

Vojtech Novitzky

Ignaz von Döllinger's Vision of Reunion and the 1874-5 Bonn Reunion Conferences



1 Introduction

On September 14, 1874, the *Musiksaal* of the University of Bonn opened its doors to a three-day conference. Select personalities of Old Catholic, Anglican and Orthodox background conversed on possibilities and avenues of reunion between these churches, to heal historical rifts on the basis of the unity of the Early Church. Approximately a year later, from August 10–16, 1875, the Second Bonn Reunion Conference resumed dialogue with a wider participation.

Contemporary press and subsequent scholarship hailed the Bonn conferences as momentous events comparable to the Florence-Ferrara council in 1434.¹ Although not official dialogues between the churches themselves, they count as a major landmark for what scholars today term “proto-ecumenical” dialogue. A complex set of factors generated the auspicious climate for the Bonn endeavour. The emergence of nineteenth-century nation states, inner-Catholic dissent produced by the clash with modernity and the First Vatican Council, Anglican and Orthodox overtures, and, not least, the fiery personality of Ignaz von Döllinger all combined to make it possible.²

The initiative sparked at the Second Old Catholic Congress (Cologne, 1872); yet its architect was unquestionably Ignaz von Döllinger (1799–1890). Döllinger was the quintessential progressive Catholic theologian of his generation: professor at the University of Munich, secretary of the Bavarian Academy of Sciences; Royal chaplain and adviser to the Bavarian government; champion of historicism in theology; fierce opponent of papal infallibility, for which he was excommunicated (1871); as well as intellectual mentor of the Old Catholic Movement. His scholarly projects and his political engagement made him aware of the necessity and opportunity of healing the divisions in the Church.

Modern scholarship generally sees an evolution in Döllinger’s attitude from polemicist in his early works towards irenicist and even ecumenist in his later life.³ But, as Victor Conzemius observed already in 1960, characteristic to Döllinger was an “esprit de combat” which never deserted him, not even when he advocated reunion between churches.⁴

This paper will analyse Döllinger's role in the 1874-75 Bonn Reunion Conferences with the aim of establishing the extent of his ecumenical engagement. As I hope to prove, the reunionist efforts of the Munich professor were influenced by his concern for the social-political and religious future of Europe;⁵ his unquestioned faith in the power of historical research to demask the source of conflicts, and in a historically informed dialogue to solve them; and his personal history, especially with the Vatican.

To that end, I shall first offer a brief outline of Döllinger's reunionist ideas prior to Bonn. Next, I shall present each conference, commenting on the proceedings, the results achieved, Döllinger's more "combative" interventions, and their reception. Especially during the second conference, Döllinger time and again set the reunion project as a reaction to the proclamations of the First Vatican Council. This (quite gratuitous) polemical dimension created more problems than it hoped to solve.

2 Döllinger's Vision of the Reunion of Churches

Return to the unity of the undivided universal Church was a long-time interest of Döllinger's, cemented by his friendship with English and French theologians of various Christian backgrounds, and his research in the history of the Church.

The young church historian ardently believed that the Catholic Church was the continuation of the universal Church; it had both the divinely appointed papacy to coordinate various local churches and it also respected national differences. Through a balanced historical judgment, he sought to present a Catholic Church that invited Protestants to rejoin its bosom. As the Holy See began to clash both with nationalism and the historical method so dear to Döllinger, he began to focus more and more on exposing the historical abuses of the papacy as major causes of the schism with the East and of the Reformation.⁶ On the eve of the First Vatican Council, he was working on the history of reunion attempts as part of a larger project.⁷ Almost a year after his excommunication,⁸ he delivered a series of *Lectures on the Reunion of the Churches*.⁹

These programmatic speeches set reunion in a missionary perspective, explored its political effects,¹⁰ and outlined the method to achieve it in post-Vatican I circumstances. Given that the Vatican decrees destroyed any hope for corporate union,¹¹ Döllinger entrusted the project of reconciliation to educated clergy and laity. They were to consult together on the basis of Scripture and the tradition of the undivided Church;¹² to remove speculative additions and unfounded opinions that distorted this tradition across history; and to discover “eirenic” explanations of creedal differences.¹³ Döllinger believed that this unionist core would generate larger and larger ripples until an international society were created, which would wash over the surface of the world.

When the Second Old Catholic Congress (Cologne, 1872) set up a Commission for Church Union,¹⁴ Döllinger accepted its chairmanship and an uneasy alliance with the Old Catholic Church¹⁵ in exchange for the opportunity to further this reunion programme. Thus began the organisation of the 1874 Bonn Reunion Conference.

