
Francia. Forschungen zur westeuropäischen Geschichte
Herausgegeben vom Deutschen Historischen Institut Paris
(Institut historique allemand)
Band 10 (1982)

DOI: 10.11588/fr.1982.0.51120

Rechtshinweis

Bitte beachten Sie, dass das Digitalisat urheberrechtlich geschützt ist. Erlaubt ist aber das Lesen, das Ausdrucken des Textes, das Herunterladen, das Speichern der Daten auf einem eigenen Datenträger soweit die vorgenannten Handlungen ausschließlich zu privaten und nicht-kommerziellen Zwecken erfolgen. Eine darüber hinausgehende unerlaubte Verwendung, Reproduktion oder Weitergabe einzelner Inhalte oder Bilder können sowohl zivil- als auch strafrechtlich verfolgt werden.

ALLAN MITCHELL

PARTNERS IN FAILURE: DUPANLOUP, DOELLINGER, AND THE
DOCTRINE OF PAPAL INFALLIBILITY

The importance of the First Vatican Council of 1870 hardly requires redefinition or reemphasis. Yet in evaluating that famous conclave, historians have as usual tended to dwell more often on success than failure, on what came to be – notably, the doctrine of papal infallibility – rather than what might have been or what was at least conceivable at the time. It is a familiar conundrum. The obvious difficulty with such counterfactual analysis is that there can be no accurate computation of how close an unrealized proposition approached feasibility. Nor can we be certain what consequences would have ensued from a set of circumstances that never coalesced. In short, there is no device to measure unexpended historical potential.

In this instance, nonetheless, it may be illuminating to pose a question about the possibility of a concerted resistance to the policies of Pius IX and to their formal proclamation by the assembled College of Cardinals in Rome. At least since the publication of the *Syllabus of Errors* in 1864, strident criticism of the papacy had been heard within the Catholic Church as well as without. But was there any realistic likelihood that a movement could be launched to block an ultimate ratification of the Pope's spiritual hegemony? Or, if not, can we at least locate the reasons why such opposition was doomed to frustration? The response lies in a reexamination of the relationship between two of the outstanding ecclesiastical figures of nineteenth-century Europe: Monsignore Félix Dupanloup, bishop of Orléans, and Ignaz von Döllinger, professor of Church history at the University of Munich.¹ Such an undertaking is now facilitated by publications from certain private correspondence, primarily that of John Acton, and by the recent availability of other still unedited letters and diaries.² From these sources we should be able in a brief space to review the

¹ See the standard biographies by François LAGRANGE, *Vie de Mgr. Dupanloup, Evêque d'Orléans*, 3 vols. Paris, 1883–1884; and Johann FRIEDRICH, *Ignaz von Döllinger. Sein Leben auf Grund seines schriftlichen Nachlasses*, 3 vols. Munich, 1899–1901. In the *Dictionnaire d'histoire et de géographie ecclésiastiques* one finds authoritative summaries on Dupanloup by Roger AUBERT (*ibid.*, 14: 1070–1122) and on Döllinger by Wolfgang MÜLLER (*ibid.*, 14: 553–63). On Dupanloup's role in the French episcopacy also see Jacques GADILLE, *La pensée et l'action politiques des évêques français au début de la IIIe république 1870/1883*, 2 vols. Paris 1967, 1:72–89. Likewise, from a German viewpoint, an indispensable study that devotes special attention to Dupanloup's contacts with Germany is that of Stefan LÖSCH, *Döllinger und Frankreich. Eine geistige Allianz 1823–1871*, Munich 1955, 247–343.

² See Victor CONZEMIUS (ed.), *Ignaz v. Döllinger – Lord Acton: Briefwechsel*, 3 vols. Munich, 1963–1971. In addition, I have been able to splice together for the first time the exchange of letters between Dupanloup and Döllinger from the holdings of the Archives du Séminaire de Saint-Sulpice in Paris and the Bayerische Staatsbibliothek in Munich. Other unpublished material – namely, reports from Baden's diplomatic envoy to Munich, Robert von Mohl – has been kindly made available to me by Professor Josef Becker of the University of Augsburg. As for memoirs, Döllinger apparently left none; but Dupanloup's unedited *Journal intime*, of which I have made extensive use, is housed in the Séminaire de Saint-Sulpice.

crisis of the Vatican Council and to augment the known historical record with some revealing details.

