

Chapter Seven: The Schism

Introduction

In accordance with the patristic tradition, Teilhard supported the concept of movement towards union with God¹ in the Universal Christ² against the general absence of those beliefs. He was also opposed to the general belief of the judicial approach to sin. It is necessary to ascertain the origins of such deviations and similar deviations from the patristic tradition. This needs to take into account the fact that, since the death of Teilhard, there may have been changes in opinion and indications of further change.

A. THE AUTHORITATIVE WESTERN POSITION AT THE TIME OF TEILHARD

God

The Council of Trent stated that Adam's sin 'incurred the anger of God,'³ and that sins have 'mortality offended ... God.'⁴ This reflected the views of Augustine of Hippo and Anselm of Canterbury of Canterbury which had become common as discussed in Chapter Two. The God of infinite love thus became a 'God' who took offence.

The judicial approach to sin

Original guilt:

Regarding the judicial approach to baptism discussed in Chapter Two, the Council of Florence decreed that 'the first man by his sin ... locked ... the entrance to the heavenly kingdom ... against himself and all his posterity.'⁵ Later, the Council of Trent stated that (Adam) 'was *stained* by the sin of disobedience (and) transmitted (it) to the whole human race ... that sin which is the death of the soul.'⁶ The 'stain' of Adam's sin was also described as the '*guilt* of original sin.'⁷ According to Trent, this *stain* or *guilt* was 'passed on' to Adam's descendants 'by propagation'⁸ just as Augustine had proposed. The Council of Trent added that 'recently born babies ... incur ... the original sin of Adam needing to be cleansed by the water of rebirth (baptism) for them to obtain eternal life'⁹ and 'even small children ... are truly baptised for the remission of sins in order that what they contracted by generation may be cleansed by regeneration.'¹⁰ It is therefore clear that original guilt inherited by generation can be cancelled out by baptism in a judicial manner. The above Councils therefore supported a Fall which was catastrophic for humankind.

Before the Second Vatican Council, the harshness of the placing of unbaptized infants in

1 Discussed in Chapter Two.

2 Discussed in Chapter Five.

3 Council of Trent, Session 5, 1546; trans. DEC, p. 666.

4 Council of Trent, Session 14, 1551; trans. DEC, p. 706.

5 Council of Basel-Ferrara-Florence-Rome, Session 11, 1442; trans. DEC, p. 575.

6 Council of Trent, Session 5, 1546; trans. DEC, p. 666.

7 Council of Trent, Session 5, 1546; trans. DEC, p. 667.

8 Council of Trent, Session 5, 1546; trans. DEC, p. 666. Cat 404.

9 Council of Trent, 1545-1563, Session 5, 1546; trans. DEC, p. 666.

10 Council of Trent, 1545-1563, Session 5, 1546; trans. DEC, p. 666-67.

Hell (*Gehenna*) decreed by the Council of Florence became modified by some. For example, Canon Cafferata modified the above by stating that ‘when a child is born, it comes into the world having the *stain* of Adam’s sin upon it ... If a child dies un-baptized, it cannot get to heaven owing to the original sin (guilt) upon it. That child’s soul must ... go somewhere (and that is the) state of the un-baptized (Limbo).’¹¹ However, as the Council of Florence has not been withdrawn, we conclude that the notion of Limbo was spurious. In any case, Limbo would be difficult to define because, from a view unrestricted by time, a person would be either united or separated from God and Limbo appears to be neither. In modern times, the notion of Limbo was discredited by Ratzinger who stated that ‘we find no trace of (Limbo) any longer in the official catechism of the Italian episcopate. Personally ... I would abandon (Limbo) since it was only a theological hypothesis.’¹² Teilhard opposed such a catastrophic Fall because it was contrary to a universe in movement towards God.

The judicial approach to actual sin and the sacrament of penance:

The aspects of the sacrament at the time of the Council of Trent comprised the forgiveness of sins and penalties for sin. Although ‘God alone ... can forgive sins’¹³ subject to repentance, a good priest should be able to judge if a person was truly repentant and advise that person accordingly. The Council of Trent took the sacrament considerably further by describing it as ‘a judicial act’¹⁴ and a ‘judicial process’¹⁵ rather than spiritual assistance. A sinful person who repented and returned to the natural path but failed to attend the sacrament before death would be condemned as ‘the souls of those who depart this life in actual mortal sin ... go straightaway to hell to be punished.’¹⁶ The Council of Trent thus made union with God a judicial matter despite the fact that nothing within time could possibly fully comprehend the divine act of union or the extent of God’s mercy. Those who proposed the decrees of that Council would therefore place themselves above God. The position of the Council was unfortunate as the true Church has an important role in assisting people to overcome sin to allow God to work through them.

The other aspect of a judicial sacrament of penance was dependant on the principle that ‘a fault is never forgiven by God without ... penalty’¹⁷ so the Council particularly stressed ‘expiation of offences’¹⁸ rather than assistance by the church to the repentant to move closer to God. The Council of Florence decreed that sins require a ‘penalty that is owed for ... *actual* guilt’¹⁹ as opposed to original guilt. This penalty is also associated with ‘satisfaction’ as ‘we suffer ... satisfaction ... in payment ... for our sins’ and the penalty depends on the *system of merit*. Under the system of merit, every work has a value and that of good works would offset bad works. Good works were described as ‘contrary virtues’²⁰ which include

11 Canon Cafferata, *The Catechism Simply Explained*, Commentary on Art 115 (London: Burns, Oates and Washbourne, 1922 and 1938), p. 58.

12 Joseph Ratzinger (Pope Benedict XVI) with Vittorio Messori, *The Ratzinger Report*, (Leominster: Fowler Wright Books Limited/Ignatius Press, 1985) p. 147.

