As the previous chapter made clear, Gladstone’s St Deiniol’s foundation was neither a straightforward outgrowth of his political liberalism, an attempt at self-memorialization, nor an altruistic contribution to the public library movement. Instead, despite his reticence on the subject of its purpose, all the indications which Gladstone gave to close friends and family suggested a central religious motivation. For instance, Algernon West recorded in his diaries during a visit to Hawarden in 1891 that: ‘Mr. Gladstone was rather in a pessimistic frame of mind on the state of society and was not, he said, over-sanguine as to the continuance of belief, and feared that the “seen,” such as riches and luxuries, was eclipsing the “unseen.”

The best way he knew to combat such dangers was to encourage reading, and with this sense of duty before him he was trying to found a library in Hawarden, where he hoped there would some day be 40,000 volumes.\(^1\)

Despite such evidence, uncertainty has persisted concerning the exact nature of both the library’s religious impetus and mission. The unsettled debate about Gladstone’s theological views and ecclesiastical alliances in the 1880s and 90s has been a contributory factor, as has the ambiguity which surrounded Gladstone’s foundation and its early history. In order to begin to explain some of these uncertainties, we need to return to Oxford in the year 1868.
‘A real home’

On St Mark’s day, 1868, the foundation stone of Keble College, Oxford was laid. As early as 1845 a scheme had been discussed for a new Oxford foundation on religious lines, but it remained unimplemented until the death of John Keble in 1867. Plans were henceforth put into motion, formulated and spearheaded by Edward Pusey, who used the occasion of the foundation to voice his fears for the future of religion in Oxford, and his somewhat lofty and austere hopes for the college.² June 1870 saw the official opening of Keble, the marriage of Edward Talbot and Lavinia Lyttelton, and Talbot’s installation as warden. It was, in the words of Pusey, ‘an act of faith’.³

On 13 November 1872, Gladstone began his first visit to the new college, renewing his acquaintance with both Pusey and Liddon, recording that the former: ‘behaved with all his old kindness and seemed to have forgotten the Temple business, or rather as if it had never been’⁴. More importantly, Gladstone was soon struck both by Keble’s character as ‘a real home’, and as a venue for spirited academic debate,⁵ and, by the time of his next visit in November 1874, he was fully engaged with the vibrant circle that surrounded the Talbots. As Lavinia wrote enthusiastically on 9 November:

You ought to hear of the success of Uncle William’s visit – he is just gone off with every sort of hearty good wishes to us & the College. He arrived on Saturday afternoon not very well, but quite up to any amount of talk, & we had a capital Munich, Dollinger & Bonn talk, Edward & all, & then at 9 came Dr Mozley for the first of many consultations over a scheme of Uncle W’s own promoting the editorship of a series of books on eirenic writers from before the Reformation’⁶.
William Whyte has recently described Keble as ‘the culmination of the Oxford Movement’, asserting that, through Butterfield’s ‘variegated brick’, the college ‘aggressively asserted its independence from a supposedly corrupt university’. In many respects, this characterization is accurate: Pusey’s vision for Keble College had been that ‘besides a simplicity of life here, there will be a religious tone’, both appropriate to its namesake, and intimating its separateness. However, the public statement of Keble’s place and mission in Oxford was only fully realized with the official opening of the new hall and library on 25 April 1878. At this important event, alternative visions for the college’s future were articulated publicly, which draw our attention both to the uncertainty which pervaded high church circles about the future of Anglo catholicism, and to Gladstone’s forward-looking religious position.

The day began with holy communion, an occasion which Gladstone found ‘very striking’. This was followed by the library opening, lunch in hall and associated speeches, ‘mine a long one’, recorded Gladstone, ‘proposing Prosperity to Keble College’. In his address, Gladstone discussed the principles that Keble represented and, in doing so, explicitly revealed the extent to which his high churchmanship had broadened out between the 1840s and the late 1870s. He fully endorsed Pusey’s ideal of simplicity but, despite his obvious respect for John Keble’s Anglo-catholic credentials, Gladstone’s vision of the college’s future was markedly different:
It has been truly said that this is a college for special purposes, and as a college for special purposes it is open to special criticism … and ought not to shrink from that criticism. There would, in my opinion, be no greater calamity than that we should see formed in Oxford any new college characterised by fanciful peculiarities, or any new college open … to the charge of being sectarian.¹²

Gladstone had been concerned about the rise of partisanship in Oxford since the 1840s, vigorously attacking its pernicious influence in Church Principles (1840).¹³ In his 1878 Keble speech, Gladstone chose to revisit the painful tractarian split and discuss its still-contested legacy. He proposed - somewhat controversially considering the occasion - that Newman had been ‘greater than either’ Keble or Pusey in terms of his religious and intellectual influence over Oxford. However, as he went on to clarify, this influence was largely negative. Newman’s secession had not only destroyed the Oxford Movement, it had also destabilized the whole intellectual basis of Anglicanism. Newman had thought his way to Rome and then abandoned thought, and the repercussions of his mental journey had been ‘to throw all the brightest and noblest intellects of the University as wrecks upon every shore’.¹⁴

By the 1870s, Gladstone was increasingly articulating concerns about the need to rebuild Anglican’s confidence in an intellectually grounded and liberated Christianity.¹⁵ Whilst he regretted that the ways of seeking knowledge familiar to Newman, Keble, Pusey and himself, as well as the institutional frameworks in which they had been fostered, had all been undermined, he nonetheless believed that the only way forward for Anglicanism was for it to become intellectually broader and academically reinvigorated. Else it risked being destroyed by what Gladstone, and
many of his contemporaries, saw as a further assault on its intellectual foundations by an aggressively marketed scientific-agnostic world view. ‘This disposition’, he had told an audience at Liverpool College in 1872, ‘is boldly proclaimed to deal alike with root and branch, and to snap utterly the ties which, under the still venerable name of Religion, unite man with the unseen world, and lighten the struggles and the woes of life by the hope of a better land’.16 In his Keble speech he reiterated his concerns about the distrustful atmosphere in existence between academic disciplines:

The knowledge of the age, and the active and successful pursuit of some particular branches of knowledge, has led to an overestimate of their comparative importance and to a desire to invest them with a domination to which they have no title, and to a character to which they cannot pretend.17

Drawing on his understanding of the epistemological debates surrounding Hume’s appraisal of the role theory, belief, and conjecture play in the creation of systematic knowledge,18 and his faith in the efficacy of Butler’s arguments for probabiliorism,19 Gladstone defended the validity of reasoning and thinking theologically and, crucially, argued for a reconciliation between Christianity and modernity to be achieved through ecumenical co-operation. Hence the staff of Keble should not give ‘too exclusive an ecclesiastical character to the college’, and needed to realize that their institution had been set up to ‘meet … special and pressing dangers’ emanating, not from the outside, but from the inside: the insularity, backwardness and fear which cause disorientation, confusion, and the desire to create immutable truths.20 In contrast, Gladstone argued, college members should maintain religion as their
‘groundwork and centre’, but ‘around that centre ought to be grouped … every accomplishment … that can tend to the development of human nature’. He continued:

There has been noticed appropriately the notable conjunction of Keble College with the [University] museum over the way. It has been well said that they are a representation of the sacred and secular at Oxford; and if the sacred and the secular do come to be compared … Keble College would have no reason to look upon the issue with dread. But it is an illustration of the harmony which ought to prevail … between the branches of education within this great university.²¹

By adopting this conciliatory approach to truth and knowledge, Gladstone was publicly allying himself with liberal not conservative religious opinion, and, by speaking so at Keble, he was addressing an audience amongst whom were those who would seek to inaugurate the revival within Anglicanism for which Gladstone called.

