

this decree, did but add lustre to the faith and bring new converts to the Church. The preamble of the decree seems but to echo the language of Demetrius a century before; what he feared has actually come to pass. Artemis is being dethroned by the preaching of the Cross.

But her final fall was delayed yet a century longer; in A.D. 262 her temple fell a prey to the Goths, and her worship ceased.

E. L. HICKS.

RECOLLECTIONS OF DR. DÖLLINGER.

III. ENGLISH TOPICS.

NOT many foreigners outside the circle of professional diplomatists have habitually preserved such a keen and well-informed interest in England as Dr. Döllinger. The many Englishmen who just once in their lives have visited Munich, and obtained half an hour's conversation with its great theologian, must often have been surprised at the amount which he knew about their own country, and the readiness with which he comprehended anything which they had to tell him respecting the questions which were occupying English thought at the time. He was a German of Germans; but after Germany England had the next place in his affection and admiration. Not a few of his most intimate and best loved friends and pupils were Englishmen. He visited England more than once, and cherished a lively and happy recollection of what he had seen there. He habitually read English newspapers and periodicals, and liked to converse in English. Whatever drew Germans and Englishmen together was a delight to him; and it was the settled conviction of his life, a conviction which during his later years became an enthusiasm,

that *in the friendship of Germany and England lay the best guarantee for the peace and well-being of Europe.*

Of English topics, three in particular never failed to interest him in conversation : the English Church ; English politics, especially the career of Mr. Gladstone ; and Oxford. The present paper will make some attempt to record a few of his utterances upon these and other kindred subjects.

There was scarcely any question connected with England, or indeed with modern problems of any description, on which he had a more decided opinion than upon the disestablishment of the English Church. He believed that such an event, if ever it came, would be utterly calamitous, and that its evil consequences would reach far beyond England or the Anglican communion. It would be a heavy blow to the cause of religion throughout Europe. The interpretation put upon it would be, that the most religious nation in the world had made up its mind that its Church was no longer worthy of maintenance, and that it would not have come to this conclusion without at least doubting whether *religion* was worthy of maintenance.

“ An establishment, among many other good things, has this great advantage. It gives you the right to appeal to all those numbers of merely nominal Christians who have not declared themselves to be Dissenters. If they profess to be Christians, and are not avowedly Nonconformists, you have a right to assume that they belong to the national Church. In these cases (and they are very numerous) it is not an impertinence on the part of the parish priest to visit such nominal Christians as being his parishioners ; on the contrary, he is only performing his duty in doing so. But if there is no established Church, then the clergy of the Church have no right to pay ministerial visits to any but those who declare themselves to be Churchmen. Even if an establishment had no advantage but this, it would be worth keeping.”

He was most anxious on the subject, especially during the clamour for disestablishment a few years ago. At that time he brought me a copy of the *Guardian*, and pointed out a letter in which the writer expressed the opinion that if disestablishment could be staved off for a year or two longer, the Church would be safe from this disaster for an indefinite period. "What do you think of that?" said Dr. Döllinger.

"I believe that there is a great deal of truth in it. Englishmen always respect hard and disinterested work. And there is such an immense amount of really splendid work being done by all sections of the clergy, that the Church is steadily regaining its hold of the masses."

"I am delighted to hear that you can think so," he replied. "I have been so long accustomed to regard the disestablishment of the English Church as only a question of time, that the opinion that it may still be averted—at least for a very long time—is quite a new light to me. No one will rejoice more than I shall, if it should prove to be well grounded."¹

On the question of the Burials Bill, he was much surprised that any English Churchmen, and especially the clergy, should object to being freed from the obligation of burying Dissenters at the cost of admitting Dissenting ministers to the churchyards. "That is astounding. Among ourselves there would not be two opinions upon the subject. We would far rather give up the churchyards to Dissenters than be compelled to use the liturgy of the Church for them. If it be regarded as a question of desecration, the desecration of Church services would seem to us a more serious matter than the desecration of Church

¹ When I returned to England I told Bishop Lightfoot of the conversation, and asked him his opinion of the view propounded by the writer in the *Guardian*. "I do not know that I should venture to say that 'a year or two' would suffice; but give us twelve years, and then I think that we are safe."

