

Examining the Work of S. W. Carruthers:

Justifying a Critical Approach to the Text of the Westminster Standards & Correcting the 18TH Century Lineage of the Traditional Scottish Text

By Chris Coldwell

In 1883 the Presbyterian Church of England published a critical text of the Westminster Confession of Faith compiled by renowned botanist William Carruthers, a leader of that church and director of their committee for publications. Of this work, B. B. Warfield noted:¹

This little pamphlet is the only attempt made in Britain, since the issue of the 'Collections' of the early eighteenth century, to set forth a critically perfected text of the Confession.

William Carruthers published an updated text in 1914, and while he "began a fuller bibliographical investigation" and intended to publish facsimiles "along with a brief account of the various editions," he never completed this work. These tasks were taken up by his son, S. W. Carruthers, M.D., who was also active in the affairs of the Presbyterian Church of England.²

In 1937 Dr. Carruthers published his own critical text of the Confession of Faith, which was an improvement and expansion of his father's earlier work (Carruthers, 9). The importance of this publication would be difficult to overstate. John Murray wrote regarding it:³ "The Church lies under a great debt to Dr. Carruthers for the painstaking and diligent labour that has given us this book"

In the course of preparing a new critical text of the Westminster Confession of Faith and Catechisms, the author has found that some refinement can be made to the work of S. W. Carruthers. A more exact detailing of the descent of the traditional text through the 18th century is possible, which allows for correcting and refining the origin of many of the textual corruptions he was the first to identify. In particular, Carruthers' lineage of the traditional text can be more correctly filled in for the period between the publication of Dunlop's 1719 edition and that of Kincaid's in 1773.

Over time printers of the Standards introduced many errors, subsequently repeated down through the various popular editions, which form the lineage of the traditional Scottish text. The Carruthers' work uncovered 242 such errors in the Confession alone, and in the process a list of editions was compiled which S. W. Carruthers believed contained: "... at least an example of every group necessary to elucidate adequately the textual history of the Confession" (Carruthers, 71).

From out of this list, Dr. Carruthers proposed a lineage for the traditional Scottish text of the Westminster Confession of Faith (See Table 1; and see Endnote A for fuller bibliographical details on the editions listed in the table).⁴

THE AUTHOR: Chris Coldwell is the editor of *The Confessional Presbyterian*. Over the years via Naphtali Press he has edited and published classic Presbyterian works, and is currently compiling a new critical text of the Westminster Confession of Faith and Catechisms.

1. W. Carruthers, ed. *The Confession of Faith of the Assembly of Divines at Westminster ...* (London: Presbyterian Church of England, [1890]). B. B. Warfield, "Notes Toward A Bibliography of the Westminster Confession: I. Britain," *The Presbyterian and Reformed Review*, xii (1901) 659. Hereafter Warfield. Carruthers, born in Scotland, studied for the ministry at New College, Edinburgh, but was advised to follow a scientific career. He became Keeper of the Department of Botany in the British Museum in 1871 ["In Memory of William Carruthers (1830-1922), From the *Journal of Botany*, v. 60, September 1922 (London: Taylor and Francis, n.d.)].

2. S. W. Carruthers, M.D., Ph.D., *The Westminster Confession of Faith: Being an account of the Preparation and Printing of its Seven Leading Editions, to which is appended a critical text of the Confession with notes thereon* (Manchester: R. Aikman & Son, [1937]) 9. Hereafter Carruthers.

3. John Murray, "The Westminster Confession of Faith by S. W. Carruthers," *Collected Writings of John Murray* (Carlisle, PA: Banner of Truth, 1982) 3.291. Hereafter Murray.

4. The lineage of the traditional text of the Confession of Faith is also that of the Catechisms and the other traditional Scottish documents at the various points each began to be published in the descending editions. On this topic see *Antiquary* later in this issue.

Table 1: Carruthers' Lineage of the Traditional Text

1. Edition Three (London, 1647)
2. Edition Four (Edinburgh, 1647)
3. Edition Five (Edinburgh, 1647)
4. Edition Six (London, 1648)
5. Rothwell (London, 1658)
6. "Third" (London, 1688)
7. "Fifth" (London, 1717)
8. Dunlop (Edinburgh, 1719-21)
9. Robertson (Glasgow, 1746)
10. Kincaid (Edinburgh, 1773)
11. Kerr (Edinburgh, 1793)
12. Blair A, B (Edinburgh, 1810; 1831)
13. Johnstone A, B, C (Edinburgh, 1851, 55, 67)

Following upon this ground-breaking work on the text of the Confession of Faith, Dr. Carruthers published two more works on Westminster texts. The later of the two, published in 1957, was an update of his father's work on the Shorter Catechism. It not only included a reproduction of the original manuscript presented to the House of Commons, but contained as well a large expansion of his father's bibliography of editions of the Shorter Catechism. The other, published in 1946, was a transcript of a manuscript of the Confession of Faith, which had been recently discovered.⁵

It is unclear how much work on the critical text of

5. S. W. Carruthers, ed. *Tercentenary Edition. The Confession of Faith of the Assembly of Divines at Westminster* (Publishing Office of the Presbyterian Church of England: London, [1946]). Hereafter *Burges*. S. W. Carruthers, *Three Centuries of the Westminster Shorter Catechism* (NB: Published for the Beaverbrook Foundations by the University of New Brunswick, 1957). Hereafter, *Three Centuries*. See also: William Carruthers, *The Shorter Catechism of the Westminster Assembly of Divines*, etc. (London: Publication Office of the Presbyterian Church of England, 1897).

6. *Three Centuries* contains helpful information on the pagination of various editions, which aided the revising of Carruthers' lineage of the traditional text presented in this article. It should also be noted that, while he published nothing further, there may possibly be unpublished research on Westminster texts amongst Dr. Carruthers' private papers, housed at Westminster College, Cambridge. According to Dr. Van Dixhoorn, who brought this collection to the author's attention, these papers have never been critically examined and studied.

7. The Larger Catechism manuscripts are in the Nalson MSS Collection, vol 22, [MS in Hand B], fos. 133r-157v and [MS in Hand A], fos. 158r-176v, Bodleian Library, Oxford. The MSS are in two distinct handwriting styles and will be referred to hereafter as MSb and MSa. While trying to locate a Larger Catechism manuscript in 2002 to aid in creating a new critical text, the author contacted Chad Van Dixhoorn, who was researching the Westminster Assembly manuscripts. He knew of none existing at the time; but later in August he discovered these and kindly notified the author.

8. The suppositions of analytical bibliography first laid out by

the Confession Dr. Carruthers continued to do after publishing this manuscript. Some of the bibliographical information he provides in his 1957 work indicates that he at least had the information that one would expect would have led to an elaboration and correction of a portion of his lineage of the traditional text. But after the publication of the manuscript text of the Confession, Carruthers apparently published nothing further regarding his textual work.⁶ With the recent discovery by Dr. Chad Van Dixhoorn of two manuscripts of the Larger Catechism, manuscripts can now be consulted for both Catechisms as well as for the Confession of Faith.⁷

With these manuscripts available, the question naturally arises: Is a critical approach to the text now unnecessary, and is a critical review of Dr. Carruthers' work superfluous? This article will therefore:

- I. Justify continuing a critical approach; before
- II. Reviewing and adjusting Dr. Carruthers' lineage of the traditional Scottish text, and
- III. Correcting the first occurrence of some of the textual variants presented in Carruthers 1937 critical text of the Confession of Faith.

I. Justifying a Critical Approach

The manuscripts of the Confession and Catechisms are clearly of great interest, importance, and use. However, as far as arriving at the intended text of the three documents, a critical approach is still necessary, taking into account not only the authoritative printed editions, as Dr. Carruthers did for the Confession, but taking into account all the known manuscripts as well. These manuscripts should not simply be presumed to be the Assembly's "final" text, but neither should they be ignored as a source for possible clarification of any long-standing textual errors, which might have escaped detection. The soundness of this approach can be supported by reviewing printing practices of the period along with the information in the Assembly Minutes regarding the manuscripts and the printing of the texts, as well as by noting some characteristics of the manuscripts themselves.

SEVENTEENTH CENTURY PRINTING PRACTICES

Bibliographical studies have sought to clarify as much as possible the process by which an author's work would come into print during the period of the hand press (approximately 1500 to 1800).⁸ In general, for

a new work, the author would deliver a manuscript text to the printer, often copied out by a professional scribe, and the compositor would mark up the text to prepare it for composition. He “marked the place in the copy where the new type page ended, and added a marginal note giving the number of the next page both in the book and in the sheet” by page and signature number (Gaskell, 40-41, 50; McKerrow, 205-207; 217-221; Simpson, 49-51). After composing the work into type, the printer would then print the “first stage” proof (Gaskell, 110-116). This was generally turned over to the corrector, who with a reader to read aloud the text from the manuscript copy, would correct the proof, making use of the compositor’s marks (Gaskell, 111). The proof with corrections would be returned to the compositor to correct the text, and a revised proof might be printed to verify that the corrections had been made. After this, the “second stage” of proofing would begin, and generally these would serve as the author’s proof, who would review them at the printer’s shop, or on occasion at his own residence. After the author’s corrections were incorporated, a “third stage” proof or “press proof” would be printed as a final check for imposition errors (Gaskell, 115). After passing this last proof stage, the actual print run commenced.

Ideally, the compositor was “strictly to follow his Copy” (Simpson, 53); but given the lack of standards in spelling and punctuation, it was common, even customary practice at this time to make changes to an author’s manuscript text. The printing shop in the early stages of the hand press became responsible for standardizing capitalization, use of italics, spelling, and punctuation – the “incidentals” of the text as opposed to the “substantials” such as the words themselves. Some authors took greater pains to see that their own punctuation and spelling were followed more exactly; but more often than not the printer saw himself as the enforcer of standards in these matters (Gaskell, 110-116; Simpson, 53-54). Also, though an author might be otherwise insistent that his manuscript be followed exactly, that did not necessarily preclude his desire that the punctuation (or “pointing”) and other incidentals be corrected and standardized (Gaskell, 339).

As for the Assembly’s manuscripts in particular, there is little information detailing how they were handled and printed. There are no surviving printer’s proofs known to exist,⁹ and the surviving manuscripts of the Confession and Catechisms do not appear to have been used in the printing process, as they lack evidence of having been handled by a compositor.¹⁰ It is necessary then, to try and construct what is likely and make sup-

positions from the general practices just outlined. However, it might be objected that perhaps the Westminster Assembly documents were a special case and not subject to normal printing practices. In answer, though there may be some direct evidence answering this (see Endnote D), it may be helpful to examine briefly an important state paper printed just a year prior to the sitting

McKerrow and updated by Gaskell appear reasonable given what is known about and what exists of the work of the Westminster Assembly. For a discussion of the different and competing approaches of recent time, see the chapter “Textual Criticism” in D. C. Greetham’s *Textual Scholarship: An Introduction* (NY: Garland Publishing Inc, 1994) especially 335ff. In sum, because of the general practice at the time of allowing the printer to standardize the manuscript text as to its incidentals (such as punctuation), the manuscript text, to that extent, is a “consciously unfinished state” of the intended text (Greetham, 336). See also: Philip Gaskell, *A New Introduction to Bibliography* (Oak Knoll Press: 1995); Ronald B. McKerrow, *An Introduction to Bibliography for Literary Students* (Oxford at the Clarendon Press, 1927; Rpt. Oak Knoll Press, 1994, with introduction by David McKitterick); R. B. McKerrow, edited by Carlo M. Bajetta, “The Relationship of English Printed Books to Authors’ Manuscripts during the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries (The 1928 Sandars Lectures),” *Studies in Bibliography*, Volume 53 (2003) 1-65; D. F. McKenzie, “Printers of the Mind: Some Notes on Bibliographical Theories and Printing-House Practices,” *Studies in Bibliography*, Volume 22 (1969) 1-77; and Percy Simpson, *Proof-Reading in the Sixteenth Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1935. Rpt. 1970). *Studies in Bibliography* is online at: <http://etext.lib.virginia.edu/bsuva/sb/>.

9. In addition to the manuscript, several printer’s proofs would have been made. “Traditionally the stages of proof-correction have been at least three: galley (whether page-or slip-), revises, and, as a last resort, stop-press. And let us not forget that the manuscript copy precedes all three. Now it is incontestable that these several stages can be found in increasing frequency as one moves from manuscript (how much of that survives?), to page-proofs (very few of these), to revises (slightly more of these – if some of our surviving ‘proof’ sheets can be so considered), to stop-press (hundreds of these).” McKenzie, “Printers of the Mind,” 44.