**Lux Mundi**

The *Lux Mundi* group was a party of Oxford clerical friends and colleagues who met regularly to discuss theology. Originally dubbed ‘the holy party’, they became known by the title of the famous collection of theological essays which they published in 1889: *Lux Mundi*, meaning ‘the light of the world’.²² Charles Gore (1853-1932),²³ first principal of Pusey House, was the driving force behind both the group and the book, writing the preface and the eighth essay, but the majority of his associates – more than half the *Lux Mundi* contributors - were, or had been, associated with Keble: Warden Talbot, Sub-Warden Walter Lock (1846-1933), William James Heathcote Campion (1851-1892), John Richardson Illingworth (1848-1915),²⁴ Arthur Lyttelton (1852-
1903), and Aubrey Lackington Moore (1848-1890). Other group members and contributors were associated with Christ Church: Henry Scott Holland (1847-1918), Robert Campbell Moberley (1845–1903), Francis Paget (1851–1911), and Robert Lawrence Ottley (1856-1933).

Of the eleven Lux Mundi contributors, Gladstone had recorded contact with all but three and, with the exception of W. J. H. Campion, all those who had been at Keble. This interaction ranged from occasional meetings, such as that with Walter Lock whom he met at Keble in 1883, to his familiar and regular dealings with his nephew, Arthur Lyttelton. Gladstone’s comments on the group were universally positive. His diary remarks are characteristically brief, but they indicate not only personal admiration but evidence of intellectual engagement. Gladstone’s recorded opinion of Charles Gore was particularly auspicious. In January 1885, he described him as ‘a person of very great promise’, and called Lord Acton’s attention to the ‘society of twenty Tutors formed for Theological study under or with him’ at ‘the Pusey Institute’ in Oxford. Gladstone also greatly admired Talbot, who formed the vital link between Gladstone and the Lux Mundi group as a whole, describing him in 1881 as ‘a fine fellow’, and in 1884 as ‘a model of dispassionate uprightness’. Gladstone held a particularly high opinion of Talbot as a priest (in his view ‘the first of callings’), and as a preacher, having no doubt that Talbot should and would go far in the church: ‘He is excellent: & will make a mark.’ They agreed on matters of faith, and Gladstone increasingly relied on Edward’s judgment on administrative matters, especially the question of disestablishment. In 1877, after discussing the ‘pending crisis in the Church’, Gladstone recorded: ‘He can hardly be too much prized’, and, in 1881, Gladstone declared himself ‘strongly confirmed’ in his opinions ‘by E. Talbot’. In turn, Talbot regarded Gladstone as the greatest layman in the Church. He wrote to Herbert Gladstone in 1924: ‘I
preserve quite unchanged the reverence for the great Christian statesman, and the
gratitude for having been in a measure brought up at his feet’.36 He took pains to
introduce Gladstone to the work of other members of the group, giving him, for
example, a copy of Aubrey Moore’s 1883 paper entitled ‘Evolution in its relation to the
Christian Faith’, following a visit to Keble.37

Even before he was ordained, Edward had seen himself as a liberal, writing to
sister-in-law Meriel Lyttelton: ‘Be free, be liberal, be courageous!’38 He argued for the
efficacy of ‘the “broad” views of our own day’, clearly articulating the difference he
perceived between the Anglo catholicism of the first generation tractarians, and that of
his own generation. In 1917 he wrote:

There is a … difference between Keble’s time and thought and our own.
His seems so much the more solemn and searching. Yet we have gained
so much by what we have learned since the Tractarians; and they
seemed to gain their solemnity by the exclusion of much which is so
genuinely a part of Christian truth and life in fruit and application that …
we should try to retain some of the Tractarian severity (I am afraid I
don’t) while opening one’s heart to the value of freer, larger, more
instinctive things from which they shrank.39

The Lux Mundi group have been categorized as pioneers of liberal Anglicanism, firstly
because the circumstances surrounding the publication of Lux Mundi created a well-
documented rift between the contributors and the older tractarian generation,40 and
secondly, because of the substantial impact made on later theological thought by the
incarnational theology\textsuperscript{41} to which they subscribed.\textsuperscript{42} The Lux Mundi group’s interpretation of the tractarian tradition was unmistakably liberal in its impetus and emphasis. The aim of publishing their essays, in the words of Charles Gore, was ‘to attempt to put the Catholic faith into its right relation to modern intellectual and moral problems’,\textsuperscript{43} a phrase which expressed nineteenth-century religious liberalism’s central tenet, and excited opposition from many who thought that spiritual truths could be precisely stated and ought to be accorded universal assent.\textsuperscript{44} Nevertheless, the Lux Mundi essayists, like Gladstone, remained fundamentally ‘catholic’ in a very real sense - Michael Ramsey, for example, is careful to categorize their era as one in which ‘conscious doctrinal reconstruction began’ - upholding a traditional high church theology and ecclesiology, and regarding themselves as orthodox.\textsuperscript{45} However, Gladstone was also on the side of Lux Mundi when it came to Christianity’s need to forge a new relationship with modernity. As early as 1869, Gladstone had told Henry Manning: ‘I profoundly believe in a reconciliation between Christianity and the conditions of modern thought, modern life, and modern society’,\textsuperscript{46} his Liverpool speech three years later had resonated with parallel ideas,\textsuperscript{47} and his Keble address, as we have seen, strongly reinforced them. Moreover, testimony to his affiliation with Lux Mundi also came from members of the group itself. Henry Scott Holland, for example, later indicated how closely Gladstone’s religious agenda had accorded with his own and that of his associates:
If Mr. Gladstone had retained his rigid Evangelicalism, he might have contented himself with denouncing the facts as the work of the Devil. But he had read Bishop Butler. He had found the Fathers. He had absorbed the rich Creed of the Incarnation, in all its fullness, in its largeness of historical preparation, in its superb honour for flesh and blood. He was bound to respect man in his self-manifestation. Therefore, his new effort lay in reconciling his own intense belief in the Catholic Church according to the form in which it had come down to him in England, with his ever-growing sense of the sanctity of life, as it revealed itself in freedom.⁴⁸

Holland explicitly linked Gladstone with the Lux Mundi project by highlighting his incarnational theology, his flexible endorsement of catholicity in Christian doctrine, and his recognition of the importance of history.⁴⁹ Furthermore, such reminiscitory characterizations are supported by earlier annotation evidence, demonstrating Gladstone’s favourable reception and response to the theology of his most influential Lux Mundi contacts: Charles Gore and Edward Talbot.

**Charles Gore: inspiration, doctrine, and ecumenical education**

On 31 January 1890, Gladstone, once again in Oxford, first recorded reading Lux Mundi, noting his approval of ‘Gore’s Masterly paper’ therein.⁵⁰ In his Lux Mundi essay entitled: ‘The Holy Spirit and Inspiration’, Gore had addressed the question of scriptural inspiration and, controversially for one brought up a high churchman, acknowledged the claims of radical biblical criticism. Although he maintained that scripture was inspired, he asserted inspiration was not the miraculous communication of unknown facts, and did not guarantee historical truth. Furthermore, he stated that
the Old Testament was a product of its time and that the bible should be read in the spirit in which it was written.\textsuperscript{51} If there was one area in which Gladstone remained influenced by his early evangelicalism, it was his attitude to the bible, which he defended, at length, in \textit{The Impregnable Rock of Holy Scripture} (1890). Why and how, then, did he approve of Gore’s position in \textit{Lux Mundi}? The broader context of Gladstone’s 1890 Oxford visit is important for understanding his position. Whilst there, he sought to prepare \textit{The Impregnable Rock} by engaging directly with the biblical criticism that Gore welcomed. On arrival he read Gore’s essay, followed by Liddon’s condemnation of what the latter saw as Gore’s capitulation to criticism,\textsuperscript{52} as well as holding discussions with specialist biblical critics such as Samuel Rolles Driver (1846–1914) and Thomas Kelly Cheyne (1841–1915).\textsuperscript{53} When Gladstone reiterated Gore’s position on scriptural inspiration in his book, therefore, his high opinion was based, not merely on the circumstances of their social interaction, but rather on a balanced engagement with and evaluation of material from both sides of the debate.\textsuperscript{54}

