

PART II

Michał Kumorek, MA, <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7462-7389>

Faculty of Philosophy

Pontifical University of John Paul II in Krakow

A study of contemporary concepts of Jesus' human knowledge

Analiza współczesnych koncepcji ludzkiej wiedzy Jezusa¹

<https://doi.org/10.34766/fetr.v48i4.964>

Abstract: The question of the human knowledge of Jesus is one of the most vividly debated issues in Christology today. The dynamics of this debate is caused by the lack of dogmatic declarations, the modern discoveries of human sciences and critical approach to the concept of omniscience resulting from the beatific vision (*visio beatifica*) of Jesus, which for many centuries was adopted almost on a par with dogma. The article compares contemporary theories of Jesus' human knowledge cross-sectional, points to theologians' mutual inspirations, and analyses the strengths and weaknesses of the most important concepts. The primary role in the article is played by the historical-critical method, which makes it possible to show and analyse the changes in the ideas of Jesus' human knowledge, which gradually abandoned the attribution of omniscience to Him. The theologians of the Reformed Churches, who were the first to recognise the paradoxes of Christ's omniscience as part of kenotic considerations, had a particular share in these developments. They wondered why, if the Incarnate God renounces His divine attributes, He would not also relinquish omniscience. Their reflections and the progressive development of the human sciences were an inspiration for many Catholic theologians, who in the 20th century also gradually began to notice the limitations of Thomas Aquinas' theory ascribing omniscience to Jesus. They have developed new ideas drawing on recent anthropology, philosophy, psychology and the human sciences. The most interesting of the theories are the hypotheses based on the mystical experiences of Jesus, which, without undermining the dogmas of His fully human nature, try to explain how He was able to contact the Father and gain knowledge of His mission. The development of new theories of Christ's knowledge by Catholic theologians, on the one hand, made it possible to approximate positions on this issue with the theologians of the Reformed Churches. On the other hand, it paradoxically opens up prospects for dialogue with some defenders of the *visio beatifica* concept, who allow its reinterpretation through the category of mystical experience.

Keywords: human nature, hypostatic union, Jesus' knowledge, Jesus' self-consciousness, mystical experience

Abstrakt: Kwestia ludzkiej wiedzy Jezusa jest jednym z najbardziej żywo dyskutowanych zagadnień we współczesnej chrystologii. Dynamiki debacie nadaje z jednej strony brak dogmatycznych orzeczeń i współczesne odkrycia nauk o człowieku, a z drugiej krytyczne podejście do koncepcji wszechwiedzy płynącej z uszczęśliwiającego widzenia (*visio beatifica*) Jezusa, która przez wiele wieków była przyjmowana niemal na równi z dogmatem. Artykuł w sposób przekrojowy ukazuje i porównuje

¹ Artykuł w języku polskim dostępny jest na stronie:

