

PHILIP DODDRIDGE
AND THE
CATHOLICITY OF
THE OLD DISSENT

by

ALEXANDER GORDON, M.A.



THE LINDSEY PRESS
14 GORDON SQUARE, LONDON, W.C.1

PHILIP DODDRIDGE
AND THE CATHOLICITY
OF THE OLD DISSENT

by

ALEXANDER GORDON, M.A.

THE LINDSEY PRESS
14 GORDON SQUARE, LONDON, W.C.1

PREFACE

THIS lecture is reprinted from the volume "Addresses, Biographical and Historical," by the Rev. Alexander Gordon (Lindsey Press), in connection with the Bicentenary of the death of Philip Doddridge. At the time of its delivery the author was Principal of the Unitarian Home Missionary College, Manchester; during his Principalship he was also, for seven years, Lecturer in Ecclesiastical History at Manchester University. In addition to his various published works he was responsible for over 700 articles in the "Dictionary of National Biography," chiefly those dealing with Nonconformist divines and personalities. This lecture was originally given in 1895 at Manchester College, Oxford, during the Summer Meeting of University Extension students.

From the same volume three relevant passages in other lectures are extracted and printed as appendices.

We gladly draw attention to another and larger publication in connection with this Bicentenary—*Philip Doddridge: his Contribution to English Religion* (Independent Press, 7/6)—a symposium edited by Dr. Geoffrey F. Nuttall. Various aspects of Doddridge's life and work are dealt with by the Editor and other contributors, including the Rev. Roger Thomas, who writes on "Doddridge and Liberalism in Religion."

January 1951.

PHILIP DODDRIDGE.—Born in London, June 26th, 1702; Minister at Kibworth, 1723-29; Began Academy at Market Harborough, 1729; Minister and Tutor at Northampton, 1729-51; Ordained, March 19th, 1730; Married, December 22nd, 1730; D.D., Aberdeen, 1736; Died at Lisbon, October 26th, 1751.

PHILIP DODDRIDGE AND THE CATHOLICITY OF THE OLD DISSENT

THE eighteenth century was in its eighteenth year when Philip Doddridge, desiring to enter the Dissenting ministry, sought to open the way by addressing himself to Edmund Calamy, D.D. (1671-1732). The interview is known only by its unpromising result, yet the historic imagination may be forgiven if it pause to picture the momentary contact between these two great liberal unionists in English Nonconformist polity.

Calamy was now in the prime of his life, and at the height of his public influence. He had added lustre to the eminent inheritance of his name, by his services as biographer of the Ejected, and as custodian of the fame of Baxter. A genial, full bodied divine, he walked before God in the healthy enjoyment of human life and human liberty. When his Scottish friends made him a doctor in divinity, he rallied them on the pertinacity of their church courts, which reminded him of the thumbscrews of the Inquisition; but he found no fault with the theology of their claret or the orthodoxy of their salmon. An absolute stranger to enthusiasms, he rode past Windermere, and recollected that this was the lake "so famous for the fish called charrs, which come potted to London, and are reckoned so very delicious." Seated in full view of one of the finest of Lancashire landscapes, he charmed a Tory lady by suggesting that the spot seemed specially adapted by boon Nature for the pleasant use of "a pipe of tobacco and a glass of October." Perhaps in Oxford, where he spent some studious months, and preached his first sermon, these finer tastes may have been cultivated. His devotion to Nonconformity was genuine and virile. He had espoused its principles with the full strength of reasoned conviction, and believed them essential to the maintenance of English liberties and English religion. He served his cause with a diplomatic prudence; no rash ventures were his, and few mistakes; his strong mundane sagacity told him what was timely, what was practicable, and then with

courtly ease he managed men and made obstacles melt. If any ambition to go too far menaced a breach of accord in the forces of Nonconformity, he made his bow and stood aside, a mere cool-headed spectator of parties; he never mixed up in a quarrel, and would touch nothing quixotic.

Such was the man who turned his eyes upon young Doddridge, with keen yet kindly glance. He saw before him a slight and sickly orphan boy, too tall for his sixteen years, too near-sighted to bear his height erect, the hectic flush of a consumptive habit showing through his olive cheek and seeming to explain the feverish and premature anxiety to encounter, with sanguine lack of prescience, the hardships of a calling full of trials for the robust. He learned that the resolve, vaguely formed at the ripe age of fourteen, had started into definite shape on the sudden disclosure of a reverse of fortune, which had stripped the schoolboy of his means and left him penniless. To overstock the ministerial market by training up a superfluous host of poor lads on small bursaries, Calamy had condemned as a cruel policy in the Presbyterians of Scotland. What wonder that he gave Doddridge "no encouragement, but advised" him "to turn" his "thoughts to something else." The counsel, though a bitter disappointment, seemed beneficently wise; and for the moment Philip felt that to gainsay it would be a forcing of Providence.

Doddridge was a year older than John Wesley, and, like Wesley, he came of Nonconformist ancestry on both sides of the house. His grandfather, on the one side, was an Ejected minister, nephew of a famous judge. His other grandfather was a Bohemian exile, who, after sojourning in Germany as a Lutheran divine, settled in England as a schoolmaster. The twentieth child of his parents, Philip at his birth showed no sign of life. In point of fact, he and a sister were the only ones reared out of this abnormal family. The story is well known of his learning Bible history from his mother with the aid of "blue Dutch tiles in the chimney-place." Losing both parents before he had well entered his fourteenth year, he fell into the hands of a well-meaning but incompetent guardian, who sacrificed his property in foolish speculations. In Samuel Clark (or Clarke) of St. Albans, compiler of the "Scripture Promises," he found a second father.

His uncle Philip had been steward in the Bedford family, and the dowager duchess offered to provide handsomely for his education, with a view to the Anglican ministry. It was on his conscientious rejection of this tempting provision that the boy had carried his young hopes to Calamy. Following the sage advice he got, he now thought of the law; but before he had closed with an advantageous prospect of study for the bar, a letter from Clark, offering him facilities for a ministerial training, decided his vocation. With Clark he made his first communion; through the influence of Clark he got a little bursary from the Presbyterian Fund.

He did not resort to a Presbyterian Tutor, though Clark ranked with that denomination; nor to a London Academy, though there were several close at hand. Reasons of health may explain the preference for an Academy in the country; the choice of an Independent Academy will be accounted for later on. I simply note here that Doddridge's student life began in October, 1719. In March of that year the ghost of the parliamentary Presbyterianism had been finally laid at Salters' Hall. There and then the so-called Presbyterians, whether subscribing or non-subscribing, joined with the other denominations in issuing a formal ratification of the absolute independency of all Dissenting congregations. Such vestiges of Presbyterianism as they retained were retained as peculiarities of individual congregations. Even Calamy had admitted, as early as 1704, that his Presbyterianism might be fairly described as "a meer Independent scheme."

The picture of Doddridge as a student is drawn by his own hand in his most engaging correspondence. We see him robed in his dark blue gown of cheap calimanco, carefully saved and often turned, seated at Kibworth in a study so spacious that, if the lower shelves were but removed, the greater part of a hoop-petticoat might at a crush be accommodated within it. We find him describing himself as "an animal that locks himself up in his closet for ten hours in the day, and romps away the rest of his time in blindman's buff, or such-like elegant entertainments." There is some truth veiled in the poetry of this overdrawn delineation. He pursued the studies of his vocation with high purpose and a willing heart. Most young men of devout intent have formed some guiding rules for the

apportionment of their time and the discipline of their conduct. Those of young Doddridge, written on the fly-leaf of his New Testament, are simple and straightforward, the self-reminders of a frank and genuine nature. Promising himself to prove "agreeable and useful to all about" him "by a tender, compassionate, and friendly behaviour," he struck the keynote of his life.

