
A table of contents for *The Churchman* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_churchman_os.php

course of action which they pursued, and from the treatment which they received at the hands of the Bishops and clergy, naturally led to the formal separation from the communion of the Church which occurred in the days of their successors in the year 1811, when men were set apart for the ministration of the sacraments within the connection. If Rowlands and his contemporaries had acted after the example of Griffith Jones of Llanddowror, it is possible that the rupture, which I lament as a calamity to the interest of the Church and of religion in the Principality, would not have followed. But the rupture came, and the course which becomes Churchmen and Separatists now to pursue is to study in a Christian spirit to heal and not to widen the breach, and I rejoice to add that this spirit was deeply felt and visibly seen in the discussions at the Church Congress which was lately held at Swansea.

J. POWELL JONES.

ART. III.—REPRESENTATIVE STATESMEN.

Representative Statesmen—Political Studies. By ALEX. CHARLES EWALD, F.S.A., Author of "The Life and Times of Prince Charles Stuart," "The Life of Sir Robert Walpole," &c. Chapman & Hall. 2 vols. 1879.

THE study of politics is so often associated in the public mind with want of interest and dryness of detail that when an author, as in the work before us, takes up the subject, and by dint of lightness of style and grouping of anecdote presents us with two very readable volumes we owe him a debt of gratitude. To describe the progress of political science from the despotism of the seventeenth century, to the latest development of Parliamentary government in the nineteenth century, at first sight appears to be a labour which may be useful but which must be dull. Visions pass before us of all the heavy machinery of legislation put into operation—Bills accepted or rejected, Debates more exhaustive of the auditor's patience than of the subject discussed, divisions, coalitions, dissolutions, and all that is contained in the dreary pages of Hansard. Mr. Ewald has, however, followed a course which, whilst it avoids the dryness of information pure and simple, yet preserves its utility. By recording the lives of men eminent in the political world, he has used Biography as a channel for conveying much sound historical knowledge to the reader. He presents each statesman to our notice as the representative of some special characteristic which tinges as it were the whole current of the politician's career, and gives a definite colour

to his life and actions. Thus, we have Strafford as the representative of despotism, the trimmer Halifax as the representative of "moderate" views, Sir Robert Walpole as the man of peace, Chatham as the man of war, Lord Eldon as the deliberative Minister, Pitt as the type of a noble disinterestedness, Canning as the brilliant Minister, Wellington as the man to whom the dictates of conscience were all in all, Sir Robert Peel as "the Minister of Expediency," and stout Lord Palmerston—"the English Minister"—as the man who displayed his nationality in everything he undertook.

Thus, through the fascinating medium of biography we have a survey of the last two centuries, and are bidden to mark the social and political changes that have occurred. We see despotism dissolve itself into prerogative, and prerogative give way to government by Parliament. We see Ministers absolute and independent of all Parliamentary control, and then resolving themselves into the responsible agents of the House of Commons. We see the Upper House governed by a powerful oligarchy, and then making room for a popular House of Commons elected by the nation. And, lastly, we see politics, once the pursuit of a privileged coterie, developing into the open and honourable profession of the country. Freedom has broadened down from precedent to precedent, till intolerance has been erased from the Statute Book.

Hackneyed as are the incidents in the life of Strafford, our author, from a careful consultation of the State Papers and other original documents, has been able to throw much light upon the career of "Thorough." At an early age Wentworth came up from Yorkshire, and sat in the last three Parliaments of James I. He enrolled himself as an opponent of the policy of the Court, detesting the favourite, Buckingham. On the accession of Charles I. he became one of the leaders of the popular party. After the passing of the Petition of Right, however, he attached himself to the Royalists, was made a peer, and became the staunchest ally of the King. And now the man showed the despotism that was within him. What Richelieu was planning for Louis, Wentworth endeavoured to carry out for Charles in England. As President of the Council of York,[1] and Viceroy of Ireland, he levied taxes and

[1] Peter Smart, one of the Prebendaries of Durham Cathedral, had opposed the ritualistic tendencies of the day, and had denounced them as but copies of "that painted harlot, the Church of Rome." He was heavily fined, and forced to resign his preferment. The Lord President was directed by the King to determine offences according to the course of the Star Chamber, "*whether provided for by Act of Parliament or not*," whilst he was informed that from his Court no appeals would lie to the Courts at Westminster.

