in 1649, is a polemical work expounding his views on the doctrine of justification. It was written in opposition to those regarded by the author as antinomian, whom he described in his \textit{Catholick Theologie} as ‘Libertine denyers of the law of Christ’.\textsuperscript{35} There is nothing similar to this work published under Doddridge’s name. The near absence of the polemical note from Doddridge’s output perhaps makes him, on this point, more Baxterian than Baxter himself.

This consideration of the genres employed by Doddridge in his publications has shown the predominance of the sermonic in his output. This is perhaps unsurprising for a busy minister, occupied in weekly teaching and preaching. Yet there is a further factor which may be relevant here. The previous chapter has shown the strong emphasis which Doddridge placed upon inward regeneration by the work of the Holy Spirit. Chapter 5 demonstrated the high regard that Doddridge had for the text of scripture. By favouring a genre of publication which consisted in the exposition of that text, pressed home to the hearts and minds of individual hearers and readers, Doddridge was simply working out the consequences of his views on what is most central to Christian belief and practice. This approach is exemplified in his response to controversy, where again he preferred to exert influence through homiletic addresses to individuals, seeking to persuade them to


believe biblical teaching on the subject in question, rather than through a direct response to his antagonist. He was in this respect quite unlike Baxter. Rather he was consistently applying to his published output his belief in the importance of preaching as a means for communicating spiritual truth.

The variety of the audiences that Doddridge sought to reach through his written work has been noted by, among others, Isabel Rivers, who speaks of his concern with ‘people of all ages and educational and social levels’.36 This variety is evident from the very nature of some of those works: the *Course of Lectures*, for students, the *Sermons to Young Persons* (1735), addressed to youth, and the *Sermons on the Religious Education of Children* (1732), intended for parents, are obvious examples. Variety can be seen also in the very specific nature of some works: the edition of the work of his late friend, David Some, *The Case of Receiving the Small-pox by Inoculation* (1750), for example, is clearly aimed at those who had religious scruples on that subject; for some, a relatively small audience is precisely identified in the title, though no doubt publication aimed to reach a rather broader target too: examples include *A Friendly Letter to the Private Soldiers, in a Regiment of Foot, Which Was One of Those Engaged in the Important and Glorious Battle of Culloden* (1747), or the sermon entitled, *The Guilt and Doom of Capernaum, Seriously Recommended to the Consideration of the Inhabitants of London* (1750), published following the earthquake there in 1750 (though in fact preached in Northampton in the previous year).37 Other works, such as the *Practical Discourses on Regeneration* (1742) or *The Rise and Progress of Religion in the Soul* ...
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37 Philip Doddridge, ed., *The Case of Receiving the Small-pox by Inoculation, Impartially Considered, and Especially in a Religious View. Written in the Year M.DCC.XXV. By the Late Revd. Mr David Some, of Harborough* (London: Printed for J. Buckland and J. Waugh, 1750); Doddridge, *A Friendly Letter to the Private Soldiers, in a Regiment of Foot, Which Was One of Those Engaged in the Important and Glorious Battle of Culloden. From a Minister of the Town in Which They Are at Present Quartered* (n.p.: n.p., Printed in the Year, 1747); Doddridge, *The Guilt and Doom of Capernaum, Seriously Recommended to the Consideration of the Inhabitants of London: In a Sermon Preached at Salters-Hall, August 20, 1749. Published on Occasion of the Late Alarm by the Second Shock of an Earthquake, March 8, 1749-50. With a Preface Relating to That Awful Event* (London: Printed and Sold by J. Waugh, 1750).
Suited to Persons of Every Character and Circumstance (1745), were clearly intended for a more general audience. Thus it is true that Doddridge, through his published works, sought to reach a wide variety of different kinds of people.

Nevertheless, some emphases are evident in Doddridge’s intended audiences. There are, firstly, works aimed at ministerial students, ordinands and ministers. Doddridge published three of the sermons which he preached at ordination services, two addresses to meetings of ministers and a set of sermons of each of two former students who had died young (Thomas Steffe and James Shepherd). In his will, he expressed the desire that, after his death, the main course of lectures which he delivered to his ministerial students, as well as his lectures on preaching, be printed. By not only preaching these messages but also making them more widely available, so that all could read what he had said about the nature, duties and importance of the ministerial office, Doddridge was demonstrating to a wider audience the significance which he placed on a trained ministry and the need within an ordered Dissent for proper procedures for the public recognition of its ministers. His desire for the posthumous publication of his academy lectures also seems likely to have been intended to facilitate their use, not just by students but also by other academy tutors, with a view to sustaining educational standards amongst Dissenting ministers. Alongside his work as tutor, Doddridge’s

38 Philip Doddridge, Practical Discourses on Regeneration, in Ten Sermons Preach’d at Northampton: To Which Are Added, Two Sermons on Salvation by Grace through Faith, Preach’d at Rowell (London: Printed and sold by M. Fenner and J. Hodges, 1742); Doddridge, The Rise and Progress of Religion in the Soul: Illustrated in a Course of Serious and Practical Addresses, Suited to Persons of Every Character and Circumstance: With a Devout Meditation or Prayer Added to Each Chapter (London: Printed and Sold by J. Waugh, 1745).

publication programme evidences the importance with which he viewed a trained
ministry and an ordered Dissent.

A second group of publications is aimed at parents and heads of households,
with advice on the religious education of children, on the more sobering topic of the
death of a child and on family religion.\textsuperscript{40} The \textit{magnum opus} for this audience was
without doubt the \textit{Family Expositor}, which provided a fresh translation of the text of the
New Testament, mingled in with a fairly full paraphrase and an ‘Improvement’ of the
main teachings of the biblical text following each passage.\textsuperscript{41} The addition of technical
exegetical and other notes undoubtedly influenced the character of the work somewhat,
as John Taylor has argued, making it more attractive perhaps to ministers and other
learned people than to the laity.\textsuperscript{42} However, these aids were placed in footnotes below
the main text and were printed in a smaller font. The main body of the text reflects the
original purpose as an aid to family devotions. Concern for the family unit thus led
Doddridge to give a significant proportion of his time to these publications.

The third kind of audience which is perhaps most marked in Doddridge’s output
is that of children and young people. In total, eight of Doddridge’s published works,
appearing between 1735 and 1744, were directed specifically at this readership. These
include the \textit{Sermons to Young Persons} (1735) and the single sermon, \textit{The Care of the
Soul} (1735). In the following year, Doddridge produced a series of sermons, \textit{Ten
Sermons on the Power and Grace of Christ} (1736), which were ‘printed with a

\textsuperscript{40} Doddridge, \textit{Religious Education}; Doddridge, \textit{Submission}; Doddridge \textit{A Plain and Serious Address to
the Master of a Family, on the Important Subject of Family-Religion} (London: Printed and Sold by J.
Waugh, 1750).

\textsuperscript{41} Philip Doddridge, \textit{The Family Expositor: Or, a Paraphrase and Version of the New Testament. With
Critical Notes; and a Practical Improvement of Each Section}, 6 vols. (Vols. 1-2, London: Printed by John
Benefit of the Family, 1753; Vols. 5-6, London: Printed and Sold by J. Waugh, W. Fenner and J.
Buckland, 1756).

\textsuperscript{42} John H. Taylor, ‘Doddridge’s “Most Considerable Work”: “The Family Expositor”’, \textit{Journal of the
particular View to the Benefit of young Persons’ of his congregation, and at the end of that year, he preached the sermon, *Youth Reminded of Approaching Judgment* (1737). The first few years of the following decade saw further works aimed at the same audience: he wrote a preface to an anonymous work published in 1741, *The Friendly Instructor*, described as ‘a Companion for Young Ladies and Young Gentlemen’ and intended to instruct them in Christian piety; in 1743, he published a work which continued to be popular into the nineteenth century, *The Principles of the Christian Religion ... for the Use of Little Children*, and wrote a preface to *An Essay for Instructing Children* by John Vowler, a wealthy Exeter merchant and friend of Doddridge, finally, the *Rise and Progress* (1745), though expressly designed for a general audience, includes the text of a letter which Doddridge says that he wrote ‘many Years ago, to a young Person of eminent Piety’, to help him in living for Christ. Doddridge himself had benefited from a similar concern for young people on the part of his mentor, Samuel Clark. The Northampton minister recalls the Thursday evening young people’s meetings held in the St Albans pastor’s vestry ‘for Religions Conversations’ which went on ‘for many Years’. Thus a concern for the spiritual good of young people, passed down from the pastor of his own youth, occupied a significant amount of Doddridge’s time and energies.

---

Alan Everitt has argued that Philip Doddridge’s ministry was central to the beginnings of the evangelical revival which broke out in England in the middle of the fourth decade of the eighteenth century. He has shown the geographical and social breadth represented amongst those who subscribed to the *Family Expositor* and thus the potential of that work for the promotion of personal piety in a manner which could help further revival. The emphases that are apparent from this examination of the intended audiences for Doddridge’s publications support the argument, to be explored more fully in the next chapter, that Doddridge had as a deliberate aim the furtherance of revival and that he saw families, young people and an adequately trained ministry as fundamental to the promotion of true religion.

Doddridge had clear views about which subjects were and were not suitable for pulpit discourse, which he set out in his *Lectures on Preaching*. In essence, the topics which were to be preferred were the more affectionate and experiential subjects at the centre of the Christian faith: the person and grace of Christ, the elements of the covenant with believers, the Spirit and his operations, the privileges of believers and matters related to godly living and the afterlife. Subjects to be avoided were the more controversial points of doctrine: the Trinity, the union of the divine and human in the person of Christ and the ‘highest points of Calvinism’; natural religion and the evidences of Christianity; and overly emphatic denunciations of sin or depictions of the wrath and judgment of God. The themes which Doddridge instructed his student to favour in their preaching are reflected in his own published sermons. In the *Sermons to Young Persons* (1735), warnings of the dangers of wickedness (the subject of the third, sixth and seventh of the seven sermons) and exhortations to trust in Christ (in the second and fifth sermons) are prominent. The focus of the ten sermons on regeneration,

---

discussed above, is self-evidently on the personal spiritual standing of the individuals addressed. It is significant that Doddridge chose not to address this subject from a mainly doctrinal standpoint, but in terms of a personal appeal based on biblical exposition. With the exception of three sermons on the evidences of Christianity published in 1736 as part of a larger series, the themes which Doddridge advised his students to avoid do not form the focus of any of his published sermons.

The themes on which Doddridge chose to publish represent the central experiential truths of the Christian faith. He can thus be seen to exemplify two of the four characteristics of evangelicalism which David Bebbington has identified: crucicentrism (taking this to include doctrines closely associated with the death of Christ and not simply teaching focused solely on the cross) and conversionism (seen in his desire to persuade his hearers and readers to put their trust in Christ). These emphases were coupled with the biblicist tone of his output, as well as an activism evidenced by the particular audiences which he had in view in his publications, as discussed above. On this analysis, Doddridge is amongst the earliest of the figures who characterised the new evangelical movement which Bebbington identifies.

Finally, Doddridge had a keen sense of the importance of style in preaching. In his Lectures on Preaching, four lectures are devoted to questions of style: Tillotson has ‘an easiness in his style, and beautiful simplicity of expression’; Wilkins is ‘almost as easy and pure’; Manton is ‘plain, easy and unaffected’; Ward is ‘generally proper, elegant, and nervous’. The tutor exhorted his students to be ‘daily endeavouring to form a good style and address’, which for preaching meant being, among other things,

49 pp. 172-73.
50 Doddridge, Power and Grace.
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53 Doddridge, Lectures on Preaching, pp. 17, 18, 11, 8.
‘Intelligible and clear’; they should also be ‘Generally plain and always unaffected’ and should avoid ‘high swelling words of vanity’ and ‘bombast expressions’.

His views were summarised in a sermon preached at a ministers’ meeting in 1741, in which Doddridge advised his fellow-preachers, ‘Greater Plainness and Simplicity of Speech might often be more useful to the Bulk of our Auditory, and perhaps more acceptable too; and on the Whole, it might be at least equally beautiful.’

For Doddridge, it was the plain style that was best adapted to preaching.

This was not, for Doddridge, simply a matter of taste: sermons were to be preached so as to be understood by those who heard them and anything which might detract from that end was to be suppressed. He describes what he sees as the true preacher’s aim:

not … to dazzle and confound his Hearers with the Artifices of Speech, to give the Appearances of Truth to Falshood, and Importance to Trifles; but to teach them to weigh Things in an impartial Balance, and by the Words of Truth and Soberness, to lead them into the Paths of Wisdom and of Goodness.