An initial meeting between Dupanloup and Döllinger occurred in September 1839 when the latter, at the age of forty, was making his first visit to Paris. There he established contacts within the circle of the Catholic liberal Comte de Montalembert, who had earlier passed several months in Munich and who now helped to provide his German colleague with access to several French clerics. Among them was Dupanloup, at the time an instructor in the seminary of St. Nicholas du Chardonnet. Although little of note has been recorded of this early encounter, it left an obvious imprint on Dupanloup, who was moved in 1848 to write to his »good and venerable friend«, asking Döllinger to file a report on revolutionary developments in Frankfurt and Munich: »You know my respect, my attachment for you. I would be a thousand times happy if the great interests of the Church would unite us even more intimately in the future.«³ Nothing came of this overture, apparently, although evidence exists that Döllinger remained well informed about Dupanloup's increasing prominence as a leader in the French episcopate and as a sometime opponent of its ultra-conservative wing, whose chief publicist was the editor of »L'Univers«, Louis Veuillot.⁴

A second rendez-vous was arranged by Montalembert in August 1855, when Döllinger and his student John Acton (who had coincidentally also been tutored as a schoolboy by Dupanloup) visited the mountain estate of Albert du Boys in the Savoy. At the chateau of LaCombe the two travelers passed »a couple of very pleasant days« in the company of Bishop Dupanloup, who thereupon invited them to stop at Orléans as their journey progressed.⁵ In mid-September Döllinger and Acton arrived in Dupanloup's episcopal seat »to pay our respects«.⁶ Once more, however, the relationship languished. More than a decade passed without further personal communication between Dupanloup and Döllinger, despite the sporadic interest each took in the other's career and the irregular link between them provided by the peripatetic Acton.⁷

Meanwhile Döllinger maintained several direct contacts in France through private correspondence and by receiving visitors in Munich. The most eager of these was Eugène Michaud, an ambitious and well connected young priest whose doctoral thesis was recommended to Döllinger by Montalembert and by Archbishop Darboy of Paris. Michaud's rather painful sycophancy limited the significance of his frequent

³ Dupanloup to Döllinger, 9 October 1848, BStB Munich, Döllinger Nachlass, II. Despite a few lacunae, including the letter cited here, the best account of the direct Dupanloup-Döllinger contacts is still LÖSCH, Döllinger und Frankreich (see n. 1) 246–85.

⁴ Ibid., 416–18. Also see Marvin L. BROWN, Jr., *Louis Veuillot, French Ultramontane Catholic Journalist and Layman, 1813–1883* Durham N. C. 1977, 348–88.

⁵ Döllinger to Montalembert, 30 August 1855, in: LÖSCH, Döllinger und Frankreich (see n. 1) 432–33. Scant reference to the LaCombe visit was made by Dupanloup in his »Journal intime«, entries for 28–29 August 1855, ASS Paris, Fonds Dupanloup, Journal.

⁶ Döllinger to Dupanloup, 15 September 1855, ASS Paris, Fonds Dupanloup, Correspondance.

⁷ Acton to Döllinger, 14 May 1860, in: CONZEMIUS, Briefwechsel (see n. 2), 1: 171–77. Döllinger to Montalembert, [?] December 1863, in: LÖSCH, Döllinger und Frankreich (see n. 3), 457–58. Acton to Döllinger, 5 February 1865, in: CONZEMIUS, Briefwechsel (see n. 2), 1: 387–89. See Georg SCHWAIGER, *Der Hintergrund des Konzils: Papsttum und Kirche in der Welt des 19. Jahrhunderts*, in: SCHWAIGER (ed.), *Hundert Jahre nach dem Ersten Vatikanum Regensburg 1970*, 11–30.

letters to Döllinger, but he was persistent and reasonably accurate in describing for his German mentor the solidification of ultramontanism in France and the relative isolation of those, such as Dupanloup, who were apprehensive about papal autocracy. »The episcopacy,« Michaud wrote in 1868 with some exaggeration, »no longer sees salvation except in Veillot, apart from a very small number of bishops who are silent and waiting.«⁸ This calm proved to be brief, since the Pope's intention to convene an ecumenical council at the Vatican was well known and the question of papal infallibility already emerged as a focus of dispute. It was the opinion of another of Döllinger's guests in Munich, the eminent Sorbonne theologian Charles Maret, that the suggestion to convene a council in Rome had actually originated with Dupanloup, that this initiative was at first resisted by the ultramontanes, but that the Roman Jesuits were cleverly beginning to maneuver the Council toward approving a formal edict of infallibility.⁹ Whatever Dupanloup's earliest intentions had been, he became openly worried about the possible consequences of a convocation, as he made clear by the publication of a pastoral letter in the autumn of 1868.¹⁰ One might have expected a favorable response from Döllinger for such an expression of concern not dissimilar to his own; but in fact the professor's attitude, stated to Maret, was frankly negative: »This seems quite vague . . . some beautiful, vapid phrases which are non-committal and which leave all questions and apprehensions regarding the Council unaffected.«¹¹ Döllinger's caveat was indicative both of a distinction in character between the two men and of a difference in their training. Döllinger was resolute, uncompromising, and habitually direct to the point of bluntness; Dupanloup was more casuistic, effusive in manner, and hence imprecise. Döllinger incarnated a strong tradition of theological faculties at the German universities; Dupanloup represented a country that lacked such schooling for its higher clergy and stressed practical training in the pastorate. Thus, unlike Döllinger, Dupanloup found himself unavoidably involved in the demanding local politics of a large diocese.¹² As a consequence, neither the latter's predilections nor his purposes coincided with those of Döllinger. These elemental

⁸ Michaud to Döllinger, 30 November 1868, BStB Munich, Döllinger Nachlass, II. Michaud's letters have been published in the *Zeitschrift für schweizerische Kirchengeschichte* 58 (1964): 309–56. There is an obvious hyperbole in this statement, yet »on exagèrait difficilement l'influence de Veillot, qui n'eut son equivalent en aucun autre pays«, observes AUBERT, *Le pontificat de Pie IX (1846–1878)*, Saint-Dizier 1952, 299.