made all obey the decisions of the King without appeal or remonstrance. He counselled Charles to govern without the advice of Parliament, to wring the moneys he required from his poverty-stricken subjects by illegal loans and benevolences, to support a standing army, and to lay down the law to the country not as interpreted by the decisions of the recognised courts of justice, but as interpreted by the decisions of illegal tribunals. And thus beneath the obstinacy of Charles, the bigotry of Laud, and the despotism of Strafford, England was humbled and oppressed, her trade was driven from her shores, her religion was debased by a Romanising sacerdotalism, her sister kingdoms of Ireland and Scotland were seething in tumult and agitation, and all was misery and wretchedness.

Strafford is the last of English statesmen [writes Mr. Ewald] who sought to create the sovereign independent of the law and the legislature. We have had Ministers who have ruled by exercising pressure upon the courts of justice, who have bribed the House of Commons, who have by their aristocratic cohesion made encroachments upon the power of the Throne, who have transformed the law of the land into an engine of oppression; but such tyranny and corruption were at least displayed under the recognised forms of administration. Though judges had delivered iniquitous judgments, still such judgments were uttered by the acknowledged representatives of the law. Though a House of Commons had passed measures injurious to the nation, or played into the hands of a foreign foe, its acts were at least committed by the popular branch of the national assembly. Though a House of Lords had kept the Prerogative in check, its restraints were exercised by those legally constituting the senate of the realm. Though kings had endeavoured to mould the wishes of the nation to their own arbitrary views, they yet acknowledged the maxim that the law was above the sovereign. But the policy of Wentworth was one utterly at variance with all such restraints, flimsy and frangible though they often were. He declined to act within recognised limits, or to be tied and bound by forms of precedent. He had, he said, the welfare of the nation at heart, and he knew better than the lawyers, than the peers, than the country gentlemen what was the best course to adopt. He would give England his brains, and the people would have but to carry out his instructions. . . . . Aware that to establish a despotism a military Cæsarism must be instituted, Strafford stoutly advocated the existence of a standing army. Aware that there can be no absolutism where justice is pure and free, Strafford sought to poison its administration by his own biassed interpretations and the high-handed proceedings of illegal Courts. Aware that tyranny and parliamentary institutions are opposed to each other, Strafford supported Laud in counselling the King to rule without the advice of an English House of Commons. Happily his evil policy was overthrown, and its defeat was the first step towards the consolidation of that freedom and happiness which we now enjoy.

The biography of Halifax, the representative of "moderate" principles in government, is interesting, because so little is known of the man, and so few materials exist by which we can be let into the secret of his character. We see him proud of his name of Trimmer, occupying the post of counsellor of moderation to the country. His voice was always raised in favour of the persecuted; now he was on the side of the Court, then on the side of the Republicans; now in favour of the Papists, then in favour of the Dissenters; opposing the bitterness of the Commonwealth, the profligate levity of our second Charles, and the bigotry of the avowed Romanist, his brother James. Apparently inconsistent, he was always an advocate of toleration, justice, and sound freedom. He lived in an age of passionate excitement, when the most opposite feelings were surging around the bark of the Constitution. Weighing down the frail vessel to her gunwale on the one side were Popery, French influence, bribery, a vicious Court party, injustice, oppression, and despotic measures; on the other side, acting as a counter-weight, were a vindictive patriotism, burning with fierce and dangerous hate of France, free thought, with a strong leaven of Republicanism, and the schemes of the dynastic intriguer. Between these two sections stood Halifax the trimmer. To use his own simile he was neither the sails nor the oars of the boat of the Constitution, but the ballast.

In the monograph upon Sir Robert Walpole, "the Minister of Peace," based upon the author's larger work on that Prime Minister, we have perhaps the most complete of these sketches. Every event in the career of the great Georgian adviser is laid before us—his sudden rise to power, his skill in finance, his cleverness in intrigue, his hatred of rivalry in the Cabinet, the dexterity with which he avoided war, the diplomacy by which he succeeded in keeping himself in power in spite of all opposition, the hold he exercised over our first two Georges, the cynical views he entertained, the sweeping accusations made against him of bribery and corruption which failed to bear investigation, his coarseness, his jokes, his love of sport, all stand out, clear and distinct, like the lines of a figure in relief. We see the hard sarcastic worldling who believed in nothing, and the purity of no intention, who considered that every man was to be bought, who thought the world revolved upon the axis of self-interest, and between the poles of venality and corruption. Yet Mr. Ewald, though he does not attempt to conceal the real character of Walpole, ably defends him from many of the grave charges that were brought against him. On the resignation of Walpole a Committee sat to inquire into the political conduct, and on investigation it was then discovered how powerfully the Tories and the Whigs he had spurned had magnified his offences.