It is characteristic that a chief recreation of his student days was found in playful and quasi-confidential correspondence with ladies: with his "mamma," his "aunt," and other and younger recipients of imaginative titles. Of Doddridge's part in this correspondence, one may say (borrowing his own description of the letters of his "dear, sedate, methodical Clio") that he writes "with such unaffected wit, pleasantry, and good nature, that it must be a gloomy animal indeed that can lay them down with a grave face, and ask for something more inspiring." The ease and polish of his address, and his knowledge of human nature, are amazing in a lad under age. His sister's "kind advice" he meets with the expostulation: "Did you ever know me marry foolishly in my life?" A little later, his first serious passion produces a series of letters to Catherine Freeman, anticipating in the analysis of female motive the best efforts of Richardson.

At some of his overtures we may smile, but his gentlemanly feeling was perfect, and his purpose sincere. "If a lady could have called me a faithless lover," he declares, "I should be ashamed to call myself a Christian or a man." When at length he wedded Mercy Maris, his marriage proved a continued romance. He never lost the feelings of a lover, still writing in middle life with all the intensity and fluctuating anxieties of a courtship. His wife was not only fair to see, but, if we view her with her husband's eyes, was "the dearest of all dears, the wisest of all my earthly counsellors, and of all my governors the most potent, yet the most gentle and moderate." The impression, however, conveyed by her own few letters is that of a well-bred, well-mannered, commonplace personage, to whom transports were foreign, indeed without very acute feelings, who better knew the meaning of "honour and obey" than that of the preceding vocable.

Perhaps the depth and tenderness of Doddridge's affectionate

heart were nowhere more apparent than in the upheaval of his whole nature on the death of his first child, a tiny girl. Some foolish fellow preached at the funeral on "Doest thou well to be angry for the gourd?" "I hope God knows," wrote Doddridge in his diary, "that I am not angry; but sorrowful He surely allows me to be." The preface to his own sermon on this occasion, while calm and free from solicitude, is a singularly honest avowal of pain still smarting, grief unappeased, the plain dealing of a man who could not but be true to his own feelings. "Formed in such a correspondence to my own relish and temper as to be able to give me a degree of delight, and consequently of distress, which I did not before think it possible I could have received from a little creature who had not quite completed her fifth year. . . . It is comparatively easy . . . to speak in the outward language of resignation. But it is not so easy to get rid of every repining thought, and to forbear taking it, in some degree at least, unkindly, that the God whom we love and serve, in whose friendship we have long trusted and rejoiced, should act what, to sense, seems so unfriendly a part; that He should take away a child; and if a child, that child; and if that child, at that age; and if at that age, with this or that particular circumstance; which seems the very contrivance of providence to add double anguish to the wound. In these circumstances . . . cheerfully to subscribe to His will, cordially to approve it as merciful and gracious. . . . This, this is a difficult lesson indeed; a triumph of Christian faith and love, which I fear many of us are yet to learn."

It is this strength of human emotion that gives health and animation to the religious genius of Doddridge. There was never anything very puritanical about his tone of mind, or his ideal of life; nor any abrupt severance of his professional character from his wholesome and genial humanity. The cleric and the man were, in him, not two but one. Why should we not speak of clerical men (I mean, if we can find any) as we speak of medical men? Doddridge allowed himself in relaxations proper to his age, and could write gaily of his social amusements, even including among these, in his early days, a hand of cards ("a chapter or two in the History of the Four Kings") after a dish of afternoon tea. But his diaries and his

letters prove that he wasted no time, that his calling was ever in his thoughts, that his religion was no conventional department of his life. His piety was a devotion of the whole human being to an ideal of consecrated service, perpetually renewed in filial communing with the Lord whom he truly loved, and served with a continually deepening attachment.

His religious genius is seen at its height in the powerful addresses which make up his volume on the "Rise and Progress of Religion in the Soul," published (1745) in his forty-third year, and since translated into almost as many languages as the "Pilgrim's Progress." Watts had suggested this work, had framed its plan, and had revised its earlier sections. But Watts could not have written it. The verve of its language; the pressure and piquancy of its appeal; the power of making conscience speak, in piercing tones, the secrets of the heart; the naturalness, the appositeness, the fervour, the pathos with which exhortation soars constantly into the domain of prayer; the prophetic faculty that betimes can even chant the plea of the awakening voice of God; these make the work unique. It is not a treatise to be calmly read; those whom it does not find will quickly drop it from their hands; those whom it captivates will follow it upon their knees. Its aim is to rouse religious feeling into a regenerative force. The practical pith of Doddridge's faithful appeal is summoned up in these words: "This must be the language of your very heart before the Lord. But then remember that in consequence thereof it must be the language of your life too . . . the most affectionate transport of the passions, should it be transient and ineffectual, would be but a blaze of straw, presented instead of incense at His altar." In an earlier publication (1736) he had asked, "What is true religion? Is it to repeat a creed, or subscribe a confession, or perform a ceremony? If it be, I am sure religion is much changed from what it was, when the Scriptures were writ; and the nature of God must be entirely changed too, before such a religion can be acceptable to Him, or before it can have the least value in His sight."

While speaking of his religious genius one thinks of Doddridge's hymns. On these I make but one remark. The hymns of Doddridge, which never rise so high nor fall so low as those of Watts, have sometimes, what Watts never achieves, a rare

quality of sustained joyousness, as in "Hark! the glad sound," which sings itself through every verse, through every line, in every tone. It is worth noting, in this connection, that Orton speaks of Doddridge as "a man who had no ear for music."

In theology Doddridge classed himself at the outset of his career (1724) as "in all the most important points, a moderate Calvinist"; and such he remained to the last. He attentively read John Taylor on "Original Sin" (1740), and was by no means shaken by it. He speaks of it as "a vain attempt to prove that impossible, which, in fact, evidently is."

Calvinism is compatible with various views of the doctrine of the Trinity; Calvin himself has not escaped the censure of purists; and it is on this doctrine that Doddridge's theological soundness has been chiefly called in question. The period of his student life was one of keen discussion of this topic, following the rupture of Salters' Hall. Many adopted the semi-Arian position of Samuel Clarke, the metaphysician; a few went beyond it. Doddridge admits that he was "wavering." Some of the proof-texts against Arianism never seemed to him in point. The recollection of his hesitancy always disposed him to respect the difficulties, and deal dispassionately with the conclusions, of other minds. His own doctrine tended towards heresy in a direction the opposite of the Arian. It was essentially Sabellian, a Trinity of divine aspects; "persons" (*prosopa*, vizors) as they were called by Sabellius, who introduced this term into Christian theology. A cruder, pre-Sabellian form of the doctrine, identified historically with the name of Praxeas, and polemically disparaged as Patripassianism, was, according to Peirce, the common creed of the unlearned among Dissenters. There is plenty of footing for it in the hymns of Watts. Doddridge held the Sabellian doctrine in its later or post-Sabellian form. This mode of thought, while admitting eternal distinctions in the Godhead, denies that they amount to co-ordinate personalities. Its advocates claim to be in good accord with the teaching of St. Hilary and St. Augustine. Wallis's exposition of the Trinity on these lines was left unchallenged by the Oxford decree (Nov. 5, 1695) which condemned as "impious" the alleged Tritheism of Bingham and Sherlock.

A Sabellianism of this kind is often accompanied by a Socinian

view of the nature of the Mediator. Doddridge escaped this by borrowing from Watts a doctrine of the pre-existence of Christ's human soul, which has ever been inseparably united to the Godhead. Barling treats this doctrine as a "graft of Arianism"; but its ancestry is not referable to the Arian school, being of older date and of different complexion. Watts got it from Henry More, the Platonist. In the estimation of Doddridge, this scheme guarded, on the one hand, against the error of reducing Christ to a mere creature, and on the other, against that of conceiving him as another God, either inferior to or coordinate with the Father. Except in his theological lectures, this rationale of his Trinitarian confession makes no show. In his practical writing, as in his hymns, the mediatorial work of Christ occupies the field. To all who are one with him in embracing this central and cardinal idea, his religious teaching will be acceptable, and will fall into harmony with theological systems diverging from his own on either hand.