⁹ Döllinger to Acton, 27 August 1868, in: CONZEMIUS, *Briefwechsel* 1: 512–14. On Maret's liberal Catholicism, see GADILLE, *Evêques* (see n. 1), 1: 89–105. A preparatory committee for the Council began to function in the autumn of 1867; and a formal bull of convocation appeared in the next summer (29 June 1868). See AUBERT, »Das Vatikanische Konzil«, in Hubert JEDIN (ed.), *Handbuch der Kirchengeschichte*, vol. 6: *Die Kirche in der Gegenwart*, Freiburg 1971, 774–91.

¹⁰ DUPANLOUP, *Lettre sur le futur concile oecumenique adressée par Mgr. l'Evêque d'Orléans au clergé de son diocèse*, Paris 1868. On the division among French Catholic leaders, and Dupanloup's place among them, see André LATREILLE et al., *Histoire du catholicisme en France*, 3 vols. Paris, 1957–62, 3: 394–95.

¹¹ Döllinger to Maret, 10 December 1868, in LÖSCH, *Döllinger und Frankreich* (see n. 1) 469–70. This was not the first instance of Döllinger's disapproval: nearly four years earlier he had (in English) castigated Dupanloup's defense of the *Syllabus of Errors* as »a very flimsy, rhetorical, unsubstantial performance«. Döllinger to Anna Gramich, 27 January 1865, *ibid.*, 253.

¹² See Christianne MARCILHACY, *Le diocèse d'Orléans sous l'épiscopat de Mgr. Dupanloup, 1849–1878*, Paris 1962, 433–576; and AUBERT, *Le pontificat de Pie IX* (see n. 8), 300–309.

discrepancies were implicit from the outset of their relationship and never ceased to color it.

It was at Dupanloup's initiative that the two resumed their acquaintance in December 1868. The Bishop had been informed, falsely, that Döllinger was soon leaving for Rome to participate in preparations for the forthcoming Council. What, Dupanloup wondered, did he hope to accomplish there?¹³ The reply from Munich made clear that Döllinger harbored no such intention, since he was considered »insufficiently ultramontane« to receive an invitation from the Vatican. Instead, he attempted in turn to prime Dupanloup with flattering words (»How many times I have wished that we had a Dupanloup in our German episcopacy!«) and with encouragement: »It is true that the French bishops, united among themselves, could prevent much damage; and even a handful of six or eight courageous bishops would suffice for that.« In addition, Döllinger delivered a Lutheresque diatribe against the »holy water, privileged altars, and indulgences without end« that had estranged Rome from »the aspirations of civilized peoples and their modern liberties«. Döllinger thereby confessed a »profound discouragement« about the current course of the Church, but he nonetheless urged Dupanloup to match »the magic of your pen and the flowers of your eloquence« against the Jesuits and the declaration of infallibility.¹⁴

By the beginning of 1869 Döllinger was thus committed to a vigorous battle against the papacy of Pius IX and he was convinced that Dupanloup's cooperation was essential to the success of that campaign. This view was shared by others, such as the Bavarian premier Chlodwig zu Hohenlohe, whose excellent connections in Rome, where his brother resided as a Cardinal, led him to conclude that »at least a minority of French bishops are beginning to become very dubious, and probably everything will depend on how Bishop Dupanloup takes a stand«. ¹⁵ Further confirmation came to Döllinger from Paris through his devoted disciple Michaud. The French clergy expected Dupanloup to play a restraining role at the Council, doubtless to the displeasure of the ultramontanes. Consequently, Michaud wrote, »I think that you are doing very well to fortify Mgr. Dupanloup. It is from him that salvation is awaited.« But he added an enigmatic word of caution: »I do not know of what he is capable. A mystery surrounds him.«¹⁶

To dispel such uncertainty and perhaps to agree on a common strategy, another direct encounter between Dupanloup and Döllinger was obviously desirable. Both felt a need to confer, as Dupanloup wrote, in order to hold »peaceful and confident

¹³ The letter began with the salutation: »Monsieur le professeur et bien excellent ami.« Dupanloup to Döllinger, 21 December 1868, BStB Munich, Döllinger Nachlaß, II.

¹⁴ Döllinger to Dupanloup, 28 December 1868, ASS Paris, Fonds Dupanloup, Correspondance. Döllinger's much later disclaimer that he had taken little note of Dupanloup thus rings entirely false: »Ich weiß von Dupanloup nicht viel; ich habe ihn nur 2 Mal [sic] in meinem Leben gesprochen. Seine Schriften habe ich nicht gelesen, nur in einigen derselben geblättert, weil ich meinte, nichts von Belang daraus lernen zu können ...« Döllinger to Acton, 7 May 1886, in CONZEMIUS, Briefwechsel (see n. 1) 3: 355.