<https://www.stowarzyszeniefidesetratio.pl/Presentations0/2021-4Kumo2.pdf>

współczesne teorie ludzkiej wiedzy Jezusa, wskazuje na wzajemne inspiracje teologów oraz poddaje analizie mocne i słabe strony najważniejszych koncepcji. W artykule główną rolę odgrywa metoda historyczno-krytyczna umożliwiająca ukazanie i analizę przemian koncepcji ludzkiej wiedzy Jezusa, które stopniowo rezygnowały z przypisywania Mu wszechwiedzy. Szczególny w tym udział teologów Kościołów Reformowanych, którzy jako pierwsi w ramach rozważań kenotycznych zaczęli dostrzegać paradoksy wszechwiedzy Chrystusa. Zastanawiali się oni, dlaczego Wcielony Bóg wyrzekając się wielu swoich atrybutów, miałby nie zrezygnować również z wszechwiedzy. Ich rozważania wraz z postępującym rozwojem nauk o człowieku stanowiły inspirację dla wielu teologów katolickich, którzy w XX wieku również stopniowo zaczęli zauważać ograniczenia teorii Tomasza z Akwinu przypisującej Jezusowi wszechwiedzę. Zaczęli oni tworzyć nowe teorie uwzględniając ograniczenia ludzkiej natury Chrystusa korzystając z nowych osiągnięć antropologii, filozofii, psychologii oraz nauk ścisłych o człowieku. Do najciekawszych z teorii należą hipotezy oparte o mistyczne doświadczenia Jezusa, które bez podważania w ramach dogmatów Jego w pełni ludzkiej natury starają się wyjaśnić, w jaki sposób mógł On kontaktować się z Ojcem i zdobywać wiedzę o swoim posłaniu i zbawczej misji. Rozwój nowych teorii wiedzy Chrystusa przez katolickich teologów z jednej strony umożliwił zbliżenie stanowisk w tej kwestii z teologami Kościołów Reformowanych, a z drugiej paradoksalnie otwiera perspektywy dialogu z niektórymi obrońcami koncepcji *visio beatifica*, którzy dopuszczają jej reinterpretację poprzez kategorię doświadczenia mistycznego.

Słowa kluczowe: doświadczenie mistyczne, ludzka natura, samoświadomość Jezusa, unia hipostatyczna, wiedza Jezusa

Introduction

The incarnation of the Second Person of the Trinity, constituting the Logos' assumption of human nature together with a human body and soul, was an important event in the history of salvation, which not only became the keystone of all Christianity but was also one of the most crucial questions of theological and philosophical reflection. The Ecumenical Council of Chalcedon gave the mystery of the Word's assumption of human nature a core, stating that the Son of God assumed the fullness of humanity while remaining the same, one hypostasis that still possesses a divine nature. The Chalcedonian Definition challenged theologians once again to try to explain the coexistence and mutual influence of two such different natures, belonging to the same person and united by the hypostatic union. Successive councils have also recognised in him two wills and two centres of action, coexisting "indivisibly, immutably, inconfusedly, inseparably" (Schaff, Wace, 2012, p. 345). Disputes over the two natures of Christ and their associated two centres of action and wills troubled the Church of that time far more than discussions over His knowledge, which was never defined by dogmatic assertions leaving theologians in the patristic period wide open to interpretation. Other discussions overshadowed the question of how Jesus came to know the divine nature in His humanity. The view of Jesus' omniscience in His human nature dominated the medieval development of speculative theology that brought many new concepts of Christ's knowledge. The concept of three levels of knowledge of Christ proposed by Thomas Aquinas in the *Summa Theologica* has gained exceptional popularity. In addition to the uncreated, divine knowledge belonging to Christ's divine nature and shared with the Father (Thomas de Aquino, 1888, I, q. 14), Aquinas distinguished three kinds of human

knowledge of Jesus guaranteeing Him omniscience in His human nature. These were the knowledge of the beatific vision (*visio beatifica*), from which Christ derived omniscience by virtue of His perpetual vision of the Father, the infused knowledge the conceptualized this vision and the empirical knowledge, which is perfected human cognition (Thomas de Aquino, 1903, III, q. 10-12). The Catholic Church accepted this concept until the middle of the 20th century as dogma, which it never formally was. It only collapsed by modern reflection on man in terms of the natural sciences and philosophy. However, Protestant theologians had already taken a much more critical approach to this issue by questioning Christ's omniscience and the theory of *visio beatifica*.

This article is devoted to theories of Jesus' human knowledge, which, influenced by the achievements of the human sciences, rejected scholastic concepts and sought new solutions. The first part will present the earliest theories breaking with the medieval tradition formed within Protestant theology. The following section will examine the shift that occurred in the debate over Jesus' knowledge in the Catholic Church in the twentieth century, which allowed for convergence of positions regarding Christ's knowledge and encouraged the development of new theories that attempt to answer the question: How Jesus, in His human nature, came to know that He was God?

