
A table of contents for the *Congregational Studies Conference Papers* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_congregational-studies-conference_01.php

1982 Congregational Studies Conference Papers

The Origins of the London Missionary Society
David Boorman

The Christian Mind of Philip Doddridge (1702–1751)
Rev. Alan Clifford

Infant Baptism
Rev. John Legg

1982 Congregational Studies Conference Papers

David Boorman,
Alan Clifford,
and
John Legg

For information on EFCC and previous Congregational Studies Conference Papers, contact:
The Administrative Secretary, An Evangelical Fellowship of Congregational Churches, PO Box 34, Beverley, East Yorkshire, England, HU17 8YY

Contents

The papers are printed in the order in which they were given at the Conference; as usual each contributor is entirely responsible for the views expressed in his paper.

The Origins of the London Missionary Society

David Boorman

Introduction

The last ten years or so of the 18th century and the early years of the 19th century saw what has been described by Johannes Van Den Berg, in his book 'Constrained by Jesus' Love', as the 'great break-through of the missionary idea'. In the short time between 1792 and 1814 several missionary societies were formed on both sides of the Atlantic. The establishment in 1792 of the Particular Baptist Society for Propagating the Gospel among the Heathen, better known as the Baptist Missionary Society, was followed in 1795 by the Missionary Society (the London Missionary Society), an organisation which brought together both Dissenters and Anglican Evangelicals, by the Church Missionary Society in 1799 and by the British and Foreign Bible Society in 1804, together with a number of missionary societies in Scotland and on the Continent. Across the Atlantic the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions was formed in 1810 and the American Baptist Missionary Board in 1814. During this period the churches were brought to a new consciousness of their missionary responsibilities; sermons, letters, and books were published with the aim of stimulating missionary interest, and the missionary ideal received a new impetus which ensured that the 19th century would be the great century of missions.

The missionary task of the church of Jesus Christ is, of course, as old as the gospel itself. It would be a great mistake therefore, to think that missionary history begins with William Carey or that Carey and his contemporaries were the first men to discover or to expound or to act upon the Biblical theology which so powerfully spurs the church on to missionary activities. The events of the 1790s did not take place in a vacuum. Beneath them there was a foundation of Protestant missionary work, especially although not exclusively among the Indians of North America, and of Biblical theology particularly in the writing of Jonathan Edwards. But why did this great outburst of missionary zeal occur when it did, and not say, 75 or 100 years earlier? The explanation must surely be sought and found in the revivals of religion which were such an outstanding feature of the 18th century from about 1740 onwards. Richard Lovett, the historian of the London Missionary Society, remarks:

> The London Missionary Society, like the other great religious and philanthropic organisations which sprang into existence at the close of the

> eighteenth and the beginning of the nineteenth centuries, is a child of the evangelical revival in England originated by Whitefield and the Wesleys. The enormous and energetic Methodist Societies had sprung into vigorous life, every other section of the Nonconformist church had been stimulated into energetic action, the Church of England had been shaken out of its spiritual torpor, and upon the hearts of the evangelical Christians had been laid the burden of the world's sin and sorrow and need, in a way quite new in English history. One of the first results of this great change was the founding of the organisation now known all the world over as the London Missionary Society.

Against this background we can now begin to look at the origins of the LMS. I have tried to divide what I want to say under three headings:

1. *The Making of the Society*—a descriptive and analytical account of the particular events which culminated in the establishment of the LMS in 1795. I intend to look briefly at some of the men involved, the means advocated, the motives urged and the misunderstandings and objections which had to be overcome.
2. *Some early policy debates and decisions*—a. Given on the one hand the fact that the field is the world, and on the other hand the fact that resources (in terms both of manpower and money) were limited, where should they begin? b. What qualifications were needed on the part of those who were to be sent to the mission field?
3. *Concluding Observations.*

The Making of the Society

In his book *As the Waters Cover the Sea,* JA DeJong comments:

> The roots of no other missionary society formed during the period under study are tangled and as diffuse as those of the LMS.

The stimulus did not come from one exclusive source, one particular meeting or even one denomination. Whereas the Baptist Missionary Society can clearly trace its origins back to the activities and prayers of a small group of ministers in the East Midlands, the sources of the LMS include Independents in London, Warwickshire and Hampshire, and Calvinistic Methodists, Evangelical Anglicans, and Scottish Presbyterians in and around London. And yet, despite the profusion of sources, the men involved soon began to meet together, confer together, and pray together with the result that within the space of a little more than two years the Missionary Society came into being.

Since we have to start somewhere in identifying sources, I will begin with Warwickshire. To quote DeJong again:

> Wedged between the western boundaries of Leicestershire and

> Northamptonshire, Warwickshire was soon kindled by the spark struck by its Baptist neighbours of the east.

At a meeting of Independent ministers held at Warwick in June 1793, the question for consideration was:

> What is the duty of Christians with respect to the spread of the Gospel?

Among the resolutions agreed to were the following:

1 It appears to us that it is the duty of all Christians to employ every means in their power to spread the knowledge of the Gospel, both at home and abroad.

3 That we will immediately recommend to our friends the foundation of a fund for the above purpose, and report progress at the next meeting.

4 That the first Monday of every month, at seven o'clock in the evening be a season fixed on for united prayer to God, for the success of every attempt by all denominations of Christians for the spread of the Gospel.

The first of these resolutions hints at one of the motives which played so important a part in stimulating missionary endeavours, namely, the Great Commission given by the Risen Lord to his disciples, a commission which, as the Baptist William Carey had already demonstrated at length, was still binding on Christians. The last resolution, with its emphasis upon stated seasons for prayer, illustrated something of the influence of the great American preacher and theologian, Jonathan Edwards, on the missionary awakening. The revivals in Cambuslang and Kilsyth in Scotland in the 1740s had been seen by a number of Scottish ministers as the beginning of a movement that would fill the earth with the knowledge of Christ and had encouraged them to engage in a concert for prayer for the spread of Christ's kingdom through a continuous outpouring of the Spirit. After a while the concert lapsed. However, when its renewal was urged in 1746, Edwards supported this bid by writing *An Humble Attempt to Promote Explicit Agreement and Visible Union of God's People in Extraordinary Prayer*. In one of his earlier works Edwards had proposed a specific day for united fasting and prayer as follows:

> I have often thought that it would be very desirable, and very likely to be followed with great blessing, if there could be some contrivance for an agreement of all God's people in America, who are well-effected to this work, to keep a day of fasting and prayer; wherein we should all unite on the some day, in humbling ourselves before God … that he would continue and still carry on this work, and more abundantly and extensively pour out his Spirit, and particularly upon ministers, and that he would bow the heavens and come down, and erect his glorious kingdom through the earth.

In the Humble Attempt, to the proposal for communal prayer is added a proposal for a regular, recurring day of prayer. To encourage compliance with

his request Edwards cited material from the prophetic portions of Scripture. 'The glory of the last days has not yet been accomplished. Its greatness was unspeakable. Had not Christ worked and prayed, and suffered for that day? All creation was groaning for its arrival. Furthermore, Scripture is full of examples, incentives, and commands to pray for it. Without using the term, Edwards reminded his readers of the many 'signs of the times' which make prayer such an urgent requirement.' (DeJong 132)

The impact of Edward's tract was great on both sides of the Atlantic, and I have given some attention to it because of its relevance to our theme. One modern writer has described the Humble Attempt as 'the most potent means of missionary education and support' and his comment that 'the more spiritual consequences were the stimulation of the world-wide vision, the focusing of attention on salvation history in time, the linking of mission with the eschaton, and giving the Christian disciple a share in God's own mission as his co-worker in some sense'. Although Edwards does not specifically mention missions, at the end of the 18th century his tract made a widespread impact on organised missions and resulted in concerts of prayer, of which the Warwickshire meeting was but one example, harnessed to the rebirth of mission effort.

From Warwickshire, we turn our attention to Hampshire—or rather to a Scotsman who was minister of the Independent church at Gosport in that county. David Bogue, described by Iain Murray as 'one of the greatest Forgotten Figures in the history of missions'. Something of Bogue's theology of missions, some insight into the reasons which led him to devote so much of his time and energy to the cause of world-wide evangelisation, can be obtained from a consideration of a sermon which he preached in 1792 before the correspondent board in London of the Society in Scotland for Propagating Christian Knowledge in the Highlands and Islands. Taking as his text these words in the Lord's Prayer, 'Thy Kingdom Come' Bogue began by reminding his congregation that they had come together: 'as the disciples and servants of Jesus Christ with the view to enlarge the boundaries of his kingdom and to increase the number of his subjects'. He urged upon them the need for zeal for the prosperity of Christ's Kingdom and he indicated that such zeal would cause them to look around the world with the view that the religion of the Lord Jesus Christ might be better understood and practised in countries where it was already known and that it might be propagated among those nations which had, to use his words, 'never heard the joyful sound of salvation by a crucified Redeemer'. Bogue then indicated five results which he considered would follow from such a survey. The first result would be that the survey would fill them with the deep sense of the miserable condition of millions of

the human race. He pointed out that one half of the habitable globe had never heard the Gospel; that Islam with its defective views of Jehovah had extended its dominion over several of the largest and most fertile countries of the world; that the Jews continued to grasp at the shadow and to spurn the substance; and that, in so-called Christian lands, many were in an equally deplorable situation. He went on to say, 'When we consider these things, if we have the spirit of Christians, rivers of water will run down our eyes, because transgressors know not Christ's Gospel, and keep not God's Law'.

In the second place, it would cause them 'to inquire into the cause of their miserable situation'. Why were so many allowed to go on in ignorance of the Gospel? 'Is it not owing to the coldness of the zeal of Christians for the glory of God and the salvation of their fellow creatures, that in so great a part of the world the darkness of paganism envelops the people.' Although Britain had colonised and conquered overseas, and had developed commerce with other lands, 'Where is the country' he asked 'which we have exerted our zeal to rescue from pagan darkness or Mohametan delusion and to bring to the knowledge and consolation of the Gospel? What tribes of pagans have been converted by our missionaries? What churches have been planted by us in lands where Satan's seat was? What nations that bowed down to sticks and stones have been influenced by us to cast their idols to the bats and the moles and are now adoring the Creator and Redeemer of sinful men? Alas we search almost in vain.' He urged upon his hearers the need for repentance, and for grace to assist and animate them in this great work.

Then, in the third place, he went on to suggest some of the motives which should influence them in this task. First, he referred them to the predictions in both the Old and the New Testament of the glory of the latter days. That, he said, should stimulate them in this work. In the second place, he referred to the fact that attempts already made to propagate the gospel had been crowned by God with considerable success. Then, thirdly, their exertions would cause great happiness as men and women were delivered from bondage and from the evil one and brought into the liberty of the Lord Jesus Christ. Fourthly, great would be the honour of those who exerted themselves in advancing the Kingdom of Christ. Fifthly, their efforts would be but a just return for the benefits which this country had received from God. In the sixth place, Britain had not as a nation exerted itself to promote the Gospel of Christ to the degree that it should. Seventhly, they should see in the recent discoveries God's providential design that his truth should be taken to these newly discovered lands. And finally their example would stir up others.

Bogue's fourth main point dealt with the means to be used in extending the knowledge of the Gospel. Here we see how Biblically rooted was the whole

teaching of men like Bogue and his contemporaries. The means he emphasised was preaching, 'This method of God's appointment is as powerful now as it was at first. It forms characters of the very same kind: it makes men equally good as in any former age and by it, I doubt not, will God accomplish the glory of the latter days and bring Mahometans, Jews and Pagans into the Kingdom of God's dear Son.'

In the fifth place, the result of such a survey would be that his congregation, would be stirred up to give liberally for the support of that particular Society and its work and to recommend the activities of the Society to others. He concluded by expressing his conviction that the times were ripe for missionary activity. Tyranny and popery were on the wane; God was at work preparing the way, 'Improve then, my dear hearers the delightful prospect: contribute your share towards diffusing that light before which the works of darkness must flee away. View every change in the moral world as connected with the progress of religion, as to the influence that it is likely to have on the cause of the Redeemer: seize the present favourable opportunity to convey the Gospel to the heathen notions and hasten by your united and vigorous exertions the morning of that joyful day when it shall be proclaimed "the kingdom of our Lord is come: men are blessed in him and all nations shall call him blessed: Hallelujah, for the Lord God omnipotent reigneth".'