10. While part of the manuscript of the Directory for Public Worship bears some evidence of handling by the printer (see Endnote D), and other manuscript documents still need close scrutiny, the author has examined the copies of the Catechisms for compositor’s marks, and none are discernible. Dr. Van Dixhoorn, who in 2002 located almost all of the Assembly’s original papers and documents, and completed the first unabridged transcription of the Minutes [See Appendix A in “Reforming the Reformation: Theological debate at the Westminster Assembly, 1643-1652,” Ph.D. dissertation, University of Cambridge, 2004. Hereafter Van Dixhoorn], confirmed to the author that the manuscript of the Confession is similarly unmarked. Neither, in all his research, has Dr. Van Dixhoorn discovered any surviving printer’s proofs, or additional manuscripts of the Confession and Catechisms, other than the known examples of the Shorter Catechism and Confession of Faith, and the two of the Larger Catechism. These last two manuscripts are surely the Parliament copies, and according to Dr. Carruthers that of the Shorter is the copy presented to the Commons, Nov. 25, 1647, and he believed that of the Confession was the one prepared by Dr. Burges [Burges, Editorial Note; Alexander F. Mitchell and John Struthers, eds., *Minutes of the Sessions of the Westminster*

of the Westminster Assembly, which exists in manuscript with printer's marks. As an official declaration of Parliament, it may illustrate how the printer may have handled Assembly manuscripts.

A Manuscript with Printer's Marks

The manuscript in question is titled "The Declaration of Both Houses of Parliament of May 19, 1642."¹¹ Ac-

Assembly of Divines (Edinb.: William Blackwood & Sons, 1874) 308. Hereafter *Minutes*.] However, according to Dr. Van Dixhoorn, all handwriting ascriptions need to be studied and reassessed "now that almost the full corpus of the Assembly's papers have been located" (Personal Communication with Dr. Chad Van Dixhoorn, Dec. 7, 2004).

11. *Parliamentary History Part 2: The Braye Manuscripts from the House of Lords Record Office. Braye MSS. Vol. 7. "Declaration of Both Houses. 19 May 1642"* (Adam Matthew Publications, 1995). Reel 3. Item 1. This was one of a number of exchanges between Parliament and the King leading up to the English Civil War.

12. It seems unlikely that documents of such length and longer would have gone through the printing process unmarked (or even without occasional evidences of handling, such as an inky thumb print). There were many reasons the printer would need to make such notations on manuscript copy. At first the compositor would need to know roughly the length of the document to determine format. Subsequently, he would need a more exact idea of length in order to have sufficient paper. Also, the printer would need to know precise pagination if he was setting by forms or was going to spread the work among more than one compositor. Gaskell, 41-42.

13. *The declaration or remonstrance of the Lords and Commons in Parliament assembled: with divers depositions and letters thereunto annexed* (London: Printed for Joseph Hunscoth and John Wright, 1642). *Early English Books 1641-1700, STC II* (Ann Arbor, MI: University Microfilms International, [1975?-]). Reel 252:E.148, no. 17 (Wing E1517). The Declaration takes up the first 24 pages. The depositions and letters are not part of this manuscript, which contains just the text of the Declaration; but manuscript copy does exist elsewhere in the Braye MSS collection (Braye MS 3, ff 149-59, 203-12). See Endnote C for a list of the other editions of the Declaration.

14. For instance, on the first page of the Hunscoth/Wright edition, the spelling in the manuscript has been changed from: *bin* to *been* or *beene*, *greate* to *great*, *varietie* to *variety*, *plots* to *Plots*, *Ruynie* to *ruine* and *deitie* to *deity*. As noted, capitalization was changed in two of these instances as well. In addition, *Services* was changed to *services*, and *Counsells* to *counsells*.

15. On the first page alone, there are more than a dozen additional commas that do not appear in the manuscript; and in the first paragraph, which is one long sentence in both texts, the printed text has changed one comma in the manuscript to a semi-colon, and one comma to a colon. There are many other instances of the introduction of harder "stops" throughout the text, some in places where the manuscript has no discernible punctuation.

16. And possibly more carefully proofed. See footnote 22.

17. Baillie may have had an unofficial MS. Carruthers, 14, 19.

18. See also Lightfoot's Journal. "Being set, Dr. Burgess read what we had done and finished of government, to be sent to the Houses: and he and the scribes compared the original and his transcript." *The*

according to a note inside the front cover of the bound manuscript, "This is the original sent to the printer." Compositor's marks as previously described are present in the margin, as might be expected in a document of this length.¹² When the texts of the manuscript and the published version are compared,¹³ it becomes clear that even with such important Parliamentary documents, the printer had discretion regarding the incidentals of the text. In this specific example, the manuscript has no indication for use of the italic face (which would have been indicated by underlining text to be italicized), but the printer has throughout used it for names of months, places and individuals. Spelling and capitalization have also been changed in the printed text.¹⁴ As for punctuation, the printed text has supplied it where the manuscript has none discernible, including the addition of many more commas, and where present, the punctuation in the printed text varies often from the manuscript.¹⁵ All this strongly indicates that printing of state papers was handled in accordance with the general practice outlined earlier.¹⁶

With this brief review of general printing practices and one example of the period in mind, the facts regarding the Westminster Assembly documents can be examined and some suppositions made about the manuscripts and their subsequent printing.

MANUSCRIPTS OF THE CONFESSION & CATECHISMS

There were probably at least as many as four official manuscript copies of the Westminster Confession of Faith and Catechisms.¹⁷ Two manuscript copies are certain, as a copy of each document approved by the Assembly was formally presented (i.e. "given") to each House of Parliament. This was true, beginning with the partial manuscript containing the first nineteen chapters of the Confession of Faith, and subsequently it was ordered that completed documents were to be presented to both Houses (*Minutes*, 290-291, 303, 308-309, 349, 354, 484-485, 491, 492, 510). This is supported by the existence of the two Larger Catechism manuscripts, which given their provenance are surely the Parliament copies. As it seems very unlikely that either of these would have been returned to the Assembly, they probably retained a third copy. This appears to be the case when several places in the Minutes are compared (*Minutes*, 303, 308, 319; 349).¹⁸ This copy quite possibly would have served as the master copy from which the others were made, and differences in the two Larger Catechism manuscripts may support this. Where the two differ, the printed text sometimes follows one, and

sometimes the other, which may indicate the existence of this Assembly master copy, unmarred by the unique variants in each copy not appearing in print. But this does raise the question, which manuscript copy would have been submitted for printing? Obviously, a 'best practice' would be for an author not to send the only copy of a work abroad to the printer, without retaining a master,¹⁹ and it is certainly reasonable to assume that a fourth copy would have been prepared by the Assembly scribes, specifically for the printer's use. The preparation of these additional copies is supported by the absence of any evidence that the printer handled most of the surviving manuscripts (See Endnote D).

THE PRINTING OF THE CONFESSION & CATECHISMS

As for what is actually known about the printing of the Confession and Catechisms, a few facts are recorded in the Minutes of the Assembly and Journals of the House of Commons and House of Lords. The Houses tasked the Westminster Assembly with the responsibility for the first printings of the documents (*Minutes*, 354 n1, 356). The Assembly in turn gave to their scribes, Henry Roborough and Adoniram Byfield, the responsibility for choosing and working with a printer. For instance, in the case of the Directory for the Public Worship of God, the Assembly ordered (*Minutes*, 66): "That the scribes take care of the printing of ... the Directory for worship, and that they do appoint who shall print it." Regarding the printing of the first nineteen chapters of the Confession of Faith, and subsequently the whole of that document, the Assembly ordered that the scribes "take care of the exact printing of the Confession of Faith" (*Minutes*, 296, 310 n1). In the case of the Catechisms, the Assembly ordered that "Mr. Byfield take care of the printing 'of both' the Catechisms" (*Minutes*, 492; n1, n2). And when the Scripture proofs had been added, the Parliament ordered regarding the Shorter Catechism: "It is this day Ordered by the Lords and Commons in Parliament assembled, that the Shorter Catechism be forthwith printed and published; wherein Mr. Henry Roborough and Mr. Adoniram Byfield, scribes of the Assembly of Divines, are required to use all possible care and diligence, that it be from time to time faithfully and exactly done. And for preventing of all abuses therein, it is further Ordered that no person whatsoever do presume to print or reprint the same in any volume, but only such as shall be appointed and authorized thereunto by the said scribes ..." (*Minutes*, 512-513 n1).

The Minutes contain entries showing the Assem-

bly's concern for publications of the time. They had a committee dealing with the printing of Bibles, were interested in particular printing projects, as well as in censorship of books.²⁰ As to the last, the Assembly was particularly concerned with the number of books promoting blasphemy and heresy (*Minutes*, 218), and apparently brought to Parliament's attention any work that became a concern to them (*Minutes*, 170, 172-173; Lightfoot, 9). Also, the Parliament on its part would on occasion ask the divines to review a book (*Minutes*, 338, 351). The usual agent of such censorship was the Company of Stationers, which had been given power to seize books and make arrests, since the time of Queen Mary,²¹ when they were granted a monopoly over all printing. On at least one occasion, the Stationers' wardens attended upon the Assembly to bring to their attention a particular book and individual they had in their custody (*Minutes*, 105). But beyond these various interesting items, other than the orders for printing, and the expressed care for exactness, there are no details describing how the scribes were to work with the printer. Again, it becomes necessary to make reasonable suppositions based upon what is generally known about printing practices of the time.

As noted above, it is clear that the Assembly scribes

Works of the Rev. John Lightfoot, D. D. "Journal of The Proceedings of The Assembly of Divines (London: Printed by J. F. Dove, 1824) 13.323.

19. Simpson gives an example from the surviving author's manuscript of Richard Hooker's fifth book of the *Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity* (1597), where he was asked in a note by the printer to resubmit a missing page, which he was able to do, having kept a copy (Simpson, 76-77). On the other hand, the example of Nicholas Bownd illustrates the pains that it cost an author when he lost all his papers. For the second edition of his book on the Christian Sabbath, Bownd did not complete it "without some good labour to my self." *Sabbatum Veteris et Novi Testamenti: Or, The True Doctrine of the Sabbath* (London, 1606) A3-A4.

20. *Minutes*, 71, 78, 83, 97, 105, 123, 149, 166, 169, 170, 181, 182, 184, 186, 188, 192-193n.

21. W. W. Greg, *Some Aspects and Problems of London Publishing Between 1550 and 1650* (Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1956) 1-4. The Long Parliament, while curtailing some of the abusive powers granted by the Star Chamber in 1637, retained the Stationers as the enforcers of state censorship (Greg, 13). According to Sheila Lambert, the 1637 grant was at the Stationers' solicitation to protect their monopoly. [Robin Myers and Michael Harris, eds., *Aspects of Printing From 1600*, Sheila Lambert "The Printers and the Government, 1604-1640" (Oxford Polytechnic Press, 1987) 1]. Others take issue with Ms. Lambert's understating of Laudian censorship. [Robin Myers and Michael Harris, eds., "Introduction"; *The Stationers' Company and the Book Trade 1550-1990* (New Castle: Oak Knoll Press, 1997) vii-viii; and Jean Tsushima, "Members of the Stationers' Company who serviced in the Artillery Company before the Civil War: Ralph Mabbe and his Network," *Ibid.* 74; 83 n17].

were in charge of the printing of the Confession and Catechisms, and it is hard to imagine, as solemnly charged with ‘exactness’ as there were, that they would not have reviewed the “author’s proofs.”²² As already indicated, the scribes would either have visited the printer’s shop, or the proofs might even have been sent up to the scribes to review in their “chamber” (*Minutes*, 538). The latter, while not as common at the time, might have occurred given the prominence and official nature of the Assembly’s work, as well as the confidential nature of the first printings of the documents, which were only for the use of Parliament and the Assembly of Divines (*Minutes*, 354 n1).

DIFFERENCES IN THE MANUSCRIPTS & PRINTED TEXTS

What has been outlined and illustrated as the general

22. There is an indication that the proofing practice for state papers may have been an even more careful and exacting process. The Company of Stationers claimed to be burdened as follows: “The books of God & of the Statute law are to be printed with a greater care & examination than those that are ordinary” (Simpson, 179). And Greg writes: “The Company [of Stationers] sought to maintain at least some technical standard of printing in service books and other important works.” (Greg, 19). This in addition to what is known about general printing practices gives sufficient reason to believe that the proofing process for Assembly documents was a careful one. See Endnote D for comment on marks which indicate that portions of the manuscripts of the Directory for Public Worship may have been handled by the compositor for printing.