1. The rejection of the theory of Jesus' omniscience in post-Reformation theology

While the concept of Christ's three-level human knowledge in the teaching of Catholic theologians from the time of the Scholastics until the mid-twentieth century was unchanging, Evangelical theologians and philosophers more confidently confronted the problem of Christ's knowledge. God's omniscience became the subject of discussion along with His other attributes within kenotic Christology, focusing not on the possibility of attributing divine attributes to the Son but on Christ's concealment and renunciation of them. Already Martin Luther and John Calvin emphasised the development of Christ's knowledge and its limitations (Moloney, 1999, p. 69). Martin Chemnitz, a Lutheran theologian and co-author of the Formula of Concord, addressed the "communication" in Christ in His Christological treatise *De duabus naturis in Christo*, published in 1570. To the previously distinguished types of "communication of the attributes" of the two natures of Christ in the hypostatic union and the "communication of works," he added the "communication of majesty," whereby the human nature of Christ received omnipotence, omniscience, and omnipresence. He argued that without violating the Chalcedonian Definition of Faith, it could be said that the divine nature indwelt the human nature, just as fire permeates iron. Just as iron possesses the power to give off light and heat when fire permeates it, so does the human nature of Christ possess divine attributes, including omniscience (McCornak, 2015, pp. 446-447). In the 17th century, the Puritan theologian John Owen, in contrast to Thomas

Aquinas and the Calvinist theologian François Turretin, pointed out that Christ was more the object of the *visio beatifica* than its subject. Afterwards, Lutheran theologian Johann Franz Buddeus argued that Jesus made a free decision not to use omniscience. Jesus retained as a human being this omniscience, which, like omnipotence, He occasionally used, though only to a limited degree according to the Lutheran theologian (Elliot, 2015, pp. 300-305).

The belief in two natures of Christ has increasingly called into question since the Enlightenment. Hermann Reimarus sought to explain Christianity as an invention of the disciples to achieve their own goals (Klein, 2011, pp. 159-160), while Kant questioned the epistemological status of theological statements about the essence of God (Kant, 1998, pp. 662-668). Liberal Protestant theology resolved new theological problems by viewing Jesus as a man who was a teacher and model of moral values. The development of psychology as a distinct discipline also raised doubts about the direct knowing of the divine nature in Jesus' self-awareness (Law, 2013, p. 136). Hegel applied the conception of the development of history to the person of Jesus caused that the nineteenth century became the period of historicism and its related crises in theology. The German philosopher argued that in Christ God knows himself in human consciousness and the man knows himself in God, while Christ's death represents both the most extreme self-alienation of the Spirit and the point at which the new unity of the Spirit overcome this alienation (Hegel, 1980, pp. 400-421).

Friedrich Schleiermacher developed a Christology based on Christ's likeness to people in all things except sin (Hebrews 4:15). The Silesian-born theologian and philosopher believed that in the case of Christ, the unique consciousness of God was implanted in the self-consciousness of the person, which he defined as the continuous *Ego* (Schleiermacher, 1960, pp. 386-393). According to Schleiermacher, our consciousness of God, overshadowed by sensual self-consciousness, differed from Christ's consciousness, which ultimately determined every moment of His life. Schleiermacher's theory discussed the quality of Jesus' human existence rather than making ontological statements. He believed that Christ's entire existence was so God-centered that we can speak of the actual existence of God in him. In this anthropological solution, Christ does not share in the very essence of God but is a human being always directed toward God. The Lutheran theologian believed that Christ's theory of omniscience denied His true humanity (Stefano, 2015, pp. 347-361).

David Strauss, who was the student of Hegel and Schleiermacher in *Christliche Glaubenslehre*, denied the traditional kenotic theology. He believed that omniscience, like the other divine attributes, was nothing other than God Himself and thus could only correspond to the divine nature. Strauss believed that to be omnipotent not through oneself but through something else, that is, in the case of Christ through the hypostatic union, is contradictory. He believed that anyone who does not have a divine essence is not divine because a divine person presupposes a divine nature. Strauss denied the possibility of separability of divine attributes that were at the core of kenotic theology and questioned the "communication of

divine majesty," arguing that if divine attributes are accessible to human nature, then human attributes should be attributed to the Divine (Ziegler, 2015, pp. 330-331).