To convey one’s message successfully to the audience’s understanding, however, it was necessary to take into account the intellectual capacity of one’s hearers. In his Sermons on the Religious Education of Children (1732), Doddridge admits in his preface his need to ‘bring down my Discourses to common Apprehensions’. This was something which his friend and mentor, Isaac Watts, had sought to impress upon Doddridge, especially in respect of the younger man’s work, The Rise and Progress (1745). Watts, having seen the manuscript, expressed his satisfaction that his friend had been ‘perswaded to reduce the Language into easier Words and plainer Periods’.

---
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58 Isaac Watts to Philip Doddridge, 10 April 1744, Yale University Library MSS, Osborn Collection (Nuttall, Calendar, Letter no. 963).
dedication to Watts at the start of the published version of the work, Doddridge indicates that he has sought to take the admonition to heart, declaring,

I have studied the greatest Plainness of Speech, that the lowest of my Readers may, if possible, be able to understand every Word ... I have been particularly obliged to my worthy Patron, for what he hath done to shorten some of the Sentences, and to put my Meaning into plainer and more familiar Words.59

The principle of adapting oneself to one’s hearers meant that the preacher should vary his mode of address according to the subject-matter and the audience: ‘Your style must vary with the variety of your subjects ... in some measure too according to your auditory’.60 For Doddridge, it was of the essence of good preaching that the preacher should adopt the style that would best enable him to reach the understanding of his hearers.

The desire to avoid an overly ornate manner of discourse in preaching was not new in eighteenth-century Dissent. Puritan preachers of the seventeenth century and, towards the end of that century, Latitudinarian divines in the Church of England had argued for plainness and clarity of communication, rather than the classical allusions, complex syntax and extensive use of figurative language which was felt to mark some preaching. This emphasis has often been often addressed in the secondary literature,61

59 Doddridge, Rise and Progress, pp. iii, xi.
60 Doddridge, Lectures on Preaching, p. 43.
leading Ian Green recently to argue for a more nuanced approach to the study of early modern sermons that goes beyond the dualistic “plain” versus “witty” stereotype.62 In the light of this comment, some further examination of Doddridge’s preaching style and the influences on him which contributed to it is required.

The Puritan model of preaching was strongly influenced by William Perkins’s seminal work, The Arte of Prophecying (1607), in which he stated his opposition to scholarly display in preaching:

_Humane wisedome must bee concealed … [T]he Minister may, yea and must priuatly vse at his libertie the artes, philosophie, and varietie of reading, whilst he is in framing his sermon: but he ought in publike to conceale all these from the people, and not to make the least ostentation._63

One who promoted this emphasis with enthusiasm was Richard Baxter who, in his well-known work on pastoral ministry, Gildas Salvianus (1656), insisted, ‘All our teaching must be as Plain and Evident as we can make it.’64 Reflecting also the principle of accommodation to one’s audience, Baxter stated, ‘He that would be understood, must speak to the capacity of his hearers, and make it his business to make himself understood.’65 Plainness was to be the hallmark of Puritan preaching.

---

62 Green, Continuity, p. 7.


65 Baxter, Gildas, p. 123.
This Puritan emphasis was maintained in the Church of England by the Latitudinarians. The first religious publication by John Wilkins (1614–72), a principal figure amongst Latitudinarian divines who ended his career as Bishop of Chester, was his *Ecclesiastes*, on the subject of preaching.66 In his discussion of ‘phrase’, by which he meant style of expression, Wilkins insisted, ‘It must be plain and naturall, not being darkned [sic] with the affectation of Scholasticall harshnesse, or Rhetoricall flourishes.’67 John Tillotson (1630–94), Archbishop of Canterbury under William III and executor of Wilkins’s will, became well-known for his plain style and the ‘clearness of expression’ of his preaching.68 In a discussion of the nature of justifying faith and the correct manner of preaching it, Tillotson says, ‘he that would teach men what faith is, he must first acquaint men with the thing, and describe it in as proper and simple words as can be, and not by figurative and metaphorical phrases’.69 Scripture metaphors needed to be explained by the use of ‘such phrases as people are more familiarly acquainted with, and are used in our own language’.70 The Latitudinarians were for plain speech in preaching, easily comprehensible to the hearers.

The emphasis on plain preaching is evident in early eighteenth-century Dissent. Introducing his first published work on the doctrine of the Trinity, Isaac Watts says that he has tried to use ‘such plain and easy Language, that every private Christian … may

---


In writing hymns for children, he sought ‘to sink the Language to the Level of a Child’s Understanding’. So far as Doddridge was concerned, an important intermediary for this style of preaching was his tutor, John Jennings. Very little of Jennings’s work survives, but his publications include two treatises on preaching, with a preface by Watts. In the first of these writings, Jennings echoes the by now familiar theme:

Let us deliver our Selves in a Style becoming the Gospel of Christ: Not with great swelling words of vanity ... but let us use great plainness of speech, and seek to find out such acceptable words, as may best reach the Understanding and Affections of the bulk of an Auditory.

The Puritan and Latitudinarian preference for clarity over rhetoric is fully reflected in the views of these eighteenth-century Dissenters.

In Jennings’s work on preaching, an additional stream of influence becomes evident, as he goes on to refer his readers to the work of the ‘Archbishop of Cambray’s Dialogues concerning Eloquence’, which he claims he is ‘as little capable of improving upon, as I am of commending them as they deserve’. This work of the Archbishop of Cambrai, François de Salignac de la Mothe-Fénelon (1651-1715), had been published in an English translation in 1722. Irène Simon has demonstrated how Fénelon, in
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76 François Fénelon, *Dialogues sur l’Éloquence en Général, et sur Celle de la Chaire en Particulier*, in Fénelon, *Oeuvres* (2 vols., J. Le Brun, ed.; n.p., Éditions Gallimard, 1983), Vol. 1, pp. 1-87; [François Fénelon], *Dialogues Concerning Eloquence in General; And Particularly, that Kind Which is Fit for the Pulpit: By the Late Archbishop of Cambray. With His Letter to the French Academy, Concerning Rhetoric, Poetry, History, and a Comparison betwixt the Antients and Moderns. Translated from the French, and Illustrated with Notes and Quotations; By William Stevenson, M. A., Rector of Morningthorp*
encouraging a style of preaching similar to that advocated by the Latitudinarians, was following in a tradition earlier established in France by Jacques-Benigne Bossuet (1627-1704) and, before him, François Bourgoing (1585-1662), Superior General of the Oratory of Port-Royal.77 Bossuet described Bourgoing’s approach to preaching thus: ‘l’éloquence suivait comme la servante, non recherchée avec soin, mais attirée par les choses mêmes’.78 Bossuet contrasted this style with more brilliant preaching, where ‘les oreilles sont flattées par la cadence et l’arrangement des parôles’.79 The French critique, referred to by Jennings, mirrored that of their English Latitudinarian contemporaries.

Jennings’s familiarity with the French tradition enabled him to include the language (despite his uncertainty about its pronunciation) in the tuition which he offered. Doddridge thus received instruction in it once a week for the first six months of his studies and twice a week for the remainder of the first year.80 Jennings successfully passed on to his more famous pupil a love and respect for French authors. Doddridge, like his tutor, recommended Fénelon’s Dialogues, ‘which may GOD put it into the Hearts of our Preachers often and attentively to read!’81 In a letter to his friend Obadiah
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80 [Philip Doddridge], ‘An Account of Mr Jennings’s Method of Academical Education with some Reflections upon it. In a Letter to a Friend who had some Thoughts of Reviving it. Written in the Year 1728’, University of London Library, MS 609, p. 6. Doddridge and his fellow-students learned French from their tutor ‘without regarding the punctuation, with which Mr. Jennings was not acquainted’, Humphreys, Correspondence, Vol. 2, pp. 462-75 (Nuttall, Calendar, Letter no. 190).
81 Philip Doddridge, The Family Expositor: Or, a Paraphrase and Version of the New Testament: With Critical Notes; And a Practical Improvement of Each Section, Vol. 2, Containing the Latter Part of the
Hughes, Doddridge comments freely on French authors: he admires Racine above all
their other dramatic poets: ‘It is impossible not to be charmed with the pomp, elegance,
and harmony of his language, as well as the majesty, tenderness, and propriety of his
sentiments.’82 Yet the interest shown by Jennings and Doddridge in French authors is
more than merely literary: as Jennings’s reference to Fénelon’s Dialogues Concerning
Eloquence indicates, they valued the writings of these men for what they had to teach on
the subject of preaching.

There were however tensions in Doddridge’s approach to style, in that he does
not appear always to adhere strictly to the tenets of plainness and simplicity. In the very
first sentence of the first of his Sermons to Young Persons, Doddridge has a quotation
from the Apocrypha and a reference to the Iliad; he uses phrases such as, ‘it has been
Matter of long Lamentation’ and speaks of ‘the most celebrated Writers of Antiquity’,
quoting Homer (again) and Horace (and supplying, in footnotes in the published edition,
the originals in Greek and Latin); he says, ‘We perceive not’, where ‘we do not see’
might have been more readily understood, and speaks of a ‘melancholy’, rather than
simply sad, occasion;83 the syntax is rather convoluted and sounds as if it has been
constructed at least in part to sound well and not simply so as to be easily understood: ‘I
will not say there is universal Cause for such an Application; but I am sure the Face of
Affairs in many Families, and may I not add in many Churches too, is abundantly
sufficient not only to excuse, but to vindicate it.’84 If the opening paragraphs of this
sermon as printed resemble what Doddridge actually preached, the young persons for
whom it was intended may have been somewhat puzzled about what was being said to
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83 Doddridge, Young Persons, p. 2.
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them. Doddridge’s failure to bring down the level of his speech to the capacity of his hearers had troubled Isaac Watts, who complained, ‘some of our Servants do not Understand your Writings when they are read in the Parlour, and scarcely when they read themselves’. Clearly, a ‘sinking’ style did not come easily to Doddridge.

It may be significant that most of the *Sermons to Young Persons* were preached quite early in Doddridge’s ministry, some years, it would seem, before he came to Northampton. By 1729, when he was on the verge of his move to that town, some progress seems to have been made, on the evidence of a sermon preached then but only published in 1748. In the dedication, Doddridge claims that the sermon was ‘plain’ and ‘destitute of almost every Charm that might recommend it to a modern Taste’. It is however not entirely free from complex sentences:

> I aim, in my present Discourse, not so much at enlightening the Understanding in the Evidence of a Doctrine so universally allowed amongst all professing Christians; as at affecting your Heart, and my own, with a Sense of what, even while we acknowledge, we are all so prone to forget.

Nor is he quite able to resist the high-flown simile, comparing David’s guilt to ‘an invenomed Arrow shot into his Soul, the Poison of which diffused itself through all his Veins, and even drank up the vital Spirits’. Nevertheless, the register is, on the whole, set at a rather lower level than that of the *Sermons to Young Persons*. This development seems to have continued, so that later sermons tend to be rather simpler in sentence structure and vocabulary: the sermon preached at Salters’ Hall following an earthquake in 1750 might, on account of the occasion, have been thought to merit a higher register of speech, but in fact the sentences tend to be fairly short, not overburdened with
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85 Isaac Watts to Philip Doddridge, 10 April 1744, Yale University Library MSS, Osborn Collection, (Nuttall, *Calendar*, Letter no. 963).
86 Doddridge, *Young Persons*, p. v.
subordinate clauses and free of classical quotations. Doddridge, then, seems to have learned in the early years of his ministry that he needed to accommodate his language more closely to that of his hearers and found that, at least to some extent, he was able to do so.

This development in his style may indicate, however, an underlying tension in Doddridge’s thinking which goes back to the days of his own studies. Under Jennings’s influence, he saw the value of a ‘plain, practical discourse’ and appreciated that this was the style of the ‘old puritans’. Yet he also admired good taste, hastening to assure his friend, ‘you must not imagine that I have entirely lost all relish for finer compositions’. Although Jennings was an advocate of a plain style, he was keen to introduce his students to current literary trends. Classics and ‘drama’, as well as French, were studied at his academy and extracts from the *Spectator* and *Tatler* were set for translation. Doddridge evinced a keen sensitivity to questions of literary style in his early correspondence, criticising a friend’s discourses because ‘his cadences are not very harmonious’, while admitting that his own ‘style is too much neglected’. He complains of his fellow-students that ‘most of them are perfect strangers to every thing that looks like good breeding and politeness’. To his brother-in-law, Doddridge comments that the Kibworth congregation, which had issued an invitation to him to be their minister, included ‘some very stupid people’ and ‘hardly any that know any thing of politeness’. Jennings perhaps realised that Doddridge’s attitudes in this area needed
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some correction, as he advised his student that the Kibworth position would benefit him, because it would ‘do more towards making [him] a useful and popular preacher than the polite society of larger places’. Doddridge, though, clearly felt, at least as a young man, a tension between politeness and usefulness as a preacher.

