

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

**PROCEEDINGS**  
**of the**  
**CHURCH HISTORICAL SOCIETY.**

May 17, 1910.

The first meeting of the Church Historical Society was held in the Assembly Room of the Historical Society of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Tuesday evening, May 17, 1910. The meeting was called to order by Mr. John Thomson, Chairman of the Committee on Organization.

Mr. Thomson introduced the Rev. Joseph Cullen Ayer, Ph.D., Professor of Ecclesiastical History in the Philadelphia Divinity School, who delivered an address upon "Innocent III."

Immediately following the address the Society was permanently organized by the adoption of the following Constitution and By-laws :

## CONSTITUTION

### CONSTITUTION.

#### ARTICLE I.

The name of this organization shall be "The Church Historical Society."

#### ARTICLE II.

The object of the Society shall be the preservation and publication of historical documents connected with the Protestant Episcopal Church, the investigation of its history, and the development of interest in all relevant historical research.

#### ARTICLE III.

The membership shall consist of honorary, life and active members. Honorary members shall be those elected by the unanimous vote of the Society at any stated meeting. Any communicant of the Protestant Episcopal Church may be elected by the Executive Board to membership. Upon the payment of ten dollars to the Treasurer a person may be elected a life member.

#### ARTICLE IV.

The officers of this Society shall consist of a President, Vice-President, Secretary and Treasurer, and six Managers, who shall constitute the Executive Board. The officers and two Managers shall be nominated at the stated meeting in October and shall be elected at the stated meeting in January. All vacancies shall be filled by the Executive Board until the next January meeting of the Society, when an election for the unexpired term shall take place.

#### ARTICLE V.

The duties of the several officers shall be such as are usually incidental to their offices. The officers shall be chosen for one year and the Managers for three years, two Managers to be elected yearly as above set forth, provided that at the first election six Managers shall be chosen whose terms, whether for three years, two years or one year, shall be determined by lot.

## **BY-LAWS.**

### **ARTICLE I.**

This Society shall meet in the months of October, January and April, at such time and place as the Executive Board shall direct. The Executive Board (hereinafter called the Board) shall meet monthly. It shall have power to adopt rules for its own government. Five of its members shall constitute a quorum. This number shall not be decreased without the direction of the Society.

### **ARTICLE II.**

The Treasurer, when required, shall give bond in such sum as the Board may demand.

### **ARTICLE III.**

There shall be a Librarian, who shall be elected by and perform such services as the Board shall direct, be paid such compensation as it may consider just, and be subject to discharge by it.

### **ARTICLE IV.**

The annual dues of active members shall be one dollar. Members whose dues remain unpaid for more than two years may be dropped by vote of the Board.

### **ARTICLE V.**

This Constitution and the By-laws may be altered or amended at any meeting, on written notice specifying the alteration or amendment intended being given at the meeting next preceding.

### **ARTICLE VI.**

In the event of the dissolution of this Society, all its property shall immediately become the property of the Historical Society of Pennsylvania.

### **ARTICLE VII.**

A separate fund shall be created, which shall be called the Endowment Fund, and all contributions for the purpose of procuring a building, with fire-proof facilities, for the Society, together with such other contributions as may be set apart or received for that purpose, shall be invested, at convenient times, in good securities.

BY-LAWS

ARTICLE VIII.

Such Endowment Fund shall be managed by three Trustees, who shall be elected annually in the same manner and at the same time as the officers of the Society.

ARTICLE IX.

One of the objects of the Society shall be to collect for the Library and the Cabinet the particulars hereinafter mentioned, namely:

*For the Library.*

- a. Narratives relating to dignitaries and benefactors of the Protestant Episcopal Church and Missions.
- b. Biographical notices of eminent and remarkable persons.
- c. Sketches and catalogues of schools, academies and colleges.
- d. Copies of records of proceedings of religious, literary, scientific or social bodies.
- e. Journals and newspapers.
- f. Manuscripts on any subject or of any date.
- g. Magazines and pamphlets.
- h. Church almanacs, directories, diaries, etc.

*For the Cabinet.*

- a. Prints, especially of persons, church buildings, etc.
- b. Pictures.
- c. Medals.
- d. Utensils.
- e. Any article of value from its historical or biographical affinities.

The following officers were elected:

President, Henry Budd, Esq.  
Vice-President, Major Moses Veale.  
Secretary, Wm. Ives Rutter, Jr.  
Treasurer, Sydney L. Wright.

Members of Executive Board:

Term to expire 1911.

Rev. Arnold Harris Hord,  
John E. Baird.

Term to expire 1912.

Rev. Henry Riley Gummey, D.D.,  
John Thomson.

Term to expire 1913.

Allen Childs,  
Albert S. Haeseler.

**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.<sup>1</sup> 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.<sup>2</sup>

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*<sup>3</sup> 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

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

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

<sup>3</sup> 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 York<sup>4</sup> 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-

<sup>4</sup>The 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.<sup>5</sup> The most important among the proposals of Jones and his collaborators were: (1) A new, critical translation of the

<sup>5</sup> 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.<sup>6</sup>

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."<sup>7</sup> If that repre-

<sup>6</sup> 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).

<sup>7</sup> 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*,"<sup>8</sup> 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.<sup>9</sup> 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."<sup>10</sup>

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

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

<sup>10</sup> 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.<sup>11</sup>

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

<sup>11</sup> *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.<sup>12</sup>

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.<sup>13</sup> Under the chairmanship of Stone a meeting was held at the Feathers' Tavern in the Strand and a petition to Parliament<sup>14</sup> 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

---

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

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

<sup>14</sup> 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 Wollaston<sup>15</sup> 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

---

<sup>15</sup> 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." <sup>16</sup>

## 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

<sup>16</sup> 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.<sup>17</sup>

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

<sup>17</sup> 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 religion<sup>18</sup> 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.<sup>19</sup> He would alter the phrase "sitting at the right hand

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

<sup>19</sup> 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).<sup>20</sup>

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

---

<sup>20</sup> 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.<sup>21</sup> 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.

<sup>21</sup> 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.<sup>22</sup>

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-

---

<sup>22</sup> 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,<sup>23</sup>

<sup>23</sup> 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).<sup>24</sup>

*The Boston Public Library,*  
*Boston, Massachusetts.*

---

<sup>24</sup> 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.

November 9, 1910.

The second meeting of the Church Historical Society was held in the Lecture Room of the Widener Free Library, Philadelphia, Wednesday evening, November 9, 1910, the vice-president, Major Moses Veale, presiding.

The Rt. Rev. Cortlandt Whitehead, D.D., LL.D., Bishop of Pittsburgh, delivered the following address upon the "Early History of the Church in Western Pennsylvania":

## THE EARLY HISTORY OF THE CHURCH IN WESTERN PENNSYLVANIA.

By the Rt. Rev. Cortlandt Whitehead, D.D., LL.D., Bishop  
of Pittsburgh.