23. Most differences concern punctuation. For instance, in the Confession there are very few substantial differences in the text, none of which are of any consequence. Carruthers lists twelve variations in wording (*Burges*, Editorial Note). The one Carruthers lists at 27:3 (“property” for “propriety”) is actually a mistake as the Burges reading is in the early printed editions. And there is a thirteenth not listed by him at 16:3 (“besides” for “beside”).

24. See: Van Dixhoorn, v. 7, *Minutes*, vol. 3, fo. 229v; Nalson 22, MSb fo. 143r, MSa 167r; Chris Coldwell, [Unpublished] Draft Transcription of The Larger Catechism MSS (The Westminster Assembly Project, 2004) MSa, fo. 167r; MSb, fo. 143r; and *The Advice of the Assembly of Divines, Now by Authority of Parliament sitting at Westminster, Concerning A Larger Catechisme* (London: Printed by A. M. [n.d. Thomason date: Oct. 22, 1647]) 26 [sic 27]. The punctuation in Mitchell and Struthers is not original (*Minutes*, 403); there is actually little punctuation in the manuscripts. Dr. Van Dixhoorn notes the following regarding the punctuation: “Part of the difficulty in reading the text is Byfield’s general neglect of word and sentence separation: Byfield often leaves his pen on the page when moving to a new word and rarely privileges the reader with punctuation or capitalization to indicate a new sentence or paragraph. His most common punctuation mark (when one is used), is a descending line attached to the last letter of a word” [Van Dixhoorn, v.2, Introduction to Appendix B, p. xxxiii]. “Punctuating the minutes proves to be challenging since Byfield dispenses punctuation marks jealously. While Byfield does on occasion use a colon, full stop, slash, or a combination of these to indicate a sentence termination,

printing practices of the time, may shed light upon or at least help suggest reasons why the printed versions of the Assembly’s documents differ from the manuscripts.²³ Given the usual proofing process, the scribes would have been able to correct any substantial compositor’s mistakes, as well as any objectionable modifications to the incidentals (such as punctuation). And since it was the practice of the time to depend upon the printing house for standardizing and correcting these incidentals, this may explain why, though tasked with exact printing of the text, the scribes may have allowed changes in punctuation, which make up the majority of the differences. The fact that there are so few “substantial” differences, and none of these of a significant nature, indicates a great deal of care was taken with the words themselves; while at the same time all the changes in punctuation indicate that the order for “exact” printing did not necessarily extend to the incidentals of the text.

Differences in the Larger Catechism Manuscripts

Additional support for the idea that in some ways the scribes and printers might have had a free hand in the punctuation may be found in the already noted fact that the manuscripts of the Larger Catechism differ. Again, the differences are overwhelmingly in the punctuation of the text, the majority of which are accounted for by the much greater use of the comma in MSb. This at least indicates freedom in the use of the lesser “stops” of punctuation. But while less frequent, they also differ sometimes in choice and placement of the harder stops. Some of these may simply be scribal errors; but there appears to be some attempt at improvement of the punctuation in some cases. The text of the answer to Larger Catechism Question 104 may illustrate this, by comparing the text as it was printed, as it appears in each manuscript, and as it appears in preliminary form in the *Minutes*.²⁴

Example: The Variants in the Answer to WLC 104

The text of the answer to Question 104 of the Larger Catechism as it was first printed for use by the Westminster Assembly and the Houses of Parliament reads (spelling modernized; numbers added):

The duties required in the first commandment,[1] are, the knowing[2] and acknowledging of God[3] to be the only true God, and our God:[4] and[5] to worship and glorify him accordingly:[6] by thinking, meditating,

remembering, highly esteeming, honouring, adoring, choosing, loving, desiring, fearing of him,^[7] believing him,^[8] trusting, hoping, delighting, rejoicing in him,^[9] being zealous for him, calling upon him, giving all praise and thanks, and yielding all obedience and submission to him,^[10] with the whole man, being careful in all things to please him, and sorrowful when^[11] in anything he is offended,^[12] and walking humbly with him.

The variants as marked are as follows:

- [1] “commandment are”: Minutes only.
 [2] “knowing, and”: MSa & MSb. The Minutes and first printed texts do not have the comma.
 [3] “God, to”: The Minutes only have a possible comma or a descending line.
 [4] “our God, and”: MSb. The early printed texts, and MSa have the semicolon. The Minutes have a descending line or comma.
 [5] “and, to worship”: MSa only has this extra comma.
 [6] “accordingly; by”: MSb. The Minutes and MSa simply have a comma; while the early printed texts have a colon as indicated.
 [7] “fearing of him; believing”: MSa. The Minutes, MSb and early printed texts have a comma.
 [8] “believing him; trusting”: Mitchell and Struthers inserted a semi-colon (*Minutes*, 403). The comma is in both MS and the early printed texts, as well as the MS Minutes.
 [9] “him; being zealous”: MSa; Mitchell and Struthers. The comma is in MSb as well as the early printed texts and the MS Minutes.
 [10] “him with the whole”: Mitchell and Struthers only. Both MS and the early printed texts have the comma. The MS Minutes have a descending line or comma.
 [11] “in anything we offend him,”: Minutes only.
 [12] “offended; and”: MSa. The early printed texts and MSb have a comma.

In this list of variants there is one “substantial” difference, where the wording has been changed toward the end at #11. This almost certainly was made in committee and submitted back to the Assembly and approved (*cf. Minutes*, 479-484). The variants at #8 and #10 are included to indicate where the Mitchell and Struthers’ Minutes have provided their own punctuation (see footnote 24). The commas present at #2 and #3 and the one lacking at #1, may indicate changes made by either the Assembly (as in the case of #11), or by the scribes as the final copies were drafted. Variants #4, #5, #7 and #9, may simply be scribal errors, if they are not in fact examples of scribal discretion in the punctuation. It does seem likely the two semi-colons used by MSa at

#7 and #9 were an attempt to improve the punctuation of such a long sentence. Similarly, the scribe of MSb took the approach of having commas throughout except for where the listing begins at #6, where the harder stop of a semi-colon was used. Further improvement appears in the printed text, where the scribes prior to or the printer during the proofing process changed the semi-colon to a colon at #6.

The variants at #4, #7, and #12 are interesting in that they demonstrate, as already noted, that neither MSa nor MSb exclusively represent the punctuation of the finalized printed text, which at points retained punctuation or at least settled upon punctuation used in one or the other, as well as using a colon not found in either (at #6). This at the very least indicates the scribes continued to refine the punctuation of the text as they prepared manuscript copies, and supports the contention that other manuscript copies existed at one time. And all these variations in the manuscripts and the printed texts are certainly not inconsistent with the proposition that the punctuation, as incidentals under the purview of the printer, could have been changed and finalized during the proofing process as the texts were composed for printing.

THE ASSEMBLY AND DIFFERENCES IN THE TEXTS

As for the Divines themselves, the Minutes give no indication that the Assembly ever discussed these “incidental” differences. But whether they were inclined to do so or not, there certainly were reasonable opportunities to object to any changes in the printed text. This is because when the Assembly went to work on adding

he usually does not. Commas, when present, are roughly equivalent to the modern usage of colons or semi-colons. Round brackets are used but frequently not closed. Michael Hunter argues for brackets around punctuation added by the editor, suggesting that it only slightly interrupts the flow of text. While I adopt that convention in my transcription of Lightfoot’s journal, it is impracticable for this transcript since dozens of punctuation marks are needed on a single page. Thus, I add punctuation silently throughout the minutes and modify some of the existing punctuation: the slash or slash-period I render a simple full stop, and most commas as semi-colons or colons” [Van Dixhoorn, *Ibid.*, p. lvi]. “It is my hunch that similar thinking motivated Mitchell and Struthers to provide punctuation which made sense to them. Remember, too, that they did not use the original. They used Thompson’s transcript (Thompson only has commas, and he too adds some to the text). They would not know what I know, that the scribe omits some commas because he often feels that punctuation is unnecessary at the end of a line. [Personal Communication from Chad Van Dixhoorn, September 14, 2004]. Dr. Van Dixhoorn kindly provided the text as punctuated in the MS Minutes rather than as punctuated in his transcript [Minutes, Westminster Assembly. Dr. Williams’s Library, MS 38.3 fo. 229v.]

the Scripture proof texts, first to the Confession, and presumably with each Catechism,²⁵ they worked with the printed copies of the texts and not the manuscripts. It is hard to imagine, even if none of the Divines intentionally checked the text, that, given the number of incidental differences, not one recognized some changes as they handled their personal copies during this work. Surely, at the very least, Dr. Burges,²⁶ who took such an active role in the preparation of the text of the Confession, who had made the first full transcription for the Assembly, and had moved on one occasion for a change to the partial text after it was printed,²⁷ would have sought to correct anything he found objectionable in the fully printed text (*Minutes*, 285-286, 289, 290-291, 304)? While not conclusive, that there are no such objections recorded in the Minutes, nor any subsequent attempts to correct the printed text, at least does not contradict the theory that the incidentals of the text were alterable without need for Assembly approval.

A CRITICAL TEXT APPROACH: CONCLUSION

The conclusion of all the forgoing is that the coupling of what is generally known about the printing practices of the period, with what is known about the Westminster Assembly's manuscripts and their printing, and the suppositions which can be drawn from this, all support taking a critical approach toward the texts. The exist-

ing manuscripts do not necessarily represent the final texts intended by the Assembly, but may be useful in possibly clarifying or correcting any actual incidental or substantial errors that could have survived the proofing process. But even with the few substantial differences, a critical approach is appropriate, since, with no printer's proofs, and so few surviving manuscripts of those likely to have existed, it cannot be verified whether a change was a mistake in printing, a mistake in the surviving manuscript, a correction to an error discovered in the proofing process, or at exactly what point and for what reason the change occurred.

II. Examining Carruthers' Work

Having established that continuing a critical approach to the text of the Westminster Standards is still justified, the balance of this article will focus on refining and correcting some of the data presented in S. W. Carruthers' 1937 work. Following a brief review of the early critical texts, some refining will be made to Dr. Carruthers' lineage of the traditional text as it descended in various popular 18th century editions. The article will then conclude by correcting the first occurrence of some of the textual variations identified in Carruthers' critical text.

THE 18TH CENTURY COLLECTIONS

As noted by Warfield, prior to the work of the Carruthers, one must go back to the early 18th century "Collections" to find the previous advancements toward a critical text of the Westminster Standards. The two rival collections were:

1. "Dunlop." *A Collection of Confessions of Faith, Catechisms, Directions, Books of Discipline*, etc. (Edinburgh: James Watson, 1719, 1721).

2. "Reformed Presbyterian." *The Confessions of Faith, Catechisms, Directories, Form of government, Discipline*, etc., of publick Authority in the Church of Scotland, etc. (Edinburgh: Thomas Lumisden and John Robertson, 1725).

Dunlop's Collection

The edition by James Watson of Edinburgh has become known by the name of the primary editor. William Dunlop (c.1692-1720) was Professor of Divinity and Church History at the University of Edinburgh.²⁸ In the advertisement regarding the text, after bemoan-

25. Detail is lacking in the Minutes as to the process of adding the Scripture proofs to the Catechisms, but it is reasonable to assume the same process was used as with the Confession of Faith (*Minutes*, 505, 508-511), where the Assembly marked the proofs as they were approved in the margin of one of the copies without proofs from the limited printing ordered by the Parliament.

26. Dr. Carruthers believed that Dr. Burges was responsible for the punctuation in the surviving manuscript of the Confession of Faith (*Three Centuries*, 1, 19; *Minutes*, 308. But see footnote 10 above). He noted that it follows a logical rather than a grammatical system, and was of the opinion that the punctuation in the manuscript could be helpful in showing the proper balance of a passage (*Burges*, Editorial Note). On the other hand, while he did not fault Dr. Burges in the 1946 edition of the manuscript, he indirectly did in his 1937 critical text, as some punctuation he criticized in various printed editions, occur in the manuscript as well (see for example error #38, #116, #146, #154, #163, #171, #178, #187, #229, #233; Carruthers, 102, 123, 130-131, 133, 135, 137, 139, 142, 153, 154).