Lutheran theologian Gottfried Thomasius also addressed the problem of Christ's knowledge. He argued that Christ's omniscience would prevent Jesus from the psychological and emotional development common to all human beings. He proposed a "state of humiliation" for Christ in which divine attributes, including omniscience, do not degrade human nature. He wondered if there were possible temporary "states of exalting" in which Christ used His divine attributes. In dialogue with Thomasius, the problem of divine attributes, including omniscience and Christ's consciousness, was raised by Isaac August Dorner, Wolfgang Friedrich Gess, and Scottish theologians Peter Forsyth and Hugh Mackintosh (McCornak, 2015, pp. 451-455; Thompson, 2010, pp. 87-95). Another Lutheran professor, Wilhelm Herrmann, reflected on the inner life of Jesus and the content of His self-awareness. He believed that the basis of Christianity lies not in historical research or anything else but only in viewing the inner life of Jesus, which is the highest form of morality and the purest sacrificial love (Damon, 2008, pp. 43-54).

The theories of Reformed theologians and the development of historical-critical methods applied to the Bible influenced the slow progress of research on the knowledge of Jesus also among Catholic thinkers. In the middle of the nineteenth century, the German dogmatists Heinrich Klee and Franz Xaver Dieringer interpreted the beatific vision of Christ historically and considered its limitation as a result of kenosis. Herman Schell distinguished between Christ's knowledge and His consciousness. According to Schell, the knowledge of the incarnate Son of God was experimental human knowledge with a high degree of perfection. In contrast, the consciousness of Jesus was the knowledge of Himself as the Son in whose life the virtue of God's light was unfolding (Ullrich, 1990, p. 112). Jesus' self-consciousness was, according to Shell, the perfect knowledge of His divinity through the self-revelation of Jesus' divine "Self" and the indwelling in the Father and the Holy Spirit (Balthasar, 1978, pp. 177-179).

The crisis of scepticism that followed historicism and the empiricization of the sciences eventually caused defensive reactions in the Catholic Church. The conservative wing of neoscholasticism developed against changes perceived as threats to traditional theology. The rigid reference to the thought of Thomas Aquinas and his concept of the three-level human knowledge of Christ in the context of the development of other empirical sciences sometimes resulted in bizarre conclusions, among which the Carmelites of Salamanca distinguish themselves. "In applying St. Thomas principle of perfection to the universality of Christs' acquired knowledge, they did not hesitate to attribute to Christ every kind of natural knowledge. Thus, in their view, Christ was 'not only the best dialectician, philosopher, mathematician, physician, moralist and statesman, but also the best musician, grammarian, orator, artisan, agronomist, painter, navigator, soldier, and so on'" (Galot, 1980,

p. 347). A few years later, Alexis Marie Lèpicièr made practical conclusions based on the omniscience attributed to Jesus, claiming that by looking at plants, He could make their botanical classification, just as He could establish theorems in mathematics or social economics. In response to the crisis of scepticism in the late nineteenth century, the Roman and Tiberian schools began to develop. These schools explained in a new way the possibilities and principles of the development of dogmas and truths related to them, which brought a real breakthrough in the discussion of Christ's knowledge in Catholic theology in the second half of the 20th century.