¹⁵ Mohl to Freydlorf (Baden's foreign minister), 25 April 1869, Generallandesarchiv Karlsruhe, Abteilung 49, Bayern Fasz. 96, 235/13 034 (recently reclassified under the rubric »Das römische Concil«). Chlodwig zu HOHENLOHE-SCHILLINGSFÜRST, Denkwürdigkeiten, 2 vols. Stuttgart and Leipzig 1907, 1: 351–53, 359–60.

¹⁶ Michaud to Döllinger, 15 May 1869, BStB Munich, Döllinger Nachlass, II.

discussions of the great interests that are soon to be debated«. ¹⁷ Döllinger had already plunged into polemical warfare with a series of anonymous articles that attacked the designs of the Roman Jesuits and their ultramontane collaborators. His hopes were rising that Dupanloup would join in the crusade, and he took pains to warn the Bishop that the Church was approaching its most critical and dangerous juncture in the past three centuries – in other words, since the Counter-Reformation. ¹⁸ Visiting in Paris meanwhile, Acton learned that Dupanloup was indeed »standing firm«, but it was impossible to foresee just how persistent he would be. ¹⁹ Hence Döllinger, who had been unable to accept Dupanloup's invitation to meet in the French Alps at Menton in June, suggested that the two converse during Dupanloup's autumn vacation in Switzerland. The matter had become urgent, he thought, because of the recent vote in favor of infallibility by the Council's preparatory committee in Rome, raising his fears of »the total dissolution of Catholicism in Germany«. It was therefore imperative that they should consult, Döllinger wrote in glowing prose to Dupanloup, »for I am persuaded more and more that you are destined to become a chosen instrument which God wishes to employ in order to preserve the Church from immense danger«. ²⁰ In Döllinger's mind, we may conclude, a solution was beginning to emerge whereby he and Dupanloup would form the nucleus of a united Franco-German opposition to Pius IX. From Munich Döllinger would supply information and ideas, while in Rome Dupanloup would provide the indispensable political leadership on the scene once the Council was convened. Döllinger based his hopes on »the resistance that some French bishops, followed by some German bishops, may be able to mount against the decree [of papal infallibility]. At present this resistance is our only anchora salutis«. ²¹

The circumstantial evidence makes clear that mutual interests and common antipathies, as well as a certain curiosity, brought Dupanloup and Döllinger together for the last time in their lives on 5 September 1869. Dupanloup's diary relates that he felt extremely fatigued and uncertain about venturing a trip to Germany at all, but that Döllinger's pleading helped to sway him. The Bishop traveled by train to Cologne and then up the Rhine to Coblenz before arriving at Acton's private estate of Herrnsheim near Mainz. The meeting proved to be brief and inconclusive, at least for Dupanloup. In the usual cryptic style of his diary, he recorded only: »Döllinger . . . nothing but

¹⁷ Dupanloup to Döllinger, 29 May 1869, *ibid.*

¹⁸ Döllinger to Dupanloup, 2 April 1869, ASS Paris, Fonds Dupanloup, Correspondance. For the moment Döllinger was optimistic: »Anderseits ist Dupanloup und sind andere französischen Prälaten mit ihm entschlossen, Widerstand zu leisten.« Döllinger to Oxenham, 12 May 1869, cited by FRIEDRICH, Döllinger (see n. 1) 3: 483. See Walter BRANDMÜLLER, *Ignaz v. Döllinger am Vorabend des I. Vatikanums*, St. Ottilien 1977, 10–12.

¹⁹ Acton to Döllinger, 20 July 1869, in CONZEMIUS, *Briefwechsel* (see n. 2), 1: 565–66.

²⁰ Döllinger to Dupanloup, 10 August 1869, ASS Paris, Fonds Dupanloup, Correspondance. Increasingly Döllinger indulged in apocalyptic visions: »Bitter klagte Herr von Döllinger über die Unbekümmertheit und Unwissenheit der katholischen Laien. Wenn diese wüßte, wovon es sich auch für sie handle, so würde das ganze katholische Deutschland in lichten Flammen stehen.« Mohl to Freydorf, 9 June 1869, GLA Karlsruhe, Abt. 49, Bayern Fasz. 96, 233/11 749.