27. On a previous occasion Dr. Burges moved to make a change to WCF 19.6 after the text of the first nineteen chapters had been printed. The phrase "upon the performance of them" was changed to "upon the performance thereof," and this is how the text reads in all editions from the second limited printing forward (*Minutes*, 307).

28. "William Dunlop," *Dictionary of Scottish Church History & Theology*, Nigel M. de S. Cameron, David F. Wright, David C. Lachman, Donald E. Meek, eds. (Downers Grove: IVP, 1993).

ing the defectiveness of previous editions of such an important work, it is stated:²⁹

This moved several Gentlemen to bestow their Labours upon this Edition, and to employ all the Methods they could, to purge it from Errors which had crept into former Impressions, to dispose every thing in the most convenient Order, and render it at least tolerably perfect. . . . For this End, the Copy which this Edition was printed from, was compared with the utmost Care with all the authentick Editions published by Authority. . . .

Subsequently, the Dunlop edition of the Confession and Catechisms, acquired the reputation as a highly accurate and critical text; but there “is no doubt that this estimate is largely based on an acceptance of Dunlop’s own statement . . .” (Carruthers, 78). Murray sums up Carruthers’ findings regarding the Dunlop text of the Confession (Murray, 293):

‘Now what are the facts?’, the author asks. Of sixty errors in the text existing before his time Dunlop corrected nine. Among the fifty-one remaining are not a few important ones. He actually introduced fifty-two new errors. Only four of these affect the words, but of these one has radically altered the meaning and two are arbitrary changes without any discoverable excuse. As to punctuation no principle or system is apparent. ‘It is unmistakably evident, moreover’, he concludes, ‘that he had no eye what-ever for the logical balance of propositions in the sections, which, as we shall see, forms a great feature of the carefully considered punctuation³⁰ of the Assembly’ (pp. 78f.).

Although now esteem for Dunlop may be tarnished, at the time his work was viewed as quite significant.³¹ Still, while his text with some modification became the standard, the edition itself was not reprinted. Dunlop’s early death, preventing him from completing the proposed third volume of his Collection, may have contributed to this. Also, strong dissatisfaction with his omission of some documents led to the production of a rival “Collection” (Warfield, 641):

This [the 1725 edition] is the first edition of the rival “Collection” published on account of dissatisfaction with the “Collection” of 1719-1722, edited by Dunlop – because “some things of no small moment belonging to such a Collection, and in use to be printed and bound with former editions of our Westminster Confession” [the *Sum* and Solemn League and Covenant

are particularly meant] “are left out, and others which have no pretense thereto are inserted.”

The Reformed Presbyterian Collection

The edition published in 1725 by the Edinburgh firm of Thomas Lumisden and John Robertson, is attributed by the Carruthers (*The Shorter Catechism*, 48; *Three Centuries*, 59) to the Reformed Presbyterian Church of Scotland (hereafter RP). The editor is unknown, and no intimation is given of the work that must have gone into preparing the text. Dr. Carruthers explains (Carruthers, 80):

But the final result of the collation is a great respect for the accuracy of the editor, and for his modesty. He really did collate the original editions and said nothing about it; Dunlop had said a great deal about it, but had done it very imperfectly.

This rival Collection fared better than the Dunlop edition, and was republished in 1739, 1761, 1764, 1771 and 1785. However, neither did it become popular as a standard text, though these editions remain of some interest because the preparers of the early American texts of the PCUSA and ARP may have consulted them. Of more interest, is that textual variations found in the 1725 RP text were introduced at some point into the traditional text. This is the reason for Carruthers’ interest in the 1746 Robertson/McLean edition (see Table 1), as it contains these variations, and he believed it was possibly the bridge between Dunlop and the 1773 Kincaid. However, the source of these variations is actually the Lumisden and Robertson edition of 1728, and not the 1746 Glasgow John Robertson / Mrs. McLean (hereafter RbMcLean).

29. *A Collection*, etc. (Edinburgh, James Watson, 1719) 1.clvii.

30. Perhaps Dr. Carruthers realized that all the punctuation was not necessarily the Assembly’s, as he acknowledges in *Three Centuries* that the scribes had differing practices. While this article argues that the punctuation in the printed texts was to some degree a collaborative process, Carruthers viewed printer’s changes as taking liberties. As to wording changes, he does offer some brief but unverifiable theories on why there are differences between the Shorter Catechism MS and the printed text (*Three Centuries*, 1, 19).

31. The “Advertisement” to the Reformed Presbyterian edition notes: “And altho’ that Collection [Dunlop], for Neatneff and Correctneff of the Impression be justly commended. . . .” *The Confession of Faith, Catechisms*, etc. (Edinburgh: Thomas Lumisden and John Robertson, 1725) iii-iv.

Lumisden and Robertson

The two rival Collections contained a much broader array of documents than simply the Westminster Standards, and to some extent in each case, this may be a reason why neither became widely popular editions of the Westminster Standards. In 1728, Lumisden and Robertson (hereafter L&R), who had printed the first and second RP editions in 1725 and 1739, published their own edition of the Westminster Standards. Learning perhaps from the controversy which had called forth the rival RP collection in the first place,³² the “proper” set of documents was included. And the publishers also took the pains to print the Scripture proofs in full (which had been only by reference in the RP editions), as in the Dunlop edition in “greatly improved form in two columns” (Warfield, 638). To what extent, or whether these were contributing factors or not, this form of the Westminster Standards became so accepted, that it essentially “set” their traditional appearance and form from that point forward. “This is the first edition in which are included the various documents found in the authorized editions of the Confession” (Warfield, 643).³³ The L&R text, which is based upon Dunlop with some RP variations, became the traditional Scottish text of the Westminster Standards.

The 1728 L&R edition follows a 552 page format with a 24 page index. Except for one addition,³⁴ and changes in size and format, the contents, including the index, changed little from this point forward. L&R issued one known reprint of this 1728 form in 1736. Warfield on the basis of the work of Lee lists a 1735 edition by Lumisden & Robertson (Warfield, 644), but this is the same as the 1736. Evidently the printing be-

32. While there is no direct connection to the author’s knowledge between Lumisden or Robertson and the Reformed Presbyterians, L&R did published material for the Secession Church. “Lumisden,” *Scottish Book Trade Index* (SBTI), National Library of Scotland. See URL: <http://www.nls.uk/catalogues/re-sources/sbti/index.html>.

33. Warfield is incorrect as far as the general order and selection of documents is concerned, which had a precedent in the 1679 “Covenanter” edition published in Holland. See *Antiquary*.

34. The 1690 Act did not appear in the traditional text until those of Francis Orr and Sons in the 1840s. See *Antiquary*.

35. An examination of this writer’s copy confirms this, and Carruthers comments on this as well (*Three Centuries*, 60). Another correction to the known Lumisden & Robertson editions should be noted. The National Library of Scotland has listed in the past, that in their collection they own both a 1744 and a 1745 edition. However, upon this writer’s communicating with NLS about these two volumes, it was discovered that both were examples of the 1744. There does not appear to be any such Lumisden and Robertson edition for 1745, as the only basis for suggesting one was this erroneous entry in the NLS catalog.

gan with the Catechisms late in 1735, as the separate title pages both bear that date. Those for the Confession and the other documents, as well as the main title page, are dated 1736.³⁵

There was one other printing set to the 1728 L&R format. This was in fact the 1746 Glasgow printing of John Robertson and Mrs. McLean, proposed by Dr. Carruthers as the source of the introduction of the RP variations into the traditional text.

THE 1746 ROBERTSON EDITION

Carruthers explained the reason for his interest in the RbMcLean edition thus (Carruthers, 82):

The Glasgow edition of 1746, which is probably representative of a considerable number of Glasgow editions, is of interest. Presumably the J. Robertson who issued it is the same who was previously in partnership with Thomas Lumisden in Edinburgh. If that be so, it would account for the fact that though the edition is based on Dunlop it has a number of variations traceable to the Reformed Presbyterian edition (e.g., 14, 43, 70, 83, 159, 178, 186). There are also some peculiarities which occur in the “Third Edition” (e.g., 15, 18, 40). This edition is also of importance because it was from a copy of it that Kincaid’s edition was set up. This is shewn by such peculiarities as 15, 18, 70, 83, 109, 124, 128, 159, 178, 186, 231.

*Robertson of Glasgow Equals
Robertson of Edinburgh?*

Carruther’s statement that the RbMcLean edition was the direct source for Kincaid will be refuted later, but as for his hypothesis regarding Robertson, it can be disputed on two counts. First, the supposition that John Robertson of Glasgow once worked for L&R in Edinburgh can be disproved. According to the Scottish Book Trade Index, the John Robertson of L&R died before 1752, probably prior to 1747 when Lumisden & Robertson became Thomas Lumisden and Company. The SBTI notes regarding a son of Robertson: “John Robertson, son to deceased John Robertson printer, apprenticed to Thomas Lumsden [sic] printer 5 November 1752” (SBTI, “Robertson, John, printer and bookseller, Edinburgh”). The index also makes it clear that the Glasgow Robertson had been residing and working in that city for some time: “John Robertson and Mrs. McLean in the Middle of the Salt Market 1739-53” (SBTI, “Robertson, John printer and bookseller, Glasgow”). Clearly

these Robertsons are two different people. Neither does it appear that the man in Glasgow had any special connection to the man in Edinburgh (Scottish Book Trade Index, *ibid*).

Secondly, the theory is disproved when one examines the text of the RbMcLean edition and those published by L&R in 1728 and 1736. What becomes clear is not only does the 1746 RbMcLean follow the form of the L&R editions; it is set from one of them. From page to page the beginning and ending words are the same, not only in the text, but in the Scripture proofs as well. It is, as much as humanly and technically possible, an “image” of the earlier L&R printings. This is not surprising, as in general the printers set uncritically, unless the undertaking intentionally involved a critical review of the text. And in particular, printers of the Standards in the 18th century often set fairly close copies of previous printings, sometimes matching pages and line endings as exactly as possible.³⁶

In theory, it may be supposed, while it was set closely to the L&R edition, that RbMcLean introduced some minor changes, and could still be the source of the RP variants. However, this is also disproved by examining the list of variants provided by Carruthers, traceable to the RP text (Tables 2&3).

In Carruthers’ comment regarding the Robertson and McLean edition, the three lists of numbers reference the 242 textual variants he traced in his critical text of the seven leading editions. Carruthers used the first of the three to demonstrate that variations from the Reformed Presbyterian texts, not present in Dunlop, are in the text of the Robertson-McLean Glasgow edition. Table 2 on the next page shows a comparison of these places in the text of the Confession of Faith, as they occur in the RP text of 1725, the L&R editions of 1728 and 1736, and the RbMcLean of 1746. Table 3 shows the three variants traceable to the “third” edition.

Regarding the data in Tables 2 & 3, two errors must first be noted. Carruthers is mistaken when he writes that the RbMcLean text has a colon in variant #14 at WCF 3.2, which he contended was the same punctuation used in the 1739 RP edition.³⁷ He also mistakenly attributes a semi-colon to the RbMcLean at variant #159 in WCF 22.6. What becomes clear, taking these corrections into account, is that at least with these variants the RbMcLean matches exactly the L&R text, while both vary from the RP of 1725 at #14 and #159. When the three variants that Carruthers traced to Edition Three are examined, it is clear that L&R and RbMcLean match as well. It also appears likely that the RbMcLean text was set from the 1736 L&R and not the earlier 1728

edition (note the readings at #178 in Table 2, and at #124 in Table 4).

A MORE COMPLEX PATH

Clearing up the question of the origin of the introduction of the RP variants into the Dunlop text, is only part of the problem in tracing the descent of the traditional text through the middle of the 18th century. If Scottish printers had continued copying the 552 page L&R format begun in 1728, tracing the lineage of the text down to the 1773 Kincaid edition may have been a simpler matter. However, L&R itself did not continue long with this format.

In 1744 L&R published a new edition, this time following a 546 page format, with a 22 page index. While most 18th century editions of the standards are rare, this edition is particularly so. And while almost all English titles through the year 1700 are available in the Early English Books collection,³⁸ a similar project to film 18th century titles is far from complete.³⁹ Happily, a copy of the 1744 L&R is owned by the National Library of Scotland, and the Curator of Rare Books, Dr. Anette I. Hagan, kindly arranged for a preservation film, and a copy for the author’s use.⁴⁰

The popularity of the 1744 L&R edition is illustrated perhaps by the fact that surviving copies are so rare, and by the fact its form was subsequently followed many times by other printers. However, in trying to determine if the 1773 Kincaid edition descends from this one by L&R, another twist appears. The Kincaid is indeed set to a 546 page format with a 22 page index. However, it varies enough from the 1744 form so as to be distinct. What becomes apparent in examining these 546 page

36. It was common to set copies in this way, though obviously differences in type and equipment made perfectly exact copies difficult. McKerrow, 181, 186-188.