In truth, the details of a technical theology were brought home to Doddridge by no necessity of his own mind; and, perhaps, had it not become part of his duty to act as an exponent of systematic theology to others, he would have himself lost interest in this department of study. Practically the theological text-book which was always in his hands, which formed his habitual phraseology and inspired his living thought, was the Bible. The Bible to him was the New Testament. I do not mean that he discarded the Old Testament, but that he read it as a part of the New. To him its theme from end to end was the Christian salvation. There is no evidence that he anywhere detected in it a failure of the evangelical spirit, though, of course, there were degrees in the completeness with which that spirit was apprehended by those whom the Biblical writers from time to time addressed. Watts, in his paraphrases of the Psalms, thought it necessary, as he says, to make David "speak like a Christian." I do not know where there is in Doddridge any similar confession of the discovery of a jarring note, a felt discord between successive strata of revelation. He brought the harmonizing element with him in the evangelical fullness of his own spirit.

We are using the language of very thoughtless ingratitude when we permit ourselves to speak of the eighteenth century as

a period of religious stagnation. It was not an age which readily responded to an enthusiasm, or suffered itself to be led by a sentiment; it was an age of strong and resolute thinking. It was not an age of fluent preachers; but why? Because the preachers were not allowed to take anything for granted. Christianity was put upon its trial; everything was brought to the test of fact; everything was examined with full use of all the resources of reason. Bishop Butler told Wesley (1739) it was "a horrid thing, a very horrid thing" to pretend to "gifts of the Holy Ghost"; and advised him, "You have no business here, you are not commissioned to preach in this diocese." Anglicans were not alone in failing to comprehend Wesley, or to estimate the value of those religious forces of which Methodism was the instrument in the hand of God. Doddridge was an exception, but his goodwill to the Methodists brought down upon him the indignant remonstrances of his London friends. These good people honestly held that to encourage Whitefield was to play into the hands of infidelity, that the enthusiasts were simply making fresh ground for the deists. They pointed triumphantly to the fact that Henry Dodwell's anonymous brochure, "Christianity not founded on Argument" (1742) was so well calculated to serve the interests either of enthusiasm or of deism indifferently, that men did not know to which school it should be assigned, and remained in doubt as to the quarter from which it had been launched.

An age of religious stagnation is an age when religion ceases to provide matter for the exercise of independent thought, when tradition and superstition send the mind to sleep. In the eighteenth century, all who thought at all, applied a keen and alert intelligence to religious matters, with the robust intention of distinguishing realities from shams. Certainly it was an age of controversy within Christianity, rather than of conquests by Christianity, though these also were not wanting. Yet we must not forget that we owe to it, through Watts, the modern Christian hymn, and through Doddridge, as we shall see, the forecast of the modern Christian mission.

Near the close of the seventeenth century (1689) the Non-conformists had accepted the Anglican articles as their authorized doctrinal standard of public toleration. Hence upon Dissent there lay, till 1779, the dead-weight of a Toleration

Act which was practically another Act of Uniformity. This was a serious bar to the bolder enterprises of religious thinking within the recognized bounds of Nonconformity. To mark the progress of ideas by the proclamation of new results was penal. It is said that the example of the early Quakers might have been followed, in defying the law, and extorting privilege by persistent and invincible efforts of self-assertion. I have often thought it might; I have sometimes wondered that it was not. The truth is, that this course would have been impossible to the ordinary Dissenter. He looked to Parliamentary law as to a divine institution. It was the very foundation of the State, the only basis of the throne. He believed in its omnipotence. Already it had done much for him, and could do more. A martyrdom of restriction and repression, meanwhile, he was prepared to endure; but to come into open and avowed conflict with the safeguard of society would have appeared to him suicidal, and a flying in the face of Providence. So he bided his time and guarded his course; but his mind was wakeful and his thought progressive.

The stream of learning and the currents of thinking were kept in movement within his borders by the action of the Dissenting Academies; institutions, to the history and scope of which a very insufficient attention has been directed, considering their national and permanent importance. The Dissenting Academy was the Nonconformist University, the university of private enterprise. Richard Frankland has the honour of being the first to set on foot (1670) in the North an institution for "university learning." The succession of Academies descending from Frankland has its lineal heir in Manchester College.* Frankland's, however, was not a school for theology alone, nor were his first pupils either designed for the ministry, or drawn only from the ranks of Dissent. He represented the Cromwellian tradition of a Durham University, and he pursued in his northern refuges the methods of his Cambridge training. Frankland's institution set the model for all the older Academies whose Tutors ranged themselves under the Presbyterian name. Philosophy and theology formed the solid nucleus of study;

* [Manchester College, Oxford; originally (1786) established at Manchester, removed to York (1803), Manchester (1840), London (1853), Oxford (1889).]

philology, science, Biblical apparatus were added in varying proportions, according to the aptitudes and particular tastes of individual Tutors. It was not uncommon for a studious youth to keep terms in succession at two or three of these Academies, selecting those whose departmental advantages promised to reward his curiosity on specific topics. Secker, for example, was at three Academies, one in the North, one in the West, and one in London. He was also at Paris, and at Leiden to boot, before he went to Oxford. Perhaps all this was overdoing it a little. For Tom Secker in his young days had a merry wit. He was not born to be the block for a bishop's wig, and to crown a Lord's anointed such as George the Third-rate.

The first of Secker's many *almae matres* was the Academy of Timothy Jollie at Attercliffe. Now Jollie's Academy, though an offshoot from Frankland's, was an example of the Independent Academy, as contrasted with those of the Presbyterian type. How did these types differ? To fancy that the Independents cared less for learning than the Presbyterians did, or were excelled by them in point of attainment, is to fall into a ludicrous mistake. The pursuit of learning was equal in these bodies; but the Independents, numerically the smaller of the two, can claim a larger proportion of scholars distinguished by great achievements. In illustration of this point, it may suffice to recall the "Vindiciæ Fratrum Dissidentium" (1710), by James Peirce; the "Credibility of the Gospel History" (1727-57), by Nathaniel Lardner; the "History of the Puritans" (1732-38), by Daniel Neal. Again, there was no denominational difference in the matter of an entrance subscription to the Academies, so long as these institutions were regulated by private enterprise. Subscription on entrance was later introduced into some Academies founded and managed by societies. The Presbyterian Academies had their origin in private enterprise till 1754, when Warrington Academy was projected (opened 1757). The London Independents had founded the King's Head Society, for establishing an Academy, in 1730. When subscription began in it I do not know, perhaps in 1730, certainly not later than 1744. This was the Academy which Priestley would not enter because of its subscription. Its Divinity tutor, Zephaniah Marryatt, was a Presbyterian,

while the Academy to which Priestley repaired on account of its non-subscription had an Independent divinity tutor, Caleb Ashworth, and was managed by Independent trustees.

Not less learned than the Presbyterians, the Independents were, however, less conventional; hence, perhaps, sometimes more free. They were readier for extremes on either hand than was consonant with the steadfast Presbyterian middle way. They showed this in their Church administration, and they showed it in their Academies.

Thus, among teachers of philosophy, Thomas Rowe, the London Independent, was the first to desert the traditional text-books, introducing his pupils, about 1680, to what was known as "free philosophy." 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. Watts, Neal, Hunt, Grove were among his pupils. None were sent to him from the Presbyterian Fund.