The records of the Episcopal Church in Western Pennsylvania now accessible do not extend beyond the year 1792. There can be little doubt that its services and sacraments were frequently celebrated before that date. In 1758 General Forbes obtained possession of the ground at the forks of the Ohio, and there created Fort Pitt. The colonial government of Pennsylvania was desirous of opening an accessible communication with that distant post, and accordingly dispatched Colonel Burd with two hundred men to open the road from Braddock's trail at the western base of Small Hills to the Monongahela River at Redston Old Fort (now Brownsville, Penna.). The Rev. Dr. Allison accompanied the expedition as chaplain, and was doubtless the first Episcopal, or at that time, Church of England, or Protestant clergyman, that had ever preached west of the Alleghenies. How long Dr. Allison remained, or what became of him, we have no means of knowing. From the year 1758 Fort Pitt was occupied as an English military station and the site of the present city of Pittsburgh was laid out and building begun about 1764, by settlers almost exclusively of English descent. It is hardly probable that such an important point was wholly neglected by the clergy of the Established Church, or that so many families of Church people as then resided in the neighborhood would have been content to give up entirely the Christian privileges to which they had been used.

However this may have been, it is certain that no definite attempt was made to organize and perpetuate the Church of England in this part of Pennsylvania before the Revolution, or the Episcopal Church after it, until towards the closing years of the last century. Even the venerable "Society for the Propagation of the Gospel," to which we owe so largely the planting and nurture of the Church before the separation from the mother country, appears to have made no effort to care for its members in Western Pennsylvania. In Bishop Perry's voluminous collection of historical documents relating to this time and region there are but two incidental references to Fort Pitt, and they have no connection with the work of the Church.

The farthest station westward seems to have been Carlisle.

The timidity and inertia of the bishops, influential clergy and laity in the eastern part of the state during the fifty years following the War of Independence are notorious, and would be surprising did we not know the difficulties with which they had to contend. The popular prejudices which existed against the clergy, who for the most part had adhered to the king's side in the great struggle, extended to the Liturgy, and the whole system of the Church to which they belonged. The Episcopal Church was everywhere on the defensive. It was considered essentially monarchical and aristocratic in its spirit and influence; unsuited to the wants of the people of a Republic. So strongly did this public sentiment affect the rulers of the Church that for a long time nothing more was done than to keep alive existing congregations. The idea of extending the work of the Church into new regions was hardly thought of. Up to the year 1811, we are told on good authority, that not only was there no growth throughout the United States, but a positive decrease, especially of clergy, and one of the foremost of the bishops expressed the opinion that its ultimate extinction was only a question of time.

Nevertheless we have unquestionable proof that in the whole region west of the mountains there was a numerous body of people, by birth and education attached to the Church, who would have gladly welcomed its services and might easily have been kept in its communion. Our principal authority on this point is the Rev. Joseph Doddridge, M.D. He was himself born in Bedford County, Penna., within one hundred miles of Pittsburgh, in 1769, and for some time resided in Washington County, in the near neighborhood. To him we owe many interesting details of the condition of things in the Church about the close of the last century; and it was mainly through his persistent efforts that the attention of Eastern churchmen was gained to the work to be done in this region. He was himself a clergyman of the Episcopal Church, and spent his life in constant missionary labor in Western Virginia and Southern Ohio. He held the first Christian service in Washington, Penna., in 1792. Some rowdies were hired by a prominent whiskey vender to intimidate the young preacher, and prevent his return to preach in the place. This we are told as a tradition in a letter of Dr. Doddridge's daughter to Bishop Kerfoot in 1873.

We are indebted to the late Hon. Judge Scott, of Chillicothe, Ohio, an early and intimate friend of Dr. Doddridge,



for some reminiscences of his life and early labors in the ministry.

Mr. Scott was in his earlier years an itinerant in connection with the *Wesleyan Society*, and travelled extensively in Western Virginia. He says: "My acquaintance with the Rev. Joseph Doddridge commenced in 1788, at the house of the Rev. J. Jacob, in Hampshire County, Va. He was in company with the Rev. Francis Asbury. At the request of Rev. F. Asbury, Dr. Doddridge studied the German language, in which he acquired such proficiency as to be able to address a congregation in that language. In subsequent years he found that acquisition very valuable, as a medium of communication with the German population of the country. He was held in high estimation by Mr. Asbury, and although he was but little more than nineteen years of age, he was a successful and highly esteemed laborer in our Society."

His connection with this Society, however, was not of long continuance. Being called from his field of labor to the paternal mansion in 1791, by the sudden death of his father, in consequence of which event, his step-mother and the younger members of the family were placed in circumstances requiring for a time his personal supervision, the youthful itinerant felt it to be his duty to resign his charge, and in conformation with the last wish of his deceased parent, who had appointed him executor of his will—to apply himself to the settlement of the estate. This accomplished, finding himself in possession of some available means, he resolved to qualify himself more thoroughly for the responsible calling he had chosen, by devoting some time to perfecting his education; and with this view, accompanied by his brother Philip, he entered Jefferson Academy, at Canonsburg, Penna., they being among the first students at that pioneer literary institution, in what was at that period in the Trans-Montane States, the "Far West."

The Wesleyans having laid aside the Prayer Book or ritual designed to be used on occasions of public worship by the founder of their Society (a formula which Dr. Doddridge's judgment sanctioned as being beautifully appropriate and highly edifying), he did not therefore resume his connection with them after his return from Canonsburg, but diligently applied himself to an examination of the claims of the Protestant Episcopal Church, with a view to offering himself a candidate for Orders in its ministry. Having become satisfied during the progress of his investigations, and fully prepared, he was, in

1792, in Philadelphia, admitted to the Order of Deacons, by the Rt. Rev. William White, and some years later, in the same place, to the Order of Presbyters, by the same Reverend Prelate.

"During the year 1793," says Mr. Scott, "I occasionally attended the ministrations of this zealous advocate of the Gospel of Christ, at West Liberty, which had until recently, been the seat of Justice for Ohio County, Va., and the residence of many respectable and influential families. At this place, divine worship was held in the Court House. Although still quite a young man, Dr. Doddridge was an able minister of the New Covenant. When preaching he spoke fluently, and there was nothing either in his manner or language that savored of pedantry or rusticity; yet he did not possess that easy, graceful action which is often met with in speakers in every other respect his inferiors; but this apparent defect was more than compensated by the arrangement of his subject, the purity of his style, the selection and appropriateness of his figures, and the substance of his discourses. He was always listened to with pleasure and edification, commanding the attention of his hearers not so much by brilliant flights of imagination or rhetorical flourishes, as by the solidity of his arguments, and the lucid exhibition of the truths which he presented for their prayerful and deliberate consideration."

The Rev. George Brown, in his "Itinerant Life," says: "I heard the first sermon ever preached in the town of Steubenville. It was called the 'Christening Sermon,' and was delivered by the Rev. Joseph Doddridge, in an upper room in the old log Court House, in 1796." He held occasional services in that place until the Rev. Intrepid Morse took charge of the parish.

About the year 1800, Dr. Doddridge removed to Charlestown, now Wellsburg, Va., and while laboring there, he learned that many families reared in the Episcopal Church, had settled west of the Ohio River, and that they were wholly destitute of spiritual guidance and instruction. To those of them within a convenient distance, he was in the habit of making frequent visits, holding worship in temples not made with hands, but by the great Architect of Nature. About this time he formed the nucleus of S. James' Church, Cross Creek, Ohio, which subsequently under his ministry, expanded into a flourishing parish, and is still in existence. Some years later, he collected congregations at St. Clairsville and Morristown, in Belmont County, in both of which churches were erected, and for some

years the prospect of permanence seemed good. But for want of pastoral teaching and supervision both congregations, since Dr. Doddridge's death, have been dispersed and their church edifices demolished or appropriated to secular uses.

