

Gladstone's Church Principles considered in their Results: A Layman's Ecclesiastical Treatise

David Bebbington

*I*n the autumn of 1840 the thirty-year-old W.E. Gladstone published his second book, *Church Principles considered in their Results*. Gladstone had been working on the manuscript of the book in July when he celebrated the first anniversary of his marriage; and his first son, another William, had been born in the previous month. He was still an idealistic young man.¹ Although he had sat in parliament for eight years, his leisure time was largely spent in exploring ecclesiastical affairs. The fruit was a treatise on the claims of the Church of England considered as a branch of the Church Catholic. It was a massive work of 528 pages, not counting three appendices, one of them 30 pages long. T.B. Macaulay, fresh from excoriating Gladstone's earlier book, *The State in its Relations with the Church* (1838), in the pages of *The Edinburgh Review*, declined to review the new volume, dismissing it as "a theological treatise."² That judgement, however, represented a misunderstanding of the purpose of the author, who claimed to have kept off theological ground as far as possible.³ The eventual reviewer in *The Edinburgh*, Henry Rogers, a tutor at the new Spring Hill Congregational College in Birmingham, also failed to grasp what Gladstone was about. Like many subsequent commentators, Rogers treated *Church Principles* as an apologia for the Oxford Movement.⁴ In reality, as will appear, Gladstone deliberately dissociates himself from the Tractarian leaders. Although the book has been valuably explored by Perry Butler in his *Gladstone: Church State and Tractarianism* and has been covered in my study of *The Mind of Gladstone*, it deserves further examination in its own right.⁵

Gladstone writes in the capacity of “a layman as contradistinguished from a minister of the Church.”⁶ He disclaims all authority, for he is not a “commissioned instructor” but a “private person.”⁷ Why does he insist on his lay status? It is so that within the sphere he chooses he can carry all the more weight. Unlike William Palmer of Worcester College, Oxford, whose *Treatise on the Church of Christ* (1838) was a major influence over Gladstone’s book, or Henry Manning, whose *The Unity of the Church* (1842) was dedicated to the politician, Gladstone does not present a strictly theological treatment of ecclesiastical theory. His method, he explains, is not “the scientific process whereby these principles are deduced and proved from Holy Scripture.”⁸ Rather, as his title proclaims, he is concerned with the results of Church principles. The title, Gladstone admitted to his friend Manning who was then rector of Lavington in Sussex, was not very good, but “it covers and describes the matter of the book.”⁹ If the subject of ecclesiastical theory were divided into three, the theological, the ethical and the practical, Gladstone was concentrating on the last two aspects. Together they dealt with the consequences of adopting a high view of the Church. They were the proper province of a layman, an area not requiring doctrinal erudition but where experience of the world was an asset. “In this labour,” Gladstone assures his readers, “there is less that bears a strictly professional character.”¹⁰ He was not engaged in full-blooded dogmatic theology, for he was not a clergyman.

Yet Gladstone hankered after that role. Had his father not desired otherwise, he would probably have been ordained.¹¹ In 1840, with his friend James Hope, a lawyer and Fellow of Merton College, Oxford, Gladstone was beginning to concoct a scheme for a combined seminary and public school serving the Episcopal Church of Scotland that was to emerge as Trinity College, Glenalmond.¹² He would have clergymen trained even if he could not be one himself. He conscientiously preached substantial weekly homilies to his household.¹³ In correspondence with Manning in 1837 and 1838 he had contended for a much greater role in Church government than his friend would allow.¹⁴ *Church Principles* should be seen as another instance of a frustrated clergyman wishing to be

as fully involved in ecclesiastical affairs as possible. Hence it is not surprising that, for all Gladstone's disavowals of professional expertise in doctrinal questions, he does include theological matter. Part of the book is a series of chapters on the doctrines of the Catholic renewal in the Church of England. Although the effect of the doctrines is their theme, they necessarily contain dogmatic exposition. Consequently Gladstone, acutely aware of not possessing teaching authority, submitted them for examination by Manning, with whom he spent a morning discussing them.¹⁵ The text was also read by Gladstone's brother-in-law, George Lyttelton, to whom the book was dedicated, but it was Manning's clerical approval that Gladstone sought before proceeding to publication.¹⁶ His insistence on the lay tone of the book is partly a symptom of thwarted ambition for a clerical career.

