

PROCEEDINGS
OF THE
Church Historical Society

PART I

Post-Caroline English Revision Attempts

The London Reprint of the Proposed Book
of 1785/6

By
WILLIAM MUSS-ARNOLT, B.D., Ph.D.
*Member of the Society of Biblical Experts and Literators,
The American Oriental Society, B.S., E.S.*

The Early History of the Church in Western
Pennsylvania

BY THE
RT. REV. CORTLANDT WHITEHEAD, D.D., LL.D.
Bishop of Pittsburgh

PHILADELPHIA
1915

POST-CAROLINE REVISION ATTEMPTS
and
**THE LONDON REPRINT OF THE PROPOSED
BOOK OF 1785/6.**

By
WILLIAM MUSS-ARNOLT, B.D., Ph.D.,
Member of the Society of Biblical Exegesis and Literature;
the American Oriental Society, Etc., Etc.

Delivered Before the Church Historical Society,
April 29, 1915.

Note.—The subject of this paper has so important a bearing upon the early history of the Church in America and on the Prayer Book, that its insertion out of the order of chronological succession has been deemed proper.—*W. I. R., Jr., Secy.*

"Nolumus leges Angliæ mutari."

That the Liturgy of the Church of England should have remained more than 200 years, since the passing of the Act of Uniformity of 1662, without any thorough revision, although it was revised no less than six times in the 125 years between the Reformation and the passing of that Act, is all the more surprising, when it is considered how many learned and pious men, both of the clergy and the laity, both in and out of the Church of England, at home and abroad, have at various times, and by various means, with a seriousness and sincerity becoming Christians, and with a temper and moderation the most unexceptionable, suggested the necessary improvements requisite to make it fully answer the end designed, and to do all the good of which it is so capable, if the proposed alterations were but adopted. These repeated attempts to amend and improve the Book of Common Prayer are a proof, at once, of the excellence of its composition as a whole, and of the defects of its subordinate and inferior parts.

I.

Attempts toward union with the dissenting brethren were constant and most earnest from the time of the Restoration.

In October, 1667, and February, 1668, were set on foot the two abortive schemes of comprehension, first perfected by the Lord Keeper of the Great Seal, Sir Orlando Bridgman. The "Comprehensive Bill," as it was styled, was based on the declaration from Breda of Charles II., with a view of "relaxing the terms of conformity to the established church." It was drawn up by Sir Robert Atkins and the Lord Chief Justice, Sir Matthew Hale. It was revised and endorsed by Thomas Barlow and his friend John Wilkins, Bishop of Chester. The introduction of the bill was frustrated by a declaration of the House of Commons against it; and the plan was dropped. The project was revived for the time in 1674 by John Tillotson and Edward Stillingfleet, and arranged by them to the satisfaction of the leading nonconformists. But it was again defeated. For, it would, of necessity have brought in its wake a revision of the Articles and of the Prayer Book.

The one serious and official attempt at a reconstruction of the Liturgy in post-Caroline times was that which grew out of the revolution of 1688-89. In every previous crisis of political change, the Prayer Book had felt the tremor along with the statute-book. Church and state, like heart and brain, are sympathetically responsive one to the other. Revisions of rubrics go along with revisions of codes. It was only what might have been anticipated, therefore, that when William and Mary came to the throne, Parliament should request the king to summon Convocation "to be advised with in ecclesiastical matters." A royal commission, of ten bishops and twenty clerics was appointed September 17, 1689, to prepare alterations in the Liturgy and the canons, and to "water down" the Liturgy so as to make it acceptable to the dissenting brethren, who had warmly supported the revolution and whose services the king desired to requite, so as to secure their good will in the future. The commission numbered some great men, such as Edward Stillingfleet, John Tillotson and William Beveridge. Their report fell flat, and was never offered for adoption to Convocation, whose opposition was obvious from the very beginning. The Lower House of Convocation showed itself unfriendly to anything like concessive measures. Its opposition, however, was grounded not so much on love and veneration for the Liturgy as it stood then, as on political reasons. The

main body of the clergy were Tories. They were opposed to the attempts now made by the court and the bishops for the comprehension of dissenters as brethren in the Protestant religion. The more dignified part of the clergy, "the wearers of the gown and scarlet hood," as Dean Swift characterizes them, were by the careful exercise of preferments made agreeable to the king's wishes. Lacking nine of their ablest prelates, however, they were powerless to control the clergy, who were disposed to sympathize with Sancroft and his non-juring clergy. The prelates were Whigs and sympathized with the king's enlightened toleration policy as well as with his continental projects. They were Latitudinarians and were too advanced for the sturdy and narrow bigotry of the body of the clergy. Men like Burnet, Tillotson and Tenison, leaders of the Whig hierarchy of William, were in constant opposition to, and entirely out of sympathy with, the Lower House of Convocation and the interests which that house represented.¹ The almost sneering *Nolumus leges Angliæ mutari* (we do not want the laws of England to be changed) of William Jane (1645-1707), the prolocutor of the Lower House, with which he ended his speech when he was presented to the president of the Upper House, put an end to the comprehension scheme.²

So complete was soon the obscurity into which the doings of the commission fell, that church historians as late as 1849 speak as if they knew nothing of the whereabouts of the records. In 1854 the manuscript of the minutes was discovered in the library of Lambeth Palace, and was printed as a Blue Book by order of the House of Commons. It can readily be seen that the guiding principles of the compilers of the Proposed Book of 1785/6 were, on the whole, those which characterized the work of the Commission of 1689. The American clergy undoubtedly drew their information from Birch's *Life of Tillotson*³ and from Calamy's *Abridgment of Baxter's Life*.

The title page of the Blue Book reads: "Book of Common Prayer . . . copy of the Alterations in the Book of Common Prayer, prepared by the Royal Commissioners for the

¹ F. W. Wilson, *The Importance of the Reign of Queen Anne in English Church History*. Oxford, 1911, pp. 18-19.

² See also, Blackburne, Works, &c., Vol. 5, pp. 88 foll. (Cambridge, 1804.)

³ Thomas Birch, *The Life of the Most Reverend John Tillotson*. Compiled chiefly from his original papers and letters. London, 1752. VII, (1), 489, (1) pp. Sm. 8vo.

Revision of the Liturgy, in 1689. (Extracted from the original volume in the custody of the Archbishop of Canterbury at Lambeth Palace, and accompanied by explanatory documents.) Ordered, by the House of Commons to be printed, 2 June, 1854." 110 pages. 8vo.