Gladstone maintained this intellectual respect for Gore. In March 1893 he read his \textit{The Mission of the Church} (1892), placing an ‘+’ in his diary.\textsuperscript{55} This work further confirmed for Gladstone how different Gore was from the original tractarians, and his strenuous endorsement strongly indicates how far his own views were also distinguished from theirs. He wrote enthusiastically to his son Stephen, on 20 March 1893:
I have been reading with great delight Mr. Gore’s ‘Mission of the Church’. I do not know when I have seen so much matter in so small a book and in general so admirably stated … he ought to be advanced and I should be glad if he resigns his present employment [at Pusey House]. He is a much broader man than Dr. Pusey, with rather a different work to do – and the association with the name does him some injustice.\textsuperscript{56}

Gore’s book had consisted of four lectures given at St Asaph, Flintshire, in June 1892. Over the course of his talks, Gore expounded his vision of the church’s mission in theology and to society, and explored questions of Christian unity and Anglican responses to ‘independent and hostile opinion’. He presented a traditional, high-church interpretation of the Anglican church as fully apostolic. As claims to apostolic status depend on a conception of unbroken tradition and reliance on scriptural authority, Gore unsurprisingly stressed the importance of upholding Anglican traditions and gave the bible a prominent role throughout.\textsuperscript{57} Central to this understanding of church tradition was the system of doctrine, which summarized and defined belief. Gore identified the creeds, with their stress on the incarnation, the ministry of the Holy Spirit, the resurrection, and judgement, as the primary source of belief instruction for Anglicans. However Gore also underlined the value of the catechism, ten commandments, the Lord’s prayer, the sacraments (principally baptism and the eucharist), and, in qualified terms, the thirty-nine articles.

Gladstone’s estimation of the importance and character of Anglican doctrinal structure was very similar. He had defended the importance of doctrine in 1888, typifying it as an important ‘provision made through the Church of Christ for the
perpetual conservation and application of its living powers’. However, although he described himself as:

One altogether attached to dogma, which I believe to be the skeleton that carries the flesh, the blood, the life of the blessed thing we call the Christian religion … I do not believe God’s tender mercies are restricted to a small portion of the human family … I was myself brought up to believe that salvation depended absolutely on the reception of a particular and very narrow creed. But long, long have I cast those weeds behind me.59

That Gladstone accepted that over zealous adherence to, or teaching of, doctrine could be, and had already proved itself, harmful was confirmed in the closing comments of his 1894 review of the autobiography of the theosophist Annie Besant:

It cannot be denied that upon … doctrines rash things have been said, with the intention of defending them, but with a great lack of wisdom in the choice of means for making that defence effectual … The … causes [of] which may require the exercise of careful and constant criticism over the forms of language in which Christian doctrine has to be inculcated, and the application of a corrective and pruning process to retrench excesses unwittingly committed by believers.60
Gladstone therefore believed that the solution lay in a future concentration on Christianity’s ‘cardinal and central truths’.\textsuperscript{61} Gore too, although he held a traditional and conservative conception of Anglican structure and doctrine, did not see the church’s role as unchanging. He thought it should be capable of ‘varied adaptation to the different needs of different ages’, maintained a strong insistence on doctrinal conformity, but, like Gladstone, disagreed with the proliferation of doctrine for its own sake. The more the church limited its doctrinal structure to the essentials, the better equipped it would be to meet cultural change. He consequently argued for greater inclusivity amongst all traditional parties of the church. Exclusive ‘views of truth’ and concentration on favourite doctrines – sacramental grace for high churchmen, atonement and justification by faith for evangelicals, and good moral living for broad churchmen – indicated ‘foolish one-sidedness’ and sustained divisions. Such conflicts limited the church’s ability to present a united message in times of crisis.

He argued that education was the key to lessening Anglican divisiveness and aiding ecumenical understanding. Following Gladstone’s friend Döllinger, Gore argued that ‘common education, promoting friendliness among those who are to be clergy of the Church or ministers of different religious bodies, may do much good’. He asserted that education, in the broadest sense of communication and association, was already softening party divisions, leading ‘men of different schools … to know, understand and tolerate one another better’. Gore furthermore advocated an interdisciplinary approach to study, which would counter the ‘one-sided teaching, or the neglect of parts of the truth’ that so often aggravated party divisions. This then was what the ‘temper of theology ought to be’, he said, ‘the temper of appreciation’.\textsuperscript{62}

Gladstone shared Gore’s belief that the Anglican’s approach to other opinions should be to ‘endeavour to see as much good in them as possible’.\textsuperscript{63} As we have already
seen, Gladstone had long endorsed open-mindedness and toleration in the pursuit of knowledge, as well as according it spiritual and moral relevance. Furthermore, his public statements at Liverpool and Keble, which Gore’s writings echoed strongly, make it increasingly difficult to characterize Gladstone as a curmudgeonly reactionary, or to miss the affiliation he so obviously had with the broad sweep of liberal Anglicanism. Further corroboration of Gladstone’s intellectual leanings towards liberal Catholicism is offered by his engagement of Edward Talbot’s work.

**Edward Stuart Talbot: history, kenoticism, and the evolving Christ**

All the essayists who contributed to *Lux Mundi* were, and still are, in critical terms, overshadowed by Charles Gore. However, Edward Talbot was of equal importance to Gladstone’s intellectual involvement with late nineteenth-century liberal catholicism. Talbot’s contribution to *Lux Mundi* was ‘Preparation in History for Christ’, and, although Gladstone did not record it in his diary, he read and annotated Edward’s essay in his own copy of the book.64 Talbot’s essay aimed to show how the incarnation exemplified the universal nature of religion.65 He suggested that the universal tendency to ascribe godlike attributes to humanity reflected a unique appreciation of the true terms of engagement between humankind and the divine. He pointed to the value placed on higher human qualities in classical philosophy and the Hebrew prophecies in which ‘the strange vision of a human king with Divine attributes … strain[s] towards some manifestation of God in present nearness’.66 Gladstone marked this passage with two heavy vertical lines in the margin, meaning a special degree of notice. Well he might notice it, for Talbot’s thesis echoed the great theme of Gladstone’s unfinished work on Olympian religion, and mirrored almost exactly arguments he had made in his article on ‘the Unity of History’ in 1887:
There was one country [Greece] in the world where, for centuries before the Advent, it had been the prime pursuit of Art to associate deity with the human form; and … where this practice spontaneously grew out of the prevailing and fundamental idea of the established religion. This aim led the artist ever upward to surmount imperfection and to reach upward after perfection. And though the finite could not incorporate the infinite, yet … actual performance was advanced to a point in the presentation of form, such as to supply a model for every country or age.⁶⁷

Talbot related his thesis, as Gladstone had done, to the evolutionary historicism inherent in Victorian intellectual culture. Modern students and enquirers were interested in change and movement, he argued, but simultaneously retained a need to see ‘the beauty of process’, and to discern pattern and meaning in change. The mind, ‘in the fullest sense of the word’, is ‘not the mere critical understanding, but the whole spiritual and rational energy’.⁶⁸ This desire to construct an evolutionary aesthetic, informed by romantic philosophy, to match an evolutionary science is where the religion of the incarnation, to Talbot and Gladstone, became ever more central.