3 The 1874 Bonn Reunion Conference

In July 1874, an invitation was sent out to select personalities principally from the Anglican Communion, the (Old) Catholic Church and the Eastern Churches. The aim of the conference, it stated, was to bring about “ecclesiastical intercommunion and religious fraternity” while respecting confessional freedom and national particularities. This would be founded on the consensus of the ancient, undivided Church as expressed in Patristic teaching and institutions, as well as the decrees of Ecumenical Councils.¹⁶

Fifty-six participants gathered from Germany, Switzerland, France, Denmark, Russia, Greece, England and the USA. Delegates belonged to Old Catholic, Anglican and Episcopalian (USA), and Orthodox Churches. Many of them were Döllinger’s personal contacts. Discussions took place mostly between Döllinger; Joseph H. Reinkens (1821–1896), Old Catholic bishop; Edward H. Browne (1811–1891), bishop of Winchester; John S. Howson (1816–1885), dean of Chester; Henry P. Liddon (1829–1890) – from

England; John B. Kerfoot (1816–1881), bishop of Pittsburgh; Robert J. Nevin (1839–1906); William C. Langdon (1831–1895) – from the USA; Zikos Rhosis (1838–1933) – from Greece; I. L. Yanyshch (1826–1910), rector of the St. Petersburg Clerical Academy; Alexander Kireyev (1833–1910), Secretary of the St. Petersburg Society of the Friends of Spiritual Enlightenment; Arsenius Tatschaloff (1838–1890), archpriest in Wiesbaden – from Russia. Only one Roman Catholic attended, Henry Nutcombe Oxenham (1829–1888) from England. A small number of Protestant theologians were invited as expert guests and listeners.¹⁷

In preparing the agenda Döllinger consulted with the Anglo-Continental Society (Frederick Meyrick, 1827–1906), and the Society of the Friends of Spiritual Enlightenment at St. Petersburg (Kireyev).¹⁸ Following their response, he prepared in advance 14 articles to be submitted for discussion alongside the *filioque*. These concerned: 1. the canon of Scripture, 2. the authority of the original Scriptural languages, 3. the use of Bible translations, and 4. of vernacular in liturgy, 5. salvation in relation to faith and love, 6. the salvific merit of acts, 7. the merits of the saints, 8. the number of the sacraments, 9. tradition and apostolic succession, 10. the Immaculate Conception, 11. confessions, 12. indulgences, 13. prayers for the dead (touching also on purgatory), and 14. the Eucharist.¹⁹

Against Meyrick's wishes that special committees should study each article in part before presenting them to the plenum,²⁰ Döllinger chose to submit them directly to bilateral and plenary sessions. The first eight articles, deemed to reconcile Western differences, were discussed only with the Anglicans (although Orthodox were present). The rest, as relevant to all participating Churches, were approached in plenary sessions. In the final session, dedicated to specific theological and disciplinary differences between the Catholic and the Orthodox Churches (that Kireyev identified in his letter), the Old Catholics sat with the Orthodox.²¹

Döllinger was intent on keeping discussions at the level of history rather than theology. His own background might have influenced his expectations of success: His Anglican contacts belonged mostly to the Oxford Movement, members of which had already contemplated a vision of reunion based on a return to origins.²² The English and American delegations arrived with the

prospect of intercommunion ahead.²³ Moreover, Döllinger was convinced that up to 1870 the Catholic and Orthodox Churches could claim unity of doctrine – albeit realising it required some effort.²⁴ Indeed, most of the articles occasioned seemingly easy-going agreement.

At 3 pm on September 14, the Catholic and Anglican participants conducted a first round of discussions.²⁵ On the agenda were a common proposal on the *filioque*, to be discussed in the plenary session later; and reconciling differences within the Western tradition, as formulated in the first eight articles. The latter were hardly objectionable, especially in light of the reforms introduced by the Old Catholic community.²⁶ Minimal amendments, mostly for linguistic precision, were introduced to articles 5 and 6 (salvation in relation to faith and merits). Article 8 generated more exchange, but remained unmodified. It accommodated the primacy of baptism and Eucharist as the sacraments necessary to salvation with the established tradition of seven sacraments in pre-Reformation Churches (a mere historical development).²⁷