The text of the report of the commission is printed on pages 3-88 in two columns to the page, the one containing *the Printed Text*, 1683-86, the other, *Alterations and Amendments*, 1689. Pages 91-110 contain copies of illustrative documents, from the archiepiscopal records and the library at Lambeth Palace, consisting of (1) the Royal Commission to the Archbishop of York⁴ and others, dated 17 September, William and Mary, 1689; (2) Diary of the Proceedings of the Commissioners, from 3 October to 18 November, 1689, written by Dr. John Williams, a commissioner and later Bishop of Chichester; (3) and (4) Directions, from the Dean of the Arches, respecting the custody of the interleaved copy of the Liturgy, containing the Alterations and Amendments prepared by the commission.

The alterations and amendments, amounting to 596, were prepared in an interleaved copy of a black-letter edition of the Book of Common Prayer. The document was not made public at that time and was supposed for many years to be lost. A copy was given to Dr. Calamy, the eminent dissenting divine, who thought that the scheme could have brought in two-thirds of the dissenters. His copy was lost by lending. An abstract was published by him in his *Life of Baxter*, page 452. The interleaved Prayer Book, however, was left with Dr. Thomas Tenison, later Archbishop of Canterbury. It passed, after his death in 1715, into the hands of Dr. Edmund Gibson, Bishop of London, by whom it was deposited in the Lambeth library. The editing of the 1854 edition was made under the superintendence of William Henry Black (1808-1872), assistant keeper of the public records.

The proceedings of this attempted revision were, likewise, published in 1855, and entitled: "The Revised Liturgy of 1689: Being the Book of Common Prayer, interleaved with the alterations prepared for Convocation by the Royal Commissioners, in the first year of the reign of William and Mary. Edited from the copy printed by order of the House of Com-

⁴The Archbishop of Canterbury, William Sancroft, it will be remembered was removed from his archbishopric on his becoming a non-juror. His successor, Tillotson, was not consecrated until 1691.

mons, by John Taylor." London: Samuel Bagster & Sons, 1855. VIII pages, XVIII and 78 leaves. Large 8vo.

The introduction of Taylor's publication contains a brief but succinct history of the plans and the work of the commission. The revision of the commissioners ended with "The Commination Service," though several notes made in committee were attached to the remaining services. A note at the beginning of "The Psalms of David" says: "This translation was to be revised. Dr. [Richard] Kidder had done it; but it was not examined for want of time." This revision of the Psalms is probably somewhere still in existence. Another note appended to the "Form and manner of making, ordaining and consecrating of Bishops, Priests and Deacons" says: "The Commissioners proceeded no further for want of time; the Convocation being met." This refers to the Convocation which began its sittings November 6, 1689.

II.

During the eighteenth century numerous attempts were made and pamphlets published by individuals and small groups both of clergy and laity to bring about a revision both of the Liturgy and of the Articles. The most noteworthy are these:

(1) The Rev. David Hughes, Fellow of Queens' College in Cambridge [A.B., 1725; A.M., 1729; S.T.B., 1738], had printed in the *Gentleman's Magazine*, for January, 1737, "Some observations on the Church Liturgy, or the Scruples of a Country Curate." He maintained that "If it was thought *necessary*, in the year 1689 (almost *half a century ago*), to undertake a general *Review* of the *Common Prayer Book*, I am sure that the *same necessity* still subsists; and, I believe, will be thought by most people to be *now* somewhat *stronger*." Hughes, a country curate at Kent, in England, was a man of great modesty, liberality and knowledge of the Scriptures, and his memory was much revered at Cambridge for many years. Hughes' periodical article was soon redeemed from oblivion by appearing as an appendix in a book, which proved to be the forerunner of a number of similar productions. Early in 1749 was printed for Ralph Griffiths a pamphlet entitled:

(2) "The expediency and necessity of revising and improving the publick liturgy, humbly represented. Being the substance of an essay for a review of the Book of Common Prayer, so far as relates to that point. Annexed a letter in favour of a review, by a clergyman [*i. e.*, David Hughes]." London. VII,

136 pages. Small 8vo. The book, published anonymously, was written by John Jones (1700-1770), for many years vicar at Alconbury, hence generally known as Jones of Alconbury. The same year appeared also:

(3) "Free and candid disquisitions relating to the Church of England, and the means of advancing religion therein. Addressed to the governing powers in Church and State, and more immediately directed to the two Houses of Convocation." London, printed for A. Millar. MDCCXLIX. XXVII, 340 pages. 12mo. Its contents are an introduction, followed by thirteen chapters; a postscript and an appendix. The thirteen chapters treat of (1) Translation of the Bible; (2) Frame and design of the public service; (3) An occasional dissertation, containing a short inquiry, whether our first *service*, as distinct from, and independent on the other two may not be ordinarily sufficient for our stated matins, or morning worship on Sunday; (4) A general survey of the principal matter and general order of our *Liturgy*, with remarks; (5) Queries and observations relating to the Psalms, Lessons, Epistles and Gospels; (6) Athanasian Creed, catechism, collects, prayer for Parliament; (7) The several offices; (8) Suppletory offices, occasional prayers, calendar, rubrics; (9) Some objections considered. Correct printing of the Bible and Liturgy; (10) Articles, subscriptions, homilies, catechising, canons, oaths of churchwardens; (11) Certain grievances, generally complained of in the Church; (12) The application, relating to a review in general, as before proposed; humbly pressing it upon further motives, and fairly reconsidering the supposed difficulties; (13) The conclusion; wherein some farther considerations are urged in support of this address; and particularly with regard to its being made at this time.

The postscript contained "some occasional observations, occurring upon a review of the whole." The appendix sets forth the concurring judgment and declarations of several learned men of the Church of England, relating to some of the principal points contained in the foregoing disquisitions.

That Jones was only a part contributor and the editor of the book can clearly be seen even by a superficial reader. Who the authors really were has never been proved.⁵ The most important among the proposals of Jones and his collaborators were: (1) A new, critical translation of the

⁵ See also, Colligan, *The Arian Movement in England*, p. 108, note 1.

Bible; (2) the shortening of the morning services, i. e., the Morning Prayer, the Litany, and the pre-Communion, which used to be read together; (3) a new lectionary; (4) discontinuance of the custom of private baptism, and (5) discontinuance of enforcing subscription on youths at schools. At the present time most of these proposals have been carried out. Many good churchmen would now agree with these authors that the reformation work had not been absolutely perfect; that even the Liturgy might be improved and that the Articles, written in time of hot controversy in the sixteenth century, long before the Church of England had reached a settled condition, were subjects open to amendment. Objection was also made against (1) the reading of the Athanasian Creed in divine service; (2) the burial office; (3) the frequent repetition of the Lord's Prayer during the same service; (4) the promiscuous reading of the Psalms, and (5) the Sunday lessons as ill-chosen and improperly divided.⁶

These modifications of the church services and of the ritual were proposed with a view of meeting difficulties of the Latitudinarian party within the Church of England, rather than to the comprehension of the dissenting brethren.