In terms of Lux Mundi’s Christology, Gore’s embryonic kenotic theory has been the primary focus for the book’s readers. In his essay, Gore had argued that the eternal word of God, logos or Christ, had deliberately limited the knowledge of his human incarnation, Jesus of Nazareth, to that of a human being of his time.⁶⁹ Gore would develop this idea in his later work, but even hints at such a conclusion were controversial. However, Talbot suggested something equally, if not more, radical in the following depiction of an evolving Christ.
The beginnings of life, as we know them, are laid in darkness: they emerge crude and childish: the physical and outward almost conceals the germ of spiritual and rational being which nevertheless is the self, and which will increasingly assert itself and rule. It may be so with that organism which God was to make the shrine of His Incarnation.  

Gladstone passed over this astonishing passage without comment, just as he had Gore’s observations on kenosis. Incarnational theology of this type had featured in his lists of reading during previous visits to Keble, and, moreover, he had long accepted that the human aspect of Christ was fully subject to time, temptation, and change. As David Bebbington has conclusively shown, the increasing prominence of ‘humanity’ in Gladstone’s thought was deeply rooted in his Christology. Deeply affected by his spiritual crisis of 1850-1, Gladstone’s faith became far more focused on the person and life of Christ, rather than on the institutional life of the church. In seeking to conquer his own trials and temptations, Gladstone meditated on those of Christ, drawing inspiration from what he saw as Christ’s perfection of his human nature through suffering. This in itself was a radical idea – orthodox Christian teaching insisted on the absolute sinlessness of Christ – which had a lasting effect on Gladstone’s attitude to humanity as a concept. By hinting that ‘the incarnate Christ, in his weakness under testing, had greater moral stature than God in the abstract’, Bebbington argues, Gladstone demonstrated the high and fixed place to which the category of humanity had been elevated in his thought. Gladstone’s estimation of the dignity of human nature itself increased as a result of this heightened appreciation of its potential for progressive improvement. As such, Gladstone was not only exhibiting clear sympathies with broad church and liberal Christianity, but he was also
identifying himself with broader contemporary currents of thought - expressed by writers such as Arnold, Tennyson and others – which explored the history and progress of human civilization. As Bebbington has shown, particularly compelling evidence is offered by Gladstone’s positive review, published in *Good Words* January to March 1868, of J. R. Seeley’s *Ecce Homo* (first published anonymously in 1866), in which he defended the author’s exploration of the humanity of Christ in the face of much dogmatic opposition. Gladstone, ‘profundly moved’ by the book, criticized negative reviewers of *Ecce Homo* for their ‘determined adhesion to fixed and unelastic modes of thought’ which have ‘unhappily, put a dead stop to any real investigation of the work in its general bearings’, and differed sharply in his interpretation of the work from other, even appreciative, readers. Engagement with the work further affirmed Gladstone’s renewed and strengthened affinity with a human Christ. His annotated copy of this work includes ‘+’s by the following quotations, which anticipates both the kenoticism and humanism of *Lux Mundi*.

[+ and double line:] This temperance in the use of supernatural power is the masterpiece of Christ … This repose in greatness makes him surely the most sublime image ever offered to the human imagination …

[+:] Christ raised the feeling of humanity from being a feeble restraining power to be an inspiring passion … humanity changed from a restraint to a motive.
The following passage, which actually describes John the Baptist, also illustrates the characteristics of struggling humanity that appealed to Gladstone:

He was a wrestler with life, one to whom peace of mind does not come easily, but only after a long struggle. His restlessness had driven him into the desert, where he had contended for years with thoughts he could not master, and from whence he had uttered his startling alarum to the nation. He was among the dogs rather than among the lambs of the Shepherd. He recognised the superiority of him whose confidence had never been disturbed, whose steadfast peace no agitations of life had ever ruffled. He did obeisance to the royalty of inward happiness.77

It is not difficult to see why Gladstone identified his position with that of John when he read this passage, reminiscent as it was of his own vocational struggles, sense of isolation, and unpopularity. However, the fact that he wrote the name ‘Lancelot’ in the margin – the knight who ‘would indeed have been more than human’ had he ‘been unstained’, gives a fascinating indication of the extent of the intertextuality which profoundly shaped Gladstone’s intellectual world.78 Reading of Ecce Homo not only combined with thoughts of the Arthurian legends, but also with extensive work on Homer, all of which served to focus Gladstone’s mind on the value of the human condition, and illustrates to us something of the way his mind interrelated those liberal catholic concepts of ‘divinity’ and ‘humanity’ which underpinned his St Deiniol’s foundation.
**St Deiniol’s Library**

*Rejection or regeneration?*

Links have previously been proposed between the foundation of St Deiniol’s library and Gladstone’s Oxford connections. Pritchard concludes that the germination of the St. Deiniol’s project took place shortly after Edward Pusey’s funeral in 1882, where plans had been discussed for the establishment of an institute in memory of the tractarian.79 This, as Henry Parry Liddon later wrote, was envisaged as ‘a College of Clergy in Oxford, … a centre of religious faith, theological learning, and personal sympathy’ based around Pusey’s surviving library and constituting ‘the most fitting Memorial of one whose whole heart was devoted to the preservation of the Faith, and whose days had been spent in fighting its battles in Oxford’. In the final words of his biography, Liddon articulated the hope that the work of the memorial would continue ‘to impart new spiritual energy to the English Church’, and it is clear from the surviving evidence that Gladstone always intended that St Deiniol’s should have at least this function.80 Moreover, he also considered a future for it as a ‘College of Clergy’, and the Pusey House model was directly referred to during the formulation of the library’s Trust.81 However, there are limits to the equivalence. Gladstone was advised by close associates not to base St Deiniol’s on the tractarian memorial. G. W. E. Russell, for one, felt ‘the distinctiveness, individuality, and characteristic features of the Foundation would be lost’ if St Deiniol’s was too closely associated or even eventually merged with Pusey House.82 Furthermore, Gladstone himself had serious enough reservations about the institution to suggest he would not have adopted it as too slavish a model. His disappointment with both Pusey House and its library,83 and subsequent wish that Gore would devote himself to ‘different work’,84 all indicate that he was planning something very different. Furthermore, both Pusey House and
Liddon House, which was later established later in London, were established first and foremost as memorials, whereas there is no evidence to suggest that this was the case with St Deiniol’s. Besides, the nature of Gladstone’s relationship with the Oxford liberal catholics makes the memorialization thesis unlikely considering the movement’s emphasis on shaping the future of the church rather than enshrining unchanged aspects of its past.

Nonetheless, such evidence has not prevented associations being made between Gladstone’s library and the latter impetus. Richard Shannon draws a direct link between St Deiniol’s and Gladstone’s desire to fight those aspects of Oxford thought which were apparently too radical for him. Thus in his biography he states:

It [St. Deiniol’s] was a concept quite characteristic of and conformable to Gladstone’s long held prepossessions, but the immediate stimulus was the implications for Christian belief he saw dangerously present in such things as Robert Elsmere, the ‘new lines of criticism’ pressing hard, and needing to be resisted. Gladstone invited the Humphry Wards to Hawarden in September to witness, so to speak, Gladstone’s preparations for his bastion of defence against them.  