Nevertheless, Gladstone does reveal preoccupations that differentiate him from an ordinary theologian. The doctrines of the visible Church, the sacraments, and the apostolic succession are reviewed for the sake not of vindicating their truth but of setting out their "moral characteristics and effects."¹⁷ The three chapters on these themes constitute the ethical section of the treatise. Gladstone writes as one who has "given his mind to moral speculations."¹⁸ His thinking had been formed at Oxford by Aristotle, whose influence is detectable in phrases such as one claiming the correspondence of Church principles to "the necessities and the capabilities of human nature."¹⁹ The theologian F.D. Maurice, himself a Platonist by disposition, was struck by the Aristotelianism of the book.²⁰ Its strategy is to commend the principles for their effectiveness in "the formation of human character."²¹ Gladstone set great store by the evidential power of holiness. Its presence in the Church of Scotland, for instance, was the chief prop for his belief that it should continue to be the established church north of the border.²² The favorite doctrines of the Catholic revival were brought to the same test of their moral consequences. Thus Gladstone argues that an appreciation of the visible Church tends to depress selfishness, enlarge love, and encourage sympathy.²³ The sacraments, though less directly moral in their effects, as

“the chief and central fountain of the vital influences of religion,” strengthen the spiritual life and therefore the ability to act responsibly.²⁴ The chapter on the apostolic succession, which Gladstone found intractable in revision,²⁵ is least convincing because it fills so much space with an historical investigation of the doctrine that seems remote from the ethical sphere. The chief moral advantages specified for apostolic succession are a heightened sense of clerical duty and an increased willingness by the people to respect their pastors, perhaps not very persuasive considerations.²⁶ Even if the argument appears weaker at this stage than elsewhere, Gladstone believed that he had made out a case for Church principles passing the ethical test.

The practical section of the book, presented as a single chapter but over two hundred pages long, is founded on Gladstone’s experience as a politician and his consequent insight into contemporary opinion. The experience of sitting through the protracted parliamentary debates on ecclesiastical questions during the 1830s had familiarized him with the views of the liberal Anglicans around Lord John Russell who were emerging into prominence on the Whig benches.²⁷ Gladstone knew what these leading opponents of his standpoint believed. Acquaintance with ordinary folk, he was convinced, had also shown him how best to present the Catholic teachings that (as he put it) they were inclined to reject as mysticism, popery, bigotry, or pure nonsense.²⁸ A layman like himself, with the advantage of being immersed in everyday affairs, could be most persuasive by adopting “a strictly practical manner of considering the question.”²⁹ Gladstone rightly believed that this section was more readable than some of the earlier, more abstract, parts of the treatise.³⁰ In the practical portion he was nearer to the debating mode in which he excelled. The whole book is an exercise in party rhetoric, even if the parties concerned are ecclesiastical rather than political. It is the work of “a man living in the world of politics as opposed to one living in studious retirement.”³¹ The rising statesman could not fail to leave a distinctive stamp upon the book.

The ecclesiastical parties whose positions are criticized in the book are three: the latitudinarian, the Evangelical, and the Tractarian. In

addition, Gladstone makes out a case for his own standpoint. The purposes of the book can best be understood by examining each of the positions separately, with Gladstone's stance receiving consideration before Tractarianism. In the first place he loads the latitudinarianism of the Georgian Church with contempt. The "cold theology of the last century" consisted of a set of "trivial, feeble, and depreciated notions."³² Its adherents "never truly thought upon spiritual religion."³³ The Church was regarded as "little more than a sort of religious club," dependent on the state for its authority as well as its temporal possessions, and so was allowed "to slumber and decay."³⁴ The master-sin of the Georgian Church was "rationalism," to which Gladstone devotes a whole chapter. "Now rationalism," he explains, "is commonly [...] taken to be the reduction of Christian *doctrine* to the standard and measure of the human understanding."³⁵ It underestimates revelation, eliminates the supernatural and places reason on the throne. Gladstone's revulsion is patent, but he holds that rationalism is a declining force. It was increasingly appreciated, he contends, that other human qualities must be called into play alongside reason. Gladstone was conscious of participating in the romantic reaction against the legacy of the Enlightenment, of being "awakened by exciting events to a keener sense of the faculties within us." Hence the affections, and not just the understanding, must be transformed so that the will of God can be made paramount.³⁶ Christianity was shifting from its eighteenth-century moorings. Latitudinarian opinion was "verging towards extinction."³⁷ The only question was about what should supersede it.

Evangelicalism had staked a claim to the succession. Gladstone accorded the movement its due. The message of the Evangelical fathers, "the Romaines, the Newtons, the Scotts, the Cecils," was valid in itself.³⁸ Such men had reinvigorated the Church after its Georgian torpor. They had "infused all that was most truly vital and material in their favourite tenets into the common and pervading tenor of pastoral instruction throughout the country."³⁹ This genuine revival, however, had been tainted by the "besetting sins of precipitancy and inconsiderateness, perhaps of violence and vanity."⁴⁰ There was a hasty censuring of others, sometimes

entailing undue polemic and assertive self-confidence. Furthermore, Evangelicals neglected the power of the sacraments and denied the need for an apostolic succession.⁴¹ Their teaching required the complementary “doctrines of Catholic consent, of grace in the Sacraments, of succession in the ministry, of visibility in the Church.”⁴² They ought to “explore an old way, not to survey for a new one.”⁴³ That was the path that Gladstone had himself taken during the 1830s, moving from Evangelical belief to a much higher churchmanship.⁴⁴ He wished others to follow. Evangelicalism was not wrong, but inadequate.

