

The Elstobs, Scholars of Old English and Anglican Apologists

by

Michael Murphy

First published in

Durham University Journal 55 (1966), pp. 131-138

Notes are at the end.

The Elstobs, Scholars of Old English and Anglican Apologists

IT is often remarked in a general way that Old English texts were used by some of the early Reformers in England as ammunition in the wordy polemical battle with Catholics. What is not often stressed is the fact that this practice of early English Protestants was merely the beginning of a long tradition that lasted well into the nineteenth century, and has been able to show a little life even in the twentieth. The practice was begun, in print at least, by Archbishop Parker and his secretary, John Joscelyn, with their publication of **A Testimonie of Antiquitie** in 1566, the first book ever printed in Old English; and it was regularly, not to say monotonously, followed by most of the students of the language in the next couple of centuries.

A unique figure among the earlier students in this tradition who used the fruit of their Old English studies as apologetic was Elizabeth Elstob (1683—1756) . . . ‘our Saxon nymph’, as Ralph Thoresby, with rather heavy gallantry called her.¹ The study of Old English was not (and is not) a discipline favoured by a large number of people and, understandably, had been a totally male preserve up to Miss Elstob’s time, as, indeed, were most branches of learning. It is all the more surprising, then, to find a girl in the early years of the eighteenth century not only studying Old English with enthusiasm, but able and willing to publish the results of her work.

Elizabeth was born in Newcastle in 1683. She and her brother William were orphaned early and were placed under the care of an uncle, a prebendary of Canterbury cathedral, who had small belief in encouraging intellectual pursuits in women.² It was with some difficulty, therefore, that Elizabeth managed to get permission to give some worthwhile occupation to an alert and lively mind by learning French; and when the incubus of her uncle’s authority was removed, she eventually acquired an acquaintance with Latin and seven other languages.³

Her brother became a member of Queen’s College, Oxford, famous at this time for its large output of ‘Saxonists’, and from him she received her first interest and her training in Old English. William was described by George Hickes, the greatest Old English scholar of his age, as ‘in literatura et antiquitate Septentrionali praeclare eruditus’,⁴ [remarkably learned in Northern literature and antiquity] and it would seem that his sister eventually equaled him in mastery of Old English. Certainly she published more, though she had his help in this. They both planned to publish a good deal of work in Old

English, either together or separately, but their more ambitious designs never fully materialized. William, for example, planned an edition of Alfred's Orosius, and while still a young man had made a transcript of the Junius copy at Oxford. No more than a specimen was ever printed (at Oxford, 1699), though Daines Barrington eventually used Elstob's transcript for his much-criticized edition in 1773.⁵ William also hoped to publish a corrected edition of the laws of Anglo-Saxon England, and got as far as publishing proposals for such a work to replace the imperfect editions of Lambarde and Wheelock.⁶ This projected book of his never appeared either.

[132]

Equally ambitious was another abortive attempt by his sister to put out an edition of the Homilies of Aelfric in Old English though this effort came closer to completion. In 1713 she published, in the form of a letter to her old guardian, the Rev. Charles Elstob, an advertisement for her projected work: *Some Testimonies of Learned Men in favour of the Intended Edition of the Saxon Homilies*. Among the prestigious names was that of Hickes who had thrown the weight of his scholarly prestige behind her venture. The year before he had written to Charlett, the Master of University College, Oxford:

'I suppose you may have seen Mrs. Elstob, the sister of Mr. Elstob . . . and the MSS she hath brought to be printed at your press . . . the publication of the MSS she hath brought (the most correct I ever saw or read) will be of great advantage to the Church of England against the Papists; for the honour of our predecessors, the English Saxon clergy, especially of the episcopal order, and the credit of our country to which Mrs. Elstob will be counted abroad as great an ornament in her way, as Madam Dacier is to France.'⁷

His hope that the publication would be to the advantage of the Church of England against the Catholics was obviously shared by the editor herself. Shortly after the publication in London of her first editorial venture, the *English-Saxon Homily on the Birth-Day of St. Gregory* (1709), she had sent a copy to Ralph Thoresby, the antiquarian, and in a covering letter she wrote: 'I have some thoughts of publishing a set of Saxon Homilies, if I can get encouragement, which I believe will be very useful, the doctrine being for the most part orthodox; and where any errors have crept in, it may not be amiss to give some account of them.'⁸