The *filioque*, however, proved the proverbial thorn in the side. The organisers wanted to eliminate it from the creed, since no council had sanctioned it; and clinging to it only hindered “future unity and peace”.²⁸ The Americans approved. English delegates (Browne, Liddon, Howson, Oxenham), however, feared the doctrinal and liturgical consequences.²⁹ As much as Döllinger insisted that the article in no way concerned the doctrine of the procession of the Holy Spirit – but rather that it “crept into” the creed unilaterally –, the English insisted that the doctrine should be addressed too. Eventually Browne’s compromise was adopted: the *filioque* was irregular; decision to return to the original creed pertains to the whole Church; with the proviso that the doctrinal truth expressed in the Western formula be safeguarded.³⁰

In the second part of the afternoon the Orthodox joined the discussion on the *filioque*. They, too, steered towards the double procession of the Holy Spirit, finally forcing Döllinger to admit that this was indeed a doctrinal contention between West and East.³¹ The morning of September 15 set the Easterners against the English: The former thought renouncing the formula as well as the doctrine of the *filioque* was a precondition for any future reunion. The latter advocated the truth of the doctrine and the freedom to profess it. Eventually, in the spirit of true ecumenism, but also because the

discussion seemed to be leading nowhere,³² the conference provisionally adopted Browne's version, and mandated a special commission to study the topic³³ (this became the preparatory commission for the Second Reunion Conference).³⁴

The following plenary meetings addressed the remaining six articles. Of these, more challenging were articles 9b, 10, and 13.

Article 9 defined tradition as an authoritative source of teaching; and apostolic succession as the norm for the preservation of authentic tradition.³⁵ Its second clause, which affirmed the “unbroken episcopal succession” of the Church of England and its derivatives,³⁶ invited trouble. The Orientals hesitated and voiced their suspicions. This implied that a question mark hung over the very participation of the Anglican and Episcopalian Churches to the conference. Döllinger demonstrated in a veritable mini-lecture the legitimate consecration of the first Anglican bishop, expecting that this would be sufficient proof for the apostolic succession of the English Orders. Yanyshév, however, conceded only that the Russian Church ought to look more closely at this issue.³⁷

Article 10 rejected the dogma of the Immaculate Conception as “contrary to the tradition of the first thirteen centuries”.³⁸ Fuelled by Old Catholic protest against the Vatican, this was the only openly polemical (anti-Roman, and therefore un-ecumenical) article of the entire conference – the English were apprehensive. Oxenham, himself a Roman Catholic, reproached that the conference was “erecting a new dogma” by rejecting another. Twice Lid-don tried to appease the heated spirits: Twice he lost. Firstly he suggested that the Immaculate Conception could be held as a pious opinion, albeit not an article of faith. Then he tried to recast the article into a milder form that conveyed protest against the Roman dogma, but not a radical rejection.

Döllinger remained exceptionally vehement. Speaking in the name of the “German theologians” (i.e., Old Catholics), he claimed the Immaculate Conception was *fons et origo malorum* that paved the way for papal infallibility: A historical forgery, it was untenable even as a pious opinion. If not the article itself, the debate it generated took the contours of a Döllingerian type of Old Catholic manifesto against the Vatican. In the end the English and Americans

assented to the article as a gesture of solidarity (Kerfoot), in full understanding that this was the support of private individuals only (Howson).³⁹

Lively discussions ensued on articles 13 (prayers for the dead) and 14 (Eucharistic sacrifice), in which differences of opinion amongst the Anglican delegates (English–American, High Church–Low Church) transpired.⁴⁰ Eastern participants opposed the second clause of article 13 (the invocation of saints as not necessary for salvation). In spite of Döllinger's historical explanations in support of the clause, it remained suspended.⁴¹

At the final bilateral meeting with the Orthodox, Döllinger presented the dogmatic, canonical and ritual differences between Catholicism and Orthodoxy raised in the preparatory letter sent by the Society of the Friends of Spiritual Enlightenment. These concerned: papal primacy, *filioque* and the double procession, the Virgin Mary, good works, sin, state of the departed, rite of baptism, confirmation, communion in both kinds, *epiklesis*, clerical celibacy, and the sacraments of penance and unction. Döllinger set a rapid pace of discussion, detailing mostly the topics unresolved in earlier sessions. The Russian Orthodox (Tatschaloff, Yanyshhev) generally accepted his explanations of Western rites, and considered that ritual differences were no impediments to reunion.⁴² Döllinger concluded that only two (unspecified) issues remained unresolved, which would be addressed at the next conference.