2. Contemporary theories of Jesus' human knowledge

Karl Rahner began a new phase of discussion about Jesus' self-awareness and knowledge in Catholic theology with a lecture at Trier in 1961. He challenged the traditional teaching of *visio beatifica* by finding in it a threat to the reality of Christ's humanity. Rahner assumed at the core of his conception that human consciousness is a multidimensional reality containing reflective, conceptual, and transcendental consciousness as well as *a-priori* and *a-posteriori* knowledge of one's consciousness (Rahner, 1966, pp. 199-200). According to the German theologian, the *a-priori* knowledge was the non-objectified knowledge of the self, available in the beatific vision and the *a-posteriori* knowledge was the categorised knowledge. The intuitive knowledge imparted to Jesus in the *visio beatifica* was not an accidental perfection of humanity derived from the hypostatic union but was this union's inner, constitutive moment. Jesus rejoiced in the beatific vision of God, which was the non-conceptual horizon of His consciousness. Christ's growth and development were made possible in His objective consciousness by the progressive conceptualisation in reflective consciousness of what Jesus saw in the non-conceptual beatific vision. Thus, the human consciousness of Jesus united the non-conceptual awareness of the infinite mystery of God with the conceptual, finite, and objectified knowledge existing in the horizon of consciousness (McDermott, 1986a, pp. 107-121). Rahner did not explain the modality in which this combination and conceptualisation of Christ's non-conceptual knowledge occurred. The German theologian emphasised the human reality of Jesus. He assumed as the foundation of Christology the human experience of Jesus, whose consciousness was open to the horizon of transcendence, without being different from any other consciousness limited by ignorance, prone to mistake, troubled by doubt, and in need of faith (McDermott, 1986b, pp. 314-317).

The Jesuit Bernard Lonergan modified the concept of Christ's knowledge even more. He based his discussion of Christ's consciousness and knowledge on the assumptions of the hypostatic union (Rosenberg, 2010, pp. 830-839). He emphasised that just as Jesus had two natures and two wills, He also had two consciousnesses through which He experienced

Himself. Jesus' knowledge is derived from His experiences, accompanied by understanding and judgment. In addition to ontological kenosis, the Jesuit pointed to psychological kenosis, through which Jesus' experience of self and knowledge were human (Lonergan, 2002, p. 223). During His earthly life, Christ as an earthling and pilgrim (*viator*) possessed expressible human knowledge similar to classical acquired knowledge, and inexpressible divine knowledge similar to divine infused knowledge. As a heavenly man (*comprehensor*), Jesus possessed *visio beatifica*. According to Lonergan, this was the incommunicable knowledge by which Christ came to know God and all that pertained to His mission (Lonergan, 1964, pp. 332-400). This *visio beatifica*, according to the Jesuit, was accessible only to the Divine consciousness of Christ, which did not merge or interchange with the human consciousness, just as the Divine nature did not merge with the human. Christ recognised His divinity through human, evolving consciousness and knowledge (Tortorelli, 2005, pp. 55-58). Jesus received this inexpressible knowledge without the involvement of His senses and imagination in the process presented by Lonergan as the analogy to Paul of Tarsus experience. As a human (*viator*), he experienced a supernatural vision of the essence of God (2 Cor 12:2-4). Lonergan explained the relationship between these two states of Jesus' knowledge by analogy with people's desire for knowledge in two dimensions: the light of the intellect and the concept of essence. The light of the intellect and the supernatural light of faith define what people desire and where they seek to go, is the analogy of Jesus' knowledge given to him in the beatific vision. This intangible desire for humans to know God is then grasped into linguistic concepts just as Christ's *visio beatifica* was discovered and conceptualised by him becoming expressible (Lonergan, 1964, p. 406).

Despite the development of new concepts of the knowledge of Christ, the Second Vatican Council did not undertake this question, which opened possibilities for new perspectives of research on this issue. It was related to the general condition of Thomism, which, despite its appreciation at Vatican II, was in crisis. Thomistic theology lost the primacy that had lasted for centuries and, with it, the concept of omniscience that derives from the *visio beatifica*. German theologians: Helmut Riedlinger and Philip Kaiser, and the American Jesuit Raymond Moloney referred to Karl Rahner's concept in 1966 after the Council. Helmut Riedlinger pointed to Christ's omniscience as the hermeneutical principle in *Geschichtlichkeit und Vollendung des Wissens Christi*. While this principle in dogmatic theology involves the recognition of the fullness of Christ's knowledge because of the salvific purpose of His mission, and in the context of biblical studies, it maintains a careful balance between the incomplete knowledge presented in the Synoptic Gospels and the omniscience of Jesus in the Gospel according to St. John. As a result of this conflict, Riedlinger proposed the category of the "historical view of God," which, in contrast to the *visio beatifica*, offered the hope of finding harmony between the discourse of dogmatic theology and biblical history (Strzelczyk, 2016, pp. 248-250). Philip Kaiser also referred to Rahner's thought, emphasising