On the other hand, at Attercliffe, Jollie, in 1689, put under a ban "the mathematics," a term of wide significance then, on the supposition that this class of acquirement tended to make sceptics. The prohibition acted as usual: "Don't read this." There was much private study of the mathematics among Jollie's young men, one of whom ultimately held a mathematical chair at Cambridge. Whether from this spur of revolt, or from whatever reason, I believe it may be admitted that Jollie turned out men more prominent in the gifts of leadership than Frankland, his master, had done. Among Frankland's pupils, I suppose the best known name is that of William Tong, the biographer of Matthew Henry. Jollie's much shorter list includes such types as Thomas Bradbury, the zealot of orthodoxy, leader of the subscribers at Salters' Hall, and Benjamin Grosvenor, equally a zealot, though a Calvinist, for freedom in religious opinion.

Again, Jeremiah Jones, of Nailsworth, was an Independent Tutor; and Jones' posthumous "Method of settling the Canonical Authority of the New Testament" (1726), a work of original plan, and, for its day, exhaustive research, was certainly the most valuable outcome of the tutorial work of the old

Academies, or, indeed, of English contemporary scholarship. It was several times reprinted at the Clarendon Press. Next to it in permanent importance among the fruits of the erudition of the old Dissenting lecture-room may be ranked the post-humous "Jewish Antiquities" (1766) of David Jennings, a London Independent Tutor.

Moreover, it was a London Independent Academy which furnished the solitary instance of a theological chair filled by a layman, John Eames, F.R.S., whom Watts considered the most learned man he knew, and whose reputation was made in natural science, Sir Isaac Newton being his patron and friend. The appointment (made by the Congregational Fund in 1734) was as successful as it was unprecedented; but the Presbyterian Fund sent no bursars to this Academy while Eames filled the Divinity chair.

I mention these facts, in order to bring out, what I think some have missed, the character of variety, fresh force and unconventionality, which distinguished the Independent Academies from their more staid competitors in the Presbyterian Dissent. Doddridge, you remember, entered as a pupil in the Independent Academy at Kibworth. His Tutor was John Jennings (d. 1723), son of an Ejected minister, elder brother of David Jennings above mentioned, and grandfather of Mrs. Barbauld. In theology Jennings was an eclectic. "He encourages," writes Doddridge, while at his Academy, "the greatest freedom of inquiry, and always inculcates it, as a law, that the Scriptures are the only genuine standard of faith." How did this work out? Doddridge writes again: "I have almost finished Mr. Jennings' system of divinity, and the better I am acquainted with it, the more I admire it. He does not entirely accord with the system of any particular body of men, but is sometimes a Calvinist, sometimes a Remonstrant, sometimes a Baxterian, sometimes a Socinian, as truth and evidence determine him. He furnishes us with all kinds of authors upon every subject, without advising us to skip over the heretical passages for fear of infection. It is evidently his main care to inspire us with sentiments of catholicism."

The four years' plan of studies under Jennings was very comprehensive. Mathematics suffered no exclusion; Jennings was himself an elegant mathematician. His pupils learned

French, this being somewhat of a rarity; and they learned it "without regarding the pronunciation, with which Mr. Jennings" was "not acquainted." They learned anatomy, a subject which Eames, I think, had been the first to add to his curriculum. They learned architecture; probably that they might be able to plan additions to their meeting-houses. For some occult reason they also learned heraldry, an accomplishment cultivated in other Independent Academies. These were some of the ornaments of a solid course of philology, philosophy, physical science, and divinity. There is a very curious little manual, published (1721) by Jennings as a conspectus of lectures in certain departments. It begins with vocal music, and winds up with a philosophical alphabet. Jennings compiled his own logic, which, though written in Latin, is founded on Locke. His metaphysical compend is scholastic to a fault. It still contains (it is true, in a recreative appendix) such refreshing problems as the following: "Si bucephaleitas separaretur ab equitate, utri istorum adhaerebit hinnibilitas?" One exceedingly important branch of study came off badly in all the old Academies. While general history, and especially chronology, received some attention, it is not a little surprising that both constitutional history and ecclesiastical history were ignored. Priestley was the first to call attention to these serious defects, and to introduce the study of constitutional history, on his own motion, at Warrington in 1761. His lectures when published (1788) were recommended at Cambridge by John Symonds, professor of modern history. It does not appear that the curriculum included any special provision for the teaching of ecclesiastical history till the appointment of John James Tayler at Manchester in 1840; nor was there any attention paid to the history of doctrine.

It had been felt for some time that the sudden and early death (1723) of Jennings had created a serious void in the list of Dissenting institutions for theological training. The need existed for an Academy in the Midlands, at once liberal in tone and evangelical in spirit. There was a Presbyterian Academy in the Midlands, that of Ebenezer Latham, at Findern, and this at first was left to supply the vacancy; but in the opinion of Doddridge's London correspondents Latham, who practised also as doctor of medicine, was not an efficient Tutor. Dod-

dridge's detailed account of Jennings' plan of studies brought him overtures which led to his becoming Jennings' successor after an interval of six years. Isaac Watts declared that the reopening of the Academy might well be undertaken by one who had "so admirably described" it. The suggestion was followed up by the unanimous approval of a meeting of ministers at Lutterworth. At this time Doddridge, whose residence was at Market Harborough, had been for six years minister at Kibworth, on a stipend of £36, plied up to that enormous sum by help from eleemosynary funds, since the Kibworth Independents were unable to reach the modest figure of £30. His Academy had hardly been begun (July, 1729), when he removed (December, 1729) to the more important congregation at Northampton, where for twenty-one years he discharged the duties of Pastor and Tutor.

To Doddridge's Academy some reference has already been made.* Here it may be well to pursue the topic in more detail. His first idea was to take only divinity students into his Academy. It was David Jennings, younger brother of John, who strongly advised him to admit lay pupils also. This he did in the fourth year of his enterprise. Almost immediately he was called upon by the ecclesiastical authorities to take out a licence in the bishop's court. He refused to do this, and carried the case to Westminster Hall. It went in his favour, but an appeal would probably have been decided against him on a technicality, had not George II intimated his displeasure at the revival of such prosecutions.

Perhaps it may be interesting to learn the cost of an education at Doddridge's Academy. The figures cannot be compared with modern estimates without an appreciable allowance for subsequent decrease in the value of money. Doddridge's charges were somewhat above the average. Every student had to pay, on entrance, a guinea for his room, another towards the maintenance of the library, a third for the wear and tear of scientific apparatus.† His tuition cost him four pounds a year, his board sixteen. He had to find his own candles, settle his

* [This reference is to an earlier Lecture (see Preface), entitled "Early Nonconformity and Education"; the passage is quoted in full in Appendix I, p. 39.]

† [See Appendix II, p. 39.]

laundry bill, and provide a pair of sheets. What he did while this pair was in washing, is not stated. The fixed charges, then, were: entry money, three guineas; annual dues, twenty pounds for four years. If he were a bursar on any of the denominational Funds, Presbyterian or Congregational, his board was reduced to fourteen pounds, and the library and laboratory charges were halved, bringing his entrance money to two guineas, and his annual dues to eighteen pounds. We may then gather this that Doddridge expected to make a profit of six pounds a year on ordinary students, four pounds on bursars. His actual gains were less, for he kept a generous table, being a hospitable entertainer of frequent visitors, often of high station. The prudent Orton was of opinion that his students lived too well.

