The Archer sermon manuscripts are in excellent condition overall, and the majority of handwriting quite legible. However, some sections of text and some individual words presented significant difficulties, and each sermon posed unique problems to be resolved. Archer frequently modified his writing using the methods that all early writers used, and still use today: Words and phrases to be deleted were indicated by strikethrough, and additions and other modifications by the use of interlineation; that is, writing between lines, usually above the line he intended to modify. Those areas of text which contained both elements were challenging to discern and to transcribe.

To aid in the recognition process, we examined each sermon under magnification and relied heavily on the Oxford English Dictionary, A New English Dictionary on Historical Principles, and Webster's Third New International Dictionary, Unabridged. As necessary, we also consulted several of the earliest English language dictionaries, and other contemporary English and Latin dictionaries that were in our reference armamentarium. Many hours were expended in an attempt at discernment and comprehension of some areas of text, and even of individual words or letters. If, however, we could not discern a word or phrase, we indicated this with an ellipsis within square brackets (e.g., [...] ). If we were less than certain about an entry, but felt that a reasonable conjecture was in order, we indicated this by placing a question mark inside the bracketed word or text (e.g., [? text] ).

Archer wrote in the style of the period in which he lived, a style that may not be familiar to modern readers. Spelling, punctuation, and capitalization were often inconsistent. A single sentence might fill an entire paragraph, with the semi-colon used repeatedly in place of a comma or period. Sentences often began without being capitalized, yet other words in the same sentence might be capitalized in one instance, but not in the other. Words may be spelled with multiple variations within the same sermon. Additionally, Archer often placed punctuation with barely discernable markings, appearing to have added punctuation with an almost dry pen after writing a sentence or paragraph. Other chirographical and stylistic issues we grappled with were duplicated and divided words (e.g.; never theless, enter tainment), words that were truncated at the page margin, and other early grammatical practices we now try to avoid.

One of the most vexing problems was Archer’s many modifications by interlining words or phrases, but without striking the often synonymous words or phrases from his first draft on the line below. In some sermons he even took the time to use the caret symbol (^) to indicate his intention that the new material was to be included, but still without lining out the original. We debated this issue extensively: Was this deliberate or did he simply neglect to strike through the portion he decided to modify? Did he intend for both to be used, perhaps for oratorical effect, and if so, in what order? Did he choose as the occasion demanded or he thought most appropriate? Whatever the reason, we speculated that such frequent occurrences of this pattern were not unintentional.
Some insight into Archer’s thinking was revealed when, in the course of this project, we discovered that some sermons were corrected copies of the first draft. These showed that our speculation was largely correct. Archer used his original phrasing in some instances, and his revised, interlined phrasing in others. Beyond these exceptions however, we could not determine his intentions and elected to include the original word or phrasing, and the interlined text, which is demarcated within vertical brackets, also known as pipes (e.g., “Whose fleece was white [bright] as snow.”).

On occasion, Archer made notations by interlining, and we transcribed these within vertical brackets as well. However, interlineations without question as to meaning and intent, often indicated by Archer with the caret, were transcribed normally. Single words that were lined out were omitted, although we attempted to discern and include multiple words, phrases, or sentences that were stricken in order to capture Archer’s initial thoughts. These are indicated with the strike-through (e.g., strikethrough).

Although we transcribed the majority of Archer’s words verbatim, we made occasional and sparing corrections of obvious misspellings, usually of a single letter, which might interfere with comprehension, and equally sparing additions of punctuation or missing words to improve readability. In most cases, when we felt clarification was in order, we inserted the corrected word or phrase in brackets immediately after the occurrence. British spelling has been retained and all additions or annotations have been enclosed within square brackets (e.g., [annotations], [:]).

Archer was fond of using terms and senses that now or were, even in his day, archaic or obsolete. We have endeavored to understand such usage and provide brief definitions to improve comprehension and clarity. As these are historical documents, we did not attempt however, to identify misspellings or other non-standard, idiomatic usage with the Latin term “sic” (sic erat scriptum; thus was it written). To do so would have been excessively redundant and significantly impaired readability.

We were not able to reproduce Archer’s handwriting in every respect. Like most writers of his day, he routinely used the lowercase “long s,” also known as the “medial” or “descending s.” It is similar in appearance to the lowercase letter “f,” but with the horizontal bar only on the left side of the vertical stroke, represented in typeface as “ſ” or “ſ.” Archer primarily used the “long s” as the leading letter in double “s” spellings, as in the words “Passion” (Pasion) or “Blessing” (Blessing). We transcribed these using the modern lowercase “s.” Superscript has been rendered as closely as possible, with the exception of a small dot or bar which was placed directly beneath the superscript (e.g., “S” = S). Neither of these stylistic issues has consequence as to meaning.

Archer often employed the use of abbreviations in his writing, of which the following were the most frequent in his English usage: “Aud.” (Auditors), “Breth.” (Brethren), “C.” (Chapter), “Cand.” (Candidate), “D” (Dear), “J. C.” (Jesus Christ), “S” (Saint), and “V.” (Verse). In Latin, he often used the ampersand (&) as an abbreviation for the word “et” (and), and the ampersand with a lowercase “c” (&c) for “et cetera” (etc.). It is also to be noted that Archer followed the custom
of the day in using the equals sign (=) rather than the hyphen when dividing words by syllable at the end of the line (e.g., con= versation, them= selves). It was unnecessary to indicate divided or hyphenated marginal words on the same page; however, this practice was duplicated in the transcription when a word was divided between adjacent pages.

Archer began each sermon with a Latin inscription and regularly included Latin scriptures and other phrases in his texts. Where he did not provide an English translation, we have added it as a bracketed annotation. Although his Latin was generally good, he often omitted words or made other errors. When these were detected, we added corrections within square brackets or as annotations, and all Latin phrases were italicized.

Because Archer was Roman Catholic and attended the University of Douai (France), we utilized the Latin Vulgate and the Douay-Rheims Bible (DRB) as reference sources for cited scripture, which appears to be in agreement with Archer’s usage. Note that when some Old Testament scripture (especially Psalms) are cited, there may be a slight variation of chapter number with other bible versions due to differences in the Masoretic (Hebrew) and Septuagint (Greek) numbering systems.

Although we undertook many steps to ensure an extremely high degree of fidelity with the original manuscript, despite our best efforts, there is little doubt that technical and human errors were introduced during the transcription process. While we regret such occurrences, we hope these mistakes are minimal and believe that they do not appreciably affect the overall intent, tone, or context of Archer’s excellent work.