At Charlestown, his place of residence, and at Wheeling, he had large congregations. The latter kept together by occasional visits and services until a resident pastor could be obtained for it, the Rev. John Armstrong. In addition to the church in Charlestown, S. John's, of which Dr. Doddridge retained the pastorate for thirty years, another one called S. Paul's was also formed in Brooke County.

Speaking of his missionary labors in a letter to Bishop Moore, of Virginia, in 1819, he says: "With the view to the attainment of an Episcopacy in this as early as possible, I have devoted much of my clerical labors to the State of Ohio, under the impression that that object could be more speedily accomplished by the forming of congregations in a State where there was no Bishop, than by doing the same thing in the States of Pennsylvania and Virginia, in each of which there was a Diocesan."

To the doctrines and formularies of the Protestant Episcopal Church he was ardently attached, and although for more than twenty-five years he occupied the position of advance guard in the minority, yet he faltered not in his labors, but untiringly devoted himself to promote its growth and prosperity, and also to awaken a practical interest in the Eastern Dioceses, by frequent and earnest appeals to their bishops and clergy, in behalf of the scattered members of the fold, who in the vast regions of the West were wandering as sheep without a shepherd.

At the time when Dr. Doddridge took Orders in the Episcopal Church, he resided in Pennsylvania, but some years subsequent to that event, as previously stated, he removed to Virginia. Owing, however, to the distance of his residence from the Bishop of the Diocese, and the great difficulty, at that early period, of holding correspondence with him, with the consent of Bishop White, he continued in fact, although not canonically, under the jurisdiction of the latter, and accordingly during many years all his communications relative to the Church were made to him.

His correspondence with his clerical brethren was extensive, and we regret that our limits will admit so small a portion of it. The following letters to Bishop White and Bishop

Hobart are lengthy ones, and of later date than we have now reached, but as they contain a recapitulation of events that had transpired relative to Church matters in the West, during the preceding fifteen years, they are appropriate at this point and we prefer quoting from the documents rather than to give their substance in our own words.

LETTER FROM DR. DODDRIDGE TO BISHOP HOBART.

December, 1816.

Right Reverend Brother:

The situation and wishes of your Episcopalian brethren in this country have no doubt reached you through various channels ere this, some time past.

Some five or six years ago, in 1810, the few Clergymen in the western part of Pennsylvania and Virginia held a meeting relative to Church matters among us, in which it was resolved that I should open a correspondence with Bishop White for the purpose of obtaining, through him, permission from the General Convention to form ourselves into a Convention in the Western Country. I did it accordingly, and accompanied the request with as full a statement as I could make at that time concerning our congregations and prospects here.

Eighteen months elapsed before I heard of the fate of our petition, and that the project had been laid aside on account of the death of Bishop Madison. (March 6, 1812.) I then lost all hope of ever witnessing any prosperity in our Church in this part of America. Everything fell into a state of languor. The Vestries were not re-elected; our young people joined other societies. Could I prevent this when I indulged no hope of a successor in the ministry? When I had no expectation that even my own remains after death would be committed to the grave with the funeral services of my Church? The circumstances of my residence being at some distance from those of my brethren in the Ministry, and of my being the junior in years among them, brought this melancholy prospect more frequently before my mind. I resolved, however, that I would not desert my post of duty, and with God's help, I will not. How often did I reflect with feelings of the deepest regret and sorrow, that if anything like an equal number of professors of any other Christian community had been placed in Siberia or India, and equally dependent upon a supreme ecclesiastical authority in this country, that they would not have been so neglected, that a request so reasonable would have met with prompt and cheerful compliance! With the voice of the first

missionary in the western part of Pennsylvania my hope began to revive. When I heard the "glad tidings" of the good and great work among the Episcopalians in the Eastern States, I also heard of the zeal and activity of Bishops White and Hobart in their respective Episcopates.

I resolved through divine assistance that another effort should be made amongst us to raise and build up our fallen Zion. With a view of ascertaining the practicability of planting Churches to the "Westward," in the fall of 1815, I made a missionary excursion in Ohio, as far as Chillicothe, performing divine service in all the intermediate towns. I found skeletons of congregations in almost every place. In the past summer the Rev. Mr. Kilbourne called at my house on his return from the Eastward, and related a conversation which he said he had had with you on ecclesiastical affairs, informing me that you advised the immediate call of a Convention of all our Clergymen, and the election of one of them for Bishop; and that the General Convention would certainly confirm our action and consecrate the Bishop elect. He proposed his residence, Worthington, as the place of holding the Convention. This I reluctantly acceded to, although I knew that place to be improperly chosen, being so far from our three Presbyters in the western part of Pennsylvania, who are all too advanced in years to undertake so long a journey. Accordingly they did not attend, but wrote us their acquiescence in any measures we might think proper to adopt, two of them going so far as to name their choice for Bishop. The result of this meeting may be seen in the circular and copy of petition which accompany this. On many accounts I thought any attempt to elect a Bishop would be premature. Our people, although anxious, were by no means prepared for the event. These papers, however, have had a good effect; they have turned the attention of the laity to the subjects of a western convention and a Bishop. Since then, several new congregations have been formed, of which I am at present the pastor, viz.: one at Zanesville, formed in October, 1810; one at St. Clairsville, one in Jefferson County, Ohio, in 1802; S. James', on Cross Creek, and several more, I hope, will shortly be formed in Ohio. These, in addition to the congregations which I have in Virginia, make me the pastor of six congregations at the present time; and in the course of next spring two more, I trust, will be organized. In some of the places my absence is supplied by a Lay Reader, who performs divine service every Sunday. There are, I think, three congregations in and about Worthington, Ohio. How many there are at present in the western part of Pennsylvania I have not been informed. I think it probable that by the time of the sessions of the General Convention the whole number of our con-

gregations in the country will exceed twenty. The number of our Priests within my knowledge is four, that of Deacons two.

I shall now proceed to state such facts with regard to the religious and moral character of the people of the Western States generally, as may enable you to judge whether any attempts to build up our fallen Zion here have probable chance of success.

It must be well known to you that the States of Kentucky, Tennessee, the Territories of Mississippi and Illinois, the State of Indiana, as well as some large districts in the State of Ohio, have been settled by emigration for the most part from Maryland and Virginia, the Carolinas and Georgia. Most, if not all of these states, were before the Revolution. Crown States, and their inhabitants members of the established Church. The western part of Virginia has received the population from the same source. The people still retain many of the distinguishing features of the general characteristics of their forefathers, the Royalists of the reigns of Kings Charles I. and II. Among these traits of character is that of a strong dislike to Puritanism, and this is one that still exists among them in considerable force. No great number of them have ever united with the Presbyterians. You may have supposed from the pompous reports which have appeared from time to time concerning the progress of the Presbyterians, Methodists and Anabaptists in the western countries, that they had long before now swallowed up almost all the population of this country. Not so, for with the exception of the western part of Pennsylvania, go where you will, you will find from one-third to one-half the population of the towns and villages and their neighborhoods of no religious profession whatever. Ask them concerning the religion of their forefathers. They all answer, they were Church people. Many of these people still retain an old Prayer Book as a venerable relic of antiquity. They still have a reverence for Baptism and the Lord's Day. The Church, they say, was once pure and good, but now it is fallen, and they fear will never be revived again.