No sooner was the book published, than it was attacked by several churchmen, who feared that any step towards a further reformation would lead to the utter subversion of the Church of England. Among these attacks we may mention: "Remarks upon a treatise entitled *Free and Candid disquisitions relating to the Church of England, &c.* In some letters to a worthy dignitary of the Church of Wells." Part the first. By a presbyter of the Church of England. London, 1750. 79 pages. 8vo. The author was John Boswell (1698-1756), vicar and schoolmaster of Taunton, England, and prebendary of Wells Cathedral. The greater part of his treatise is taken up with a vindication of the length of the public service, and the frequent repetition of the Lord's Prayer in the liturgy, maintaining—as did another writer in 1790—that in his church the Lord's Prayer was repeated each time within the record period of "twenty seconds."⁷ If that repre-

⁶ Further remarks on John Jones and the *Free and Candid Disquisitions*, see the *Monthly Review*, Series 1, Vol. 1, pp. 198-211 (London, 1749); John Nichols, *Literary Anecdotes of the Eighteenth Century*, Vol. 1, pp. 585-640; 3, pp. 15-17; 8, pp. 289-292 (London, 1812, 1814).

⁷ See further, the *Monthly Review*, Series 1, Vol. 2, pp. 406-407; Nichols, *Literary Anecdotes*, Vol. 2, p. 507.

sented the custom in most churches, can we wonder at a contemporary statement, that "to the majority of church-goers, we fear that our excellent form of prayer is become little better than a mere *prayer of form*"?

In answer to Boswell's *Remarks*, Francis Blackburne then just made Archdeacon of Cleveland, entered the lists, without the participation or even knowledge of Mr. Jones or any of his more confidential associates, in an "Apology for the authors of *The Free and Candid Disquisitions*,"⁸ printed for Millar, 1750. Blackburne had read the "Disquisitions" in manuscript, but there was not a line nor a word in it written or suggested by him notwithstanding many confident reports to the contrary.

Boswell and his supporters were also answered in two volumes, published in 1750 and 1751, respectively, and entitled "An appeal to common reason and candor, in behalf of a review; submitted to the serious consideration of all unprejudiced members of the Church of England. With a word concerning some late *Remarks upon the Free and Candid Disquisitions*." 154 and 279 pages. 8vo.⁹ The *Appeal* provoked another broadside from Boswell, entitled "Remarks upon a treatise, intituled *Free and candid disquisitions, relating to the Church of England, &c.* In some letters to a worthy dignitary of the Church of Wells, wherein an attempt towards a discovery of the true and real design of the *Disquisitions*, is humbly submitted to the consideration of the serious and thinking members of the establishment." Part the second. By a presbyter of the Church of England. London, 1751.

The author maintained that, if the proposals of the disquisitioners made and repeated again in their *Appeal* were put into practice, it would be a means of putting an end to "that little sense of religion, which is left amongst us." Their design, he proceeds to point out, "bids fair, unless timely prevented, to overturn our constitution in church and state." The author of the disquisitions he honors constantly with such genteel appellations as, "insolent schismatic," "sceptical trifler," "poultry sneerer," "impertinent caviller," &c., and in one place he calls him "a pert, impudent, prevaricating, sceptical knave."¹⁰

⁸ Published in his theological and miscellaneous works (Cambridge, 1804), Vol. 2, pp. 135-178.

⁹ See the *Monthly Review*, Series 1, Vol. 3, pp. 1-9; Vol. 5, pp. 81-86.

¹⁰ See further, the *Monthly Review*, Series 1, Vol. 6, pp. 62-69 (London, 1752).

III.

In the year 1766 Blackburne published anonymously his best-known book, "The Confessional: or, a Full and Free inquiry into the right, utility, edification and success of establishing systematical confessions of faith and doctrine in Protestant Churches." London: Millar. 8vo.

The work is an examination into the rise and progress of the requirement in Protestant Churches, as prescribed in the 36th Canon of the Church of England, and into the arguments brought in defence, or rather in excuse of it. Blackburne was greatly encouraged in the progress of his work by the bishop of Carlisle, Dr. Edward Law, and others. The book practically advocated the abolition of subscription not only to the Articles and the Liturgy, but to the Creeds themselves. It elicited many answers, the most effective, perhaps, being that of William Jones, of Nayland (1726-1800), in his "Remarks on the principle and spirit of a work, entitled 'The Confessional,' being a sequel to the second edition of 'A Full Answer to an Essay on Spirit' [by Bishop Robert Clayton]." London, 1770. 8vo. Jones took a true church line, by showing that what was really aimed at was latitude on the vital doctrine of Trinity.

Fifteen years before the publication of *The Confessional*, another anonymous writer had endeavored to promote the design of revising the Liturgy, Articles and Canons of the Church of England by a pamphlet, entitled "Reasons humbly offered for composing a new set of Articles of Religion: With twenty-one Articles of Religion, proposed as a specimen for improvement." London: Griffiths. 105 pages. 8vo. He quoted largely from Stillingfleet, Burnet, Nicholls, Bennet and other learned men, to shew that the present thirty-nine articles of religion admit of different interpretations; that a subscription to them does not in any manner contribute to prevent diversities of opinion in religious matters, or promote uniformity of sentiment; and that, consequently, the retaining of them, as they are now expressed in such doubtful and uncertain terms, cannot in any respect tend to the security of religion in general, or to the preservation of the Church of England in particular; since they are at present no bar to exclude any but such as are truly conscientious and deserving, who ought on no account to be kept out of the communion of the Church of England.¹¹

It was not until the year 1865 that even the clerical subscription was changed to its present form.

¹¹ *Monthly Review*, Series 1, Vol. 4, pp. 167-172.

One of the ablest books in opposition to Blackburne's *Confessional* was Archdeacon Thomas Rutherford's "A Vindication of the right of Protestant Churches to require the clergy to subscribe to an established confession of faith and doctrines, in a charge delivered at a Visitation in July, 1766." Cambridge, 1766. 8vo.

