exercise—and of course the display—so with the saint: religion was a method rather than a comfort. "The health of the body is preserved by exercise," wrote Thomas Taylor, "so is the health of the soul by the exercise of grace." He went on to describe the arduous method of self-examination. "Sanctification is a continual act and proceeding..."—a continual effort. Similarly, grace was an exercise and not a pleasurable, soul-filling ecstasy. Similarly again, gentility was no longer a status confidently assumed; there was the difficult matter of observing the proprieties and diligently, day after day, carrying out the correct tasks. The activity of the gentleman acquired a new precision at the same time as his person became more difficult to define. The same can be said of the saint; and in the amalgamation of sainthood and gentility can be seen that reinforcement of self-esteem and confidence which made possible (and which was expressed in) the diligently "reforming" activity of the pious magistrate.

There were gentlemen enough, of course, who took their natural superiority entirely for granted, without anxiety and without any noticeable diligence in their activity. Many country squires would have agreed with Viscount Conway's summary of their prerogatives: "We eat and drink and rise up to play and this is to live like a gentleman, for what is a gentleman but his pleasure?..." Nor did the social how-to-do-it literature require anywhere near so arduous a self-discipline as was demanded by the Puritan method. Brathwait, indeed, had a gift only for the platitudinous; his four-hundred-fifty page book makes Shakespeare's Polonius appear a model of wit. Along with a certain puritanical piety, he added only proximity to the older humanist idealism; his real importance lay with his audience, assiduously gathering the elements of respectability from his text. There was an alternative outcome of sixteenth-century humanism, however, even less compatible with Puritan discipline; this was best revealed in Henry Peacham's Complete Gentleman (1622), which may be taken as a character of the future Cavalier. Peacham emphasized the importance of education, but he had little to say about the practical activity of the gentleman; hence education for him culminated in external accomplishment and display rather than in humanist civility or in anything resembling Puritan magistracy. The object of learning was something very near to personal development; it quite clearly was not the service of God. More than this, it was a fine sense of personal worth and a trained capacity for adventure that he required of his complete gentleman and not a conscientious concern with duty—founded, as among the Puritans, upon a certainty of personal worthlessness or at least upon some more vague sense of social or spiritual inadequacy.

Peacham's book dealt only briefly with the public role of the gentleman. In this sense, the Cavalier, for all his culture and accomplishment, was something of an anachronism long before the period of Jacobitism and romantic decline. For the aristocracy of the seventeenth century was increasingly defined by its public activity. This was the period of the rise on the continent, under the auspices of royal absolutism, of aristocratic military and administrative castes. And it was the period in England when the parliamentary gentlemen and the Justice of the Peace reached peak of their importance. The Cavalier was too much a cultivated and adventurous individual to feel at ease in a world of prosaic or pious officialdom. He did have something in common, however, with the new ideal types of the continental aristocracy. At court and in the military castes a corporate sense of pride was cultivated which, in fact, closely resembled the Cavalier's more personal sense of honor and worth. In general, it may be argued that with Cavalier and army officer alike, honor took the place that conscience filled in the pure type of the Christian gentleman. And honor was related only indirectly to civic or religious

---

57 Taylor, Progress of Saints, pp. 80-81, 809.
59 See discussion of honor morality in Kelsor, English Gentleman, pp. 96ff. Berkhart describes honor as "that enigmatic mixture of conscience and egotism..."
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duty; it involved, instead, a personal, familial, or corporate sense of dignity and courage; it required the graceful display of those attributes conventionally assumed to belong to aristocracy. Conscience, on the other hand, dictated and presumably directed the acting out of inner goodness. The two were not, of course, entirely distinct: some sense of duty developed alongside the nervous egotism of the Renaissance courtier; and the reformed magistrate, for all his sober piety, did not surrender a certain pride of place and a considerable flair for self-dramatization. Conscience and egotism, piety and honor—all four had their place in the formation of the rigorous social and moral codes of the new administrative and military elites. This is especially evident in any examination of the continental officers’ corps that had its origin in the seventeenth century. However, the stereotyped honor of the court clique and the military caste did not make for independent political activity. Wounded honor was satisfied in the duel; injured conscience led to political opposition.

