

RECOLLECTIONS OF DR. DÖLLINGER.

V. BIOGRAPHICAL.

IT will probably be a long time before a life of Dr. Döllinger is written. Unless some competent person has already been at work for some years, which is hardly likely, we shall have to wait until the large amount of material which exists can be collected and placed in its proper relations. Meanwhile those who have material for such a work will do well to make it known. In the present paper I propose to put together a few facts which happen to be known to myself, all of which are of interest, and a few of which may be of permanent value.¹

Dr. Döllinger was born at Bamberg, Feb. 28th, 1799, but his boyhood was spent at Würzburg. When the University of Bamberg came to an end in 1803, his father, who had been Professor of Medicine there, was translated to Würzburg, where he remained for twenty years, and then moved to Munich, which was not yet the seat of a university, but became so in 1826. In 1841 the father died at the age of seventy-one. The father was a celebrity in his day, famous as a teacher of anatomy. Teaching his little son the rudiments of learning was a different matter. When the boy was five years old he began Latin, and two years later Greek, which the father himself learnt, in order to teach his son, because at that time there was no one in Würzburg able to teach Greek. Of course the boy made mistakes in his exercises, and these tried his father's temper. After a series of perhaps specially faulty exercises had been produced, the father threatened him that unless the next one was done without a mistake, he would abandon the attempt to make a scholar of him and give him the choice of a *trade*. The boy never doubted, either

¹ The very full article by Lord Acton in the *Historical Review* for October, 1890, ought to be studied.

that there would be mistakes, or that his father would keep his word. He lay awake choosing his trade, and decided on that of a bookbinder. But the next exercise was free from mistakes, and the bookbinders lost an interesting apprentice. When he was seventeen he went to the *gymnasium* at Würzburg, where Richarz, afterwards Bishop of Augsburg, was one of his teachers, and later on to the university.

It was probably before he went to either that he made his first and last attempt at smoking. I once remarked that as a German professor who did not smoke he was exceptional, and asked him whether he had ever done so. "No," he replied; "with one exception, never. Once I did make the attempt; but it made me so miserably ill, and my father, when he discovered it, boxed my ears so soundly for it, that I never repeated the experiment."

He was fond of entomology then, and it is said that he acquired a great knowledge of the subject. But in later life he seemed to have lost all interest in the study. I have no recollection of the insects which we saw during our walks ever leading him to converse on the subject, or of his ever drawing an illustration from insect life. His illustrations were generally historical.

He had no interest for sport. During a drive at Tegernsee, in 1878, I had been asking some questions about game in the neighbourhood. He told me what he could, and then added: "But I do not know much about the subject. I never fired a gun in my life."

It was during the early Würzburg days that he laid the foundations of that extraordinary command of modern languages which so distinguished him in after life. As already stated,¹ he learnt the elements of English from one of the last remaining Benedictines in the old Scotch monastery at Würzburg; and among the first English books which he studied were the *Vicar of Wakefield* and

¹ See THE EXPOSITOR for August.

the *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*. The way in which he learnt French (and probably Italian) is still more interesting.

In August, 1876, my wife and I had been dining with him, and after dinner he took us into his library, which he wished her to see, saying in his playful way: "Not *quite* all my books are uninteresting. Only an unmarried man could have so many books.¹ A husband would not be allowed to have so many. You see, I am obliged to make use of all available space. That was once a wood closet." Among the books which he showed and commended to us was Lanfrey's *Life of Napoleon I.*; and he went on to tell us of his seeing Napoleon at Würzburg.