In the summer of 1794 Bogue was preaching in Bristol. While he was there, he was invited to meet the Baptist minister, John Ryland, who had just received a letter from William Carey giving news of what was happening in India. Following his meeting with Ryland, Bogue was very concerned that, while other groups of Christians were actively engaged in missionary work, the Independents were not. He discussed with some of his fellow ministers ways in which public concern for sending the gospel to the heathen could be aroused, and as a fruit of these discussions, wrote an article which was published in the Evangelical Magazine for September 1794 under the heading: 'To the Evangelical Dissenters who Practise Infant Baptism'. This article has been described as 'one of the first and most important steps in the great and providential work of originating the London Missionary Society'. Bogue urged his readers to consider on the one hand the vast number of people in the world who were without the gospel and on the other hand the little that had been done for their salvation. He addressed his remarks specifically to evangelical non-conformist paedobaptists because 'all other bodies of professing Christians have done, and are doing something for the conversion of the Heathen. We alone are idle. There is not a body of Christians in the country, except ourselves, but have put their hand to the plough. We alone have not sent messengers to the Heathen to proclaim the riches of redeeming love.' What motives should

spur them on? Bogue's answer to this question can be summarised as follows:—Since God has favoured us with the knowledge of the way of salvation through a crucified Redeemer, we are under an obligation to God to take the Gospel to the heathen world. As the supreme end of our existence is to glorify God, we should therefore seek to lead 'our brethren in pagan lands to glorify him also by making them acquainted with his nature, government and grace'. Our love to the Lord Jesus Christ binds us 'to shed abroad the sweet odour of his name in every place'. We have a duty to carry out Christ's great missionary commission; and gratitude to God, a sense of justice and love to our neighbour should urge us on to fulfil that Christ given commission.

What encouragements did they have to engage in this work? 'The sacred Scripture is full of promise, that the knowledge of Christ shall cover the earth, as the waters cover the channel of the sea; and every promise is a call and motive to enter on the service without delay. It is the cause of God, and will prevail.' What means should be employed in this great work? 'Need I say, Brethren, that our duty is to use the means of divine appointment? In every age of the church, the propagation of the Gospel has been by the preaching of the ministers of Jesus Christ. By the same method are we to propagate the Gospel now.' What was needed? Men and money. As to the first, Bogue expressed views about their training which later, after the founding of the LMS and in its early years, would bring him into conflict with some of his fellow Directors:

> It will be necessary to found a Seminary for training up persons for the work. An able and eminently pious minister in a central situation must be sought for to superintend it. And as the education of a missionary must be in many respects widely different from that of those who preach in Christian countries, it may be expected that every man of talents will unite his endeavours to render the plan of instruction as well adapted to answer the end in view, and in every respect as complete as possible.

For funds, Bogue looked to congregations for annual subscribers and contributions and to Christians in general for donations and legacies. Bogue closed his appeal by calling upon the London ministers 'without loss of time to propose some plan for the accomplishment of this most desirable end, that our Lord Jesus Christ may have the Heathen for his inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for his possession'.

Founded in 1792, the Evangelical Magazine, in which Bogue's article appeared, had already done something towards bringing together in fellowship evangelical Anglicans and paedobaptist nonconformists.

The November 1794 edition carried a favourable review by an Anglican minister, Thomas Haweis, of a book entitled *Letters on Missions; addressed to the Protestant Ministers of the British Churches,* by the Rev. Melville Horne, a

clergyman of the Church of England, who had been a chaplain in Sierra Leone and who indicated in his book, that differences of ecclesiastical policy and also to a limited extent even in doctrine need not hinder combined activity in the cause of missions.

In warmly commending Horne's book, Haweis concluded:

> Could a new society be formed for the promoting of the Gospel, and those, who now as individuals long for it be united together, without respect to different denominations of Christians, or repulsive distance arising from the points in dispute between Calvinists and Arminians. Would the really faithful and zealous look out for men who love our Lord Jesus Christ in sincerity, and begin with one corps of missionaries to the Heathen in the South Seas; would they pursue their object without being discouraged by disappointment, and try again and again, till it should please God to open the way for success: No expense attending it deserves for a moment to come into the consideration.

In London, following the publication of Bogue's appeal and the review of Melville Horne's book, events moved rapidly. John Eyre, one of the editors of the Evangelical Magazine, took the initiative in bringing together in November 1794 a number of ministers to give formal consideration to the practicability of founding a new missionary society. They met on 4 November, at Baker's Coffee House, Cornhill, which at that time was used every Tuesday morning as a place where the London ministers came together to exchange news. Eyre himself had been educated at the Countess of Huntingdon's College at Trevecca and was minister of the Episcopal Chapel at Homerton. Others present at the meeting included Bogue, Joseph Brooksbank, John Reynolds and John Townsend who were Independent ministers, John Love and James Steven, both ministers of Scottish churches in London, and Matthew Wilks, minister of Moorfields Tabernacle. This was the first of a series of meetings for which the venue was soon changed to the Castle and Falcon in Aldersgate Street as other ministers were drawn into the discussions.

At these meetings the first hour was spent in prayer and in reading those passages of Scripture which bore directly on the conversion of the heathen. Then discussion would take place specifically upon missionary efforts. A form of subscription in the following terms was drawn up for those who attended these meetings.

> We whose names are here subscribed declare our earnest desire to exert ourselves for promoting the great work of introducing the Gospel and its ordinances to heathen and other unenlightened countries, and unite together, purposing to use our best endeavours that we may bring forward the formation of an extensive and regularly organised society, to consist of evangelical ministers and lay brethren of all denominations, the object of which society

> shall be to pursue the most effectual measures for accomplishing this most important and glorious design.

In January 1795 the ministers involved in these meetings sent out a circular letter announcing the intention of holding, early in the following summer, a general meeting of ministers and lay brethren deleted from all parts of the country to plan and organise a society. An address which had been drafted by the Rev. George Burder of Coventry and which had been revised by two other ministers was also widely circulated. Burder took up the themes which had been expounded and proclaimed by Bogue. He began by referring to the commission and the promise given by our Lord shortly before his Ascension and to the obedience which had been yielded to Christ's command by the disciples and by the primitive church leading to an initial triumph and progress of the Gospel. Then had come the dark ages until at length 'the Apostolic spirit revived in the glorious Reformers'. And yet (and here was a note of sadness and regret), since the Reformation the efforts of Christians to evangelise the pagan parts of the world had been few and feeble. 'Where was the primitive zeal?' Where are the heroes of the church, men who would willingly spend and be spent for Christ, who have the ambition to tread in a line not made ready for them, but to preach Christ where before he was not named? Men who count not their lives dear, so that they might win souls to Christ?' Burder noted that one of the results of the Evangelical Revival had been that some Christians had 'expressed most vehement desires to do something for the poor heathen'. He expressed the hope that the happy period was now approaching 'when the Redeemer shall take unto him his great power and reign. "He must increase, his name shall be great!" And is there not a general apprehension that the Lord is about to produce some great event? Already have we witnessed the most astonishing transactions, and is it not probable that the great Disposer of all is now about by shaking terribly the nations, to establish that spiritual and extensive kingdom which cannot be shaken?' He urged upon his readers the establishment on an interdenominational basis of a missionary society. Difficulties should not deter them. 'Ought we not to blush at being deterred from the God-like attempt by difficulties scarcely considered when fame or worldly gain is the object?' To do something would be highly pleasing to God and would show that we love his name and prize his salvation. 'Let it be remembered that Britain, Christian Britain, was once an island of idolatrous barbarians, and such it had yet remained, unless some of God's dear people in distant countries had formed the benevolent plan of sending missionaries hither. Let us in return go and do likewise.'

It was eventually decided to hold a series of meetings in London in September 1795 for the purpose of constituting the new society. At the first of

these meetings held on the evening of 21 September and very well attended by both ministers and lay men, it was unanimously resolved 'that it is the opinion of the meeting that the establishment of a society for sending missionaries to the heathen and unenlightened countries is highly desirable'. An outline plan for the establishment of a society was approved and a subscription list opened. On the next day a large congregation gathered together in Spafield's Chapel to hear Dr Thomas Haweis preach. He referred to the united aim, irrespective of denomination, to 'make known abroad the glory of his person, the perfection of his work, the wonders of his grace, and the transcendent blessing of his redemption, where his adorable name hath never yet been heard'.

From the beginning the inter-denominational, or trans-denominational, emphasis of the founders of the Society was clearly seen. Haweis rejoiced in the prospect of 'merging that day, the petty distinctions of names and terms, the diversities of administrations and modes of Church Order in the greater, nobler, and characteristic name of CHRISTIAN'.

He then took up three points—Where must we go? Whom should we send? What message was to be preached?

On the first he observed that the field was the world. But he advocated that initially missionaries should be sent to Polynesia. As to the missionaries themselves, they were to be 'such as the Lord had prepared and qualified for the arduous task'; they must be men ready to spend and be spent in the work; moved by the Holy Spirit to devote themselves to the work and having a 'divine ardour, prompting them to prefer the salvation of men's souls to every earthly consideration'. Although he did not minimilise the advantages of education, he felt it necessary to add that 'a plain man, with a good natural understanding, well read in the Bible, full of faith and of the Holy Ghost, though he comes from the forge or the shop would, I own, in my view, as a missionary to the heathen be infinitely preferable to all the learning of the schools; and would possess in the skill and labour of his hands advantages which barren science would never compensate'. Of the message to be preached there could be no doubt. 'We appeal to the experience of all ages, what ever did or ever can control the unruly wills and affections of sinful men, but the preaching of the cross of our Lord Jesus Christ.'

A committee was set up to draft a constitution for the new society. It soon had something ready including the name 'The Missionary Society', and the object which 'is to spread the knowledge of Christ among heathen and other unenlightened nations'. Further meetings were held on 23 and 24 September. On the evening of 24 September, David Bogue preached on Haggai 1–2. He set himself on this occasion the task of dealing with the various objections which had been raised in opposition to the formation of the society. It is very

interesting to notice some of the objections which some people were bringing forward.

> 1. The work itself is so very arduous that success cannot be hoped for. 2. The time for the conversion of the heathen is not yet come, because the millennium is still at the distance of some hundred years. 3. What is there in the state of the Christian church at present that flatters with peculiar hopes of success for a mission to the heathen? Many ages have elapsed and little has been done; what makes the time now so favourable? Are we better than our fathers? 4. The governments of the world will oppose the execution of the society's plans and defeat its design. 5. The present state of the heathen world is so unfavourable with respect to religion that little hope can be entertained of success. 6. How and where shall we find proper persons to undertake the arduous work of missionaries to the heathen? 7. Where will the societies and the missionaries be able to find support? 8. There is no door opened by providence for the entrance of the Gospel. We should wait until such an event takes place, and then diligently improve it. 9. What right have we to interfere with the religion of others? 10. We have heathen enough at home, let us convert them first before we go abroad.

Bogue recognised at the outset that there would be difficulties.

> Difficulties—the most tremendous difficulties, are to be looked for. Will Satan suffer his kingdom to fall without a struggle? No; he will rouse all here to arms against us; and his instruments on earth, uniting themselves to the host from beneath, will do everything in their power to prevent the progress of the gospel of the Redeemer. But here is the foundation of our hope. Christ has all power both in heaven and in earth. He is infinitely mightier than his opposers, and all his enemies shall be made his footstool: and he has assured us that he came to be a light to enlighten the heathen, as well as to be the glory of his people Israel.

Bogue then proceeded to take up one by one the objections which were being brought forward and to answer them in a most convincing way. He reminds his hearers of the power of God to 'Create the soul anew in Christ Jesus unto good works'. To those who said that the time for the conversion of the heathen has not yet come, he remarked that 'in aiming to propagate the gospel, we are to be guided by what God enjoins as a duty, not by what he delivered as a prediction'. He rejoiced to see Christians 'of different denominations, although differing in points of church government, united in forming a society for propagating the gospel among the heathen. Behold us here assembled with one accord to attend the funeral of bigotry.' Far from despairing of success, Bogue expressed his trust in the ability of the Sun of Righteousness to banish heathen ignorance, and in the power of the glorious gospel to dispel human prejudices. Where were prospective missionaries to be found! The same Lord who found

twelve men to send out into all the world and convert the nations to the faith of the gospel could with equal ease find missionaries now. So Bogue pressed on to his conclusion:

> This year will I hope, form an epoch in the history of man; and from this day, by our exertions, and by the exertions of others whom we shall provoke to zeal, the Kingdom of Jesus Christ shall be considerably enlarged both at home and abroad and continue to increase 'till the knowledge of God cover the earth as the waters cover the sea! Now we do not think ourselves in danger of being mistaken when we say that we shall account it through eternity a distinguished favour, and the highest honour conferred on us during our pilgrimage on earth, that we appeared here and gave in our names among the Founders of the Missionary Society, and the time will ever be remembered by us, and may it be celebrated by future ages, as the era of Christian benevolence.