Much of *Church Principles*, and especially the chapter on rationalism, is therefore designed to appeal to Evangelicals. Rightly accepting the corruption of every aspect of human nature, according to Gladstone, they recognized in principle the fallenness of the understanding. They rightly drew the inference that the understanding is not the arbiter of revealed truth. Scripture is an authority superior to reason. Consequently, Evangelicals believed themselves to be the foes of rationalism. Gladstone contends, however, that they themselves were the victims of rationalism in a milder form. They held that, though human understanding requires correction, it is the means by which the preached word is to be received, the avenue for conversion. That, Gladstone argues, is too much for a fallen faculty to achieve. Only if the affections are stirred to faith by “a distinct and transcendent [sic] influence” can true religion exist: “there must in every case be an action upon the man independent of the understanding, or the word preached will not profit.”⁴⁵ It is the appointed role of the sacraments to create faith. Evangelicals must accept their divine power to impart spiritual life and so should embrace Church principles in their fulness. F.D. Maurice summed up Gladstone’s case against the Evangelicals as, “Press your opinions to their results and they become rationalistic.” It was an ingenious argument, he remarked, but it was “fitter for the courts than for a theological controversy.”⁴⁶ The politician can have swayed very few by his attempt to woo Evangelicals.

The statement of Gladstone’s own position may have influenced more of his readers. He establishes the right of the Church of England to

exercise Catholic privileges on the twin grounds that Christian antiquity sanctions her principles and that the Reformation did not break her continuity: "she is at this day historically the same institution, through which the Gospel was originally preached to the English nation."⁴⁷ But he was particularly concerned, as he had told James Hope in the previous year, to present Church principles in a "conciliatory" form.⁴⁸ He intended, he told his father while completing the book, "to soften & mitigate opposing sentiments."⁴⁹ Gladstone was adopting his characteristic technique as a politician of showing that his stance was less hostile to other standpoints than might be imagined. Church principles, he insists, were not blemished by intolerance. He assumes a public policy of toleration for other religious bodies, referring the interested reader to *The State in its Relations with the Church* for treatment of the subject.⁵⁰ Furthermore, by contrast with William Palmer, Gladstone does not dwell on the exclusive claims of the Church.⁵¹ Unlike Manning as well as Palmer, he does not uphold, even in the qualified form that they adopt, the maxim *extra ecclesiam nulla salus*.⁵² He stresses that his principles "exclude no true lover of Christ from the true Church of Christ."⁵³ He ungrudgingly concedes the lower claims of Protestant Dissenters for their churches. Although they lack the apostolic succession, their congregations produce holiness and so must enjoy divine grace.⁵⁴ There is a distinctly generous tone toward the end of Gladstone's book. So long as the faith is fully maintained, the Church must aim to be as comprehensive as possible because of "the Christian principle of love."⁵⁵ The book illustrates what Gladstone described to Manning in the following year as "genuine elasticity in the principles of Catholic Communion."⁵⁶ The politician was portraying his position in the most effective way to disarm critics.

Most strikingly, there is a vision of the Church of England as the center of unity for divided Christendom. The unique combination of "adherence to primitive antiquity together with the reform of abuses" in the English Church qualified her for the role.⁵⁷ Gladstone was aware of currents of opinion on the continent that revealed an openness to change within the Roman communion. There might be scope for reforms such as

the Church of England had adopted in the sixteenth century. He was in touch with the French liberal Catholic Count Montalembert, though Gladstone was far more critical of papal claims than he.⁵⁸ The politician had read a work by another liberal Catholic, Montalembert's compatriot the Abbé de Lamennais, recounting his break with the pope.⁵⁹ Gladstone also refers in *Church Principles* to two of their German equivalents, J.A. Möhler and J.J. von Görres, as portents of illumination within Roman Catholicism.⁶⁰ Gladstone recognised that, in most countries, there was no possibility of national sections of the Roman Catholic Church joining a movement towards unity. Yet he hoped that "singly some one or more might lead the way in breaking from the heavy fetters which Trent has imposed upon them."⁶¹ Perhaps, he mused, they might follow the example of the English Church in repudiating their obedience to the pope while retaining their Catholic identity. He hoped the churches of Eastern Orthodoxy might find the path to reunion easier to pursue since they had "never pledged themselves to their abuses."⁶² Implausible though his aspirations might be, Gladstone cherished an ecumenical vision with Anglicanism at its core.