"I admired him then perhaps as much as I detest him now. But my mother did not admire him at all; for, during a whole year we had three or four soldiers billeted upon us, and she had to lodge and feed them. I liked it well enough, for I was glad of an opportunity of practising my little knowledge of French with the soldiers, who were always affable enough, and pleased to be understood by me. Moreover I was scarcely a German then; for in Würzburg we hardly knew what we were. Napoleon had given us a Tuscan duke, who went back to Tuscany again when Napoleon fell. There was not much German sentiment in us then. So as a lad I naturally enough admired Napoleon for his success, and did not care much about anything else. I remember very well hearing that there was to be a review, and that Napoleon was to be there. We lads ran off to get as near to him as we could; and I got very near—almost as near as I am to you; and we tried to keep up with him as he went along the line. Of course there was

¹ About 30,000 volumes. Many of his shelves had two rows of books, one behind another; and he knew what books were in the back rows, although most of them had been out of sight for years. In his last illness he wanted a book from one of these back rows, and was able to tell exactly where it would be found.

great enthusiasm ; every one was full of admiration for him. But in his face there was not the slightest response ; no emotion whatever ; no sympathy with those around him. It was a face of stone, like the statue in *Don Giovanni* ; there was nothing human in it. I have never seen anything like it before or since—never. The turning point of opinion about him in Bavaria was the Russian campaign. When 30,000 Bavarians were left dead in the retreat from Moscow, that opened people's eyes.¹ I cannot feel any admiration for him now. I dislike him, if for nothing else, for his heartless conduct to women ; and, besides that, his whole policy was utterly selfish. His soldiers were devoted to him, because he gave them plenty of *gloire* and pillage : a Frenchman is always intoxicated with *gloire*. The Italians, who are not, were not devoted to him ; they disliked the whole war, and would gladly have gone back to Italy. We had Italian soldiers quartered upon us as well as French."

He could remember Scribe's plays being the rage when he was a boy—probably a little later than the incident with Napoleon. "Scribe has given rise to a word which bids fair to be universal in its use. 'Chauvinism' is thoroughly admitted into German. Chauvin is a fire-eater in one of Scribe's plays, who is always wishing for war, in order to gain territory and *gloire* for France."

Not all of Dr. Döllinger's school life was spent at Würzburg. During the latter portion of it he was at Munich. In 1878 he told me that, when he first came to Munich as a lad, a certain Herr Lange and his sons were painters there. Lange had a good deal to do with the arrangement of the Pinakothek. A visitor once asked him whom he

¹ One day, as we passed the bronze obelisk which Ludwig I. erected to the memory of these 30,000, with the inscription, "They too died to set their country free," Dr. Döllinger remarked, "That is a monument put up to the shame of Germany!" But his special aversion in history was, not Napoleon, but Philip II. He would not allow that even our king John was as detestable.

considered to be the first among living artists in Europe. "My son," said Lange, "is the *second*; modesty forbids my naming the *first*." I said that a similar remark is attributed to an Oxford scholar, who said that Oxford possessed three theologians: Pusey, Mozley, and one whom modesty did not allow him to mention. "He was modesty itself compared with Lange," said Dr. Döllinger: "he only put himself third in Oxford; Lange put himself first in Europe. I can tell you another of Lange's feats. He was commissioned to paint an altarpiece for the Studien-kirche in Munich—the one on the Promenade Platz. The subject was to be 'Suffer the little children to come unto Me.' Lange had a daughter of about seventeen, who was very coquettish indeed. What did he do but paint this girl, with her coquettish face and manner, as the principal figure among the children brought to Christ! The altar-piece was put up and was the talk of Munich. Every young man and most of the boys who went to the church knew perfectly well whose portrait it was over the altar. I saw it there myself. I was a boy in the upper classes, just going to the university. But it did not remain there long. It caused such a scandal, that after a short time it was removed."

In 1880 he said to me: "We Germans have a saying—I do not know whether you have the same in England—that what one wishes for much in youth one has in old age in abundance. Goethe has put it as the motto in his autobiography.¹ There are two things which I used to wish for very much as a young man, and I used to look forward to the day when I should possess them—a country living and a garden. And I have got neither of them, and am never likely to get them; so that the saying does not hold good in my case. I had them in a sort of way for a very short

¹ "Was man in der Jugend wünscht, hat man im Alter die Fülle" is the motto to the second part of the autobiography.

time. For just one year (1822, 1823) I was coadjutor—what you would call a curate—to a very old priest. And then I was appointed professor at Aschaffenburg; and so it all came to an end. One thing more I used to wish for very much, and that I *have* got; *viz.* a library.”