A copy exists of the unpublished rules and regulations of Doddridge's Academy, with the signatures appended of students, who promised faithfully to obey them. They are very minute; and again citing Orton's candid criticism, the testimony is that they were largely a dead letter in practice. Doddridge's numerous engagements threw the work of tuition somewhat out of gear as regards times. It now and then occurred (though the Tutor rose at five) that what should have been the Academy work of the morning did not come on till late in the day. It is right to specify these drawbacks; on the other hand, the atmosphere of the house must have been thoroughly good and wholesome. Its tone was high. Doddridge's personal influence with his pupils was individually felt. They all loved him. Few Tutors had so little occasion to lament the failure of moral promise in their students. He kept them closely under his eye, and never allowed them to forget their vocation. David Jennings was, though a non-subscriber, a stickler for certain points of doctrine, and expelled from his London Academy students of whose theological turn he did not approve. It is not recorded that Doddridge ever did this; but if, as happened once or twice, he found reason to think the religious spirit was wanting, then he did not hesitate to tell such student that the Academy was no place for him.

In regard to methods of teaching, Doddridge, as might be expected, took John Jennings as his model. He avowedly made Jennings' lectures in philosophy and theology the basis of

his own. For the choice of topics, the structural arrangement, the geometrical plan (axioms, problems, theorems, corollaries, and so forth), the style of treatment, he was indebted in the first instance to Jennings. In using and adapting Jennings' outlines he introduced several new features.

Up to the time of Doddridge, the lectures on divinity, philosophy, science, in all Dissenting Academies had been delivered in Latin. In many cases Latin, except during certain privileged hours, was the current language of all academical business. Such customs, retained from the older universities, had outlived their usefulness. Doddridge began by abolishing what remained of them. He was the first of theological Tutors to lecture in English. It was a great innovation. It meant much more than a welcome relief from a tiresome linguistic strain. Perhaps we can hardly estimate how much it signified, both in the way of renouncing ancient prejudice and in opening new views of theological study, under the guidance of fresh text-books. Consequent on the dropping of Latin as the teaching medium would follow the comparative neglect of the older books of reference, venerable treatises of foreign divinity, framed in the ancient tongue. Lectures in English would naturally be illustrated from English sources, at once more easily and rapidly consulted, and more modern in their range of thought, in their reach of sentiment. Theology, released from the trammels of unvarying technical terms, could take on new forms of expression; a living language is the only right vehicle for living thoughts. I think I love the Latin language as much as any man can. For many important purposes I prefer it to any other, and deeply regret its disuse as the common tongue of European learning. I fully recognize that in certain departments it is, as it has been called, the sacred speech of Christendom. These are departments in which it has been spontaneously used by men to whom it was the fit discovery of their thoughts, the natural utterance of their hearts. In theological terminology it does not shine at its best. To make it the vehicle of a native English theology is a strangely artificial process; it is to subject the thinking mind to an unnatural restraint. Richard Baxter produced a system of theology in a Latin quarto (1681); whatever else this *tour de force* may be, it is not Baxter.

Therefore, I greatly honour Doddridge as the author of that salutary revolution, which for the first time invited the learners in theology to think out its problems during their student years, in their own tongue. Looking at his theological lectures, I am struck with the vast wealth of illustration, poured upon all topics, from the living literature of his own time. True that his authorities are ancient now; cramped, crusted, and mouldy, we may deem some of them to be. They were fresh then; a new modern world of varied and animated thinking, presented for the scrutiny and the stimulus of young and eager souls. It was from a stray reference to Hartley, in Doddridge's published lectures, that Priestley gained his introduction to the writer who formed his mind in principles of philosophic analysis.

This is not all. Doddridge was the founder of what may be called, though not in quite the modern sense, a science of comparative theology. What was the old method of teaching any given doctrine of divinity? The lecturer began by defining the view of his church, or his school, making it his own. This, he would say, is the right doctrine. Then came some account of other opinions on the topic. These, he would say, are the heresies and aberrations that prevail in outside circles. He would arrange them according to the degree of their approach to, or divergence from, the doctrine already propounded as the truth. His arguments would all be directed to prove this, to disprove those. Such is the manner of the vast majority of text-books. Doddridge took another plan. He began by laying before his pupils, with all the fairness of which he was master, the various views which had been entertained upon the point, and the arguments adduced in their favour. These he proceeded to compare, measuring them one against another, weighing their merits, trying them by Scripture, by reason, by each other, with the object, if possible, of eliciting the truth; which might at last be thought to coincide exactly with no one of the systems thus brought into competitive examination. What the master attempted, the pupils were urged in like manner to endeavour for themselves; the Tutor's business being to see that they were in possession, as far as might be, of the materials for a judgment; among the most important of those materials being an intelligent knowledge and appreciation of the thoughts of others.

Another new feature of Doddridge's lecture-room was the insistence upon the employment of shorthand. Every student had to learn shorthand, and had to copy out every lecture in shorthand. The point was not that he was to try to take a lecture down while listening to it, an impossible feat. He listened to it, and thus took it in. He then transcribed it from the Tutor's manuscript (itself in shorthand), and so had it by him for reference and for preservation. Not only did he carry away a complete set of manuals of his studies, vastly superior in fullness of treatment to Jennings' breviary, but he possessed, to boot, a rich magazine of references to books, as a guide for his future reading. Should any unlucky layman, intent upon penetrating to his minister's sources, chance to pick up a volume of the series of note-books, his inquisitiveness would be stopped by the hieroglyphics.

Doddridge was one of the first to perceive the full advantages of shorthand to the student in the saving of time and economy of writing material. The old Puritans had made a plentiful use of it for taking abstracts of sermons; they had few other applications for it, and though, of course, it found its way into earlier Academies, there was no systematic employment of it. Doddridge, as his basis, took Jeremy Rich's shorthand, invented or rather adapted in 1659. It may have been the best available to him in his schoolboy days, but it was a cumbrous and arbitrary system, much inferior to Byrom's (1720), which Wesley and Hartley adopted. Priestley, by the way, used Annet's. Doddridge made improvements on Rich, not so much in the direction of speed as in saving of space and increase of legibility. His shorthand found its way into other Academies as his pupils advanced to the dignity of Tutors. It was recommended and taught by Dr. Martineau, who used it for all his lectures and sermons.

Doddridge made a practice of exercising his students in village preaching. As a system this was somewhat new. It was so pursued as to constitute Northampton a centre of missionary and evangelizing effort, quietly but effectively pursued, under the Tutor's inspection and with his active aid and co-operation.

A considerable proportion of his students found their first settlements in the Midland district; thus the productive value of the Academy was locally felt. By no means did he thus

render service to the Independent denomination only. A letter (1750) from John Barker, of Hackney, thus expresses the obligation under which Doddridge laid the Dissenting cause generally: "Had not you supplied our Presbyterian churches for many years, what would have become of us? Nay, it is certain that what is called the Presbyterian interest in England has been supported by Independent Tutors." This statement is fully confirmed by inspection of the lists of ministers in congregations of Presbyterian name, especially in the Midlands and the North. Many of the most trusted leaders of the old Liberal Dissent were men whose minds were moulded by Doddridge. Their character was not that of controversial preachers; their tone was evangelical, their influence suasive; their Liberalism was undemonstrative, but steady and sure. They did much to build a bridge of practical Christianity over which the transit from an older to a newer type of doctrinal ideas was effected with a minimum of agitation. For their sympathies were broad enough to keep them in touch with the generation that was passing away, and at the same time to give them the confidence of the younger generation.

Of such men, Job Orton (1717-83) was a prominent example. Orton retired from pulpit work with the ailments of a valetudinarian, at an age which (but for an early addiction to an opium habit) should have been his prime. Yet in his seclusion at Kidderminster he held an advisory correspondence with Dissenters of every class except, perhaps, the irregulars of Methodism, for whom he had no love. His favourite reading lay in the works of the elder Puritans, his tastes were tame, his ideas of ministerial deportment were, perhaps, timid and strait-laced. In religion he was for the old-fashioned Gospel, and all novelties were displeasing to him. Yet his own orthodoxy was of a carefully attenuated sort. It is characteristic of his generous welcome for the conscientious convictions of others, that he could write with unstinted admiration of Lindsey's sacrifices on behalf of principle, expressing nothing but good wishes for the success of a chapel opened to promote doctrines in many respects alien to his most cherished positions in philosophy and theology.*

* [See Appendix III, p. 40.]