Some Early Policy Divisions

If the meetings which marked the beginnings of the Missionary Society were characterised by a spirit of harmony, not only between men of various denominational origins but also between men who differed in temperament and outlook, it was not long before serious disagreements and differences of opinion came to the surface. Two issues in particular had the effect of bringing these differences to light. The first concerned the sort of training which missionary candidates should receive before they were sent to the mission field, and the second concerned the most appropriate parts of the world in which to begin missionary work. On both of these matters Thomas Haweis may be regarded as representative of one point of view and David Bogue of the other.

1 Training for Missionary Candidates

In his article 'To the Evangelical Dissenters who practise Infant Baptism', Bogue publicly expressed his conviction that special education was needed for missionary candidates:

> It is highly probable that some zealous men would present themselves who are well qualified to go immediately on a mission among the heathen, but in general they will require some previous instruction, and therefore it will be necessary to found a seminary for training up persons for the work. An able and eminently pious minister in a central situation must be sought for to superintend it. And as the education of a missionary must be in many respects widely different from that of those who preach in Christian countries, it may be expected that every man of talents will unite his endeavours to render the plan of instruction as well adapted to answer the end in view, and in every respect as complete as possible.

However, during the early years of the LMS this particular point of view did not prevail.

Within a week of the formation of the Society, the Board of Directors had adopted a set of rules for the examination of missionaries, which included the following provisions:—'It is not necessary that every missionary should be a learned man; but he must possess a competent measure of that kind of knowledge which the object of the mission requires'. 'Godly men who understand mechanic arts may be of signal use to this undertaking as missionaries, especially in the South Sea Islands, Africa and other uncivilised parts of the world.'

Commenting on the attitude beneath these resolutions, Richard Lovett remarks

> Doubtless many of the Directors fear that it was hardly possible in the face of the enthusiasm they had so recently witnessed to keep rigidly to the course of true wisdom, and to insist that no man should be sent forth until he had received at least two or three years intellectual and spiritual training, and had evidenced his fitness for the foreign field by exhibiting his capacity to stand the scorching discipline of college training … It is also practically certain that many connected with the management of the Society had most erroneous views, first as to what heathen life was like, and secondly as to the type of man best fitted to deal with it. 'Godly men who understood mechanic arts' were by not a few of the fathers placed much higher in the scale of usefulness among uncivilised nations than the student, the preacher, the man of scholarly and disciplined mind. The enormous waste of resources caused by the practical adoption of this view in the early years of the Society's work is an object lesson for succeeding generations.

However, as Lovett also reminds us, there was another group of men who 'Held it to be little short of folly to expect warm and fervent religious feeling to compensate for lack of mental force and spiritual training. They themselves experienced the same intense yearning for the salvation of the heathen, but they did not believe that this would necessarily keep undisciplined minds and natures from errors of the most serious kind.'

The minutes of the Board of Directors contain a number of references to pleas which Bogue made that appropriate training and education should be provided for intending missionaries. But the other Directors, by and large, would not listen to Bogue and his warnings and in the end they had to learn the hard way the lesson that something was radically wrong in their whole scheme of the selection and training of missionary candidates. In 1797 two missionaries who had been sent out failed to occupy their mission stations in the Pacific. In the following year the majority of the missionaries who had arrived in the South

Sea Island of Tahiti deserted. Three of the missionaries married pagan women, 23 of the 30 missionaries who returned to England after the capture of the *Duff* quitted the Society and never went to the mission field; and some of the missionaries sent out on the Society's first African mission proved to be completely unreliable and unfaithful. Facts such as these at last forced their attention upon the Directors, and they had to reconsider their policy.

The first remedy took the form of a London Committee which was appointed to instruct the missionaries in theology, grammar and geography—a scheme that was to be augmented by ministers in the country who were to take into their care persons in their own or neighbouring congregations who had been approved for missionary work. It was under this plan that a few young men found their way to David Bogue's Dissenting Academy at Gosport. This was only an initial step; it was not what Bogue wanted, he wanted more. It was in 1800 that the big move forward took place. This followed the offer of £500 from two men, one of whom was the well known Scotsman, Robert Haldane, toward a seminary for the training of missionaries. The Directors set up a committee to draw up plans for a missionary institution. In July of 1800 it was decided to invite David Bogue to be the tutor and to select Gosport to be the place, and, in early August, Bogue accepted the invitation. He at once, with his customary zeal and diligence, began to draw up an appropriate course of lectures for the missionary candidates. The committee which the Directors had set up had recommended that there should be in this course the communication of Scriptural knowledge, not that relating so much to criticism and controversial issues but that of a sound judgement and a thorough grasp of the principles of the Word of God. The students should attend especially to missionary subjects and, above everything else, care was to be given to the development of their own spiritual life and walk with God. Therefore, the committee wrote in these terms:

> The instructions must chiefly refer to the heart and, instead of cherishing the desire of shining in the world by distinguished talents, must aim at subduing every elating thought and mortifying the vain propensities of our nature. When he leaves his native country and friends and goes forth to seek the salvation of the untutored heathen, he is to take this for his motto, 'I am crucified to the world and the world is crucified to me', and therefore the great scope and tendency of the instruction he is to receive are to impress upon his heart the self-denying principle, as it relates to temporal things and animates the springs of faith and hope in respect to the future world. Thus he may be expected to unite great activity with great meekness, faith with patience, and at length, we trust, great success with humility and praise.

Henceforth, it was to be Bogue and his supporters who would mould, determine and direct the educational policy of the Society. Bogue, in the words of his biographer, James Bennett, 'was deeply convinced that Christ, instead of sending his apostles to learn to catch fish called them away from ships and nets to follow him and learn to become fishers of men'.

2 Where must we go?

'Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel unto every creature.' There is no part of the inhabited earth which is to be excluded from evangelistic and missionary activity. However, given the limited resources available, the founders of the LMS had to decide where a start should be made. Preaching on the occasion of the Society's formation, Thomas Haweis reviewed the possible areas of missionary activity: Africa, 'where scarce a gleam of light illumines the darkness, from the Pillars of Hercules to the Cape of Good Hope'; China, with its three hundred million souls and hardly one who 'knows the true God, and Jesus Christ, whom he hath sent'; India, where 'commercial Christians seem to worship no other god but gold' and are reprehensibly apathetic towards the evangelisation of the Hindus. Then he painted a glowing picture of the new world so recently opened up by the discoveries of Wallis and Cook. Haweis warmed to his favourite theme—the suitability of the South Sea islands as a scene for pioneer missionary effort.

> No region of the world, which I have yet observed (and I have considered the matter with much attention) affords us happier prospects in our auspicious career of sending the Gospel to the heathen lands; nowhere are the obstacles apparently less, or the opportunities greater, for the admission of the truth as it is in Jesus. No persecuting government, no Brahmanic castes to oppose, no inhospitable climate to endure, a language of little difficulty to attain, and of vast extent, with free access, and every prejudice in our favour.

As Arthur Skevington Wood remarks in his biography of Haweis, 'here Haweis breathed the spirit of his age, for the eighteenth century tended to locate Utopia in Tahiti'. Like many others of his contemporaries, Haweis had read the thrilling narratives of Samuel Wallis and James Cook describing their voyages to the South Seas, and, like William Carey, had felt the challenge of Cook's prophecy that the island of Tahiti would never become the scene of a Christian mission. Haweis longed to see these far-off regions won for Jesus Christ.

> I could not but feel deep regret that so beautiful a part of creation, and the inhabitants of these innumerable islands of the Southern Sea, should be regions of the shadow of death and dens of every unclean beast and habitations of cruelty devouring literally one another. Led by the Gospel through grace on all occasions to look for help to him who is mighty to save, I could not but hope and pray that this providential discovery of a before unknown world might lead

> to the communicating of Divine truth to these benighted lands, and bring them out of darkness into his marvellous light, Who is the light of life.

In fact, he had longed, certainly since the late 1780s to see missionary work started in Tahiti, and in 1789 Lady Huntingdon had offered him two of her Trevecca students to be trained for this purpose. However, for reasons beyond the scope of this paper, the project came to nothing. But the desire still remained, and the Evangelical Magazine for July 1795 carried a long article from Haweis entitled 'The Very Probable Success of a Proper Mission to the South Sea Islands'. In the course of this article Haweis commented that 'the work indeed is wholly divine; but some nations appear in a state more ready than others for the introduction of the Gospel'. Both the principle and the observation would have won Bogue's approval—but the differences between Bogue and Haweis are thereby brought out in the conclusion which Haweis drew from his observation: 'The castes of Industan, the government as well as the pride of the Chinese in their attachment to established forms, raise barriers terrible against the admission of the Christian doctrines: Whilst the very uncivilised state of the South Sea Islands gives such a high superiority to whatever missionaries from us can be sent among them, as cannot fail to secure their respect.'

What, then, was the opposite point of view? I take David Bogue as the spokesman, and draw my material from lectures which he gave to his missionary students at Gosport. He began by emphasising that no field was to be neglected, pointing to the Great Commission. All men need the gospel; it is suited to all, and is efficacious to the salvation of all. However, some fields are more important than others:

1. Where great numbers speak the same language.
2. Where language is written, and books are common
3. Where people are accustomed to reading
4. Where there is much social intercourse throughout the country
5. Where the influence is extensive and spreads to other countries.

'Among civilised people, native missionaries and preachers are likely to be soon found, who will spread the Gospel throughout their country.' Bogue reminded his students that Christ came to the centre of the civilised world, that the apostles laboured among civilised nations, that the Gospel went from civilised to barbarous nations and not vice versa. He concluded with the remark that 'three converts in China are worth twenty in Tahiti … with respect to the advancement of the Kingdom of Christ among men'.

Conclusion

The Founders of the LMS, together with the vast majority of the men associated with them in the great missionary awakening of the late eighteenth century, loved the doctrines of grace. The facts themselves demonstrate that to be a champion of the doctrines of free and sovereign grace, far from being incompatible with an interest in missions, is in itself a spur to missionary endeavour. The glory of God was central to these men's thinking, and they were persuaded that the salvation of the heathen would lead directly to the glory of God. In his pleas to his fellow dissenters, Bogue asked whether their obligations to glorify God were fulfilled, 'while we have employed no methods as a Christian body to lead our brethren in Pagan lands to glorify him also'. The truths of sovereign election, of a limited atonement, and of irresistible grace were a source of comfort and support rather than snares and hindrances. These doctrines gave to all missionary work the assurance that the grace of God was able to break all resistance, and that the eternal destiny of nations was dependent not on puny creatures but on a sovereign, merciful God and that missionary labours would not be in vain.

At the same time, divine sovereignty did not reduce human responsibility to a meaningless term. In emphasising this fact, the men of missions were convinced that they stood in a line of succession which could be traced back through Calvin and Augustine to Christ and the apostles. The Baptist Andrew Fuller argued that 'neither Augustine or Calvin, who each in his day defended predestination, and the other doctrines connected with it, ever appear to have thought of denying it to be the duty of every sinner who has heard the Gospel to repent and believe in Jesus Christ'. Carey was not slow to point out the inescapable connection between the duty to believe and missionary activity on a world wide basis. 'If it be the duty of all men where the Gospel comes to believe unto salvation, then it is the duty of those who are entrusted with the Gospel to endeavour to make it known among all nations for "the obedience of faith".'

The duty of evangelising was rested in the Great Commission which Christ gave to his disciples shortly before his ascension. 'Go … teach all nations.' 'All nations', of course, included England as well as the uttermost parts of the earth. The evidence shows plainly that, for Bogue, Haweis and their fellow-labourers, concern for the heathen of other lands was not an excuse for inactivity at home, equally, the needs of unbelievers in England did not cancel out responsibility for unbelievers across the seas. The command of Christ was clear: 'Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself', and the word 'neighbour' was to be interpreted both as broadly and as narrowly as possible.

The doctrines of grace, the duty of sinners to believe the Gospel, and our Lord's Great Commission were central in the missionary motivation of these

men. Their eschatological convictions, although important, were never the exclusive stimulus to missionary action. They were always subordinated to other motives; they provided an assurance of success but could not add to nor detract from the duty to evangelise the heathen. This is not to deny the role of eschatological expectation. They had a spirit of expectancy. They clearly shared with George Burder the hope 'that the happy period is approaching, when the Redeemer shall take unto him his great power and reign'. They looked forward to the Millennium, a period in which the spiritual dominion of Christ would spread over all the earth. Missionary activity was seen as a sign of the approach of the Millennium; at the same time, such activity was also to be viewed as a preparation for the Millennium; and yet again, those events which seemed to them to be ushering in the Millennium spurred them on to even more vigorous missionary activity. In some respects, of course, they were wrong. Today Rome, Islam and the religions of the Orient seem as strong as ever, and the optimism of Bogue and his contemporaries seems strangely out of place. But this is not to deny the correctness of their millennial doctrines nor the value of those doctrines as an incentive to missionary endeavour. Is there nothing to hope for before the Second Coming of Christ? True, even if the answer is 'no', we must still labour on in obedience to our Lord's commands. But if the answer is 'yes', the duty is likely to be accompanied with a spirit of eager, prayerful expectancy acting as a powerful stimulus.