Gladstone’s engagement with Mary Augusta Ward and Robert Elsmere significantly took place at Keble just as his ideas for St Deiniol’s were crystallizing. The defensive tone of Ward’s record of their meeting on the 8 April 1888, and her side of their subsequent correspondence, has distorted the way in which Gladstone’s attitude to Elsmere has been assessed. Firstly, Ward’s testimony is not entirely reliable; she was clearly mistaken, for instance, in her belief that ‘the new lines of criticism are not
familiar’ to Gladstone. Secondly, commentators have neglected the substantial evidence, presented in Gladstone’s review of the novel, of his preoccupation with Ward’s diametric opposition of Christian belief as emotional and unintellectual, and theism as the rational outcome of rigorous, intellectual enquiry. Gladstone, for example, took issue with Ward’s presentation of Elsmere’s intellectual development, arguing that, in fact, she showed no evidence of an intellectual process in Elsmere in either his renunciation of orthodox Christianity or his maintenance of a belief in God. He demonstrated this disparity by comparing the characters and fates of Wendover – who followed his scholarship to its logical conclusions in unbelief, and yet died insane - and Elsmere, who despite his researches in the squire’s library, continued to defer to emotion in his decision making, providing arguments neither for rejecting Christianity, nor for remaining a theist, ‘nobly kills himself with overwork’ before passing ‘away in a final flood of light’. But the force of Gladstone’s criticism was reserved for Ward’s lack of engagement with scholarship: ‘there is nowhere a sign that the authoress has made herself acquainted with the Christian apologists, old or recent … If such be the case, she has skipped lightly (to put it no higher) over vast mental spaces of literature and learning relevant to the case, and has given sentence in the cause without hearing the evidence.’ This criticism was meant to cut deep, for, as the niece of Matthew Arnold and a close associate of the liberal Anglicans in Oxford engaged in just this apologetical endeavour, Gladstone thought Ward had no excuse for being so ill-informed. Ward thanked Gladstone for ‘the courteous & kindly way in which you have criticised the book & what it puts forward’, and sent him, by way of thanks, a handsomely bound copy of Robert Elsmere, containing pictures of the Lakeland locations which had inspired the earlier part of the novel. The two had, during their earlier exchanges, also traded texts: Gladstone had sent Ward a marked copy of
Gleanings with the hope that she would read his ‘Life of the Prince Consort’ and ‘Courses of Religious Thought’, whilst she had sent him copy of T. H. Green’s Lay Sermons. Both of Ward’s gifts were placed by Gladstone in St Deiniol’s Library, further undermining the force of Shannon’s characterization of the institution.

Gladstone next visited Keble in November 1888, his exchanges with Mary Ward fresh in his mind. Before this visit, Gladstone’s plans for the disposal of his library had been hazy, and discussion of them had been restricted to his immediate family. Now, he was anxious to move forward with his scheme. Significantly, Gore and Talbot were the first people outside this intimate circle to be informed. On the very evening of his arrival, Gladstone sounded Gore on the project. He reacted with initial incredulity, complaining: ‘Really it is a joke. Mr. Gladstone wanted to see me last night … about a scheme he has got for the furtherance of theological study amongst the clergy, as if he had no other thought in the world’. By doubting his seriousness, Gore misjudged Gladstone, who spent the following day busily devouring Gore’s The Ministry of the Christian Church (1888) to facilitate further debate. On the 12 November, Gladstone held a: ‘Full conversation with Warden [Talbot] & Mr Gore on [the] Meditated foundation’, and it was following this meeting that Gladstone wrote a memorandum laying down, for the first time on paper, his vision for St Deiniol’s.

Gladstone left Keble on 13 November 1888, but both Gore and Talbot followed him with letters in which they expressed growing enthusiasm for the library scheme. Gore told Gladstone that his experience at Pusey House ‘encourages me in the belief that a library is an admirable basis of operations for an Ecclesiastical institution such as you propose’, and: ‘I cannot but feel … that a great deal of good to religious learning may come of the enterprise’. Nonetheless, both men continued
strongly to question Gladstone’s choice of location. Gore accepted Gladstone’s need to supervise the foundation personally, which would ‘leave no doubt as to the place where the start of the undertaking should be’, but maintained that:

The ultimate situation of the library should be left an open question. Its first organization should be arranged so as to admit of its being ultimately moved, if it was found advisable, wherever its chances of usefulness would be greatest. I … still incline to the opinion that on the whole it is more likely ultimately to be found workable in a town.\(^{102}\)

Talbot’s reaction was similar, if more conciliatory: ‘I quite feel now that it would be best for you to proceed with the organisation of the library at Hawarden, though in a way which would make after transplantation possible & even probable’.\(^{103}\) According to Gore, Gladstone – who had spent a considerable amount of time combing the village for a suitable site - was incensed by the suggestion of Liverpool. ‘He never spoke another word for the next six miles of our walk, and I think I have never in my life felt so much like a whipped schoolboy. But I still believe I was right.’\(^{104}\) Despite this reported disagreement, Liverpool was cited in the Keble Memorandum as ‘the only possible town’ site, although apparently only as part of a compromise.

One of Gladstone’s primary motivations for instituting the library, and for locating it in Hawarden, was his belief that the church in Wales would soon be disestablished and would urgently require independent educational support.\(^{105}\) Gladstone also wanted personal control of the foundation in his lifetime, which was a significant objection to situating St. Deiniol’s in Liverpool, but the fact that he began to entertain the possibility of a ‘later transmigration’ clearly reflected the level of
influence Talbot and Gore had on him, as did Gladstone’s eventual decision to build the library in galvanized iron, which was only ever going to be a temporary solution. Furthermore, Gladstone remained aware of the challenge of the urban environment for the Church, especially in Liverpool. Lady Charlotte Ribblesdale recalled in 1904 that: ‘Gladstone said that as a town it was very irreligious, and he had to bring home to it in consequence its duty as well as its capacity to build a cathedral.’ In a later memorandum he stated that he wished the library to provide assistance, from a distance if necessary, to that ‘great city’, but he noted that ‘an inhospitable atmosphere cuts off all idea of my personal agency’. This undoubtedly reflected Gladstone’s ambivalent, and frequently uncomfortable, relationship with the city of his birth, whose radical toryism and religious sectarianism, intensified by the Home Rule question, would indeed have provided an inhospitable atmosphere for the kind of institution which Gladstone envisaged.

Nonetheless, Gladstone’s foundation of a rural library appeared to go against the prevailing trend of Victorian ecclesiastical interest - the cities, their heaving populations, and overworked clergy - which undeniably formed the basis of Gore and Talbot’s objections, especially considering Gore and his associates’ contribution to the resurgence of Christian Socialism in the 1880s. However, there was a coincident strand of Anglican thought that identified the countryside - always its stronghold - as ‘the pastoral ideal’. Gladstone pledged that his library would provide ‘aid to the local church’, foresaw it might have a ‘connection with … local study’, and form a ‘centre of occasional instruction by Lectures’. Moreover, he held a positive opinion of the advantages of an isolated rural location for similar institutions. In 1891, he defended the isolated situation of Glenalmond College, which he had helped to found in the mid-1840s, in the similar terms:
It may seem that it was a daring and a rash proceeding to attempt to found a college of this description at so great a distance from centres of population … I dare say it may be said that … a town offers a more popular and attractive site … Undoubtedly … proximity to masses of the population offers considerable advantage … But … there are some advantages … that should not be overlooked with respect to … [a] foundation … in the country[:] … the opportunity of free communication with nature … larger liberty, and … a practical acquaintance with the beautiful and romantic.¹¹⁴

This speech was aimed at schoolboys, but the emphasis given in Gladstone’s first memorandum to St Deiniol’s as a place of rest, holidays, refreshment, and retirement in many ways connotes popular idealizations of rural life and beliefs in the spirit-enhancing benefits of leisure. Hulda Friederichs’ propounded a similar understanding of St Deiniol’s, suggesting that:

The restlessness and roar of millionfold human life would be a disturbing element in any library intended for a Temple of Peace … The perfect seclusion of the village; the ease with which it may be reached; … the beauty and healthiness of the district; and also the associations of the whole place with Mr. Gladstone; all seemed to point to Hawarden as the ideal situation for the Theological library.¹¹⁵
Moreover, Gladstone wished to establish an independent institution in St Deiniol’s, in the same way as he had sought to establish a liberal and, in Scottish terms, an independent episcopal school at Glenalmond. In Gladstone’s original memorandum, he tied in the library very closely to the idea of locality, but its central purpose was to be far more wide-reaching and universal in scope.\(^\text{116}\)