About fifteen years ago the "Age of Reason" of Thomas Paine took a rapid and extensive circulation through this country, and I regret to say that these people were very extensively the dupes of that infamous work. This infidelity is fast wearing away, and they begin to feel, I trust I may say, in common with more than half the world, the necessity of piety to God. My experience warrants me in saying that an Episcopalian missionary will not have to encounter the difficulties incident to the propagation of a new religion. No, he will everywhere find the skeletons of congregations and strong predilection in his favor. I will give you two examples which go to

show what can be done for our Church in this country. The first is Zanesville. I visited this place in the fall of 1815 on my way to Chillicothe, and held service on a week-day. On my return I held service on Sunday. They then reported to me about forty persons who were all of our Church. In October, 1816, on my way to Worthington, to attend the Convention previously mentioned, they formed themselves into a congregation, and appointed Dr. H. Reed as delegate. On my return I officiated on Sunday, and administered the Sacrament. From the list of names attached to the petition which they have sent me, it appears that their congregation is already large, wealthy and respectable, and they talk of building a Church next summer. The next is St. Clairsville, formed in 1813. For three years past I have visited this place two or three times a year on account of a few Episcopalian families of my particular acquaintance. Since the meeting at Worthington, they have formed themselves into a congregation, which at present consists of fifty families, and the warden who took the signatures to the petition informed me that they will, in a short time, be joined by as many more. At Morristown, ten miles from the above place, there will shortly be a congregation of at least fifty. In all of these places a short time ago, the name of an Episcopalian was scarcely mentioned. In how many places might the same thing be done if we had laborers for the work! I shall now state the measures which appear to me necessary for the creation of Episcopal Churches in this country.

The first is a Convention, for the reasons stated in the accompanying circular. Alas! my brother, how little reason has the Bishop of Virginia to regret a concurrence in this measure, when I am under the painful necessity of stating that I am the only Episcopal Clergyman in the western part of Virginia, where by this time there ought to have been at least forty! If the whole western part of the state should be thought too much, the counties of Brook, Monongahela, Harrison, Randolph, Ohio and Tyler will be sufficient. In this session he will lose but one Clergyman.

The next is a Bishop. The very idea of a Bishop several hundred miles from his flocks is discouraging in the extreme. The Methodist Bishops have been frequently through this country, and even the Catholics, though few in number, have been comforted by the presence and services of their Episcopal Pastor. No such event has happened to us. For many great and important purposes well known to you, the holy Episcopal office, to be serviceable, should be at hand. Our people here wish and pray for this, and I trust we are worthy of an Episcopate among ourselves. It must not be made by a number of Presbyters less than six. Might not deacons be allowed to vote? Might not a lay delegate from each organized congregation be

allowed to participate in the important decision? If allowable in any case, it would be highly acceptable here. As we have material for forming congregations here, so I trust there are some for the Ministry. The clerical profession is becoming reputable in this country. Some physicians and lawyers have expressed a desire to take orders in the Church. Could it be done with convenience? When I reflect upon the little which has been done for the promotion of our Church in this extensive region, I feel abased. If I should say that there are at present half a million of Episcopalians and their descendants in the western country, including the whole of Western Virginia, I verily believe that I should not be justly chargeable with exaggeration. What has been done for the spiritual interests of these people? Almost nothing at all. Had we imitated at an early period the example of other societies, employed the same means for collecting our people into societies, and building Churches, and with the same zeal, we should have had by this time four or five Bishops, surrounded by a numerous and respectable body of Clergy, instead of having our very names connected with a fallen Church. Instead of offering a rich and extensive plunder to every sectarian missionary, we should have occupied the first and highest station among the Christian Societies of the West. Ought we not to hasten to gather those still within our reach? Yes, they wish, they pray, for our Bishop. Oh! let that assistance which they consider so necessary for their eternal welfare be no longer withheld! In the course of next spring, 1817, I shall send a file of petitions, with a detailed report of each place and congregation from which they come, to Bishop White, who will commit them to the hands of the Secretary of the General Convention.

I humbly hope, Right Reverend Brother, that you will freely and speedily communicate to me your remarks on our proceedings in this very interesting and important business. If in anything we have done amiss or omitted anything we ought to have done, let us know it.

Your brother in Christ,

JOSEPH DODDRIDGE.

#### LETTER FROM DR. DODDRIDGE TO BISHOP WHITE.

Wellsburg, December 14, 1818.

Right Reverend and Dear Brother:

Yours by the Rev. Mr. Johnson came duly to hand. Its contents gave me no small degree of grief, but the arrival of Mr. Chase, which took place soon after the receipt of your



letter, dissipated the uneasiness occasioned by the prospect of a failure in our endeavor to attain an Episcopacy in this country, a majority of the Committees having signed the requisite testimonials. Thus an event which ought to have taken place many years ago is likely to take place at last.

The contents of your letter seem to require from me a frank and candid statement of my views in doing what I have done for the benefit of the Episcopal Church in this country, together with the treatment I have received from my clerical brethren from first to last.

Considering the Christian religion as the basis of all that is good and great among men, I sincerely wished for its promotion in that profession whose doctrines appeared to me truly evangelical, and whose forms of worship unite *piety, morality* and *edification* in the most effectual manner, and on the broadest basis. Such was and still is my view of the Protestant Episcopal Church.

I trust I possess all the Christian charity which is due from me to the religious societies of this country, and I am free to say that much is due to them for the zeal and steadiness with which they have prosecuted their pious labors. To the Presbyterians alone we are indebted for almost the whole stock of the literature of our country. They began their labors at an early period of the settlement of the country, and have extended their ecclesiastical educational establishments so as to keep pace with the extension of our population, with a godly care and diligence which do them honor. Before they were able to build even their log meeting-houses, they officiated in tents in the woods, with the little contributions their poor people were able to give they built academies, some of which are now colleges.

The Roman Catholic Clergy, without making any ostentatious parade, are traversing every part of the country in search of their scattered flock, and carrying the ministry to almost every family of their people. I am informed that they have already two colleges in Kentucky, a Bishop in the state, and another in Louisiana. At David's Town, in Kentucky, they are building a large Cathedral. Whether this statement as it respects the colleges and Bishop is correct, I am not able to say, but presume it is.

Were it not for the Herculean labors of the Methodist Society, many of our remote settlements would have been at this time almost in a state of barbarism. The cabins of our settlements were scarcely built and the little fields scarcely enclosed, before the missionaries of this society appeared among them, formed them into societies, and taught them the principles and duties of our holy religion.

There is scarcely a single settlement in the whole extent of our western country which has not been blessed with the ministry of this people, and to this ministry the public morality and piety are immensely indebted.