13 Mk 2.7.

14 Council of Trent, Session 14, 1551; trans. DEC, p. 707.

15 Council of Trent, Session 14, 1551; trans. DEC, p. 708.

16 Council of Basel-Ferrara-Florence-Rome, Session 6, 1439; trans. DEC, p. 528.

17 Council of Trent, Session 15, 1551; trans. DEC, p. 708.

18 Council of Trent, Session 14, 1551; trans. DEC, p. 707.

19 Council of Basel-Ferrara-Florence-Rome, Session 8, 1439; trans. DEC, p. 543: ‘Penalty that is owed for ... original and actual guilt’.

20 Council of Trent, Session 14, 1551; trans. DEC, p. 709.

‘penalties enjoined by a priest, ... fasts, almsgiving or other works of devotion’²¹ as implied by Duchesne as noted in Chapter Two.

The penalty for sin, if not discharged during life, would have to be discharged after death. The Council of Florence decreed that ‘those who die ... before they have made satisfaction for acts and omissions (have) their souls ... cleansed *after* death by cleansing pains.’²² Similarly, the Council of Trent decreed that ‘once ... the fault of a repentant sinner is forgiven (the) debt of temporal punishment remains to be discharged either in this world or *later* in Purgatory, before entry to the kingdom of heaven can lie open.’²³ It is noteworthy that suffering in Purgatory is *after* death and not *at* death implying that suffering in Purgatory is a delay to union with God. In modern times, Ripley confirmed this by stating that punishment is a *delay* to union with God as souls ‘are separated from God for a time’ in Purgatory.²⁴ As time is an attribute of the universe, union with God would be subordinated to earthly matters distinct from God such as time.

Conclusion:

The Council of Trent made it clear that penalties were imposed by the church ‘to deter people from sin.’²⁵ However, it had no right to expect that God holds the same view because God is unrestricted by time as discussed in Chapter One. The criteria for union with God according to the Councils of Florence and Trent were based on judicial and mathematical criteria rather than love or the lack of it. We ascertained that progress towards union is based upon matters of the heart so it is difficult to assess the relevance of this judicial approach to sin. Furthermore, while the Councils did not deny the love of God, there was a danger that the judicial approach would eclipse it in the context of union with God.

The Mother of God

In Chapter Five, we ascertained that the mistranslation of the Niceno-Constantinopolitan Creed implied that, at her conception, the Mother of God became merely an empty vessel controlled by God. We also noted that, unlike any other human person, there was a view that the Mother of God was free of original guilt. Accordingly, the Council of Trent decreed in 1546 that ‘it is not (our) intention to include (the) Mother of God ... when ... dealing with original sin.’²⁶ In 1854, it was decreed that ‘the most Blessed Virgin Mary was, from the first moment of her conception, by a singular grace and privilege of almighty God and by virtue of the merits of Jesus Christ, Saviour of the human race, preserved immune from all *stain* of original sin.’²⁷ Accordingly, in his commentary on the Roman Catechism prior to 1994, Canon Cafferata stated that God ‘did not allow (Mary’s soul) to be stained with original sin’ so that Christ ‘*prevented* Mary from being stained by it’²⁸ quoting Gen 3.14-15. Mary would therefore have had no control over this divine preventative act.

If, at her conception, the nature of the Mother of God was directly changed by God to one

21 Council of Trent, Session 14, 1551; trans. DEC, p. 713.

22 Council of Basel-Ferrara-Florence-Rome, Session 6, 1439; trans. DEC, p. 527.

23 Council of Trent, Session 6, 1547; trans. DEC, p. 681.

24 Francis J. Ripley, *This is the Faith* (Billinge, Lancs.: Burchley Hall Press, 1951) p. 313.

25 Council of Trent, Session 15, 1551; trans. DEC, p. 709.

26 Council of Trent, Session 5, 1546; trans. DEC, p. 667.

27 Pope Pius IX, *Dogma of the Immaculate Conception*, 1854; Cat 491.

28 CAF, Article 117, p. 58.

which prevented her from sinning, it would place God within time. Moreover, she would not therefore be fully human so that Christ would also not be fully human. If however, God did *not* change her nature at her conception, but she followed God and her Son despite the imperfection of her human nature, she would be fully human, an example to us and the best of *us*.

B. THE FUNDAMENTAL NATURE OF THE SCHISM

The loss of the God of Otherness and Love

The religion of the God of Otherness and Love:

Such a religion is one based upon the *essence* of the Truth of the God of Otherness and Love. We concluded that such a God loves all things infinitely with an influence upon the universe which results in movement. Because that influence is divine, that movement and its goal in essence can be expressed as His Plan or *Logos*. Consistently, church fathers such as St Maximus stressed the importance of the movement of the universe towards union with God which is based upon the true concept of God. Furthermore, in order to influence the universe, God as Spirit must somehow operate within the universe despite being distinct from it.

Religions often base their theology on a holy book and Christianity is no exception. Isaiah cites God as stating that ‘there is none like Me’²⁹ and St John stated that ‘God is love’³⁰ confirmed the God of Otherness and Love. The psalms state that God guides us³¹ and we delight to do His will³² implying movement under His influence. The Old Testament also implies that there is union between God and human persons³³ but as God has no partiality, there must also be a union between God and the universe. This was confirmed in the New Testament by verses such as Ephesians 1.9-10 and Jn 12.32 with a union encompassed by Christ. We conclude that the theology of the God of Otherness and Love is a very simple one and is supported by Christian scripture.

Instead of regarding God the Father, Spirit and *Logos* as aspects of God, Christianity developed the Trinity much further because Christ was regarded as a person in His own right. It was also necessary to explain the union between God and the human Christ. However, none of such developments should have affected the basic Truth of the God of Otherness and Love which should underlie not only Christianity but all monotheistic religions.

A characteristic of the religion of the God of Otherness and Love is that its God cannot be bettered. There is nothing higher than what is infinite whether it describes God or how He loves. The only way we could deviate from the religion of the God of Otherness and Love would be to have a ‘God’ who was less infinite and therefore less loving bringing Him into the world of time. The earth and universe is however the world of number and therefore variety. There is therefore no single possible deviation from God of Otherness but a multiplicity of diminished gods. The situation might eventually stabilise if the achieved lowest common denominator became based upon a ‘God’ far removed from the Undiminished God.