The expectation of Welsh disestablishment largely legitimized the library’s foundation in Wales but Gladstone consistently privileged intellectual over practical motivations. Lord Stanmore (formerly Sir Arthur Gordon) had questioned Gladstone on this point in 1892, and received an evasive answer.\(^\text{117}\) Writing in a private memorandum the following year, Gladstone confirmed that there was more to his plan:

I have not here principally in view the likelihood that … the Church in Wales may be deprived or discharged of her temporal endowments, this constitutes a call for pecuniary aid with a view to the due and dignified maintenance of her ministrations … I refer to a deeper & more searching need.\(^\text{118}\)

He continued: ‘a special necessity appears to have arisen at the present epoch requiring to be met by special means’. The ‘necessity’ was ‘a severance between the Christian system and the general thought of the time’; one of the ‘means’ was to be St Deiniol’s: an intellectual resource for a beleaguered and isolated Church,\(^\text{119}\) and Gladstone’s personal contribution to the project that aimed to return ‘the Catholic faith into its right relation to modern intellectual and moral problems’.\(^\text{120}\) For there was clearly a coterminous vision being articulated by Gladstone and the *Lux Mundi* Group, of an ecumenical,\(^\text{121}\) interdisciplinary, associationalist, clergy-led Christian culture, the
growth of which would redress existing imbalances in Victorian intellectual life. Gore had written, in his Mission text, of what he understood to be the central paradox inflicting the relationship between theology and other intellectual disciplines, which Gladstone also recognized and acted upon in Hawarden. Whilst the ‘principle of faith is brought into exercise to some extent in all human life and knowledge’, including the sciences, there remained a lack of dialogue between the disciplines to the detriment of all. This mirrored one of Gladstone’s enduring convictions about the need to restore a right relationship between theology and other disciplines, which he expressed and embodied most explicitly in St Deiniol’s:

Christianity is a religion adapted to the elevation and development of the entire nature of man, and, so far from seeing any antagonism between the prosecution of Divine knowledge and the prosecution of knowledge which is human and secular, in my opinion they never can be separated without disadvantage.

In the combative intellectual climate of the late nineteenth century, Gore and Gladstone saw a clear choice for theology. Either it could continue a threatened withdrawal from current intellectual debate, prompted largely by ignorance and fear of new developments apparently antagonistic to faith, or it could stand its ground and keep the channels of communication open. To Gore it was a matter of ‘duty’ that Anglicans should learn from other branches of knowledge in order to assess more clearly their relative contribution to the sum of human knowledge. This, and Gore’s call for Christians from different traditions to communicate and associate, was central to Gladstone. Both preoccupations can be seen directly informing the structure of his
library: the proximity of theological and secular texts on its shelves and the engagement in debate between both believers and non-believers in its hostel.

The most striking characteristic of the first library’s classification scheme was the sheer broadness of its divinity section. ‘Magic and Spiritism’ was included in the very centre of the room, as well as ‘Non Christian Religions’, ‘Pre-History’, and the ‘Philosophy of Man’ and ‘Of Nature’. Radically, Gladstone regarded these as major parts of his collection; minor sections, including such mainstream and ‘orthodox’ subjects as ‘Epitaphs &c. Books on marriage &c. Hymns. Liturgies’, were relegated down the hierarchy. Several contemporary commentators stressed the breadth and inclusiveness of the St Deiniol’s theological collection. David Williamson wrote: ‘The choice of volumes was made on no exclusive basis, and I noticed the works of Churchmen, Catholics, and Nonconformists side by side’, and J. C. Story observed:

The theological student who examines the books in the Divinity Room will be struck with the breadth of the donor’s conception. Here is no sign of narrowness; nothing of the sectarian spirit; all is otherwise … From Fetishism and Animism up to Judaism; from Judaism up to Christianity, in every phase and expression of the same, all may be traced, and the shelves, as they succeed one another, point the way.

Moreover, to look at surviving photographs of the original library and hostel, it can be seen how closely liberal catholic theories had been put into practice. The hostel was parsonage-like and yet, adjacent to an eclectic library, it challenged the priest to be both pastor and academic theologian. The warden was represented in quiet studious
contemplation in his study reading. Smaller studies or carrels were provided for visiting readers but domestic space was shared: a communal dining room encouraged debate with the hope of increased mutual understanding, and the prayer room, although decorated, was not ostentatiously sectarian.

Circumstances thus enabled Gladstone’s personal organization of the library within a well-known context, both harmonizing it to the needs of the locality, as well as offering the benefits of rest and retirement he himself had enjoyed in Hawarden to those further afield. There remained, nevertheless, questions over the future direction of an institution which the founder himself described as still in embryo. Gladstone expended time and energy considering the possibility that St Deiniol’s might house a religious community, a process which revealed not only the influence of but also the profound uncertainties which underlay the liberal catholic movement, and which had an important influence over later interpretation of the library’s purpose.

The Question of Community

A significant revival of Anglican religious community life took place from the mid-Victorian period. The impetus for this clearly came from the Anglo-catholic wing of the church but there were specifically liberal catholic communities instituted, most significantly, Gore’s Community of the Resurrection, founded in Oxford in 1887.
In his Keble memorandum, Gladstone had included amongst his ‘higher’ purposes the ‘gradual formation of a body’, and in 1893 he proposed that:

The Trustees may place the Institution under the control of or in association with any Community or Institution having similar aims and may devolve on such community all or any of their powers; provided they shall be satisfied that the purposes of the Institution will thus be more effectively answered.\textsuperscript{130}

It is important to note Gladstone’s obvious caution here. As we have established, he was, unhappy with the notion of study divorced from wider interaction. Whilst he was broadly supportive of lay, or ‘third’ orders, he was also somewhat unconvinced of the efficacy of religious life and worship conducted in seclusion.\textsuperscript{131} In 1895, in a typical compromise, Gladstone approached an Oxford religious community - the Society of St John the Evangelist, the oldest of the nineteenth-century Anglican foundations - for help and advice.\textsuperscript{132} In return he received a detailed memorandum from R. L. Page, which addressed the practicalities of the library’s association with a religious community.\textsuperscript{133} Page stated that SSJE was unable to get practically involved itself,\textsuperscript{134} but provided Gladstone with his opinions on the potential function of the library. He too questioned Hawarden’s suitability as a location. ‘London, Oxford, Cambridge or (Durham) seem more suitable,’ he wrote, ‘as having the largest libraries, being seats of learning & more easy of access for persons generally’.\textsuperscript{135} Page proceeded to set out a vision of St Deiniol’s as a theological ‘think-tank’: a body of theologians giving advice and publishing on a range of theological issues to meet the needs of the church. He suggested that St Deiniol’s might become a theological college, a retreat centre.
with clergy versed in ‘ascetic theology’, and a place of rest and help to the local clergy. This in part mirrored Gladstone’s vision of how ‘divine learning’ might be successfully promoted but, in Page’s opinion, because the library’s endowment was insufficient to support a paid staff, an existing theological college or religious community should take over the running of the institution. Significantly, he proposed Gore’s Community of the Resurrection.