Gladstone felt his irenic position to be different from the stance that was emerging in the Oxford Movement. He had read many of the *Tracts for the Times*; he had publicly defended their authors; and in his book he expresses esteem for the ability of John Henry Newman, still the active leader of the movement.⁶³ Gladstone applauded the Tractarian assertion of Church principles, but by early 1840 a fissure had opened between him and the men of Oxford. They were prepared to sacrifice the state connection of the Church for the sake of its Catholicity, but he was not.⁶⁴ He was also dismayed by the Romanizing tendencies of the Tractarians that had come to light in the publication of Hurrell Froude's *Remains* in 1838. Froude was the chief target of Gladstone's contention that upholders of Church principles may "be inclined to judge too harshly of mere Protestantism, and thus negatively favour its opposite."⁶⁵ In private Gladstone was also becoming dismayed, as he told Manning in the following year, about the apparent tendency of Newman to permit human

merit to enter the grounds of acceptance with God.⁶⁶ Any such belief was as intolerable to Gladstone as it had been to Augustine, but the politician did not express his anxiety in public.⁶⁷ What Gladstone did not foresee in 1840 was Newman's secession to Rome. Church principles, he contends in his book, form "the one barrier which effectually closes the way thither."⁶⁸ No dedicated proponent of "the specific principles of the Church of England," he notes, had become a Roman Catholic convert.⁶⁹ Gladstone wished "to catholicize the members of the Church of England, but without 'unprotestantizing' them."⁷⁰ He was beginning to be wary that a group at Oxford wished to go further.

What most disturbed Gladstone in 1840 about Oxford developments was the rise of partisanship there. The Tractarians seemed to have formed a party in the Church to propagate their views, whereas Gladstone aspired to carry the whole Church into an era of fresh convictions. "Church principle," he had written to Hope earlier in the year, "utterly rejects the notion of party or combination standing between the individual and the Church."⁷¹ The claims that the politician was commending must therefore be dissociated from the Tractarians. It was "the greatest possible error," Gladstone asserts in his book, "to suppose that the teaching of these doctrines in the present day is peculiar to certain pious and learned individuals in the University of Oxford."⁷² In order to demonstrate the validity of that judgement, Gladstone compiled thirty pages of opinions on Church authority and the apostolic succession. All are from individuals outside the Oxford Movement. They include Evangelicals such as Daniel Wilson, Bishop of Calcutta; R.D. Hampden, a broad-minded opponent of the Tractarians; and Richard Bagot, Bishop of Oxford, whose episcopal charge of 1838 critiquing the Tractarians is quoted.⁷³ The catalogue proved to Gladstone's satisfaction that "the maintenance of the doctrines of Authority and Succession is very far indeed from being peculiar to the authors of the series entitled Tracts for the Times."⁷⁴ The teachings that he was commending were those of the Church as a whole.

Henry Rogers' supposition that Gladstone was defending the Oxford Movement could hardly have been more mistaken. Nor, apparently, did

Newman recognize the book's thrust: "it is doctrinaire," he wrote of it, "and (*I think*) somewhat self-confident, but it will do good."⁷⁵ The problem was that Gladstone wrote in so convoluted a fashion that he failed to communicate his intended meaning. The style was in part habitual, in part deliberately guarded so as not to create unnecessary offense. The presentation was also a result of hasty revision. The book began as a set of papers on particular Church principles written some time before,⁷⁶ and the material is not smoothly welded together. The practical section could have formed a separate work, a policy that Gladstone was considering even during the final process of rewriting in August 1840 when he was only ten days away from dispatching the text to the publisher.⁷⁷ He was "much dissatisfied" with the rambling first two chapters at proof stage in the following month and still "had some thoughts of cutting off I & II without mercy."⁷⁸ The publisher reported in December that the volume had sold 1,300 copies,⁷⁹ but few readers will have spent the time needed to grasp the sense of the tortuous and discursive prose. When Owen Cole, an Oxford friend, thanked Gladstone for a copy of *Church Principles* in December, he remarked that it was "addressed to a higher order of mind than mine, but whenever I perceive your meaning I am struck with the truth of your remarks." Only occasionally, when Gladstone "condescended to an illustration" did Cole find the text illuminating.⁸⁰ If that was the view of a friend, it is not surprising that the book's opaque pages created little stir.