In 1767, a second edition of *The Confessional* appeared, enlarged by a preface, wherein Dr. Rutherford's principles were examined and some notes added, on particular passages, in the same charge, and in a vindication of it in answer to Dr. Benjamin Dawson's examination of Archdeacon Rutherford's charge.

A third edition of *The Confessional* was published in 1770. This was reprinted in 1804 as volume 5 of "The Works, theological and miscellaneous, of Francis Blackburne." Cambridge. (4), 559 pages. 8vo.¹²

A summary of the controversy started by *The Confessional* will be found in "A short view of the controversies occasioned by the Confessional [of Francis Blackburne] and the Petition to Parliament for relief in the matter of subscription to the Liturgy and thirty-nine Articles of the Church of England." [By John Disney. 2d edition. London, 1775.] XXII, 24 pages. 8vo. This second edition appeared seven years before Disney left the established Church and became a Unitarian and colleague of Theophilus Lindsey.

In 1768 Francis Stone (1738-1813) initiated the movement for a petition to Parliament for relief from clerical subscription. Blackburne drew up in 1771 a set of Proposals.¹³ Under the chairmanship of Stone a meeting was held at the Feathers' Tavern in the Strand and a petition to Parliament¹⁴ was signed by 250 persons, clergy and laymen, for giving effect to Blackburne's proposals, whose main object was to bring relief to the dissenters by the abolition of clerical subscription, so as not

¹² On *The Confessional*, see also Nichols, *Literary Anecdotes*, Vol. 3, pp. 10-21 (London, 1812).

¹³ Reprinted in Vol. 7, pp. 1-12 of his theological and miscellaneous works (Cambridge, 1804).

¹⁴ Reprinted, *ibid.*, pp. 13-19. These are followed in the same volume on pp. 21-31 by "A Sketch of Contradictions and inconsistencies in the obligations laid upon clergymen, in order to qualify themselves for ministering in the Church of England, as by law established" [first printed, 1772]; and this again, on pp. 33-228, by "Reflections on the fate of a petition for relief in the matter of subscription, . . . The 2d edition" [first printed, 1774].

to exclude them in the future from the universities and consequently, to some extent, from the liberal professions. The petition was presented to the House of Commons on February 6, 1772, by Sir William Meredith, Baronet. The bishops, however, were opposed to changes of any kind and were supported by the Government. It was rejected by a vote of 271 to 71, after a speech in condemnation, by Edmund Burke. The movement soon died out. In 1774 Francis Wollaston¹⁵ published "Queries relating to the Book of Common Prayer, &c., with proposed amendments. Addressed to those in authority and submitted to their consideration." London. 8vo.

The book was soon forgotten amidst the political disturbances created by the declaration of independence of the American colonies and the subsequent war of independence.

IV.

Two years after "The Church of England in America" had ceased to exist and had reappeared as "The American Protestant Episcopal Church," a General Convention, held in Philadelphia, drew up and framed their liturgy, known as "the Proposed Book." It embodied many of the proposals of the Royal Commission of 1689, for the enactment of which so many of the English clergy during the eighteenth century had striven in vain. While the Proposed Book was severely disapproved of by the English bishops and by many of the clergy of the American Church, it acted as a stimulus and incentive for fresh efforts on the part of many followers in England of John Jones, Blackburne and Wollaston.

In the year 1788 appeared "Hints, &c., submitted to the serious attention of the clergy, nobility and gentry, newly associated." By a layman, a friend of the *true* principles of the Constitution, in church and state, and to religious and civil liberty. London, 1788. 8vo. This first edition was recalled in consequence of the king's illness. Immediately upon the latter's recovery, a second, revised and enlarged, edition was issued in 1789. (4), 72 pages. 8vo. It urged the propriety of amendment of life by the upper classes, and greater attention to public worship, to insure which a revision of the Liturgy was necessary. On pages 55-72 the author prints David Hughes' "Scruples of a country curate," in confirmation of the arguments elucidated

¹⁵ Born 1731 and died 1815. Ordained deacon in 1754 and priest in the following year.

in his brochure. It is well known now that the writer was Augustus Henry Fitzroy, third duke of Grafton (1735-1811). It was through some of Bishop Watson's little tracts and his acquaintance with the new Liturgy of the American Church that Grafton turned his attention to religious inquiry.

Grafton's publication was attacked and his views condemned by several writers. Two pamphlets soon appeared, one entitled "A vindication of the doctrine and liturgy of the Church of England, in answer to a pamphlet, entitled 'Hints to the New Association,' and other late publications of a similar tendency. In a letter from a gentleman in the country to a friend in town." London: Debrett, 1790. 59 pages. 8vo. The author maintains that "there are *no* parts of the liturgy to which a candid person can reasonably object." Simultaneously came out "An apology for the liturgy and clergy of the Church of England: in answer to a pamphlet, entitled 'Hints, &c., by a layman.' In a letter to the author, by a clergyman." London: Rivingtons, 1790. 95 pages. 8vo. The "clergyman" has been supposed to be Samuel Horsley (1733-1806), Bishop successively of St. David's and St. Asaph.

The Duke of Grafton had been a patron of Richard Watson (1737-1816), Bishop of Llandaff (1782-1816), especially while the latter was regius professor of divinity at Cambridge. During his lifetime Watson was equally distinguished as a divine, a natural philosopher, a polite scholar and a politician. When the duke's views were condemned, he found a staunch defender in the bishop, who wrote "Considerations on the expediency of revising the liturgy and articles of the Church of England: in which notice is taken of the objections to that measure; urged in two late pamphlets." By a consistent Protestant. London: Cadell, 1790. (1), 112 pages. 8vo. A second edition appeared during the same year, 1790. "The reader," says a contemporary critic, "will here meet with the knowledge of a scholar, the liberality of a gentleman, and the seriousness of a Christian; and he will see an excellent specimen of that manly freedom and spirit, with which it is possible to assert our own opinions, without the smallest mixture of rudeness or offence toward those who differ from us. Without denying any one doctrine of the Church of England, the author has shown, that it is inherent in the very nature of Protestantism, and incumbent on all who would claim, with consistency, the title of Protestant, to maintain their Christian liberty; to press continually onward to higher degrees of perfection; and not

to abandon the principles, nor defeat the intentions, of their ancestors, by blindly acquiescing in *their* decisions, or in those of any other man, or number of men, however venerable and learned." ¹⁶

V.