37. It is possible that Dr. Carruthers consulted an example of RbMcLean that contained a variant, but this author’s copy has the semi-colon, and it appears the source of the colon is the 1744 L&R edition. See footnote 49.

38. *Early English Books 1475-1640*, STC I (Ann Arbor, MI: University Microfilms International, [1937?]-1993). *Early English Books 1641-1700*, STC II (Ann Arbor, MI: University Microfilms International, [1975?]-).

39. *The Eighteenth Century* (Primary Source Microfilm, an Imprint of the Gale Group). RbMcLean is available in this set. Unit 264, No(s). 1-26. Religion & Philosophy. Box 2208. Reel 9219.

40. Dr. Hagan was very helpful in aiding the research for this paper, and the author was also able eventually to obtain microfilm copies of a number of rare editions that factor in the lineage of the traditional text: the Watson 1708, the E. Robertson of 1756, the 1771 (n.p.), and Kincaid’s 1773.

Table 2: Reformed Presbyterian Variants in RbMcLean and L&R

WCF Variant	RP 1725	RbMcLean	L&R1728/1736
#14 @ 3.2	conditions, yet	conditions; yet	conditions; yet
#43 @ 7.6	Christ the substance was	Christ the substance was	Christ the substance was
#70 @ 10.1	pleased, in his	pleased, in his	pleased, in his
#83 @ 11.4	elect; and Christ	elect; and Christ	elect; and Christ
#159 @ 22.6	duties; or	duties, or	duties, or
#178 @ 25.1	church, which	church, which	church, which (1728 lacks “;”)
#186 @ 26.2	saints, by profession, are	saints, by profession, are	saints, by profession, are

Table 3: “Third” Edition Variants in RbMcLean and L&R

WCF Variant	RP 1725	RbMcLean	L&R1728/1736
#15 @ 3.4	designed, and their	designed; and their	designed; and their
#18 @ 3.7	mankind, God	mankind, God	mankind, God
#40 @ 7.3	saved, and promising	saved; and promising	saved; and promising

Table 4: Tracing Variants from Lumisden & RbMcLean to Kincaid

WCF Variant	L&R1728/1736/1744	RbMcLean	E. Robertson	Kincaid
#15 @ 3.4	designed; and their			
#18 @ 3.7	mankind, God			
#70 @ 10.1	pleased, in his			
#83 @ 11.4	elect; and Christ		elect: and Christ	
#109 @ 17.3	Spirit; come ... comforts; have ... wounded; hurt			
#124 @ 19.6	Rule of life, informing (except 1728: “Rule, of life informing”)			
#128 @ 19.7	cheerfully, which	cheerfully which	cheerfully, which	
#129 @ 19.7	God revealed in the law requireth			
#159 @ 22.6	duties, or			
#178 @ 25.1	church, which (except 1728: “church which” as in Dunlop)			
#186 @ 26.2	saints, by profession, are			
#231 @ 31.3	God, appointed			

editions, is that they generally fall into two forms. Form A follows the 1744 form set by L&R. Form B follows an edition published by E. Robertson in 1756. Table 4 demonstrates that this edition was derived from the 1744 L&R. The differences in the forms are clearly seen in comparing where each begins the texts of the Confession and the Catechisms, as shown in Table 5.

Table 5: Pagination Differences in 546 page Forms A & B

Section	Form A	Form B
WCF	23	21
WLC	161	167
WSC	359	381

In examining the bibliographies compiled by Warfield and S. W. Carruthers, it appears there were at least seventeen editions of the 546 page form which can still be traced, with ten following Form A and seven following Form B.⁴¹

As for Form A, except for the first by Lumisden & Robertson of Edinburgh in 1744, all the subsequent editions were printed in Glasgow.

Table 6: Nine Editions of Form A (L&R 1744)

1. J. Robertson and Mrs. McLean, 1749
2. William Duncan, 1749
3. James Knox, 1752
4. William Duncan, 1753
5. John Robertson Sr., 1753
6. Bryce & Patterson, 1755
7. John Robertson Sr., 1756
- 8.a Archibald McLean for John Orr, 1757
- 8.b Also: for Alexander Weir, 1757
9. William Duncan, 1762

In addition to the microfilm of the 1744 edition, the author has examples of #5 and #9. These two closely follow the 1744. The Robertson Sr. of 1756, one example of which has some sections dated 1757, varies slightly. Carruthers noted that the Shorter Catechism begins on page 359 instead of 357, but that it nevertheless follows the same printer's 1753 text so closely, that the line endings are almost all the same (*Three Centuries*, 62). The McLean printings (which evidently are the same printing issued with different title pages for the two booksellers) follow the Robertson, Sr. of 1756 in the pagination of the Shorter Catechism, and are evidently set from it. Another variant, apparent from Carruthers' description (*Three Centuries*, 61), is that

the Shorter Catechism in the William Duncan edition of 1749 ends on page 397, while still extending to 546 pages. And the William Duncan of 1753 varies in that it has only 544 pages; however, the Shorter Catechism still runs from pages 359 to 398 (with 398 evidently blank as Carruthers has "357-398 ['397']" – which may also be the case with the 1749 edition).

Form B begins with the Edinburgh edition of E. Robertson (E.Rob).⁴² Except for the Kincaid, and possibly the 1771, all the other editions of this form were printed in Glasgow.

Table 7: Six Editions of Form B (E.Rob, 1756).

1. Glasgow (n.p., 1764)
2. For Alexander Weir (Glasgow, 1767-68)
3. Glasgow (n.p., 1768)
4. Robert Duncan (Glasgow, 1768)
5. Edinburgh? (n.p., 1771)
6. Kincaid (Edinburgh, 1773)

Three of these editions do not identify a publisher, and the strange characteristics of #4 are detailed by Warfield (Warfield, 648).⁴³ The author owns examples of #4 and #6.

Glasgow vs. Edinburgh

It is interesting that in both cases the form was set by an Edinburgh edition, and all but a couple of the subsequent copies of the forms are Glasgow printings. In fact, in reviewing all the different editions of the Westminster Standards published between 1719 and 1773 where the place is noted (*Three Centuries*, 53-74), it appears that there were only ten or eleven Edinburgh editions, while at least 37 Glasgow printings occurred over that period. Of the Edinburgh editions, six were printed by L&R, while E. Robertson published two.

It is not clear why nearly four times the number of Edinburgh editions would be called forth during the

41. A Glasgow edition (n.p.) of 1763, while it may derive from either Form A or B, varies significantly enough over its 544 page length that it has not been included under either form.

42. The author gratefully acknowledges the help of Rev. Sherman Isbell who carefully checked various readings in the example of the E. Robertson edition owned by the Library of Congress, and examined copies of #1, #2, #3 and #5 at the NLS while in Edinburgh during the summer of 2004.

43. Warfield examined several copies of this edition and the various title pages of the different pieces are dated 1755 as well as 1768. Thus this edition may have been pieced from earlier as well as newer print work; but the pagination nevertheless is that of Form B.

same period in Glasgow. The fact that the printing industry had just really started to get going in Glasgow in the late 1730s, after faltering for a long period,⁴⁴ along with the close proximity of a new type foundry and a source for paper (*Glasgow*, 9-10), as well as the presence of an active group of booksellers available to market products (*Glasgow*, 10), may have all contributed toward making Glasgow amenable for new printers to open shop. And if the market really could bear so many editions of the Westminster Standards over that period, perhaps the infrequency of editions from Edinburgh, was an opening for Glasgow businesses to exploit? At least it is hard to imagine printers would have continued to so often reprint the Standards if the books were not finding a market.

E. Robertson and Thomas Lumisden

As noted previously, Dr. Carruthers was incorrect in attempting to connect John Robertson of L&R, Edinburgh, with the John Robertson of Robertson/McLean in Glasgow. However, as it turns out, there is still a Robertson connection in the descent of the traditional text; but it involves a different Robertson and different editions. A connection can be made between L&R and E. Robertson. Ebenezer was another son of John Robertson of that firm, and was apprenticed to Thomas Lumisden after his father's death. "Ebenezer Robertson son to John Robertson printer, apprenticed to Thomas Lumisden [sic] printer 11 July 1750" (SBTI, "Robertson, Ebenezer and John printers and booksellers Edinburgh"). Also for a short time the two worked together in partnership in 1757.⁴⁵ Thus, in addition to the fact that the first editions of both forms are Edinburgh editions, there is this familial and business link between the two publishers of the two patterns followed by the various Glasgow printers.

44. The Scottish Printing Archival Trust, *A Reputation for Excellence: A History of the Glasgow Printing Industry* (Edinburgh: Merchiston Publishing, 1994) 4, 7. Hereafter, *Glasgow*.

45. James Burgh, *Britain's remembrancer: or, the danger not over* (Edinburgh: T. Lumisden and E. Robertson, 1757). A search of the COPAC union catalog (<http://www.copac.ac.uk>) indicates this may have been the last publication with Lumisden's name involved. An errant entry indicating a later publication should be disregarded, as it mistakes the Roman numeral date of 1743 for 1763.

46. The 1764 edition varies from the other Glasgow printings, in that it has a colon: "consent. Yet ... Lord: and". This indicates later examples of Form B probably do not directly derive from the 1764.

47. Consequently, it became important to double check the variants Carruthers attributed to Kincaid (Carruthers, 85). Dr. Rowland S. Ward, who was traveling from Australia to Edinburgh on the way to Philadelphia to lecture on the Directory for Public Worship at the

Connecting E. Robertson to Kincaid

It seems unlikely that Alexander Kincaid, an Edinburgh printer, would have used a Glasgow printing of Form B from which to set his edition. Table 8 demonstrates that the variants introduced by E. Robertson into the Confession of Faith, in setting his text from the 1744 L&R, do not appear in the Glasgow forms copying his edition. But these do appear in Kincaid's 1773 edition. This at first glance, would seem to indicate that Kincaid derives directly from E. Robertson.

Table 8: E.Rob, Kincaid & Glasgow Editions Compared

WCF	E.Rob/Kincaid	Form B Glasgow eds.
9.5	"free to do good"	"free to good"
24.3	"consent: yet/Lord."	"consent. Yet/Lord;" ⁴⁶
25.6	"Christ; nor"	"Christ. Nor"
27.4	"Lord: neither"	"Lord; neither"

The 1771 Intermediate Link to Kincaid

However, another interesting wrinkle enters into the lineage of the traditional text at this point. Kincaid did not set his 1773 text directly from E. Robertson's 1756, but set his text from the 1771 (n.p.) edition. When Rev. Isbell had examined this edition, it was only for the purpose of classifying it as Form A or B. The initial assumption was that the 1771 was a Glasgow edition, and that it was more likely Kincaid would have set from an Edinburgh printing. Also, to this point no edition in the lineage had been anonymously published. But, it is as likely the 1771 was an Edinburgh printing, and since it is the closest edition of Form B to the 1773, upon reflection, it was obvious it needed to be more carefully examined. It became clear the 1771 was the source for Kincaid,⁴⁷ after Dr. Hagan kindly checked a few key places. Except for one difference where it follows the Glasgow texts (which are correct in dropping the added "do" at WCF 9.5), the 1771 edition matches the E. Robertson text in the places just noted.

Table 9: E.Rob, Kincaid and 1771 Editions Compared

WCF	E.Rob/Kincaid	1771 n.p.
9.5	"free to do good"	"free to good"
24.3	"consent: yet/Lord."	the same
25.6	"Christ; nor"	" "
27.4	"Lord: neither"	" "

However, there are some differences in the Kincaid and E. Robertson texts and these differences appear to have been introduced in the 1771 edition.

Table 10: Differences in E. Rob and Kincaid and 1771

WCF	1771/Kincaid	E. Rob.
8.2	“without sin: and”	“without sin, and”
22.6	“creature but to”	“creature, but to”
LC 13	“glory; and,”	“glory, and,”
LC 15	“world, and all”	“world and all”
LC 30	“leave all men”	“leave all mankind”
LC 35	“Baptism, and”	“Baptism and”

While the 1773 is not so closely set to the 1771 that its appearance is the same page for page and line ending for line ending, there are some physical similarities. Both are among the larger format editions of those published in the 18th century. According to the data given by Dr. Carruthers (*Three Centuries*, 62-63), the 1771 is 17.1 x 9.7 cm and the Kincaid measures 17.0 x 9.7, and both are the only 4^o (quarto) editions for the period from 1719 to 1773, aside from the 1756 E. Robertson (which measures 15.6 x 9.3 cm).