In the short term, the writing of *Church Principles* undoubtedly affected Gladstone's revision of his earlier book defending the established status of the Church of England. *The State in its Relations with the Church* had first appeared in 1838 with second and third editions virtually unchanged in 1839. By contrast, the fourth edition, published in the spring of 1841, was transformed. The first three editions had appeared in only one volume, each of them 324 pages in length, but the fourth edition was in two volumes, at 344 and 406 pages, each of them longer than the previous single volume. The argument was hugely expanded. This greater prolixity was in part the result of a close relationship with *Church Principles*. On 9 October Gladstone was still correcting the revised proofs

of that book when he recorded in his diary that he "Wrote on Ch[urch] & St[ate]. I must now think seriously of my recasting process."⁸¹ Only ten days later he set about the task, working intermittently but intensely on the process over the next two months. The final preparation for the printer was made on 30 December.⁸² Although the preface of the fourth edition was dated 3 April 1841, it had been completed immediately after *Church Principles*. Gladstone carried over his long-winded writing technique from one book to the other. There was a consequence for the content as well as the scale of the text. In the preface to the fourth edition he remarks that a prominent objection to his work had been that the doctrine had "a tendency towards exclusion, and even persecution."⁸³ He meets that case, central to Macaulay's biting review, by enlarging his section rebutting the charge from seven to forty-one paragraphs.⁸⁴ In *Church Principles* he had taken pains to adopt an irenic approach and so to repudiate the claim that a high view of the Church led to persecution. The emphasis on conciliating opponents was sustained at length in the fourth edition of *The State in its Relations with the Church*.

Over the longer term the volume has some significance as a statement of Gladstone's churchmanship. He was to modify what he looked back on from 1894 as its "very sanguine Anglicanism,"⁸⁵ but he was not to depart from its fundamentals. He went further into Anglo-Catholic culture and adopted the teaching about the eucharist and the incarnation of the Tractarians during the later 1840s,⁸⁶ but he did not repudiate the distancing from the Tractarian position set out in *Church Principles*. Gladstone's abhorrence of party continued to differentiate him from the Oxford Movement. Although he might accept the theology of the movement, he did not embrace its exclusive ecclesiastical stance. His eagerness for an accommodation with liberal Catholics and Protestant Dissenters expressed in 1840 anticipated his ecumenical concerns of the 1870s.⁸⁷ He continued to believe that the apostolic succession does not invalidate Nonconformist churchmanship, a position that smoothed his political conjunction with Nonconformists in later life.⁸⁸ And he persisted in holding that the Evangelicals in the Church of England were properly the foes, not of High

Church doctrine, but of latitudinarian laxity.⁸⁹ For Gladstone, Catholic principles remained elastic.

The book of 1840 also helps explain something of Gladstone's subsequent behavior. Its argument that Church principles form a bulwark against Roman Catholicism was deeply felt, as is evidenced by the inclusion in the volume of an appendix devoted to dealing with an apparent exception to the rule.⁹⁰ That shows why Gladstone was overwhelmed by a sense of betrayal when, in 1851, the two men who had shared his vision of a Catholicized Church of England most closely, Hope and Manning, went over to Rome. It is not surprising that the event precipitated the greatest psychological crisis of Gladstone's career.⁹¹ A rumbling aversion to papal claims later burst out in a volcanic eruption of pamphlets against "Vaticanism" in 1874-75. Behind Gladstone's fierce polemic lay the shattering by the First Vatican Council's definition of papal infallibility of the dreams for liberal Catholic developments in the Roman Church sketched out in *Church Principles*.⁹² And the book of 1840 helps explain Gladstone's future course in another way. By self-consciously writing as a layman on Church questions, Gladstone was identifying a role which he continued to consider of great importance. In 1852 he published a case for the introduction of laymen into the government of the Episcopal Church of Scotland.⁹³ When out of office in the 1870s, 1880s and 1890s he filled much of his time in producing articles on religious issues.⁹⁴ Because of his eminence as a statesman, Gladstone was able to gain a far wider audience for his views than if he had written as a clergyman. As he recognized in 1840, a layman could sometimes be the best advocate of an ecclesiastical cause.⁹⁵

University of Stirling

Notes

¹ *The Gladstone Diaries*, ed. Michael R.D. Foot and H. Colin G. Matthew, 14 Vols. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1968-94), Vol. 3, 49 (25 July 1840), 32-33 (3 June 1840).

² T.B. Macaulay to Macvey Napier, 13 November 1840, in George O. Trevelyan, *The Life and Letters of Lord Macaulay* (London: Longmans,

Green and Co., 1881), 395.

³ William E. Gladstone, *Church Principles considered in their Results* [hereafter *CP*] (London: John Murray, 1840), 30.