The homely English proverb [writes the author], "Give a dog a bad name and you may as lief hang him," not inaptly illustrates the fate of Walpole. History had conferred upon him her bad name, and the result was that everything in his disfavour was remembered and exaggerated, while his good deeds were carefully and maliciously forgotten. It was known that he had bribed, therefore he was accused of continuous and wholesale corruption. It was known that he had paid for the services of certain of his political hirelings, therefore he had tampered with the virtue of the whole body of his supporters. It was known that he had been accused, no matter how unjustly, of deriving profit from Government transactions, therefore much of his acquired wealth had been obtained by presents from interested merchants and by the pillaging from State contracts. It was known that he made no pretensions to scholarship, therefore he was deficient in education, a man of very moderate ability, who compensated for the deficiencies of intellect by cunning, intrigue, and the most lavish system of venality. It was known that he was in favour of peace, therefore he was a coward, a traitor to English interests and a servile courtier of foreign Powers. It was also known, but wilfully suppressed, that this same Minister, who was all baseness and incapacity, had kept the country, without any loss to her prestige, free from war longer than she had ever been kept since the days of James I.; that at the time when the nation was on the verge of ruin, at the collapse of the South Sea Scheme, he had been implored to come forward, and in the most skilful manner had weathered the financial storm; that he had been the first to relieve commerce from its heavy and mischievous taxation, and that under his long rule the trade of the country had been prosperous, the revenue increasing, and the landed interest eased of its burdens.

The Article on Chatham, the representative of the warlike policy, labours under the disadvantage of having been made the special subject of an essay by the brilliant Macaulay. Mr. Ewald, aware that he is trespassing upon the domain of the historian, endeavours to avoid going over the same ground, although he does not always succeed in his efforts. We have speeches which are not to be found in the essays of Macaulay, and incidents brought prominently forward which the historian has kept in the background, but which in the opinion of our author tend to reveal the hot, imperious character both of the statesman and his policy. The conduct of Chatham in opposing hostilities with America is well described, and no one can read the splendid speeches of the great statesman without feeling that he was a true Minister of War—because he knew so well when to advocate peace. The portrait of the man strikes us as good.

Nature had cast Chatham in one of her severest moulds. He possessed in an eminent degree those gifts which create fear, inspire respect, and repel love. Stern, unbending, proud with the consciousness of a lofty nature that is incapable of mean acts, endowed with an intellect which was inspired by the sacred fire of genius, a sound and quick judge of character, ceaseless in his efforts till the end he put

before him had been reached, passionate, impetuous, eloquent, he was one of those men born to command and to whom submission is instinctively given. He posed as the superior being, and never descended from his pedestal. There is but one step from the sublime to the ridiculous; but the narrow borderland was never crossed by Chatham —he was always sublime, He knew the danger to dignity which the great man incurs by lowering himself in his tastes, his pleasures, his social converse to the level of those around him. Chatham never unbent; he was always the stately personage, always in full dress. When he entered society, his bearing, his smile, his cold, haughty courtesy so deeply impressed the guests, that his appearance at once hushed gaiety and silenced the most flippant. The House of Commons trembled at his frown, and listened awe-struck to his impetuous eloquence and to his fierce and ready rejoinders. Even the bravest felt his heart grow sick and chill when those savage eyes were turned upon him, causing the jest or malicious interruption to be crushed at its very outset. Who does not know the story? "Sugar, Mr. Speaker," began Chatham, on one occasion, when so abrupt an introduction of the subject created a laugh. The eagle glance of the Minister swept the House, and the usual expressive silence ensued. "Sugar, sugar, sugar," he slowly repeated, looking the while at his interrogators, who were hushed as schoolboys detected by their master; "who will now dare to laugh at sugar?" "His words," says Lord Lyttelton, "have sometimes frozen my young blood into stagnation, and sometimes made it pace in such a hurry through my veins that I could scarce support it."