The project was evidently dear to the heart of George Hickes, for he had hoped to do it himself; but the circumstances of his troubled career, as well as his other work, kept him from it. Still, he gave enthusiastic support to Elizabeth's efforts, as George Ballard relates:

Well knowing the great use that those homilies had been of, and still might be, to the Church of

England, he designed to publish, among other Saxon tracts, a volume of Saxon Homilies. But . . . though for want of further encouragement he could not carry on any one of those designs, yet it was no small pleasure to him to see one of the most considerable of them attempted, with so much success, by Mrs. Elizabeth Elstob, ‘who,’ adds he, ‘with incredible industry hath furnished a Saxon Homiliarium, or a collection of the English-Saxon Homilies of Aelfric, Archbishop of Canterbury, which she hath translated, and adorned with learned and useful notes, and for the printing of which she hath published proposals.’⁹

Robert Harley, Earl of Oxford, had got the patronage and bounty of the Queen for the proposed edition. But the prestige of scholars and the limited financial support of royalty were not, apparently, sufficient to ensure success. Printing started in 1715, but, though the whole of the Old English text seems to have been prepared and some of it already translated, only thirty-six pages were finished because work was broken off ‘for want, I imagine, of encouragement’, as Nichols puts it.¹⁰

[133]

J.

If this sizeable project failed, Miss Elstob had, nevertheless, two other works in Old English to her credit. In the same year that the abortive edition of Aelfric began printing she published in London *The Rudiments of Grammar for the English-Saxon Tongue* in which, for the first time, the commentary in an Old English grammar was in English rather than Latin, since it was designed, rather hopefully, for young ladies. In the preface Elizabeth takes issue in a lively manner with the ‘wits’ who have a contempt for the scholars of northern antiquities equaled only by their own ignorance of the subject. One of the chief offenders was Swift, to whose *Proposals for Correcting, Improving and Ascertaining the English Tongue* (1711) she refers several times, and of which her preface is meant to be a decided refutation in the part of his subject which Swift has touched without adequate knowledge.¹¹

Of more interest here, however, is her earlier publication to which I referred before, *An English-Saxon Homily on the Birth-Day of St. Gregory* (London, 1709), ‘a pompous book, in large octavo, with a fine frontispiece, headpieces, tailpieces and blooming letters’.¹² This book has a preface in an equally spirited vein. There is a lively defense of Anglo-Saxon studies, and of study in general as a quite appropriate occupation for women. This plea occupies something of a pioneering position in the history of the feminist cause, so it is perhaps a trifle surprising to find how pleasant it is to read: such manifestoes can easily be guilty of excessive claims and some silliness. Miss Elstob avoids both. She has, moreover, a clarity of style that comes as something of a relief after the syntactical meanderings of some earlier writers on the subject of Old

English. Most of her energy is taken up, not with her feminist plea, but with some assessment of critical attitudes to St. Gregory and St. Augustine, the apostle of England. Her lively style is accompanied and informed by knowledge of her subject; and here, as in her later work, she does not hesitate to disagree with eminent figures in her own field, in a manner that is sometimes nicely ironical but never abusive.

Contrary to the opinion of many who had written on the subject of Anglo-Saxon history or language she finds Augustine and Gregory, particularly the latter, to be admirable men. Today there will be few to disagree; but they had had plenty of detractors before Miss Elstob's time, and she makes it clear that she has no sympathy with what she regards as the bigotry and unfairness of the attackers.

Apart from Stillingfleet, she is more than discreet about mentioning these men by name, but she is obviously well acquainted with their writings, particularly with the seventeenth-century edition of Bede's History by Abraham Wheelock from which she quotes passages of the homilies of Aelfric which Wheelock had printed in sizeable selections in his notes to that book.¹³ The common and exaggerated fear by Anglicans of anything connected with the Roman Church, to the point of denying any real association between the Roman and the early English Churches, is gently ridiculed; and while she herself never deviates from her position as a loyal member of the Church of England, she is unable to see why this fact should prevent her admitting the obvious truth that the English Church was originally a province of the Roman in the latter's days of greater purity and freedom from 'corruption'.