Delegates left the conference feeling optimistic about the real potential for Christian reunion. Döllinger's generally bonhomous and erudite presidency⁴³ certainly created the impression that substantial consensus had been reached. Döllinger himself appreciated the results of the first Reunion Conference as the joint orthodoxy of Germanic peoples (the German, and the English).⁴⁴ Yet, the reception of the 1874 conference revealed its weaknesses, too.

England was divided between enthusiasm and scepticism. The inner-Anglican divisions carried into the reception of the conference. A most astonishing opponent was Edward Bouverie Pusey (1800–1882), whom Liddon kept apprised through correspondence. Pusey criticised Döllinger's exaggerated lenience towards the Easterners. He thought venerable Western doctrines such as the *filioque* should not be sacrificed for the sake of union; nor was

this the only theological obstacle to communion. Pusey also resented the anti-Vatican taint Döllinger imprinted on parts of the proceedings.⁴⁵ In England, the Catholic Church had barely come out of the shadow; and a conference at which English clergy seemingly sanctioned outbursts such as Döllinger's opening address at the first plenary session⁴⁶ was bound to raise questions.

On the eve of the 1875 Reunion Conference, Browne and William E. Gladstone (1809–1898, English Prime Minister up to 1874) sent letters with advice on contentious issues of the previous year.⁴⁷ Browne also wrote on the apostolic succession of English Orders. Both Browne and Gladstone were against the article on the invocation of saints, and against compromising the integrity of Western pneumatology. As the latter explained, to alter the creed could be construed as altering the very faith it expressed.

In Russia Yanyshév published his own report. Whether intentionally or simply by misunderstanding, he intimated that, pending further discussion, the Old Catholics were amiable to recognising the primacy of the Patriarch of Constantinople.⁴⁸ In his presentation, the unresolved issues that would form the agenda of the next conference were precisely the primacy of the patriarch and the *filioque*.⁴⁹ In reality, only papal primacy was briefly mentioned at the first conference. Döllinger stated only that the topic was still debated amongst Old Catholics, therefore no conclusive view could be offered at the time. In response, Orthodox participants agreed that primacy was a topic for the special commission.⁵⁰

Yanyshév's report is also suggestive of the political interests at stake in light of the Eastern Question. From the Russian point of view, reunion with Old Catholics would give Russia a solid footing with the Catholic minorities in the Balkans against Austria-Hungary. The benefits of reunion for the Balkans had not been lost on Döllinger either, although he expected Russia to moderate her "crusading spirit" as a result.⁵¹ Alongside his exaggerated sense of Western historical responsibility for the schism with the East, this understanding of the role of Russia informed his lenience towards the Easterners. He as much as declared it openly at the second conference, when he noted that Orthodoxy no longer needed to fear the West because they now had the protection of Russia.⁵²

4 The Second Reunion Conference in 1875

The invitation to the Second Reunion Conference (July 22, 1875), addressed anyone with sufficient theological education who was interested in joining. A more numerous attendance included active participants of the previous year's conference, Anglican divines and Orthodox prelates, lay theologians and dignitaries, as well as a larger number of Lutherans and Reformed. The Anglican delegation, comprising personalities from England, Ireland, Scotland, and the USA (including secretaries of both Houses of the General Convention), was headed this time by Charles W. Sandford (1828–1903), bishop of Gibraltar. The much larger Eastern group included representatives of the Patriarchate of Constantinople; Archbishop Lykourgos of Syra and Tenos (1827–1875); as well as Church dignitaries and delegates from almost all Balkan countries.⁵³ Evidently, reunion or some form of reconciliation among Churches was a pressing subject in the region.

The *filioque*, this time with a focus on the doctrine of the procession of the Holy Spirit, took the lion's share of the proceedings. Döllinger also brought up several more times the apostolic succession of Anglican Orders, in response to Orthodox reservations reiterated in private conversations.⁵⁴ To solve the language difficulty, he divided talks into morning sessions in German or French, and afternoon sessions in English. Although all were plenary, in the mornings his targeted conversation partners were the Orthodox, in the afternoon the Anglicans. Unfortunately, these factors contributed to sharpening the “battle lines” that were felt already in 1874. The larger attendance revealed not just inner-Anglican divisions, but also differences of opinion between various Orthodox Churches.