grounds. In Germany no difficulty ever arises from Catholics and Protestants using the same burial grounds simultaneously; and where there is a Catholic mortuary chapel, the Protestants never attempt to obtain the use of it. This use of common graveyards has produced a curious influence of Protestantism upon the Church. Formerly Catholics never had any address made at the grave; merely the Church's office for the burial of the dead, but no sermon. Protestants, on the other hand, always had an address; and now that both use the same burial grounds, Catholics have been induced to have an address also, this custom being very much liked. And one may add, that the Protestant addresses are commonly much better than the Catholic ones. But the whole system is an evil. Of course the dead person has to be mentioned, and much of what is said is taken up with the chief points in his life. For the sake of the friends and relations present the mention is laudatory, and in some way or other the deceased person is held up as exemplary.' It sometimes happens that the minister at the grave praises a man whom all the bystanders know to have been utterly godless. I remember the case of a professor, who made no secret of being a sceptic, and told his colleagues that he regarded the Bible as a tissue of fables. When he died, those who attended his funeral were told by the minister that the deceased was one who in his study of the past always found God in history:—and I do not suppose that the word 'God' occurs from the first page to the last in his writings. If some one in England were to lift up a warning voice on this subject, he would be doing good service."

On another burning question he took a somewhat similar view, *viz.* that of the Athanasian Creed. In Germany such a commotion as we had had in England about the use or disuse of the creed would scarcely (he said) be possible.

"Few people here would insist upon rigid agreement

with formulas in a matter of such inscrutable mystery as the Trinity. In some particulars it is impossible to know the meaning of the terms used. The most subtle philosopher and the most profound theologian cannot explain the difference between 'generation' and 'procession' in the 'generation of the Son' and the 'procession of the Spirit.' I believe that the Athanasian Creed is as old as the sixth century, about A.D. 580 or 590, and that it was put together soon after the conversion of king Recaredo in Spain. When it was composed Arianism was abroad. Whole nations were converted to Arianism, and every one was keenly alive to the doctrine of the Trinity. The questions which perplex *us*, and which *we* have to try to solve, are of a very different kind. The Reformers made a great mistake in putting the creed in the public service; it should never have been placed there. With us it is recited only in the choir service on Sunday, a service at which very few of the laity, if any, are present; and if any are present, they are not likely to be offended by the creed, for it is said in Latin, and so fast, that the congregation will probably not know what is being said."¹

"Do you think that if the English Church were to abolish the public use of the Athanasian Creed, it would have any effect with regard to a future union between the English Church, the Old Catholics, and the Orientals?"

Dr. Döllinger laughed, and said: "Not the least effect, whatever you do. The Old Catholics are not so fond of the Athanasian Creed, least of all the damnatory clauses. Of course they believe the main body of doctrine contained in it, but they have no special affection for the creed as it

¹ When I told him that some experts who had been examining the Utrecht MS. containing the creed had pronounced it to be of the latter part of the sixth century, he shook his head very doubtfully. "That is very difficult to affirm. It is almost impossible to distinguish between MSS. of that age, of the seventh, and of the beginning of the eighth centuries, unless the *matter* of the MS. is decisive. There is no difference in the writing."

stands. *But you will not abolish it. You will retain it, and make the use of it optional.*"

"We are sometimes told that if we abandon the use of the creed, there will be an end of all chance of union with the Old Catholics."

"Oh, no; it would make no difference."

Dr. Döllinger was fully convinced that Anglican orders are at least as valid as those of the Church of Rome. He believed that the more the subject was investigated the more it would be found out and admitted that a better case can be made out for English orders than for Roman. At the time of the Council of Florence Pope Eugenius IV. published a decree (*Decretum pro Armeniis*) in which the matter and the form of the seven sacraments were defined; and in the case of ordination the matter essential to validity was ruled to be, *not* the imposition of hands, but the giving of the cup and paten (*porrectio instrumentorum*) to the candidate for priest's orders. This decree was acted upon. Ordinations in which the customary tradition of the paten and chalice had been omitted were treated as invalid. On the other hand, the imposition of hands was treated as a merely symbolical act, a usual accompaniment of the ceremony, but not essential. So that in numberless ordinations in the Roman Church since the decree of Eugenius IV. there is at least a possibility that the imposition of hands was omitted. The decree was drawn up by the famous Turrecremata (Torquemada), and it is one more illustration of the astounding ignorance of scholastic theologians respecting the doctrines and discipline of the primitive Church. In this case a leading theologian induced a pope to decree as of apostolic authority a custom which at the very utmost is not older than the end of the eleventh century, and probably is not earlier than the twelfth. It was about that time that the custom of presenting the chalice and paten to the person to be ordained priest was introduced. This grave