CORRECTED LINEAGE OF THE TEXT

With this rather large adjustment to the middle portion of the 18th century lineage of the traditional text of the Confession of Faith completed, there remain a few minor modifications to note before offering corrections to some of the entry points of textual corruptions given by Dr. Carruthers (Carruthers, 85).

In brief, Watson’s Fourth can be added between “Third” and “Fifth,” as the evidence suggests that Crutenden and Cox set up their edition from it. Also, two later Kincaid editions can be added between Kincaid’s 1773 and Kerr, as many if not most of the variants Carruthers traced to Kerr actually first occur in these.

In addition, there is evidence that rather than setting up their first edition of 1851 from a Blair edition, Johnstone & Hunter apparently followed an edition by Francis Orr & Sons. This is because Orr’s addition of Mark 9:43 to reference ‘o’ at Larger Catechism 29 is reproduced in the first Johnstone & Hunter edition, but this change is not in the Blair editions published between 1803 and 1841.

The corrected lineage of the traditional text of the Standards can now be presented (Table 11. See Endnote B for the fuller bibliographical details of the editions not given in Endnote A).

Table 11: Corrected Lineage of the Traditional Text

1. Edition Three (London, 1647)
2. Edition Four (Edinburgh, 1647)
3. Edition Five (Edinburgh, 1647)
4. Edition Six (London, 1648)
5. Rothwell (London, 1658)
6. “Third” (London, 1688)
7. Fourth (Edinburgh, 1708)
8. “Fifth” (London, 1717)
9. Dunlop (Edinburgh, 1719-21)
10. L&R A, B (Edinburgh, 1728/36)
11. L&R C (Edinburgh, 1744)
12. E. Rob (Edinburgh, 1756)
13. 1771 ([n.p.], 1771)
14. Kincaid A (Edinburgh, 1773)
15. Kincaid B, C (Edinburgh, 1781/88)
16. Kerr (Edinburgh, 1793)
17. Blair (Edinburgh, 1803-41)
18. Orr (Glasgow, 1842)
19. Johnstone A, B, C (Edinburgh, 1851, 55, 67)

III. Correcting the First Occurrence of Textual Variants in the Traditional Text

With the lineage corrected, the edition of origin of many of the textual variants Carruthers first traced in the traditional text of the Confession of Faith can be reassigned and corrected.

WATSON’S FOURTH

For his critical text, Carruthers did not examine an example of the edition published by James Watson in 1707/08, though he speculated it contributed to the variations in the traditional text (Carruthers, 77). Watson evidently began to print late in 1707 as there are varieties dated 1707 and 1708, with the 1707 styled the “Fifth edition” and the title page of the 1708 reset as the “Fourth edition.” Carruthers in his later work expressed the opinion that they are from the same type, and an examination of each at several points confirms this. Watson may have first used “fifth edition” counting from Sanders’ “Glasgow Fourth” (*Three Centuries*, 58), and then reconsidered the numbering after commencing with the printing. In his earlier work, Carruthers

2004 Westminster Assembly Conference, generously agreed to check these variants in the examples of the E. Robertson and the 1771 edition at the National Library of Scotland.

proposed that the correction to “Fourth” was to represent the “Fourth” edition following the Third of 1688, with the emphasis in the Scripture references in an italic font (Carruthers, 76-77). Whatever the reason, Watson’s 1707-08 edition does appear to descend from the “Third” of 1688, rather than the “Glasgow Fourth” edition of 1675. This is shown by the presence of two variations introduced by “Third” that are in Watson.

Table 12: Watson Descends from “Third”

WCF“	Third”/Watson	Glasgow 4th
#35 (6.3)	“posterity, descending”	no comma
#164 (23.2)	“occasions.”	“occasion.”

Of the three variants Carruthers traced to “Third,” the last (#210) does match up with Glasgow Fourth rather than Watson. Glasgow Fourth and Watson have at WCF 29.2: “Father; nor.” “Third” has: “Father, nor.” But the weight of the uniqueness of the other two variants point toward Watson’s reliance upon “Third” to set his text. As the semi-colon is the correct punctuation, Watson could have simply corrected it from the comma, or independently introduced the correct reading by accident.

When the six variants are examined which Carruthers traced first to Cox’s “Fifth,” it also becomes clear that Watson’s Fourth neatly drops into the lineage of the traditional text between “Fifth” and “Third.” All six appear in Watson, but not in “Third” (or in Glasgow Fourth for that matter). These are: #32, #89, #96, #97, #107, and #125 (see the list given at Endnote E). Of these six, Carruthers appears to have an error regarding #32, which he attributed correctly to “Fifth” in the summary list of variants (Carruthers, 85). However, in

48. The author once again must express his appreciation to both Sherman Isbell who collated the two Watson editions at points of interest, and to Dr. Hagan for checking against the Watson text, the six variants traced by Carruthers to Cox (Carruthers, 85).

49. The author has two copies of the Kincaid text. In addition to the NLS film copy, the author subsequently acquired an example once owned by Westminster College, Cambridge. According to the bookplate inside the front cover, William Carruthers donated this copy to the college in 1907. As with any correction the author has made to S. W. Carruthers’ work, it is certainly possible that the text he examined may have had a different reading than that found in these two examples. In the process of printing, type can drop out and the printer may have subsequently replaced the missing block with the incorrect type. Thus there can and often are variants within a single edition (see McKerrow, 204). However, in this case it appears to be a mistake or conflation of facts on Dr. Carruthers’ part, as the note in question covers several variants, with different histories and introduction points (Carruthers, 114).

his note, it is indicated that the variant “only” occurs in Anderson and Reformed Presbyterian (Carruthers, 100), contrary to the fact it remained in the traditional text from Watson/Cox onward.⁴⁸

ROBERTSON AND MCLEAN’S 1746

Of those variants Carruthers traced to the 1746 Rb-McLean edition, numbers #1, #18, #31, #40, #43, #70, #83, #124, #129, #159, #186, and #231 all trace to the L&R text first published in 1728. Variants #14 and #15 appear first in the 1744 L&R text. Variant #178 as noted in Table 4 first occurs in the L&R 1736 edition, as does #109. Also, while #83 first occurs in the L&R text, it has a more complex history not noted by Carruthers. E. Robertson introduced a colon for L&R’s semi-colon which is in the 1771 edition, as well as Kincaid’s 1773. The semi-colon was restored in Kincaid’s 1781.

In addition, several variants are attributed to Rb-McLean in error in the summary list (Carruthers, 85). Variant #34 is not in RbMcLean, but does occur in Kincaid’s 1773. Neither does #48 appear in RbMcLean (Carruthers, 105). Variant #91 is incorrectly listed under RbMcLean and should have been listed under Kerr. It is also incorrect in the note (Carruthers, 115). For #182, Carruthers correctly traced the first occurrences to their proper editions in his note, but inexplicably lists the variant under RbMcLean in the summary list (Carruthers, 85, 141).

KINCAID’S 1773

The following attributed to Kincaid’s 1773 edition occur first in L&R’s 1744 edition: #37, #62, #68, #94, #98, #113, #175, #196, #221, #230. Variant #221 is listed under Kincaid in Carruthers’ list (Carruthers, 85); but in the note it assigns the variant to Kerr. It does appear in Kincaid, but as noted, the introduction to the traditional text came in L&R’s 1744 edition. Also, two of several variants Carruthers lists in #65 as introduced by Kincaid, came in earlier, one in the 1744 edition, the other in E. Robertson’s 1756.

Other errors in the list occur. Variant #72 at WCF 10.2 (“man; who”) does not occur in Kincaid. The semi-colon was introduced in Kincaid’s 1788 edition. The comma was restored in Kerr, but the semi-colon was reintroduced in Blair’s 1803. Variant #69 has a more complex history, for which see the note in Endnote E.

There also is an error in assigning Variant #85 at WCF 12.1 (“God: have”) to Kincaid, which reads “God; have.”⁴⁹ The text from Rothwell through Cox had “God.

Have.” Dunlop changed this to a colon. L&R introduced a semi-colon, which remained in the traditional text. A comma, present both in the manuscript and early printed texts, is the correct punctuation. Interestingly, the RP text of 1725 has the comma, supporting Carruthers’ esteem for its accuracy over Dunlop.

Variant #140 was introduced by Dunlop, which is indicated in Carruthers’ note (Carruthers, 129), but the entry is duplicated for some reason under Kincaid as well in the summary lists (Carruthers, 85). Variant #159 is similarly listed in duplicate under RbMcLean as well as Kincaid, but is not mentioned in the note (Carruthers, 134). And as already corrected under RbMcLean, #159 actually came into the traditional text with the L&R editions.

Of the remaining variants listed by Carruthers, the following were introduced by the E. Robertson edition: #7, #55, #74, #127, #133, #157, #165, #171, #177, #184, #195, #197, #200, #201, #208, #236, #240, #241. Also, one of two variants listed in #224 assigned to Kincaid, first occurred in E. Robertson’s text, which also happened to restore the correct text in the other, but the second variant was restored by the 1771 (See Endnote E). In addition, the following were introduced by the 1771 edition rather than by Kincaid: #47, #60, #102, #111, #119, #231.

This leaves only three variants of the more than forty Carruthers originally assigned to Kincaid, as actually coming into the text with that edition: #3, #17, and #34.

KINCAID AND KERR

The firm of Alexander Kincaid followed up their very nice 1773 octavo edition with two smaller 12mo versions, one in 1781 and the other in 1788. Carruthers did not examine either of these, and many of the variants he traced to Kerr’s 1793 first occur in them. Kerr is also a 12mo edition and appears to be set fairly carefully from the 1788 Kincaid. Of the variants Carruthers attributed to Kerr, the following occur in both the 1781 and 1788 Kincaid editions: #2, #10, #25, #28, #50, #52, #82, #100, #105, #106, #115, #116, #128, #148, #150, #158, #192, #199, #211, #221, #226. The following two were introduced in the 1788 edition: #80, #104. Carruthers listed #10 under both Kincaid and Kerr, and only listed Kincaid in the note on page 93. However, Kincaid’s 1773 text has the correct reading and it is Kerr that has the variant. In addition, the variant was actually introduced in Kincaid’s 1781. The portion of variant #115 assigned by Carruthers to Kerr, first occurs in Kincaid’s 1781 as

well (the other portion was changed in L&R’s 1744). This leaves #91 in Carruthers’ list, as the only variant introduced by Kerr (Carruthers, 85).

BLAIR & BRUCE

The Edinburgh printing firm of Sir D. Hunter Blair and Bruce produced seven similar editions of the Standards over forty years (one each in 1803, 1810, 1815, 1827, 1831, 1836 and 1841). In looking at these editions, one would think they were printed from the same stereotype plates, they so closely follow each other. But they are actually each carefully set by hand. Carruthers only examined the 1810 and 1831 editions. The five variants he traced to the 1810 edition (Carruthers, 85), all appear first in the 1803. Of the six attributed to the 1831 printing only #4 first appeared in that edition. Variants #95 and #181 first appear in the 1815 edition, and #33, #39, and #117 in the 1827 edition.

JOHNSTONE & HUNTER

The Johnstone & Hunter editions were dominant from 1851 through the end of the century. There are three distinct types. Carruthers’ Johnstone “A” was stereotyped and published in 1851, and was very likely set from an edition of Francis Orr and Sons, because of the addition of Mark 9:43 as a Scripture proof text at WLC 29. Johnstone “B” is the 1855 large format edition with the reintroduction of the italics in the Scripture proofs, which had first been introduced by Rothwell in 1658. Johnstone “C” is a small compact edition first published in 1860, and reprinted many times through the end of the century. Graham and Heslip in Belfast published a photo-reprint of this type in 1933. Copies of this edition were purchased by the Free Presbyterian Church of Scotland, and there are also Free Church editions with additional matter issued as the *Subordinate Standards and Other Authoritative Documents of the Free Church of Scotland*. One of the two variants which Carruthers assigned to Johnstone “B”, is apparently incorrect (Carruthers, 85, 133). Variant #155 should rather be assigned to Johnstone “C” (See Endnote E).