In 1877 he told me of an amusing experience which he had in this curacy (at Markt-Scheinfeld). A Protestant had died, and a pastor came to bury him. A Protestant funeral being a rare event in the village, the Catholics gathered in numbers to witness the ceremony. The pastor and his congregation were in the churchyard round the grave, while the Catholics crowded round outside the wall, which chanced to be a low one. At Protestant funerals it is usual to sing a hymn, which is given out by the sacristan. The Catholics knew something of the Protestant hymn-book, and knew that there was a hymn beginning with the words, “Ach, Gott, wie is der Mensch so dumm!” Accordingly, before the sacristan could give out the proper hymn, one of the Catholics from the wall gave out this one, to the considerable amusement of the bystanders.”

He had known an instance of the *stigmata*. We were talking in 1872 of the *stigmata* of S. Francis.

“It is a thing about which there is a good deal of doubt as to the fact, and also (if it was a fact) as to the cause. Instances of the stigmatization of women are common enough; but that of S. Francis is the only case of the stigmatization of a man. It is recorded of many female saints, and is *known* to have taken place in some cases. I saw one instance of it myself in the Tyrol. The woman had a reputation for great sanctity, and pilgrimages were made to see her. She may be living yet. I was living close by, and saw her several times and observed her. She was constantly in a state of ecstasy, quite unconscious. I remarked that flies walked about over her eyeballs, without her taking any notice. She was an invalid, and confined

to her bed. But every Thursday evening and Friday she gave herself up to the contemplation of the passion, kneeling up in bed in quite an ecstatic condition. When she returned to consciousness, she did not speak, but made signs of recognition. The stigmata were rosy-coloured spots on her hands, and she was believed to have the same on her feet. The latter of course I did not see. How they were produced I do not pretend to say. It is not yet sufficiently known how far such things may be the result of natural causes, such as a violently excited imagination. On the other hand, some women have such an intense passion for being considered peculiarly saintly or endued with special spiritual gifts, that they will do the most extraordinary things to obtain such a reputation. Some of these cases of stigmata may be mere trickery. The stigmata caused disputes between the Franciscans and Dominicans. The Franciscans wanted to have a monopoly of the stigmata, while the Dominicans claimed the honour for S. Catherine of Siena."

Clement Brentano, author of a *Life of the Virgin, according to the Visions of Anna Katharina von Emmerich*, lived for some years at Munich, and Dr. Döllinger used to see him rather frequently and walk with him. Brentano told him a great deal about this celebrated Westphalian nun, whom he used to visit. Apparently without being aware of the fact, Brentano used to supply her with materials for her visions; *i.e.* he told her things of which she had never heard before, and these came back to him again in the form of visions and revelations, which he took down from her lips and afterwards published. These were chiefly minute details about the passion and about the Virgin Mary, such as are to be found nowhere excepting in legends. I asked Dr. Döllinger whether he thought that in such cases the woman was generally honest.

"Only half, only half. The temptation to be 'inter-

esting' is to most women almost irresistible. They will practise deception involving the most painful privations and sufferings in order to be thought specially gifted. Another famous case was that of a Spanish nun, Maria d'Agreda (1602-1675), authoress of *The Mystic City of God*. It created an immense amount of controversy. Bossuet and other French prelates wished Rome to condemn it. The whole Franciscan order defended it, for the nun was a Franciscan. Meanwhile the book was translated into several languages and circulated everywhere. It makes the blessed Virgin a kind of second Saviour, and has been one of the main causes of the modern extravagant cultus of the Virgin.¹ An attempt was made to get the nun canonized, but the Pope refused. Brentano told his nun all about the Spanish nun, of whom she had not previously heard. A few days after this she had had a vision. She had seen a church with an open door, and a nun in the Franciscan habit on the door-step. Two monks were trying to push her into the church. All of no avail: the Franciscan nun was too stout, and could not be made to pass through the door-way! This was Maria Katharina's reproduction of what Brentano had told her, with the implication that Maria d'Agreda ought not to be canonized, and that the *Mystica Ciudad de Dios* was all nonsense. This was Brentano's own opinion of the book, as he told me; but he never seemed to see the similarity between his own nun and the Franciscan nun."