Among Doddridge's pupils some few were from the first intended for the Anglican ministry, and one, Thomas Gillespie, became the founder of a secession from the Scottish kirk in the interests of ecclesiastical freedom. An unusual number of his students became Tutors themselves; one was promoted to an Edinburgh chair. One of his pupils, never a Tutor (yet a maker of Tutors, being a Coward trustee), exercised a decisive influence on theological progress. This was Hugh Farmer (1714-87), the Independent. Farmer's preaching is curiously described by Kippis as having a kind of "swell" in it, which seemed the prelude to the enunciation of very high doctrine, but it never reached that point. Farmer's "Dissertation on Miracles" (1771), to which those on the Temptation (1761) and the Demoniacs (1775) are subsidiary, is an epoch-making book. Its aim is to vindicate the unshared sovereignty of God. He disallows the agency in the physical universe of any invisible power save One, dismissing as superstition the alleged physical operations either of evil spirits at war with God, or of angelic beings his delegates. Those of his readers who were convinced by his premises were not slow to advance beyond his conclusions; soon denying the very existence of invisible beings who had no work to do in the visible world. In the long run his jealous reverence for the unbroken course of Nature was more effective than his arguments for the production of "new phenomena," designed to reduce the paralysing impression of the conception of fixed law. Farmer's treatise at once became a text-book with the Rational Dissenters; its leading principles had an enduring effect in clearing up, to those who accepted them, the full meaning of the Unity of God, and the far-reaching significance of the undivided nature of his sway.

The successor to Doddridge's Academy was that at Daventry, of which, in its early days, Priestley has given us a most graphic and instructive account, drawn from the memories of his own experience. At Northampton Doddridge always kept an absolutely free hand. At Daventry the appointments were made and the management was regulated under the supervision of the Coward Trustees, a small body of Independent ministers and laymen. Still, the spirit of Doddridge remained the real regulating influence. The Tutors were two, of whom Caleb

Ashworth, the head, took on all questions a conservative position, while Samuel Clark, the junior, held the opposite side. And these two worked quite harmoniously together. Nay, they did what is, perhaps, a difficult thing for Tutors to do. They encouraged, in free intercourse with their pupils, the canvassing of the very points on which the Tutors differed; "a discipline," says Huxley, "which, admirable as it may be from a purely scientific point of view, would seem to be calculated to make acute rather than sound divines."

Now it is instructive to note that both these men were pupils of Doddridge, by him selected for tutorial office. Clark was his assistant. Ashworth was nominated, in Doddridge's will, as his own successor. These, then, were the chosen trustees of Doddridge's academic methods. It is clear that he made provision for a future of liberal management and progressive teaching. So indeed it proved. The history of Daventry Academy culminated in the divinity tutorship of Thomas Belsham, who, by following Doddridge's comparative method of studying the problems of theology, was brought to the point of identifying himself (1789) with the rising movement of Unitarianism under Lindsey. Removing to Hackney College he had a pupil there in Charles Wellbeloved, the first divinity Tutor at Manchester College, York, who advanced beyond Arian lines. It is worth remembering that as at Warrington Academy, in the person of Aikin, so at Manchester College, in the person of Wellbeloved, the lineage of Frankland and the lineage of Doddridge blend.

The principles on which Doddridge based his academic work were those which guided his whole interpretation of the function of English Dissent. To him, the establishment and maintenance of an Academy was not an end in itself; it was part of his larger purpose as a religious leader. Very early in his career as a Tutor, Doddridge felt called upon to vindicate the cause of Dissent, and to define his own position towards it. The occasion was an "Enquiry into the Causes of the Decay of the Dissenting Interest," issued anonymously (1730) in the character of a candid friend among the Dissenting laity by Strickland Gough the younger. This son of a Presbyterian minister had himself been educated for the Presbyterian ministry, but had not got beyond a licence to preach. Gough's

pamphlet was well written and able. His quarrel is chiefly with the ministers of Dissent. He brings against them the not very consistent charges that they humour the prejudices of their people, and that they "worship God for twenty minutes" and "dictate to men for sixty." In ignorance of their own true principles, they set their faces against free inquiry, which the Established clergy, in defiance of the terms of their subscription, do much to encourage. The pamphlet was the prelude to its author's conformity, Hoadly admitting him to holy orders. Doddridge published anonymously (1730) his "Free Thoughts" in reply. He agreed with many of Gough's observations, but called attention to a much more important class of causes, and was quite at issue with Gough as regards the remedy.

Calamy read both pamphlets, in ignorance apparently of their authorship. He deprecates the whole controversy. "If there were any real decays, this way of proceeding was rather likely to increase than abate them." Nevertheless, he does admit that "a real decay of serious religion, both in the Church and out of it, was very visible." Calamy's anxiety for the maintenance of the Dissenting cause was predominantly that of the politician. As a political force the Dissenters were a mainstay of the Hanoverian interest, a bulwark against the encroachments of popery and the pretensions of absolutism. To detract from "the considerableness of their body," by representing them as declining in numbers, was, to say the least, "grossly imprudent." He questioned whether there were any such decline on the whole, for if decrease was noticeable in some quarters, advance was manifest in others. This was Doddridge's opinion too. In his neighbourhood the number of Dissenters had been greatly augmented within twenty years. The interest of Doddridge in the Dissenting cause was not political. He refers, indeed, to the political influence of Dissent as that which gained consideration for it from those who had "no regard at all" for its true principles. His main point is that "there is generally more practical religion to be found" among Dissenters than in the Establishment. He makes the remarkable suggestion that "if the Established clergy and the Dissenting ministers . . . were mutually to exchange their strain of preaching and their

manner of living but for one year, it would be the ruin of our cause." With Calamy, he is for maintaining a united phalanx of Nonconformity, not, however, as a political engine, but for the welfare of "practical religion."

Gough had noticed the lapse from Dissent of men of social position, polite culture, and latitudinarian views; and had advised the attempt to cater for this class, and neglect the vulgar. Here Doddridge joins issue with him. He is firm in the conviction that the ministry of Dissent, while liberal in its temper, must be evangelical in aim; and must speak with an effective voice to the common people, who form the solid strength of Dissenting congregations. He maintains that a man of good taste may be a plain and moving preacher, and will then satisfy all those whose interest in his ministrations is a religious one. On the difficult question of a contrariety of sentiment, he holds that division into congregations of opposite principles is suicidal. "Bigotry," he observes, "may be attacked by sap more successfully than by storm"; and, again, there is such a thing as being "a bigot in defence of catholicism," or, as we say, catholicity. Religion and prudence must go hand in hand.

Warburton complimented Doddridge's pamphlet as "a masterpiece, both for the matter and composition." It may certainly be said to exhibit high qualities of ecclesiastical statesmanship. To the ideal it sets forth, Doddridge, throughout an influential career, was consistently true. It should be added that, while he was a Dissenter on principle, it was not on a principle of objection to an Establishment. He was a Dissenter simply for the sake of freedom to serve the cause of evangelical religion. Hence he claimed that Dissent should not be viewed or treated as schismatical; and he urged upon Archbishop Herring, that Dissent ought to be relieved of this stigma, by an authorized interchange of pulpits between the Established and the Tolerated clergy.