The Cavalier, in summary, was less a divine instrument than a courtly ornament and if at times an ornament of courage and prowess, then also an ornament of conversation, personal beauty, and erotic attraction. These last were simply ignored in the Puritan literature, which always disparaged the values of personality and wit. What is more important, they were absent also from the conduct literature in which the ideal of the Christian gentleman was developed. Throughout the pamphlets and treatises the impact of seriousness is apparent; it came eventually to be thought a character trait of the English. And seriousness combined with a peculiar style of personal effacement: “Let us therefore be persuaded,” Stephen Marshall told the members of the Long Parliament at Pym’s funeral, “to use men as God’s instruments, but build nothing upon them . . .”

which often survives in the modern man after he has lost . . . faith, love, and hope.” Renaissance, p. 265.

61 See G. A. Craig, The Politics of the Prussian Army, 1640-1945 (Oxford, 1955), pp. 11, 16. Craig quotes the following description of the officer corps under Frederick II, p. 16n.: “The officers are always prepared for the ‘renunciation of all personal advantage, of all gain, of all comfort—yes, of all desire if only honor remain! On the other hand, every sacrifice for this, for their King, for their fatherland, for the honor of Prussian weapon! In their hearts, duty and loyalty, for their own lives, no concern!’”


The century before 1640 can be regarded as the time of the gentleman’s education: in “city-arts,” in “the new art of gentilizing,” in the godly method and finally in “parliament-craft.” Pym, Hampden, Cromwell—such men were the products of this education. The how-to-do-it books were a part of their training: so were the Puritan sermons; so, in fact, was the whole wide range of published works, so tremendously expanded by the early seventeenth century and including by 1620 the ancestor of the modern newspaper. Significantly, it was the new men and the saints who sought to know the “news.” The readers of the weekly pamphlets of the twenties were characterized by an antagonistic court poet in a revealing bit of doggerel: “. . . the ‘prentices, new maids, and rich, wealth-wit’d Loobies . . .” 63 Ben Jonson satirized the gentleman in search of information and gossip in his play The Staple of News and described the fledgling Puritan statesman in an epigram “The New Crie:”

Ere cherries ripe, and straw-berries be gone
Unto the cries of London Ile add one;
Ripe statesman, ripe: They grow in every street.
At sise and twentye, ripe . . .
The councils, projects, practises they know
And what each prince doth for intelligence owe,
And unto whom
They carry in their pocket Tacitus
And the Gazetti, or Gallo-Belgicus . . .
. . . And they know,
If the States make peace, how it will goe
With England. All forbidden booke they get,
And of the poulder-plot they will talk yet.
At naming the French King, their heads they shake
And at the Pope, and Spaine slight faces make.
Or ’gainst the Bishops, for the Brethren, raile . . .

The Gallo-Belgicus was a yearbook reporting the news of the continental religious struggles; it was succeeded in the 1630’s by the Swedish Intelligencer which described news of even greater interest.
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Cromwell apparently conformed his lessons in 
strategy from the *Intelligencer's* detailed accounts of Gustavus' 
German campaigns. This too was a form of education. Interpreting the account of Jonson, we find that "new statesmen" 
with the Puritan "brethren." Upstarts both, they were bound 
together by more than their mutual sense of newness. Puritanism 
was functionally related to the politics of public opinion, even 
when it did not provide its actual content. Like the handbooks 
and the compilations, but far more importantly, the literature 
of the clerical intellectuals taught the "new statesmen" a style. 
Serious endeavor and self-control, the intellectuals' response to 
disorder in the social and religious world, were the primary 
elements of this style and both were appropriate to men in the process 
of achieving a new place for themselves in the world of affairs— 
making their way through the universities, into the city, into 
Parliament. There is a close historical correlation between the 
political development of the English Commons and the spread of 
Puritan piety: the men who connived at the committee system, 
insisted on a say in foreign policy and fastened a hold on the national 
purse were above all serious men and serious in the Puritan sense, 
their egos and their consciences inseparable. They or their 
kin or their friends or their supporters—perhaps all together— 
took notes at sermons, consulted with the ministers, and recorded 
in their diaries their daily sense of accomplishment and failure. 
All this was education, too. Braced by their contact with Calvin's 
God, imagining themselves to be his instruments, country gentlemen and city merchants and lawyers learned to be parliamentary 
statesmen.