the dialogical character of Christ's knowledge and self-consciousness. In *Das Wissen Jesu Christi in der lateinischen (westlichen) Theologie*, he points out that this dialogical character took on two references: vertical as a reference to the Father and horizontal: as a reference to the Son. According to Kaiser, Jesus progressively discovered awareness and knowledge of His divinity in His humanity through human experience. What is undefined in the German theologian's theory is how the vertical dimension merged with the horizontal, that is, how Jesus discovered His divinity and sonship in His human experience (Strzelczyk, 2016, pp. 254-256). Raymond Moloney also argued against the omniscience of Jesus following Rahner's concept. He accepted the multilevel nature of Christ's human consciousness, pointing to the probably much more complex system of consciousness of a person existing in two natures that is inaccessible to us (Moloney, 1999, pp. 126-138).

Hans Urs von Balthasar also negated the possibility of Christ's *visio beatifica* in *Theodrama* published in 1973. Referring to Schell's concept, he presented Jesus as conscious of the goal of His salvific mission, the knowledge of which eluded His human consciousness. Jesus intuitively perceived in His consciousness a divine element defined by the awareness of His mission. The source of knowledge of Christ's mission was the Father, and the Holy Spirit actively participated in its transmission. It was the salvific mission that, according to Balthasar, was the only object of Christ's direct vision, which also included an awareness of divine sonship. There was an identity between the knowledge of the mission and Jesus' Self that involved His memory, mind, and free will. Jesus' relationship to the Father gave confidence and "archetypal faith" to His actions, which were entirely subordinate to His mission. By focusing his discussion on Jesus' knowledge, Balthasar thus avoids the issue of the relationship between His divine and human consciousness (Balthasar, 1978, pp. 149-154, pp. 167-185). Lutheran theologian Wolfhart Pannenberg argued for a similar concept a few years later. According to Pannenberg, Jesus' knowledge was not direct but mediated through His filial relationship with the Father. According to Pannenberg, the culmination of His human personality of Christ was His sonship (Pannenberg, 1976, pp. 345-349; Ullrich, 1990, p. 113).

The question of the knowledge of Jesus was not touched for a long time in the official documents of the Catholic Church despite the dynamic development of new concepts and discussions around them. The International Theological Commission (ITC) referred to the problem of consciousness and knowledge of Christ in three documents to actualise the teaching to contemporary achievements of human science between 1979 and 1985. The ITC addressed the problem of the consciousness of the eternal existence of Christ in the context of His mission to redeem the world very generally. The members of the ITC referred to the biblical analysis of the word "I" spoken by Christ in the gospels (Sharkey, 1989b, pp. 216-218). Document *The Consciousness of Christ Concerning Himself and His Mission*, published in 1985, treats the problem of Christ's foreknowledge most comprehensively. The ITC did not