²¹ »Copie d'une lettre de M. le Docteur Döllinger à l'évêque de Sura [Maret]«, August 1869, ASS Paris, Fonds Dupanloup, Correspondance. See BRANDMÜLLER, *Döllinger am Vorabend* (see n. 18), 41.

very well ... except quite ironic smile.«²² Expressed in several letters to various friends, Döllinger's version of the encounter was far more detailed and revealing. In essence, Dupanloup had assured Döllinger that nearly fifty French bishops were prepared to join »hand in hand with the Germans« in opposition to the proclamation of papal infallibility. But this message posed two problems that Döllinger was quick to articulate. First, the number predicted by Dupanloup was possibly inflated, apart from »the question ... whether they will remain steadfast«. Second, the theological and political basis of opposition was still left to be defined. Dupanloup took the view that promulgation of papal infallibility would be inopportune, whereas Döllinger objected fundamentally to the doctrine itself – a categorical opinion that he published, ill concealed, under the soon infamous pseudonym of Janus. In private Döllinger expressed fears that the result of Dupanloup's position would be to have the matter »merely retarded, not resolved« (*bloss aufgeschoben, nicht aufgehoben*). We touch here once again on discrepancies of temperament and theology that had appeared at the first and would persist to the end. The final confrontation between Dupanloup and Döllinger at Herrnsheim therefore confirmed rather than mitigated their differences.²³

Nevertheless, as the opening of the Vatican Council approached, the two worked seemingly in tandem, each publishing anti-ultramontane tracts and each spurring the other on. After the scathing criticism of the Pope by Janus had created a sensation in Germany, Döllinger made confidential arrangements to have his brochure translated and distributed to French bishops.²⁴ Beset by requests that he travel to Rome, he entertained a personal visit from Cardinal Schwarzenberg of Prague and received an urgent letter from Montalembert, who (prompted by Dupanloup) called Döllinger »incontestably the leading figure of the Church in Germany«. Montalembert added: »Today it is from the Rhine that we receive light.« Yet Döllinger remained unmoved, convinced that his presence as *persona non grata* at the Vatican would be ineffective as well as intolerable. His light would continue to shine from Munich.²⁵

²² Dupanloup, »Journal intime«, entries for 10 August and 5 September 1869, ASS Paris, Fonds Dupanloup, Journal. The remark quoted here is omitted from LOUIS BLANCHEREAU (ed.), *Journal intime de Monseigneur Dupanloup, Evêque d'Orléans*, 2nd ed. Paris 1910, a selection too erratic to be very useful as a guide to the original diary, which merits a careful scholarly edition.

²³ Döllinger to Hohenlohe, 5 September 1869, in HOHENLOHE, *Denkwürdigkeiten* (see n. 15), 1: 392–93. Döllinger to Reusch, 13 September 1869, cited by FRIEDRICH, *Döllinger*, 3: 494–96. Döllinger to Montalembert, 31 October 1869, in LÖSCH, *Döllinger und Frankreich* (see n. 1), 473–75. On the Herrnsheim meeting and the Janus articles, see BRANDMÜLLER, *Döllinger am Vorabend* (see n. 18), 49–80.

²⁴ »Reichsrat von Döllinger hat mir das ergebenst angeschlossene Schriftchen mit der Bemerkung übergeben, es sei dasselbe dazu bestimmt, in gedrängter Kürze und leicht fasslicher Form die Gründe gegen das angebliche Dogma der päpstlichen Unfehlbarkeit darzulegen. Er hat Sorge getragen, dass es jedem französischen Bischofe zukommen werde. Eine deutsche Ausgabe zu gleichem Zwecke werde folgen.« Mohl to Freydorf, 31 October 1869, GLA Karlsruhe, Abt. 49, Bayern Fasz. 96, 235/13 034. The effort to influence French opinion by this means is confirmed by a letter from Michaud to Döllinger, 4 November 1869, BStB Munich, *Döllinger Nachlaß*, II.

²⁵ Montalembert to Döllinger, 7 November 1869, in LÖSCH, *Döllinger und Frankreich* (see n. 1), 475–77. Apparently Dupanloup had also directly encouraged Schwarzenberg to urge Döllinger to attend the Council, but the latter commented: »Tout cela est comédie – ich werde mich, wie Sie wissen, unter keinem Vorwande hinlocken lassen.« Döllinger to Acton, 22 November 1869, in CONZEMIUS, *Briefwechsel* (see n. 2), 2: 6–7. On this question see Hermann TÜCHLE, »In beiden Lagern. Deutsche Bischöfe auf dem Konzil«, in SCHWAIGER (ed.), *Hundert Jahre nach dem Ersten Vatikanum* (see n. 7), 31–49; and Klaus

Dupanloup was likewise active, but with two manifest differences: the authorship of his own polemics was undisguised; and his presence at the Vatican Council was of course foregone. For those reasons – although, as we have noted, not for them alone – his phrasing was less incisive than Döllinger's. Moreover, the Bishop's opposition remained essentially a criticism of the poor timing rather than an unequivocal rejection of the principle of papal infallibility.²⁶ Michaud tried to reassure Döllinger that Dupanloup only »pretends to wish to avoid the basic question«, but Döllinger was sceptical and continued to grumble about »this unfortunate inopportunity«.²⁷ Yet when Döllinger received a copy of Dupanloup's latest brochure, he exclaimed delight with the text and professed that »it surpassed my expectations«. He judged that, despite some obligatory »fleurettes for Rome«, Dupanloup's message was »a sharp slap in the face« for »the Roman-Jesuit party«. John Acton, already in Rome, did not altogether share Döllinger's stated optimism about Dupanloup's »declaration of war«. Admittedly the essay was, »despite all its absurdities and weaknesses«, a courageous statement; but in Acton's opinion its political premise was untenable and could only divide the inopportunists from the outright opponents of infallibility. Döllinger nonetheless took immediate steps to have Dupanloup's work translated into German and circulated throughout the country.²⁸