In contending, as he does, for the exercise of all possible forbearance and respect in relations with men of dogmatic temper, Doddridge gives the best proof of the essential catholicity of his own mind; for he had no sympathy with their attitude. He was the first, at any rate among divines, to use the terms "orthodox" and "orthodoxy" ("a certain equivocal

word beginning with an O") as labels for a theological spirit which he was far from sharing. On entering the ministry he had qualified under the Toleration Act. To the phrases of the Westminster standards he "was resolved never to subscribe," either actually or virtually; and he sacrificed many tempting opportunities of promotion by adhering tenaciously to this resolve. Yet of those whom he styles "the rigidly orthodox," while he unfeignedly laments their "unhappy attachment to human phrases, and nicety in controversial points," he nevertheless admires their good qualities, and pardons an "excess of zeal," "artificially . . . infused," yet "innocently . . . retained," and "from a real principle of conscience to God." If he could "put a tolerably good sense on any of their favourite phrases," it would surely, he reasons, argue a "perverseness of temper" to avoid such "merely because they admire" them. It is at least possible to lay aside phrases "offensive to them." "Our human forms are no more necessary than theirs."

Thus Doddridge made friends with Bradbury, the redoubtable champion of Dissenting subscription, and admitted Whitefield to his pulpit, to the disgust (as we have seen) of London supporters of his Academy. Thus, too, especially as a young man, and while he was forming his opinions, he used a playful caution in declining to be drawn out prematurely, and committed to a side. In an early letter (1724) to John Mason, he remarks: "You very expressly tell me that orthodoxy requires you to deny the salvability of the heathen; and then you desire me to send you an abstract of the best arguments I can meet with for the defence of the contrary opinion. What if such a dissertation should fall into the hands of some *durus pater* or *durior frater*? Then am I caught in the very act of Baxterianism; and by consequence am an Arminian, and therefore an Arian, and therefore, perhaps, a Deist. . . . My good sir, *hæreticus esse nolo*." On the other hand, he recognized the evangelical character of Peirce, whose alleged heresies had given to Bradbury his opportunity of standing forth as the leader of Trinitarian orthodoxy. In the case of a member of his own congregation, admittedly of Arian proclivities, he acknowledged him as "a real Christian" notwithstanding; and declared that he would lose "his place and even his life" rather than exclude such a man from communion.

He wrote of Deists without severity, except as their principles or their conduct appeared to him tending to laxness of morals. "Every benevolent and useful man in society," he says, "I love and honour as such, whether he be or be not a Christian."

His daughter said of him, "The orthodoxy my father taught his children was charity." He says of himself, "I have lately . . . the character of a very orthodox divine; but to my great mortification, I hear from another quarter that my sermons are all Do! Do! Do! To speak my sentiments without reserve, I think the one too favourable and the other too severe." This was when he had got the decalogue painted on the wall of his chapel at Kibworth. His position was not very intelligible to Rational Dissenters, as the Arians then styled themselves. They thought he trimmed. Samuel Bourn, of Birmingham, did not hesitate to tell him so. They mistook his courageous liberality for a crypto-heterodoxy. They considered that his true place was with them. To his breadth of view, his perception of a common evangelical aim underlying differences of doctrinal expression and divergences of doctrinal vision, they were strangers. They very much overrated his accord with their distinctive opinions.

In ecclesiastical polity Doddridge expresses himself (1723) as "moderately inclined" to the Congregational form. Four elders were appointed (1740) in his Northampton church. They were not elders in the Presbyterian sense, having no conduct of affairs. They relieved him of some of his pastoral work, and were, in short, a species of curates, two of them being, indeed, young ministers. So far as Church government went, he was a Congregational pure and simple, locating all ecclesiastical authority in the assembly of the individual church. He felt, however, the difficulty of the purely Congregational position, in face of the obvious need of securing some good provision for filling the ranks of the ministry.

In the view of every evangelical Christian a minister is made a minister by Jesus Christ whose minister he is, and by him only. The differences of Church order arise with the question of vouching for a man's ministerial character and fixing his sphere. Theoretically, in Congregationalism a man is authenti-

cated and declared to be a minister by the sole act of a congregation, choosing him as such. Theoretically, he is in consequence authorized as minister in and for that congregation alone. Practically, a congregation expects its minister to be regarded not merely as its own particular officer, like its secretary or its treasurer, but as holding ministerial status in the general denomination, and as far as its communion extends. Hence the authentication of ministers is a matter for a wider consensus than that of a particular congregation.

Peirce of Exeter, who was a Congregational, nevertheless came over to what he termed Presbyterian ordination; a mistaken term, for he did not propose that ordination should be committed to a presbytery, a mixed body of clergy and lay deputies. He developed into a definite theory the practice pursued by the Baxterian clerical associations, and recognized in the terms of the Happy Union of 1691. He reserved it as the right and privilege of ministers to authenticate the standing of ministers; a right and privilege which any company of ministers might exercise by mutual agreement. He left to congregations the right and privilege of making their own selection out of the number of ministers thus approved. Such, in Peirce's view, was the only regular course, though he admitted that any ministry of proved usefulness was thereby shown to be valid, however irregular.

This theory was advanced by Peirce in 1715. The way for its acceptance had been opened by Calamy's treatise of 1704. It replaced the proper Presbyterian view among many so-called Presbyterians of the last century. In the judgment alike of Presbyterians and of Congregationals proper, it placed in the hands of the ministerial class an irresponsible and somewhat dangerous power. There came a time when it was at any rate imagined that the exercise of this power placed arbitrary restrictions on doctrinal expansion; when it was thought that the line was drawn at Arianism by the "Presbyterian hierarchy"; a contradiction in terms, yet a common phrase, the meaning of "Presbyterian" being lost. The consequence was that ordination, if retained at all, was reduced to a purely congregational arrangement.

Doddridge, without adopting Peirce's high view of the rights of the ministry, nevertheless approved the practice to which it

pointed. Disclaiming any notion of making this practice imperative, he outlined, in 1745, his idea of the wisest course to be pursued.

Persons intended for the ministry, should, before they begin to preach, be examined as to character and qualification, by three or four ministers. If fit, they are then licensed to act as candidates.

On being chosen as preacher to a congregation, a minister is not at once ordained; during the interim he fulfils all ministerial duties, short of administration of the sacraments. Arrangement for these is made with neighbouring pastors.

A minister is not ordained till he has been formally called to be pastor; of this call he notifies neighbouring pastors, asking their concurrence in his ordination.

Prior to ordination, he exhibits, if required, his licence and credentials; and gives the ordainers "satisfaction as to his principles," the ordinary way being a written confession of his faith, drawn up by himself. This, in the opinion of Doddridge, avoids "the indolence of acquiescing in a general declaration of believing the Christian religion," and "the severity of demanding a subscription to any set of articles."

At the ordination, he recites this confession, as approved by his ordainers; and answers questions relating to his sense of the obligations of the pastoral office.

The actual ordination is by prayer and imposition of hands, and is followed by charge to minister and congregation.

When his pastoral relation has been thus ratified, it is understood that he has permanently dedicated himself to the ministerial character. In the practice of that age, he is now for the first time distinguished by the appellation of "Reverend Mr.," though of this Doddridge says nothing.

Such is his plan for the institution of a minister. The removal of a minister rests with the congregation alone, in terms of the Salters' Hall agreement.

There is nothing new in the plan. It is avowedly a selection from existing usages, and Doddridge presents it as a sort of harmony of general practice. So long as it prevailed, the old distinctions of a denominational style, Presbyterian and Congregational, were little more than nugatory. Where they had

any real meaning they referred, as already hinted, to differences of internal management; the Independents maintaining among themselves the cohesion of autonomous church association, while the Presbyterians were rather in the position of subscribers to a lectureship, leaving matters of business in the hands of a self-elected body of trustees, or a lay committee of management. The denominational names were revived at a later date, and without much reference to the history of congregations, in the interest of that redistribution into doctrinal parties which Doddridge, we have seen, deprecated as a suicidal policy. Walter Wilson, the historian of London Dissent, expresses himself in 1808 as if the division had already issued in destruction. He writes like the shade of Doddridge, seeking in vain to find the old Liberal Dissent. "The Presbyterians have either deserted to the world, or sunk under the influence of a lukewarm ministry; and the Independents have gone over in a body to the Methodists." These, doubtless, were the very dangers against which the mind of Doddridge was forewarned. Hence it was that he dedicated the continuous aim of his faithful zeal to the work of realizing, as far as possible, the happy dream of the Union of 1691.