With the Anabaptists I have little acquaintance, but I have been informed that many of their establishments are respectable. The settlements and meeting-houses of the Friends in the State of Ohio are numerous and in a flourishing condition.

All these communities, as to everything belonging to Apostolic zeal for the salvation of the world, have certainly gone far beyond ourselves. They have not waited for a request from their people for spiritual help, but have gone into "hedges and highways," or to use a more appropriate phraseology, into the "brush and woods" to seek for them; and their arduous labors have, for the most part, been marked with a degree of disinterestedness which entitles their Clergy to highest credit.

I feel a reluctance to finding fault with religious societies so commendable for zeal, and so abundant in labors for good, but the doctrinal points of difference between the Calvinist and the Episcopalian are so important in the view of a great number of both communities, that they are not likely ever to get rid of the ancient prejudices of the Churchman and the Puritan against each other. At any rate, it has so happened in this country, for notwithstanding the destitute condition of our Church here, very few of her members have attached themselves to any description of Presbyterians.

It is a subject of great regret that the Calvinists in this country are cleft into so many divisions, and that they are so much the Jews and Samaritans to each other. These divisions and contentions are reproaches to the Reformation, the scoff of Catholics and unbelievers. How much is the value of their public profession of religion lessened by the apparent want of that charity which the Saviour of men so strongly points out as one of the distinguishing features of the divine character.

I formerly indulged the hope that the Methodist Society would, sooner or later, in obedience to the order of their spiritual father, John Wesley, adopt the use of the service book which he gave them, and that with the increase of their numbers and wealth, they would found literary establishments in this country, so as to associate science with their public ministry of the Gospel.

One serious objection, in my opinion, applies to all the religious professions of this country, I mean the want of established forms of worship. My zeal for their introduction will not be considered as a zeal without knowledge, when it is remembered that, until the Reformation, the Christian world knew no other, and that even the present exceptions to the

general practice on this subject are on a very limited scale. The public reading of the Holy Scripture and the participation of the people in the public offices of devotion are certainly matters of the highest importance to the edification, faith and piety of all.

The confidence which I have in the Apostolic Succession, renders the lay ordinations of this country less sacred and respectable in my view. To a very considerable extent the aspect of the religious profession as to its intrinsic character is by no means such as I think it ought to be. It is not the profession of the steady exercise of faith, hope and charity, exemplified by a constant succession of good deeds; but that of a certain routine of supernatural feelings in which science, faith and moral virtue have little to do.

Private instruction and, as I fear, private devotions also, have been partially laid aside for the public profession, and the exhibition of enthusiastic raptures, which certainly have for their ultimate object the making of proselytes. Alas, even among the various societies of Presbyterians, the catechist and the catechumen are less and less frequently mentioned. The holy ordinance of Baptism, once so sacred, is duly administered, but little or no importance is attached to it. To a great extent a profession of supernatural feelings, and those too of a particular stamp and configuration, in conformity to the respective models furnished by different societies, constitute the larger amount of the claim of the applicant to Church membership and the ministry. What a misfortune that a test purporting to be of so much importance, and yet so equivocal and delusive, and so favorable to hypocrisy, should have been so extensively adopted by societies in which there is certainly much of real piety.

As a patriot as well as an Episcopalian, I wished for that system of Christian doctrine, those forms of worship, and that form of Ecclesiastical Government, which bear the stamp of the Primitive Ages, and which are, of course, best for this world as well as the next. For the spiritual benefit of many thousands of our Israel, I was anxious for an Ecclesiastical Government in this country at an early period.

All my endeavors to attain these objects were unsuccessful. From year to year I had the mortification to witness the immense plunder of our people to increase the numbers and build the Churches of societies in my view less valuable than their own. How often have the people said to me in the bitterness of their hearts, "Must we live and die without Baptism for our children, and without the Sacrament for ourselves?"

The great States of Kentucky and Tennessee have been settled for the most part by descendants of members of the

Church of England. Not one in a hundred of these people have to this day ever heard the voice of a Clergyman of their own Church, but they have those of all other denominations. Hence the greater part of them are lost to us forever.

The course I have pursued for the attainment of an Episcopacy in this country is partially known to you. The negligence to which I have referred—and alluded to in your letter—shall be frankly but briefly stated. In relation to myself personally, it is unimportant. In proportion as it has borne the aspect of indifference on the part of the Fathers of the Church to the spiritual needs of our people in these immense regions, it has been a fruitful source of mortification and regret to me.

When in 1810, the few Episcopal Clergymen in this country held a meeting and resolved that I should open a correspondence with you for the purpose of obtaining from the General Convention permission to resolve ourselves into a Convention with a view to forming a separate Diocese in the Western Country, I did so, accompanying the request with as full a statement as I could make out at the time, of our congregations and prospects here; and we confidently expected that, as our local situation so evidently demanded the arrangement, it would be made.

We received no information respecting the fate of our petition, until the summer of 1812, when we learned unofficially, that the project had been laid aside in consequence of the death of Bishop Madison.

This issue of the business blasted our hopes. From that time our intercourse with each other became less frequent than it had ever been before; our ecclesiastical affairs fell into a state of languor, and one of our Clergymen, wearied with disappointment, and seeing no prospect of any event favorable to the prosperity of our Church, withdrew from the Ministry.

I kept my station, cheerless as it was, without hope of doing anything beyond keeping my parishioners together, during my lifetime, after which, I supposed, they must attach themselves to such societies as they might think best.

Such was the gloomy prospect before me. How often during hopeless years of discouragement, have I said to myself, Is there not a single clergyman of my Church, of a zealous and faithful spirit, who would accept the office of a Chor-Episcopus for my country, and find his reward in the exalted pleasure of an approving conscience in gathering in the lost sheep of our Israel, and planting Churches in this new world? Is there not one of our Bishops possessed of sufficient zeal and hardihood to induce him to cross the Alleghenies and engage in this great and good work? Year after year answered these questions in the negative.

You may imagine how strange it appeared to me to see the annual statements of the contributions of my Atlantic brethren to Bible Societies and other institutions for propagating the Gospel in foreign lands, while no concern was evinced, or measures adopted for the relief of their own people, in their own country, who were perishing for lack of knowledge.

Meanwhile other denominations here were blessed with the presence of their Episcopal Fathers, while to this day, this country has never been favored with the presence of a Bishop of the Episcopal Church.

We claim, and as I trust, justly, the Apostolic Succession; but where, I ask, is our Apostolic zeal for the salvation of mankind? While the Roman Catholic missionaries for the Societe de Propaganda, as well as those of other societies, are traversing the most inhospitable climes, encountering every difficulty, privation and danger, for the laudable purpose of making converts to the Christian Faith, will the spiritual Fathers of our Church never leave the temples erected by the piety of their forefathers to visit and minister to their destitute people, even in their own country?

When about three years ago I heard some favorable reports concerning the prospects and extension of the Episcopal Church in the Eastern states, I resolved, through Divine assistance, to make one more effort to raise and build up our fallen Zion among us, and with a view of ascertaining the practicability of planting Churches in the westward, in the autumn of 1815, I made a missionary tour of the State of Ohio, going as far southwest as Chillicothe, where I held services and preached twice; I also officiated in all the intermediate towns between Chillicothe and my place of residence, both going and returning. The prospect which this missionary excursion presented was not discouraging; in almost every place I found the skeleton of an Episcopal congregation.