blunder of Eugenius IV. is a more serious difficulty with regard to Roman orders than anything which can be urged against Anglican orders; and if Anglican controversialists always met the attack on their orders by pointing out the confusion introduced by Eugenius IV., such attacks would probably become less frequent. The Nag's Head fable is of course exploded. The consecration of Bishop Barlow, Parker's consecrator, was never called in question until 1616, eighty years after the event; and the validity of Parker's consecration is so strongly attested that Lingard does not venture to question it. Bossuet also admitted it; and it cannot be questioned excepting upon sceptical grounds which would render history impossible.

“One thing which strikes a German very much when he travels in England is the silence of church bells. During the whole six work-days he never hears them; and his ear is so accustomed to the sound of them at home that the absence of it at once makes itself felt. Daily service, you tell me, has greatly increased of late years; still the lower orders in England (I am speaking of Protestants) hardly know what prayer means; they have never been brought up to it. Now the poor with us, especially the women, when they are in trouble, go instinctively to the church and pray, and come away soothed and comforted. English poor read their Bibles, but they do not pray much. Very much the same holds good of German Protestants. But our Protestants have their religious songs, their *Lieder*, and many of these are prayers, and are a great help to them. They know them by heart, for their rhyme and rhythm make them easy to remember; and thus they are always ready at hand when they are wanted. In England you have not this; and you have not the word to express it, not having the thing itself. ‘Song’ will not do; a *Lied* is not exactly a song.—We all of us have a great deal to learn from one another. All the great Christian communities must try to

learn one another's *good* points: that is one of the ways in which reunion will come about. The walls of partition must be broken down more and more."

"They have begun to crumble somewhat already."

"Yes," said Dr. Döllinger; "another such pope as Pius IX. will help forward the work greatly."

"You mean, that the constraint will become intolerable, and then the barriers must give way."

He nodded assent, and continued: "I only hope that we may have a pope who will make two more new dogmas. I could wish for nothing better. Say, the immaculate conception of S. Joseph, or of the blessed Virgin's legendary grandmother, S. Anna; or, again, the assumption. It is not impossible that the bodily assumption of the Virgin may be erected into a dogma. It is impossible that a hundred and eighty millions of people can go on believing such things as elements of the Christian faith. A time must come when reason will assert itself, and then true religion will obtain a hearing."

Dr. Döllinger was a good deal perplexed as to the small amount of intellectual and moral resistance which the Jesuits have met with in England as compared with that which has confronted them in Ireland; and, so far as I am aware, he never found a solution which satisfied him. "I have often wondered," he said, "and I have never yet been able to satisfy myself about the matter, why it is that the Jesuits have never made any way in Ireland. They never seem to have done so. In the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries one hears little or nothing of them in the island: and even now, I believe, their influence there is very small. One is inclined to think that there must be something in the Irish character which makes it not very suitable material for Jesuit influences to work upon. Yet one would have thought that the English character was still more alien to the Jesuit system of espionage, casuistical

shuffling, sacrifice of the intellect, and so forth. When I was at Stonyhurst, however, there were about a dozen Englishmen, all Oxford men, all converts, and all being trained as Jesuits. The same difference is seen in the United States. The Jesuits get very little hold over the Irish Roman Catholics there, and make very few recruits from among them; whereas with Roman Catholic immigrants from other nationalities they have some success. I do not know what the reason is."