⁴ [Henry Rogers], "Puseyism, or the Oxford Tractarian School," *Edinburgh Review* 77 (1843), 501-62. See also, e.g., Daniel C. Lathbury, *Mr. Gladstone* (London: Mowbray, [1905]), 25-26.

⁵ Perry Butler, *Gladstone: Church, State and Tractarianism: A Study of his Religious Ideas and Attitudes, 1809-1859* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1982), 59-66. David W. Bebbington, *The Mind of Gladstone: Religion, Homer and Politics* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004), 69-74. This essay draws extensively on the latter book.

⁶ *CP*, 33

⁷ *CP*, 34.

⁸ *CP*, 30.

⁹ W.E. Gladstone to H.E. Manning, 31 August 1840, British Library [hereafter BL] Add. MS 44247, f. 88r.

¹⁰ *CP*, 31.

¹¹ Peter J. Jagger, *Gladstone: The Making of a Christian Politician* (Allison Park, PA: Pickwick Publications, 1991), Ch. 8.

¹² Robert Ornsby, *Memoirs of James Robert Hope-Scott*, 2 Vols. (London: John Murray, 1884), 206-14.

¹³ David W. Bebbington, "Gladstone's Preaching and Gladstone's Reading," *Nineteenth-Century Prose*, Vol. 39, No. 2 (2012), 113-36.

¹⁴ W.E. Gladstone to H.E. Manning, 28 September 1837, 11 November 1837, 18 February 1838, in *The Correspondence of Henry Edward Manning and William Ewart Gladstone*, ed. Peter C. Erb, 4 Vols. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013), Vol. 1, 71-74, 82-86, 88-91.

¹⁵ W.E. Gladstone to J.R. Hope, 24 October 1839, Hope-Scott MSS, National Library of Scotland [hereafter NLS], MS 3672, ff. 44v-45. W.E. Gladstone to H.E. Manning, 11 April 1840, 11 July 1840, 31 July 1840, in Erb, ed., *Correspondence of Gladstone and Manning*, Vol. 1, 153, 166, 174. *Gladstone Diaries*, ed. Foot and Matthew, Vol. 3, 46 (17 July 1840).

¹⁶ *The Gladstone Diaries*, ed. Foot and Matthew, Vol. 3, 53, 54 (16,

19 August 1840).

¹⁷ CP, 28.

¹⁸ CP, 32.

¹⁹ CP, 31.

²⁰ F.D. Maurice to Julius Hare, 28 December 1840, in *The Life of Frederick Denison Maurice*, 2nd edition, ed. Frederick Maurice, 2 Vols. (London: Macmillan and Co., 1884), Vol. 1, 302.

²¹ CP, 31.

²² W.E. Gladstone to H.E. Manning, 23 April 1837, in *Correspondence of Gladstone and Manning*, ed. Erb, Vol. 1, 51.

²³ CP, 123-29.

²⁴ CP, 183.

²⁵ W.E. Gladstone to H.E. Manning, 11 August 1840, in *Correspondence of Gladstone and Manning*, ed. Erb, Vol. 1, 182.

²⁶ CP, 258, 267.

²⁷ Richard Brent, *Liberal Anglican Politics: Whiggery, Religion and Reform, 1830-1841* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1987).

²⁸ W.E. Gladstone to H.E. Manning, 11 August 1840, in *Correspondence of Gladstone and Manning*, ed. Erb, Vol. 1, 182.

²⁹ CP, 34.

³⁰ W.E. Gladstone to H.E. Manning, 13 November 1840, in *Correspondence of Gladstone and Manning*, ed. Erb, Vol. 1, 192.

³¹ CP, 33.

³² CP, 27, 34.

³³ CP, 165.

³⁴ CP, 99, 13.

³⁵ CP, 37.

³⁶ CP, 13.

³⁷ CP, 34.

³⁸ CP, 471.

³⁹ CP, 470.

⁴⁰ CP, 20.

⁴¹ CP, 165, 193.

⁴² CP, 470-71.

⁴³ CP, 25.

⁴⁴ Bebbington, *Mind of Gladstone*, Ch.3.

⁴⁵ CP, 54, 46.

⁴⁶ F.D. Maurice to Julius Hare, 28 December 1840, in *Frederick Denison Maurice*, ed. Maurice, Vol. 1, 302.

⁴⁷ CP, 313.

⁴⁸ W.E. Gladstone to J.R. Hope, 24 October 1839, NLS MS 3672, f.45.

⁴⁹ W.E. Gladstone to John Gladstone, 11 August 1840, Glynne-Gladstone MSS, Flintshire County Record Office, Hawarden, 226, f.40.

⁵⁰ CP, 315.

⁵¹ Bebbington, *Mind of Gladstone*, 68.