It is not generally known that some of the Liberal French bishops, Dupanloup, Maret, and others, were among the first to suggest to the Pope the idea of a General Council, which they thought might check ultramontanism and effect

¹ It has a chapter on what Mary was doing before she was born, and gives a long prayer which she offered in her mother's womb (i. 20)! Mary ascends with Christ (vi. 29), and then returns to earth to become the "patroness and mistress of the Church" (vii. 1); as such she instructs the apostles, sends S. James to *Spain*, etc., etc.

some reforms. Most of the Curia were quite opposed to the proposal; but the Pope, who saw in it an opportunity for much ceremony and parade, was very pleased with the idea. Thereupon the Jesuits and Manning stepped in, and turned the Council into an engine for the *promotion* of ultramontaniam. Maret himself came to consult Dr. Döllinger on the subject, and the latter told the Bishop of Sura that he thought the project of agitating for a General Council one of very dubious expediency.

January 4th, 1871, the Archbishop of Munich wrote to Dr. Döllinger a long letter, conjuring him to cease from helping to disturb the unity of the Church, and threatening him with penalties if continued provocation should be given. In his reply of the 29th Döllinger said that if he were able to refute, or see refuted, the objections which he himself had publicly urged against the dogma, he would submit and with sorrow confess his errors. If he submitted *without* this refutation, no one would believe in the sincerity of his submission; he would be convicted of cowardice and hypocrisy. February 14th, Archbishop Scherr told him curtly that he must declare his position towards the Vatican decrees by March 15th—the Ides of March;¹ which was another coincidence, like the definition of the dogma on the *dies Alliensis*. March 14th, Döllinger asked for another fortnight, which the archbishop granted, intimating however that no further delay would be allowed. This request of Dr. Döllinger for extension of time was variously interpreted at the moment. Some said that he was going to yield; others that there were certain services in the Royal Chapel in which the *Stiftspropst* would have to take a prominent part, and that it would be equally awkward, whether

¹ It was on March 15th, 1890, that the minister Von Lutz allowed it to be stated in the Bavarian diet that the government could no longer regard the Old Catholics as members of the Catholic Church. A few weeks later he resigned, and a few months later died.

he was absent because of being excommunicated, or present in spite of this. Delay would enable these services to be held before the excommunication. Here is his own account of the matter. We had been talking in 1872 of some eccentric doings of the Bishop of Passau. "He is a strange man," said Dr. Döllinger. "He was the last of the German bishops to give in his adhesion to the Vatican Council—only at Easter last year. He wrote to the Archbishop of Munich to say that he had been meditating during Holy Week on the passion of our Lord, especially on the bloody sweat; and that he himself had been well nigh in the same condition in considering what was to be done respecting the decrees of the Council. He had a great deal more trouble than I had. It did not take me two minutes to decide what I ought to do: I very soon made up my mind about that."

"Although the archbishop did give you some extra weeks in order to think it over—after March 15th."

"Yes; I had been told to declare myself by that time. But I wrote and told the archbishop, in a letter which I mean to publish some day,¹ that I was not ready with my statement; that I should require some time before I could finish, but that as soon as it was completed he should have it. The fact was, I had not quite made up my mind what points I would bring forward most prominently, and what I would leave out altogether. The archbishop wrote back, and said that I could have two more weeks. I sent him my declaration within the time, telling him that it would be published in the *Allgemeine Zeitung* the same day. The services in the Royal Chapel had nothing to do with the delay; it was merely that my declaration was not ready."