Amidst the excitement created in England by these new attempts on the part of Lords, temporal and spiritual, and others, to bring about a revision of the Liturgy and the Articles, there appeared in London the reprint of the "Proposed Book of 1785/6." Its title, conforming to the original, reads:

The | Book | of | Common Prayer, | And Administration of the | Sacraments, | And other | Rites and Ceremonies, | As revised and proposed to the Use | of | The Protestant Episcopal Church, | At a Convention of the said Church, in the State of | New-York, New-Jersey, Pennsylvania, Delaware, | Maryland, Virginia and South-Carolina | Held in Philadelphia, from September 27th to October 7th, 1785, || Philadelphia, Printed: | London, | Reprinted for J. Debrett, | Opposite Burlington House, Piccadilly. | M; DCC; LXXXIX. |

The book has 362 unnumbered pages, the last page containing as *Errata* three corrections of printer's errors in the "Psalms fitted to the Tunes used in Churches, selected from the Psalms of David; Portions of which are to be sung at suitable Times in Divine Service, according to the Direction of the Minister." These errors are to be found also in the edition of 1786, without, however, being detected by the final proofreader. Hence, in the original output this last page (362) is blank.

The page of type in the London reprint measures $3\frac{3}{8}$ by $5\frac{3}{8}$ inches; that of the 1786 book $3\frac{1}{8}$ by 6 inches. The size of the page of paper, untrimmed, is $4\frac{1}{2}$ by $7\frac{5}{8}$ inches. The eight pages of engraved tunes of the 1786 output were not reprinted.

The reprint follows the original very closely in arrangement as well as in typography. Only now and then do the lines differ in the reprint from the arrangement in the original. In addition, there are several variations, chiefly in

The two publications differ materially as regards the signatures:

The 1786 book is arranged as follows: Signatures a-e, in fours, for the introductory matter, *i. e.*, Nos. 1-4 of the table

¹⁶ See, also, *Monthly Review*, Series 2, Vol. 2 (1790), pp. 401-403.

of contents. Of these forty initial pages, pages 1-4 are blank, page 5, title; 6, Extracts from the Minutes of the Convention, and the certificate of the notary public; page 7, the contents of this book, reverse blank. Preface, pages 9-16. Pages 17-40 contain the three tables (Nos. 2-4 of table of contents). This introductory matter is printed in long lines across the page. The text proper is on signatures A-Z, Aa-Ss 2, in fours, Ss 3, reverse, is blank. Ss 4, obverse, contains the title: Tunes | suited to the | Psalms and Hymns | of the | Book | of | Common Prayer | ; reverse blank. Follow eight pages of engraved music. The text is printed in two columns to the page, excepting the selections from the metrical Psalms and the fifty-one hymns (Nos. 26 and 27 of the table of contents). At the end of the hymns is printed the line: *End of the Prayer-Book*.

The signatures of the London reprint are as follows: Introductory matter on a 3 and 4; b, 6 leaves; A, 6 leaves, and B 1, 2, 3 and 4. The text begins on B 5. Follows B 6, and C-P in twelves; Q, 6 leaves. The text ends on Q 5, obverse, with the words, "End of the *Prayer Book*." The reverse contains *Errata*. The last leaf of this signature is covered with publisher's announcements. The distribution of the type into one or two columns is the same as in the Philadelphia imprint of 1786.¹⁷

In volume one of the *Historical Magazine and Notes and Queries concerning the Antiquities, History and Biography of America* (Boston, 1857), the late Bishop William Stevens Perry (1832-1898), at that time assistant minister at St. Paul's Church, Boston, Massachusetts, had printed on pages 219-221 the titles of eight early editions of the American Prayer Book, prior to A. D. 1800. The English reprint of the Proposed Book is mentioned here as No. III. In a note Bishop Perry further stated: "The only copy of this [*i. e.*, No. III] I have ever seen was in the library of the Rev. Wm. B. Stevens, D.D., of Philadelphia, and contains immediately under the book-plate of one of the English nobility, from whose collection it originally came, the manuscript note that only fifty copies were published—probably for the use of the English bishops who were then considering the request of the American Church for

¹⁷ On the importance of signatures in the examination of original and reprint see especially the article on "The duplicity of duplicates," by Falconer Madan, Bodleian Librarian in the University of Oxford, England, *Transactions of the Bibliographical Society*, London, 1914, Vol. 12, pp. 15-20.

the 'succession.' Its rarity may be also inferred from the fact of its re-publication as one of the volumes of *Reliquiae Liturgicae*, Documents connected with the Liturgy of the Church of England, Exhibiting the substitutes that have been successively proposed for it at home, and the alterations that have been made in the adaptation of it to other Churches. Edited by the Rev. Peter Hall, M.A. 5 volumes. 18°. Bristol, Eng., 1841." In the printed sermon of Bishop Perry, *The American Prayer Book revisions of 1785 and 1789*, delivered at Christ Church, Philadelphia, October 10, 1892, and printed in 1893, we find on page 17, note, the sentence "This work [the Proposed Book] was reprinted in London in 1789, and was highly praised in a critical notice in the *Monthly Review* (Vol. 80, p. 337)." The reference should rather read Series 1, Vol. 80, pages 387-390.

Thus Bishop Perry. He is followed by the Rev. Frederick Gibson in his bibliographical sketch of "The standard editions of the American Book of Common Prayer," contributed to the *Liturgiae Americanae* of William McGarvey (Philadelphia, 1895). Under the heading "Proposed Edition of the American Prayer Book," Dr. Gibson has printed on page LV "The short-lived 'Proposed Book' was printed in Philadelphia, Hall & Sellers, MDCCLXXXVI, 8vo, and 4000 copies of it were ordered to be published. A few of these were handsomely bound in red morocco with gilt ornamentation. It was reprinted in London, England, M, DCC, LXXXIX, 8vo, and from a manuscript note in Bishop Stevens' copy, as mentioned in *The Historical Magazine*, vol. I, p. 221, we learn that there were only *fifty* copies of this English Reprint published, and these were probably for the use of the English Bishops, who were then considering the request of the American Church for the 'Succession.'"

Likewise, John Wright, *Early Prayer Books of America* (1896), page 103, states "The book (of 1786) was reprinted in London in 1789, and the copies were limited, it is said, to *fifty*."

It is a matter of surprise that men of the type of Perry and Gibson should not at once have noted the anachronism in this statement concerning the *raison d'être* of the republication of the Proposed Book in 1789, two full years after Bishops White and Provoost had been consecrated, February 4, 1787; and that not one of the more recent writers on the Book of

Common Prayer should have found the right interpretation of the statement copied by Bishop Perry. The statement, although written on the inside front cover of the London reprint, had reference only to fifty copies of the 1786 output sent for examination to the English bishops. These copies were received by the bishops "the last day of April" [1786]. For, in their answer to the second address of the American clergy, which was read at the General Convention held at Wilmington, Delaware, October 10, 1786, the archbishops state that "The Journal of the Convention, and the first part of the Liturgy, did not reach us till more than two months after our receipt of your address [dated October 5, 1785], and we were not in possession of the remaining part of it, till the last day of April" [1786].