Before the Anglicans arrived, parts of the Eastern delegation had already sat two sessions with the Old Catholics (August 10 and 11). This time, they made clear what they were not willing to accept: any doctrinal innovation – i.e., any declaration not sanctioned by an ecumenical council, the only infallible organ of the Church in matters of doctrine – and any notion suggestive of a double principle or causality in the procession of the Holy Spirit. They agreed to base discussions on the creeds and ecumenical councils of the undivided Church; and on patristic pneumatology up to John of Damascus.⁵⁵

On the morning of August 12, the plenum convened. As in 1874, Americans seconded the Old Catholics in their wish to eliminate the *filioque* from the creed. As William S. Perry (1832–1898), Secretary of the American Convention, reported in one of the informal meetings at Sandford's hotel apartment, American dioceses had petitioned the General Convention to remove the *filioque* from the creed.⁵⁶ Among the English, Howson approved too,⁵⁷ but others, especially Liddon, were adamant that it should be kept, not least because of its role in liturgy and the questions it would raise in uninformed minds regarding Trinitarian theology.⁵⁸ Liddon proposed again that the matter should be decided in an ecumenical council – this was, however, dismissed as unlikely to ever occur.⁵⁹

For the remainder of the conference, participants immersed themselves in discussions on the theology of the procession of the Holy Spirit, the relationship between the Holy Spirit and the other two persons of the Trinity, the differences of terminology, dissecting the Fathers' texts for proof. Döllinger hoped that, by showing openness to the Orthodox and formulating the doctrine in a manner as pleasing as possible to them, they could be persuaded to accept the Western teaching.⁶⁰

But the crux of the matter was whether the *filioque* was a dogma or a theological speculation in the West. Even so, Yanyshév alone inclined to receive the Western explanations, as long as they remained a theological opinion.⁶¹ Fault was also found with the Anglican rejection of the seventh ecumenical council – which undermined the very basis of dialogue.⁶²

Eventually a special committee met on the mornings of August 14 and 15,⁶³ proposing six articles for plenary debate: Essentially, these stated that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father alone (single procession), but that the Son is the means and locus of procession. In other words, the Son has no agency in the procession of the Holy Spirit, but remains indispensable for it.⁶⁴ Although participants eventually gave their assent, it was clear that the *filioque* was the Achilles' heel of the reunion project. To make matters worse, Howson turned against the article on Eucharistic sacrifice that he had subscribed a year before,⁶⁵ threatening to undo even the progress achieved in 1874.

The impasse of the second conference rested in its goals: it tried to squeeze out creedal unity, albeit, as the invitation stated, without injury to “traditional peculiarities generally, whether in doctrine, constitution, or ritual”.⁶⁶ The *filioque*, however, with its historical stumbling-block role and its doctrinal ramifications, constituted too serious an obstacle. As the American Philip Schaff (1819–1893) noted, this was a complex exegetical, historical, and doctrinal problem. Instead, he argued, reunion should find suitable ways for Christians of various backgrounds to achieve “living unity in liberty and liberty in unity”. Sandford, too, urged that more practical aspects of reunion should be prioritised.⁶⁷

It did not help that throughout the conference, Döllinger polemicised against the Vatican in several lengthy speeches. His opening address on August 12 and his closing five-hour lecture encased proceedings in this “combative” dimension. Döllinger sought to expound the historical causes of division in a style reminiscent of the *Lectures on the Reunion of the Churches* (Western propensity to dominate the Eastern Churches; the history of papal despotism founded on forgeries; scholasticism and the Jesuits as agents of papal ambition). But he drew a direct connection between the *filioque* and papal infallibility, as marked instances when the papacy exceeded its authority with disastrous consequences for the unity of Christendom.⁶⁸ He went so far as to state that after the Vatican decrees Christians worldwide had a duty to confront Roman Catholics; and that this confrontation was the stimulus for reunion that made the Bonn conferences possible.⁶⁹

The 1875 conference received even more attention in the media and in educated circles, with similar polarisation. This time, Pusey took his critique to the papers, and some fierce sparring occurred with Meyrick in the *Times* and the *Guardian*. His hostility, which had created sensation in England, contributed to Döllinger’s dejection.⁷⁰ Among the Orthodox, Julian J. Overbeck (1820–1905), himself a convert to Orthodoxy, campaigned against receiving the results of the Bonn conference, discontented with the fact that Anglicans did not acknowledge the seventh ecumenical council. Political events also conspired to discourage the organisation of a new conference, which probably would have had this as a topic. In Germany the *kulturkampf* (1872–1886) was raging. Tensions in the Balkans reached a critical point by 1876, leading to the Russo-Turkish war of 1877–1878. As Britain supported

the Ottoman Empire, it would have been very difficult for Anglicans and Orthodox to sit at a common table. Amidst such adversities, the project was suspended indefinitely, never to be resumed.