At the outset of the Vatican Council, the Dupanloup-Döllinger alliance probably constituted the sole possibility of a meaningful opposition to Pius IX. If the two men proved unable to rally the wavering and persuade the cautious, then the consequences could not be in doubt. Both were fully aware of the role they had to play. Although he was nagged by self-doubts, regularly confided to his diary, Dupanloup arrived in Rome with a determination »to do all that I can«.²⁹ Waiting for him there was a supportive letter from Döllinger, with a promise to continue to supply fresh data and documented arguments as the Council deliberated. Döllinger assured Dupanloup that his writings had already created an impact »equally as great in Germany as in France«

SCHATZ, *Kirchenbild und päpstliche Unfehlbarkeit bei den deutschsprachigen Minoritätsbischöfen auf dem I. Vatikanum*, Rome 1975, 121–33.

²⁶ Dupanloup's pastoral letter was published on 11 November 1869 as »Observations sur la controverse soulevée relativement à la définition de l'infailibilité au prochain concile«. Hohenlohe commented: »Dupanloup's Brief ist gut. Man sieht, Janus und andere Bücher sind ihm in die Nase gestiegen.« HOHENLOHE, *Denkwürdigkeiten* (see n. 15), 1: 404. Suspicion of collusion between Dupanloup and Döllinger thereafter became widespread. See AUBERT, *Le pontificat de Pie IX* (see n. 8), 321–22; LÖSCH, *Döllinger und Frankreich* (see n. 1), 278–80; and BRANDMÜLLER, *Döllinger am Vorabend* (see n. 18), 49–50.

²⁷ Michaud to Döllinger, 17 and 19 November 1869, BStB Munich, Döllinger Nachlaß, II. Döllinger to Michaud, 19 November 1869, in LÖSCH, *Döllinger und Frankreich* (see n. 1), 272. In two more articles (on 19–20 November 1869) in the *Augsburger Allgemeine Zeitung* Döllinger dismissed inopportunism as unserious and self-contradictory. See BRANDMÜLLER, *Döllinger am Vorabend* (see n. 18), 43.

²⁸ Döllinger to Michaud, 21 November 1869, in LÖSCH, *Döllinger und Frankreich* (see n. 1), 272. Döllinger to Acton, 22 November 1869, in CONZEMIUS, *Briefwechsel* (see n. 2), 2: 6–7. Acton to Döllinger, 22 November 1869, *ibid.*, 16. Dupanloup's pamphlet appeared at the end of the year in Munich as »Sendschreiben an den Klerus seiner Diocese über die Frage der päpstlichen Unfehlbarkeit.« See BRANDMÜLLER, *Döllinger am Vorabend* (see n. 18), 49–50.

²⁹ Dupanloup, »*Journal intime*«, entries for 17 September–5 December 1869, ASS Paris, Fonds Dupanloup, *Journal*. See AUBERT, *Mgr. Dupanloup au début du Concile du Vatican*, in: *Miscellanea Historiae Ecclesiasticae*, Louvain 1961, 96–116.

and claimed that »it has rarely been possible for a man, even a bishop, to produce such an instantaneous effect«. Now the same opportunity was presented to Dupanloup in Rome: »All eyes are turned toward you. You are regarded as the center of all sincere lovers of truth . . . The rest of us can only pray to God that the number of those who allow themselves to be guided by you will not be too small.« If it were only possible to persuade enough bishops to enter seriously into examination and discussion of the issues, Döllinger concluded with a parting flourish of bravado, »then I believe that the victory of truth is virtually assured«. ³⁰

We need not recapitulate here the history of the Vatican Council itself, for which competent and comprehensive studies already exist.³¹ It is only necessary to remark how quickly and completely a disillusionment with the possible alliance of Franco-German bishops became evident. Dupanloup's arrival in Rome on December 5 had temporarily lifted the spirit of opposition: »all hopes are pinned on him«, Acton informed Döllinger. But within a week Acton was already worrying again about Dupanloup's »somewhat immature« ideas. He soon came to regard the Bishop as an intellectual featherweight, a rhetorician who lacked any capacity »to peer into the depths« and who betrayed »the ill humor of an ignorant man«. These harsh judgments were soon reinforced when Acton learned that Dupanloup had never actually read the Janus tract before reaching the Vatican and that, upon doing so, the Bishop was »appalled« at its boldness.³² Such unnerving details confirmed once more the essential theological differences between Döllinger and Dupanloup: the one opposed the substance of the infallibility doctrine, while the other was merely persuaded that its proclamation would not be salutary. By mid-January 1870 Acton was convinced that Dupanloup could not be relied upon and that the »firm basis« of doctrinal opposition in Rome should henceforth be the Croatian Bishop Joseph Georg Strossmayer. Within but a few weeks the Dupanloup-Döllinger front thus began to dissolve.³³