This process is crucially important and needs to be described 
in much greater detail than is possible here. In one sense, parliamentary politics was only the "reflection" of the solidity and seriousness of the new gentry. Just as the clerical saints imagined a church 
rulled by men like themselves, sincere, learned, conscientious intellectuals governing purely by the Word and not requiring the 
support of sensual garments, ritual or art, so the Christian gentleman constructed his politics from the elements of his character and his interests. The pious magistrate was a rural judge or a member of Parliament, raised up in the universities and preached at endlessly in the name of God and public service. Soon enough he produced a commonwealth governed by men like himself, diligent parliamentarians, lawyers, and judges—and godly major-generals—who did not require the symbolic accoutrements of power, for whom the book and the sword sufficed. Milton spoke for 
both groups, ministers and gentry, when he denounced not only the "costly and dear-bought scandals and snares of images, pictures, rich copes, gorgeous altar cloths . . ." but also "the dissolute and haughty court . . . of vast expense and luxury." Devotion and talent were best symbolized by a plain black suit and a modest manner. Thus the older humanist tradition of civility survived but was transformed by the impact of Calvinist piety and discipline. Milton, in a way, was the embodiment of both. It was the fusion of the two also in the character of the English gentleman that provided the intellectual and spiritual basis for political opposition.

But opposition in practice required something else, some more special preparation—a peculiar certainty, a willfulness, almost a fanaticism. This was exclusively a Puritan product, the result of an intense, disciplined response to deeply felt anxieties, to some secular form of the ministers' "unsettledness." When the gentleman's nervous self-esteem took the form of sainthood, when he saw himself an instrument of God, then his pious willfulness set him free from traditional political controls. So the ministers had been set free in the 1580's and had laid the foundations of radical politics. "In pursuit of their aims," writes J. E. Neale, "they taught the House of Commons methods of concerted action and propaganda. Indeed, the art of opposition . . . was largely learnt from them or inspired by them." By the 1640's, this art had been widely diffused through lay society and the philosophical or theological principles that might have limited its use had been


65 See the preface to the second part of *The Swedish Intelligencer* (London, 1693); the author writes that "God has begun to send a deliverer unto his people" and that to bring this news to "well-affected Englishmen . . . was next unto the preaching of the Gospel." On Cromwell, see Firth, *Oliver Cromwell*, pp. 89-90.
worn away. More than this, a large number of laymen had been trained in the Puritan congregations who saw in the art of opposition an inescapable duty.

"If we have the honor to be God's instruments," Edward Corbett told the Commons in 1642, "we must do the office of instruments and be active ... we must go along with Providence." But the "office of instruments" included many duties which the office of a member of Parliament did not traditionally include. The persistent invasions of the royal prerogative by Puritan parliamentarians were probably the acts of instruments more often than of members—though for many men the two identities fused, each strengthening the other. Thus Peter Wentworth, a country gentleman from Northamptonshire imprisoned in 1591 for his attacks upon the Queen's prerogative, asked the privy councilors how else he could have behaved—"the Lord opening a clear view thereof to mine eyes, and I being a Parliament man?" They had no choice, thought the Puritan member Dalton; they must "proceed orderly to the discharge of their own consciences in making law." And "let them care for the rest whom it behooveth." Without some such attitude, radical politics is probably inconceivable. Oliver Cromwell at least would never have acted as he did—so he told the First Protectorate Parliament in September 1654—had God not again opened a "clear view." Not as a Cambridgeshire gentleman but only as a saint could he rule England. "I called not myself to this place." But the Lord had "most clearly by His Providence" put power into Oliver's hands and not until the providences were clear again could he yield it up.

This extraordinary sense of religious vocation, reinforcing secular reasons for opposition to the crown, can be seen at work in three different aspects of parliamentary life: in elections, in political organization, and in the religious "exercises" that were so crucial to revolutionary activity in the 1640's. This can only be outlined here; they deserve to be examined much more carefully—perhaps through a number of biographical studies of the political saints in which the delicate task of weighing the impact of religious zeal might be undertaken. For the moment, it can only be suggested that in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries radical innovation in politics (especially when this involved the cooperation of numbers of men) was inconceivable without the moral support of religion—and that religion probably provided the major incentive for innovation.