Some care is needed in assessing the evidence quoted above, as those through whom it has been mediated had a clear interest in portraying their subject as a cultivated member of polite society. Job Orton’s account of Doddridge’s classical studies under Jennings is fairly plain, Orton contenting himself with the remark that such studies laid a foundation for ‘Solidity, Strength and Correctness, both of Sentiment and Style’. Andrew Kippis, however, another former student of Doddridge, deals with the same topic in a rather more fulsome manner:

By forming his taste upon the great models of antiquity, to which he added an acquaintance with the polite writers of his own country, he acquired an ease and elegance of stile which he would not otherwise have attained. His merit was the greater in this respect, as few of the Dissenters had hitherto cultivated the graces of composition, and perhaps not many of them had excelled even in the perspicuity and correctness of their language.

Doddridge’s cultural attainments were to be presented as something special. The Doddridge which his eighteenth- and early nineteenth-century biographers wanted to present was learned, cultured and ‘polite’.

Nevertheless, the evidence of Doddridge’s own early preaching, cited earlier, is consistent with the evidence available for Doddridge’s interests and studies as a

96 Philip Doddridge to John Nettleton, 11 April 1723, Humphreys, Correspondence, Vol. 1, pp. 218-19 (Nuttall, Calendar, Letter no. 58).
97 [Orton], Memoirs, p. 16.
98 Andrew Kippis, ‘The Life of Dr Doddridge’, in Philip Doddridge, The Family Expositor: Or, a Paraphrase and Version of the New Testament; With Critical Notes, and a Practical Improvement of Each Section. Volume the First ... The Seventh Edition (London: Printed for T. Longman et al., 1792), p. xviii; see also Kippis’s further comments, p. xxiii, assuring his readers that Doddridge, during his time at Kibworth, ‘did not discontinue his regard to polite literature’; Kippis describes Doddridge’s preaching at this time as ‘judicious, and frequently elegant’ and ‘at the same time, plain and easy to be understood’, p. xxv.
99 pp. 188-89.
young man. Furthermore, although the tension can be seen to have been resolved to some extent in his preaching in the direction of usefulness rather than literary show, the question of politeness was still alive during his Northampton ministry. Orton relates that Doddridge required his students to study classics and that ‘Polite Literature’ was ‘by no means neglected’. Indeed, the latter subject was considered necessary, affirms Orton, to ensure that the students ‘might be qualified to appear with Esteem and Honour in the World, and preside over politer Societies with Acceptance’. Confirming this assessment, Doddridge himself describes how a former student at the Northampton Academy, in the course of his studies there, ‘did not despise any Part of polite Literature, which seemed subservient to his honourable Appearance in the Ministry in so learned an Age and Country as our own’. Thus even in his mature ministry, Doddridge continued to place value on polite forms of speech in preaching, whilst, it would seem, consciously seeking to subordinate these concerns to the requirements of plainness and simplicity.

The aim of the plain style, properly accommodated to the ability of the hearers, was not simply to inform or even to persuade the mind. Doddridge’s ultimate objective was the heart. The mind had to be addressed, for it was through that medium that the passions were stirred - influence over the latter was not to be sought directly; but the mind was not the final target of true preaching: ‘nor can I imagine it would bode well to the Interest of Religion in general, to endeavour to lay all those Passions asleep, which surely were implanted in our Hearts by God to subserve the religious as well as civil Life’. The passions are ‘the sails of the soul. -- The preacher must endeavour to fill
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them with a prosperous wind.’ Job Orton speaks of the ‘Earnestness and Pathos’ in Doddridge’s own preaching, which ‘tended greatly to affect his Hearers’. However, preachers must take great care not to bypass the understanding: ‘I hope I shall always remember how unworthy the Character of a Man and a Christian it is, to endeavour to transport Mens Passions, while the Understanding is left uninformed, or the Judgment unconvinced.’ Equally, the preacher must be cautious lest his own emotions are overly affected and he ‘appear ridiculous’ to his hearers. Nevertheless, in Doddridge’s view, the preacher must move his hearers as well as inform them, if he is to provoke them to action.

Doddridge’s approach to preaching, however, required something more even than a moving of the affections. For Doddridge, what was needed was a wholesale inward change brought about by the grace of God through regeneration. Given that the exercise of such grace was beyond human control, the question might arise as to what the point of preaching was at all: the preacher may be able to inform the mind of the relevant truths and move the passions to some kind of response, but how precisely does the act of preaching relate to a divine intervention upon which the outcome exclusively hangs? Some clue to how Doddridge saw this is given towards the end of one of the Sermons to Young Persons, where he pleads with his hearers their need to ‘learn our Duty and our Wisdom’; he urges them, not merely to reform themselves or increase in understanding, but to remember that the Success depends upon a divine Co-operation, and therefore go frequently into the Presence of GOD by Prayer; ... importunately intreat the regenerating and sanctifying Influences of his Spirit.
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One outcome for which the preacher may hope, therefore, is that his hearers may be
driven to prayer. Yet an even tighter connection between the preacher’s task and the
work of God appears to be assumed when Doddridge, in one of the *Regeneration*
sermons, speaks of

> those *sharp-pointed Arrows*, which I am now drawing out of the
> *Quiver of GOD*’ in the hope that some of them ‘may, by the Direction
> of his Spirit, *enter the Reins* of some against whom they are levelled,
> and convince them of the *absolute Necessity* of an entire *Change* in
> their *Hearts*.\(^9\)

In a subsequent sermon in the same series, the preacher’s work and God’s work appear
to be almost identified: ‘*Evangelical Subjects*, when opened with *Perspicuity*, and
inforced with *Vigour* and *Tenderness* ... are generally the *Occasion* of producing the
most immediate, and the most important *Change*’;\(^10\) and, in the same sermon: ‘the
*Reading*, and especially the *Preaching of the Word*, is the grand *Occasion* and
*Instrument* in the *Conversion* of Souls’.\(^11\) On Doddridge’s analysis, preaching does not
simply move to action, even to the action of prayer: it becomes itself God’s instrument
in the great transforming act of conversion.

> It is here that a difference of emphasis from the *Latitudinarian* approach is plain.

John Wilkins, in the 1675 edition of his *Ecclesiastes*, speaks of

> *The great End of Preaching, being either to inform or perswade;*
> *This may be most effectually done by such rational ways of*
> *Explication and Confirmation, as are most fit and proper to satisfie*
> *mens judgments and consciences*.\(^12\)

Emotions were not neglected: Tillotson’s biographer, in his second edition of his work,
said of his subject’s preaching: ‘his arguments of persuasion were strong and nervous,

\(^12\) VWilkins, *Ecclesiastes*, ‘To the Reader’, A5.
and tended to gain the affections by the understanding’. However, the affections tended not to be the principal or ultimate objective. For the Latitudinarian, the important thing on the whole was to reach the understanding; for the Dissenter, by contrast, the understanding was only a means to a higher end.

For the Latitudinarian, the main aim of preaching was moral change, an attitude summed up by Jonathan Swift: ‘the two principal Branches of Preaching, are first to tell the People what is their Duty, and then to convince them that it is so’. Tillotson believed that the preacher was required to demonstrate that the religious duties of man were reasonable and to give him sufficient motivation to obey them. In one of his most popular sermons, ‘The Precepts of Christianity not grievous’, Tillotson has three propositions:

1. That the Laws of God are reasonable, that is, suitable to our nature and advantageous to our interest. 2. That we are not destitute of sufficient power and ability for the performance of them. And 3. That we have the greatest encouragements to this purpose.

For Tillotson, then, the work of preaching was primarily intellectual and motivational, the power to change lying within the native ability of the hearers.

There has been a tendency in the secondary literature to assume that the more moralistic preaching of this kind dominated the English pulpit in the first part of the eighteenth century prior to the revivals under Whitefield and Wesley, to the exclusion of all else. James Downey argued that, ‘until after 1740, rational, ethical homiletics had only one competitor for pulpit priority, and that was polemical preaching’; by 1723, he says, with the banishment of Francis Atterbury for Jacobite conspiracy, ‘much of the
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force of polemical preaching had been spent’; and so: ‘The years 1720-40 are the period of greatest vogue for Tillotsonian theology and ethical preaching.’ Horton Davies asserts that preaching, both Anglican and Dissenting, became ‘more like discourses or essays than prophetic proclamations or learned lectures’. The focus was on morality, rather than faith. Rolf Lessenich took a similar line: preachers on all sides of the doctrinal and denominational divides ‘united their strength in a joint oratorical crusade against vice, the common enemy of human happiness and social order’. More recently, Isabel Rivers has emphasised what these authors have not, that, even prior to the revivals, there was amongst Dissenters preaching which sought to move the passions as well as to inform the mind. The above analysis vindicates this conclusion, but also takes it forward, showing that, for Doddridge, preaching was the instrument in God’s hand for effecting the divine work of regeneration in the human heart.

If this aspect of Doddridge’s approach to preaching distinguishes him from the Latitudinarians, it places him firmly in the Puritan tradition. In 1723, the year in which John Jennings died, two discourses of his were published together which consciously identify this distinctive strand of preaching as one rooted in Puritanism. The publication begins with two quotations from seventeenth-century divines, the first from the funeral sermon for Thomas Jacombe preached by William Bates on 3 April 1687, the second from Richard Baxter. Jacombe (1623/4-1687), a friend of Baxter, and Bates had both been ejected from their respective livings in the established church in 1662. Jennings quotes Bates emphasising the need for a supernatural, fundamental change in heart rather than mere moral instruction:

116 Downey, Eighteenth Century Pulpit, pp. 17, 19.
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120 Jennings, Two Discourses.
His [Jacombe’s] Design was to convince Sinners of their absolute Want of Christ ... [T]he laying down of moral Rules for the Exercise of Virtue, and subduing vicious Affections, without directing Men to derive spiritual Strength by Prayer, and in the Use of Divine Ordinances, from the Mediator the Fountain of all Grace; and without representing his Love as the most powerful Motive and Obligation to Obedience, is but pure Philosophy, and the highest Effect of it is but unregenerate Mortality [sic].121

The misprint in the final word (which of course reads ‘Morality’ in the original) is unfortunate, for the whole point of the quotation is to distinguish preaching which brings about the effects of which it speaks, by the power of Christ, from that which produces mere ‘unregenerate morality’.122

The second quotation at the beginning of Jennings’s work is from Baxter’s Gildas Salvianus. It is shorter and emphasises simply: ‘All our Work must be done spiritually’. Again, the stress is on the supernatural, for Baxter contrasts this way of working with those men in whom ‘this sacred Tincture is so wanting, that even when they speak of Spiritual Things, the manner is such as if they were common Matters’.123

The quotations are followed by a preface by Isaac Watts, in which he asks, ‘Have not some of us spent our Labour to build them [the hearers] up in the Practice of Duties, without teaching them to search whether the Foundation has been laid in an entire Change and Renovation of Heart?’124 The same point is found in the discourses themselves. Jennings states that one of the responsibilities of the preacher is to ‘quicken the Saints to Duty’, by demonstrating that ‘tis not outward Reformation that will stand the Test in the Day of Judgment, but an inward Renewal of the Soul’.125 Doddridge, then, is standing in a tradition which self-consciously locates itself in seventeenth-
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century Puritan preaching, in which preaching was seen not merely as the means to convey truth to the intellect and to stir people to action through the passions, but as the instrument in God’s hands to achieve in the hearer that spiritual awakening which was itself the subject of the preaching.

Under the influence of the seventeenth-century Puritans, reinforced by the approach of the Latitudinarians later in that century, a plain style in preaching had become the accepted norm in Dissent as well as in the established church. In the preaching of the Latitudinarians, this plain style became the means for propagating a message of the reasonableness of the Christian religion: people could be persuaded by rational argument to believe the truths of Christianity and also to obey its precepts. The affections were not ignored, but they did not have the first place in these preachers’ estimation: that went to the intellect, which mattered above all. The Dissenters of the early eighteenth century who followed in the tradition laid down by Baxter, Watts and Jennings were, like the Latitudinarians, fully persuaded of the need for a plain style in preaching, but differed fundamentally from their establishment counterparts in the emphasis of the content of their preaching. They addressed the mind, not as an end in itself but as a means to reach the affections which they regarded as the key to human motivation; and those, in turn, could only be truly brought into a state where they would submit to Christ’s laws by means of a supernatural inward change. Preaching, on this view, could even be seen as a channel for the exercise of God’s renewing power.

Philip Doddridge’s published output reveals a clear preference for an oral style of communication designed to communicate his message to a broad range of audiences. He demonstrates a particular desire to reach young people, heads of household and those either in or training for ministry. The subjects which he addressed in his writings evince a concern to inculcate Christian piety in the daily lives of his readers, to
encourage the education of the young in the truths of the Christian faith, to assist heads of household to conduct family worship and to help provide for a trained ministry. He tended to avoid controversial subjects and to focus on central Christians truths, his writings being distinguished particularly by his emphasis upon regeneration as the fundamental initial Christian experience. He preferred the mode of biblical rather than doctrinal exposition to communicate truth and favoured the personal, sermonic approach to the more confrontational polemical method adopted by some others. He is thus a good exemplar, at an early stage, of the four characteristics of evangelicalism identified by David Bebbington. Although a large degree of continuity can be demonstrated, for all these characteristics, with seventeenth-century Puritanism, they appear to be a particularly pronounced feature of Doddridge’s ministry.