Inside the Vatican Council political maneuvers meanwhile continued. Two developments are worth noting. One was an attempt to rally a joint action by French and German bishops. This coordination not only failed to materialize, since the two groups determined to caucus independently, but the number of those willing to

³⁰ Döllinger to Dupanloup, 29 November 1869, ASS Paris, Fonds Dupanloup, Correspondance. See CONZEMIUS, *Briefwechsel* (see n. 2), 2: 23, note 2.

³¹ To be especially recommended from the vast literature are the three accounts by AUBERT, *Le pontificat de Pie IX* (see n. 8), 322–59; Vaikanum I, Paris 1964; and *L'infailibilité*, Paris 1970. A brief but informative depiction of the German delegation is contained in the authoritative work of Hans Erich FEINE, *Kirchliche Rechtsgeschichte*, 4th ed. Cologne and Graz 1964, 662–67. Highly critical is August Bernhard HASLER, *Pius IX. (1846–1878), Päpstliche Unfehlbarkeit und 1. Vatikanisches Konzil: Dogmatisierung und Durchsetzung einer Ideologie*, Stuttgart 1977.

³² These views were communicated to Munich in a series of reports from Acton to Döllinger, 7 December 1869–9 January 1870, in CONZEMIUS, *Briefwechsel* (see n. 2) 2: 24–77. Acton's fears were more justified than he realized. Soon after his arrival Dupanloup conferred privately at the Vatican with Pius IX and the Papal Secretary of State, Cardinal Antonelli. Of the former he recalled: »hier audience du Pape . . . seul . . . nul autre. Très bienveillant comme toujours«; and of the latter: »Je lui ai à peu près tout dit . . . d'accord sur tout.« Dupanloup, »Journal intime«, entry for 14 December 1869, ASS Paris, Fonds Dupanloup, Journal. Yet only a few days later Dupanloup told Acton: »Le temps travaille pour nous.« Acton to Döllinger, 18–19 December 1869, in CONZEMIUS, *Briefwechsel* (see n. 2) 2: 41. It is impossible to ascertain whether Dupanloup was deceived or duplicitous.

³³ Reports from Acton to Döllinger, 12–15 January 1870, *ibid.*, 84–89.

identify their names openly with the opposition fell far short of Dupanloup's earlier predictions and Döllinger's more sanguine expectations. If the separate resolutions adopted by the French and German prelates contained no major differences in principle, as Acton correctly observed, neither were they sufficiently forceful to have much impact on the Council. At best, he judged, »the crisis is adjourned«. In reality, even that hope was in vain. Within hours a proposed text of the infallibility decree was circulated to all members of the Council and then made public. The debate was moving swiftly into its final phase.³⁴

Another potential tactic, also abortive, was to bring a restraining pressure to bear on the Council through diplomatic intercession by the major European governments. Dupanloup was cheerfully optimistic about this prospect, claiming that it would be »easy to defeat the Roman curia with the help of the states«. ³⁵ He was heartened in this view by private talks with the Prussian emissary Harry von Arnim. It is true that Bismarck belatedly decided to probe more actively into the affairs of the Council, but – in the midst of controversy over succession to the Spanish throne – this was surely not the time to contemplate realistically an unified effort by French and German statesmen to dictate the internal policies of the Roman Catholic Church. An effective intervention by the temporal powers of Europe in the spring and summer months of 1870 was just another mirage.³⁶

As the Council approached its conclusion, the contacts between Dupanloup and Döllinger ceased. Each was left in a separate heap of discouragement. After publication of the text of the proposed infallibility decree, Dupanloup blurted: »our throats are being slashed.«³⁷ Meanwhile in Munich Döllinger was receiving travelers returning from Rome, who unanimously concurred that the decree would be adopted by a substantial majority. He was therefore prepared for the »worst possible« decision by the Council, even though he thought it would provoke »a powerful movement« of protest throughout Germany. Döllinger thereby bartered one delusion for another and prepared to embark on a course of frustration during the next decade.³⁸ As for

³⁴ Reports from Acton to Döllinger, 25 February–8 March 1870, *ibid.*, 179–98.

³⁵ Acton to Döllinger, 11 February 1870, *ibid.*, 155–56. Döllinger's own view was far less sanguine: »Die Lage wird immer ernster und drohender . . . Das Rettungsmittel wäre ein gemeinschaftliches Vorgehen der Mächte, Frankreichs vor allem, Österreichs, Bayerns. Aber dazu, fürchte ich, ist keine Aussicht.« Döllinger to Hohenlohe, 21 February 1870, in HOHENLOHE, *Denkwürdigkeiten* (see n. 15) 1: 439.