In some respects Doddridge's public position of influence was unique. It has been said that he occupied a more distinguished place in the eyes of his countrymen than has been attained by any other Nonconformist divine. He did not seek any such prominence, and never came forward as a representative man. All the same, he responded to every call upon his time. His correspondence was enormous; he employed no amanuensis; and he made shorthand copies of all the letters he wrote. He speaks of answering letters incessantly for a fortnight, and still having 106 to deal with. He met on equal terms the leaders of English religion and many of the leaders of English society. On all hands his services to religion were acknowledged with genuine admiration and gratitude. His diploma in divinity (1736) came from the two universities at Aberdeen. The English universities did not thus honour themselves, but he was welcomed as a visitor, and consulted as a correspondent, by the highest representatives of learning, both at Oxford and Cambridge. The extent to which he was in confidential communication with Anglican clergymen of

various schools is very remarkable. Wesley sought his advice in the formation of a library for the use of young preachers. Probably no man was more widely read in every department of religious literature. He furnished Wesley with a very detailed list, a sort of *catalogue raisonné*, drawn up in a very catholic spirit. "You will not," he adds, "by any means imagine that I intend to recommend the particular notions of all the writers I here mention; which may, indeed, sufficiently appear from their absolute contrariety to each other in a multitude of instances. But I think that, in order to defend the truth, it is very proper that a young minister should know the chief strength of error." He specially includes works bearing on the critical study of the Scriptures. Evidently he thought that such would be useful reading for Methodists. "For, perhaps," says he, "when young people are accustomed to that attention of thought which sacred criticism requires . . . it may prevent those extravagant reveries which have filled the minds of so many, and brought so great dishonour on the work of God."

His instinct of philanthropy was as strongly marked as his spirit of evangelization. It will not be said of him as has been said, not very justly, of the Quakers that in the eighteenth century they turned from religious to philanthropic labours. He developed, as they also did, the philanthropic side of religion, and exhibited Christianity as a beneficent spring of endeavours for social amelioration, and for the relief of suffering. He showed this temper in individual cases; at the risk of being called a Jesuit, when he took up the cause of an Irish Catholic. He clothed it in projects, successful in themselves, and influential as leading the way to kindred efforts. From his foster-father, Clark, of St. Albans, he took the idea of a charity school, for teaching and clothing poor boys and girls; his foundation of this kind at Northampton was the model for others elsewhere. At Northampton, too, he had a main hand in the establishment of a county infirmary. Bishop Maddox at Worcester followed suit, writing to Doddridge for plans and advice. Bishop Secker wrote from Cuddesdon to Doddridge, congratulating him on the success of the infirmary, expressing his sense of the advantages it would be to have one at Oxford, and the hope he entertained that the Radcliffe trustees when

they had finished their library, might employ some part of the residuary funds in this excellent work. Long after Doddridge's death this was done.

Doddridge's philanthropy engaged itself also in the formation of the first project of foreign missions originated by Dissenters. It ranks as the first, for though it would be wrong to forget that the high theme of missions to the heathen had enlisted the thoughts and stirred the hearts of individual Nonconformists from the time of Baxter, yet there had been no suggestion of concerted action on the part of Dissenters until Doddridge's preface (February 1st, 1742) to a sermon on the general revival of religious effort. In this he informed his brethren that at Northampton a regular society had been formed, both for holding religious exercises with a view to excite the missionary spirit, and for collecting contributions in aid of the work.

It must be owned that this whole project was in advance of the ideas of Doddridge's day. Missions to the heathen were regarded as quixotic, chimerical, almost out of place. The missionary spirit was as yet practically unfelt in dissenting circles. Doddridge, whose enthusiasm had been kindled by Zinzendorf, was here a pioneer, deserving all praise for his true perception of the need, and his prompt and wise endeavour. The distinctive thing about his presentation of the missionary idea was that he connected it with the healthy activity of church life. He did not leave it to take its chance as an extraneous luxury of superfluous enthusiasm, but put it in its place as an integral part of that enterprise which is at once the outcome and the stay of Christian zeal. His measure of immediate success amounted, on his own confession, to "a feeble essay." The interest slumbered after his time, to be awakened by louder appeals at a later date. Then his project was recollected, then his example fired the hearts and strengthened the hands of subsequent workers.

We must not forget that the comparative shortness of his life (he died at forty-nine) conspired with the multiplicity of his engagements to fracture his efforts. True, that in part his was a career of achievements reached and registered. Still more, however, was it a record of great ideas arrested in their course. His family motto suited him well, *Dum vivimus*,

vivamus. He illustrated it in an epigram, pronounced by Dr. Johnson to be one of the finest the language :—

Live, while you live, the epicure would say,
And seize the pleasures of the passing day :
Live, while you live, the sacred preacher cries,
And give to God each moment as it flies.
Lord, in my views let both united be,
I live in pleasure while I live to Thee.

APPENDIX I

DODDRIDGE'S ACADEMY

DODDRIDGE initiated an important change in the Nonconformist Academy, amounting to a revolution. Before his time, following the practice of the older Universities, all lectures were in Latin, prayers were in Latin, and Latin was the customary speech during business hours within the Academy walls. English was only permitted on stated occasions, *e.g.*, always on Sunday evenings, when sermons were repeated. Indeed, the amount of linguistic facility which was exacted from ingenuous youth in those days may well surprise, if not shame, our modern backwardness. Thomas Hill, of Findern Academy—who died in 1720—expected his students to sing their Psalms, not merely as rendered into Latin, but in Greek verse too. A Tutor of a yet severer stamp made his pupils sing them in the original Hebrew. The day for such heroic exercise is long gone.

Whether or not it was entirely for good, Doddridge changed all that ; lecturing in English, as the appropriate vesture of a more modern Science, a more modern Philosophy, a more modern Theology. The three branches just enumerated were the main items of the curriculum, and formed the staple of the old Academy courses of instruction.—*From the Lecture on "Early Nonconformity and Education."*

APPENDIX II

EARLY ACADEMY LIBRARIES

THERE were no Academy libraries in those days. Doddridge, I think, was the first to establish one. The pupils, however, had the free run of their Tutor's often scanty shelves. A new arrival would tell of a better store under the roof of some other Tutor, and so tempt to a migration on this ground alone.

Thus, Thomas Emlyn left John Shuttlewood's Academy at Sulby, simply because Shuttlewood "had very few books, and them chiefly of one sort." It was, indeed, hardly likely that he should have many, or rejoice in a rich variety; for he was one of the hunted Tutors.—*From the Lecture on "Early Nonconformity and Education."*

APPENDIX III

ORTON AND LINDSEY

To prudent Job Orton, the opinions put forward by Priestley and his friends were daring novelties, alike distasteful and distressful for one whose spirit clung to the demure Nonconformity of a staid generation, moderate in all things. Yet when Lindsey, with whom he had corresponded, quitted the Establishment, to give effect to convictions with which Orton had no sympathy, the pious recluse hailed the new confessor as a "glorious character," was delighted to hear that his "chapel was so well filled," and declared to the editor of Calamy that, were he to publish an account of Ejected Ministers, he should be "strongly tempted to insert Mr. Lindsey in the list," though he "brought him in by head and shoulders." Such was the impression, made by a supreme act of conscience, upon a man not easily moved to an enthusiasm.—*From the Lecture on "Theophilus Lindsey and his Chapel."*