5 Concluding Remarks

A modern church historian and liberal Catholic thinker, Döllinger could never condone the turn the Holy See took in the later nineteenth century. As the above exposition shows, he never missed an occasion to fight fire with fire, even when less opportune to do so.

Whether consciously applied at Bonn or not, Döllinger's idea of expanding unionist ripples generated from a core of like-minded intellectuals backfired for several reasons. First and foremost because delegates brought their personal opinion to the discussion; they were not official representatives. This meant that agreement to an article did not necessarily reflect the received view in a given Church, and could be withdrawn at any time (e.g., Howson's withdrawal). When in 1875 interest in the Bonn project took a semi-official turn (especially in the Balkans), the rifts became more visible and less easy to overcome. 1875 showed that theological differences could not be explained away using just the historical method, as Döllinger had hoped.

Döllinger also underestimated the force that debates on the sacraments, Ritualism, and the Athanasian Creed still carried in England. These "made any ecumenical manoeuvres fraught with danger".⁷¹ Moreover, in spite of his own caveat, that union should be holistic,⁷² Roman Catholicism was not given a proper voice at Bonn. Döllinger's attitude, especially at the Second Conference, seemed that of rubbing reunion in Rome's face, a fact which estranged even some supporters of the project across the Channel.

This polemical dimension was certainly in the air: Vatican I had accelerated the budding spirit of openness, both on the Anglican and the Orthodox side. Although the Bonn conferences had "ecumenical" aspirations, the principal target of both Churches was to arrive at an understanding with

the Old Catholic Church. High-Churchmen in England recognised in the Old Catholic Movement a national Catholic Church akin to how they themselves perceived Anglicanism.⁷³ As for the motivations behind Eastern overtures, especially from the St. Petersburg Society of the Friends of Spiritual Enlightenment, more thorough research is needed to assess them properly.

Vojtech Novitzky ist römisch-katholischer Theologe. 2020 schloss er den Bonner Masterstudiengang „Ecumenical Studies“ mit einer Arbeit über Döllinger ab.

Anmerkungen

- 1 Cf. Thomas Albert Howard, “Neither a Secular nor Confessional Age: The Bonn Reunion Conferences of 1874 and 1875”, *The Journal of the Historical Society*, 11 (March 2011), 59–84 at 76, 80 (on international press coverage).
- 2 For a detailed presentation of the “road to Bonn”, see Thomas Albert Howard, *The Pope and the Professor: Pius IX, Ignaz von Döllinger and the Quandary of the Modern Age* (Oxford 2017), 16–190. On nineteenth-century irenicist movements, see Howard, “Neither a Secular nor Confessional Age”, 61–65; and Victor Conzemius, “Ignaz v. Döllinger: The Development of a XIXth Century Ecumenist”, *Internationale Kirchliche Zeitschrift* 64 (1974), 110–127 at 125.
- 3 See, e.g., Conzemius, “Ignaz v. Döllinger”, 110–127: sui generis ecumenical preoccupations are a constant throughout Döllinger’s career, but reach the forefront in his later life. Angela Berlis, “Ignaz von Döllinger and the Anglicans”, in S. J. Brown, P. B. Nockles (eds.), *The Oxford Movement: Europe and the Wider World 1830–1930* (Cambridge 2012), 236–248 at 243: Döllinger’s ecumenical reorientation in later life paralleled his disenchantment with Rome. Hubert Huppertz, “Döllingers Bedeutung für die ökumenische Bewegung”, in E. Bach, A. Berlis, S. Thuringer (eds.), *Ignaz von Döllinger zum 125. Todestag: Spuren-suche, Schlaglichter auf ein außergewöhnliches Leben* (Munich 2015), 115–34, identified three Döllingers: the polemical (up to 1848), the controversial theologian (up to 1861), and finally the irenicist. Howard, *The Pope and the Professor*, 85: interest in critical history, in German identity and in Christian unity combined to define Döllinger’s personality.
- 4 Victor Conzemius, “Aspects ecclésiologiques de l’évolution de Döllinger et du Vieux Catholicisme”, *Revue des Sciences Religieuses*, 34 (1960), 247–279 at 251.
- 5 Conzemius, “Ignaz v. Döllinger”, 114, noted that, although Döllinger “never heard anything of political theology”, he was “very much of a political theologian”.
- 6 See, e.g., *The Church and the Churches or the Papacy and the Temporal Power: An Historical and Political Review* (1861; English tr. London 1862); *Fables Respecting the Popes in the Middle Ages: A Contribution to Ecclesiastical History* (1863; English tr. London 1871).
- 7 Conzemius, “Aspects”, 247–48.
- 8 On the convoluted events leading to Döllinger’s excommunication in April 1871, see Howard, *The Pope and the Professor*, 15–67. Cf. also Michael Chandler, “The Significance of the Friendship between William E. Gladstone and Ignaz von Döllinger”, *Internationale Kirchliche Zeitschrift* 90 (2000), 153–167 at 161; and Luise von Kobell, *Conversations of Dr. Döllinger* (English tr. London 1892), 261–63.
- 9 Published first in English tr. (New York 1872).
- 10 *Lectures*, 14–29.
- 11 *Ibid.*, 135, 160: “The Vatican Council was organized for the express purpose of making all plans of reunion for ever impossible”.
- 12 *Ibid.*, 163.
- 13 *Ibid.*, 32.
- 14 On this Commission and its goals see Mark D. Chapman, “Henry Liddon and the Bonn Conferences”, in *The Fantasy of Reunion: Anglicans, Catholics and Ecumenism, 1833–1882* (Oxford 2014), 224–262 at 225.
- 15 Although *de facto* the spiritual leader of the Old Catholic Movement, Döllinger never condoned the separation from the Roman Church,