³⁶ »Erlaß an den Gesandten in Rom von Arnim,« 13 March 1870, in Herman von PETERSDORF et al. (eds.), *Bismarck. Die gesammelten Werke*, 15 vols. Berlin 1924–1935, 6b: 1527. »Telegramm an den Gesandten in Rom von Arnim,« 23 March 1870, *ibid.*, 1538. Acton to Döllinger, 3 April 1870, in CONZEMIUS, *Briefwechsel* (see n. 2), 2: 283–84. The German diplomatic dispatches are well summarized by George O. KENT, *Arnim and Bismarck*, Oxford 1968, 20–38. Despite sporadic rumors that French troops might be withdrawn from Rome, thereby throwing the entire Council into jeopardy, the French government of Napoleon III remained content from the outset to observe a strict policy of non-intervention. See LATREILLE et al., *Histoire du Catholicisme en France* (see n. 10), 3: 396–97.

³⁷ Acton to Döllinger, 13 March 1870, in CONZEMIUS, *Briefwechsel* (see n. 2), 2: 214.

³⁸ Mohl to Freydorf, 14 April and 12 May 1870, GLA Karlsruhe, Abt. 49, *Bayern Fasz.* 96, 233/11 749. Döllinger was excommunicated on 17 April 1871. On the Catholic schism in Germany, which Döllinger supported but never formally joined, see C. B. MOSS, *The Old Catholic Movement: Its Origin and History*, London 1948; Erich SCHMIDT-VOLKMAR, *Der Kulturkampf in Deutschland 1871–1890*, Göttingen 1962, 66–69; and Rudolf LILL, »Die Entstehung der alkatholischen Kirchengemeinschaft,« in: JEDIN (ed.), *Handbuch der Kirchengeschichte* (see n. 9), 6: 792–96.

Acton, his own disappointment became venomous. He fell to castigating Dupanloup repeatedly, describing the Bishop's writings as »dreadfully anachronistic«, his attitude as naive, and his political talent as virtually nil. A brief recurrence of optimism in May altered nothing. On June 10 Acton spent his last day in Rome, already conceding by his departure that little more could be done to deflect or defer the proclamation of papal infallibility.³⁹

The estrangement between Félix Dupanloup and Ignaz von Döllinger – after they had exchanged so many brave words and noble sentiments – afforded a paradigm of international Church politics in 1870. Their failure, born of profound differences in theological principle and personal temperament, accurately defined the limits of opposition to ultramontanism. If the debate over the doctrine of papal infallibility did not divide the Roman Catholic hierarchy precisely along national lines, it exposed the inability of either French or German ecclesiastical factions to mount an effective resistance to Pius IX, much less to create an united Franco-German front. Except for the seriously deluded, there could no longer be the faintest ambiguity about the Holy See's doctrinal and political dominance. The verdict of the Vatican Council was thus unequivocal: for all branches of the Church, it was primarily the relationship with Rome that counted, and not the connection between the episcopal leadership of one European people with another. This elemental postulate, always implicit in the tradition and hierarchical structure of the Church but often contested in its history, thereby received its most categorical formulation. And on that rock broke the potentialities of a Dupanloup-Döllinger alliance.

An attempt to trace the ramifications of this story would naturally exceed by far the evidence presented here. In general one can only observe that the buttressing of papal authority came not a moment too soon. As we know, the Franco-Prussian war commenced within hours after the conclave in Rome was concluded; and the Church was to be deeply troubled in the following decades by the eruption of the *Kulturkampf* in Germany and the application of the Ferry laws in France. That is another matter.⁴⁰ Yet the importance of the outcome in 1870 may perhaps be best suggested by an effort to imagine the results if Dupanloup and Döllinger had actually succeeded in creating an opposition sufficiently powerful to deter the doctrine of papal infallibility. Although we can only speculate, of course, it appears certain to conclude that Rome would have been far more vulnerable to attacks by Catholic dissidents and much less capable of countering the onslaught of anticlericalism that swept thereafter over the continent of Europe.

³⁹ Acton to Döllinger, 9 and 27 March 1870, in CONZEMIUS, *Briefwechsel* (see n. 2), 2: 203–206, 257. In Acton's final message from Rome, Dupanloup's name was conspicuously absent: »Ich bleibe jetzt bei meinem früheren Urtheil: Strossmayer, Kendrick, Darboy, Hefele sind die besten Männer.« *Ibid.*, 422. More than a decade later Acton summarized his view of Dupanloup and other »Catholic notabilities« who failed to adopt Döllinger's position on the question of papal infallibility: »I came very slowly and reluctantly indeed to the conclusion that they were dishonest. And I found out a special reason for their dishonesty in the desire to keep up the credit of authority in the Church . . . There was a conspiracy to deceive, and this conspiracy was identical with the desire to uphold the hierarchy.« *Ibid.*, 3: 283–84.

⁴⁰ Some of these implications will be examined in the forthcoming sequel to my study of *The German Influence in France after 1870*, Chapel Hill 1979.