The year following, in accordance with an agreement with the Rev. James Kilbourn, made at my home some weeks previous, I went to Worthington, Ohio, his place of residence, to attend a Convention of Episcopalians appointed in that place, to confer on the interests of the Church. The proceedings of our meeting on that occasion are well known to you. The communication which I made to yourself and Bishop Hobart concerning them met with no response. During the tour I officiated eighteen times.

Last week I made a missionary excursion of six days, in the southern part of Belmont and Munroe Counties, Ohio, during which I held divine service seven times, forming one congregation in the latter county, and baptized thirty children. I was told that had not a mistake occurred in the appointment the baptisms would have exceeded one hundred.

Many of the people had been my parishioners previously to removing to their present locality, and with their neighbors had delayed the baptism of their children twelve years, in the hope of having that holy rite administered by a minister of their own Church. This circumstance affected me painfully.

Your brother in Christ,

JOSEPH DODDRIDGE.

When at length after years of inaction and neglect the effort was made to organize the Protestant Episcopal Church in these parts, the work was far more difficult than it would have been had Dr. Doddridge's plea been listened to. A great opportunity had been lost and did not return. Not only were the "thousands of its members" which Dr. Doddridge assures us then lived in this region, alienated from it, but a change had taken place in the character of the immigration to this Western Country. The early settlers at Pittsburgh and its vicinity were, as has been mentioned, very largely members of the Episcopal Church. But in after years there came that influx of hardy, thrifty Scotch-Irish people, who in a short time became the dominant element throughout Western Pennsylvania. They brought with them not only their energy and thrift, but a sturdy aggressive Presbyterianism which was intolerant towards Episcopal Government and Ritual Worship. In their eyes such things were but little removed from popery itself. They very soon covered the ground left vacant by the Church, and made all subsequent efforts to regain what had been lost far more difficult.

Under such adverse circumstances it is not to be wondered at that we find no organization of the Episcopal Church in Western Pennsylvania until the year 1790; and it is significant that this was made not at Pittsburgh where we would naturally look for it, but among a rural population, such as Dr. Doddridge describes in his letters as everywhere asking for the services of our Church. The first congregation established was in Chartiers Township, about six miles from the city, under the name of St. Luke's Church. The record reads, "The first Episcopal Church west of the mountains was organized, and the Church built by several persons, viz.: General Johnson Neville, his son, Pressley Neville; Major Isaac Craig and others. The lot, ten perches square, was given by William Lea, for a site and graveyard." The church building was begun in 1790, and furnished in the following year, but not entirely finished until

some time afterward. By whom the services were given or who had charge of the flock is not mentioned. But we learn that "Mr. Francis Reno was taken under the care of Mr. Neville and educated and prepared for the ministry of the Church." In due time he was ordained by the Bishop of Pennsylvania, and called to the rectorship of the church at Chartiers. "He officiated there for some years until an insurrection (the Whiskey Insurrection of 1794) disturbed the public peace and drove the supporters of the Church from the locality." Sometime afterward we find that Mr. Reno was engaged to officiate alternately at Chartiers and Pittsburgh, but soon left the neighborhood. The church appears to have been closed, and being built of wood, soon fell into decay, and almost every trace of the building was removed. The record goes on to state that no decided step was taken to rebuild the church until 1851. However this may be, the insurrection could not have completely discouraged the congregation, for we find in Dr. Doddridge's Memoirs a report of "a Convention of four clergymen held at S. Thomas' Church, Washington County, Pennsylvania, September 25, 1803," Mr. Reno being one of them, at which it was resolved that the next Convention be held at the church near General Neville's old place on Chartier's Creek, Penna., to commence the Saturday before Whitsun Day.

In the year 1851, through the efforts of the Rev. Dr. Lyman, then Rector of Trinity Church, Pittsburgh, a new church was begun on the site of the old one, and regular services resumed. From that time until 1871 the church was kept open and the congregation held together by various rectors who seem never to have remained for any length of time. Since then only occasional ministrations have been given. The building up of other centers of population at Mansfield (now Carnegie), and Crafton, and the founding of churches there, divided the already diminishing flock until literally nothing remains of what was once a numerous congregation. The church building is occasionally occupied during the summer months, and with its old graveyard around it stands as a monument of the first effort of reviving life in the Episcopal Church in Allegheny County.

What steps were taken to establish the Episcopal Church in *Pittsburgh* prior to 1797 is not known. But as the Rev. Mr. Reno is recorded to have officiated there in connection with Chartiers shortly after 1794, it is likely there was some move-

ment towards that end. In 1797, however, we learn from the records of Trinity Church that the members of the Protestant Episcopal Church residing in Pittsburgh invited the Rev. John Taylor to officiate for them; but it was not until September 4, 1805, that a regular parish organization was formed by obtaining from the Governor of Pennsylvania a charter "making and instituting the Rev. John Taylor the minister of the congregation of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the Borough of Pittsburgh, Pressley Neville and Samuel Roberts the Wardens of said Church, and Nathaniel Irish, Joseph Barker, Jeremiah Barker, Andrew Richardson, Nathaniel Bedford, Oliver Ormsby, George McGunnigle, George Robinson, Robert Magee, Alexander McLaughlin, William Cecil and Joseph Davis the Vestrymen of said Church, and their successors duly elected and appointed in their place, a Corporation and body politic in Law and in Fact, by the name, style and title of the Minister, Church Wardens and Vestrymen of Trinity Church, Pittsburgh."

Such was the decisive step which gave to the Church in Allegheny County a definite standing and centre of growth. From this time for many years, the history of Trinity Church is virtually the history of the Church in Allegheny County, and in Western Pennsylvania. From the mother parish nearly all the new enterprises took their start and looked to it for support. About the same time with the organization, the building of a church was begun. It stood on the triangular lot at the intersection of Sixth Street with Wood and Liberty Streets, now occupied by a business block. Four hundred dollars was paid for the lot. In order to conform to the shape of the lot it was built in an octagonal, or oval form, and was familiarly known as "the old Round Church." The cornerstone was laid July 1, 1805, but the church was never consecrated and no bishop visited Pittsburgh until 1825. To defray the indebtedness of the church, we find that the expedient of a lottery was resorted to. In the *Pittsburgh Gazette* for March of 1808, Anthony Beelen advertised tickets for sale in the Trinity lottery at his shop on Front Street, now First Avenue; highest prize ten thousand dollars; tickets selling for a dollar and a half. This was an approved means of raising money in those days, and was in accord with the prevailing moral sentiment.