After a pause he went on:

"In the fifteenth century it was the German universities which stood up for the liberties of the Church

¹ It has just been published in *Briefe und Erklärungen*, a most interesting collection of documents (Beck: Munich, 1890).

against the Pope, and contended for the principle of the Council of Constance—the superiority of councils to popes. It was that wretched Frederick III., the worst emperor in the whole succession of emperors, who made a bargain with the Pope, and (for a large sum of money and absolution from all his sins) sold to Eugenius IV. the liberties of the German Church. He forced the universities to give way. Vienna held out longest; it still held to the Council of Basel. But at last it gave way also; the faculty of theology last of all. *Janus* exposes that transaction between Frederick III. and the Pope (§ xxvi., p. 352); it was not so well known before that. People have remarked a likeness between *Janus* and *Quirinus*; but whether they are brothers, or cousins, or what, is still discussed. It was a *bishop* who supplied most of the material for *Quirinus' Letters from Rome*. *Ce qui se Passe au Concile* was written by a Parisian, Jules Galliard; but he had good materials to work from.”

People are apt to think that excommunication is an obsolete and ridiculous weapon, incapable of injuring the object of it. That certainly was not Dr. Döllinger's view of his own sentence. He fully believed that it was iniquitous and therefore invalid, and that it left him spiritually unharmed; but he was profoundly sensible of other effects. A Roman Catholic friend, who to a large extent shared his views, said to him, “Well, at any rate, they cannot burn us at the stake.”

“No,” said Döllinger sternly; “they cannot burn us at the stake. But they can inflict an amount of moral torture, to which the stake would perhaps be preferable.”

To another he said, “I am the fascine, which is flung into the ditch, to help the others to cross.”

And even the stake was not so far off. The penalty which was inflicted on him was “the greater excommunication, *with all the canonical consequences which are attached to*

it." Among these "canonical consequences" is this, that any zealot may slay the excommunicated person. It is laid down that any one who out of genuine zeal kills such an one *nullam meretur pœnitentiam*. And the Munich police formally warned Dr. Döllinger that violence was contemplated, and that he ought to be cautious and not go out unattended. This will to some seem incredible; but he himself states it both in his letter to Archbishop Steichele and in that to the nuncio, Ruffo Scilla (*Briefe und Erklärungen*, pp. 140, 153).

Few things were more touching, even in his pathetic life, than the way in which he would excuse (defend he could not) those bishops who, before and during the Council, made use of him to oppose the dogma, and afterwards condemned him for not accepting it. He would point out the terrific oath of subservience to Rome which every bishop in her communion has to take at his consecration; the habit, which for generations has been a second nature with them, of exhibiting this subservience on all occasions; and the huge difficulties which bishops who refused to submit would have had to confront. "There would have been a schism in every diocese. Every bishop would have had a large number of his clergy, and of the laity also, up in arms against him. Those opposed to him would of course have Rome on their side: and among those opposed to him would be *all* the religious orders and *all* the old women; and those are two hosts in themselves. The state of things would have been intolerable; it would have been impossible to go on."

"And now," I ventured to reply, "instead of a schism in every diocese, you have a schism in every individual conscience. I am not sure that that is not worse."

He gave no answer. After a pause he said: "Had I been a bishop in the circumstances, what I should have done would have been this. As soon as I returned from

Rome, I should have called a diocesan council, as many of the clergy as I could get, and a certain number of the laity ; and I would have said to them : ' I cannot accept this new doctrine ; it is not the doctrine of the Church. If you cannot accept it either, good : we will stand by one another. You must support me, and I will support you.' But if a large majority had said, ' We submit ; we accept the dogma,' then I should have resigned my bishopric. This is what our bishops might have done ; but they were not men of character enough for that."

" What would have been the result here in Munich ? Would the archbishop have been supported by his clergy ? "

" Yes, he would."