- and never declared himself a member of the Old Catholic Church. Nonetheless, at both reunion conferences he spoke as representing the Old Catholic (“German”) position. See, e.g., Conzemius, “Aspects”, 265–67.
- 16 The invitation letter was released to international press, e.g., *The Guardian* (5 August 1874, 991). Cf. Howard, “Neither a Secular nor Confessional Age”, 199.
- 17 A detailed list of participants is included in *Report of the Proceedings at the Reunion Conference Held at Bonn on September 14, 15, and 16, 1874. Translated from the German of Professor Reusch* (London/Oxford/Cambridge 1875), VII–XL.
- 18 *Report 1874*, 93–95 (Meyrick’s letter); 34 (reference to the St. Petersburg letter) and 80–91 (discussion of its articles).
- 19 My keywords.
- 20 *Report 1874*, 4–6.
- 21 *Ibid.*, 80–91. Anglicans also attended, but only Liddon intervened. Language difficulties, too, probably played a role in these separations, since hardly any Eastern participant spoke English (Döllinger often had to translate both ways).
- 22 On Döllinger’s relations with members of the Oxford Movement, see Berlis, “Ignaz von Döllinger”, 238–44.
- 23 *Report 1874*, 9, 11.
- 24 Lectures, 1–2, 9.
- 25 The English and American delegates had met in the morning to decide on a common stance. Cf. *Liddon Diary*, cited in John O. Johnston, *Life and Letters of Henry Parry Liddon* (New York 1904), 183. See also Chapman, “Henry Liddon”, 229.
- 26 Encouraging the use of vernacular and tempering the cult of saints. Howard, *The Pope and the Professor*, 185.
- 27 *Report 1874*, 18–21. Howard, “Neither a Secular nor Confessional Age”, 74.
- 28 *Ibid.*, 7–8.
- 29 Not to mention that, as Chapman observed (“Henry Liddon”, 230), this would lead to definitive rupture with the Vatican.
- 30 *Report 1874*, 8–17. Howard, “Neither a Secular nor Confessional Age”, 72–73.
- 31 *Ibid.*, 36.
- 32 As Liddon later remarked; see Chapman, “Henry Liddon”, 232.
- 33 *Report 1874*, 40–47.
- 34 It consisted of Döllinger himself; Kireyev; Rhossis; Nevin; and Meyrick.
- 35 *Report 1874*, 47–50. Participants returned to it on the last day: *Ibid.*, 75–77.
- 36 *Ibid.*, 50.
- 37 *Ibid.*, 50–55 (without mentioning whether the clause was accepted or not). The legitimacy of English Orders carried into the Second Bonn Conference.
- 38 By which Döllinger understood the undivided Church.
- 39 *Report 1874*, 55–60; Owen Chadwick, “Döllinger and Reunion”, in R. G. Evans (ed.), *Christian Authority: Essays in Honour of Henry Chadwick* (Oxford 1988), 296–334 at 325–326. On Liddon’s motivation here, see Chapman, “Henry Liddon”, 233–234.
- 40 *Report 1874*, 62–65; Chapman, “Henry Liddon”, 234. The Eucharistic controversy and Ritualism are just two of the English controversies with a bearing on the opinions expressed at Bonn. On these see, e.g., Peter B. Nockles, *The Oxford Movement in Context: Anglican High Churchmanship, 1760–1857* (Cambridge 1994), 235–48; Nigel Yates, *Anglican Ritualism in Victorian Britain 1830–1919* (Oxford 1999), 45–63 and 150–276.
- 41 *Report 1874*, 65–69.
- 42 Although Rhossis considered the Western rite of baptism inadmissible. *Ibid.*, 84, 87.
- 43 To the point of “explaining Orthodoxy to the Orthodox”, Chapman, “Henry Liddon”, 229.
- 44 Chapman, “Henry Liddon”, 241, citing Döllinger to Charlotte, Lady Blennerhassett (November 10, 1874).
- 45 Chapman, “Henry Liddon”, 242–43; Chadwick, “Döllinger and Reunion”, 331–32.
- 46 *Report 1874*, 22–31. Intended to outline the history of the schism with the East, the address was actually a bitter attack against the wrongdoings of the papacy from the beginnings up to 1870.
- 47 *Report of the Proceedings at the Reunion Conference Held at Bonn between the 10th and the 16th of August, 1875. Translated from the German of Professor Reusch* (London 1876), 138–146 (Appendix).
- 48 И.Л. Янышев, “Боннская конференция”, Христианское чтение [I.L. Yanyshev, “Bonn Conference”, *Christian Reading*] 10 (1874), 150–184 at 177.
- 49 *Ibid.*, 183.
- 50 *Report 1874*, 80–81.