"Father Taylor," as he came to be called, held the rectorship until 1817, when he resigned. But few traditions of his ministry survive. He seems to have been a faithful and devout



clergyman, of blameless life, who probably did as much for the church in those days as any ordinary man could. It is said that he was killed some years afterwards by a stroke of lightning near Shenango, Mercer County, Penna. In the short space of six years between Father Taylor's resignation in 1817 and 1823 three clergymen were chosen to the rectorship, served for brief periods and in turn resigned. No statistics of the parish for these years exist. Of the success or growth of the congregation, of its hopes and outlook no records remain. But from the fact that in 1823, when after two years' service the Rev. William Thompson resigned the charge of the church, no attempt was made to elect a successor, it may be inferred that the prospects of the parish were not very encouraging. Nor could it have reasonably been expected that an Episcopal church, situated in a region so remote as Pittsburgh then was, deprived of the care of a bishop and without the privilege of confirmation for the children, by which alone new communicants could regularly be admitted, would make any striking progress in a hostile community. It is rather a matter of surprise that it survived at all. During this period of twenty-five years or more, repeated efforts were made to enlist the sympathy and help of the Church at the East, and to obtain for the whole region west of the Allegheny Mountains, then settled, the erection of a diocese and the consecration of a bishop. Dr. Doddridge, though not then residing in Pennsylvania, never ceased to urge it. In 1810 at a meeting of Episcopal clergymen, held at S. Thomas' Church, Washington County, he was authorized to open correspondence with Bishop White, of Pennsylvania, for the purpose of obtaining through him permission from the General Convention of the Church in the United States to carry out this project; such consent being necessary under the Canons of the Church.

The petition was presented by Bishop White, and at one time there seemed to be hope of its favorable consideration; but the matter was dropped as usual, and the clergy sending the memorial never so much as heard of its fate until nearly two years afterwards through the chance visit of a clergyman from the East. But some symptoms of interest in the state of the Church west of the mountains began to show themselves about the same time. The formation of the Society for the Advancement of Christianity in Pennsylvania took place in 1812. This was the first attempt to make an organized effort to plant the Church on new ground. Shortly after the found-

ing of this Society, the Rev. Jackson Kemper, afterwards Missionary Bishop of the Northwestern Territories, visited Pittsburgh and its vicinity, and on his return made an interesting report, which has been lost. In 1814, the Rev. Jehu Clay, then a deacon from Philadelphia, was sent out on a visit of enquiry, and supplied Mr. Taylor's place at Trinity Church for three Sundays while he made a missionary tour to various points where services were desired. It is also on record that the Rev. Mr. Richmond, a missionary in the employment of the Society, supplied Trinity Church with services for a short time. Probably these were the first clergymen from the East who had ever seen Pittsburgh, and it was certainly the first and only time that Trinity Church received ministrations through the agency of the Church in the East. Elsewhere the new Missionary Society had begun its active operations, so successful and efficient in after years in planting churches which have become strong and flourishing.

An event now took place which explains partly the failure to elect a new rector in the place of the Rev. Mr. Thompson, and which is really the first of the two decisive events in the history of the Church in this country. After Mr. Thompson's resignation in 1823, we are told that at the request of the Vestry John H. Hopkins, Esq., then a layman of Trinity Church, was invited to hold services. Years before Mr. Hopkins had removed to Pittsburgh, studied law and very soon became a very prominent member of the bar. It is said that his income at this time was five thousand dollars per annum. He had been brought up in the Protestant Episcopal Church, but through friendships and social influences had, like many other members of the Church, been led to attend the Presbyterian services. His musical abilities led him to take charge of the organ and choir of Trinity Church. Very soon he became a communicant, and finally a candidate for Holy Orders. Shortly after he was invited to read services for the congregation as a layman, he was also elected rector of the parish in advance of the ordination, which took place December 14, 1823. A week later he entered upon his duties as Rector of Trinity Church, and from that time dates a new order of things in the Church in Allegheny County, and, in fact, throughout the whole of Western Pennsylvania. Almost immediately there were signs of reviving hope and courage. The project of building a new church, which had for some time been talked of, was put into execution. Mr. Hopkins made the plans of the new church,

and with his own hands executed a large part of the interior decorations. It was the first example of Gothic architecture not only in Pittsburgh but in the country. The new church, estimated to seat one thousand persons, was completed and consecrated on S. Barnabas' Day, June 11, 1825. (Life of Bishop Hopkins, pp. 72, 73.) It was a great step forward for that day, and meant that the Church intended to stay and to grow. Up to that time no bishop had ever crossed the Allegheny Mountains. In 1824 Bishop White made an attempt to visit the western part of his diocese, but meeting with an accident at Lewistown, he returned to Philadelphia. In 1825 he made a second effort and succeeded in reaching Pittsburgh to consecrate the new edifice of Trinity Church, thirty-eight years after his consecration, and seven years after Dr. Doddridge's letter, which I read to you just now. During his visit he also confirmed nearly one hundred and fifty persons belonging to the congregation, the first time that ordinance had ever been administered in the West. He also visited Connellsville, Wheeling and some other points. Within one year the list of communicants at Pittsburgh was increased from forty to about two hundred, so that it became at once the third parish in numerical strength within the Diocese of Pennsylvania. From that time it took its place in the front rank of influential parishes in the country, and was the recognized representative of the Church west of the mountains, and an important center of expansion. The varied and remarkable gifts of the rector as a preacher, a writer, a theologian, a musician, an architect, a lawyer and an artist gave him a wide influence throughout the Church, as well as in the city of Pittsburgh. Mr. Hopkins did not confine his labors to his own parish. He made a missionary tour as far north as Meadville, and eastward as Greensburg, holding prolonged services in both these places, gathering members into the Church (in the former place about sixty), and laying the foundations of future parishes. No less than seven new parishes were thus established by him in as many years. Not content with such personal efforts, he also tried to supply the need of additional workers in the field. He saw that if a sufficient number of the clergy were to be secured for the then remote West, it must be done by training them up on the ground. When it took a week's time or more to make the journey from Philadelphia or New York to Pittsburgh, it was in vain to look for any considerable number of promising recruits from the East. He therefore began a Theological

Training School for Clergymen in his own house. He had, before entering the ministry, purchased a large tract of ground on the Ohio River, in the very heart of what is now Allegheny City, but was then open country. On this he built a large brick house, which still stands as one of the landmarks of sixty years ago. In this house Mr. Hopkins fitted a chapel and recitation rooms, and received into his family such young men as desired to prepare for Holy Orders.

In 1829 four young men thus trained by him were ordained deacons, and four others were among the candidates for Orders reported by the bishop in his annual address.

Passing over much that was of interest in the rapid growth which followed in and about Pittsburgh, we come to the year 1860, when there again came to the front the question of setting up a separate diocese in the counties lying west of the Allegheny Mountains. The project had never been entirely abandoned; but for a time the increased and rapid means of communication with the East had rendered the need of a bishop on the ground less urgent. It was now easier to reach the most remote missionary station in the northwest corner of the diocese, than it was to get to Lancaster or Harrisburg in the days when Dr. Doddridge and his friends were pleading for a bishop and a diocese for the West. Besides, the consecration of Bishop H. U. Onderdonk in 1828 as assistant to Bishop White gave more adequate Episcopal supervision and quieted for a time the demand for a separate jurisdiction. The election of Bishop Alonzo Potter in 1845, with his splendid physique, commanding powers and untiring labors, still further tended to satisfy Churchmen in the West with their condition, for the time being. But in 1860 came the discovery of petroleum in the northern counties, and with it a great rush of fortune seekers, not only to the oil producing country but to Pittsburgh as the center of trade at that time. The increasing need of Episcopal labor, especially in these parts of the State, and Bishop Potter's failing health, led to the election of Dr. Samuel Bowman as assistant bishop. From the very first he took the liveliest interest in the Church in the western counties, and with all his might pushed forward the plan of a new diocese with its own bishop. His sudden death by the wayside while making a missionary tour in this part of the diocese did but fire the determination of Churchmen in the western part of the State never to give up the agitation until their prayer should be granted. For six years longer the conservatism of