The Founders of the LMS lived and laboured in an era when doors were already opened or were in the process of opening for missionary endeavour. Recent years have seen a closing of doors. To what extent, then, are the strategies which these men proclaimed and practised of relevance in a very changed situation? The emphasis which was placed on the establishment of indigenous churches is clearly of vital importance. The gathering of local churches, the choosing and ordaining of elders and deacons from among their members, the training and encouragement of native workers, and the insistence that the native church itself has a missionary responsibility in its own neighbourhood and country, should, of course, be basic aims in every situation. Some may question whether the Founding Fathers went far enough in this direction. They stressed the necessity of native churches and native workers but, at the same time, expected such churches and workers to be under the superintendence of European missionaries. In their defence, it ought to be pointed out that it is difficult to determine the precise nature of the relationship between the missionary and the native church which is formed of those converted, in the sovereign gracious purpose of God, through his evangelistic labours. The Apostle Paul, perhaps the greatest of human instruments used by God in the planting of churches, obviously did not regard

his work as complete, and his responsibility as at an end, with the establishment of a local church. He wrote and visited; he informed, advised, commanded and encouraged the young churches; he watched over them as a father does over his children. It is realised that, unlike Paul, the modern missionary cannot lay claim to apostolic authority. But, as Dr JH Bavinck has pointed out in his *Introduction to the Science of Missions,* a young church

> at first cannot do without the care of the missionary. Its minister is not very well grounded and he usually has little access to theological literature. When complications and difficulties arise, in cases of discipline, and the like, he frequently does not know what to do. He cannot consult books, and he still has had very little experience of his own. Moreover, his own conscience is too little formed by the Scriptures, so he cannot be sure of acting without making mistakes. It is not at all surprising that for the time being he gladly appeals to the missionary's greater wisdom and competence. The missionary is, of course, willing to give help. Moreover, he is deeply convinced that his calling includes such assistance. For the missionary knows that although a newly established church is completely independent, it is still very immature.

However, the aim must still be an independent, self-governing church.

Although the closing of some doors has limited the choice of spheres of missionary activity, should priority continue to be given, within the range of choice available, to more civilised areas and to widely used languages? This is a difficult question to answer. The New Testament places emphasis on 'all the world', 'all nations', 'to the end of the earth'. The Gospel is the only hope of both the most civilised and the most barbarous people, for 'it is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth'. Considerations such as these have led some to the most isolated regions of the earth to work with people whose language has taken long to learn and required much patience to reduce to writing. It is interesting and perhaps significant to observe that many of the doors already closed or in process of closing are in lands with a civilisation of their own and where a common language, albeit diversified into many dialects, is spoken by millions. To continue to communicate the gospel to people in such places may call for radio work and the dissemination of literature as well as for the witness of the local churches already established in those lands. By contrast, personal missionary effort may have to be directed primarily, although not exclusively, to more inaccessible and less civilised peoples and territories.

Whatever strategy is adopted, whatever eschatological hopes or fears may possess our minds, whatever relative value we give to the various motives impelling us to missionary endeavour, one truth is clear—the message to be preached never varies. The message of the early Church, of the Reformers, of the men of the Evangelical and missionary awakenings—the good news of

redemption in and through Jesus Christ alone—must continue to be at the centre of all missionary preaching and teaching. The object of the Missionary Society founded by Carey and his fellow Baptist ministers in the East Midlands was

> to evangelise the poor, dark, idolatrous heathen, by sending missionaries into different parts of the world, where the glorious Gospel of Christ is not at present published, to preach the glad tidings of salvation by the blood of the Lamb.

Bogue and those associated with him in the foundation of the London Missionary Society stressed that 'the sole object is to spread the knowledge of Christ among heathen and other unenlightened nations'. The Anglican, John Venn, in his *Account of a Society for Missions to Africa and the East,* emphasised that the first desire of missionaries must be 'to make known to their perishing fellow sinners the grace and power of a Redeemer, and the inestimable blessings of his salvation'. Clearly, then, the missionary's message to the heathen was to be the gospel. What are the essential elements of this gospel? Thomas Haweis expressed it thus:

> Jesus Christ is the corner stone—his Godhead and glory expressly defined,—his vicarious sacrifice in the human nature laid down as the sure foundation of a sinner's hope,—his obedience to death imputed to us for righteousness by faith alone,—his spirit communicated, as quickening the dead in trespasses and sins, and giving faith, and every grace, by his own divine inspiration,—producing righteousness and true holiness,—and leading infallibly to eternal life, the gift of God, through Jesus Christ.

When the gospel is given its rightful place, then preaching has its rightful place as the God-appointed means of communicating that gospel and of 'saving them which believe'. To quote Haweis again,

> Our whole success will depend upon this one point,—if Christ be preached,—only preached,—always preached,—then shall we see the power of his death and resurrection, and the Lord will add again daily to his church of such as shall be saved.

We may lament that these men are no longer with us, and be inclined to feel that, in the presence of such giants, we are but pygmies. But Christ's commission has not lost its validity, nor the gospel of God its power to save. The promises of the extension and success of Messiah's kingdom remain to encourage us in our praying and preaching, and, as one missionary remarked on hearing the news of Carey's death, 'the God of missions lives for ever'.

The Christian Mind of Philip Doddridge (1702–1751)

or The Gospel According to an Evangelical Congregationalist

Alan Clifford

Philip Doddridge is usually remembered as a hymnwriter. For the majority of English speaking Christians, their knowledge of him stops there. This lecture is concerned to demonstrate that Doddridge represents all that is best and biblical in the 'evangelical congregationalist' tradition. His evangelicalism is conspicuous in his hymns, and his convictions regarding church order and baptism place him in that denomination of Protestant Dissenters known as 'Congregationalists'.

As a hymnwriter, Philip Doddridge needs no introduction. The hymn books of many denominations suggest that his name will not be forgotten. 'Hark the glad sound' and 'O happy day' still find a place in worship of God's people. It is no small commendation that 'O God of Bethel' was chosen for the Queen's Silver Jubilee service at St Paul's Cathedral in June 1977.

Yet Doddridge's hymns were just a fraction of his vast literary output[1] and an even smaller part of his many and widely creative activities. Apart from Doddridge's regular preaching ministry, the hymns might never have seen the light of day. They were written to supplement the sermon, and given out, line by line, after it had been preached. The hymns were used as a teaching aid, designed to reinforce and apply the preached word. This fact reminds us that Doddridge was primarily a minister of the Gospel of Jesus Christ, a calling which he considered 'the most desirable employment in the world'.[2]

From the time of his settlement in Northampton, in December 1729, to his death in October 1751, Philip Doddridge served the cause of Christ with intense energy and total dedication. As Charles Stanford wrote in 1880, he 'seemed to live—so many lives at a time'.[3] In addition to being the pastor of Castle Hill Independent Church—his ordination took place on 19 March 1730—he was principal tutor of what was to become the most famous of all the Dissenting Academies.[4]

The dual role of pastor and tutor involved Doddridge in a wide range of interests and pursuits. As a tutor, he became an apologist (or defender of the faith), philosopher and a man of science, besides being a theologian, training

young men for the ministry. What Doddridge managed to accomplish in 21 busy years was directed by a single preoccupation. In the words of Dr Geoffrey Nuttall, evangelism was 'the thread on which his multi-coloured life was strung. It was for this above all that he wrote, preached, corresponded and educated his students in the Academy.'[5]

Doddridge lived at a time when rationalism was gnawing at the roots of Christianity. Fierce theological controversy was commonplace, it was no easy thing for a young minister to be certain which opinion best reflected 'the mind of God in the Scriptures'. It was a day of extremes, and Doddridge believed with Richard Baxter before him that the Bible demanded a 'middle-way'. That meant avoiding the incipient fatalism of much High Calvinism on one hand, and the implicit humanism of Arian-Arminianism on the other.[6]

Agreeing with Baxter's theological eclecticism (seeking the best of all traditions), Doddridge was also deeply concerned with Protestant unity. He did all he could to root out bigotry and sectarianism, being a friend to all who 'Loved the Lord Jesus in sincerity and truth'. He had fraternal relations with Dissenters and Churchmen alike.[7]

In his Academy lectures[8] we see how rigorous was the intellectual training Doddridge provided for his students. In his teaching method he was 'liberal' rather than 'dogmatic'; in other words he encouraged free enquiry. He was impatient with any theological system which failed to observe the balance of Biblical truth. Scripture was to be the only ultimate authority. He was concerned that truth itself, rather than his or any man's opinion, should mould his students' minds.

Doddridge's essentially conservative outlook is best seen in his magnum opus, *The Family Expositor*,[9] and his *Dissertation on the Inspiration of the New Testament*.[10] His theological foundations being assured, Doddridge was an advocate of the 'good old evangelical way of preaching'.[11]

In acquainting his students with philosophy and scientific questions, Doddridge wanted them to be thoughtful preachers, who would be able to say *why*, as well as *what,* they believed. He believed Christianity was capable of a rational defence. He was therefore concerned with apologetics. Doddridge's reply to Dodwell's *Christianity not founded on argument* was his most ambitious intellectual piece of writing, in which he demonstrates that faith and reason do not necessarily conflict.[12]

Of equal importance to Doddridge was the practical impact of the gospel. He was no armchair theologian. As co-founder of the Northampton Infirmary and promoter of a charity school in the town, Doddridge demonstrated the power of Christian example. His patriotic activity in connection with the invasion of Bonnie Prince Charlie in 1745, when he urged his congregation to

join the Northampton Militia and thus helped to decide the invaders to turn back at Derby, reveals his sense of Christian social responsibility.[13]

Nowhere is Doddridge's commitment to evangelism more clearly seen than in the welcome he extended to the infant Methodist movement.[14] His friendship with George Whitefield, John Wesley and others, was typical of his spirit. When older Dissenters, including Isaac Watts, viewed the revival with cool and suspicious detachment, Doddridge was ready to perceive the hand of God at work. He rejoiced that God had raised up such men, in such an ungodly age. The new Dissent turned to the old for guidance. Whitefield asked Doddridge to revise his *Journal* and John Wesley consulted him for a reading list for his preachers. Doddridge's own lasting contribution to the revival was his most popular book, *The Rise and Progress of Religion in the Soul*. It was to the reading of this book that William Wilberforce traced his own spiritual awakening.[15]

As with Mozart in another context, one feels that Doddridge's life was cut short. He died and was buried in Lisbon, whither he had been sent by his congregation in the hope of restoring his health, at the age of 49. One cannot but be amazed at the consistent Christian dedication of a life all too brief. His life and example have bequeathed a rich and lasting legacy to the churches.

Whereas a certain amount of interest in Doddridge has been generated in recent years, more attention has been paid to the man than to his beliefs. This is understandable, since Doddridge was an attractive personality by any standard. However, it is also unfortunate, since for Doddridge personally, his faith and his life were of a piece: what he *was*, was due, in great measure, to what he *believed* and *thought*. At least two reasons can explain the deficiencies in current Doddridge interest. *Firstly,* Doddridge was not an original and profound thinker of the stature of Augustine, or Thomas Aquinas, of Luther, Calvin or Barth, although he was an independent one. *Secondly,* the late twentieth century is little interested in the kind of theological convictions shared by Doddridge and his generation. This was stated quite explicitly in the bicentenary celebrations of Doddridge's death in 1951, when Roger Thomas said, 'The important thing for us, however, is not Doddridge's theological opinions …'[16]

Renowned as Doddridge was for his gracious and charitable disposition, it has become necessary to dispel the myth that truth and conviction were unimportant to him. His daughter's oft quoted retort to a critic of her father's theological views, 'My father's orthodoxy is charity'[17] has reinforced the fact that, in his lifetime, Doddridge was accused of being indifferent to theological convictions. The truth, however, is otherwise, although in an ecumenical age, one is not surprised to find that the myth is preferred to the reality. Whilst

Doddridge always lectured, preached and wrote according to the apostolic maxim of 'speaking the truth in love', it must never be forgotten that it was undiluted Biblical truth which he attempted to proclaim. We must not allow Doddridge's charm to seduce us into neglecting Doddridge's theology.

The task before us is to allow Doddridge the theologian to speak to us. It would have been much more *entertaining* to dwell upon the purely biographical and anecdotal details of this godly man's life, but we must be concerned, not so much with entertainment, as with instruction. My desire is to complete the picture, to correct any misconceptions, and to justify a continuing study of the life and work of Dr Philip Doddridge.