To look at her approach in more detail: in her 'Epistle Dedicatory' to the Queen she follows the double line laid down in the earliest days of Old English scholarship. Old English, she says, was the language in which Queen Anne's progenitors 'laid the foundation of those laws, by which you so happily govern, and in which they received

[134]

that orthodox faith of which you are the undoubted defender'. Here again is the great pride in England's past and in her heritage of law that was so marked a feature of the English Renaissance and Reformation, and which reached its fullest expression in the constitutional struggles of the seventeenth century.¹⁴

In the preface (pp. vi—vii) she gives a brief account of how she came to learn Old English, and then proceeds to one of her main themes. Unlike Wheelock and others

before her she respects Augustine as the apostle of the English, and her attitude to Gregory is positively reverent:

It is one of the great blessings of our conversion, and one of the great comforts that attended it, that it was effected at a time and by such persons as made it, with respect to faith and discipline, both orthodox and regular. It is true, we received the Christian faith from the Roman Church, but when that church was a sound and uncorrupt branch of the Catholic Church: when it taught no other doctrine, and imposed no other articles of faith, than had been delivered down from the first ages by the Catholic Church. That faith and discipline which was first sent hither by St. Gregory, which was first preached to the English Saxons by St. Augustine; the same continued in its primitive purity for some ages, the same, after a long night of ignorance and superstition, was revived and restored by the Reformation.

And is it not one of the greatest advantages that we can boast of, that we of the Reformed Church of England as to Faith, and Worship, and Discipline, and all that can make a rightly constituted Church are the same with the primitive English Saxon Church?

This is some, no small satisfaction that we reap from Saxon learning: that we see the agreement of the reformed and the ancient Saxon Church. That it is no new Church. but the same it was before the Roman Church was corrupted (Pref., pp. xiii—xiv).

She makes a brief defense of episcopacy, in the course of which she says: ‘We can reckon up our Archbishops of Canterbury from this present time to St. Augustine, who was sent by St. Gregory, who derived his succession from St. Peter: and who, having sent Christianity hither in the purity of faith and doctrine, we have this assurance that our Church is apostolical . . .’ (p. xiv).

This is a far cry from Matthew Parker and his generation who had so fiercely denigrated Augustine. She has a reference to scholars of their way of thinking, and disapproves of them and their ‘violent prejudice’, pointing out with her sharp common sense that, though we know Christianity had been in Britain before Augustine, in his time England was ruled by pagan Saxons; and that from what we know from Gildas of the state of the British Church at that date, we could take no great pride in descent from it. She has no time for those who side against Augustine in the affair of the meeting with the British bishops at Augustine’s Oak (p. xvii). At this meeting, first related by Bede, Augustine had confronted the British bishops, asking their help in converting the heathen Anglo-Saxons, and asking also that they conform to some of the accepted norms of the Roman Church, notably in the time of keeping Easter. When the bishops

had refused on all counts, Augustine had foretold that they would meet disaster at the hands of the very people he was asking them to convert. This ‘prophecy’ was later construed, especially by some Reformers, as a threat which was carried out at the battle of Chester where many Welsh monks were slaughtered. Augustine was held to have been an accessory in bringing about this massacre in order to avenge his injured pride. Miss Elstob takes a different view, and admires Augustine for his virtues, attested by both Bede and Aelfric. Reviewing this affair of Augustine’s interviews with the British bishops she comes out strongly on his side, and asserts that ‘it is plain on which side the obstinacy lay’ (xxii). She rejects out of hand the contention that Augustine’s design was merely to establish the Pope’s supremacy with superstitious and unnecessary ceremonies; and she indignantly repudiates the accusation of his complicity in the slaughter of the Bangor monks (xxvi—xxviii).

[135]

In connection with this charge she inevitably brings up the question of the authenticity of the clause (by this time notorious) in the Latin of Bede’s History (Bk. II, chap. ii), which declares that Augustine had long been dead at the time when his prophecy was fulfilled. This is what the Latin text says: ‘Sicque completum est praesagium sancti pontificis Augustini, *quamvis ipso jam multo ante tem pore ad coelestia regna sublato*, ut etiam temporalis interitus ultione sentirent perfidi, quod oblata sibi perpetuae salutis consilia spreverant.’ In the very paraphrastic Alfredian version there is no translation of the italicized section, and this fact gave anti-Augustinians a peg on which to hang their accusation that the Latin clause was interpolated by a later medieval monk in an attempt to whitewash Augustine’s ‘crime’. Miss Elstob points out that Wheelock had confessed to finding the clause in the most ancient Latin manuscripts; and she informs readers of the assurance of John Smith (who

was preparing his great edition of Bede) that this was true. She supports her position further by citing a number of other prominent scholars and historians, including Sir Henry Spelman, Henry Wharton, and Jeremy Collier, who either reject the accusation against Augustine or are seriously dubious of its fairness (xxix).