In his style, Doddridge aimed for plainness and simplicity, again in line with Puritan, as well as later Latitudinarian, principles, though there was some tension in Doddridge, particularly in his earlier years, between that approach and the contemporary expectations of politeness of style. His tutor, John Jennings, was particularly influential in mediating to him both the Puritan plainness and the more contemporary concern for politeness, as well as introducing him to French homiletic models. Style was not an end in itself: the objective of preaching and other modes of communication was to inform the mind with Christian truth and stir the passions so as to transform understanding into action. Like the Puritans of the previous century, Doddridge believed that it was this mode and style of communication which would ultimately effect the kind of spiritual transformation in his audiences which would lead to a revival of true religion.
Chapter 8

Identity

Throughout his life, Philip Doddridge identified himself firmly with the Dissenting cause, yet Dissent in Doddridge’s time was not monolithic: there were distinct tendencies within it. Historians have generally identified two wings of Dissent at this time, the one holding to an orthodox, Calvinist theology, the other taking a more liberal approach which valued reason and freedom of enquiry, nurtured a deep suspicion of creeds and confessions and was uncomfortable with traditional Calvinist doctrine and trinitarian theology. The former party has often been denominated by the secondary literature ‘evangelical’ or ‘orthodox’, while the latter has been referred to as ‘liberal’ or ‘rational’ and sometimes ‘heterodox’. The division has sometimes been seen as reflecting, at least to some extent, denominational differences, with the Independents favouring the more orthodox, evangelical approach and the Presbyterians the rational. Generally, the narrative has been one of the decline of Dissent, the causes of which have been variously identified as internal strife, arid orthodoxy, dry rationalism, the advance of heterodox belief and the onset of the evangelical revival under Whitefield and the Wesley brothers. Rational Dissent is seen as developing in the second half of the century into fully-fledged Socinianism and finally Unitarianism, with the orthodox wing of Dissent superseded by the evangelical revival.¹

Within this state of affairs, Philip Doddridge has usually been seen as a beacon of light, one of the few rays of hope for the Old Dissent, cut off prematurely by his

early death in 1751. A favourite metaphor to describe him is that of a bridger of gaps. Geoffrey Nuttall and Johannes van den Berg, in their assessment of Doddridge and his relationship with the Netherlands, describe him as the promoter of a moderate tradition which ‘could bridge the gap between rigid Calvinism and more enlightened thinking’.2 Jeremy Goring describes him as the leader of the moderate party within Dissent, in succession to Edmund Calamy: ‘Throughout his life he tried ... to steer a middle course between the strict orthodoxy of most Baptists and Independents and the heterodoxy which was claiming an ever increasing number of Presbyterians.’3 Michael Watts sees Doddridge as the propagator of the liberal tradition of free enquiry in his academy, whilst remaining free from the taint of heterodoxy in his theology, an approach which eventually, according to Watts, won the day for an orthodox Independency.4 Doddridge’s appeal to a wide range of different theological positions is understood by R. K. Webb as ‘a real, if increasingly unequal struggle between his Calvinism, moderate though it was, and his rationality, and between his rationality and his piety’, as he sought to keep together the increasingly divided wings of Dissent.5 Isabel Rivers understands Doddridge, with Isaac Watts, as the men ‘who tried to balance the rational and evangelical tendencies of dissent’, ‘moderates’ who ‘attempted to bridge’ the opening gulf between the ‘rationalist’ and orthodox wings of Dissent.6 Some have seen the middle position which evangelical moderatism sought to uphold as inherently unstable, resulting in an increasing number of defections from Dissent to the established church.7 Doddridge, on this account, is the man of moderation who sought to bring and

5 Webb, ‘Emergence’, p. 36.
hold together two centrifugal tendencies within Dissent, without committing himself entirely to either of them.

The premise that there was, in Doddridge’s time, a ‘rational’ wing of Dissent distinguished primarily by a commitment to liberty of conscience, an opposition to the language of creeds and confessions and the importance of reason in the formation of religious belief needs first to be tested. Liberty of conscience was a fundamental Dissenting principle: believers should be free to determine for themselves what the Bible required them to believe as well as the manner in which they were to worship and serve God. There has been a tendency in the secondary literature, however, to conflate the issue of liberty of conscience with the issues of subscription to confessions and the authority of the Bible, with the consequence that those Dissenters who supported the use of confessions as a test of faith have been assumed to be less supportive of liberty of conscience and of supreme biblical authority. So according to Jeremy Goring it was the Arminians who ‘had long been saying – that Scripture, and Scripture alone, provided men with all that was essential for salvation’.  

8 Isabel Rivers, in common with others, identifies ‘liberty of thought and conscience’ as one of the characteristic emphases of the ‘rational’, as opposed to the ‘evangelical’, wing of Dissent.  

9 It may be questioned, however, whether either a belief in the sole sufficiency of scripture, as against confessions, or the advocacy of liberty of conscience is in fact an adequate identifying characteristic of a particular wing of Dissent. Abraham Taylor, who directed an academy contemporary with Doddridge’s and who required his students to subscribe a confession of faith, held that ‘the meanest and most ignorant’ in a congregation ‘must judge for themselves in the best manner they can, and, with the Bereans, search the
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scriptures daily, whether the things they hear are so’.

Taylor held liberty of conscience to be fundamental to the Dissenting position, confessing that the ‘principle of liberty for every man to form his own sentiments, and pursue them by all lawful and regular methods; to disclaim the impositions of men, and to worship God according to the dictates of his own conscience is very dear to me’. Thomas Bradbury, who took the subscribers’ side at Salters’ Hall, declared that it is both the ‘Duty and Glory of a People to break any Yoke that’s hung upon their Liberty’. The examples of Taylor and Bradbury throw considerable doubt on the proposition that scripture sufficiency and liberty of conscience are adequate distinguishing marks of a ‘rational’ wing of Dissent.

It is the contention of this chapter that, although Doddridge’s personal relationships spanned a variety of doctrinal positions, he should be regarded, not as a bridge between two wings of Dissent, but as a leader and promoter of a particular tendency within it, a tendency which can be characterised by reference to the issues of theology, subscription, ecclesiology, social and national involvement, international links and revival. Each of these will be considered in turn, beginning with theological issues.

Accounts of Doddridge in the secondary literature tend to give the impression that, in terms of his relations with other Christians, theological issues were of relatively low importance. The ability to cultivate and maintain good relations with Christians of a variety of denominational and theological commitments is, in the secondary literature,
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one of the hallmarks of Philip Doddridge’s character. Roger Thomas wrote of the Northampton minister’s ‘catholicism, ... his wide inclusive tolerance’, Geoffrey Nuttall of his ‘eagerness for Christian association and unity beyond the bounds of Independency’. Nuttall, in his study of Richard Baxter and Doddridge, identifies the motives undergirding this cordiality of spirit as ‘an eagerness for Christian unity, a consequent impatience with the doctrinal phrases and tests which divide, and a concern rather for the “Heart-work and Heaven-work” which already unite in Christian experience’.

In Nuttall’s view, Doddridge’s idea of Christian unity was one which overlooked theological differences because it was rooted, not in doctrinal uniformity, but in a common inward spiritual experience, and in this respect, Nuttall argues, Philip Doddridge was the heir of Richard Baxter. Similarly, Roger Thomas holds that Doddridge, though he had clear theological convictions of his own, was a man of an ‘undogmatic temper of mind’. This view of Doddridge is well established in the secondary literature.

However, it is argued that Doddridge’s inclusive attitude to relationships reveals only one side of his view of contemporary Dissent, for although he kept up a wide correspondence and sought to avoid polemics, Philip Doddridge did identify himself with a tendency within Dissent which was narrower than the circle of his correspondence and relationships might indicate and which is defined, at least in part, by reference to theological issues. These issues have been inadequately explored: closer attention to them will help explain some anomalies which otherwise arise and will give a more accurate picture of where Doddridge stood within Dissent.

Theological issues were certainly to the forefront in Doddridge’s dealings with the Deists. Those who denied that God continually exercised a providential care for his creation had to be opposed, in Doddridge’s view, and so in 1742 and 1743 he published a threefold answer to a 1741 tract, *Christianity Not Founded on Argument*, the work of the Deist, Henry Dodwell (1706-84). In his reply, Doddridge exerts his intellectual powers to refute his opponent’s arguments, which Doddridge considers tends ‘to subvert the Faith of Christians, and to expose the Gospel to the last Degree of Contempt’. This is strong language for Doddridge; it indicates that Doddridge wished to situate his opponent well outside the pale of the Christian faith. The Deist contention that the Christian faith is not susceptible to defence by reasonable argument cannot, for Doddridge, go unchallenged. Doddridge also uses strong language of Roman Catholicism, whether considered religiously or politically:

> If Popery be consider’d in a religious View, it must appear the just Object of our Contempt, as well as our Abhorrence; but if we regard it as a political Contrivance, to gratify the Avarice, and Ambition of the Clergy, it will appear very artfully adapted to answer that End.

He could speak of the ‘Errors of Popery’ and of the ‘bloody and relentless Rage of *Popish Superstition*’. Doddridge would thus have nothing to do with either group and goes to considerable lengths to distance himself from them both: he is clearly of the
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view that the differences between him and them go deeper than those which subsist between Christians of differing opinions on matters of doctrine or practice.

However, for Doddridge, clear boundaries also need to be drawn between Protestant Christians where significant doctrinal questions are at stake. So in 1737, he refused his pulpit to James Foster (1697-1753), a Baptist minister in Exeter, even though it appears that he had previously agreed to Foster’s preaching for him. Foster had published his *Essay on Fundamentals* in 1720, arguing that trinitarian doctrine was not essential to the Christian faith. He is listed as a ‘Socinian Baptist’ in a survey of London ministers. His heterodox views on the subject of the Trinity would appear to lie behind Doddridge’s decision to keep him from preaching to the congregation at Castle Street, even though Foster’s views were well-known and had not previously, it seems, prevented Doddridge from allowing Foster to preach for him. Samuel Clark on this occasion took issue with Doddridge over the younger man’s behaviour towards Foster, warning against giving ‘any countenance to that narrow spirit which has done so much mischief in the Christian church!’ Clark identifies differences about ‘trinitarian’ and ‘calvinistical’ sentiments as those, among others, which should not give rise to exclusions from pulpits. Doddridge appears to have been of a different view, on this occasion, from his esteemed mentor and, indeed, seems to have taken a stricter position than he had previously adopted with regard to Foster. This change of attitude perhaps indicates a hardening of his views in an orthodox direction, since the early years of his ministry. This aspect of Doddridge’s conduct has tended to be downplayed
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in the secondary literature and historians have found it difficult to account for, Roger
Thomas accusing Doddridge of moving ‘far ... from his own principles’ and describing
the exclusion of Foster as ‘out of character’. The evidence would rather suggest that
Doddridge acted in the belief that some doctrines had to be defended, amongst them
central aspects of orthodox trinitarianism.

There were other theological issues between professing Christians which, in
Doddridge’s view, were serious enough to prevent full fellowship. Doddridge’s series of
sermons on regeneration, preached and then published in the context of a controversy
over that subject and the doctrine of original sin, has already been discussed. Clear
lines, for Doddridge, had to be marked out when central points of Christian doctrine
such as these were challenged. Similarly, when the Moravian movement developed an
antipathy to the sacraments, perhaps with antinomian tendencies, causing, it seems,
some of Doddridge’s own congregation to withdraw and join the local Moravian
meeting, his initial warmth towards them turned to outright opposition. Doddridge’s
aversion to published polemics should not mask the clear action he was prepared to take
to distance himself from those propounding views which he believed were opposed to
essential points of Christian doctrine.