What we are doing needs little justification. Serious Christian people are aware that important issues demand our attention. Ours is the day of such books as *The Myth of God Incarnate*. It is also the day of the Ecumenical movement, the Nationwide Initiative on Evangelism, Liberation theology, the Charismatic movement and the Papal visit. The Christian Church is a restless institution, uncertain of its message, and doubtful of its relevance or place in the modern world.

Whilst Philip Doddridge is no infallible guide, he did at least address himself to issues very similar to those which face us today. Since these issues are of eternal significance, we are not being retrogressive in considering some of his views, although they were uttered 250 years ago.

Doddridge was, pre-eminently, a biblical theologian in the Reformed tradition. He believed in the full Divine Inspiration and authority of the Bible. For him, the Bible was the Word of God. In his *Dissertation on the Inspiration of the New Testament*, he tackles the issues which still trouble biblical scholars. His view of inspiration does not lead him to deny that the human instruments employed their own choice of words; he is not therefore committed to the crudely mechanical dictation theory of inspiration. Whilst denying that the original documents had any errors, he does not feel that the cause of truth is lost in admitting the possibility of minor errors in copies. Doddridge emphasises the relationship between *inspiration* and *authority:*

> Nothing can be more evident, than that a firm and cordial belief of the inspiration of the sacred scripture is of the highest moment; not only to the edification and peace of the church, but in a great measure to its very existence. For if this be given up, the authority of the revelation is enervated (or weakened), and its use destroyed: The star which is to direct our course, is clouded; our compass is broke to pieces; and we are left to make the voyage of life in sad uncertainty, amidst a thousand rocks, and shelves, and quicksands …[18]

For Doddridge, the Bible itself is above theology. It tests and regulates our thinking:

> Let us therefore always remember that … we are indispensably obliged to receive with calm and reverend submission all the dictates of scripture; to make it our oracle; and, in this respect, to set it at a due distance from all other writings whatsoever; as it is certain, there is no other book in the world, that can pretend to equal authority, and produce equal or comparable proofs to support such a pretention. Let us measure the truth of our own sentiments, or those of others, in the great things which scripture teaches, by their conformity to it. And O that the powerful charm of this blessed book might prevail to draw all that do sincerely regard it, into this centre of unity.[19]

On so basic a doctrine as the Trinity, Doddridge honestly faced the problems we all have in making rational sense of our faith. He was afraid of giving the impression that there are three gods—a misunderstanding which the Athanasian creed might suggest—and equally he was at pains to avoid the idea that the names of the three persons are but mere names of *one* person—the Sabellian heresy. His statement of the Trinity in his *Divinity Lectures* is simple and straightforward:

> The Scripture represents the Divine being as appearing in, and manifesting himself by the distinct persons of *Father*, *Son*, and *Holy Ghost*, each of which has his peculiar province in accomplishing the work of our redemption and salvation, and to each of which we owe an unlimited veneration, love and obedience.[20]

The fundamental difficulty reason poses for faith is met by a quotation from Jeremy Taylor, the famous seventeenth century bishop:

> Dr Jeremiah Taylor says, 'that he who goes about to speak of the mystery of the trinity, and does it by words and names of man's invention, talking of essences and existences, hypostases and personalities, priorities in co-equalities, &c, and unity in pluralities, may amuse himself and build a tabernacle in his head, and talk something he knows not what; but the good man, that feels the power of the Father, And to whom the Son is become wisdom, sanctification and redemption, in whose heart the love of the Spirit of God is shed abroad, this man, though he understands nothing of what is unintelligible, yet he alone truly understands the Christian doctrine of the Trinity.'[21]

It is surely wise to settle the matter thus!

The early eighteenth century debates about the doctrine of the Trinity centred on the person of Christ. The most urgent question of the day was, 'What think ye of Christ; whose son is he?' Arianism denied the full deity of Christ, insisting that he was created rather than begotten, and, in his early years, Doddridge admits to leaning toward this view. By the time he

commenced his ministry, his views were thoroughly orthodox. In the *Family Expositor* we read:

> (I AM ALPHA AND OMEGA). That these titles should be repeated so soon, in a connection which demonstrates they are given to Christ, will appear very remarkable … And I cannot forbear recording it, that *this text* has done more than any other in the Bible, toward preventing us from giving in to *that scheme*, which would make our Lord Jesus Christ no more than a deified creature (Note on Rev. 1:11).[22]

> I am deeply sensible of the sublime and mysterious nature of the doctrine of Christ's deity, as here declared; but it would be quite foreign to my purpose to enter into a large discussion of that great foundation of our faith, it has often been done by much abler hands. It was, however, a matter of conscience with me, on the one hand, thus strongly to declare my belief of it; and, on the other, to leave it as far as I could in the simplicity of scripture expressions (Note on John 1:1).[23]

> Justly hath our Redeemer said, blessed is the man that is not offended in me: and we may peculiarly apply the words to that great and glorious doctrine of the *deity of Christ*, which is here before us. A thousand high and curious thoughts will naturally arise in our corrupt hearts on this view of it; but may divine grace subdue them all to the obedience of an humble faith; so that, with Thomas, we may each of us fall down at his feet, and cry out with sincere and unreserved devotion, My Lord and my God! (Comment on John 1:1–14).[24]

When such foundational truths of the Bible were discarded, it was common for many to preach a gospel of morality, rather than a gospel of Grace. When 'evangelical doctrines' were under threat, Doddridge made his unequivocal response in his two sermons on *Salvation by Grace.*

> Salvation by grace is not a subject which grows out of date in a few months. This glorious doctrine has been the joy of the church in all ages on earth; and it will be the song of all that have received it in truth throughout the ages of eternity, and be pursued in the heavenly regions with evergrowing admiration and delight.[25]

At the very heart of the Gospel was the cross of our Lord Jesus Christ. For Doddridge, there was no salvation, but through the precious blood of Christ. It was a substitutionary atonement. In his sermon *Christ's Invitation to Thirsty Souls,* he declares:

> The tears of our blessed Redeemer must needs be convincing and affecting, if the mind be not sunk into an almost incredible stupidity; but his blood is still more so. View him, my brethren, not only in the previous scenes of his abasement, his descent from heaven, and his abode on earth; but view him on mount Calvary, extended on the cross, born with thorns, wounded with nails,

> pierced with a spear; and then say, whether there be not a voice in each of these sacred wounds, which loudly proclaims the tenderness of his heart, and demonstrates, beyond all possibility of dispute or suspicion, his readiness to relieve the distressed soul, that cries to him for the blessings of the gospel. He died to purchase them, not for himself, but for us; and can it be thought he will be unwilling to bestow them? We may well conclude that he loved us, since he shed his blood to wash us from our sins (Rev. 1:5): For greater love hath no man than this, that a man lay down his life for his friends (John 15:13); but he hath commended his love toward us, hath set it off by this illustrious and surprising circumstance, that while we were strangers and enemies he hath died for us (Romans 5:8).[26]

That our salvation was in the hands of God, and that the initiative of redemption was with him, led Doddridge to embrace two other great Bible truths which were under attack in his day—Predestination and Election. In the *Family Expositor* we read:

> … let us go back with unutterable pleasure to the gracious purpose which he was pleased to form in his own compassionate breast, when he chose us in Christ before the foundation of the world, when he predestinated us through him to the adoption of children. Let us acknowledge the freedom of his grace in it, that we are thus predestinated according to the purpose of him who, with proper regard to the nature of his intelligent and free creatures, worketh all things agreeably to the good pleasure of his will, and maketh us accepted in the beloved, that we may be to the praise of the glory of his grace (Comment on Eph. 1:1–14).[27]

In short, grace was the saving work of a sovereign God. In his Divinity Lectures we read:

> From hence it will further appear, that the reason of God's predestinating some to everlasting life, was not fetched from a foresight of their faith and obedience, considered as independent upon any communication of grace from him, but that it is to be referred into his sovereign mercy and free grace; which is also the language of many other scriptures. Titus 3:4,5: Ephesians 2:8, 9.[28]

Therefore, as a concomitant to the natural unbelief of the human heart, Doddridge—with Calvin and Baxter—resolves the difference between the believer and unbeliever in terms of *Common and Special Grace*. In Christ's *Invitation to Thirsty Souls* he says:

> I know, there is a great deal of difference between the common operations of the Spirit on the minds of those who continue obstinate and impenitent, and those special influences by which he sweetly but powerfully subdues the hearts of those, who are chosen in Christ Jesus before the foundation of the world. Yet I am persuaded, that none to whom the Gospel comes are utterly neglected by that sacred agent.[29]

As a theological tutor, Doddridge was aware of the danger of pushing logic too far: it must be kept under a tight rein. As with Richard Baxter before him, Doddridge resisted the temptation to deduce from election that Christ only died for the elect. There were too many 'alls' in Scripture. So, in his Divinity Lectures, Doddridge says:

> It is plain … that 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 sincerely embrace the Gospel. Cf. John 3:16, 6:50,51, Romans 5:18, 8:32, 1 Corinthians 8:11, 2 Corinthians 5:14,15,19, 1 Timothy 2:4, 6, Hebrews 2:9, 1 John 2:2.[30]

It is interesting to observe at this point, that Doddridge refers his students to John Calvin's views on the extent of the atonement. What Dr RT Kendall[31] has stunned the Reformed Evangelical world with in recent days was known to Baxter and Doddridge—that Calvin believed Christ died for all men.[32] The doctrine of limited atonement was an instance of logic going beyond Scripture. Thus Dr John Owen, whose view Baxter opposed, was called the 'over-orthodox doctor',[33] because of his work on the atonement, *The Death of Death in the Death of Christ*. Owen's position was embryonic hyper-Calvinism—what Doddridge called 'High Calvinism'. He, like Baxter, was known as a 'moderate' (or 'true') Calvinist.

However, the efficacy of the atonement was guaranteed by election, and this was where 'moderate' Calvinism differed from the universalist view of the Arminians. So, with Baxter and Calvin, Doddridge says in his Lectures:

> … there (is) a sense, in which Christ might be said to die for all; as all men partake of some benefit by his death, and such provision is made for their salvation, as lays the blame of their ruin, if they miscarry, entirely upon themselves: but it was in a very peculiar and much nobler sense, that he died for the elect, intending evidently to secure for them, and only for them, the everlasting blessings of his Gospel … John 10:15,16,26; 17:2,9,16.[34]

Doddridge had no inhibitions about being evangelistic as a result of the Bible's teaching about election. To say that God's sovereignty makes humans mere automatons, or that evangelism is unnecessary, and that strivings for holiness are pointless, is to abuse the doctrine of election and fly in the face of God's Word. Therefore, Doddridge shows us the biblical basis for human activity. In the *Family Expositor*, he says:

> (Will have all men to be saved) It is far from being my design, in any of these notes, to enter deep into controversy, but I must confess I have never been satisfied with that interpretation which explains all men here merely as signifying some of all sorts and ranks of men; since I fear it might also be said, on the principles of those who are fondest of this gloss that he also wills all

> men to be condemned. On the other hand, if many are not saved, it is certain the words must be taken with some limitation, which the following clause, he wills their coming to the knowledge of the truth, must also prove. The meaning therefore seems to be, that God has made sufficient provision for the salvation of all, and that it is to be considered as the general declaration of his will, that all who know the truth themselves, should publish it to all around them, so far as their influence can extend (Note on 1 Tim. 2:4).[35]

With the advent of the Methodist revival, attention became focused on the doctrine and work of the Holy Spirit. Doddridge made plain his view of the Holy Spirit's work in the new birth through his *Discourse on Regeneration*.[36] As regards what is known today as the 'Baptism in the Holy Spirit', Doddridge believed a distinction was to be drawn between the new birth and the baptism of the Spirit. In the *Family Expositor,* he comments on the outpouring of the Holy Spirit at Pentecost thus:

> Thus did the blessed Jesus accomplish what had been foretold concerning him (Matthew 3:11), that he should baptize his disciples with the Holy Ghost and with fire. And surely the sacred flame did not only illuminate their minds with celestial brightness, but did also cause their whole hearts to glow with love to God and zeal for his gospel. To this purpose, may he still be imparted to us, whether we hold public or private stations in the church; and may our regards to him be ever most dutifully maintained. Especially may he be poured out upon the ministers of it, to direct them how they should speak the wonderful things of God; and may their hearers, under his gracious energy, gladly receive the word (Comment on Acts 2:1–21).[37]

Doddridge understood the 'sealing' or 'witness' of the Holy Spirit in the context of the pentecostal blessing. He expounds Romans 8:16 as 'some inward impression of God's Spirit upon the believer's mind, assuring them that they are Christians indeed'.[38] For this blessing Doddridge urges the doubting believer to 'Plead hard … at the throne of grace. Lay hold on God by faith; and say, "Lord, I will not let thee go till thou bless me …"'[39] However, Doddridge also distinguished between the Baptism of the Spirit and the extraordinary gifts of the Spirit. Now that the Canon of Scripture was complete, the latter were not necessary. He was at one with the Reformers, Puritans and Methodists when he said that:

> Many things may be said of the charismata, or the extraordinary gifts and powers of the Apostles and primitive (early) Christians, which were so peculiar to that age, that we have no personal concern in them at all.[40]

Doddridge also shared Baxter's passion for Christian Unity, what we would regard today as evangelical unity. He was grieved at the Christian 'fragmentation' of his day. In his comment on John 17:21, he says:

> (That the world may believe that thou hast sent me.) This plainly intimates that dissentions among Christians would not only be uncomfortable to themselves, but would be the means of bringing the truth and excellence of the Christian religion into question: and he must be a stranger to what hath passed, and is daily passing, in the world, who does not see what fatal advantage they have given to infidels to misrepresent it as a calamity, rather than to regard it as a blessing to mankind. May we be so wise as to take the warning, before we are quite destroyed one of another! (Galatians 5:15) (Note on John 17:21).[41]

Doddridge was impatient with denominationalism, which he called 'party spirit'. He did all he could to bring Christian people together, believing that what was agreed upon was much greater than what divided them. Listen to his rebuke of our divisions:

> In the meanwhile, let us avoid, as much as possible, a party spirit, and not be fond of listing ourselves under the name of this, or that man, how wise, how good, how great soever, for surely, if the names of Peter and Paul were in this view to be declined, much more are those, which, in these latter days, have so unhappily crumbled the Christian and Protestant interest, and have given such sad occasion to our enemies to reproach us. Christ is not divided: nor were Luther, or Calvin, or even Peter, or Paul, crucified for us; nor were we baptised into any of their names (Comment on 1 Cor. 1:10–17).[42]

Christian re-union did not mean the sinking of differences, or that our sincere convictions were to be suppressed. It was a case of 'speaking the truth in love', as he explained in a sermon:

> Truth is indeed too sacred a thing ever to be denied on any consideration: and so far as we are in our own consciences persuaded that any particular truth is important, neither honour or charity will allow us to give it up, as a point of mere indifferent speculation. Let us therefore ever be ready, when properly called out to the service, to plead its cause in the name of the God of truth, but let it be in a manner worthy of him, a manner which may not offend him as the God of love. And let us be greatly upon our guard that we do not condemn our brethren, as having forfeited all title to the name of Christians, because their creeds or confessions of faith do not come up to the standard of our own.[43]

Doddridge possessed what was called a 'catholic' spirit. His concern for unity brought him a wide acquaintance. He had discussions with the Archbishop of Canterbury, Dr Herring, as well as Baptist Pastors; he was a friend of Methodist revivalists as well as more traditional Dissenters. However, it is obvious from his correspondence and writings that he was concerned with *Protestant* Unity, in days when no one doubted that the Church of England was a Protestant Church.

If he could not justify perpetual divisions between the Protestant bodies, he had no doubts about the duty of separation from the Roman Catholic Church. In his sermon on the *Iniquity of Persecution*, he starts with this forthright statement:

> If Popery be considered in a religious view, it must appear the just object of our contempt, as well as our abhorrence.[44]

In another sermon, he explains his position very clearly:

> My brethren, pardon the freedom of my speech. I should have thought it my duty to have separated from the Church of Rome, had she pretended only to determine those things which Christ has left indifferent: How much more when she requires a compliance with those, which he hath expressly forbid? … You shall not only bow at the venerable name of our common Lord, but you shall worship an image: You shall not only kneel at the communion, but kneel in adoration of a piece of bread: You shall not only pronounce, or at least appear to pronounce, those accursed, who do not believe what is acknowledged to be incomprehensible, but those who do not believe what is most contrary to our reason and senses. When these are the terms of our continued communion, the Lord judge between us and them! Had nothing but indifferent things been in dispute, we should have done, as we do by our brethren of the Church of England, taken our leave of them with decency and respect: We should have loved them as our brethren, while we could not have owned them as our Lords. But when they require us to purchase our peace, by violating our consciences and endangering our souls, it is no wonder that we escape as for our lives.[45]

For Doddridge, the position and power of the Pope, the doctrine of the Mass and transubstantiation, and worship of the Virgin Mary were major issues at stake. On papal power and influence, he says:

> (Above all that is called God, &c.) The usurpation of the papacy in Divine things is so unequalled, that if these words are not applicable to it, it is difficult to say, who there ever has been, or can be to whom they should belong. The manner in which the Pope has exalted himself above magistrates (civil governments) is equally remarkable and detestable … (Notes on 2 Thessalonians 2:4).[46]

> The scandalous and extravagant pretences which the followers of the papacy have made to miracles, exceeding in number, and some of them in marvellous circumstances, those of Christ and his apostles, plainly display the energy of Satan, that father of frauds, pious and impious. And the most incredible lies, which they have, by solemn and irrevocable acts, made essential to their faith, shew the strength of delusion … (Comment on 2 Thessalonians 2:1–12).[47]

For Doddridge, the doctrine of transubstantiation was as ridiculous as it is unbiblical:

> (This is my body) When I consider that (as a thousand writers have observed) on the same foundation on which the papists argue for transubstantiation from these words, they might prove, from Ezekiel 5:1–5, that the prophet's hair was the city of Jerusalem; from John 10:9 and 15:1 that Christ was literally a door and a vine; and from Matthew 26:27,28, and from 1 Corinthians 11:25, that the cup was his blood, and that Christ commanded his disciples to drink and swallow the cup; I cannot but be astonished at the inference they would deduce from hence (Note on Matt. 26:26).[48]

Prayers to the Virgin Mary were a failure to grasp the nature of our Lord's authority as well as a denial of the direct access we have to the throne of grace:

> If his mother met with so just a rebuke for attempting to direct his ministrations in the days of his flesh, how absurd it is for any to address her as if she had a right to command him on the throne of his glory (Comment on John 2:1–11).[49]

It is plainly true, therefore, after the survey we have made of some of Doddridge's convictions, that he was far from indifferent to doctrine. Indeed, it was clearly of the greatest importance to him.

However, Doddridge also made it clear that there was more to being a Christian than doctrinal exactness and precision. He makes this judicious observation in the *Rise and Progress of Religion in the Soul:*

> The exercise of our rational faculties upon the evidences of divine revelation, and upon the declaration of it as contained in Scripture, may furnish a very wicked man with a well-digested body of orthodox divinity in his head, when not one single doctrine of it has ever reached his heart.[50]

Doddridge's views on Roman Catholicism may cause disappointment to some who have viewed him as an ecumenical prophet, and yet reassurance for others. It must be said in all truth that he clearly drew a distinction between Roman Catholicism and Roman Catholics, between the system and its blind devotees. Nowhere is this more perfectly illustrated than in the 'Connell Affair'. One Bryan Connell was found guilty of murdering a man at Weedon, near Northampton. Doddridge befriended the poor man, who pleaded innocence, and Doddridge believed that he was not guilty. Despite an appeal, Connell was executed on 3 April 1741. Now Connell was a Roman Catholic, and Doddridge's concern for him even led many to suggest that the Reformed pastor had inclinations towards Roman Catholicism. In a letter to Connell, written only two days before the execution took place, Doddridge pleads with the condemned man to seek salvation in Christ. The letter also tells us a great

deal about Doddridge—the Protestant, the Evangelical, the spiritual and truly Christian man that he was:

> I beseech you by the worth of your precious and immortal soul! that in these solemn moments, you guard against every false dependence. You well remember how frequently and how earnestly I have repeated this caution. I rejoice in finding you so often declare, that you put no confidence in the power of a Priest to forgive sin; nor in the efficacy of sacraments to save an impenitent sinner; nor in the intercession of saints and angels; nor in the value of your own blood, supposing it, in this respect innocent, to make satisfaction to God for the sins of your life; but that you desire to trust in the mercy of God, through the blood and intercession of our Lord Jesus Christ alone. Whatever your opinion of the church of Rome may be, which this is not a time to debate, you are in all these things a very good Protestant in your notions; but let me remind you, Sir, that we cannot be saved by the soundest notions, but must feel their power to change our hearts, and must act upon them. I do therefore again, that I may deliver your soul and my own, solemnly exhort you most earnestly to seek the renewing influences of Divine grace, to change your sinful heart, and to fit you for the presence of God. Pray that God may give you repentance unto life, not merely a grief for temporal ruin, and a dread of that future punishment which the worst of men must desire to escape, but a repentance arising from the love of God, attended with a filial ingenuous (or sincere) sorrow for the indignity and dishonour which your sins have offered to so excellent and so gracious a Being. Oh! while there is yet hope fly to the blood and the righteousness of Christ, and to the free grace of God in the Gospel which is manifested to the greatest of sinners, and shall be manifested in you, if you sincerely believe. I am glad I have seen no crucifix near you, but in a spiritual sense to lie at the foot of the cross, and to look by faith unto him that died upon it, is the safest and best thing you can do. Pardon and grace, help and happiness must be sought here, not only by you, my friend, but by the most upright and virtuous man upon the earth, or he will appear a condemned sinner before God. God is my witness that this is my refuge: let it be yours, and we may have a happier meeting than we have known upon earth.[51]

For Doddridge, his Protestant, Reformed, and evangelical orthodoxy was no negative thing. For him, the truth of God should lead to the God of truth; the written word should lead us to the Incarnate Word, and Gospel of Christ should lead us to the Christ of the Gospel:

> Would to God that all the party-names, and unscriptural phrases and forms, which have divided the Christian world were forgot, and that we might agree to sit down together, as humble, loving disciples; at the feet of our common Master, to hear his word, to imbibe his spirit, and transcribe his life in our own.[52]

This was the main spring of Doddridge's Christianity—without which, it is impossible to arrive at a correct estimate of the man. He summed up the blessed secret of his life a secret all may share, in his own epigram on the family motto DUM VIVIMUS VIVAMUS (In living, LIVE), described by Dr Samuel Johnson as one of the finest in the English 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 life let both united be,
> I live in pleasure, when I live to thee.[53]

References

1 See Erik Routley, 'The Hymns of Philip Doddridge', in *Philip Doddridge, His Contribution to English Religion*, ed. GF Nuttall (1951), p. 46f. Also Ernest Payne, 'The Hymns of Philip Doddridge', in *Philip Doddridge: Nonconformity and Northampton*, ed. RL Greenall (1981), p. 15f.
2 Job Orton, *Memoir of the Life, Character and Writings of the late Rev. P Doddridge, DD of Northampton* (1766), in Doddridge, *Works,* ed. Williams and Parsons (1802–5) Vol. 1, p. 260.
3 Charles Stanford, *Philip Doddridge* (1880), p. 41.
4 See Irene Parker, *The Dissenting Academics in England* (1914), p. 101.
5 Introduction to *Calendar of the Correspondence of Philip Doddridge, DD* (1702–51) (1979) p. xxxv.
6 See GF Nuttall, *Richard Baxter and Philip Doddridge: A Study in Tradition* (1951).
7 See GF Nuttall, 'Chandler, Doddridge and the Archbishop: A study in eighteenth-century ecumenism', *Journal of the URC History Society*, Vol. 1, No. 2 (1973), p. 42f.
8 See 'Lectures on Pneumatology, Ethics and Divinity', in *Works*, Vols. 4 & 5.
9 Many editions were published. See *Works*, Vols. 6–10.
10 *Works*, Vol. 4, p. 168f.
11 Orton, in *Works*, Vol. 1, p. 153.
12 Ibid. p. 469f.
13 See Malcolm Deacon, *Philip Doddridge of Northampton*, (1980), p. 114f, and also Victor A Hatley, 'A Local Dimension: Philip Doddridge and Northampton Politics', in Greenall, *op cit.*, p. 77f.
14 See my 'Philip Doddridge and the Oxford Methodists' in *Proceedings of the Wesley Historical Society*, Vol. XLII, Part 3 (1979), pp. 75–80. Also Alan Everitt, 'Philip Doddridge and the Evangelical Tradition' in Greenall, *op. cit.*, p. 31f.
15 See RI and S Wilberforce, *The Life of William Wilberforce* (1838) Vol. 1, p. 760.
16 Roger Thomas, 'Doddridge and Liberalism' in *Religion in Philip Doddridge*, ed. Nuttall (1951) p. 134.
17 See *Philip Doddridge*, ed. Nuttall (1951) p. 35.
18 'Dissertation on the New Testament', *Works*, Vol. 4, p. 168.
19 Ibid. p. 193.
20 *Works*, Vol. 5, p. 187.
21 Ibid. p. 193.
22 *Works*, Vol. 10, p. 431.
23 *Works*, Vol. 6, p. 24.
24 Ibid. p. 29.
25 *Works*, Vol. 2, p. 553.
26 Ibid. pp. 601–2.
27 *Works*, Vol. 9, p. 328.