In fact, she brings into question the whole Reformation attitude of many Protestant Englishmen who are unwilling to admit any real connection between the Church of England and the Church of Rome: ‘And yet surely there has been a time when it was no shame to be thus related; when St. Peter and St. Gregory held the chair it was worth owning an acquaintance with it’ (xxx). She concurs in the notion that the Church of Rome became and remained corrupt, but not in the contention that these corruptions were introduced into England by Gregory and Augustine; she feels that it would be well

for writers who favour the Reformation to remember this, and not to be forever seizing upon anything that might seem to save them from the unwelcome idea that they had ever had any connection with the Church of Rome. In fact, she asserts, a greater knowledge of the history of the Saxon Church would convince them of its ‘exact agreement with the Reform’d’ (xxxix), and answer the question so popular with Catholics: Where was your Church before Luther? “We give them too great an advantage to allow, that the Saxon Church, planted here by St. Augustine, was the same in error and corruption with the Roman Church at this day” (xxxix).

Like others before her she takes up, though briefly, the matter of Scripture in Old English, the spiritual supremacy of the Pope, praying to the saints, transubstantiation etc. She gives from Wheelock examples of prayers in Old English, including the Lord’s Prayer and the Apostles’ and Nicene Creeds; and she refers to published works of such earlier Old English scholars as L’Isle, Junius and Marshall, Thwaites, and John Spelman to prove that the Anglo-Saxons had the Scriptures in the vernacular. She discusses papal supremacy, using in part extracts from homilies published in Wheelock, but she hardly contributes anything new or original to the discussion: the Old English piece which she labels ‘Against the Supremacy’ (xli) is nothing more than a rather ordinary exposition of the ‘Tu es Petrus’ text declaring Christ to be the rock on which the Church is built.

On praying to the saints and the veneration of images she takes a significantly different stance from Wheelock’s, for example. She quotes (xlv—xlvi) with obvious approval a sermon from Wheelock’s *Bede* which deals with praying to saints in a way which Protestants could approve of, and follows with a piece of her own on the right use of images, defending Augustine from the charge of having introduced the superstitious worship of them. In her support she cites Bede, Spelman, and her everfavoured Gregory. On transubstantiation she refers to the inevitable Paschal Homily so often cited by the Reformers, and frequently reprinted since the time of Archbishop Parker; and she reproduces Aelfric’s letter to Wulfsgige (xlix—li) which was first printed by Joscelyn and Parker in 1566 with the homily. She does not much approve of relics, and

her brief comment only accentuates the feeling in the reader that she is at something of a loss in being unable to deny that her hero St. Gregory did send relics to [136] Augustine (Appendix p. 45). Finally she reiterates in a determined but not uncharitable way her defense of the unanimity of the contemporary Church of England with the Saxon Church, in contrast to the divergence between the same Saxon Church and the contemporary Church of Rome, acknowledging at the same time once more that England did originally receive the faith in its pure form from Rome.

After 1715 Miss Elstob published nothing, though she lived until 1756. The early death of her brother in 1715, and of George Hickes her encourager and guide, her reduced circumstances as a result of her brother's death, and her disappointment at the failure of her major work, must have combined to diminish her interest in the pursuit of Old English studies. Indeed, her rather desperate attempts to make a living after William's death made such work well-nigh impossible.¹⁵

It was from William, as I have said, that she had first gained a knowledge of Old English, though he now seems a more shadowy figure than his sister. This is due in part, no doubt, to the fact that he published little in the field of Old English, and that little was in the larger books of George Hickes. William's ambitious plans for an edition of Alfred's Orosius and for a new edition of the Anglo-Saxon laws came to nothing. Indeed, his life seems to have encompassed a sizeable number of serious disappointments and unfinished projects. While at Oxford, according to the peevish Thomas Hearne, he failed to be elected a fellow of All Souls as a south country man, and so he became a 'Northern man' and was elected to University College, where his northern birth was, it seems, more acceptable.¹⁶ Another of his abortive projects had also to do with his northern origin. 'We are informed by his accomplished sister', says John Nichols, 'that he made a collection of materials towards a history of his native place; that he had collected a vast number of proper names of men and women formerly used in northern countries . . . What is become of the two collections above mentioned is uncertain and not very material.'¹⁷