Gladstone also received some strong advice against the idea of associating St Deiniol’s with a religious community, reflecting tensions between understandings of St Deiniol’s as either an independent, or a community-led, institution. G. W. E. Russell responded to Page’s ideas with misgiving, pointing out that the presence of such a community would not guarantee learning. He estimated that monastic guidance would be ‘undesirable’ for both local clergy and for any future theological college students, concluding with the following indictment:

St Deiniol’s would necessarily become a mere creature of the Community, influenced and ruled according to the prevailing idea at the moment in the mind of the Superior or Community. The Founder’s Hand would cease to operate; and the distinctness and individuality of the Institution would disappear as completely as if the library were bodily removed to Oxford.136

In a subsequent letter, Russell cast doubt on Page’s assertion that a community would ensure permanence: ‘I do not think that we can yet be assured of the permanence of the Cowley Brotherhood’, he wrote.137 Edward Talbot was also doubtful about
Gladstone’s idea of ‘some form of community-life akin to that of Pusey House’ growing up round the library.\(^{138}\)

There was thus consistent and close involvement by liberal catholics in Gladstone’s deliberations over the question of the library ‘community’ and staffing, but their contributions displayed inconsistency and disagreement. This was because of the fundamental paradox in founding what were essentially counter-cultural communities to further the liberal catholic aim of participating fully in and shaping modern life. The documentary evidence surrounding Gladstone’s search for a warden for his library both shows how influential the liberal catholic nexus continued to be following its institution, but also demonstrates the problems that dogged efforts to realize the liberal catholic vision.\(^{139}\)

Henry Scott Holland wrote to Gladstone suggesting a member of the Community of the Resurrection, Mr Rackham, as a possible first warden. He added: ‘it seems to me a real gain to associate this high venture for Theology, with the Company gathered under Gore’s leadership, who have the cause so deeply at heart, and who are working toward the same ends in so congenial in spirit’.\(^{140}\) However, despite his enthusiastic attitude to the library, Gore, as Community Superior, forbade Rackham’s candidature, voicing a widespread anxiety amongst fledgling Anglican orders not to disperse before an enduring sense of community had been established.\(^{141}\) Instead, he joined Talbot and Walter Lock in proposing a Keble man, E. W. Delahay, for Warden.\(^{142}\) Delahay did not, however, stand much chance of appointment: as well as Stephen Gladstone’s judgement that ‘Mr. Gore’s man’ was too young, he was engaged to be married.\(^{143}\) As was made clear in the original advert for the wardenship, Gladstone was keen to appoint an unmarried man, ostensibly for reasons of space, but also because he was considering the possibility of a celibate community.\(^{144}\) However,
this criterion proved more difficult to satisfy than Gladstone anticipated, as a significant number of those who either applied or were suggested were married or engaged.\textsuperscript{145} This was true of Arthur Cayley Headlam (1862-1947), then a young fellow of All Souls, who was Gladstone’s first serious choice.\textsuperscript{146} As a liberal catholic, Headlam was an ideal candidate for Warden in view of the purpose of the institution. W. Saceday wrote to Gladstone confirming Headlam’s - and by implication Gladstone’s - liberal catholic credentials:

He would approach matters very much from the point of view from which I believe that you would wish them approached – that of a High Churchman, progressive, independent and anxious to bring theories of doctrine into accord with the realities of things, but never rash in grasping at novelties.

He added more generally on the role of the library itself: ‘I entertain great hopes as to the possibilities of the new foundation in helping to correct one of the weakest points in the English Church – a want of thoroughness in thought & study’.\textsuperscript{147} However, Headlam ultimately decided that Gladstone’s offer was one he ‘could not accept … on the terms you offered it’.\textsuperscript{148} He had initially made clear he was unlikely to be suitable, both having resigned his fellowship in order to marry, and also having already accepted a parish elsewhere, but Gladstone had pressed ahead regardless because, he argued, ‘the idea I wish to suggest is one generically so different’.\textsuperscript{149} Headlam was unconvinced and told Gladstone, in his characteristically bald manner, that he desired practical, parochial work, not ‘theology divorced from life’, which was a brutal check for Gladstone who envisaged, of course, that St Deiniol’s would directly counter this
tendency. He had from the beginning recognized the difficulties inherent in trying to achieve the ‘gradual formation of a body’ in Hawarden, but Headlam’s refusal so seriously questioned the direction in which Gladstone’s plans were taking him that he was persuaded to abandon the idea of forming a community proper. Indicative of this change of heart is the fact that, in his negotiations with the eventual first Warden, G. C. Joyce - another scholarly priest from the catholic wing of the church – Gladstone placed far less emphasis on devotional life than he had during his discussions with Headlam.

**St Deiniol’s after Gladstone**

Historically speaking, Gladstone’s ultimate rejection of the idea of St Deiniol’s as a counter-cultural religious community has not been made much of by commentators. Principally this has been because of his own family’s disagreements over the institution’s purpose following his death, and their key role in publicizing it. Mary Drew was the crucial figure here. After her father’s death Mary became chiefly responsible for publicizing St Deiniol’s, and her version of its foundation and purpose was styled as the ‘authoritative account’, something which proved to be not only influential on but also misleading to both her contemporaries and later scholars. In her article, Mary stated unequivocally that the library was designed ‘for the purposes of study and research, “for the pursuit of divine learning,” a centre of religious life, a resident body of students, men of studious mind and habit, unfitted by various causes for active life or the turmoil of great cities’. She regarded the work of the temporary library as only in line with Gladstone’s ‘secondary purposes’ for the institution; it was only with the completion of ‘a permanent Residence for Warden and Students’ or Community that ‘will arrive the real opportunity of fulfilling the main design of the founder’. Although she described the library as being ‘open to thinkers of every class,
even to those to whom the gift of faith has been denied, earnest enquirers, seekers, searchers after the truth that is divine’, she maintained that:

For ‘the advancement of divine learning’ he looked specially to the resident community. And the type of men that undoubtedly he had in view … were men residing in religious bodies already existing and in working order, men who … would do for their own generation what Pusey and Stubbs, Lightfoot and Westcott had done for theirs. Mr. Gladstone saw that … it would be good to revive something of the methods of the wise of old. By their … austere experience they had shown it could best be sustained by the spiritual discipline of the consecrated life, inspired and strengthened by corporate devotion and aspiration.\textsuperscript{153}

This vision was far in advance of anything that Gladstone had himself articulated and, by privileging the qualifications of a withdrawn ‘consecrated’ community to form the heart of the library, Drew obscured much of the liberal catholic communitarian spirit that had informed Gladstone’s project. Although apparently Gladstone did not think ‘luxurious living … conducive to the well-being of the increased intellectual activity of those whom the institution is intended to benefit’, this was a far cry from wanting it to be a place of ascetic denial.\textsuperscript{154}

There were other versions of the story available. Prominent amongst these was that articulated by Stephen Liberty, sub-warden of the library between 1906 and 1910. His short introduction to the library, written soon after Drew’s article, by implication took issue with her interpretation. He acknowledged her ‘authority of intimate
knowledge,’ but asserted: ‘Foundations, however, like individuals, require a little time to “find their level”; indeed the Founder in this case himself wisely left it to future generations to decide … the exact shape which his Institution should assume.’ His account concentrated on the role the library fulfilled for working clergy, which tallied more accurately with the original ethos envisaged by Gladstone had and put into practice by Joyce:

Here is a house which all the year round opens its doors to any man who wants to return for a long or short time from the burden and heat of action to the upper air of learning and resolve, which first sent him out into the world. In some cases a long stay and an extensive course of study would be found practicable … but in cases (probably the majority) where this is not expected, it is, surely, something for the hard-worked or isolated parson to be able to come even for a week or two and turn over the new books, to discuss them in friendly intercourse with others either of his own or of a different standpoint, and generally to renew contact with the main stream of Christian thought … The supplying in this way of an admitted need of the clergy is probably the most considerable, at any rate the most tangible, work that St. Deiniol’s has yet been able to do.156

Gladstone’s difficulty in combining the library and community ideas lay in a significant disjunction between their intellectual and theological rationale. Gladstone’s central aim was for St Deiniol’s to foster theology’s engagement with the world by functioning principally as a periodical resource rather than as a place of
permanent withdrawal for clergy.\textsuperscript{157} Unlike SSJE, which ‘was not called by human wisdom’,\textsuperscript{158} St Deiniol’s was conceived as a response to contemporary moral and intellectual problems, and its primary aim was to effect a much needed rehabilitation of theology. Although Benson’s vision of how SSJE should serve the Church - through mission preaching, retreats and teaching - to an extent accorded with Gladstone’s, Benson’s view that all intellectual study must be ‘subservient to holiness and the love of God’, was diametrically opposed to Gladstone’s belief that the understanding and practice of religion was rooted in intellectual study.\textsuperscript{159} Unsurprisingly, the religious community did not materialize. Gladstone did not set out to found such a community and, following his preferred candidate’s rejection of the wardenship, essentially turned against the idea. Ultimately, however, although Drew did not see her ideal community installed at St Deiniol’s, the authority of her ‘intimate knowledge’ significantly contributed to a consequent neglect of the library’s liberal catholic context.