If Mr. Ewald is not so fortunate in his sketch of the sire, he is very nearly at his best in his description of the son. The Article on William Pitt, the representative of the disinterested politician, is most readable. The "heaven born" Minister stands before us as posterity loves to remember him, devoting his whole life and talents to the good of his country, indifferent to office unless the measures he considers right are advocated, and ready at any moment to resign the seals and the salary of power, and go back to his chambers in the Temple, and his modest 300*l.* a year. *Non sibi sed patriæ* was his motto. When in office he gave titles and grants from the Treasury to others, yet no coronet glistened on his own brow, no fortune swelled his own slender estate. To feel that he had done his duty, to keep his country free from the poison of a mischievous socialism, and to crush the dangerous ambition of Napoleon, were the objects and rewards of his life. Let us listen to the eulogistic, yet discriminating remarks of Mr. Ewald:—

Of all the Ministers of England who have ruled supreme in the councils of the Cabinet, none have been more bitterly and generally hated than Pitt. There have been statesmen, such as Walpole, who have been as much hated as liked; others, such as Newcastle and Portland, who have been deemed beneath the dislike of their fellows;

others, again, like Chatham, who have been too much feared to be cordially hated; whilst of the political mediocrities, the Rockinghams and the Percevals, their very want of individuality and of marked capacity has kept them free from the malice and all uncharitableness of their colleagues and opponents. But with Pitt it was different. He was one of those minds which dawns at rare intervals upon the world; yet with the exception of his lofty intellect and his splendid sense of independence, which commanded the homage of all, he possessed few of the qualities which Englishmen admire in their rulers, and many of the faults which they detest. He was intensely proud, and save in the bosom of his family, where he was warmly loved, stiff, cold, and ungenial. When he appeared in public, even when he was cheered and fêted, his harsh features seldom relaxed their haughty, repellent expression. Kings bowed and smiled, but Pitt, the commoner, the son of a newly-created peer, took scant pains not to show that he held such homage in contempt. His conduct was irreproachable. In an age of much profligacy he wore the white flower of a blameless life; his private morals were so pure that they were often thrown in his teeth as a reproach; he did not gamble; scandal could find no fault in him, yet the warm heart of the ruined spendthrift Fox made all who came in contact with him love him, whilst the virtues of Pitt were so hard, so austere, so cold, that they grated upon the sensitiveness of mankind. . . . . He wanted humility, toleration, charity. . . . . But separating the man from the policy, we find in Pitt statesmanship of the highest order. He had the great gift which is often more allied with common sense than with genius, of seeing what was the right course to be pursued precisely at the right moment. In seasons of crisis, his judgment was seldom at fault, or clouded by the sense of fear or responsibility. His control both of our domestic and foreign affairs, during times of grave peril, was firm, judicious, and far-sighted. A great mind lives in advance of its age, but no one more anticipated the future than Pitt. He saw and endeavoured to remedy the evils that were afterwards removed by Parliamentary reform, Roman Catholic emancipation, and by the establishment of the principles of Free Trade. His patriotism was pure, lofty, and jealous. He was loyal to the Throne, but, though acrid and ungenial, he was also a warm friend of the people. There have been on the bead-roll of English Ministers men more popular, more kindly, more generous, but none more able, more straightforward, or more worthy of the high position he held, than the great, the disinterested, the severe William Pitt.

The biographies of the great lawyer, Eldon, and the great soldier, Wellington, in a work of this kind we cannot but consider as a mistake. The object of Mr. Ewald, however, may have been to show how men may be educated in politics, may work their way to a high position in Parliament, may be raised to power, and yet be wanting in those qualities of prescience, judgment, soundness of decision, and well-balanced sympathy, which go to make the typical statesman.