Like some other great scholars he worked as if he were to live for ever, keeping many things on hand, planning many others, and finishing very few. I sometimes ventured to urge him to complete and publish something, or I counted up the number of subjects on which *I* knew him to be at work ; and there were of course others. At one time he would reply, " Yes, it is too much, too much," or, " The fact is I have too many irons in the fire " ; at another, " There is one happy thing however, that I am still strong and in good health, able to work all day and take pleasure in it."

His walking powers to the last were extraordinary. When I suggested that he had done too much, he said, " Oh ! a walk never tires me." In 1886, when he was eighty-seven, he walked with me one evening for three hours and a quarter, without once sitting down. Last year, when he was ninety, he walked with me for nearly an hour in unfavourable weather.

And his abstemiousness was extraordinary. For many years he took only a meal and a half a day, a light breakfast and an early dinner, after which he ate nothing till the next morning. " Of course when I was your age I used to

take supper ; but now I do not require it. Your late dinners do not suit me at all." Of late years he drank no wine, excepting when his doctor ordered it. Beer he never would touch ; he thought that it made people heavy, and less fit for intellectual work. He had been told that the Bavarian beer had also bad physical effects, and that the frequent incontinence of the Bavarian clergy was in a measure owing to their free consumption of beer. "But, as I never drink it myself, I do not know whether there is any truth in this."

His great fondness for children has been noticed. He was not fond of dogs or of animal pets. On one occasion we passed a frightful poodle, to which I said, "You ugly dog!" Dr. Döllinger asked me whether I had ever kept a dog ; and when I replied in the negative, he said : "Nor have I. I have always been able to live without animals about me. One child is much more interesting to me than the whole animal world put together."

On another occasion he remarked that a dog is the only animal that makes a noise for the mere sake of making it, —a *very* characteristic reason for dislike. "No animal is so shamelessly obscene. Having dogs for pets is a modern and western invention. Neither the old Greeks nor the old Romans made pets or companions of them, nor do orientals at the present day." He was quite otherwise with respect to children. The year after my eldest child was born, his first inquiries, after greetings had been exchanged, were about him. "The older I grow the more interest I take in children."

"We say in England that they are young bears, with all their troubles before them."

"Yes, and their *choice* before them also. And the object of education is just that—to make the choice and the happiness superior to the troubles."

Dr. Döllinger had never seen the notorious Lola Montez. It was strange that I, who had never been in Munich before

1869, eight years after the famous ballet girl had died in comparative poverty at New York, should have seen her and heard her lecture, while Dr. Döllinger, who had suffered severely through her intrigues, should never have set eyes on her. Of course he knew a great deal about her. She was the natural daughter of a Scotch officer and a Creole, who, after adventures in India, England, Paris, and Brussels, went to Munich in 1846 as a Spanish dancer, and there captivated Ludwig I. Dr. Döllinger said that the king was quite fascinated, but that he believed there was nothing positively wrong in his relations to the actress. She tried to gain over some of the students' clubs to her coterie, but quite without success. She took captive however many individual students, and made them into a club of her own, which she called the Alemannia. No inn or hotel in the city would allow her to make its premises the headquarters of this club, so she had an elegant *Kneipzimmer* fitted up at the back of the charming house which the king had given her. Here she would meet her worshippers. The club colours were red, blue, and gold, and it sometimes came into collision with other clubs. She caused the overthrow of the ultramontane ministry of Abel, which opposed the king's proposal to ennoble her. Under Wallerstein's ministry this was accomplished, and she was created Gräfin Landsfeld. Her insolence and that of her club brought things to a crisis in 1848. She had to leave Munich, and never returned. Owing to her intrigues Dr. Döllinger lost his professorship for a time (1847-1849), and thereby his seat in the chamber. It was during this interval that he was a member of the Parliament of Frankfurt in 1848, of which there is now only one member surviving, Dr. Sepp. When Ludwig I. resigned, King Maximilian II. restored Dr. Döllinger to his professorship.