(1) Elections. Since the divine instruments (except for Oliver) were in fact elected by men, Puritan preachers tended to infuse the election process with a religious purpose. They appealed to the seriousness of the electors: the "holy choice" was to be made with "religious care," preached Thomas Adams, and only after a period of "public devotion." Adams' intention was to overcome or at least call into doubt the old ties of family and patronage. He could hardly have been successful in 1625; what is important is that the intention was present, working its way into the consciousness of the voters. The preacher warned against the casual assumption of office by the son of the previous incumbent: "Nature is regular in the brute creatures; eagles do not produce cravens ... But in man she fails ... Children do often resemble their parents in face and feature, not in heart and qualities ..." Similarly, John Preston insisted that "it is an error among men to think that in the election of burgesses ... [they] may please their friends or themselves ..." Preston described the way instruments might be chosen who would be free, under God and the discipline of conscience, to act for the public good. The electors, he wrote, "ought to keep their minds single and free from all respects; so that when they come to choose, they might choose him whom in their own consciences and in the sight of God, they think fittest for the place ..." Had he lived, the Puritan leader would undoubtedly have been pleased with the report that Isaac Pennington was elected to Parliament by the London Common Hall in 1640 because of his "known zeal, by his keeping a fasting Sabbath ..." This was an election, presumably, in the godly manner—and it also suggests the nature of Puritan campaigning.

70 Quoted in Neale, Elizabeth I and Her Parliaments: 1559-1581 (New York, 1933), p. 213 (emphasis added).
72 Adams, Holy Choice, pp. 56-57, 69.
To insure such a choice as Preston described it was necessary to make the election a public proceeding and godliness a political issue. The Elizabethan Puritan Job Throckmorton told his constituents that he "would not have this matter [the parliamentary election] huddled up in a corner, as most of your matters be." He would not, in other words, have elections settled through old-fashioned familial negotiation. In the seventeenth century the spread of political consciousness made it increasingly difficult to "huddle up" the choice of M.P.'s. Elections became instead occasions for the assertion by the gentry of their new public spiritedness and their new godliness. When John Pym rode through England in 1640 promoting the election of "puritanical brethren" he was acting out a conception of political activity that had had a long development. That same year the "ripe statesmen" whom Ben Jonson once satirized were vividly present at the London elections. The result of all this activity, a Puritan preacher suggested, was that the members of the Long Parliament represented "laconically and by way of abridgement, the piety and holiness . . . of a kingdom"—and not the leading subjects merely or the dominant interests.74

(2) Political organization. As familial and personal loyalties were not to influence elections, so hierarchy was not to limit the zeal of elected representatives. Only action, the ministers taught, "makes us instruments of God's glory." In order that action might be free, the parity of ministers found its political parallel in the equality of magistrates. "The conscience of the monarch and the conscience of the inferior judges are equally under subjection to the King of Kings," wrote Samuel Rutherford, "for there is here a co-ordination of consciences, and no subordination . . . it is not in the power of the inferior judge to judge . . . as the king commandeth him . . ."75 This is another example of the leveling power of the Calvinist God. At the same time, it was exaltation indeed for rural J.P.'s, city aldermen and members of Parliament and it made possible new sorts of organization among them. Like the ministerial conferences and the Puritan congregations, these new organizations were based upon the mutual recognition of equality and dignity. They committed men to coordinated activity and generated new patterns of trust and loyalty appropriate to the difficult and dangerous work of the lay saints.

Among the parliamentary Puritans of the seventeenth century there already existed a complex system of matrimonial alliances. In part, this system was the outcome of Puritan separatism: the saints would have nothing to do, and would permit their children to have as little as possible to do, with the ungodly. But, of course, the Puritan "party" was also, quite simply, an association of relatives and it was undoubtedly strengthened by familial loyalty. What was new about the Puritan parliamentarians, however, was that they were strengthened also in a very different way. Alongside the old-fashioned matrimonial alliances they developed associations more like those with which the ministers had experimented in the 1580's—just as, alongside the traditional parliamentary ritual, they produced new "exercises" of commitment which resembled the religious exercises of the Puritan congregation. The Solemn Oath and Covenant was typical of the new associations; it was conceived as a parallel to the Old Testament covenant of the lay saints. Puritanism and the Gentry 261

The public fast was the most important of the religious "exercises" that Puritans turned into a kind of political propaganda. Pym moved a day of national fast at the
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opening of Parliament in 1626, but the members voted the celebration only for themselves. Even so, it was a significant act, a deliberate effort to arouse emotion and already a feature of oppositional politics. Stephen Marshall in 1648 complained that before the revolution "sometimes a dozen, sometimes more years passed in this land and kingdom without any public fasts..." Throughout the revolutionary period fasts were held monthly and were accompanied by sermons and prayer meetings.