The question of how and to whom the gospel of Christ may be freely preached
became a matter of controversy in Dissent with the publication in 1737 of A Modern
Question Modestly Answer’d by Matthias Maurice (1684-1738), who had until 1736
been minister at the Dissenting meeting in Rothwell, Northamptonshire. In this work,
the author affirms that ‘God does by his Word plainly and plentifully make it the Duty

23 Thomas, ‘Doddridge’, p. 149.
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of unconverted Sinners, who hear the Gospel, to believe in Christ.\textsuperscript{26} Maurice was answered in 1738 by Lewis Wayman, who denied that the unconverted could be under any obligation to have a saving interest in Christ. Doddridge did not publish anything in the controversy, but did take other action which indicates the significance which he placed upon it. A regular lecture had been established at Brigstock, a town about eight miles east of Kettering. John Brine (1703-65), native of Kettering and Baptist minister at Curriers’ Hall, Cripplegate, from about 1730, recounts that a dispute had broken out over this lecture, concerning the ‘Manner of addressing Sinners, with Relation to evangelical Repentance, and special Faith in Christ’.\textsuperscript{27} Brine, evidencing the high Calvinist view which he espoused, affirmed,

\begin{quote}
Some of the Lecturers were of Opinion, that special Faith is the immediate Duty of unregenerate Persons, who hear the Gospel. Others of them, apprehended, that unregenerate Persons are not bound to exercise this special Faith in Christ.\textsuperscript{28}
\end{quote}

As a result, continued Brine, ‘another Lecture was opened by Dr. Doddridge, who is well known for his remarkable Candour of Temper, and Catholic Sentiments’.\textsuperscript{29} The question whether unbelievers were under a duty to exercise saving faith in Christ, which Brine denied and Doddridge affirmed, thus represented another point of theology on which Doddridge believed that he had to make a stand. There were thus a number of doctrinal issues, controverted amongst Protestant Dissenters, on which Philip Doddridge believed that a stand had to be taken, in particular when they concerned
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central matters of Christian doctrine and practice such as the Trinity, original sin, regeneration, the sacraments and the manner of preaching the gospel to unbelievers. On these issues, Doddridge was prepared to express his differences from others and, if necessary, to separate from them.

In an examination of Doddridge’s position within Dissent, attention needs to be paid to the identity of the individuals with whom he associated most closely. Had he truly acted as a bridge between the evangelical and ‘rational’ wings of Dissent, as the secondary literature to date has tended to argue, he might be expected to have enjoyed equally cordial relations with individuals from each of those wings. That is not, however, the picture which the evidence provides. His most frequent and friendliest correspondence, of that which remains, is with those who shared his concern for central evangelical doctrines: in addition to his mentors Isaac Watts and Samuel Clark, these included John Barker, a Presbyterian minister some years his senior, and Samuel Wood, a former pupil who ministered in East Anglia. Nuttall’s Calendar includes fifty-two letters with Barker and twenty-nine with Wood, more than with any other minister save Watts and Clark.30 Both men held the same central evangelical views as Doddridge. In Norfolk, Doddridge was close to others beside Wood. He kept in touch with Thomas Scott, Independent minister in Norwich, and with Richard Frost, minister at Great Yarmouth, visiting them and preaching for them on his journeys into East Anglia.31 In London, the people whom Doddridge visited and dined with included the Independent minister David Jennings, the historian Daniel Neal and his son Nathaniel, a lawyer, and the publisher Robert Cruttenden. All these preached or published views of Christianity

30 Geoffrey F. Nuttall, Philip Doddridge: Additional Letters ... (London: Dr Williams’s Trust, 2001) lists a further three with Barker.
31 See Samuel Wood’s diary mentioning Doddridge’s visits to preach on, for example, 3, 4 & 13 July 1744, ‘Extracts from the Journal of a Suffolk Minister’, The Congregational Magazine n.s. 10 (1834), p. 723.
and of Dissent which Doddridge shared: his circle of close associates thus manifested a common commitment to central evangelical doctrines.

By contrast, Doddridge did not maintain close relations with those who did not share those convictions: his correspondence in 1741 and 1742 with Samuel Bourn, who regarded Christ as subordinate to the Father and criticised Doddridge’s *Family Expositor* for being inconsistent and ambiguous on this issue, was frosty, Doddridge suggesting that Bourn’s letter effectively questioned the Northampton minister’s honesty. Jeremy Goring, seeking to identify a nascent ‘liberal’ party in Dissent from 1730, names Samuel Chandler, Nathaniel Lardner, Moses Lowman, Jeremiah Hunt, George Benson, John Brekell and Josiah Owen as putative members of it. Doddridge, however, counted none of these men amongst his circle of close associates and, in his extant correspondence, there are letters only to Chandler, thanking him in 1733 for his help with the prosecution brought against Doddridge in his early years at Northampton, and, from 1741 until his death in 1751, with Lardner, which, though not unfriendly, remained at the formal level. These were not men with whom Doddridge regularly associated, in the way that he did with Watts, the Neals, Jennings and others. Goring

---


takes the author of a 1732 survey of London ministers to task for placing Isaac Watts amongst the Calvinists, rather than, as Goring argues he should have done, amongst the middle way men with those ‘of doubtful orthodoxy’ such as Jeremiah Hunt. A more persuasive line would have been to take the 1732 survey as simply reflecting the reality of personal associations, based on a common, orthodox evangelical theology, which saw Watts, and Doddridge, meeting regularly the ‘strict Calvinists’ Bradbury and Guyse and having little to do with the ‘liberals’ with whom Goring would prefer them to have been placed.\(^{36}\) The tendency to which Doddridge belonged was not liberal, but clearly and self-consciously evangelical in its theology.

Attitudes to subscription to creeds and confessions formed a significant dividing line within Dissent during Doddridge’s lifetime. It has been seen already that he himself took a clear position on the issue, against the imposition of creeds and confessions as a test of orthodoxy.\(^{37}\) That this was an important dividing line for him within Dissent can be seen from his comments on those to whom he sometimes referred as the ‘rigidly orthodox’ and whom he regarded as guilty of ‘bigotry’. Those who espouse bigotry, according to Doddridge, are also fellow-Christians who are to be treated as such, with Christian love, and who, where possible, should be reasoned with, from scripture, in an attempt to bring about a unity of view.\(^{38}\) Nevertheless, Doddridge is capable of speaking sharply about them. In 1733, he referred in correspondence to pupils of another academy as ‘some of our high orthodox people’ who had subjected Doddridge to a ‘very furious and severe attack’.\(^{39}\) Doddridge’s concern here centres not so much upon theological substance as on questions of attitudes. Some subscriptionists could be


\(^{37}\) See above, pp. 112-13.


\(^{39}\) Philip Doddridge to John Barker, [August 1733], Humphreys, Correspondence, Vol. 3, p. 207 (Nuttall, Calendar, Letter no. 390). The academy concerned, at Moorfields, was run by Thomas Ridgley.
so attached to confessional language, in Doddridge’s view, that they would reject those who did not express themselves in that language, even though they might share a similar theology. Such people thereby transgressed one of the cardinal principles on which Doddridge has been seen to conduct himself, that of charity towards those from whom he differed. Such people were not to be treated as outside the Christian fold; nevertheless, Doddridge did not wish to be identified closely with them. Attitudes to subscription thus formed one of the dividing lines marking the position with which Doddridge identified himself within Dissent.

Ecclesiologically, Philip Doddridge was a Dissenter, an obvious point which has two implications of significance for the argument of this chapter. Firstly, it demonstrates that a distinction needs to be drawn between, on the one hand, Doddridge’s ability, much noted in the secondary literature, to maintain cordial relations with members of the establishment and, on the other, the identification of those with whom he formed close relationships and with whom he sought to work in order to promote a particular cause. Although he recognised that he had much in common with a churchman such as William Warburton, with whom he maintained a regular correspondence, he made no attempt to work with him in the way that he did with his Dissenting associates. Secondly, Doddridge’s position on this question was rather different from that of Richard Baxter, with whom he has been compared for their apparently similar views of unity, referred to above. As Paul Lim has shown, Baxter was strongly anti-separatist in his ecclesiology: his ideal was a parish congregation and he consistently resisted the creation of a conventicle within it. Baxter’s separation from the establishment in 1662, following his failed attempts to achieve comprehension, was reluctant, forced upon him unwillingly by his conscience.

---

40 p. 118.
Doddridge, by contrast, was no reluctant Dissenter, although he would no doubt have welcomed closer relationships with the establishment, whether through comprehension or some form of mutual recognition of ministers, as he himself discussed with the Archbishop of Canterbury on one occasion.  

Thus whereas Baxter advocated occasional conformity, Doddridge (though not adamant on the matter) viewed it as generally contrary to the Dissenting interest. As Martin Sutherland has argued, Baxter was concerned for the visible unity of the church, this unity to take the form preferably of a national ecclesia. By contrast, John Howe, the subject of Sutherland’s study, focused his ecclesiology primarily on the invisible church. As Sutherland says, Doddridge was in this respect far more similar to Howe than to Baxter, something which the secondary literature has previously failed to recognise (due, perhaps, in Sutherland’s term, to the ‘Baxterisation’ of Dissenting history at this point). Although Doddridge set a high price on charity between professing Christians, he was not overly concerned with engineering institutional unity. He was happy to correspond on friendly terms with churchmen and could discuss ecumenical schemes with archbishops when occasion presented itself, but he knew himself to be a Dissenter and with that, unlike Baxter, he was quite content.

Within Dissent, the secondary literature has tended to emphasise denominational labels as important dividing lines. The three denominations of Presbyterian, Independent and Baptist are given prominence both by histories which focus on one or other of them in particular as well as by those, such as Michael Watts’s *The Dissenters*,

---

42 John Barker to Philip Doddridge, 2 February 1748, Westminster College, Cambridge, United Reformed Church History Society MSS (Nuttall, *Calendar*, Letter no. 1314); Philip to Mercy Doddridge, 4 August 1748, DWL, New College Library MSS L1/1/102 (Nuttall, *Calendar*, Letter no. 1377).

43 Richard Baxter, *The Cure of Church-Divisions: Or, Directions for Weak Christians*  


which seek to cover the history of Dissent as a whole. Frequently, attempts are made to identify theological positions, other than those which necessarily define them, with particular denominations: historians tend to characterise Presbyterians as more influenced by heterodox opinion than Independents, who are seen as remaining closer to evangelical doctrines for longer. While there appears to be historical justification for this latter view, it does not necessarily follow that Dissenters at the time saw themselves primarily in terms of denominational allegiance. Indeed, the evidence suggests that that factor was relatively unimportant in determining groupings within Dissent, at least as far as Doddridge’s experience goes. Thus he would regularly speak at meetings during the week at the Baptist chapel in ‘Colledge Lane’, Northampton; he paid relatively little attention to denominational adherence in determining his close friendships, his mentor Samuel Clark being usually considered a Presbyterian, as was John Barker, the correspondent with whom, after Clark, the largest number of letters with a fellow-minister survives. As some historians of Dissent have accepted to be generally the case, denominational adherence was not, for Doddridge, an important marker of groupings within Dissent.

If Doddridge was not overly concerned about denominational allegiances within Dissent, he was concerned that the Dissent which he promoted should be an ordered Dissent. He believed in an ordained ministry, in the maintenance of regular meetings of the gathered church and in the orderly administration of the sacraments. This aspect of his thought may help explain his ambivalence towards the new Methodist movement. In 1743, George Whitefield preached at Doddridge’s church in Northampton, an event which led to a rebuke to Doddridge from the trustees of the Coward Trust, a Dissenting body which supported students at Doddridge’s academy. Nathaniel Neal wrote on

46 See, for example, Philip to Mercy Doddridge, 12 December 1742, DWL, Congregational Library Reed MSS 68 (Nuttall, Calendar, Letter no. 822).
47 See, for example, Rivers, Reason, p. 165.
behalf of the trustees expressing their ‘utmost concern’. The grounds of this concern were not, however, doctrinal; rather, Neal expresses anxiety for Doddridge’s reputation, and that of his academy, as a result of his association with ‘methodists’, a group alleged, at least, to be guilty of ‘imprudencies’ and ‘a forward and indiscreet zeal, and an unsettled injudicious way of thinking and behaving’.48 David Jennings conveyed the trustees’ desire that Doddridge should break off ‘all Correspondence’ with Whitefield, something that Doddridge was not willing to do.49 Doddridge in other correspondence expressed his own reservations about Whitefield, whom he described in 1741 as ‘a very honest tho a very weak Man. ... He certainly does much good & I am afraid some Harm.’50 In relation to the sermon in question, Doddridge appears to have spoken highly to Neal, commending it for ‘its excellence and oratory’;51 yet he is ‘not so zealously attached to him as to be disposed to celebrate him as one of the greatest men of the age, or to think that he is the pillar that bears up the whole interest of religion among us’.52 Doddridge’s unwillingness to cut Whitefield off, despite his friends’ remonstrance, seems to be because there was no substantial doctrinal issue at stake. Nevertheless, the Northampton pastor kept some distance in the relationship, as, it would seem, he had concerns about the level of propriety and prudence in Whitefield’s conduct. For Doddridge, proper order was an important component in his understanding of the church.

