

The Bishop again animadvert upon Lord Ma-  
caulay for the picture which he has drawn of the  
clergy as they were 200 years ago.—Every one,  
who knows anything about the history of that  
period, knows that the great historian has under-  
stated, not overstated, his admirable representation  
of a class of men, not, perhaps, utterly defunct as  
regards the main points of their character even in  
the present day. Can we suppose that the great-  
est writers of the last century have drawn incor-  
rect or unnatural representations of the clergy?  
Can we imagine that such shrewd, accurate and  
acute observers of life and manners as Dean Swift,  
Fielding, Goldsmith, &c., &c., would delineate  
them incorrectly? Have we not all read of Par-  
sons, Adams, Trulliber, Thwackum, &c., and the  
Vicar of Wakefield, and him who was “passing  
rich on forty pounds a-year?”

There is a certain class of men who are always  
ready to come down upon you with texts of scrip-  
ture, twisted and wrested from the context to suit  
their own particular purposes. I hope I need not  
say that I condemn any such practice. In this  
manner it has been asserted that Bishops should be  
given to hospitality. That they should not be the  
entertainers of wealth and fashion, to the exclusion  
of honest rectitude of character. That they should  
remember that the incomes which they enjoy  
should be spent upon their diocese, not upon them-  
selves and families. The great divine of the Ana-  
logy enjoyed for some years the princely revenues  
of the See of Durham. During that period he built  
and repaired churches, constructed bridges, assist-

ed the  
gy, w  
found  
benefi  
seem  
a-day  
  
I ha  
Lords  
even  
treat  
(howe  
they c  
my be  
gener  
tle ha  
comm  
canno  
nestly  
ter” a  
some  
and  
there  
terly  
is in  
sage  
have  
readi  
but th  
and l  
as fol  
cast  
exam