Whilst offering every tribute of praise to Wellington's de-

votion to duty,[1] Mr. Ewald indulges in some severe criticisms touching the political conduct of the Great Duke, and especially with regard to his desertion of Canning. If Canning is not Mr. Ewald's political hero, he is certainly depicted in these pages in the most flattering colours. He was, according to our author, in the first rank as a politician, a statesman, and an orator. He did nothing which he did not adorn. The chief features in his career are his loyalty to Pitt, his dislike of Addington, and his consistent advocacy of R. C. emancipation. To Pitt, Canning was united by every tie of friendship and gratitude, and when he saw at a season of grave crisis a political mediocrity like Addington usurp the place and power of the "heaven-born Minister," his indignation knew no bounds. Addington was the son of a physician, and the wags had nicknamed him "the Doctor;" this title was now to be made the most of by Canning in many a bitter squib. "Ridicule," said Lord Chesterfield, "if thrown by a skilful hand, will stick for ever." From the full quiver of Canning's satire, these were two-barbed arrows—

Old Rome in times of danger sought
Dictators from the plough,
And prosper'd; we in England take
A different practice now;
For when compell'd with modern France
And Buonaparte to wrestle,
We borrow our Dictator from
The mortar and the pestle.

AN INSCRIPTION.

As sick in her cradle poor Britain was laid
Between two silly nurses that rock'd her,
O Pitt! she exclaim'd, prithee haste to my aid,
Or you see I shall die of the doctor.

Of all the politicians of his time Canning was the one who pre-eminently distinguished himself in his advocacy of "Catholic relief." No one more rejoiced than he that we had separated from the Church of Rome, and had purified our Church from Papal glosses and corruptions; but he failed to see that there was sufficient in the creed of the Roman Catholic to justify Protestants in denouncing Popery as incompatible with the discharge of the duties of a good and loyal subject. He, therefore,

[1] "I was marvellously struck," writes Charles Greville in his Memoirs, after a ride through St. James's Park with the Duke of Wellington, "with the profound respect with which the Duke was treated . . . . every appearance of his inspiring great reverence." Mr. Ewald tells a good story of a boy dining with the Duke (it was his valet's son); after dinner, the Duke said, "Now, go to your father, be a good boy—*do your duty.*"

considered the exclusion of the Papist as unjust, and not to be persevered in. He held that by emancipation the discontent in Ireland would cease, and that, therefore, it was not only just, but sound policy to press the legislature to pass the measure. Such were his views, and whether they were right or wrong, or have been justified by subsequent events, he consistently maintained them. Within a few months after his death, those who had opposed him found themselves compelled to maintain his views, and to pass the measure he had so strenuously supported. Discontent in Ireland, however, has certainly not ceased.

Few statesmen have so rapidly declined in the estimation of public opinion as Sir Robert Peel, termed the representative of expediency. Sir Robert's mind lacked those statesmanlike gifts which can to a certain extent anticipate the course of events. He was always being led and not leading; now he was under the wand of Lord Eldon, then he was the fond disciple of the Great Duke, and, again, he was led by the country instead of giving it a policy and directing its issues. It is a curious fact that in every one of the great measures with which the name of Peel is connected he was indebted to others. Mr. Horner had introduced the Currency Bill, it had been opposed by Peel, then it had been advocated by him, and, finally, it was by Peel and not by Horner that the Bill became law. Canning had warmly fought for Catholic emancipation, Peel had as warmly opposed it; yet it was through Peel, and not through Canning, that the Papists obtained relief. Cobden had upheld Free Trade, Peel had laughed it to scorn; yet it was by Peel, and not by Cobden, that the Corn Laws were abolished. Were the terrible sneers of the then Mr. Disraeli wholly unjustified? Was not the political career of Peel "one long appropriation clause?" Did he not see the Whigs bathing, and steal their clothes? Was he not a man "who never originated an idea;" a mere watcher of the atmosphere—"a man who, as he says himself, takes his observations, and when he finds the wind veers towards a certain quarter trims to suit it?" Was he any more a great statesman than the man who gets behind a carriage is a great whip? "Both may perhaps get a good place," laughed his terrible assailant, "but how far the original momentum is indebted to their powers, and how far their guiding prudence regulates the lash or the rein it is not necessary for me to notice."