The committee appointed to edit the Proposed Book had sent the printed sheets to England as they came from the press, but through some miscarriage they had not reached the bishops at the time of their answer to the first address by the American clergy. Fifty copies of the four thousand of the Proposed Book were undoubtedly sent to England and to these applies the remark found by Bishop Perry in the London reprint, as stated above.

It is said by Procter-Frere, *A new history of the Book of Common Prayer* (London, 1905), page 238, that the Proposed Book "was reprinted in England with the label 'American Prayer Book'"; and Dean Hart, *The Book of Common Prayer* (1910), page 20, note 5, has it that the English reprint was put out "with the label 'American Prayer Book.'"

I have examined a number of copies of this London reprint, most of them in original cardboard covers and with untrimmed edges; but not one has the label "American Prayer Book." The statements of Frere and of Dean Hart can only mean that the whole output of 1789 was labelled by the publisher "American Prayer Book."

Upon inquiry, Dean Hart writes to me, 10th August, 1914, "My copy of the English reprint of the Proposed Book is in the original cardboard binding, untrimmed edges, and has a label on the back between the second and third ribs with

American
Common
Prayer

done with a pen. And I am confident that I have seen other copies thus labelled:

"

This, I believe, is most evident proof of the fact that the edition was not marked by the publisher as "American Prayer Book"; that, in every case, it was done by some early individual owner in England.

We hope to have, thus far, succeeded in relegating to the land of fairy-tales the stories of the limited output of the London reprint and of its being labelled, by the publisher, "American Prayer Book."

And, now, we are ready for the main question, why should this American publication, attacked, rejected and ignored in the country of its birth, have been republished in England fully three years after its original publication in America? Who had it reprinted and what was his purpose in so doing?

VI.

In the same year, 1789, in which this London reprint appeared, there was printed for John Debrett, a treatise, entitled "Observations upon the Liturgy. With a proposal for its reform, upon the principles of Christianity, as professed and taught by the Church of England; . . . by a layman of the Church of England, late an Under Secretary of State. To which is added, The Journals of the American Convention, appointed to frame an ecclesiastical constitution, and prepare a liturgy for the Episcopal Churches in the United States." London . . . (1), 212, (1) pages. 8vo.

The author of these *Observations* writes on the subject of revision not with the asperity of a sectarian, but with the mildness of a friend to the national Church of England. He points out, in a dispassionate and agreeable manner, many defects in the Liturgy which evidently require amendment. Anxious for its prosperity and reputation, he longs to have its public service rendered wholly unobjectionable. He proposes no changes in the constitution, or discipline of the Church; he merely suggests the propriety of removing a few expressions from the Liturgy which he thinks it can very well spare.

Reviewing the Liturgy he summarizes under four heads the particulars in which the Church of England may be said to give offence to real Christians, who make the Holy Scriptures the rule of their faith.

Quoting the author as nearly *verbatim* as possible, we mention that:

"The first is the retaining in its articles and liturgy things or expressions which the most orthodox of the clergy think

it necessary to explain away in the pulpit, or give a very different meaning to from what the words made use of convey in their ordinary and usual acceptation" (p. 15). The author instances the teaching of the 9th, 11th and 13th articles of religion¹⁸ and the statement in the Catechism concerning the unworthy receiving of the Communion.

"Under the second head may be comprised such things in the articles or liturgy, which, perhaps, from a desire to avoid the danger of reforming too much, or to accommodate to the prejudices of men at the time, or from the fallibility of human reasons in those who compiled the articles and liturgy, are not *strictly* conformable to the doctrine of Christ and his Apostles, and cannot be *literally* proved from the New Testament" (p. 17). Among other instances mentioned under this heading as calling for revision the author says (p. 27): "I trust I shall live to see the Apostles' Creed in its *primitive* state, the only Creed of the Church of England. I say in its primitive state, for I do not find any warrant for the modern interpolation of Christ's *descent into Hell as that place* is considered by Christians as the place of punishment for the fallen angels and wicked men after judgment."

He calls to our mind the promise of Christ to the thief upon the cross: "*This day thou shalt be with me in Paradise.* Now, if the soul of Christ went both to Hell (so the Apostles' Creed) and to Paradise (so the New Testament), which do they suppose it went to first? If to Hell, he must have taken the soul of the penitent thief along with him, who must have thought it at least a *round-about* way to Paradise, and entertained some apprehensions that his conductor had *mistaken the road.*"

But if it be said that Christ or his soul went into Paradise and leaving *there* the penitent thief, went down *afterwards* into Hell, the article ought to have been so expressed, and his ascent into Paradise put before his descent into Hell" (pp. 31, 32). The excision from the same creed of the words "the Holy Catholic Church" and "The Communion of Saints" is likewise urged.¹⁹ He would alter the phrase "sitting at the right hand

¹⁸ Articles "Of original and birth-sin"; "Of the justification of man," and "Of works before justification."

¹⁹ These two articles of the Apostles' Creed are also omitted in the adaptation of the Book of Common Prayer to the use of Unitarians which the Rev. James Freeman prepared in 1785 for King's Chapel, in Boston. It is quite possible that the writer knew Freeman's publication, although he does nowhere in his book betray the slightest acquaintance with this socialized prayer book.

of God" for "hereby we express a belief and teach it to children, that God has hands."

"The third point, which has been the natural, though most unhappy, consequence of the preceding is the erroneous zeal of representing and defending the Athanasian Creed as *so literally* copied from the Evangelists and Apostles, that who-soever refuse his consent to every tittle of it, is considered as a disbeliever of Christ's Divinity, and a denyer of the three distinctions in the Divine Nature in which we are commanded to be baptized; and what is still more to be lamented, many who go to that creed to learn Christianity as conceiving it to contain nothing but what all Christians must and do believe, come away shocked or confounded, and in compliment to their own reason, or to preserve it, enlist under the banners of Deism; in so much, that I really believe that creed has made more Deists than all the writings of all the opugners of Christianity, since it was first unfortunately adopted in our liturgy" (pp. 37-39).²⁰

In addition to the Athanasian Creed, that opprobrium of orthodoxy, of which already Archbishop John Tillotson, in answer to Bishop Gilbert Burnet, in 1694, wished that "we were well rid of it," the author would also exclude the Nicene Creed, because neither are drawn in terms of Scripture nor can they be proved to have been used in the primitive Church. It is well known to the twentieth century student that the Nicene Creed is not the Creed of the Council of Nice nor the Athanasian Creed the work of St. Athanasius.