- 51 *Lectures*, 9–10, 27.
- 52 *Report 1875*, 86.
- 53 *Ibid.*, lv–lxix, contains an incomplete list of participants. See also William S. Perry, *The Reunion Conference at Bonn, 1875: A Personal Narrative* (Printed privately, 1876), 2–3. A summary of topics and discussion can be found in e.g., Howard, “Neither a Secular nor Confessional Age”, 77–80.
- 54 *Ibid.*, 33: with Sandford’s objection that his personal experience in Smyrna confirmed the Eastern recognition of Anglican apostolic succession; and 106–7: focusing on the rite and sacrament of ordination. Perry, *The Reunion Conference*, 8: Sandford and Langdon refuse to submit the validity of English Orders for discussion, but agree that it should be explained again.
- 55 *Report 1875*, 1–17.
- 56 Perry, *The Reunion Conference*, 10; Chapman, “Henry Liddon”, 245, citing Liddon to Pusey (13 August 1875). Liddon complained: “Altogether I could have cried, at the exhibition we made as a Church: the Times has its reporter here and will make great fun of us”.
- 57 *Report 1875*, 40–41, 73–74.
- 58 Perry, *The Reunion Conference*, 10.
- 59 *Report 1875*, 71–73.
- 60 *Ibid.*, 66–67.
- 61 *Ibid.*, 60, specifying he was voicing his personal view.
- 62 *Ibid.*, 92–95.
- 63 *Ibid.*, 80–84, 99–101.
- 64 *Ibid.*, 103–104.
- 65 Howson’s statement is reproduced integrally in *Report 1875*, 150–51.
- 66 *Ibid.*, liii–liv (common creed as the basis of intercommunion).
- 67 *Ibid.*, 66 (Sandford); 74–80 (Schaff). Perry, *The Bonn Conference*, 11–12: participants, including Döllinger, lost patience with Schaff’s “intrusive” speech.
- 68 *Ibid.*, 17–27; 105–130. Perry, *The Bonn Conference*, 6: Döllinger’s opening lecture was the “keynote” of the conference.
- 69 *Ibid.*, 42–48.
- 70 Cf. Chadwick, “Döllinger and Reunion”, 331–32; Chapman, “Henry Liddon”, 253–257; Howard, “Neither a Secular nor Confessional Age”, 81.
- 71 Chapman, “Henry Liddon”, 248.
- 72 *Lectures*, 38.
- 73 See Mark D. Chapman, “Das Erste Vatikanische Konzil und der Anglikanismus”, *Ökumenische Rundschau* 69 (2020) 183–195 at 186, 191–194.



Alt-Katholische und Ökumenische Theologie 5 (2020)

Jahresheft des Alt-Katholischen Seminars
der Universität Bonn

150 Jahre Erstes Vaticanum · Hirtenbrief über
das Gewissen von Joseph Hubert Reinkens
Überlegungen zum priesterlichen Amt

von Andreas Krebs und Joris Vercammen

Historische Schlaglichter von Christoph Lichdi,
Ruth Nientiedt und Vojtech Novitzky



Alt-Katholischer Bistumsverlag