In 1873 Dr. Döllinger asked me what was thought in Oxford of Gladstone's Irish University Bill. I replied, "Much the same as in England at large: general approval at first, followed by criticism of details, and ending in decided hostility." Dr. Döllinger said that he quite understood ultramontane opposition to the bill. If the university was made such as to attract Catholic laymen, and bring them into contact with sound education and with the better class of Protestants, the Catholic laity would soon be emancipated from the priests. At the same time he thought that the bill offered advantages to Catholics, which were not likely to be offered again; and hence the opposition of Protestants to it. He did not think that the fact of having two professors in the same faculty preaching exactly opposite doctrine was the objection to concurrent endowment. They had had Catholic and Protestant chairs in theological and other subjects for years at Tübingen, Bonn, and elsewhere, and no difficulty had arisen on that score. *The* objection was, that directly you appoint a Catholic professor as such, you put the whole faculty at once in the power of the bishops, *i.e.* of Rome. He believed, however, that Cardinal Cullen's opposition to the bill was quite *bonâ fide*; there was no wish to grumble at it, and yet get it passed. In spite of its concessions to Catholics, it was too much against ultramontane interests to be acceptable.

The proposal to yield to Mr. Parnell's demand for an Irish Parliament he regarded as disastrous and amazing. He said to me in 1886, that Mr. Gladstone's change of policy seemed to him "one of the most extraordinary delusions ever seen in a statesman. It is so perfectly evident that whatever power is granted to an Irish Parliament will be used to make the separation between the two countries more complete." He laughed at Manning's heroic audacity in asserting that Roman Catholics have never persecuted Protestants in the past, and therefore are not likely to do so in the future. "One of the first things that the Irish Parliament would do would be to take possession of Trinity College, Dublin, and turn it into a Roman Catholic University." He was surprised at Cardinal Newman's silence on the subject. "It is not often that he allows a great question like this to arise without expressing an opinion upon it. But even Manning himself has become more cautious."

Dr. Döllinger considered that one of the main sources of the strength of the English Church was the fact that on the whole clergy and laity have the same education. He was entirely opposed to the system of seminaries, *i.e.* separate schools and colleges for those who are destined for holy orders.

"The system was ordered by the Council of Trent, but until the last thirty or forty years it was but little known in Germany. It has its advantages, but its disadvantages are enormous; and the marked inferiority of the younger clergy, who have been brought up under this system, to the older, who have not, is everywhere admitted. By the seminaries boys and young men are, so to speak, *cheated* into taking holy orders. They are taken from their families before they know anything of the world or their own tastes, and they do not return into the world until the irrevocable step has been taken. They know nothing of women, young or old,

and at four and twenty they are in the confessional hearing the confessions of girls and women of all ages, with nothing to guide them but the coarse books of casuistry on which they have been trained in the seminary. With some ill-advised question they reveal evil not dreamed of before, and ruin a young girl's delicacy of mind for ever."

For schools, he was inclined to think that the confessional was almost a necessity; not as being either prevention or cure, but as acting as a check upon grave evils, of which you would otherwise know nothing; or which, if you did know of them, you would be unable to reach.

Although full of sympathy for the High Church and historical school in the Church of England, Dr. Döllinger had no admiration for Ritualism. "What an extraordinary thing that is,—that enthusiasm about vestments, which makes men fanatical about a chasuble! It is a condition of things which you would find in no other country. And about a chasuble of all vestments, which is certainly neither graceful nor convenient! *We* are so used to them, that they do not strike us as particularly bad; but if we had not got them, we should not be likely to desire them.¹ The chasuble is not at all an ancient vestment. I do not understand why those who care for such things do not go to the Greek Church for their models. The Greek vestments are both more convenient and more dignified; and, indeed, in most matters of ritual Greek usage is more in conformity with the primitive type.—An English clergyman once called on me, who evidently thought that I should be very pleased to know that, in celebrating the eucharist, he wore vestments

¹ On one occasion he spoke of a chasuble as a *shocking* garment. He was also of opinion that elaborate ceremonial is distracting rather than helpful. At pontifical high mass, for instance, the celebrant *cannot* attend to the prayers: he must give his whole attention to the ritual, or all will go wrong. And, as a matter of *personal taste*, he disliked music at the eucharist. Beautiful music interrupted instead of helping his devotion.

closely resembling those of our own clergy. And some time afterwards I received a photograph of him in this costume: beretta, chasuble, lace, and all the rest of it. It amused me much, and (I confess) rather disgusted me: first, that he should care to be photographed in such attire; and, secondly, that he should suppose that I should care to have the photograph."