Days of "solemn prayer" were also the occasions for public and private "exercises" designed to stimulate religious zeal and political activity. Before going to London for the meeting of the Short Parliament in 1640, Sir Robert Harley "kept a day" with his family, praying for guidance. A short time later his wife reported again: "We at Brompton kept the day... to our God for his direction of the Parliament. I believe that hierarchy must down and I hope now."80 Years later, in 1649, when monarchy went down as well, the remaining parliamentarians (Harley not among them), the army officers and the king's judges were stimulated and sustained by days of "public humiliation," fasts, and frequent prayer meetings. All this obviously tended to reinforce devotion to the cause, to calm the consciences of men doing terrible and dangerous deeds. The Long Parliament carried on its business in an atmosphere frequently marked by religious excitement and its accomplishments are hardly to be explained without taking that excitement into account.

Puritan electioneering, the equality of magistrates, parliamentary association, and the religious "exercises"—these derived from the conception of the official as an instrument of God. They illustrate the role of Puritan piety in the education of the parliamentary gentleman. Taken together, given their maximum impact, however, they clearly reach beyond the gentleman, for all his serious ambition and his conscientious self-esteem. They suggest one of the most fundamental doctrines of radical politics: that men unwilling to be instruments have no right—whatever their social status—to be magistrates. Pym's Association of 1621 would have excluded from office anyone who refused the prescribed oath. The parliamentary purges of the 1640's were undertaken in the same spirit: it was necessary, preached George Hughes to the Commons in 1647, "to honor God's kingdom so much as to make gross sin uncapable of membership among you."81 Even in Elizabeth's England, a daring Puritan preacher, the Welsh evangelist John Penry, had argued a similar doctrine. Addressing himself to the Queen's Lord President of Wales, Penry wrote: "If it lie not in you to bring Wales unto the knowledge of God, or if your leisure will not serve thereto, then be not the Lord President thereof." It belonged to the "essence" of his calling, Penry went on, to see the true religion preached. Men "have no allowance to be rulers where the Lord is not served..."82 This was surely no more than a logical development of the Puritan doctrine of vocation; yet, just as obviously, it called the identity of gentleman and saint into question.

The Commons, after all, was a class organization; the Christian gentleman might expect to behave with all due piety when he was a member and thus vindicate his gentility. He did not expect, however he behaved, to be excluded from membership. The purge of the Long Parliament and the dissolution of the Rump were thus revolutionary acts; yet they were also acts of godly gentlemen—functioning as instruments rather than as members. At this point, however, the two identities could no longer be joined and men had to choose. Those who were, in Cromwell's words, "gentlemen, and nothing more" went home.83 The places left vacant had then to be filled with other men, saints without breeding. When Lazarus Seaman told the members of the House of Commons in 1644 that "the supply of our king's failings are expected at your hands," he was stating a principle obviously capable of extension.84 So the supply of the aristocracy's failings would be filled from among other social groups.

82 John Penry, An Exhortation unto the Governors and People of Her Majesty's County of Wales (n.p., 1586), pp. 16-18.
83 Letters and Speeches, I, 135.
84 Lazarus Seaman, Solomon's Choice: or, A Precedent for Kings and Princes and All that are in Authority (London, 1644), p. 40.
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The initial Puritan effort had been to turn gentlemen and magistrates into saints "to convert great men." "If they were once converted, hundreds would follow their example." But in the course of the revolution this effort was at least partially reversed: in effect the ministers called upon the saints, gentle and ungentle alike, to become magistrates, to make themselves, like those Puritan angels, "serviceable to God." Sainthood blurred the distinction between public and private men, for the saint's conscience was God's writ and imposed public duties. "If you be of a private station," preached William Bridge in 1641, "yet you ought to be of a public spirit." There were many "wearisome tasks" to be performed; soldiers in the army and merchants in London alike had public roles to fill if God was to be served. So the saints prepared. When the future Colonel Hutchinson of Cromwell's army heard of the quarrels between king and Parliament, he retired to his study—so his wife relates—"applied himself to understand the things then in dispute, and read all the papers that came forth . . . besides many other private treatises . . . Hereby he became . . . convinced in conscience of the righteousness of the Parliament's cause . . ." The same papers and treatises that Hutchinson read in his country home were read also in the London rooms of the future Colonel Harrison; he was as convinced in conscience and as ready to act. But Harrison was not a gentleman.