It is argued, therefore, that, within Dissent, Doddridge stood for an anti-subscriptionist position which held to an ordered ecclesiology separate from the

48 Nathaniel Neal to Philip Doddridge, 11 October 1743, Humphreys, Correspondence, Vol. 4, pp. 274-75 (Nuttall, Calendar, Letter no. 922).
49 David Jennings to Philip Doddridge, 20 October 1743, DWL MS 71.15 (Nuttall, Additional Letters, Letter no. 924A).
50 Philip Doddridge to Daniel Wadsworth, n. d., DWL, Congregational Library Reed MSS 34 (Nuttall, Calendar, Letter no. 705).
51 Nathaniel Neal to Philip Doddridge, 10 December 1743, Humphreys, Correspondence, Vol. 4, p. 288 (Nuttall, Calendar, Letter no. 933).
52 Philip Doddridge to Nathaniel Neal, 12 December 1743, Humphreys, Correspondence, Vol. 4, p. 292 (Nuttall, Calendar, Letter no. 934).
establishment and promoted central evangelical truths. Confirmation that this was Doddridge’s position and some further refinement of the definition of the Dissenting tendency to which he belonged can be gathered from examining his position within international Protestantism, his sense of British identity and, finally, the programme which he promoted in the last decade of his life to revive this kind of Dissent.

In his sermon of thanksgiving in April 1749 for the peace of Aix-la-Chapelle, signed the previous year to bring to an end the War of the Austrian Succession, Doddridge made reference to ‘the Protestant Interest in general’, by which he meant Britain’s Protestant allies. Doddridge’s Dissent formed part of a Protestant international movement which extended to the continent of Europe - in particular, Holland and Germany - and to New England, as well as to Scotland and Wales. His correspondence with fellow-Protestants in those countries evidences a sense of identity of interest in a common cause, through the exchange of information about the progress of the gospel and through mutual encouragement in the work. Letters are extant between him and, amongst others, Aaron Burr, president of New Jersey College, and Daniel Wadsworth, minister in Hartford, Connecticut, David Longueville and Wilhelmus Peiffers, ministers in Amsterdam, and the Moravian leader Count Zinzendorf, giving accounts of the state of religion in their respective countries and elsewhere. Doddridge took French and Dutch students at his academy; translations of his publications were made in his lifetime into Dutch, French, German and Welsh and correspondents expressed their interest in and appreciation for his works in Scotland, Holland, Germany and New England. Perhaps the strongest evidence of Doddridge’s sense of identity with continental evangelicals is found in the two works which he

---

published in Dutch in 1747 and 1748. These works, which did not appear in English, though the first was translated into French, were appeals by Doddridge to the Protestants of Holland to observe a greater piety, given the apparent expression of God’s judgment upon their nation in the form of the French siege of Bergen-op-Zoom which was ongoing at the time of the first of the two works. Doddridge was particularly concerned that the Dutch Protestants should observe the sabbath more strictly and give themselves more closely to family devotions. In all these ways, Doddridge demonstrates himself to be part of an international and intercontinental Protestant movement.

This was more than simply a Protestantism defined by opposition to Roman Catholicism. The circles with which Doddridge corresponded were not merely Protestant but also evangelical, with an emphasis like Doddridge’s on regeneration, heart religion and other core evangelical doctrines. It is significant in this respect that the names of the English members of the ministerial correspondence network identified by Susan O’Brien and by John Walsh in their studies of transatlantic evangelical connections are Watts, Whitefield and Jennings. The names of Doddridge’s subscriptionist contemporaries in England, such as Abraham Taylor, and of members of the antinomian right wing, such as John Brine, are missing from this list. This was an international movement which, like that to which Doddridge belonged at home, was not

54 [Philip Doddridge], *Aenspraek aen de Protestantsche Ingezetenen der Vereenigde Nederlanden, door eenen hunner Broederen in Groot Brittanje, Bedienaer van het eeuwig euangelium: Geschreven kort na dat Bergen op Zoom door de Franschen ingenomen was.* (Amsterdam: Isaak Tirion, 1747); *Tweede Aenspraek aen de Protestantsche Ingezetenen der Vereenigde Nederlanden, door eenen hunner Broederen in Groot Brittanje, geschreven kort voor het teekenen der Preliminaire Vredens-Artikelen en de daer opgevolgde Wapenschorsinge. Naer het eigenhandig Opstel van den Auteur uit het Engelsch vertaelt* (Amsterdam: Isaak Tirion, 1748). For an extensive discussion of Doddridge’s relationship with and impact upon Protestantism in Holland, see Berg & Nuttall, *Doddridge and the Netherlands*.

interested so much in confessional agreement as in seeing God’s hand at work in the
new birth.\textsuperscript{56} Recent scholarship has shown how subscription and confessionalism
became a significant dividing issue in many parts of Protestant Europe, with the new
international movement for revival eliciting opposition from the orthodox confessional
parties in Holland and Germany as well as in England, Scotland and Ireland.\textsuperscript{57} Like
Doddridge, the leaders of this movement stressed the importance of focusing on central
evangelical doctrines and seeking in preaching to speak plainly and to reach the heart,
not merely the intellect, of their audience. Doddridge’s brand of affectionate
evangelicalism resonated with leaders of revival on the continent of Europe and on the
other side of the Atlantic, causing him to see himself as part of a wider, international
movement.

Doddridge’s sense of his place within Dissent can be seen also by attitudes
towards the British nation. During the time of persecution following the Act of
Uniformity, Dissent had inevitably been relegated to the shadows of national life,
leading to a defensiveness which continued beyond toleration in 1689. In the early years
of the new century, Edmund Calamy had thought it necessary to produce a substantial
work explaining and defending the reasons why those ejected from their livings in 1662
had considered it impossible to conform.\textsuperscript{58} That such work was indeed necessary is
demonstrated by the vigorous responses which it provoked from churchmen as well as
by other publications of the time which attacked the Dissenting cause.\textsuperscript{59} The reign of

\textsuperscript{56} Ward, \textit{Awakening}, p. 2.
\textsuperscript{57} Ward, \textit{Awakening}, pp. 47-49; Berg & Nuttall, \textit{Doddridge}, pp. 54-71; Anthony Steers, ‘“New Light”
Thinking and Non-Subscription amongst Protestant Dissenters in England and Ireland in the Early 18th
Century and Their Relationship with Glasgow University and Scotland’ (PhD, University of Glasgow,
2006).
\textsuperscript{58} Edm[und] Calamy, \textit{A Defence of Moderate Non-Conformity} ... 3 vols. (London: Printed for Tho.
Parkhurst, Jon. Robinson and J. Lawrence, 1703-1705).
\textsuperscript{59} For example, John Ollyfe, \textit{A Defence of Ministerial Conformity to the Church of England: In Answer
to the Misrepresentations of the Terms Thereof by Mr Calamy} ... (London: Printed by T. W., 1702);
Benjamin Hoadly, \textit{The Reasonableness of Conformity to the Church of England, Represented to the
Dissenting Ministers} ... (London: Printed by J. Leake, 1703); [Samuel Wesley], \textit{A Letter from a Country
Queen Anne, marked as it was by some resurgence of anti-Dissenting feeling, saw the passing of the Occasional Conformity Act 1711, requiring communion to be taken in the Church of England at least three times a year in order to qualify for civic office, and the Schism Act 1714, preventing Dissenters from teaching without a licence. However, by 1730, when Doddridge began his Northampton ministry, the Occasional Conformity and Schism Acts had been repealed and prevailing government policy was not hostile to Dissent. Significant restrictions remained in place - for example, in relation to the holding of government office or the taking of university degrees - but with the memory of severe persecution fading and the security of Hanoverian rule, Dissenting writing has a less defensive tone and a more confident voice.

Philip Doddridge certainly believed in his right and duty as a Dissenter to participate fully in national life. He refused to allow difficult clergymen to treat him as a second-class citizen, making clear to James Wells, the local curate who had sought to prevent him teaching in the area, that his grasp of the classical languages was adequate to the task of reading ‘Clemens Romanus and Ignatius, if not in the translation you so kindly recommend, at least in the original, which answered my purpose quite as well’. He not only preached sermons for significant national occasions but published them as well. He assisted the Earl of Halifax to raise a troop to repel the Jacobite forces in 1745, when it was feared that they might reach Northampton. The first volume of his Family Expositor was dedicated to the Princess of Wales and he maintained a friendly...

---

60 Philip Doddridge to ‘Rev. Mr Wills’ [sic; recte, James Wells: see Nuttall, Calendar, pp. 64-65], 14 August 1732, Humphreys, Correspondence, Vol. 3, p.100 (Nuttall, Calendar, Letter no. 375).

61 For example, Philip Doddridge, The Necessity of a General Reformation, in Order to a Well-Grounded Hope of Success in War: Represented in a Sermon Preached at Northampton, January 9. 1739-40. The Day Appointed by His Majesty for Publick Humiliation (London: Printed for R. Hett and J. Buckland, 1740); Doddridge, Divine Providence.

62 Philip Doddridge, ‘To Whomsoever It May Concern’, 26 September 1745, DWL, Congregational Library Reed MSS 95 (Nuttall, Calendar, Letter no. 1096).
correspondence from at least that time until his death with George Lyttelton, adviser to
Frederick, Prince of Wales. Beyond politics, Doddridge was socially active in the
promotion of a project to establish an infirmary in Northampton,63 as well as developing
friendships at the universities of Cambridge, Oxford, Glasgow and Aberdeen.64 Despite
the legal disabilities which still applied, Dissenters in the second quarter of the
eighteenth century were able to participate actively in community and national life in a
way and to an extent which had not previously been possible.

Not all of Dissent, however, behaved in this way. Ministers of a more self-
consciously orthodox Calvinist and subscriptionist stamp, such as John Gill, did not
tend to help found hospitals or raise troops to combat the Jacobite threat. Abraham
Taylor published no sermons celebrating the flight of the Jacobites in 1746 or giving
thanks for peace with France and Spain in 1749. In 1730, Taylor published a fifth of
November sermon on The Instability of Earthly Monarchs,65 in which he spoke at
length of Christ’s supreme power on earth, including the power to raise up and to
overthrow kings: ‘the most powerful monarchs are but as grasshoppers before him’.66
He applies these truths to Britain by celebrating the triumph over Roman Catholicism
under the Tudors, lamenting the return to Rome under the Stuarts and offering thanks
for the ‘honest hero’ William of Orange who ‘established the Protestant succession’.
George I and II and the defeat of the Jacobites, however, receive only a passing, though

63 See Philip Doddridge, Compassion to the Sick Recommended and Urged, in a Sermon Preached at
Northampton, September 4, 1743. In Favour of a Design then Opening to Erect a County Infirmary There
for the Relief of the Poor Sick and Lame (London: Printed for M. Fenner and W. Dicey, 1743).
64 See, for example, Philip Doddridge to Henry Baker, on behalf of the Northampton Philosophical
Society, 3 November 1747, John Rylands Library, Manchester, Rylands Eng. MSS 19/3.169 (Nuttall,
Calendar, Letter no. 1287); Doddridge’s account of his visit to Cambridge, Philip to Mercy Doddridge,
18 and 20 June 1741, DWL, Congregational Library Reed MSS 22, 23 (Nuttall, Calendar, Letters nos.
679, 680); Doddridge’s correspondence with George Costard, fellow of Wadham College, Oxford,
Letters, pp. 333-47; with William Anderson, Professor of Ecclesiastical History, Glasgow; and with
David Fordyce, Professor of Moral Philosophy, Aberdeen (Nuttall, Calendar, Letters nos. 457, 459, 582;
1083, 1131, 1200, 1328, 1435; 1535, 1604, 1722; 543, 565, 568, 587, 617, 644, 702, 898, 1242, 1325).
65 Abraham Taylor, Of the Instability of Earthly Monarchs, and of the Nature and Stability of Christ’s
66 Taylor, Instability, p. 5.
thankful, reference, before Taylor concludes with a very downbeat estimate of the current spiritual and moral state of the nation (‘kindnesses bestow’d without desert were never more abused, than they have been in our unthankful nation’)\(^67\) and a call to repentance. It is difficult to imagine Taylor giving the kind of detailed commentary, in terms of the actings of providence, upon the progress of the war which Doddridge gives in his sermon celebrating the Treaty of Aix-la-Chapelle.\(^68\) The section of Dissent with which Doddridge identified was thus self-consciously part of, and active within, the Hanoverian British nation.

The perceived decay of the Dissenting cause was the subject of a number of publications in 1730 and 1731, including treatments by Doddridge and Isaac Watts, in which the causes of and remedies for such decay were debated but the fact of decay appeared to be accepted.\(^69\) A decade later, in March 1741, by contrast, Philip Doddridge wrote to Daniel Wadsworth, pastor of the First Church of Christ, Hartford, Connecticut, reporting on the ‘State of our affairs’ which, Doddridge says, is ‘of a very Comfortable nature’. Of the ‘dissenting interest’ in southern England, he writes, ‘I dont think its much on the decay’; indeed, he says of his own area, ‘I bless God religion is in a very flourishing state’, and of his own church, ‘God has of late given us a Sensible revival’.\(^70\) These comments are remarkable in the light of a more recent historiography which has tended to portray early eighteenth-century Dissent as a decaying movement which had

\(^{67}\) Ibid., p. 54.