Dr. Döllinger was always interested in the work being done by the Clarendon Press. He thought that it ought to publish a good edition of the Greek Fathers. "That is a thing still wanted. If I had large sums of money to dispose of, the first thing I would do would be to publish a new and entirely revised text of the general councils—the Greek ones, of course—especially the third, fourth, fifth, and sixth; above all, the council at Constantinople at the time of Photius. A text was published at Rome in the seventeenth century, when Baronius and Bellarmine were still living; and that text is very uncertain and suspicious. I believe that all our printed texts are mere copies of that. They need to be revised with the MSS. which exist at Paris, Vienna, Munich, and elsewhere. You may have some in Oxford. Some society ought to undertake the work; and, of course, it would require the united labour of many persons to carry it out. It was talked of in Paris not long ago, and I was consulted about it; but the war of 1870 intervened, and I heard no more of the subject."

He was curious to see how the translation of Ranke's *History of England*, undertaken by the Clarendon Press, would be received in England. He greatly admired Ranke's thoroughness and enormous powers of production; even in Germany there was no one like him. He considered the histories of England, of the Reformation in Germany, and of Wallenstein, to be Ranke's best productions. They formed complete wholes, and were the result of his more mature powers. The *History of the Popes* was an earlier

work, and defective in many ways. Changes of policy in the popes were not noticed, and the whole of the Jansenist controversy was very inadequately treated, and apparently not understood.

On the propriety of allowing books to be taken out of the Bodleian Library to the homes of students, Dr. Döllinger had a very strong opinion. He was in favour of a very large amount of freedom. He said that if the restrictions enforced at the Bodleian prevailed in the public libraries of Germany, the literature of the country would be reduced by one-half. Not that such a result would be altogether to be deplored, if only one could choose the half. But it was precisely the more solid and valuable half that would be sacrificed.

He thought the method of appointing professors by the whole university, *i.e.* by Convocation, about the worst method possible, and one which ought to be altered at the earliest opportunity. An intelligent despotism, such as the Crown, is perhaps the best authority in such matters.

He thought it a strange thing that, while France had its Academy for the promotion of the highest kinds of literary work, and Germany had several such, England had none. England had great wealth, a high average of education, splendid libraries, scientific and artistic collections of quite unrivalled excellence—in fact, all the conditions of a successful Academy, and yet no such thing existed. I said that the functions of an Academy were discharged in other ways, and that we were apt to regard the French Academy as a warning, rather than an example. He thought that the two great universities prevented the growth of an English Academy. Neither of them was comprehensive enough to furnish the material, and outside of them a sufficient number of learned and scientific men was not to be found.

Among modern English writers, Dr. Döllinger had a

decided liking for Carlyle. "Carlyle is a wonderful person. He seems to me to stand quite alone in literature. He is like nobody else; *we* certainly have no one like him. He has founded no school, and he has had no imitators. Indeed, an imitator would be intolerable. Carlyle himself is irritating enough. But it is always worth while puzzling out what he means. One cannot compare Victor Hugo with him. Victor Hugo never wrote anything serious. The only person who seems to me to be at all like him—and he is very unlike—is Ruskin. It is difficult to compare the two; they are so different. And yet one feels that they have something in common. They might be called prophets, but without the gift of prophecy."

But I have seldom, if ever, heard him speak with greater admiration of any book than he expressed to me last July for Dr. Salmon's *Infallibility of the Church*. He had read it with the keenest delight. Its humour, *good* humour, dialectical skill, and thorough knowledge of the ins and outs of the controversy, had given him immense enjoyment. And of the whole subject treated in the volume there was no critic who could at all equal Dr. Döllinger. If the knowledge of his admiration for the book induces any reader of this article to study the volume, he will thank me for having mentioned the fact.

ALFRED PLUMMER.