28 *Works*, Vol. 5, p. 259.
29 *Works*, Vol. 2, p. 600.
30 *Works*, Vol. 5, p. 214.
31 See *Calvin and English Calvinism* (1979) p. 13f.
32 Calvin on the extent of the Atonement:
   (a) It is incontestable that Christ came for the expiation of the sins of the whole world … Hence, we conclude that, though reconciliation is offered to all through him, yet the benefit is peculiar to the elect … God reconciles the world to himself, reaches to all, but that it is not sealed indiscriminately on the hearts of all to whom it comes so as to be effectual (*Concerning the Eternal Predestination of God,* tr. JKS Reid, (1661) p 148–9).
   (b) Paul makes grace common to all men, not because it in fact extends to all but because it is offered to all. Although Christ suffered for the sins of the world, and is offered by the goodness of God without distinction to all men, yet not all receive him (*Commentary on Romans* (5:18), tr. Ross Mackenzie (1961) p. 117–118).
   (c) Christ suffered sufficiently for the whole world but effectively only for the elect … I allow the truth of this *(Commentary on St John and 1 John,* (1 Jn 2:2) tr. THL Parker (1961) Vol. 2, p. 244).
33 See Nuttall, *Richard Baxter and Philip Doddridge*, p. 10.
34 *Works*, Vol. 5, p. 263.
35 *Works*, Vol. 9, p. 581.
36 *Works*, Vol. 2, p. 371f.
37 *Works*, Vol. 7, p. 514.
38 'The Witness of the Spirit' in *Sermons* (1826), *Works,* Vol. 2, p. 381.
39 *Ibid.*, Vol. 3, p. 15.
40 *Works*, Vol. 1, p. 554.
41 Note on John 17:21 ('Family Expositor'), *Works*, Vol. 7, p. 339.
42 'Family Expositor', *Works*, Vol. 8, p. 564.
43 'Christian Candour and Unanimity' (1750), *Works*, Vol. 3, p. 267.
44 *Works*, Vol. 3, p. 119.
45 'Lectures on Popery', quoted in 'Orton's Memoir', *Works*, Vol. 1, p. 123.
46 'Family Expositor', *Works*, Vol. 9, p. 551
47 Ibid. p. 554.
48 Ibid. *Works*, Vol. 7, p. 296.
49 Ibid. *Works*, Vol. 6, p. 135.
50 *Works*, Vol. 1 p 422.
51 *Correspondence and Diary of Philip Doddridge, DD*, ed JD Humphreys (1829–30) Vol. 3, p. 556f (*Calendar*, ed. Nuttall, Letter 667). It seems that Connell was not converted. *op. cit.,* Vol. 5, p. 425.
52 Preface to the 'Family Expositor', *Works* Vol. 6, p. 13.
53 GF Nuttall, 'Doddridge's Life and Times', in *Philip Doddridge*, ed. Nuttall p. 21 and other places.

Infant Baptism

John Legg

At the 1976 Westminster Conference a speaker referred to infant baptism as 'this curious belief'. I know that many Christians disagree with the idea, but to refer in this way to the practice of John Owen, Thomas Goodwin, John Cotton, Thomas Shepard, Jonathan Edwards, Isaac Watts, Philip Doddridge and the founders of the London Missionary Society is itself more than curious! It seems to suggest that no thinking person could hold such a belief. Historically, Congregationalists or Independents, at any rate, have believed in and practised infant baptism. The trust deeds of almost all of our church buildings assert this, resting as they do upon the *Savoy Declaration* of 1658 or the almost identical doctrinal articles of the *Westminster Confession* or the much weaker, but still explicit *1833 Declaration*.

Church history, of course, settles nothing; Scripture must be our only authority. Nevertheless history may help us to identify crucial issues and avoid foolish mistakes, so I shall try to refer to past statements and controversies as we proceed. I shall also try to be practical, since it is at this point that many find difficulties.

1 The Baptism of Covenant Children

We do not base our belief on tradition or the authority of the church. We do not believe that baptism regenerates or automatically imparts grace. We are not in the same camp as the RCs, the ACs (Anglo Catholics) or liberal URCs, any more than our baptist brethren are to be linked with the 'Jehovah's Witnesses' because they both baptise 'believers' by immersion! Our doctrine is covenant doctrine, not the church covenant beloved of our independent forebears, but the covenant of grace manifested historically in the various covenants of promise from Abraham to the New Covenant. This was the teaching of the 17th century Independents, as it has been of their successors. Thus the *Savoy Declaration* reads:

> Baptism is a Sacrament of the New Testament, ordained by Jesus Christ to be unto party baptized a signe and seal of the Covenant of Grace, of his ingrafting into Christ, of regeneration, of remission of sins, and of his giving up unto God through Jesus Christ to walk in newness of life.[1]

Simply stated, the doctrine is this: God has always dealt with his people by means of covenants. In these covenants he has always included the children of believers with their parents and the sign of the covenant was given to them accordingly. Thus baptism, the New Testament equivalent of circumcision, is

to be given to them. This is not, as is often alleged, a complicated belief, still less 'curious'. The complications only arise, as with other doctrines like the Trinity, when objections are raised. Thus where the Puritans wrote pamphlets (imagine Owen dealing with the subject in 5½ pages!), we have to write books in which we have to try to establish the basic presuppositions which we can no longer take for granted in these days.

It is noticeable that the increase in support for the baptist position has coincided over the last 120 years or so with three developments, which have affected these presuppositions.

1. There has been a growth in Arminianism which has led men to deny God's right to include children in the covenant without their consent, as well as stressing almost exclusively the aspect of man's confession rather than God's use of a means of grace.
2. Unbelieving modern scholarship—and the necessary preoccupation of evangelicals with it—has destroyed for many the unity of the Bible, removing any awareness of the development of God's covenant dealings with his people. (One supposedly evangelical baptist tries to avoid the implications of Genesis 17 by dating it during the exile!)
3. Dispensationalism, popularised by the Schofield Reference Bible, with its teaching that God deals with every age differently, has also militated against seeing the continuity between the two testaments.

It is when one has to try to deal with all these ideas before coming to the doctrine of baptism, that the matter becomes complicated.

Some may want to object that there are many baptists, an increasing number today, who are not modernist, dispensationalist or Arminian—any more than CH Spurgeon was. It is a pleasure to acknowledge this and to welcome the recognition of the idea and unity of the covenant which one finds in writers of this school. Nevertheless, it seems to me that they have not really grasped the nature of the covenant. They always assume that to be 'in covenant' equals being saved; hence their fears about baptismal regeneration. They do not observe the biblical distinction, which our forefathers made between an external and an internal covenant, but which I would prefer to make between a covenant made and a covenant performed, between the privileges and the blessings of the covenant. Psalm 103:17–18.

In the light of this, I must expand the basic simple statement, although I cannot, of course, deal with all the presuppositions. The following points should be noted.

1. The 17th century Independents made much of the argument from silence, an argument which has been misrepresented and then held up to ridicule, so let us try to understand it. John Owen:

> But now the spiritual privilege of a right unto and a participation of the initial seal of the covenant was granted by God unto the infant seed of Abraham. Genesis 17:10,12.
>
> This grant, therefore, must stand firm for ever, unless men can prove or produce—
>
> 1 An express revocation of it by God himself; which none can do either directly or indirectly, in terms or any pretence of consequence.
>
> 2 An instance of a greater privilege or mercy granted unto them in the room of it; which they do not once pretend unto, but leave the seed of believers whilst in their infant state, in the same condition with those of pagans and infidels; expressly contrary to God's covenant.[2]

Notice, Owen is not saying that there is *no* New Testament evidence, merely that there is no revoking or annulling of the link between parents and children established in the Old Testament, which must therefore be assumed to remain in force.

2. Thus we can proceed to New Testament evidence which positively indicated that the inclusion of children in the covenant continues. This begins with Acts 2:38–39: 'Repent and be baptised every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost. For *the promise is unto you and to your children*, and to all that are afar off, even as many as the Lord our God shall call.' There is more, however, according to the baptist argument, at this point, *i.e.* Pentecost, the apostles should have told the Jews that their spiritual privileges had ended, that those who on Pentecost minus one were in covenant with God with all its attendant privileges, as specified in Romans 3:1–2, had now lost that position. Instead we find Peter referring to unbelieving Jews in Acts 3:25 as 'the children of the prophets and of the covenant which God made with our fathers, saying unto Abraham, and in thy seed shall all the kindred of the earth be blessed'. We find them preaching first to the Jews and Paul asserting that it is right, Romans 1:16.

Thomas Shepard in New England quotes Ephesians 2:12–13, very much to the point:

> If it was the curse of Gentiles to be strangers to the covenant of promise (made with Jews) before they became the churches of God, then by being churches, this curse is removed, and hence (Ephesians 2:12–13) the apostle saith they were strangers to the covenant and commonwealth of Israel, but are not so now. If you say that the Ephesians were in covenant but not their seed, and so they were not strangers, I answer, that the apostle doth not set out their cursed

> estate merely because they were without *any* covenant, but because they were strangers to that covenant of promise which the Israelites had.[3]

The holiness asserted of a believer's child in 1 Corinthians 7:14 must be the holiness of sacred things, those in some sense belonging to God and the picture of the olive tree in Romans 11 contains the same idea. John Tombes, a 17th century baptist denies this: 'For there is not a word of taking any into the olive tree … but by faith, not the least hint of infants taking with their parents.'[4] However, Romans 11 certainly speaks of branches being broken off, as does John 15:6, so unless we are prepared to admit that believers can be lost we must accept that these branches were in the tree or vine without faith, that is because of their link with the holy root or because they were part of the community of God's people.

> The Jews are cut off from the fatness of the olive tree and the Gentiles put in, or ingrafted in their room. Now this ingrafting is not into Christ by saving faith, for it is impossible that such should ever be broken off who are once in it must therefore be meant of their ingrafting into the external state of the visible church.[5]

3. When we refer to household baptisms in the New Testament, it is often argued in reply that these households did not necessarily include infants. While it is highly unlikely that there were no children, that is not really the point. The point is that in each case baptism is given to the household because of the faith of the head of the household, just as with Abraham and his household.

4. The New Testament also bears evidence of the spirituality of the Old. Baptists frequently argue or assume that the Old Covenant was a purely national affair, that circumcision was only a carnal sign and that all that was, therefore, done away with in the New Covenant. This, of course, ignores the fact that the covenant with Abraham preceded the law by 430 years and was not set aside by it (Galatians 3:17). It ignores the spiritual significance of circumcision as a sign of regeneration, Deuteronomy 30:6, 'And the Lord thy God will circumcise thine heart, and the heart of thy seed, to love the Lord thy God', and of justification, 'The sign of circumcision, a seal of the righteousness of the faith which he had yet being uncircumcised', Romans 4:11. This sign and seal of the new birth and of justification was given to infants. Thus the argument that baptism, because it signifies salvation, cleansing from sin, dying and rising with Christ, must only be given to actual believers, would apply equally to God's clear command that infants should be circumcised. (In fact most of the arguments against infant baptism would also condemn infant circumcision!)

5 This brings me to a final matter. Much of the difficulty in this area arises from a misconception about the nature of the sacraments. It is here that Arminianism with its stress on man's confession has had a bad effect. The sacraments are visible words, confirming the promises and demands of the covenant and of the gospel. They are attached to the word of God rather than to people. In themselves the sacraments do not confirm that any individual is saved, whether infant or adult, as we can see from the case of Simon in Acts 8:13,21. A proper understanding of this avoids any suggestion of baptismal regeneration and helps us to appreciate the significance of baptism for a child.

We must, therefore, be covenant baptists as were our forefathers. I do not claim that they always expressed themselves accurately or happily—they would almost certainly have the same reservations about me!—but their central affirmation, that baptism is a sign and seal of the covenant and therefore to be given to believers and their children, was, I believe, biblical and true.

2 The definition of Covenant Children

We are concerned here with the limits of infant baptism, a most important topic, if only because malpractice at this point has most prejudiced sincere Christians against infant baptism. They feel that it gives false security to hardened unbelievers, an attitude with which I have much sympathy, even though I regard it as somewhat exaggerated. The *Savoy Declaration* is in no doubt on this matter:

> IV Not only those that do actually profess faith in, and obedience unto Christ, but also the Infants of one or both believing parents are to be baptized, and those only. (The last three words were added to the statement previously made in the *Westminster Confession*.)

Sadly, later generations of Congregationalists departed from this and the 19th century saw the introduction, although not without opposition, of indiscriminate infant baptism. Halley and RW Dale argued for this on the basis of Matthew 28:19, saying that the 'them' in that verse referred to 'all nations' rather than to those made disciples. As our present committee has made clear in *Evangelical and Congregational*, 'Dale's view has little to commend it Scripturally and is quite a novelty to earlier Congregational thinking'.[6] In the 20th century, 'christening' has become little more than a tribal custom, with evangelicals trying to salve their consciences by making some evangelistic use of the Cradle Roll.