Such deviations included notions such as bringing divine acts within time including Origen’s version of Creation and the judicial approach to sin. Others were a denial of the movement of the universe and humankind towards union with God including Origen’s circular movement, the flawed universe of Mani and the similar view generally held in Teilhard’s time. As the movement of the universe is fundamental to the theology of the Undiminished God, all the above schismatic notions can be regarded as religions of the diminished gods.

29 Isa 46.5.

30 1 Jn 4.8

31 Ps 66/67.5.

32 Ps 39/40.8.

33 Ps 22/23.6, Ezek 18.28, and Wis 5.15.

Losing the religion of the Undiminished God:

Even in modern times, many people believe in God but a significant proportion are not interested in theology. A person's God is often the God of that person, its family and a few friends. Such a person might give alms to his religious group or the poor but whether or not God is also the God of the whole universe is not often considered.

In earlier times and in many areas even today, societies hardly survive. In such societies, it is only the few who are able to visualize a better society. The world of the masses would be a static one relative to God and their only hope would be to escape from their harsh world. Of course, education assists people to find ways towards a better future, but actual progress requires motivation, a motivation to change society for the benefit of others. The ideal motivation is that powered by the Spirit of the God who loves all things. When those with the power of the Spirit are few, there would be a tendency for religion of such societies to descend to the theology of the general public which tends to be based upon a multitude of religions based upon diminished gods. They would all operate with a love which is deficient relative to divine love of all things. A characteristic of these religions is therefore that they tend to attack other religions.

The true religion continues because people not only find God by contemplation but learn from others before them who have learnt how to express the Truth. Those people may be patriarchs, bishops, religious or ordinary people who value the Truth. Some theologians tend to stress that the continuity of the true religion depends on a list of names of popes or patriarchs regardless of whether or not they were true teachers of the faith. However, sometimes the Truth escapes from hierarchs of religions and their successors have to recover the Truth from those of lower rank. This does not negate the necessity of appointing people to protect the Truth.

When the Truth has been lost by those in authority, authorities often attempt to prevent schism with a strong organisation under their control. However, the resulting stability would be vulnerable because it would be based upon religions of diminished gods which naturally tend to fragment.

The schism relative to the authoritative western position

Schismatic notions arising from the development of the authoritative position:

Not all the schismatic notions ascertained by Teilhard were directly due to the western authoritative position. A consequent development of the Fall according to that position was that the Fall corrupted the nature of not only humankind *but the whole universe*. Teilhard realised that such a fallen universe could not move towards God so that it would become static relative to God. As the union between God and the universe and movement towards it is scriptural, the abandonment of that union would be a schismatic notion. The loss of the principle of the union must have been due to a lack of an authoritative defence of patristic eschatology.

The Fall according to the western authoritative position also led to the notion that the human person was only a soul with an attached flawed body. The goal of the human person would therefore be to escape from the flawed universe at death. This notion was curiously contrary to the Council of Florence which stated that at the *Parousia*, 'all shall rise again *with their bodies* ... and go to eternal life but those who have done evil shall go into eternal

fire'³⁴ which was presumably disregarded. A further consequence of the flawed universe was that people no longer loved the universe despite the scriptural direction of loving one's neighbour.

The loss of the concept of the union between God and the universe led to the eclipse of the Universal Christ as He would no longer encompass all unions with God. This in turn led to the loss of the liturgy which reflected that union. A Christ who was not universal would not be the God who loves all things without partiality. It must have been because of the judicial approach to sin of the authoritative position that the purpose of the Cross was considered an expiation for Adam's sin but it was unclear how this expiation related to the divine and natural energies. The judicial approach also led to the notion of the Mother of God as an empty vessel and the Cross as a judicial act. It was also a factor in the decline of ascent by the faithful in the Eucharist.

Schismatic notions arising from ignorance

Some of the schismatic notions ascertained by Teilhard were not directly caused by conciliar decrees or their development but by ignorance. For example, Teilhard alleged that the common view was that divine acts were seen as sporadic events within time. Creation thus became an instantaneous event and the *Parousia* became a sudden catastrophe. If the divine acts were reduced to temporal events, God would become a creature of time.

This approach also applied to the acts of Christ so that they became only brief moments of the past implying that Christ was not truly divine. In particular, the *Parousia* and therefore the *Pleroma* and movement towards it were reduced to obscurity. The loss of importance of the *Parousia* implied that there was no divine Plan for the universe and further undermining the principle of the Universal Christ. The root of this problem may have been the lack of understanding of the relationship between the divine and natural energies. It appears that the religion of the Undiminished God had been lost long before the time of Teilhard so the unauthoritative schismatic notions merely filled a vacuum arising from that loss.

Conclusions

While the western authoritative position has been judicial in character for some considerable time, the fact that many of the schismatic notions within its jurisdiction were not directly due to that position gives an opportunity to restore the theology of the Undiminished God. Of course, the judicial approach to sin of the Councils of Florence and Trent could not survive if the religion of the Undiminished God was fully restored and their rejection by the educated laity must hasten the withdrawal of those conciliar decrees. A restoration of the Undiminished God could restore the cosmic liturgy but the reversion to practices lost so long ago would probably take a considerable time.

34 Council of Basel-Ferrara-Florence-Rome, Session 8, 1439; trans. DEC, p. 552.

C. LATER DEVELOPMENTS

Rome against Teilhard

Introduction:

We have ascertained that the essence of Teilhard's writings were in accordance with the patristic tradition. We will therefore examine the dispute between Teilhard and those in authority in his church. This may indicate its position after Teilhard's death.

Opposition to the works of Teilhard by the Vatican and the Jesuit Order:

In 1922, Teilhard wrote an essay entitled 'Historical Representations of Original Sin' for discussion with theologians. It may have been stolen from his desk³⁵ but somehow was sent to the Superior General of the Jesuits in Rome.³⁶ On 13 Nov 1924, Teilhard was summoned to be reprimanded by his Provincial, Père Costa de Beauregard at Lyons.³⁷ As a consequence, in 1926, Teilhard was forbidden to teach any longer at the Institut Catholique in Paris³⁸ and left France for China.