\(^{68}\) Doddridge, *Divine Providence*, pp. 7-21.


\(^{70}\) Philip Doddridge to Daniel Wadsworth, 6 March 1741, Connecticut Historical Society, Turnbull MSS (Nuttall, *Calendar*, Letter no. 663).
lost its way and which was superseded from about 1740 onwards by the evangelical revival. Michael Watts, writing of the ‘decay of the Dissenting interest’ over the first forty years of the eighteenth century, cites specific reports (admittedly by establishment clergy) of reduced numbers and chapel closures amongst Dissenters between 1738 and 1744.71 For R. Tudur Jones, Independency in the first half of the eighteenth century was laudably serious and devout, but incapable of reaching the multitudes beyond its walls: for that, the ‘mighty force’ of the evangelical revival was required.72 By contrast, Doddridge’s comments in 1741, even allowing for a degree of bias, appear to challenge the idea that Dissent was in a state of uninterrupted decline in the first half of that century, prior to being rescued by the revival.

Some months following his letter to Wadsworth, Doddridge addressed a meeting of ministers in Denton, Norfolk, at which he set out ‘some Hints of a Scheme, which I was then forming for the Revival of Religion in our Parts’.73 The scheme consisted of a ten-point plan, which was discussed and agreed at the meeting, covering practical steps to be taken to encourage greater piety within the congregations. The measures to be taken involved monthly preaching on family religion and on secret prayer, greater attention to pastoral visiting and to catechising, encouragement to members of the congregation to a regular attendance at the Lord’s Supper, more effective discipline for offensive behaviour, the establishment of small group meetings with recognised leaders, the formation of local associations of ministers for mutual help, consultation and prayer and the regulation of the admission of young people into the ministry. Doddridge added an eleventh element, which had not been discussed in

71 Watts, Dissenters, pp. 385-86.
73 Philip Doddridge, The Evil and Danger of Neglecting the Souls of Men, Plainly and Seriously Represented in a Sermon Preach’d at a Meeting of Ministers at Kettering in Northamptonshire, October 15, 1741. And Publish’d at Their Request (London: Printed and sold by M. Fenner, 1742), p. ii.
Denton, for the promotion of societies to support foreign mission work. This last item has been noted in the secondary literature as an early example of a proposal for a missionary society, but the significance of the main body of the scheme has been curiously neglected by historians. Doddridge, writing to his wife, describes the Denton meeting as

one of the most delightful Days of my whole Life. Seventeen Ministers were there of wh[om] 8 officiated indeed excellently well. We held a Kind of Council afterward concerning the Methods to be taken for the Revival of Religion & I hope I have set them on Work to some good Purpose.

Richard Frost, minister at Great Yarmouth, who was at the meeting described it in his funeral sermon for Doddridge, more than ten years later, as ‘a remarkable day indeed, when the presence of GOD filled our Assembly ... one of the best days of our lives’.

The presentation of Doddridge’s scheme was an auspicious occasion.

It would seem that the ministers who were gathered at Denton that day had begun to meet in this manner, out of concern for the decline of religion in their parts, in March of the same year. The scheme which Doddridge presented at Denton seems, similarly, to have grown out of a regular meeting of ministers in Northamptonshire, set up at Doddridge’s instigation in January that year: ‘We are to have but one Sermon & to spend the Afternoon in consulting what may be done for the Revival of Religion in our respective Congregations.’ Following the Denton meeting, Doddridge took the scheme to a gathering of London ministers ‘of different Denominations’, where it met

---

75 Details of the ministers present were recorded by Samuel Wood in his diary: ‘Extracts from the Journal of a Suffolk Minister’, The Congregational Magazine n.s. 10 (1834), pp. 718-19.
76 Philip to Mercy Doddridge, 2 July 1741, DWL, Congregational Library Reed MSS 26 (Nuttall, Calendar, Letter no. 664).
79 Philip Doddridge to Samuel Clark, 14 March 1741, DWL, New College Library MSS L1/10/53 (Nuttall, Calendar, Letter no. 664).
with approval, and also placed it before his fellow-ministers in and around Northampton in August of the same year. The Northampton ministers agreed to consider Doddridge’s proposals in detail at their meeting in Kettering on 15 October, where they were ‘unanimously approved’ and were being implemented. Doddridge had written to Mercy from London in July, presumably when he was presenting his scheme to the city ministers:

I long to begin a Reformation in Northamptonshire that I may w[i]th the better Grace attempt to propagate it elsewhere. I earnestly desire your prayers for me that God may direct my Counsels & prosper my Undertakings wch. if he vouchsafe to do I hope to see some considerable Changes produced in less than a year.

In order to reach as many people as possible with his proposal for a scheme for revival, ‘who may be curious to know what the Particulars were’, Doddridge published the sermon which he had preached in Kettering, together with details of the proposed scheme and a history of its genesis, implementation and presentation. This, then, is a carefully considered, deliberate and sustained attempt on Doddridge’s part, worked out into practical steps and brought before several groups of ministers across a broad geographical area, for the promotion of religion within Dissent.

It is clear that the religion which the scheme seeks to promote is that of an ordered Dissent, as evidenced by the focus on the Lord’s supper and discipline. Although the scheme does not detail the doctrines to be inculcated, its concern is clearly for central evangelical tenets: heads of families are to be charged to attend to religious matters ‘in their Hearts’ as well as their homes and the aim of the catechising is to promote ‘real, vital, Catholick Christianity’. These short phrases reveal the concern for regeneration and heart religion which formed the substance of Doddridge’s own

81 Philip to Mercy Doddridge, 10 July 1741, DWL, Congregational Library Reed MSS 28 (Nuttall, *Calendar*, Letter no. 690).
82 Doddridge, *Neglecting Men’s Souls*, p. iii.
ministry. The scheme envisages no doctrinal tests for the ministers’ meetings, consonant with an anti-subscriptionist brand of Dissent. The fact that Doddridge was actively engaged at this time in promoting a detailed programme for the revival of this kind of Dissent in various parts of the country and that that programme met with acceptance and action on the part of those to whom he presented it indicates that the tendency within Dissent with which Doddridge primarily identified had a significant degree of vigour and expectation. It indicates that others besides Doddridge considered that there was still a future for the Old Dissent and failed to assume that revival could come only through Whitefield and the Wesleys. Here, then, is another example of the lively evangelical piety which Geoffrey Nuttall has documented, but not, as there, at a merely individual level: the evidence indicates the existence of a significant number of ministers, acting together, to promote the revival of religion within the Old Dissent.

This chapter has argued for a significant repositioning of Philip Doddridge within Dissent, away from that generally given him in the historiography, where he is viewed as a bridger of the gap between two wings of Dissent, rational and evangelical. The analysis in previous chapters of Doddridge’s philosophy and theology, the focus of his preaching and the nature of his piety lead to the conclusion that his own doctrinal position was evangelical and that he had little sympathy with non-evangelical rationalist beliefs. Although this is generally acknowledged in the secondary literature, the consequent apparent contradiction with his assumed location at a mid-point between the evangelical and rational parties has gone generally unchallenged. The evidence brought together in this chapter, focusing on the nature of his close associates in Britain and overseas, points, it is argued, in a different direction, one which is more in keeping with Doddridge’s own convictions. Whilst he was indeed a man of wide sympathy and
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generous tolerance, able to maintain good relations with others from whom he held very
different views, he chose to work primarily with a narrower group of associates with
whom he sought actively to promote his view of what Dissent should be.

The Dissent with which Doddridge identified can thus be distinguished from the
emerging rationalist tendency which questioned central points of Christian doctrine
such as original sin, regeneration or the Trinity. On the more orthodox side, too,
distinctions can be made: Doddridge’s anti-subscriptionist position stands over against
those, like Abraham Taylor, who shared much of the Northampton minister’s theology
but adhered strongly to a confessional position. Both Doddridge and Taylor, by contrast,
distinguished themselves from those, such as John Brine, who denied that unbelievers
have a duty to believe and thus opposed preaching which offered gospel benefits freely
to all or which urged hearers to obedience in matters of Christian duty. Doddridge’s
position within the Old Dissent was thus distinct from the rationalist tendency, from
confessionalists and from antinomians.

The Dissent with which Doddridge identified focused on central evangelical
doctrines and heart religion. It promoted an ordered ecclesiology, placing considerable
importance on the local congregation, a trained ministry and the ordinary means of
grace, including in particular the sacraments. It was not stiff in its relations with others,
nor was it introverted and pre-occupied only with its own affairs: it played an active role
in community and national life and had considerable sympathy with and interest in
revivals at home and abroad, although, because of its desire for order, eschewed the
more extreme and enthusiastic elements of the new movement as well as those that
rejected mainstream evangelical doctrine. Philip Doddridge was not a bridge between
two wings of English Dissent; he was one of the leaders amongst those in Dissent who
sought to promote evangelical heart religion in an anti-subscriptionist, ordered
ecclesiology as part of a wider international Protestantism orientated towards revival.
Chapter 9

Conclusion

Philip Doddridge has been portrayed in the secondary literature as a warm-hearted preacher, pastor and tutor, of evangelical convictions, mildly Calvinist in his theology but broad-minded in his personal relations with Christians of a wide variety of opinions, a champion of scripture language rather than the merely human language of creeds and confessions and a determined opponent of subscription. His views have been seen as part of a larger intellectual shift in European thought from an Aristotelian scholasticism heavily dependent for its conclusions on tradition and authority to an empirical approach to knowledge influenced by Newtonian and Lockean principles. He is said to have inherited the irenical spirit and godly piety of Richard Baxter and to have advanced his predecessor’s vision of a more united, less divisive church. He sought with mixed success to promote a religion of the affections to an audience made up both of those who shared his evangelical views and of others of a more sceptical and rational tendency. His death at a relatively young age deprived moderate Dissent of its principal surviving leader and no successor of comparable influence arose to continue the work. With no one of sufficient standing to bridge the gap between the evangelical and ‘rational’ wings of Dissent, those two parties finally split apart, the evangelical to become aligned with the rising Methodist movement and the latter eventually to take an increasingly heterodox direction culminating ultimately in Unitarianism. ‘Middle Way’ Dissent, on this account, had all but failed.

This thesis has sought to argue that the above analysis of Philip Doddridge’s thought and position within Dissent, though containing much truth, requires some significant modification which needs to be based on a more thorough-going and detailed account of his views and practice than has been attempted to date. Accordingly,
Doddridge’s philosophical and theological position on a number of issues of debate in the early eighteenth century has been examined, as have his views in the more practical areas of Christian piety and communication and his identity within the Dissent of his day. On this basis, some overall assessment of Philip Doddridge and his thought in the context of early eighteenth-century Dissent may be attempted.

An examination of Doddridge’s philosophical views, chiefly on the basis of the first three Parts of the *Course of Lectures*, has confirmed the strong influence upon his thinking of John Locke, but has also shown that it is inadequate to consider Doddridge as simply Lockean in his philosophy. Locke was certainly an important influence upon Doddridge’s epistemology, so that the eighteenth-century minister rejected the earlier assumption of innate ideas as well as the scholastic method of reasoning and adopted an understanding of the working of the human mind which followed fairly closely the contours of Locke’s thought: ideas were obtained by sensation and reflection and developed by observing the connection between them rather than through the old syllogistic method. However, the pervasive influence of Locke’s approach in these areas by the second quarter of the eighteenth century means that these conclusions do not advance very far an understanding of Doddridge’s thought, for they do not significantly distinguish the Northampton tutor from many of his contemporaries. More significant are the points at which Doddridge rejected Locke’s approach, especially on points which affected the distinction, insisted upon by Christian apologists, between matter and spirit. Doddridge likewise rejected much of Locke’s thinking on the question of the liberty of the will, fearful that the latter risked obscuring human responsibility, and took a more pessimistic view than Locke about human ability to overcome faults. Doddridge’s departure from Locke’s thought on these points resulted from the pastor’s
desire to preserve what he regarded as a specifically Christian view of those matters and demonstrates that, for him, philosophy ultimately was guided by theology.

On the crucial question of the relationship between reason and revelation, the secondary literature has tended to assume that Doddridge simply took on Locke’s view that human reason was the touchstone of revelation, such reason thereby becoming the gateway for the legitimate acceptance of revelation. It has been shown, however, that Doddridge did not express himself in this way: his emphasis was upon demonstrating, particularly in the Course of Lectures, that there is nothing in the Christian revelation which is contrary to reason and in showing that a chain of reason from natural to revealed religion can legitimately be constructed. He is clear that it is revelation not human reason which should have epistemological priority: the line of reasoning from natural to revealed theology simply leads to conclusions which should already be known and is not generally a sound method for presenting the truths of the Christian religion. Doddridge thus took on Locke’s empiricism, as had most of his contemporaries, but preserved a traditional Christian view of the relationship between reason and revelation.