The addition in the *Savoy Declaration* may have been a reaction to loose practice by their presbyterian contemporaries or possibly to the debate on the other side of the Atlantic, which resulted shortly afterwards in the notorious Halfway Covenant. This allowed baptism to the children of those who had

themselves been baptised in infancy, but who, while orthodox and moral, could not satisfy the rigorous New England requirements for communicant church-membership. What we might consider to be over-strict requirements may explain this, but cannot excuse it: the requirements should have been changed, not baptism extended, but more of this later. It must be obvious that such a practice will end in indiscriminate baptism as the next generation claims the same right on the same ground, a sort of quarter-way covenant! In spite of biblical statements about the covenant being to a thousand generations, we must reject all such ideas in the light of what Genesis 17, for instance, has to say about the consequences of breaking the covenant. Thus we are left with the baptism of the children of believers, or, in the light of 1 Corinthians 7:14, of one believer.

Nevertheless, this is not the end of the matter. We must also consider the question in the light of the clear New Testament practice of believers' baptism, and also section VII of the *Savoy Declaration:* 'Baptism is but once to be administered to any person.' The connection is this. Most of the early baptists were separatists who were not so much rejecting infant baptism on biblical grounds, as they came to do later, as denying the validity of the baptism administered by what they regarded as false churches. They rejected both Roman Catholic and Anglican baptism and became Anabaptists because they wanted to be baptised once in a valid manner by a pure church. The Independents, who were not really separatists, were prepared to recognise Anglican baptism (some of them even Catholic baptism), and so retained this section as in the *Westminster Confession*.

In the light of baptist accusations that we merely pay lip-service to the idea of believers' baptism, rather than merely quote the missionary situation, let us give some thought to our own position, lest we be 'pseudo-baptists' rather than paedo-baptists.

The 19th century presbyterians spent some time debating the validity of 'romish baptism'. Charles Hodge maintained that it was valid: JH Thornwell denied it—Prof. John Murray gave it as his opinion that Thornwell was undoubtedly right. Many would argue that as long as the Trinitarian formula was used, then the baptism was valid, but what then do we do about the 'Jehovah's Witnesses', who baptise 'believers' using the words of Matthew 28:19 in spite of denying the Trinity? In any case the 'formula' in Matthew 28 is much more than that: it represents the establishing of a covenant relationship with a gracious and saving God. So if you would reject unitarian baptism because of the doctrine of the Trinity, you should also reject liberal or sacramentarian baptism, whether by Romanists, Anglicans or Congregationalists, because of the doctrines of justification, regeneration and

the work of Christ, which are just as important and are also implicit in the meaning of baptism.

This is a thorny issue with all its implications of denying churches to be *true* churches, and I do not pretend to have a full answer. We should recognise, however, at least that we are not concerned merely with rules and recognition, but with a means of grace. If a person's baptism was that, *i.e.* if the parents were real Christians or at any rate such as would have been admitted to membership of our church, whatever happened later (thus testing the orthodoxy of either parents or church), then it should be accepted. If there was no possibility or real likelihood of the children's being brought up within the covenant, then they should be given the benefit of the grace mediated through baptism on profession of faith. However, where converts are convinced that their infant baptism was valid, we should remember that 'the efficacy of Baptism is not tied to that moment of time wherein it is administered' (*Savoy Declaration* VI) and that the baptism of others can, and should, be for all of us a means of grace.

We ought, therefore, to be prepared to administer believers' baptism, where appropriate, willingly, sincerely and with a good conscience.

3 The nurture of Covenant Children

This section is not really straying from our subject because the real point at issue is the significance of infant baptism for Christian nurture. What are the implications of that baptism for the way we treat and bring up our children? It is here, incidentally, that we are compelled to recognise the importance of infant baptism. It is possible to hold to a proper kind of Christian nurture without practising infant baptism, but it is less likely. You can remember the Lord's death without attending the Lord's Supper, but God in his wisdom gave us that ordinance as a means of grace to help us. So it is with infant baptism and we despise God's provision at our peril. What deductions, then, do we draw from our child's baptism and the covenant status on which it is based?

Do we assume, as we are charged with doing, that they are regenerate and need only to be helped to grow in grace? Some paedo-baptists from the Reformers to the present day have held this view, but most of the 17th century independents, especially in New England, did not. They regarded them as being born 'Children of wrath even as others', Ephesians 2 :3, not to be regarded or treated as regenerate until they professed faith in Christ. Jonathan Edwards and many others, including presbyterians like Thornwell and William Cunningham, stressed their need of conversion.

Nevertheless, they were not to be considered in the same light as the children of unbelievers, as 'little heathen' as some modern baptists refer to their

children. 'Holy' in 1 Corinthians 7:14 must mean more than legitimate, or even baptised: holy things and people belong to the Lord in some sense. 'The nurture and admonition of the Lord' in Ephesians 6:4 must mean that in some sense they are the Lord's children and we are bringing them up for him: if not children of God in the sense of Romans 8:16, they are children and God's. (I well remember a baptist advocate of Christian schools referring without any apparent embarrassment to 'Christian children', meaning not converted, but children of Christians.)

This is a very practical matter and on which no one can avoid whatever their position. For instance, do you teach your children to pray? John Bunyan believed that you should not, rather you should teach them that they are sinners under God's wrath and then they will want to pray! He certainly had a point, but is that all you do? Do you exclude them from family prayers or teach them, as some have suggested, to pray to God only as creator and not as Father—an utterly unbiblical notion! Can you not encourage them to trust in the provision of their needs by a gracious heavenly Father? Do you say, 'He will look after me, but I don't know about you?' At this stage I only ask the questions: the answers will, I hope, emerge later.

A matter which must be dealt with in passing is that of whether they are church-members. Thomas Shepard was obviously in no doubt, since his work is entitled, *The Church Membership of Children*, but it is often noted that the *Savoy Declaration* does not follow the *Westminster Confession* at this point. Where the Confession, discussing the constitution of the church, uses the words 'and of their children', the *Savoy Declaration*, which rewrites the whole section,[7] has no counterpart. Some have seen this as a concession to or a tendency towards a separatism and ultimately a baptist position. Others see a link with the independent practice of founding churches by means of a church covenant: the children, not being able to covenant in this sense, would not be members of the church. In the light of the Halfway Covenant controversy, it would also deny them the right, not only to communion, but also to baptism for their own children.

Certainly the *Declaration* has a deeply spiritual view of church membership, which I hope we would share. Thus, instead of the Confession's 'that profess the true religion', which they may have seen as encouraging mere nominalism, the *Savoy* refers to those 'professing the faith of the gospel and obedience unto God by Christ according unto it'. The idea of members in the New Testament, that is in the picture of the body of Christ, certainly involves living, spiritual union with Christ and this would militate against saying that the children were members. However, the Independents were definitely not intending to deny the covenant status of their children, so the best policy for

us, in the light of baptist suspicions, may be to stress the covenant relationship with their parents and say that the church consists of believers *with* their children. They are part of the covenant community, but not yet in their own right.

We must return, then, to the vital topic of the attitude and practice of the parents. The children are not assumed to be regenerate: the parents must look for conversion, but how do they go about it? It is their duty to live before them as Christians, to teach and exhort them, and pray for them, expecting them to be saved, but does this mean that they wait until they reach 'years of discretion'? There is a middle way, between 'assuming' and 'assuming not', the way of expectation based on the use of means.

An important principle in all evangelism is relevant here. Faith, according to Romans 10:17, comes by hearing: the new birth, according to James 1:18 and 1 Peter 1:23, comes through the Word of truth. So we must teach our children the gospel, the promises and requirements of the covenant, so that they may manifest the new birth in repentance and faith. We must expect them to give evidence of being converted, but our expectations may be disappointed unless we remember to treat them as children, not adults, and assess the evidence accordingly.

The Halfway Covenant controversy in America can be both a warning and a help to us here. That debate concerned those who were orthodox and moral, but who could not produce a testimony of the right kind to satisfy the membership requirements of the New England churches. It seems likely that many of them were, in fact, true believers, and had been since childhood, but had never, because of that very fact, never passed through the traumatic, stereotyped pattern of conversion, beginning with extreme conviction of sin, which was expected. David Boorman writes in his *Westminster Conference* paper on 'The Halfway Covenant' about the 'relation' or testimony that had to be given before acceptance into communicant membership:

> To claim that he could never recall a time when he had not thought, talked, acted and lived as a Christian or to assert that the work of grace had proceeded almost imperceptibly in his soul as he had been nurtured in a godly home, was by no means necessarily satisfactory for this purpose. There was a clearly defined conversion process through which the potential and aspiring communicant member must have passed and to which he would be expected to refer in his 'relation'. The first stage of that process was that of overwhelming conviction …[8]

> We, too, must beware of getting the wrong standards, of demanding the wrong kind of evidence according to 20th century stereotypes, more suited to adults or even adolescents, than to children. We must look for faith in proportion as

the child hears and understands the gospel. Faith grows as more is revealed and understood. (This explains some New Testament passages like 1 John 2:11, where people who are already believers are said to believe.) There is no reason why children, born unregenerate, should not be begotten again by the word of truth, James 1:18, as soon as they hear the first teaching by their parents. Immediately they hear the gospel they believe it according to their ability. Their faith may not appear outwardly the same as that of an adult convert, but it is still genuine faith, child-like faith, and faith as a grain of mustard seed is nevertheless saving faith.

If they accept the gospel according to their understanding and ability, who are we to doubt their sincerity? We cannot read hearts and if they obey when we tell them to pray to God as their Father through Christ, or simply accept it when we do this, why should we regard them as hypocrites? We can easily discourage them by demanding a kind of conversion experience appropriate only to those who have gone deep into the ways of sin. 'What more must I do?' they may ask.

If they do not respond, if they do not keep the covenant by believing the promises and obeying the commands, then we must warn them of their danger before God and especially of the way they are despising their privileges. We shall increasingly look for a conversion more on adult lines, the return of a prodigal to his Father's house. This leads naturally to the question of prayer and the covenant promises.

Can we be certain that our children will be converted and saved? How do we apply the promises of God? We must not consider matters in isolation. God's promises on any subject are conditional and God is always sovereign (Psalm 103:17–18), but they are intended to stimulate and confirm faith. The promises of the covenant, confirmed by the seal of baptism, should encourage us both in prayer and in the use of the means that God has provided.

It is quite true that privileges are not the same as salvation, and that it is no use relying on them. Nevertheless, we are told that the covenant child has an advantage over others. 'What advantage then hath the Jew? or what profit is there of circumcision? Much every way: chiefly, because that unto them were committed the oracles of God', Romans 3:1–20. This advantage can only be, indeed, it is there stated to be, because God uses means. In terms of God's sovereign election, no one has an advantage, because God is not bound, but the Word of God says that covenant children have an advantage—and Paul is here writing about salvation, not carnal, national blessings. It would be ridiculous to say that they have an advantage, if that only meant that they have a greater condemnation. So we must not only pray in faith: we must also be careful to use all the means provided by the covenant setting in both family and church, knowing that, at the very least, our children are more likely to be

converted than others, because God ordains means as well as ends, and that he has given them a favoured position in terms of those means.

Conclusion

In recent years the paedobaptist position has gone by default. In the interests of peace and unity we have, by and large, kept silent while the baptists have made hay. While I believe very strongly that we must not allow this issue to divide us from our Christian brethren, I also believe that the implications for the nurture of our children are enormous. Therefore, while seeking to avoid misunderstandings and to remove misconceptions, we must hold firmly to this part of our Independent heritage.

References

1 *The Savoy Declaration of Faith and Order*, chapter 29.
2 John Owen, *Works* (Edinburgh: The Banner of Truth Trust, 1968), Vol. 16, p. 259.
3 Thomas Shepard, 'The Church-Membership of Children' in *The Reformation of the Church* (Edinburgh: The Banner of Truth Trust), p. 389.
4 Quoted in *Diversity of Gifts* (Westminster Conference, 1980), p. 64.
5 Thomas Shepard, *op. cit*., p. 390.
6 *Evangelical and Congregational,* p. 42.
7 *Savoy Declaration*, chapter 26, paragraph 2.
8 David Boorman, 'The Halfway Covenant', in *The Puritan Experiment in the New World* (Westminster Conference, 1976), p. 76.

Typeset and printed by Quinta Business Services, Meadow View, Weston Rhyn, Oswestry,
Shropshire, SY10 7RN, Tel: 01691 778659, Fax: 01691 777638
E-mail: info@quintapress.com; Web-site: http://www.quintapress.com