In 1933, Teilhard discovered that he had been censored for his views on original sin.³⁹ In 1947, he was forbidden to write or teach on philosophical subjects and in 1948, he was forbidden to take up a teaching post in the College of France.

On 15 Nov 1957, after Teilhard's death, the Holy Office forbade the works of Teilhard being retained in libraries including those of religious institutes. His books were not to be sold in Catholic bookshops and were not to be translated into other languages.

On 30 June 1962, the Sacred Congregation of Holy Office issued a *Monitum* (warning) regarding the writings of Father Teilhard de Chardin. The text of the *Monitum* is as follows:

Several works of Fr Père Teilhard de Chardin, some of which were posthumously published, are being edited and are gaining a good deal of success. Prescinding from a Judgement about those points that concern the positive sciences, it is sufficiently clear that the above mentioned works *abound in such ambiguities, and indeed even serious errors, as to offend Catholic doctrine*. For this reason, the eminent and most revered Fathers of the Supreme Sacred Congregation of the Holy Office exhort all Ordinaries, as well as Superiors of religious institutes, rectors of seminaries and presidents of universities, effectively to protect the minds, particularly of the youth against the dangers presented by the works of Fr Teilhard de Chardin and his followers.

Sebastianus, Notarius
30 June 1962

In order to place the *Monitum* in perspective, Teilhard's works were personally condemned by neither Pope Pius XI (1922-1939), Pope Pius XII (1939-1958) nor Pope John XXIII (1958-1963) and there were no *ex cathedra* statements issued against Teilhard's works. However, further affirmations of the *Monitum* were issued on 20 Oct 1967, 23 Mar 1970 and 9 Aug

35 Robert Speaight, *Teilhard de Chardin: A Biography* (London: Collins, 1967) p. 136.

36 Teilhard, Note following *Historical Representations of Original Sin*, 1922; 10CE, p. 55.

37 Speaight, p. 136.

38 Teilhard, Note following *Historical Representations*; 10CE, p. 55.

39 Teilhard, *Christology and Evolution*, 1933; 10CE, p. 80.

1970. The *Monitum* received some support within the Roman Church. For example, Philippe de la Trinité correctly stated that ‘Teilhard’s thought is not in accordance with Council of Trent regarding the sin of Adam’⁴⁰ and, because of the *Monitum* against Teilhard’s works, he states that the ‘Church considers the works of Teilhard as heretical.’⁴¹

However, on 12 May 1981, to commemorate the 100th anniversary of the birth of Teilhard, Cardinal Agostino Casaroli, the Vatican Head of State, sent a letter to the Rector of the Catholic Institute of Paris, Archbishop Paul Poupard. In the letter, Cardinal Casaroli praised Teilhard’s perception of creation’s dynamism with religious fervour. He also acknowledged that difficulties arose in his analyses but called for a ‘calm critical study’ of his works. The text of the letter is as follows:

The international scientific community and, more generally, the entire intellectual world is preparing to celebrate the centennial of the birth of Fr Teilhard de Chardin. The astonishing resonance of his research, as well as the brilliance of his personality and richness of his thinking, have profoundly marked our epoch.

In him, a powerful poetic intuition of nature’s profound value, a sharp perception of creation’s dynamism, and a broad vision of the world’s future join together with an incontestable religious fervour.

Similarly, his unremitting desire to dialogue with the science of his time and his bold optimism about the evolution of the world have given his intuitions considerable influence through the rich variety of his words and the magic of his images.

Completely turned to the future, this synthesis, often lyrical and animated with passion for the universal, will help to restore hope to those assailed by doubts. At the same time, the complexity of the problems he analysed and the variety of approaches he adopted raised difficulties that understandably called for a calm, critical study of his extraordinary work in the scientific, philosophical and theological realms.

There can be no doubt that the celebrations of his 100th birthday, at the Catholic Institute of Paris, the Museum of Natural History, UNESCO, and Notre Dame of Paris, are an occasion for an encouraging evaluation (of his work) using a just methodological distinction of procedures in order to achieve a rigorous epistemological study.

What our contemporaries will undoubtedly remember, beyond the difficulties of conception and deficiencies of expression in this audacious attempt to reach a synthesis, is the testimony of the coherent life of a man possessed by Christ in the depths of his soul. He was concerned with honouring both faith and reason, and anticipated the response to the appeal of John Paul II: ‘Be not afraid, open, open wide to Christ the doors of the immense domains of culture, civilization, and progress.’

I am pleased, Monsignor, to communicate this message on behalf of the Holy Father to you and all the participants of the conference over which you are presiding at the Catholic Institute of Paris in homage to Fr Teilhard de Chardin, and to assure you of my faithful allegiance.

Agostino Cardinal Casaroli

From *L’Osservatore Romano*, 10 Jun 1981.

40 Philippe de la Trinité, OCD, (Jean Joseph Rambaud) *Rome et Teilhard de Chardin* (Paris: Libraire Artheme Fayard, 1964) p. 185.

41 *Ibid*, p. 15.

Nevertheless, later that year, the Sacred Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith renewed the *Monitum* against rumours that it no longer applied. A communiqué of the Press Office of the Holy See stated:

The letter sent by the Cardinal Secretary of State to His Excellency Monsignor Poupard on the occasion of the centenary of the birth of Fr Teilhard de Chardin has been interpreted in a certain section of the press as a revision of previous stands taken by the Holy See in regard to this author, and in particular of the *Monitum* of the Holy Office of 30 June 1962, which pointed out that the work of the author contained ambiguities and grave doctrinal errors.

The question has been asked whether such an interpretation is well founded.