On other philosophical issues, Locke’s influence fades into the background and that of the theologian and apologist Samuel Clarke becomes prominent: the analysis has sought to show how significant Clarke’s influence upon Doddridge was in this area. The younger man’s discussion of the arguments for the existence and attributes of God was shaped significantly by Clarke’s Boyle lectures on those topics. The substantial amount of space given to these matters in the Course of Lectures demonstrates the importance which Doddridge placed on his students’ grasping the principal tenets of natural theology, in order, it would seem, to counter the Deist challenge to the reasonableness of the Christian faith. Doddridge’s arguments on the nature of space
were designed to develop answers on important contemporary issues of philosophy which were consonant with the Christian faith. On moral philosophy, the underlying principles on which Doddridge based his scheme were, once again, those of Samuel Clarke. Thus Doddridge demonstrates a grasp of a range of contemporary philosophical topics and an ability to argue for positions which are consistent with Christian doctrine, evidently considering this approach to be vital in order properly to equip his ministerial students for their future work. If Locke was the principal influence on Doddridge’s epistemological thinking, his views on issues of natural theology and moral philosophy were shaped by the thought of Samuel Clarke.

For Doddridge’s theological views, the reigning paradigm in the historiography has been to see the Northampton pastor as under the influence principally of Richard Baxter: this is sometimes expressed as Baxterianism, but often it is put in terms of a moderate Calvinism, or of a middle position between Calvinism and Arminianism. An examination of the way in which terms such as these were used by Doddridge and his correspondents has shown that Baxterianism and moderate Calvinism were indeed capable of describing similar theological positions, but that they were generally understood to refer to a form of Calvinism rather than to a position midway between that and Arminianism.

An analysis of the principal theological content of Baxterianism has demonstrated that Doddridge adopted Baxter’s approach on the question of the fundamentals of the faith, but that whereas Baxter was prepared to allow only a minimal credal test on the basis of the Apostles’ Creed, Doddridge went even further and rejected all confessional tests. On the substance of his soteriology, by contrast, Doddridge has been shown to have been for the most part an orthodox, though not a high, Calvinist, more in line with mainstream Puritan views than with the rather more
idiosyncratic Baxter and the evidence seems to indicate that he moved further in this direction after completing his studies under Jennings. Baxterian neonomian ideas are absent from Doddridge’s soteriology, which endorses a view of the doctrine of justification by faith which appears closer to John Owen than to Baxter, together with a Calvinist understanding of the covenant of redemption and the perseverance of the saints. Unlike Baxter, Doddridge had difficulty with the term ‘irresistible’, in relation to the work of the Holy Spirit in calling the elect to salvation. On the question of the extent of the atonement, Doddridge seems to have adopted a view similar to Baxter’s, but grounded it in his view of the covenant of redemption, rather than in the distinction drawn by Baxter between the antecedent and consequent wills of Christ. This analysis has thus confirmed Doddridge’s own description of himself as ‘in all the most important points, a Calvinist’.1

Doddridge’s opposition to confessional subscription is well known. An assessment of his reasons for holding this position has shown that his principal concern here related to Christian unity: he considered that an insistence upon confessional language had a tendency to divide, whereas the evidently divine nature of biblical language and its superiority for the expression of doctrine meant that it was the ideal vehicle around which Christians should unite. Thus scripture was for Doddridge of ultimate importance. He argued for its divine inspiration and, at least in relation to the New Testament if not expressly in relation to the Old, believed that, by the superintending power of the Holy Spirit, such inspiration extended to the entirety of its contents. Against the contemporary attacks on the reliability and genuineness of scripture, Doddridge gave a detailed, point-by-point rebuttal. His preference for scriptural over confessional language led him, on the doctrine of the Trinity, to eschew
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1 Philip Doddridge to John Mason, 4 November 1724, Humphreys, Correspondence, Vol. 1, p. 439 (Nuttall, Calendar, Letter no. 150).
the traditional phraseology developed to express the relations and distinctions between the three persons of the Godhead, focusing simply on asserting strongly the full deity of Jesus Christ, over against views, increasingly prevalent in his day, which subordinated Christ to the Father. Alongside this, he appears to have adopted a platonic view of the pre-incarnate existence of Christ, derived ultimately from Henry More, though this is not something which appears other than in his Course of Lectures, and then only briefly.

In line with his belief that Christians should unite around the language of scripture, not confessions, he refused to condemn those who expressed their views on the Trinity in language which differed from that of the orthodox confessions, provided that they upheld the full deity of Christ. The main focus of his published works is an exposition of central evangelical doctrines: regeneration, conversion, atonement, godly living, the work of the Spirit in the individual, judgment to come and eternity. The theology which Doddridge believed and taught was thus orthodox and evangelical.

Doddridge is well known for his piety: his emphasis upon a warm, heart-centred godliness which worked itself out in practical Christian living has been seen as another facet of his Baxterianism. However, an examination of the different aspects of Doddridge’s piety has shown it to be more broadly Puritan rather than specifically Baxterian. Indeed, his approach to piety falls clearly within the central seventeenth-century Protestant Christian tradition, of which the Puritans themselves formed a part.

The most significant difference between Doddridge and his forebears in this area is located in his lack of emphasis upon the decalogue as the guiding rule for Christian living. Doddridge tended to found the principles for a godly life in the New Testament, particularly in the teachings of Christ in the gospels. This shift from the emphasis of the Puritans, including Baxter, underlines a general new covenant focus in Doddridge which has not been sufficiently noted in the secondary literature.
The warm and affectionate nature of Doddridge’s preaching has also been identified in the secondary literature as a significant characteristic, either again linking him with Baxter or representing a tendency, with Watts, which sought with mixed success to reach both evangelical and ‘rational’ audiences through addressing the mind and the affections. Yet here again, it is difficult to separate Doddridge clearly from the Puritan tradition of plain discourse aimed at affecting the heart through a persuasive address to the mind. Like the Puritans and unlike many of his contemporaries in the Church of England, Doddridge believed that the end of preaching was more than simply moral reform: the objective was a changed heart, brought about by the power of God. Preaching was the means that God generally used to achieve this outcome. In this respect, Doddridge brought the main emphases of the Puritan preaching tradition into the eighteenth century. Yet the rhetorical traditions that developed in that century were different from those of the seventeenth century. In the earlier period, the Puritan plain style had represented a reaction against the more elaborate metaphysical style which dominated literary discourse at that time. By the early eighteenth century, in contrast, the plain style had become standard and the previous florid approach was no longer in favour. Thus Doddridge, in adopting the plain style was, unlike his Puritan predecessors in this respect, simply following the contemporary rhetorical approach. Doddridge’s eighteenth-century biographers were keen to stress the politeness of his style, another feature admired at the time. While there is some evidence that this aspect of Doddridge’s style has been overplayed in the historiography, the preacher’s concern to address the members of his audience in the tone most likely to appeal to them did lead him to a concern for politeness. Thus Doddridge held to a distinctly Puritan view of the

---

Doddridge’s preaching and writing were aimed at a wide audience, but his published output shows a strong interest in reaching certain groups, in particular the young, heads of households, ministers and ministerial students. Although he is generally not overtly polemical in his publications, he did not ignore contemporary controversies. His method of addressing them, however, differed from that of Baxter, with whom he is often compared on this point. Even on the rare occasion when Doddridge did publish a direct response to a work with which he disagreed, his tone is courteous rather than hostile. The content of his published output focuses on central evangelical truths and is designed to bring about the conversion of unbelievers and the edification of believers. Doddridge used the modes of communication at his disposal to seek to promote an ordered Dissent founded on these central gospel truths and united around scripture language.

Doddridge’s place within early eighteenth-century Dissent has been much discussed in the secondary literature. There is a fairly broad consensus that he played a bridging role between the evangelical and ‘rational’ wings of Dissent: for this purpose, his theology has generally been seen as mostly orthodox and evangelical, but his opposition to the imposition of creeds and confessions and his approach to theological teaching has been understood as driven by a desire to allow a significant place for ‘reason’ and liberty of conscience in the formulation of theological views. It has been shown, however, that for Doddridge, reason was not placed on a similar epistemological level to revelation. His opposition to subscription was based, not on a desire for full intellectual freedom, but on his views about the superiority of scripture language and his desire for Christian unity. Doddridge’s close associates and
correspondents were made up of those who upheld the central evangelical doctrines on which he liked to focus his preaching. He tended to exclude from his familiar circle those who opposed those doctrines, whether they were anti-trinitarian or antinomian, and sought to undermine those views, not by polemical controversial literature, but by the exposition of the doctrines to which he held. Doddridge belonged firmly to the evangelical wing of Dissent.

Within Dissent, Doddridge was a significant figure amongst those who shared his centrist evangelical convictions and who saw themselves as part of an international evangelical Protestant movement, even to the extent that Doddridge could pen two addresses to Dutch Protestants which included sharp words of rebuke and warning on the subject of the need to reform aspects of their Christian piety. Doddridge saw himself as an integral part of the contemporary British nation, politically supportive of the Hanoverian settlement, marking the country’s victories with thanksgiving sermons and its reverses with calls to prayer, even assisting it militarily when the need arose.

Socially, he played a significant role in a project to establish a local infirmary in his home town. Ecclesiologically, Doddridge believed strongly in the ordered, gathered church as the principal focus for the administration of the means of grace, with particular emphasis upon the sacraments. Though deliberately separate from the established church and still suffering occasional persecution from some sections of it, Doddridge and those with whom he closely associated within Dissent did not feel themselves to be alienated from the nation, but self-consciously part of it. Within this anti-subscriptionist, international, Hanoverian, evangelical, ordered tendency within Dissent, Doddridge was a prominent leader.

An older historiography has understood early eighteenth-century Dissent as a story of decline, partly at least due to the supposed destabilising effects of rationalism
upon the orthodox wing. Doddridge’s role, as the ‘bridge’ between the two wings, and as one of the last of the middle way men, has been seen as particularly precarious in this respect. However, this picture seems inadequate as an explanation of the vigour of those within Dissent with whom Doddridge associated most closely, particularly during the last ten years of his life. Knowing that Doddridge died in 1751 and aware of the immense impact made by the evangelical revival from 1735 onwards, historians may easily be betrayed into reading back into the story of the Old Dissent an inevitable sense of decline which may not in fact have been there. Though there was a sense of decline, particularly around 1730, later years saw expressions, from Doddridge at least, of encouragement at the progress of the Dissenting cause. The deliberate schemes which Doddridge sought to implement in local churches and groupings of ministers, from 1741 onwards, in different parts of England, and the tone of the correspondence relating to them, indicate a vigour and liveliness of response to perceptions of spiritual decline which are evidence of strength of purpose, desire for common action and a belief in the possibility of success, rather than the inevitability of decline. Further research on the vibrancy of the local congregations in East Anglia, Northamptonshire, London and elsewhere, which participated in these schemes, might reveal the extent to which Doddridge’s programme of action was in fact taken up and the effects which it had on the lives of the congregations involved. In any event, the story of the unmitigated decline of the Old Dissent during the latter part of the first half of the eighteenth century and of the instability of Doddridge’s supposed attempts to bridge the evangelical and rational wings of Dissent require, it is argued, substantial reworking to recognise Doddridge’s place within the evangelical wing of Dissent. Despite the onset of the Methodist revival, Philip Doddridge and his fellow-ministers within Old Dissent did not
yet see the need to fade away. In their eyes, the future still lay with them, rather than with Wesley and Whitefield.

Philip Doddridge has been presented in the secondary literature as Lockean in his philosophy and Baxterian in his theology and piety. This analysis has not been based, however, on any thorough examination of Doddridge’s philosophical and theological beliefs or, for the most part, of the influences upon the outworking in his life and ministry of those beliefs. This thesis, through such an examination, has sought to show that Doddridge falls much more squarely within the Calvinist Puritan tradition than has previously been appreciated. It has argued that Doddridge sought to promote and defend, within the intellectual and cultural contexts of the early eighteenth century, the doctrines and the practices for which that tradition stood. He was not a rationalist, in any meaningful sense of that word, but clearly fell within the evangelical wing of Dissent, a Dissent which was outward-looking, organised and vigorous, increasingly so in the decade terminating in Doddridge’s early death. Philip Doddridge, it is argued, is not best understood as a Baxterian influenced significantly by Lockean approaches to reason, seeking to uphold an increasingly unstable and untenable bridging position between the rational and evangelical wings of Dissent. He was, rather, a member of a vigorous evangelical tendency within Dissent, maintaining an essentially orthodox Calvinist theology and a Puritan piety, shaped to fit the culture and language of early eighteenth-century England.
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