During the last fifteen years of his life two things grieved him sorely: the *non possumus* attitude adopted by Dr.

Pusey on the *Filioque* question, and the abolition of clerical celibacy by the Old Catholics. The one he attributed to casuistical tendencies and a constitutional dread of possible consequences ; the other he regarded as fatal.

“You in England cannot understand how completely engrained it is into our people that a priest is a man who sacrifices himself for the sake of his parishioners. He has no children of his own, in order that all the children in the parish may be his children. His people know that his small wants are supplied, and that he can devote all his time and thought to them. They know also that it is quite otherwise with the married pastors of Protestants. The pastor’s income may be enough for himself, but it is not enough for his wife and children also. In order to maintain them he must take other work, literary or scholastic ; only a portion of his time can be given to his people ; and they know that when the interests of his family and those of his flock collide, his family comes first and his flock second. In short, he has a profession or trade, a *Gewerbe*, rather than a vocation ; he has to earn a livelihood. In almost all Catholic congregations a priest who married would be ruined ; all his influence would be gone. The people are not at all ready for so fundamental a change, and the circumstances of the clergy do not admit of it. It is a fatal resolution.”

But he was not at all bitter about this or about other things which much more nearly affected himself. In his later years, while his convictions deepened, he became more and more tolerant of the convictions of others and more gentle towards them. He did not shrink from owning that there had been a time when he had spoken and written with harshness about opinions which were much nearer the truth than he had then believed. He had found out many mistakes in his own views ; and this fact, together with his natural goodness of heart, made him increasingly

tender towards others. His own difficulties and trials did not harden him : they made him all the more sympathetic and generous.

During the last nine or ten years of his life one of his nieces devoted herself to taking care of him, and during the last six years a second niece joined her sister in this willing and constant devotion. A translation of a letter from Dr. Friedrich has been published, in which he is made to imply that there had been a time in which the nieces had not been on good terms with their uncle, and had not done their duty towards him. What Professor Friedrich actually wrote I do not know ; but I have good means of knowing that the translator must have given a meaning to the original which it neither expressed nor implied.

A few words about his ecclesiastical position since April 23rd, 1871. He was an unjustly excommunicated Roman Catholic. He shared the convictions of the Old Catholics, was on terms of closest friendship with their leaders, and was always ready to give them advice and other assistance ; but *he was not a member of the Old Catholic communion*. The evidence for this is overwhelming.

1. Excepting at the Reunion Conference at Bonn, *he never attended an Old Catholic service*. At Bonn the service was exceptional. It was an earnest of the reunion for which those who went thither were working. If attendance at that service proved Döllinger to be a member of the Old Catholic body, then various members of the English, American, and Lutheran Churches are proved to be so also by precisely the same fact. At Munich he never entered the Old Catholic church, although his relations attended the services. To explain this by saying that he was an old man, and that he lived some distance from the church, is *strangely to impugn his religious earnestness*. He could walk for two or three hours without resting, and he was

well enough off to afford a carriage whenever he needed one. His reason for absenting himself from Old Catholic services had nothing to do with the distance between his house and the building in which they were held.

2. One of his nearest relations said to me last July that his funeral was very characteristic; it was attended by Old Catholics, Anglicans, Greeks, Lutherans and other Protestants;—in short, by representatives of almost every Church, *excepting his own*.

3. Since his death his letter to the papal nuncio has been published, in which he states expressly: "*I do not choose to be a member of a schismatical society; I am isolated.*"

Je suis isolé. After his death, when his features had settled into their natural repose, his friends were struck by their resemblance to those of his favourite author, Dante. But he and Dante resembled one another in many other things besides face. They were alike in the greatness of their spirits, in the profundity of their convictions, in their dismay at the ruin of Christendom through the substitution of the papacy for the Church, in their endeavours to repair this ruin, and in their consequent sufferings. Each had this heavy price to pay for his greatness—he was alone.

ALFRED PLUMMER.