After having consulted the Cardinal Secretary of State and the Cardinal Prefect of the Sacred Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith, which, by order of the Holy Father, had been duly consulted beforehand about the letter in question, we are in a position to reply in the negative. Far from being a revision of the previous stands of the Holy See, Cardinal Casaroli's letter expresses reservation in various passages – and these reservations have been passed over in silence by certain newspapers – reservations which refer precisely to the judgement given in the *Monitum* of June 1962, even though this document is not explicitly mentioned.”

From *L'Osservatore Romano*, 20 July, 1981

Discussion:

Once official criticism of Teilhard's works began, there was a danger of entrenchment without any prospect of a solution as shown by the several confirmations of the *Monitum*. Also, by the time of the Casaroli-Poupard exchange, there were underlying issues.

Although nowhere in the official criticism of Teilhard's works was their essence made clear, if we recall the draft paper Historical Representations of Original Sin, it would be highly likely that the issue was Teilhard's denial of the paradisaic state of Eden although, elsewhere in the paper, Teilhard admits there must have been a 'moral crisis.'⁴² Teilhard states that 'however far we look into the past, we find nothing that resembles this wonderful state' of Eden.⁴³ Without the paradisaic state, the Fall would lose its severity with the result that the doctrine of original guilt would be untenable but, at that time, it was fully supported by Rome.

We have ascertained that the differences between Teilhard and his circle were based upon those between patristic and the medieval theology supported by Rome. The dispute between Teilhard and his circle was therefore based upon not only original guilt but on many issues. These issues centred on the difference between the theologies of the Undiminished God and those of the diminished gods.

Rome may have chosen to ignore these issues possibly because it did not wish to draw attention from the fact that public opinion was turning away from medieval theology. This would be consistent with the fact that there have been no further renewals of the *Monitum* since 1981. Cardinal Casaroli would also have been aware of Teilhard's support for the Universal Christ as he cites Teilhard's 'passion for the universal' and realised that the

42 Teilhard, *Historical Representations of Original Sin*, 1922; 10CE, p. 52.

43 Teilhard, *Historical Representation*; 10CE, p. 47.

decrees of the Second Vatican Council, at least partly, supported Teilhard's position. However, as there were inconsistencies in Teilhard's works, Casaroli was obliged to state that they 'raised difficulties' presumably to avoid criticism of himself.

The Second Vatican Council (1962-1965)

Introduction:

The schism observed by Teilhard was prior to the Second Vatican Council. That Council was an important one so that it could have changed the character of the schism. We therefore need to ascertain if the council decrees had any effect upon the schism.

Councils of Florence and Trent:

The Council specifically upheld the decrees of the Councils of Florence and Trent.⁴⁴ It also stated that the 'definitions (of the) bishops ... with the successor of Peter ... in an ecumenical council ... must be adhered to with the obedience of faith.'⁴⁵ Presumably, the Vatican Council therefore supported the judicial approach to sin including original guilt, merit and punishment of actual sin. Consistently, the Council upheld the judicial approach by stating that sin is 'an offence against God.'⁴⁶ Also, it appeared that the notion of the corrupted universe was upheld by the Council as it decreed that, in the context of Adam's sin, the 'world ... has been deformed by sin.'⁴⁷

The *Parousia* and movement towards God:

Prior to that Council, the union between God and the universe had been eclipsed by an emphasis upon judgement sometimes linked with Christ⁴⁸ but occasionally linked with the resurrection of human bodies.⁴⁹

In stark contrast, despite some decrees favouring the Councils of Florence and Trent, the Second Vatican Council defined the *Parousia* as 'the time of *universal* restoration.'⁵⁰ This principle was supported by the citation of several scriptural verses quoted in Chapter Five including Ephesians 1.9-10, 1 Corinthians 15.28, John 12.32, and Colossians 1.20.

This change of emphasis brought the western church closer to the Pauline approach to the *Parousia* favoured by Teilhard who referred to the same scriptural passages. However, the concept of the *Parousia* would only be a theory unless there was movement towards it, but the Council also implied this by stating that 'the promised restoration ... has already begun'⁵¹

Furthermore, it also acknowledged that 'the human race is today becoming more and more of a civil, economic and social unity'⁵² by 'collaboration'⁵³ so that humankind would make social progress perhaps also with God and 'humankind ... will be roused to a living

44 Second Vatican Council, Session 5, *Lumen gentium*, Chapter 7.51, 1964; trans. DEC, p. 891.

45 Second Vatican Council, Session 5, *Lumen gentium* 3.25, 1964; trans. DEC, p. 869.

46 Second Vatican Council, Session 3, *Sacrosanctum concilium*, 1963; trans. DEC, p. 839.

47 Second Vatican Council, Session 9, *Gaudium et spes*, 39, 1965; trans. DEC, p. 1092.

48 For example, Council of Trent, Session 6, 1547; trans. DEC, p. 678.

First Vatican Council, *Profession of Faith*, 1870; trans. DEC, p. 802.

49 Fourth Lateran Council, 1215; trans. DEC, p. 230.

Council of Basel-Ferrara-Florence-Rome, Session 8, 1439; trans. DEC, p. 552.

50 Acts 3.21; Second Vatican Council, Session 5, *Lumen gentium* 7.48, 1964; trans. DEC, p. 887.

51 Second Vatican Council, *Lumen gentium* 7.48, 1964; trans. DEC, p. 887.

52 Second Vatican Council, Session 9, *Gaudium et spes* 43, trans. DEC, p. 1097.

53 Second Vatican Council, Session 9, *Gaudium et spes*, 57; trans. DEC, p. 1108.

hope ... of being received into peace and supreme happiness in the homeland which is radiant with the glory of God.⁵⁴ It is therefore implied that the movement applied to humankind as a whole in a Teilhardian manner.