"The last head of complaint," our author continues, "I have to discuss is that the rulers of our church, though sensible themselves of these improprieties, continue to press them on their clergy and flocks, and oppose all attempts to reform and correct them" (p. 39).

Having thus finished his complaints the author imbibes hope for the near future from the proceedings of the American Church, stating that:

"Among the many and great advantages this kingdom has derived, as well as imminent dangers it has escaped, through the separation of the thirteen American States from its Government, may be reckoned the erection of an American Episcopal Church, independent of that of England; the heads of which have availed themselves of the opportunity to make those

²⁰ Herein the author is followed especially by Bishop Watson in his *Considerations*, pp. 29 foll.

reforms in the liturgy, which were long since proposed and settled by the great divines who flourished in the reign of Queen Anne. To the orthodoxy of this reformed liturgy, our whole illustrious bench of Bishops have set their seal, by the consecration of Bishops to preside over and superintend the American Church in the use of it.²¹ Thus sanctioned, I have caused it to be reprinted and published here, for the general information of all denominations of Christians, but especially the members of the established Church; and I have annexed to this paper [pp. 95-212] the proceedings of the American Convention, and the letters to them from the English Bishops upon the subject of their new establishment and reformed liturgy; and whoever reads them over, without feeling his *heart burn within him*, at the manifestations they display of that truly Christian spirit; that soundness of judgement and benevolence of heart which the writers so eminently possess, deserves not to be of the flock of such shepherds, or wants sentiment to enjoy the blessing within his reach" (pp. 40-42).

Thus, our author. And who was he? His name was William Knox. He was born in Ireland in 1732 and died at Ealing, near London, August 25, 1810. In 1756 he was appointed by Lord Halifax "one of his majesty's council and provost-marshal of Georgia." He returned to England in 1761. George Grenville (1712-1790) made him agent in Great Britain for Georgia and East Florida. In the interest of the Colonies, Knox sent a memorial to Lord Bute recommending the creation of a Colonial aristocracy and the inclusion in Parliament of representatives of the Colonies. His services as agent were dispensed with by resolution of the Georgia Assembly, November 15, 1765, for two pamphlets written in defense of the Stamp Act which Knox considered to be the least objectionable mode of taxation. In the same year, 1765, he gave evidence before committee of the House of Commons on the state of the American colonies, and from the institution of the secretaryship of state for America, in 1770, to its suppression by Lord Shelburne, in 1782, he acted as the under secretary. His views formed a basis for the conciliatory propositions of Lord North in 1776.

²¹ The author appears here to be either overenthusiastic or disingenuous. He knew quite well that the American Church before obtaining the succession had promised the English bishops the re-insertion of the clause in the Apostles' Creed omitted in the Proposed Book as well as the restoration of at least the Nicene Creed.

Knox was the author of many pamphlets, most of which dealt with the social, economic and religious affairs and conditions of the American colonies.

As of direct interest to this society I mention that in 1768 Knox drew up at the special desire of Archbishop Thomas Secker, three tracts on the conversion and instruction of the Indians and Negroes of the Colonies. And as the subject of two of these tracts was much agitated at the time when he published his *Observations*, he had them reprinted under the title "Three tracts respecting the conversion and instruction of the free Indians and Negroe slaves in the Colonies. Addressed to the Venerable Society for Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts, in the year 1768. A new edition." London: Printed for J. Debrett . . . 1789. 39 pages. 8vo. Tract one is devoted to the Indians in the Colonies; tracts two and three to the Negro slaves in the Colonies.²²

Ladies and Gentlemen of the Church Historical Society: My task is done. I hope to have shown not only the identical person who had caused the Proposed Book to be reprinted; but also, and above all else, that its publication was, so to speak, the climax of the post-Caroline attempts at a revision of the Articles and of the Liturgy of the Church of England. That not one of the suggestions made so frequently and so urgently was then adopted was a great pity. But the mind of the eighteenth century was stiff and unbending to the last degree; or rather, there was in it a disastrous mixture of laxity in practice and narrowness in theory. "Our happy establishment" was right enough in their estimation, as it was then; and the general presumption was that any change would be for the worse.

Eighty years after the London reprint of the Proposed Book passed before any of the requests of John Jones and his collaborators were carried out, by the enactment of the new lectionary, in 1871, and the shortening of the morning service, in 1872.

During the last thirty years ecclesiastical conditions in England have greatly changed. The liturgical expansion which has been such a decided feature of the Catholic revival has grown apace. But up to the present time no thorough and satis-

²² On Knox see Almon's *Biographical, Literary and Political Anecdotes*, . . . Vol. 2, pp. 112-115. London, 1797. William Bacon Stevens, *History of Georgia*, Vol. 2, pp. 42-43; and the same author's *Discourse delivered before the Georgia Historical Society*, Savannah, on Friday, Feb. 12, 1841. Savannah, 1841, pp. 10-11.

factory revision of the rubrics and the liturgy, in general, has been made. Preparations, to be sure, are being carried on and have been published in the Report and the Minutes of the Royal Commission on Ecclesiastical Discipline, printed in 1906.

The need of a thorough, yet conservative, revision of the Book of Common Prayer and its directions so as to adapt it to the wants of the modern, up-to-date congregation and church attendant is felt more and more in conservative as well as in liberal circles. That the call for such a revision is not confined to one party in the church, is proven by such publications as Frere's "Principles of liturgical reform" (London, 1911; 2d edition, 1914). "Prayer Book Revision. A plea for thoroughness. By a sexagenarian layman" (London, 1911), and the same author's "Notes on the intellectual condition of the Church of England" (London, 1914). Athelstan Riley, "Prayer Book Revision" (Alcuin Club Tracts, No. 9) London, 1911. T. A. Lacey, "Liturgical interpolations and the revision of the Prayer Book." London, 1912. In 1913 appeared "A Prayer Book revised; being the services of the Book of Common Prayer, with sundry alterations and additions offered to the reader. With a preface by the Rt. Rev. Charles Gore, D.D., Lord Bishop of Oxford." London, XXV. 259 pages. Small 8vo. An important contribution to the question of Prayer Book reconstruction" (*Guardian*). "Revision of the Book of Common Prayer from the point of view of a parish priest." By Rev. E. Boggis. Canterbury, 1914.