There were, however, 'some other little jobs in learning', as Hearne puts it. He helped his sister with the English-Saxon Homily, and he provided the Latin translation. Besides this, he contributed what seems to have been the first printed edition of Wulfstan's *Sermo Lupi* in Hickes's Thesaurus.¹⁸ He gives here the Old English with his own Latin translation. This, according to Hickes, was only the third full homily to be printed in full up to this time, the others being the familiar Paschal Homily, and—in Wheelock's *Bede* — the sermon *De Fide Catholica*.

Elstob also edited, as part of the appendix for Hickes's *Second Collection of Controversial Letters* (1715), a section called 'A Publick office of daily and nightly devotions for the Seven Canonical Hours of Prayer, used in the Anglo-Saxon Church. With a translation and notes'.¹⁹ Elstob's comments in his publications are generally brief, as if he realized that his efforts were merely appendages to the larger works of others. He certainly shows none of the lively spirit in apologetic displayed by his sister. A few of his remarks on 'A Publick office' are nevertheless of interest here. The office itself is a kind of layman's breviary or Book of Hours. An introduction in the Old English text explains why we should praise God seven times a day, and has a short

account of what the Hours are. There follows the main body of the work consisting chiefly of the Lord's Prayer, the Creed, various Psalms, parts of which are quoted and then paraphrased more fully. Hymns, too, are interspersed, the whole work making a rather beautiful collection of prayers and meditations.

[137]

This Book of Hours is written in what Elstob calls 'a musical strain', that is, a kind of poetic prose, and he therefore attributes it on stylistic grounds to Aelfric or Wulfstan who are both known for their use of rhythmical and alliterative prose. To emphasize this poetic quality Elstob arranges the Hours in verses.

The purpose of this production of an Anglo-Saxon prayer book was, in Elstob's own words, 'to shew how pure their devotion was from error and superstition in those times, and since of those hymns that were used in the service, the first line only is exhibited: to shew also that they contain nothing but what is of equal purity, I believed it might not be amiss to transcribe them from the breviary and let them appear in English' (Sign. Aa5). The presence among the Anglo-Saxons of the practice of praying to the saints was something that had always been denied by Protestant scholars of Old English, and as strenuously as anyone by George Hickes, Elstob's friend and the author of the *Controversial Letters*. Elstob's assessment of the purity of the devotions in Anglo-Saxon England is, nonetheless, not modified by the presence of a prayer among the Hours asking that 'the Holy Mother of God' intercede for the petitioner (Sign. Cc8v). Elstob does not write this off as some aberrant piece of 'error and superstition'; he even gives an example of another similar prayer from the same period in Latin. That he is making a nice distinction between this kind of prayer and direct intercession of the saints is clear in view of the fact that Hickes judged the Old English prayer orthodox by contrast with another of the late tenth century which, he felt, showed a decline into Romanist practice, though to most readers of both, the distinction must seem infinitesimally fine.²⁰ At any rate, it would seem that polemic on this point had lost some of its sharpness over the years.

Elstob's notes, after the early ones explaining the meaning of 'Uhtsang', 'Undernsang', etc., are fairly sparse; but he does occasionally point out similarities to the Book of Common Prayer 'to shew wherein the Saxon Hours agree' with the prayers in the later book (Sign. Ha5v). The parallels, however, are less impressive as proof of continuity from, and essential sameness with, the Anglo-Saxon Church, when one recalls that many of the prayers in the Book of Common Prayer could be paralleled closely in missal and breviary.

These publications hardly serve to draw William Elstob out of the comparative shadows he inhabits. It can scarcely be held that he was more than a minor part of the mainstream of published Old English studies in the seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries. He certainly displays no liking for warm religious polemics in his studies, in spite of his clerical calling. He makes a point or two in a somewhat moribund religious controversy, but does not here involve himself with vehemence like his friend Hickes or even like his sister Elizabeth. Together or singly they certainly eclipse him.