CONCLUSION

A review of what is known about the printing practices at the time of the Westminster Assembly, supports continuing a critical approach to the texts of the Confession and Catechisms. Such a review demonstrates that the record of how the manuscript texts passed into their

final printed form is far from complete. There would have been a careful printing process, with manuscripts marked up by the compositor, as well as printed proof copies, which would have passed back and forth between the printer and the scribes of the Assembly. Lacking the full record of this process, it is now difficult to determine for certain whether even the few “substantial” differences in wording between a single surviving manuscript and the printed text reflect an unauthorized change. Certainly, the case made for discretion with the “incidentals” of the text by the scribes and printer, raises the probability that the Assembly did not regard these as unalterable in the printing process. All this suggests that a critical approach to the text is prudent, making use of the first published editions as well as the manuscripts.

Having justified a critical approach to the text of the Confession and Catechisms, the balance of this article sought to correct the work of Dr. S. W. Carruthers. A fuller lineage was presented of the traditional text of the Westminster Standards than originally proposed by him in 1937, showing a more complex descent through the end of the eighteenth century. From this corrected lineage, adjustments and refinements were made to the entry points of the textual corruptions first identified by Dr. Carruthers in his ground breaking critical work with the text of the Westminster Confession of Faith.

ENDNOTES

A. The following are the fuller bibliographical details for the volumes listed in Table 1. (1) Edition Three: *The humble Advice of the Assembly of Divines, now by Authority of Parliament sitting at Westminster, Concerning a Confession of Faith, with the Quotations and Texts of Scripture annexed ...* (London: Printed for the Company of Stationers [May, 1647]). (2) Edition Four: *The Humble Advice of the Assembly of Divines ... concerning a Confession of Faith*, etc. [With an order of the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland that three hundred copies, and no more, be printed] (Printed at London and reprinted at Edinburgh by Evan Tyler, 1647). (3) Edition Five: *The Humble Advice of the Assembly of Divines, Now by Authority of Parliament sitting at Westminster, Concerning A Confession of Faith: With the Quotations and Texts of Scripture annexed* (Printed at London; and Re-printed at Edinburgh by Evan Tyler, Printer to the Kings most Excellent Majesty, 1647). (4) Edition Six: *The Humble Advice*, etc. (London: For Robert Boſtock, 1648). (5) Rothwell: *The Confession of Faith*, etc. (London: Printed for the Company of Stationers and are to

be sold by J. Rothwel, 1658). (6) “Third”: *The Confession of Faith: together with the Larger and Lesser catechisms. The third edition* (London: Printed for the Company of Stationers, and are to be sold by Tho. Parkhurst and Dorman Newman, 1688). (7) “Fifth”: *The Confession of Faith*, etc. The Fifth Edition (London: S. Crutenden and T. Cox, 1717). (8) Dunlop: “The Confession of Faith, Larger and Shorter Catechisms,” *A Collection of Confessions of Faith, Catechisms, Directories, Books of Discipline*, etc. (Edinburgh: Printed by James Watson, 1719-21) vol. 1. (9) Robertson: *The Confession of Faith*, etc. (Glasgow: John Robertson and Mrs. McLean, 1746). (10) Kincaid: *The Confession of Faith*, etc. (Edinburgh: Printed for Alex. Kincaid, His Majesty’s Printer, 1773). (11) Kerr: *The Confession of Faith*, etc. (Edinburgh: Printed for Mark and Charles Kerr, His Majesty’s Printers, 1793). (12) Blair: *The Confession of Faith*, etc. (Edinburgh: Sir D. Hunter Blair and J. Bruce: 1810 [Blair A]; and 1831 [Blair B]). (13) Johnstone: *The Confession of Faith*, etc. (Edinburgh: Johnstone and Hunter, 1851 [Johnstone A]; 1855 [Johnstone B]; and 1860 [Johnstone C]).

B. The following are the fuller bibliographical details for the volumes listed in Table 11 not already given in Endnote A. (7) “Fourth”: *The Confession of Faith*, etc. (Edinburgh: James Watson, 1707/08). (10). *The Confession of Faith*, etc. (Edinburgh: Lumisden & Robertson, 1728) and *The Confession of Faith*, etc. (Edinburgh: Lumisden & Robertson, 1736). (11). *The Confession of Faith*, etc. (Edinburgh: Lumisden & Robertson, 1744). (12). *The Confession of Faith*, etc. (Edinburgh: E. Robertson, 1756). (13). *The Confession of Faith*, etc. ([Edinburgh?]: n.p, 1771). (15) *The Confession*, etc. (Edinburgh: Assigns of Alexander Kincaid, His Majesty’s Printer, 1781); and *The Confession*, etc. (Edinburgh: Assigns of Alexander Kincaid, His Majesty’s Printer, 1788). (17) Blair: *The Confession of Faith*, etc. (Edinburgh: Sir D. H. Blair and J. Bruce, 1803); *The Confession of Faith*, etc. (Edinburgh: Sir D. Hunter Blair and J. Bruce, 1815); *The Confession of Faith*, etc. (Edinburgh: Sir D. Hunter Blair and M.S. Bruce, 1827); *The Confession of Faith*, etc. (Edinburgh: Sir D. Hunter Blair and M. T. Bruce, 1836); and *The Confession of Faith*, etc. (Edinburgh: Sir D. Hunter Blair and M.S. Tyndall Bruce, 1841). (18) *The Confession of Faith*, etc. (Glasgow: Francis Orr and Sons, 1842; 1845; 1848; 1849). Carruthers notes at least regarding the 1848 and 1849 that they appear to be the same type as the 1842 with altered title pages for the publication date. But evidently these were not stereotype editions, as he states that the Johnstone & Hunter

of 1851 appeared to be the first edition stereotyped in Britain. (*Three Centuries*, 67-68).

C. See Footnote 13. The author examined eight editions of this document printed in 1642. One of items 1, 6, or 8 probably served as the copy from which the other two were set, as they have made similar choices in the incidentals of the text. All the editions by or for F.C. appear to be the same text or set very closely to each other (2, 3, and 4).

1. *A remonstrance of the state of the Kingdome agreed on by the Lords and Commons assembled in Parliament the 19. of May, 1642* (London: Printed for Iohn Bartlet, 1642). EEB, Reel 1441:21. Wing E2222. 22 pp. Wing also lists a variant by Bartlet with the “divers depositions and letters.” Wing E2222A.

2. *A remonstrance of the state of the kingdome: agreed on by the Lords and Commons assembled in Parliament the 19 of May 1642* (Printed at London: For F.C., 1642). EEB 1651:14. Wing E2223. (2) 33 pp.

3. *A remonstrance of the state of the kingdome: agreed on by the Lords and Commons assembled in Parliament the 19 of May 1642: with Divers depositions and letters annexed* (Printed at London for F.C., 1642). EEB 1651: 15. Wing E2223, Variant. (2) 33, (1), 1, 24-50 (i.e. 46) pp. The first 33 pages containing the Remonstrance is the same as 2 above. There are variants of this title: E2223AA, E2223BA.

4. *A Remonstrance or Declaration of the State of the Kingdome, etc.* (London: Printed by R. O. and G. D. for F.C, 1642). EEB 1430:02. Wing R1023. Except for the title page this appears to be the same as 2 & 3 above.

5. *The declaration or remonstrance of the Lords and Commons in Parliament assembled: with divers depositions and letters thereunto annexed* (London: Printed for Joseph Hunscoott and John Wright, 1642). EEB 252: E.148, no. 17. Wing E1517. (2), 59 (i.e. 51) pp. The author has not found a variant edition with only the text of the Declaration by Hunscoott and Wright.

6. *A declaration or remonstrance of the state of the kingdome: agreed on by the Lords and Commons assembled in Parliament the 19 of May, 1642, and published by order of both Houses: with divers depositions and letters thereunto annexed ...: also the votes of both Houses of Parliament, the twentieth of May, 1642: with the humble petition of the Lords and Commons in Parliament assembled, to the Kings Most Excellent Majesty at Yorke* (Printed for T.P. in Queenshead-Alley, 1642). EEB 1001:26 (Wing D782) and EEB 1382:20 (Wing E1518). [2], 48 [i.e. 46] pp.

7. *A Remonstrance of the State of the Kingdome, etc.*

(London: Printed for T. Paybody, 1642). This is probably a variant of 6 above. Wing 2223A. [2] 48 pp. A copy with this imprint is noted in the collection at University of Durham, Palace Green Library, Routh.

8. *A Remonstrance of the State of the Kingdome, agreed on by the Lords and Commons assembled in Parliament May 19. 1642 (Divers depositions and letters appertaining to the Remonstrance.)* (London: Printed for Thomas Bates, 1642). EEB 2498:17 Wing E2223B. pp. 50.

The Remonstrance also appears in: John Rush-worth, *Historical collections of private passages of state, weighty matters in law, remarkable proceedings in five Parliaments*, vol. 3 (Printed for R. Chiswell and T. Cockerill, 1692) 691-703. EEB 40:1. Wing R2317-R2319. The Remonstrance and the additions also appear in: *An Exact Collection of all Remonstrances, Declarations, Ordinances and other passages between the King's Majesty and his Parliament* (London: Printed for Edward Husbands, et al, 1643). EEB 266:E.241. Wing E1533. 955 pp.

Note: The names John Bartlett, Thomas Bates, Joseph Hunscoott, and Edward Husbands, are listed in: W. Craig Ferguson, *Occasional Papers of the Bibliographical Society Number 4: The Loan Book of The Stationers' Company: With a List of Transactions 1592-1692* (London: The Bibliographical Society, 1989).

D. As will be noted in the published form of his Lecture on the Directory for Public Worship delivered at the 2004 Westminster Assembly Conference, Dr. Rowland Ward has discovered two apparent signature notations in the Assembly's manuscript copy that may have been made by the printer. He kindly provided copies of the manuscripts to the author to confirm this and to determine if there were additional markings. In examining these, it is obvious that given their quality and the slight way in which many of these marks may be made, the originals will need to be examined to make a final determination as to what extent the manuscripts are actually marked up. That said, it is at least clear from the copies that a portion of the manuscripts contain a number of compositor's notations, relating to signatures F though I in the first edition (*Directory for the Publique Worship of God* [London: for E. Tyler, A. Fifield, R. Smith and J. Field, 1644 {1645}]. Wing D1544. See 33-57.).

The presence of these marks is interesting, for as noted in this paper, normally the printer would not have handled the Assembly's copy. It may be that the manuscript provided to the printer was spoiled or defective in these places, and the Assembly's text was required at some point. Or perhaps pages were lost similar to what happened in the printing of Hooker's fifth book of the

Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity. As they are of some interest, the author may prepare a separate article describing these marks for future publication; but for now, it is sufficient to simply note that their presence confirms that the copies provided the printer would have been marked up with compositor's notations according to the general practice of the time and as exhibited in the Parliamentary paper described earlier. And, since the printers would have needed a more fully marked copy than just the section in the Assembly's surviving manuscripts, it indicates that the scribes would have prepared full copies specifically for their use.

See: Rowland S. Ward, "The Directory for Public Worship," a lecture delivered November 25, 2004, at *Westminster Assembly 2004: A Conference on the Westminster Standards*, Westminster Theological Seminary, Philadelphia PA. For descriptions and location of the Assembly's manuscripts of the Directory for Public Worship, see "Chronological bibliography of the manuscript and published papers of the Westminster Assembly" in Van Dixhoorn, 1.369-372.

E. The following are the nearly one hundred textual variants discussed in this article as numbered and described by Dr. Carruthers (Carruthers, 85; 89-157).

An asterisk (*) indicates an error by Carruthers. Either the text is not contained in the edition Carruthers cited, or it is unclear why in his Tables the variants are listed under a particular edition (Carruthers, 85). For more information on these, see comments at section III within the body of this article. The format of the following information is: Carruthers' #; WCF location, variant reading (correct reading); first edition this was introduced into the traditional text (Carruthers previous assignment for first occurrence); Note: (if any).

#1 (1.1) "inexcusable" (unexcusable). L&R (RbMclean).

#2 (1.1) "yet **they are**" (yet **are they**). Kncd1781 (Kerr).

#3 (1.1) "unto salvation: therefore" (new sentence). Kncd1773 (Kncd1773).

#4 (1.2) "Old and New Testaments" (Testament). Blair1831.

#7 (1.5) "Scripture, and" (new sentence). E.Rob (Kncd1773).