The consciences of the saints, like those of the godly magistrates, were equal and "co-ordinate"—"so shall not the conscience of him that commandeth be anymore a sovereign judge over him that obeyeth," wrote a "religious gentleman" in 1601, "then shall the conscience of him that obeyeth be sovereign judge over him that commandeth." If this did not involve actual participation in decision-making, it obviously suggested the saint's right to know the grounds of decisions made and to be convinced. Like Jonson's statesmen, the saints sought knowledge; scrupulous consciences

Model's officers' corps was drawn from the gentry). "But seeing it was necessary the work must go on, better plain men than none; but best to have men patient of wants, faithful and conscientious in their employment." He was describing here the same ideal figure that had appeared so often in Puritan sermons as the pious magistrate, not the man of valor, magnanimity, or personal cultivation, but the man "conscientious in employment." In a sense, the revolution itself was the culmination of a historical process that had long tended toward the creation of such men and had steadily set them in opposition to courtiers and old aristocrats. When the struggle between these two groups finally broke out, leaders like Cromwell were faced with the need to recruit a new magistracy (and a new soldiery) for the reformation and purification of the commonwealth. It was not to be a recruitment at random, for Cromwell thought the marks of the godly a "serious business," worthy of sustained intellectual consideration and even of definition. He came near to suggesting a heraldry for the saints: "May not this character, this stamp [of God] bear equal poise with any hereditary interest that could furnish, or hath furnished, in the common law or elsewhere, matter of dispute and trial of learning?"

It was true, then, as a Puritan minister said, that the calling of the Long Parliament "opened many mouths." It created new public men—though always from the ranks of those who had been shaped in the Puritan mold. For insofar as the new men became active in English politics, they adjusted themselves to the type of the pious magistrate. The typical revolutionary figure was still the magistrate and not yet the citizen; still the gentleman and not yet the sans-culotte. If proof were needed, the haste of the successful saints to buy land—not only for speculation but also in order to settle in the country and enter local gentry society—would be sufficient. Once established in the country, they undoubtedly thanked God for their triumph, worried in pious diaries over their worthiness, consulted a godly minister and ran for office. They conned Scripture for justification, attended the assizes and did their duty with methodical thoroughness. They were only the latest in a long line of ambitious men, serious, self-absorbed, their backs turned to the court, their faces, so they thought, to the Almighty. From their ranks came "statesmen" capable of purging a Parliament and killing a king. But in all this their models were godly gentlemen and they were inspired and driven forward by pious divines like Hugh Peter—himself of gentle birth. After the clerical insurrection of the 1570's and '80's, it was nowhere true, except among the Levellers and the more extreme sects, that the ungentle took the lead or developed new political forms. It was rather men like Cromwell who felt most deeply the impact of Puritan thought. Such men combined their conscience and their office and became something very near to lay ministers. The saint was the gentleman's alter ego and even when he was in fact a different person, the connection was always close. In a nice comparison, Cromwell set the "courage and resolution" of the Cavalier gentry against the "spirit" of the Puritan saints. In battle, surely in politics, he thought, the men of spirit were "likely to go as far as gentlemen will go." It was, indeed, for this very reason that England's revolution was also a fratricidal civil war.

84 "And if once landlords," wrote Gerard Winstanley, "then they rise to be justices, rulers and state governors, as experience shows." Quoted in Christopher Hill, Puritanism and Revolution (London, 1958), p. 156. See the discussion on land purchase during the revolution, pp. 156ff., 181ff.
85 Letters and Speeches, III, 249–50.