It is hardly to be expected that friends of Hickes who were engaged in the same field of study as he should be quite free of his powerful personality. Hickes's interest, which he shares with most of the early scholars of Old English, in using his knowledge of the field as controversial material against Catholics, carries over to his disciples. But it is no longer quite the acid spirit of Bale or Parker or Wheelock. In 1687 Henry Wharton might have had some reason to feel that the 'times now grew warm and the papists began to be very confident of their cause in so much as there was a fear, and accordingly care taken about some choice manuscripts lest they should unhappily fall into the Enemies hand'.²¹ This fear must seem a little exaggerated to us now, but in any case it must have receded after the revolution in 1688. In the older generation of men like Hickes who remembered the scare of the Popish plot and the fear of romanizing during the short reign of James II, stronger traces of anti-Romanism remain than

[138]

one comes to expect in the younger generation, especially those of High Church leanings. But old ways die hard, and the use of Old English studies for religious polemics, begun by Parker and Joscelyn in the mid-sixteenth century was still being practiced, even if less vitriolically, a century and a half after their time, when the inducement must seem to us to have long since passed.

NOTES

1. *Letters of Eminent Literary Men to Ralph Thoresby*, ed. J. Hunter (London, 1832), II, p. 160.

2. For further details of her biography see especially M. Ashdown: 'Elizabeth Elstob, the learned Saxonist', *MLR*, xx (1925), pp. 125—146; David Douglas: *English Scholars*, 2nd ed. (London, 1951), pp. 72—76.

3. J. Nichols: *Literary Anecdotes of the Eighteenth Century* (London, 1812—16), IV, p. 129.

4. 'Dissertatio Epistolaris' in Hicckes's *Thesaurus* (Oxford, 1703—05), p. 98.

5. See Nichols: *Anecdotes*, IV, pp. 121—123 and III, 4, n.

6. *Anecdotes*, IV, pp. 120—121; R. P. Wulcker: *Grundriss zur Geschichte der Angelsachsischen Literatur* (Leipzig, 1885), p. 27.

7. J. Walker: *Letters Written by Eminent Literary Persons* (sometimes known as *Letters from the Bodleian*) (London, 1813), 1, p. 243; E. Adams: *Old English Scholarship* (New Haven, 1917), pp. 134—135. The letter is dated Dec. 23, 1712.

8. See *Letters to Ralph Thoresby*, II, 198—99 and II, 226; Adams, p. 134.

9. This statement by Ballard, a friend and correspondent of Elizabeth's, is cited in Nichols's *Anecdotes*, IV, 131—132.

10. *Anecdotes*, IV, p. 133; Wulcker, p. 27. The long title of this partly printed work is, like many others of this period, indicative of the bent and purpose of the book: *The English-Saxon Homilies of Aelfric Arch-Bishop of Canterbury . . . Being a Course of Sermons collected out of the Writings of the ancient Latin Fathers, containing the Doctrines etc. of the Church of England before the Norman Conquest, and shewing its purity from many of those popish innovations and corruptions, and which were afterward introduced into the church . . .* (Oxford, 1715).

11. The preface to the *Grammar* is called 'An Apology for the Study of Northern Antiquities'. It has been separately reprinted in convenient form, and edited by C. Peake for the Augustan Reprint Soc. as No. 61 in the series (Los Angeles, 1956). The *Grammar* is directly derived from Hicckes's

Institutiones.

12. *Anecdotes*, IV, p. 129.

13. Abraham Wheloc (or Wheelock): *Historiae Ecclesiasticae Gentis Anglorum Libri V* (Cambridge, 1643; again, with additions, 1644).

14. See F. Smith Fussner: *The Historical Revolution* (New York, 1962) and Douglas's *English Scholars*.

15. See Ashdown; also Myra Reynolds: *The Learned Lady in England* (Boston and New York, 1920), pp. 169—185.

16. *Hearne's Collections*, ed. C. E. Doble (Oxford, 1885), 1, p. 1 t4.

17. *Anecdotes*, IV, p. 119.

18. See D. Whitelock: *Sermo Lupi Ad Anglos*, 2nd ed. (London, 1952), p. 55, n.

19. He had previously published this 'Office' in Hicke's *Several Letters . . .* (London, 1705). My references are generally to the later edition bound with Hicke's *Second Collection* (London, 1710—15); this second edition, Elstob says, is from a better text. The whole book has three parts, the first dated 1710; part three—the office—is dated 1715.

20. "Sign. b7v-b8, 1705 ed.

21. From the anonymous life of Henry Wharton, prefixed to a posthumous collection of his sermons, 1697; cited by Douglas, p. 142.