*  

Gladstone’s relationship with Keble and Oxford’s liberal catholic revival, with its emphasis on an academically alive, doctrinally streamlined, confident, and broad Anglicanism, provides a context in which the foundation of St Deiniol’s no longer appears so anomalous. It represented a natural and well-conceived response to the crisis of confidence afflicting Anglicanism rather than a defensive bastion against the circumstances of modern life. In fact, the evidence of Gladstone’s liberal catholic connections and theological position make it unfeasible to describe Gladstone, as Colin Matthew did, simply as ‘an orthodox sacramentalist with what was by the 1880s an old-fashioned view of heaven’, ‘an anglo-catholic’ with residual evangelical tendencies,\textsuperscript{160} or as Shannon’s intransigent and defensive church conservative. Throughout his life
Gladstone moved through several religious phases. He was brought up a strict evangelical, flirted with tractarianism in his middle years, but all along he also developed deepening broad church sympathies and ended up a liberal catholic. His increasing broadness of religious outlook did not involve repudiating his previous positions, which in many important ways continued to influence him but, when one examines the textual evidence, one can see just how far he had moved. As this chapter has shown, he valued intellectual rigour and prized an open mind too highly to remain theologically unmoved in the face of multiplying ‘modern intellectual and moral problems’.

One fascinating image of Gladstone, entitled appropriately enough *The Aged Reader*, Figure 6.3, is firmly evangelical in its references: sombre Sunday best and right hand resting on the Bible, but Gladstone’s figure is integrated into the context of a late nineteenth-century gothic revival church. Of the two images of Christ that fill the windows either side of Gladstone’s head, the one on the right is immediately recognisable as William Holman Hunt’s *The Light of the World* (1853). The first version of this painting has been in Keble College Chapel ever since the day Gladstone
made his long speech in 1878. The vaulting of this imaginary space is decorated with a criss-cross design also reminiscent of Keble. The tension between and within different Anglican traditions is marked in this composition just as it was in Gladstone’s religious mentalité, but when confronted with either we are continually pressed to recognize the eclecticism, innovation, space and depth which such a mixture afforded.

It has also been shown that that, whilst Gladstone was adamant about the intellectual rationale behind his decision to leave his books for the spiritual benefit of future generations, he was simultaneously unsure about how such the institution would be constituted and work in practice. When he confessed, in 1895, that: ‘It is an institution not yet fully developed’, he was giving a fair assessment of the state of his thinking on its future, and was articulating a broader uncertainty felt by many liberal catholics about how an intellectual vision could be implemented in a relevant and practical way. Nonetheless, despite the considerable problems which his vision faced, set within the class-related inconsistencies which afflicted liberal catholic ideology, we can clearly identify the central purpose for which St Deiniol’s was founded and those for which it was not. It was not to be a ‘public’ library in the real sense, as can be seen from the careful hedging round of both its physical buildings and its intellectual rationale, rather it was there to nurture ‘a learned clergy’. However, neither was it designed, as Mary Drew would later argue, to be a permanent retreat from the world and its problems. Note Hulda Friederichs’ 1896 description of the Hostel as ‘a congenial temporary home’ for ‘a student coming in from the busy world’, and the words of the Right Revd Dr. Edwards, Bishop of St Asaph, spoken at the opening of the memorial library, which summed up the central aim of St Deiniol’s:
If the hearts and minds of men are to be won to the faith of Christ, there must be that scientific exposition of what we know of God and of his relations to the world, which can only be effectively given by those adequately equipped in Divine learning. And while the principles are clear and definite, they are pre-eminently broad and inclusive.\(^{\text{165}}\)

St Deiniol’s was then, the expression of Gladstone’s theological and not his political liberalism. As has been consistently argued, although working compromises could be effected, tensions and inconsistencies remained in the engagement between these two species as well as in the constitution of liberal catholicism itself. Visions of how to effect change according to liberal catholic ideas were not always politically or morally liberal. For example, Charles Gore thought that the changing work of Christianity should be pioneered by ‘a spiritual aristocracy’, a vision which, in many ways, mirrored Gladstone’s vision for St Deiniol’s.\(^{\text{166}}\) As shown above, the earliest reference to Gladstone’s plan made clear that the library was intended principally as a resource for the Anglican church, and the Keble memorandum indicated that this was heavily weighted towards the needs of both local and national clergy. It was the clergy who had borrowed books from the Temple of Peace and debated with Gladstone about theology who were to be the principal inheritors of his book collection and intellectual legacy. Men like these were, in his view, the future of the Church; those who would change it by engaging in academic pursuits and practical pastoral theology. Whilst they were not to be kept isolated in community, they were still to be a powerful and influential clerisy. This vital distinction was illustrated by Stephen Liberty, who prefaced his short introduction to the library with the following quotation from Richard de Bury’s *Philobiblon*: 
Having taken a survey of human necessities in every direction, with a view to bestow our charity upon them, our compassionate inclinations have chosen to bear pious aid to … [a] class of men, in whom there is … such hope of advantage to the Church, and to provide for them, not only in respect of things necessary to their support, but much more in respect of the books so useful to their studies.  

The late Victorian successors of such men were to be the inheritors of Gladstone’s beloved theological book collection. In the same way in which he had sold his historical and political library in 1875 to one who would continue in his political stead, so Gladstone now bestowed his theological books on those who would continue the work he had begun in that sphere. In the light of our revised understanding of Gladstone’s theological priorities, and their influence over the character of St Deiniol’s, such a vision makes perfect sense.

The creative tensions observable in Gladstone’s late Victorian liberal catholicism were thus also visible in his library. They also influenced its reception within the public domain. Both press and public had been coaxed and wooed into accepting Gladstone’s intellectual life and library as outward signs of his public duty, and duly interpreted them as part of a popular Gladstonian liberal agenda. It is unsurprising, therefore, that St Deiniol’s was incorporated into this familiar context rather than being interpreted through the more private, clerical, and somewhat anomalous liberal catholic frame of reference, which was never overtly publicized and would not necessarily have found favour had it been so. Even Mary Drew felt the need to publicize the library in popular political terms and one could argue that, in the
end, Gladstone was the victim of his own success. So well had he integrated his scholarly image in this context that he had once again lost a substantial measure of control over it. Nonetheless, St Deiniol’s remains by far the most potent statement of the breadth of Gladstone’s spiritual and cultural vision. By the dynamic and selective creation of an appropriate material layout to epitomize and make sense of the knowledge that he had collected, imbibed, and used, he was making his own ultimate contribution to a lifelong ideal, that of ‘enlarging the text’ and ‘extending the bounds of the common inheritance’.¹⁶⁸
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