Sir Robert Peel [writes Mr. Ewald] has been stigmatised by many as a "turncoat" and a "traitor," but to those who carefully study his political career, he will appear more in the light of a conscientious convert than of a self-seeking apostate.[1] That he was a statesman in

[1] To Sir Robert's "high tone of honour, his love for truth, and the purity and disinterestedness of his ambition," Mr. Ewald does full justice.

the highest sense of the word—in the sense of a man whose genius offers a practical creed to his party, who inspires his followers with the spirit of his ideas, and whose tact and temper keep even discordant elements in harmony—it is idle, in the face of such open changes of opinion, to attempt to make Sir Robert Peel appear. There are authors who only want originality for their works to be brilliant successes. Give them a plot or a leading idea, and their beauty of style, their knowledge of human nature, and their powers of description will create a novel or a play which will deeply interest all its readers or spectators. What such men are in literature Sir Robert Peel was in politics. Give him a policy, and none knew better than he how to make it acceptable to his followers, how to excite the approval of the country, and how to work upon the sympathies and prejudices of the House of Commons. . . . . The purely receptive character of the intellect of Sir Robert Peel failed to raise him to the position of a great statesman, but his abilities, his eloquence, his powers of debate, his subtle knowledge of all the strategies of political warfare have caused him instead to be handed down to posterity as the greatest member of Parliament, next to Walpole, that England has ever seen.

Of all the monographs contained in these volumes, the one which in our opinion is the best done is the sketch of Lord Palmerston. The author calls him the "English Minister," and he has certainly grasped those characteristics of the statesman in his portrait which we identify with the English nation. We see Lord Palmerston depicted as we all love to remember him—as the man who hates shuffling and double dealings, who speaks out his mind and acts up to his words, who will "stand no nonsense," and declines to be intimidated, who is a thorough Englishman in his tastes and ways of thought; an earnest partisan, but not so earnest as to forget that he is an English gentleman first and a politician afterwards. It is like feeling the breezes of the moorland after a confinement in a hot-house, to read how stout "Old Pam," when Foreign Secretary, stood up to France in the different disputes that arose, and silenced her "swagger;" how frankly he refused to let her interfere with Egypt or with Belgian independence; how plain was his language of disapproval with regard to the iniquitous Spanish marriages, and how throughout the long period during which he held the seals he never permitted the England he so dearly loved to be slighted by a foreign Power, or anything that could minister to the comfort and welfare of her people to escape his attention. "The history of Lord Palmerston," says Mr. Ewald, "is that of a man who attained to power and kept it, not by a birth more illustrious than that of many of his contemporaries, nor by an industry which was insatiable, nor by talents of the very highest order: but because his patriotism was undaunted, his honour and good faith undoubted, his tact consummate, his knowledge of the world accurate and varied, his sympathy with the people over whom

he ruled ready, sincere, and never at fault—because in tastes and characteristics he was the most representative Englishman of his day. On the list of our Premiers he will be remembered as he himself would wish to be remembered, not as the greatest, but as the most English of our statesmen."

ART. IV.—CHURCH MISSIONARY SOCIETY—ITS EARLY DIFFICULTIES.

IT is one of the great advantages of such a Magazine as THE CHURCHMAN, that it supplies a means of communication through which facts may be elicited. I have experienced this advantage since the publication in the October Number of my Article on the origin of the Church Missionary Society. I have received two letters from valued friends, pointing out that in tracing the early history of the movement I did not go back far enough, as the idea had originated long before the formation of the Society with that eminent servant of God, the Rev. Charles Simeon. So far back as the year 1788 the subject of missions lay very near his heart. There were at that time some devoted men in India, the Rev. David Brown, Mr. Chambers, Mr. Grant, and Mr. Udny, who were anxious to establish a mission in India, and having heard of Mr. Simeon's zealous labours at Cambridge, wrote to him requesting him to act for them in England. This letter Mr. Simeon carefully preserved to the end of his life, and in the year 1830 he endorsed it with the words, "It merely shows how early God enabled me to act for India,—to provide for which it has now for forty-two years been a principal and incessant object of my care and labour." In a subsequent letter he was requested to send out two missionaries, Mr. Grant undertaking to provide 300 rupees a month for their support; but whether no missionaries could be found, or whether obstacles were interposed by Government, we do not know: all we know is that for some reason or other nothing was done. But when men are called of God to a great and important service they do not give up because of difficulties, and accordingly we find Mr. Simeon at a clerical meeting, held at Rauceby, seven years afterwards, earnestly pleading for missions. A gentleman had left 4000*l.* "to be laid out to the best advantage of the interests of true religion." Once more the missionary work was proposed, and two years afterwards a letter was actually written to the Bishop of London to ascertain whether he would ordain a missionary to the heathen, if a suitable person were put before him? But the Bishop declined, and again for the time the effort failed.

But the discouragement did not come altogether from