the East and other influences delayed the step. There were fears on the part of what were known as "Low Churchmen," who were in the majority in the eastern counties, as to the ecclesiastical tone of the proposed diocese. Men gravely argued on the floor of the Convention that a territory having a population of near a million, and rapidly increasing, one hundred and fifty miles long and one hundred miles wide, needed no additional oversight, that it could not provide for the decent support of a bishop if their request were granted, and that still less could it take care of its missionary stations and plant new ones called for. Against this obstructiveness the western clergy and laity worked for a long time in vain. It was to no purpose the backwardness of the whole country of which Pittsburgh is the centre—there were but six churches in which regular services were held, north of Pittsburgh, and about as many in the counties south of it, some of these feeble, and most of them stationary—that we were losing enough of our members every year to form respectable congregations for want of care. They argued without effect that the wealth of Pittsburgh and Allegheny County alone, to say nothing of the surrounding country, was ample to provide the necessary means for the salary of the bishop, and the carrying on of missionary operations. And when asked for something more definite, they could only say "Give us what we ask, and we will justify our words." At length the persistency and skillful management of a few determined men won the day, and in the year 1865 consent was reluctantly given to the formation of the new diocese, and what Dr. Doddridge and his fellow-workers had sought in vain more than fifty years before was at last obtained. To this consent, however, was attached the condition that a capital sum of not less than thirty thousand dollars should be secured as an endowment for the new bishopric. The condition was readily complied with, though under protest, as being unlawful and unwise. All preliminary steps required by the General Canons of the Church having been taken, the Primary Convention of the Diocese of Pittsburgh met in Trinity Church, November 15, 1865. It was the second decisive step forward for the Church in the western part of Pennsylvania, as Bishop Hopkins' entrance on the rectorship of Trinity Church had been the first. Many were the prophecies of new life and progress, and high were the hopes indulged by the victorious Western Churchmen. And on the other hand, not a few predicted only failure and embarrassment for the new diocese.

Warm and something more than earnest was the canvass that preceded the meeting of the Convention for the election of a bishop; for party spirit was strong in Pennsylvania in those days, and now that the foundation of a new jurisdiction was settled upon, those who had opposed it turned their efforts towards gaining control of it. The after results of this struggle are felt today, and have been sufficiently serious to modify the actual benefits realized by the division. The candidates nominated for the bishopric were the Rev. John Barrett Kerfoot, D.D., then President of Trinity College, Hartford Conn., some of whose devoted students at S. James' College, Maryland, were among the leading spirits in the movement for division of the diocese; and the Rev. Frederic Dan Huntington, D.D., later Bishop of Central New York. Dr. Kerfoot was elected on the first ballot by a large majority, and on the twenty-fifth day of January, 1866, he was consecrated first Bishop of the Diocese of Pittsburgh in Trinity Church. The event created unusual interest throughout the Church, being the first case in which a new diocese had been formed out of an old one since 1838, when Western New York was similarly formed, and also because of the long contest which had preceded the event. All eyes were turned toward the western part of the State, and the results of the experiment were narrowly watched.

Bishop Kerfoot entered upon his duties with the energy and ability which belonged to him. His decided character and deep religiousness made a strong impression from the start.

With all the drawbacks mentioned above, the formation of the new diocese more than justified the hopes of those who had earnestly pressed it. When the Diocese of Pittsburgh was formed in 1865 there had been no increase of parishes since 1859, and the number remained stationary until 1868. But these same parishes had vastly developed in working power, in liberality, as well as in numbers. The communicants had grown to thirteen hundred, and the money raised for all purposes which had amounted to but five or six thousand, now reached forty thousand. After 1868 the effect of constant supervision of the bishop, and his incessant labor, began to have its effect upon the Church in the whole county. At the time of Bishop Kerfoot's death in 1881, there were sixteen parishes and three mission stations in Allegheny County. The communicants had increased to more than two thousand five hundred, and the contributions had reached an annual average of over seventy thousand dollars, rising as high as one hun-

dred and fifty thousand dollars in a single year. While these figures are very far from being as large as they should be, they show a vast improvement over the condition of things which existed so long. The laborious and fruitful Episcopate of Bishop Kerfoot ended at Meyersdale, Somerset County, July 10, 1881. He literally wore himself out in the service of the Church. His labors were incessant and at the same time his highest pleasure. His memory will long be cherished in the diocese, and the monuments of his zeal will tell the story of his unselfish life to other generations.

And the moral of it all is: Let us not make the same mistakes as did some of those of whom we have been speaking. Let us not be dilatory, indifferent, faithless. Let us rather emulate the many things in which we can so clearly see that others of them were right—let us be loyal and true to the Church; never ashamed of her—never apologetic concerning her—but speaking the truth in love and consecrating to her and her interests our time, our money, our labors, our prayers, our very selves.

The old problems are ever at our doors, asking us to solve them. The history of the past tells us that prompt, positive, generous, self-respecting action will always ensure best results. There is room for all to work—no one need feel uninvited—no one need be unemployed.

Let our motto be

*"Pro Christo et pro Ecclesia."*

**THE CHURCH HISTORICAL SOCIETY.**

**Organized May 17, 1910.**

**Incorporated June 10, 1913.**

---

**OFFICERS—1915.**

*President.*—HENRY BUDD, ESQ., Philadelphia.

*Vice-President.*—MAJOR MOSES VEALE, Philadelphia.

*Secretary.*—WM. IVES RUTTER, JR., 525 South Forty-first Street, Philadelphia.

*Treasurer.*—JOHN THOMSON, A.M., Litt.D., N. E. Cor. Thirteenth and Locust Streets, Philadelphia.

**EXECUTIVE BOARD.**

**Terms expire 1916.**

ALLEN CHILDS, Philadelphia.

ALBERT S. HAESELER, Philadelphia.

JAMES M. LAMBERTON, ESQ.,\* Harrisburg, Pa.

REV. JOHN STOCKTON LITTELL, D.D., Keene, N. H.

REV. C. BRAXTON BRYAN, D.D., Petersburg, Va.

**Terms expire 1917.**

REV. ARNOLD HARRIS HORD, Philadelphia.

REV. G. WOOLSEY HODGE, S.T.D., Philadelphia.

REV. GEORGE C. HALL, D.D., Wilmington, Del.

EDWARD HARMON VIRGIN, New York City.

REV. E. CLOWES CHORLEY, Garrison, N. Y.

**Terms expire 1918.**

REV. HENRY RILEY GUMMEY, D.D., Downingtown, Pa.

REV. ARTHUR LOWNDES, D.D., New York City.

REV. HORACE F. FULLER, Philadelphia.

REV. WILLIAM F. PEIRCE, L.H.D., D.D., Gambier, Ohio.

HON. L. BRADFORD PRINCE, LL.D., Santa Fe, N. M.

---

\*Deceased.