The Council also appeared to support the principle that the Universal Christ is the goal of humankind by stating that ‘the Lord is the goal of human history’⁵⁵ as ‘the Church ... will reach its completion ... when the time for the restoration of all things will come and along with the human race the whole universe, which is intimately united to humanity and through it attains its goal, will be established perfectly in Christ.’⁵⁶

Furthermore, the Council implied that both the *Parousia* is a mystery as one would expect with an act of God through the Spirit. For example, it stated that ‘we do not know ... how the universe is to be transformed’⁵⁷ and that ‘the interpretation of the heavenly ... cities ... remains ... the mystery of human history.’⁵⁸

In summary, it appears that the Second Vatican Council confirmed the scriptural basis for the movement of the universe towards union with God with His assistance. However, in order to comply with the patristic tradition, it would still be necessary for church authorities to state that the universe remains as created by God and has not been corrupted by any temporal act such as the Fall. It should also make clear that when parts of the universe turn away from God and His Plan, it would be a corruption of nature but not a change of nature.

The human person and free will:

The Council upheld the principle that the human person comprises both body and soul by stating that ‘humanity (is) a unity of body and soul’ regarding ‘the body ... as good and worthy of honour.’⁵⁹ This position is fundamentally inconsistent with the notion of a flawed universe. As the concept of a human person comprising both body and soul was so recently confirmed, it would presumably be likely to prevail for the foreseeable future. We would therefore expect that support for the notions of the flawed universe and the human person being only a soul would decline in support.

Eschatological movement towards God would be impossible unless there was a freedom to join the natural path. The Council supported free will by decreeing that ‘God willed to leave (humans) in the hands of their own counsel,⁶⁰ so that they would seek their Creator of their own accord ...’⁶¹ Free will is thus a gift from God, a gift which would have presumably also been available to Adam.

The Mother of God:

The Council stated that ‘Mary was not simply a passive instrument in the hands of God but ... cooperated in the salvation of the human race.’⁶² The fact that Mary fully cooperated with God during her life is not in dispute and one might expect that this citation indicated that the Mother of God was not prevented from sinning by God. However, the Council confirmed that

54 Second Vatican Council, Session 9, *Gaudium et spes*, 93; trans. DEC, p. 1135.

55 Second Vatican Council, Session 9, *Gaudium et spes*, 45; trans. DEC, p. 1099.

56 Second Vatican Council, Session 5, *Lumen gentium*, 48; trans. DEC, p. 887.

57 Second Vatican Council, Session 9, *Gaudium et spes*, 39; trans. DEC, p. 1092.

58 Second Vatican Council, Session 9, *Gaudium et spes*, 40; trans. DEC, p. 1093.

59 Second Vatican Council, Session 9, *Gaudium et spes*, 14; trans. DEC, p. 1076.

60 Eccl 15.14.

61 Second Vatican Council, Session 9, *Gaudium et spes* 17; trans. DEC, p. 1078.

62 Second Vatican Council, Session 5, 1964, *Lumen Gentium*; trans. DEC, p. 893.

‘the Immaculate Virgin (was) preserved free from every *stain* of original sin.’⁶³ We conclude that the Mother of God was still regarded as a passive instrument of God placing the true humanity of the Mother of God in doubt.

The Eucharist:

The Council of Trent confirmed that the change of the offered gifts of bread and wine occurred at the Institution Narrative in keeping with the judicial practice of insisting that the change occurs at a particular time⁶⁴ rather than in the hearts of the faithful.

Conclusion:

The emphasis by the Council on the union between God and the universe and the movement towards it together with the confirmation of a human person as both body and soul could be described as a volte-face except for the fact that the previous Council decrees remained in force. The new emphasis could however be described as a major shift in the view of the western church. The few endorsements of previous decrees could perhaps be discounted as merely an appeasement towards their supporters.

Nevertheless, we conclude that the restoration of some of the patristic tradition by the Council has changed the nature of the schism. Before the Council, it would have been reasonable to assume that the schism was between the few who supported the patristic tradition and the many who supported the councils of Florence and Trent. After the Vatican Council, we can no longer state that the patristic tradition is *absent* from the western church. The schism therefore has become *within* the church but has not been resolved.

Developments since the Second Vatican Council

Introduction:

The decrees of the Second Vatican Council implied that there had been a shift away from the judicial approach to doctrine towards a more dynamic approach. We will therefore review some of the developments after the Council to ascertain whether or not the shift was maintained.

The change of view by the educated laity:

Following the Second Vatican Council, the faithful were encouraged to apply reason to their faith rather than merely blindly believe what they were told by the clergy. One result was that the educated laity abandoned the notion of the judicial approach to sin. We must conclude that the doctrine has been seriously weakened.

Regarding the universe, they ceased to describe it as flawed and some valued it as part of God’s creation. However, the softening of the rhetoric against the universe would be of little importance unless those in authority projected to the laity that the universe will move towards God and unite with Him according to the divine Plan. However, as that principle had been absent for such a long time,⁶⁵ it was hardly surprising that it did not return.

Progressive writers:

63 Second Vatican Council, Session 5, *Lumen Gentium*, Chap 8, 59; trans. DEC, p. 894. (See also Cat 411).

64 Council of Basel-Ferrara-Florence-Rome, Session 11, 1442; trans. DEC, p. 581.

65 Robert T. Francoeur, ed., *The World of Teilhard* (Baltimore: Helicon Press, 1961) p. 183.

The book 'Introduction to Christianity' written by Cardinal Ratzinger in 1968 was particularly relevant to the change in emphasis by the western church. He wrote it when he was the Prefect of the Congregation of the Doctrine of the Faith, an important position of authority.

Ratzinger accepted the God of Otherness by stating that God 'stands above space and time'⁶⁶ so that there is also an 'infinite gulf between God and man.'⁶⁷ He also reaffirmed the principle that the nature of God is love.⁶⁸ This scriptural principle did not prevent the notion of the wrathful 'God' becoming firmly established prior to the Second Vatican Council.

Regarding the *Parousia*, Ratzinger noted that the Christians of the Middle Ages understood the *Parousia* as 'the terrifying day of wrath,' while the early Christians regarded it as an 'event full of hope and joy.'⁶⁹ Such a joy must be expected for those united with the God of Infinite Love in the Universal Christ. Those who are unable to unite with God would be in that position not because God is wrathful but because their self-love makes them incompatible with divine love.