#10 (2.1) "judgments; hating" (comma). Kncd1781 (Kerr*/ Kncd1773).

#11 (2.2) "not deriving" (nor deriving). Blair1803 (Blair1810).

#14 (3.2) "conditions: yet" (comma). L&R1744 (RbMclean).

#15 (3.4) "designed; and their" (comma). L&R1744 (RbMclean).

#17 (3.6) "elected being fallen" (elected, being fallen). Kncd1773 (Kncd1773).

#18 (3.7) "mankind, God" (comma unnecessary). L&R (RbMclean).

#25 (5.2) "fall out according" (fall out, according). Kncd1781 (Kerr).

#28 (5.4) "God; who," (comma). Kncd1781 (Kerr).

#31 (5.6) "former sins, doth" (comma undesirable). L&R (RbMclean)

#32 (5.6) "occasion of sin" (occasions). Watson's Fourth (Fifth). Note: Most errors have been in the summary list, but here Carruthers' comment that this variant occurred only in Anderson and the Reformed Presbyterian texts (Carruthers, 100), is incorrect, as this variant has remained uncorrected in the traditional text. Contrary to the note, in the summary list Carruthers attributes the first occurrence of the variant to "Fifth" (Carruthers, 85).

#33 (5.6) Reference letter "x" used for "w" and subsequent letters shifted. Blair1827 (Blair1831).

#34 (6.2) "righteousness, and communion" (no comma). Kncd1773 (RbMclean)

#37 (6.5) "be through Christ pardoned" (be, through Christ, pardoned). L&R1744 (Kncd1773)

#39 (7.3) "whereby He freely" (**wherein**). Blair1827 (Blair1831)

#40 (7.3) "saved; and promising" (comma). L&R (RbMclean)

#43 (7.6) "Christ the substance was" (Christ, the substance, was). L&R (RbMclean)

#47 (8.1) "things; and judge" (comma). 1771 (Kncd1773).

#48 (8.1) "world. Unto whom" (colon). Bostock (Bostock/ RbMclean*). Note: RbMclean has the colon, and Carruthers incorrectly lists #48 under that edition in his summary list (Carruthers, 85).

#50 (8.2) "very God and very" (very God, and very). Kncd1781 (Kerr).

#52 (8.3) "Father; who" (comma). Kncd1781 (Kerr).

#55 (8.4) "death, yet saw" (semi-colon). E.Rob (Kncd1773).

#60 (8.6) "thereof, were" (undesirable comma). 1771 (Kncd1773).

#62 (8.6) "head, and" (semi-colon). L&R1744 (Kncd1773).

#65 (8.8) 1. "same; making" (comma in early editions) L&R1744 (Kncd1773); 2. "them; and" (comma in the early editions). E.Rob (Kncd1773).

- #68 (9.4) “sin, and by” (semi-colon). L&R1744 (Kncd1773).
- #69 (9.5) “free to **do** good” (free to good). E.Rob/Kncd1773 /Blair1803 (Kncd1773). Note: This has a complex history. In his critical text Carruthers states this variant first appeared in Sanders’ 1675 edition (Carruthers, 110). It appears in Watson’s 1707-08 text, Cox’s “Fifth”, and in Dunlop, but not in the RP and L&R texts. It was re-introduced by E. Robertson’s edition of 1756, but it was not reproduced in the Glasgow editions, or in the 1771 edition. Kncd1773 returned to it, but it was dropped in the later editions of 1781 and 1788. Blair’s 1803 reintroduced it once more into the traditional text.
- #70 (10.1) “pleased, in his” (no comma). L&R (RbMclean).
- #72 (10.2) “man; who” (comma). Kncd1788/Blair1803 (Kncd-1773*/Blair1810).
- #74 (10.3) “incapable” (uncapable). E.Rob (Kncd1773).
- #76 (10.4) “ever so diligent” (**never**). Blair1803 (Blair1810).
- #80 (11.1) “themselves; it is” (comma). Kncd1788 (Kerr).
- #82 (11.3) “them, their” (semi-colon). Kncd1781 (Kerr).
- #83 (11.4) “elect; and Christ” (comma). L&R/Kncd1781 (RbMclean). E.Rob and 1771 have a colon, as does Kncd1773. Semi-colon restored in Kncd1781.
- #85 (12.1) “God: have” (comma). Dunlop (Kncd1773*).
- #89 (13.1) “mortified, and” (semi-colon). Fourth (Fifth)
- #91 (13.2) “man, yet” (semi-colon). Kerr (RbMclean*).
- #94 (13.3) “prevail, yet” (semi-colon). L&R1744 (Kncd1773).
- #95 (14.1) “hearts, and is” (semi-colon). Blair1815 (Blair1831).
- #96 (15.5). “sins particularly” (sins, particularly). Fourth (Fifth).
- #97 (15.6). “confession and sorrow” (confession, and sorrow). Fourth (Fifth).
- #98 (15.6) “offended; who” (comma). L&R1744 (Kncd1773).
- #100 (16.3) “Holy Spirit to work” (Holy Spirit, to work). Kncd1781 (Kerr).
- #102 (16.5) “life, at the hand” (no comma). 1771 (Kncd1773).
- #104 (16.5) “profit nor” (profit, nor). Kncd1788 (Kerr).
- #105 (16.6) “in him; not” (comma). Kncd1781 (Kerr).
- #106 (16.7) GEN 4:5 with HEB 11:4, 6 (GEN 4:5 with HEB 11:4. HEB 11:6). Kncd1781 (Kerr).
- #107 (17.1) “called and” (called, and). Watson’s Fourth (Fifth).
- #109 (17.3) “comforts; have” (comma). L&R1736 (RbMclean*). Note: Possibly an incorrect entry, as Carruthers does not mention RbMclean in his note, but does list this under Robertson (Carruthers, 85).
- #111 (18.1) Hypocrites, and other unregenerate men, may” (no commas). 1771 (Kncd1773).
- #113 (18.1) God; which hope (comma). L&R1744 (Kncd1773).
- #115 (18.4) “of it; by ... temptation; by” (commas). Kncd1781 (Kerr).
- #116 (19.2) “righteousness; and” (comma). Kncd1781 (Kerr).
- #117 (19.2) “the **first four**” (**four first**). Blair1827 (Blair1831).
- #119 (19.3) Besides (Beside). 1771 (Kncd1773).
- #121 (19.5) “God, the creator” (no comma). Blair1803 (Blair1810).
- #124 (19.6) “life, informing” (no comma). L&R (RbMclean).
- #125 (19.6) “thereof, although” (semi-colon). Watson’s Fourth (Fifth). Note: This is one of the few recorded places of an official change made in the text as published in Edition I of the first nineteen chapters of the WCF from that in Warfield II containing all thirty-three chapters. The phrase “performance of them” was changed to “performance thereof” (*Minutes*, 307).
- #127 (19.6) “works: so as” (new sentence). E.Rob (Kncd1773).
- #128 (19.7) “to do that freely and cheerfully which” (to do that, freely and cheerfully, which). Kncd1781 (Kerr).
- #129 (19.7) “God revealed in the law requireth” (God, revealed ...law, requireth). L&R (RbMclean).
- #133 (20.1) “subjected, and in” (semi-colon). E.Rob (Kncd1773).
- #140 (21.1) “over all; is ... unto all; and” (commas). Dunlop (Dunlop/Kncd1773*).
- #148 (21.6) “in spirit and in truth” (and truth). Kncd1781 (Kerr).
- #150 (21.8) “rest all the day from” (rest, all the day, from). Kncd1781 (Kerr).
- #155 (22.3) “taketh on oath” (taketh an oath) J&Hc (J&Hb). Note: Carruthers assigns this to Johnstone & Hunter’s 1855 edition (Carruthers’ Johnstone ‘B’), but the example of ‘B’ in the author’s hands has the correct

text. However, the error is in Johnstone 'C', first published in 1860.

#157 (22.4) "hurt; nor" (new sentence). E.Rob (Kncd1773).

#158 (22.6) "creature but" (creature, but). Kncd1781 (Kerr).

#159 (22.6) "duties, or" (semi-colon). L&R (RbMclean/ Kncd1773*).

#165 (23.3) "entire, that ... suppressed, all ... reformed, and" (semi-colons). E.Rob (Kncd1773).

#171 (24.3) "consent: yet ... Lord. And" (consent. Yet ... Lord: and). E.Rob (Kncd1773).

#175 (24.5) "divorce, and" (colon). L&R1744 (Kncd1773).

#177 (24.6) "observed, and" (semi-colon). E.Rob (Kncd1773).

#178 (25.1) "church, which" (no comma). L&R1736 (RbMclean).

#181 (25.5) "earth to" (earth, to). Blair1815 (Blair1831).

#182 (25.6) "Rome in any sense be" (Rome, in any sense, be). (IV and RothwellB). Note: Carruthers inexplicably lists #182 under RbMclean in his summary list (Carruthers, 85, 141).

#184 (26.1) "glory. And" (glory: and). E.Rob (Kncd1773).

#186 (26.2) "saints, by profession, are" (no commas). L&R (RbMclean).

#192 (27.1) "benefits, and" (semi-colon). Kncd1781 (Kerr).

#195 (27.3) "sacraments, rightly" (no comma). E.Rob (Kncd1773).

#196 (27.3) "administer it, but" (colon). L&R1744 (Kncd1773).

#197 (27.3) "institution; which" (comma). E.Rob (Kncd1773).

#199 (27.4) "Lord; neither" (colon). Kncd1781 (Kerr).

#200 (28.1) "church, but" (semi-colon). E.Rob (Kncd1773).

#201 (28.1) "life: which" (new sentence). E.Rob (Kncd1773).

#208 (29.1) "unto Him, and" (semi-colon). E.Rob (Kncd1773).

#211 (29.2) "once for all, and" (colon). Kncd1781 (Kerr).

#221 (29.8) "table, and cannot" (semi-colon). L&R1744/ Kncd1781 (Kncd1773*/Kerr).

#224 (30.2) 1. "committed, by virtue" (colon). Dunlop (Dunlop). 2. "sins, to shut" (semi-colon). E.Rob (Kncd1773). Note: The colon was early re-

duced to a semi-colon, which Dunlop turned into a comma. E.Rob reintroduced the colon, but 1771 returned to the comma. E.Rob changed the semi-colon into a comma.

#226 (30.3) "brethren; for ... offences; for ... lump; for ... gospel; and" (commas). Kncd1781 (Kerr).

#230 (31.3) "submission, not" (semi-colon). L&R1744 (Kncd1773)

#231 (31.3) "God, appointed" (no comma). L&R/ 1771 (RbMclean). Note: E.Rob dropped the comma, but 1771 reinserted it.

#236 (32.1) "bodies; and" (new sentence). E.Rob (Kncd1773). E.Rob introduced a semi-colon, which 1771 turned into a colon. Kincaid returned to the semi-colon.

#240 (33.1) "deeds, and" (semi-colon). E.Rob (Kncd1773).

#241 (33.2) "mercy in ... elect, and ... justice in" (mercy, in ... elect; and ... justice, in). E.Rob (Kncd1773). ■

In Brief: William Carruthers: (1830-1922)

William Carruthers was born at Moffat, Dumfriesshire, where his father was a merchant, on May 29, 1830, and his education began at the Academy of that place. At the age of fifteen he went to Edinburgh University, where save for two periods during which he was engaged in teaching, he remained until 1854. In the latter half of that year he went to New College, Edinburgh, with the view of entering the ministry of the Presbyterian Church; but, on the advice of Dr. John Fleming, under whom he studied natural science, he resolved to abandon an ecclesiastical for a scientific career. The early bent of his mind, however, and the influence of his college training, found full expression in his later life. When he came to London he took a leading part in the affairs of the Presbyterian Church: from 1880 to 1910 he was first secretary and then chairman of its committee on publications, and from 1876 until the year before his death was editor of its magazine, the *Messenger for Children*; indeed, there was not one of the standing committees of the Church of which he had not at some time in his life been an active member. He was keenly interested in ecclesiastical history, particularly that of the Commonwealth period, and had a large and valuable collection of publications relating thereto...

[After his retirement] by degrees his religious and literary interests absorbed such attention as he could devote to them; and in the quiet pursuit of these in his home at Norwood, in the company of his wife and son, the remainder of his days was passed. "In Memory of William Carruthers (1830-1922), From the *Journal of Botany*, v. 60, September 1922 (London: Taylor and Francis, n.d.) [249], 256. ■