⁵² Henry E. Manning, *The Unity of the Church* (London: John Murray, 1842), 382. William Palmer, *A Treatise on the Church of Christ*, 3rd edition, 2 Vols. (London: J.G.F. & J. Rivington, 1842), Vol.1, 13.

⁵³ CP, 411.

⁵⁴ CP, 415.

⁵⁵ CP, 496.

⁵⁶ W.E. Gladstone to H.E. Manning, 22 April 1841, in *Correspondence of Gladstone and Manning*, ed. Erb, Vol. 1, 217.

⁵⁷ CP, 506.

⁵⁸ Louis Allen, "Gladstone et Montalembert: correspondance inédite," *Revue de littérature comparée*, 30 (1956).

⁵⁹ Félicité Robert de Lamennais, *Affaires de Rome* (Paris: Cailleux, 1836-37). CP, 367.

⁶⁰ CP, 360.

⁶¹ CP, 510.

⁶² CP, 509.

⁶³ John Powell, "Gladstone and the Oxford Movement," typescript, 14-16 (presented at the Christianity and History Forum, Ware, Hertfordshire, 2015). W.E. Gladstone to J.R. Hope, 13 February 1840,

NLS MS 3672, f. 57v (printed in D.C. Lathbury, *Correspondence on Church and Religion of William Ewart Gladstone*, 2 Vols. (London: John Murray, 1910), Vol. 1, 232). CP 329n.

⁶⁴ W.E. Gladstone to J.R. Hope, 13 February 1840, NLS MS 3672, f. 57v.

⁶⁵ CP, 390.

⁶⁶ W.E. Gladstone to H.E. Manning, 22 April 1841, in *Correspondence of Gladstone and Manning*, ed. Erb, Vol. 1, 218.

⁶⁷ CP, 152n.

⁶⁸ CP, 390.

⁶⁹ CP, 392.

⁷⁰ William E. Gladstone, "Present Aspect of the Church" [1843], *Gleanings of Past Years, 1843-78*, 7 Vols. (London: John Murray, 1879), Vol. 5, 61.

⁷¹ W.E. Gladstone to J.R. Hope, 13 February 1840, NLS MS 3672, f. 58, printed in Lathbury, *Correspondence*, Vol. 1, 233.

⁷² CP, 320.

⁷³ CP, 535, 552-53, 550-51.

⁷⁴ CP, 532.

⁷⁵ J.H. Newman to Frederick Rogers, 25 November 1840, in *Letters and Correspondence of John Henry Newman*, ed. Anne Mozley, 2 Vols. (London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1891), Vol. 2, 321-22.

⁷⁶ W.E. Gladstone to J.R. Hope, 24 October 1839, NLS MS 3672, ff. 44v-45.

⁷⁷ W.E. Gladstone to H.E. Manning, 11 August 1840, in *Correspondence of Gladstone and Manning*, ed. Erb, Vol. 1, 182. *Gladstone Diaries*, ed. Foot and Matthew, Vol. 3, 55 (21 August 1840).

⁷⁸ *Gladstone Diaries*, ed. Foot and Matthew, Vol. 3, 58 (9, 10 September 1840).

⁷⁹ W.E. Gladstone to John Gladstone, 12 December 1840, Glynne-Gladstone MSS, Flintshire County Record Office, Hawarden, 226, f. 64.

⁸⁰ Owen B. Cole to W.E. Gladstone, 4 December 1840, BL Add. MS 44137, f. 46.

⁸¹ *Gladstone Diaries*, Vol. 3, 63 (9 October 1840).

⁸² *Gladstone Diaries*, Vol. 3, 64 (19 October 1840), 75 (30 December 1840).

⁸³ W.E. Gladstone, *The State in its Relations with the Church*, 4th ed., 2 Vols. (London: John Murray, 1841), Vol. 1, vii.

⁸⁴ Gladstone, *State in its Relations with the Church*, 4th ed., Vol. 1, 305-42.

⁸⁵ John Brooke and Mary Sorensen, eds., *The Prime Ministers' Papers: W.E. Gladstone: 1. Autobiographica* (London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office, 1971), 145.

⁸⁶ Bebbington, *Mind of Gladstone*, Ch. 4.

⁸⁷ H. Colin G. Matthew, "Gladstone, Vaticanism and the Question of the East," in *Religious Motivation: Biographical and Sociological Problems for the Church Historian* (*Studies in Church History*, ed. Derek Baker, Vol. 15) (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1978).

⁸⁸ W.E. Gladstone to G.S. Barrett, 18 October 1894, in Lathbury, *Correspondence*, Vol. 1, 410.

⁸⁹ William E. Gladstone, "The Evangelical Movement: Its Parentage, Progress and Issue" [1879], *Gleanings*, Vol. 7.