Teilhard noted that, in his day, the view was that the purpose of the Cross was the expiation for Adam's sin by Christ, a notion which eclipsed His cosmic role. Ratzinger confirmed this by stating that 'Western Christendom ... takes it for granted that Christ had to die on the Cross in order to make good the *infinite* offence that had been committed and, in this way, to restore the order that had been violated.'⁷⁰ However, Ratzinger stated the 'blood (of the Cross) is not to be understood as a material gift, a *quantitative* measurable means of expiation; it is simply the concrete expression of a love of which it is said that it extends to the end (Jn 13.1).'⁷¹ He thus defended the importance of the Cross but indicates that its purpose must not be regarded as judicial. Similarly, he stated that 'the Cross ... is the expression of the radical nature of the love that gives itself completely' rather than 'a human sacrifice (to a) unrelenting ... God.'⁷² Furthermore, Ratzinger stated that 'God must not be thought of (as) a God who demands the slaughter of His Son to pacify His wrath.'⁷³ Also, he stated that 'in the New Testament, the Cross ... stands ... not as the work of expiation that mankind offers to the wrathful God, but as the expression of that foolish love that gives itself away to the point of humiliation.'⁷⁴ If the 'love that gave itself completely' is the kenotic love of the Father shared by the Son and Spirit, the Cross would reflect the loving nature of God which is directed to all things. Ratzinger confirmed this principle by stating that 'the Cross does not reveal only man; it also reveals God.'⁷⁵ If that was the case, Christ would take upon Himself all the sins of the world⁷⁶ to reveal His Father's infinite love. Ratzinger therefore placed the Cross in the context that Christ is divine as well as being human. The principle that God has infinite or kenotic love is incompatible with the false notion of the 'God' of Wrath.

66 Joseph Ratzinger, *Introduction to Christianity*, (San Francisco, California: Ignatius Press, 1990, 2000) p. 135.

67 Ratzinger, *Introduction*, p. 49.

68 Ratzinger, *Introduction*, p. 143; 1 Jn 4.8.

69 Ratzinger, *Introduction*, p. 326.

70 Ratzinger, *Introduction*, p. 233.

71 Ratzinger, *Introduction*, p. 287.

72 Ratzinger, *Introduction*, p. 281

73 Ratzinger, *Introduction*, p. 291.

74 Ratzinger, *Introduction*, p. 283.

75 Ratzinger, *Introduction*, p. 293.

76 Jn 1.29.

While not specifically stating that the notion of the offended or wrathful ‘God’ was an error, by condemning the judicial aspect of the Cross, Ratzinger attempted to turn the tide against the judicial approach to sin.

Ratzinger supported the principle of eschatological movement towards union with God in the context of the Universal Christ. Regarding the *Parousia* itself, he declared that the eschatological goal is in Christ because ‘in Christ the ... goal of humanity is attained, because in Him divine existence and human existence touch and unite.’⁷⁷ He confirmed that it is the union with God which takes place at the *Parousia* as it is ‘the contact of the being “man” with the being “God”.’⁷⁸ We therefore unite with God *in Christ*. In Teilhardian fashion, he discusses ‘unification around a personal Centre’⁷⁹ while elsewhere he identified the Centre as Christ in the context of the ‘end of history.’⁸⁰ He maintained that the *Parousia* is cosmic by quoting Rahner who stated that ‘in the Son ... God and the world have become one’⁸¹ He was equally clear that eschatological movement is towards God by stating that ‘the decisive factor ... lies in making progress towards the convergence of man and God.’⁸² Therefore Ratzinger made a firm stand for the patristic *Parousia* as opposed to a universe which is static relative to God.

Western support for the cosmic Eucharist and the principle of self-offering:

Although Teilhard’s approach to the Eucharist was rare in his time, some modern writers appear to concur with his position following the new emphasis on the Universal Christ at the Second Vatican Council. For example, the papal encyclical *Ecclesia de Eucharistia*, 2003, stated that ‘the Eucharist has (a) cosmic character’ and that ‘the Eucharist is always in some way celebrated on the altar of the world. It unites heaven and earth. It embraces and permeates all creation.’⁸³ It also stated that ‘the Eucharist is ... a foretaste of the fullness of joy promised by Christ.’⁸⁴ Also, Ratzinger as Pope Benedict XVI supported Teilhard by stating that:

‘Let your Church offer herself to You as a living and holy sacrifice.’ This request, addressed to God, is also made to ourselves. It is a reference to two passages from the letter to the Romans. We ourselves, with our whole being, must be adoration and sacrifice, and by transforming our world, give it back to God. The role of the priesthood is to consecrate the world so that it may become a living host, a liturgy: so that the liturgy may not be something alongside the reality of the world, but that the world itself shall become a living host, a liturgy. This is also the vision of Teilhard de Chardin: in the end we shall achieve a true cosmic liturgy, where the cosmos becomes a living host. And let us pray the Lord to help us become priests in this sense, to aid in the transformation of the world, in adoration of God, beginning with ourselves. That our lives may speak of God, that our lives may be the true liturgy, an announcement of God, a door through which the

77 Ratzinger, *Introduction*, p. 263.

78 Ratzinger, *Introduction*, p. 313.

79 Ratzinger, *Introduction*, p. 321.

80 Ratzinger, *Introduction*, p. 315.

81 Ratzinger, *Introduction*, p. 263.

82 Ratzinger, *Introduction*, p. 229.

83 Pope John Paul II, *Ecclesia de Eucharistia* 8, 2003.

84 *Ibid* 18. Cf. Jn 15.11.

distant God may become the present God, and a true giving of ourselves to God.⁸⁵

Also, Cardinal Kurt Koch advised (western) Catholics to learn from the Oriental Churches and understand that the liturgy is not just a community celebration but a ‘cosmic event.’⁸⁶ In other words, the Eucharist assists the faithful towards unity with God rather than to celebrate an existing unity. Also, Timothy Radcliffe in a recent popular book, stated that ‘the true liturgy ... renews creation and consecrates everything.’⁸⁷ Regarding self-offering in the Eucharist, Radcliffe stated that ‘we load the altar with gifts which are from God and for God (including) our own lives’⁸⁸ and ‘abandoning oneself totally to the will of God means simply placing one’s life on the altar as a gift received and given back for God to do with it whatever He willed’.⁸⁹ It is however unlikely that the emphasis upon self-offering will be restored until the liturgy once again restores emphasis upon self-offering.