In conclusion I should like to call your special attention to a set of seven pamphlets which are perhaps not known to some here present, but are of great importance. Their general title is "Prayer Book Revision series." Edited by Canon Beeching. London, 1910. Each numbering 32 pages. 12mo. The series represents fairly the general attitude of the clergy of the Church of England toward a new revision. Of the seven tracts the editor, Canon Henry Charles Beeching, contributes the first on "The desirability of revision." The two main points at issue appear to be the Ornaments Rubric and the Athanasian Creed,²³

²³ On the creeds in modern literature see, *e. g.*, Rt. Rev. Edgar C. S. Gibson, *The Three Creeds*. London: Longmans, Green & Co., 1908. [The Oxford Library of Practical Theology.] W. S. Bishop, *The Development of Trinitarian Doctrine in the Nicene and Athanasian Creeds*. New York, 1910. A. B. Crane, *The Creed of Righteousness; or the Justification by Faith of the Psalm Quicunque*. London, 1907. C. Gore, Bishop of Oxford, *The Athanasian Creed* in Oxford house papers. 3d Series. London, 1897. C. A. Heurtley, *A History of the*

the latter rejected also *in toto* by Frere. The Very Rev. Joseph Armitage Robinson, dean of Westminster and one of the greatest biblical students of England, discusses "Some practical proposals regarding the revision of the Prayer Book." After a consideration of the points *pro* and *contra* as to changes affecting the Ornaments Rubric, the Athanasian Creed, the Lectionary, and the Psalter, the dean states (pp. 30, 31): "I should wish to see an authoritative Appendix to the Book of Common Prayer, containing some additional prayers and services, and some over-riding rubrics. . . . Such an Appendix might be approved even by Parliament without risking any interference with the Prayer Book, such as many persons not unnaturally dread. After a generation it could, if need be, undergo revision in the light of experience. Presently the time would come for what the lawyers know as codification, and a revised Prayer Book would be the result." The Very Rev. Edward Clarke Wickham, dean of Lincoln, writes on "Revision of rubrics, its purpose and principles." "The Revision of the Lectionary" is taken up by the Rev. William Emery Barnes, Hulsean Professor of Divinity in the University of Cambridge. The dean of Christ Church, Oxford, the Very Rev. Thomas Banks Strong, expresses as to "the use of the *Quicumque vult* in divine service," the conviction that the case for a change of the present rubric is overwhelming. The *Quicumque vult* is a canticle or psalm, but *not* a creed, even though it is thus

Earlier Formularies of Faith of the Western and Eastern churches: added an Exposition of the Athanasian Creed. London, 1892. D. Maclean, *The Athanasian Creed*. London, 1902. [The St. Paul's Handbooks.] R. O. P. Taylor, *The Athanasian Creed in the Twentieth Century*. Edinburgh, 1911. K. S. Guthrie, *Critical Essays on the Two Creeds: the Apostles' and the Nicene Creeds, and the Lambeth Articles*. In his *The Soteriology of Jesus*. Philadelphia. [1896.] M. MacColl, *Christianity in Relation to Science and Morals*, 3d edition. London, 1890. (Lectures on the Nicene Creed.) F. Palmer, *Studies in theologic definition underlying the Apostles' and Nicene Creeds*. New York, 1895. H. B. Swete, *The Apostles' Creed: its relation to primitive Christianity*. London, 1894. Adolf Harnack, *The Apostles' Creed*. London, 1901. H. C. Beeching, *The Apostles' Creed*. New York, 1905. W. R. Richards, *The Apostles' Creed in Modern Worship*. New York, 1906. Of special interest to the members of the Society will be the many contributions of Andrew Eubank Burn, the learned vicar of Halifax, England, viz., *An Introduction to the Creeds and to the Te Deum* (1899); *The Athanasian Creed and Its Early Commentaries* (1896); *The Apostles' Creed* (1906); *The Nicene Creed* (1909), and *The Athanasian Creed* (1912), three booklets published in the series called "The Oxford Church Text-books"; *Facsimiles of the Creeds from Early Manuscripts* (1909) = Henry Bradshaw Society Publications. Vol. 36.

called in the Prayer Book. It was written in the south of France, or possibly in Spain, during the fifth century, a century of appalling disasters, brought about, to a large extent, by the Arian heretical Goths and Vandals. It was then that the processional litanies sprung up. It was then that the *Quicumque* *vult* was composed and chanted as a war cry, a manifesto, a declaration of faith. "The Revision of the Prayer Book Psalter" should be thorough going according to the Rt. Rev. Herbert Edward Ryle, Bishop of Winchester and leading Old Testament scholar. "At present the Prayer Book Version deserves to be regarded much more in the light of a generally good and beautiful paraphrase made by good Miles Coverdale, than of an accurate, literal or scholarly translation. But, as a paraphrase, it admits of being relieved of numerous grave defects which needlessly impair its intelligibility and its accuracy." The last pamphlet of the series contains a scholarly discussion of "The Ornaments Rubric" by the Rt. Rev. Archibald Robinson, Bishop of Exeter." "It would be well worth the while of all to make sacrifices of private predilection; of High Churchmen to allow the prohibition, of Low Churchmen to consent to the authorisation of vestments, if only we could get back to clear authority" (p. 31).²⁴

*The Boston Public Library,
Boston, Massachusetts.*

²⁴ The provincial convocations of the Church of England have been busy during the year 1914 with revision proposals. The Upper House of the Convocation of Canterbury decided on Wednesday, February 10, 1915, in accordance with the report of the joint committee on the revision of the Prayer Book, not to embody the proposed changes in the text, but to issue them in a separate volume or schedule for optional use for a period at present not settled. This decision represents the state of opinion and the limits of authority in the Church at present. The Book of Common Prayer, with all its claims for recognition, is not strictly followed today; and no revision of it seems likely to win general acceptance. On the report of the Joint Committee on Prayer Book Revision, see the *Guardian* (London, England), February 25, 1915, p. 174. A criticism of this report from the Roman Catholic point of view is printed in the *Tablet*, March 6, 1915, pp. 297-298. A sermon on "Prayer Book Revision," preached by Canon Beeching before the University of Oxford, Sunday, November 30, 1913, is printed in full in the *Guardian*, December 5, 1913, pp. 1536-1537; and, an address on Prayer Book Revision, by Chancellor Edward Russell Bernard, of Salisbury Diocese, in the same weekly, April 22, 1915, p. 348.