⁹⁰ *CP*, 561-62.

⁹¹ H. Colin G. Matthew, *Gladstone, 1809-1898* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1997), 93.

⁹² Matthew, "Gladstone, Vaticanism and the Question of the East."

⁹³ William E. Gladstone, *A Letter to the Right Rev. William Skinner, D.D., Bishop of Aberdeen, and Primus, on the Function of Laymen in the Church* (London: John Murray, 1852).

⁹⁴ Bebbington, *Mind of Gladstone*, Ch. 8.

⁹⁵ I am grateful to Dr John Powell for several references in this article. I am also glad to acknowledge the support from the British Academy and the Carnegie Trust for the Universities of Scotland that made possible some of the research on which this paper is based.

Bibliography

Manuscripts

Gladstone Papers, British Library, Add. MSS 44137, 44247.

Glynne-Gladstone MSS, Flintshire County Record Office, Hawarden.

Hope-Scott MSS, National Library of Scotland, MS 3672.

Other Sources

Allen, Louis. "Gladstone et Montalembert: correspondance inédite."

Revue de littérature comparée, 30 (1956), 28-52.

Bebbington, David W. "Gladstone's Preaching and Gladstone's Reading."

Nineteenth-Century Prose, Vol. 39, No. 2 (2012), 113-36.

———. *The Mind of Gladstone: Religion, Homer and Politics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004.

Brent, Richard. *Liberal Anglican Politics: Whiggery, Religion and Reform, 1830-1841*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1987.

Butler, Perry. *Gladstone: Church, State and Tractarianism: A Study of his Religious Ideas and Attitudes, 1809-1859*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1982.

The Correspondence of Henry Edward Manning and William Ewart Gladstone, 4 Vols. Ed. Peter C. Erb. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013. Vol. 1.

The Gladstone Diaries, 14 Vols. Ed. Michael R.D. Foot and H. Colin G. Matthew. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1968-94. Vol. 3.

Gladstone, William E. *Church Principles considered in their Results*. London: John Murray, 1840.

———. "The Evangelical Movement: Its Parentage, Progress and Issue." [1879]. In *Gleanings of Past Years, 1843-78*. 7 Vols. London: John Murray, 1879. Vol. 7.

———. *A Letter to the Right Rev. William Skinner, D.D., Bishop of Aberdeen, and Primus, on the Function of Laymen in the Church*. London: John Murray, 1852.

———. "Present Aspect of the Church." 1843, *Gleanings of Past Years, 1843-78*. 7 Vols. London: John Murray, 1879. Vol. 5.

- . *The State in its Relations with the Church*, 4th edition. 2 Vols. London: John Murray, 1841.
- Jagger, Peter J. *Gladstone: The Making of a Christian Politician*. Allison Park, PA: Pickwick Publications, 1991.
- Lamennais, Félicité Robert de. *Affaires de Rome*. Paris: Cailleux, 1836-37.
- Lathbury, D.C. *Correspondence on Church and Religion of William Ewart Gladstone*. 2 Vols. London: John Murray, 1910. Vol. 1.
- . *Mr. Gladstone*. London: Mowbray, [1905].
- Letters and Correspondence of John Henry Newman*. Ed. Anne Mozley. 2 Vols. London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1891. Vol. 2.
- The Life of Frederick Denison Maurice*, 2nd edition. Ed. Frederick Maurice. 2 Vols. London: Macmillan and Co., 1884. Vol. 1.
- Manning, Henry E. *The Unity of the Church*. London: John Murray, 1842.
- Matthew, H. Colin G. *Gladstone, 1809-1898*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1997.
- . "Gladstone, Vaticanism and the Question of the East." In *Religious Motivation: Biographical and Sociological Problems for the Church Historian. Studies in Church History*. Ed. Derek Baker. Vol. 15. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1978.
- Ornsby, Robert. *Memoirs of James Robert Hope-Scott*. 2 Vols. London: John Murray, 1884.
- Palmer, William. *A Treatise on the Church of Christ*, 3rd edition. 2 Vols. London: J.G.F. & J. Rivington, 1842.
- Powell, John. "Gladstone and the Oxford Movement." Typescript, 14-16, presented at the Christianity and History Forum. Ware, Hertfordshire, 2015.
- The Prime Ministers' Papers: W.E. Gladstone: I. Autobiographica*. Ed. John Brooke and Mary Sorensen. London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office, 1971.
- [Rogers, Henry]. "Puseyism, or the Oxford Tractarian School." *Edinburgh Review*. Vol. 77 (1843), 501-62.

Trevelyan, George O. *The Life and Letters of Lord Macaulay*. London:
Longmans, Green and Co., 1881.