As there is little general support for the Universal Christ, the concept of the cosmic liturgy would be unlikely to receive much interest unless it is encouraged by those in authority.

The 1994 Catechism:

The necessity for baptism in a judicial sense continued in the Catechism as it stated that because ‘we are all born afflicted ... with Adam’s sin (and) the Church baptizes for the remission of sins even tiny infants who have not committed personal sin.’⁹⁰ It also implied that Adam’s sin was original guilt rather than due to general concupiscence.⁹¹ A second but different view in the Catechism was that ‘as regards children who have died without baptism, the Church can only entrust them to the mercy of God (with the) hope that there is a way of salvation for (such) children’⁹² implying that they may not go to *Gehenna* or Limbo. If this second view became prominent, the judicial approach to original guilt would be negated. If unbaptized infants depend upon God’s mercy rather than being subject to original guilt, they would be placed upon the same footing as the baptized. However, the similar judicial notion of temporal punishment for sin outstanding at death was also upheld by the Catechism.⁹³

One important point in the Catechism is that it recognised that the risen Christ is ‘not limited by space and time’⁹⁴ just as God is unlimited by space and time. If we align ourselves with Christ in the Eucharist in true humility, we reinforce our lives of working with God to fulfil His Plan within the Body of Christ as Christ is our Archetype. This is contrast with the adoration of judicially consecrated bread which produces no action.

Conclusion:

While the above writers were eminent, we do not know the degree of support for their

85 This citation is from an address by Ratzinger (Pope Benedict XVI) when he celebrated vespers in the cathedral at Aosta, Italy in connection with Romans 8.1-2, 24 Jul 09. (From *L’Osservatore Romano*, 29 Jul 09.)

86 Report in *The Tablet* of 17 Aug 2013.

87 Radcliffe, *Why Go to Church?*, 2008, p. 113. in full

88 Radcliffe, p. 102.

89 Radcliffe, p. 105.

90 Cat 403.

91 Cat 405

92 Cat 1261.

93 Cat 1471 and 1472.

94 Cat 645

position. The above writings confirm the shift of opinion away from the judicial approach to sin but, as long as the decrees of the Councils of Florence and Trent remain binding, they will continue to have influence.

The changing position of the laity

The modern age has brought the educated laity to the fore and, although Christianity has declined, it could be invigorated by educated laity. It was after the Second Vatican Council, the western church bowed to the inevitable by permitting the laity to align their beliefs with reason. The church could therefore potentially become a gathering of persons with different talents all working with God in different ways.⁹⁵ Their activities will tend to be more extensive than it would be if it merely followed a norm and would make the church more dynamic instead of merely trying to maintain the *status quo*. However, the stability of the church will be more difficult to maintain. The tasks of the clergy will be more difficult. It would no longer be sufficient for them to merely forgive sins without addressing the individual needs of those wishing to work with God more effectively. It would no longer be sufficient for the laity to sit in rows during the liturgy only listening to or saying the same words in the liturgy despite their individual needs. Some clergy would fear that, with many individual reasoned views abounding, their authority would be challenged. They would have to use reason with their teaching and ensure that it was consistent. Such a task would not be impossible when their teaching was supported by scripture but otherwise would be more difficult.

Also after the Second Vatican Council, as noted above, the power of the educated laity was quickly realised as they rejected the judicial approach to sin which was the core of the division discussed above. They challenged the very doctrine in which the clergy had decided to define a judicial 'God' which weakened the true God in the eyes of the faithful.

95 1 Cor 12.4.

D. HEALING THE SCHISM

As religions of gods which are diminished relative to the true God tend to be the norm, it may be a difficult task to find the religion of the Undiminished God and it may not actually exist as an organized body. Many religions will falsely claim that they still adhere to the original religion. However, if they show prejudice against others, their claims can be dismissed.

Some consider belief in Christ is tantamount with the consideration of God Himself becoming secondary so that belief in Christ could hide a diminished 'God'. Such a Christ would not then be fully divine and the understanding of God the Father and the Spirit would be lost. If Christ was not divine, the true Christ would also be lost and the restoration of the Undiminished God could be difficult to restore.

Some dismiss belief in the Undiminished God as irrelevant theory, but this may disguise a belief in a diminished 'God' and, without belief in the Undiminished God, the essence of the religion would be lost. If some religions rediscover the Undiminished God, the fact that there was a long period when He was lost can be forgotten. However, without support from authorities, restoring the religion of the Undiminished God would be a matter of individuals attempting to come together against authoritative opposition.

We could easily blame religions and denominations for permitting the schism in the first place. However, for the schism to be healed as soon as possible, it will require the same charity which Teilhard himself showed. He made a stand for the original Undiminished God and was treated cruelly as a result. Nevertheless, he remained loyal to his church because he believed that, somewhere within it, the Truth remained.

In fact, the western authoritative position has a particular advantage because the Second Vatican Council included many scriptural texts supporting the theology of the Undiminished God despite its support for the Councils of Florence and Trent. It therefore had a base upon which the theology of the Undiminished God can be developed and proclaimed.

E. CONCLUSIONS

While, at first sight, the dispute between Teilhard and his superiors concerned the judicial approach to sin, it is clear that the fundamental difference between them was the nature of God. In fact, the schism he uncovered was so fundamental that it involved two different Gods, universes and how they relate so that there were two completely different religions under the umbrella of Christianity. The schism has been obscured because the original Undiminished God was lost so long ago and was so extensive.

Word count, 6 July 17: 9,206.