consider the question of Christ's knowledge in detail but addressed His consciousness in the context of the role of human nature in the mission of salvation. The ITC noted that using the historical-critical method allows for various analyses on Christ's knowledge and consciousness without a clear conclusion. The ITC also proposed four general solutions based on fundamental aspects of faith in Christ. The first proposal focuses on the filial identity of Christ, emphasising His sending, His relationship with the Father, and consequently indicating an awareness of Christ's divine authority. The second proposal points to a soteriological awareness of Jesus' mission that had its origin in His filial identity and included an awareness of His preexistence. According to the ITC, Christ's mission, within which He grew as a man "in wisdom and stature, and in favor" (Luke 2:52), is incompatible with the statement that Jesus knows all things (John 16:30). The ITC suggested within this proposal the interpretation that Jesus received from the Father that knowledge enabled Him to fulfil His mission of universal salvation. The third concept shows the "ecclesiological consciousness" of Jesus, whose actions aimed at forming the community of the Church. On the other hand, the fourth proposal points to the salvific dimension of Christ's mission characterised by His love for all people (Sharkey, 1989a, pp. 305-316). The ITC did not decide on a conclusive summary of the document. However, it is possible to deduce the opinions of its members regarding the awareness and knowledge of Jesus concerning His filial sending and mission.

Later documents of the Church also address the question of Christ's knowledge quite briefly. *Catechism of the Catholic Church* indicates that human knowledge of Jesus was limited. It made it possible for Jesus to grow "in wisdom and stature, and in favour" (Luke 2:52). This experiential acquisition of knowledge by Jesus was the consequence of His wholly voluntary humiliation and assuming the nature of a servant (Phil 2:7). *Catechism* emphasises that this human knowledge of Christ expressed and showed in Him the life of the divine person through the union of human nature with the Logos. Through this union, the Son came to know the Father directly and intimately. Jesus, in His human knowledge, revealed the ability to know the thoughts of others. At the same time, by His existence in the hypostatic union, He came to know the eternal intentions He came to fulfil and reveal. *Catechism* does not mention Jesus' *visio beatifica* and emphasises that Scripture does not provide material to clarify the question of His knowledge. Jesus sometimes emphasised His ignorance of the Father's eternal designs, such as the Day of Judgment, and in another situation states that He was commanded not to reveal those eternal truths that He presumably knew (*Catechism of the Catholic Church*, 1994, pp. 119-120). The apostolic letter *Novo Millennio Ineunte* published by John Paul II in 2001 also addressed the knowledge and cognition of Jesus. Reflecting on Jesus' passion on the cross and His cry of solitude, the pope, without referring to the term *visio beatifica*, draws attention to the blessed state of Christ's soul and the joy that flows from it, which is experienced simultaneously with the suffering that accompanies it. This

experience is, according to the pope, "rooted in the fathomless depths of the hypostatic union" (John Paul II, 2001, pp. 34-35).

The lack of conclusive statements in the documents of the Church encouraged the development of new concepts of Christ's knowledge. The Jesuit Frederick Crowe based his discussion on the threefold kenosis of Christ: ontological, psychological, and historical (Crowe, 2006, pp. 315-323). He argued that Christ's direct vision was not knowledge of individual things but a "global view" that was more general understanding. Despite this "global view," Jesus' human mind learned about the created world through a normal experiential process (Rosenberg, 2010, p. 835). Walter Kasper also considered the problem of Jesus' knowledge in two aspects. The first was the context of the debate about the theology of the kenosis of Christ. The second aspect of consideration points to the relationship between the person and natures of Christ (Kasper, 1982, pp. 216-218). In his reflections about the humanity of Jesus, Kasper assumed as the starting point the filial obedience to the Father (Borowski, 2001, p. 99). Referring to Rahner's thought, Kasper stated that the awareness of unity with the Father was not subject knowledge but a feature and a specific modus of reality that Jesus experienced in concrete situations, realising the will of God (Kasper, 1975, pp. 295-296). The Jesuits: Jacques Dupuis and Bernard Sesboüé also attempted to search for new concepts of Christ's knowledge, considering the beatific vision to be a concept incompatible with today's scientific knowledge of man. Jacques Dupuis argued that the *visio beatifica* was available to Jesus only after fulfilling His redemptive mission. Bernard Sesboüé, on the other hand, claimed that the beatific vision of Christ postulated by medieval theologians would reduce His relations with other people to an artificial game in which He knew the answers to the questions He asked (Dupuis, 1996, p. 174-178; Sesboüé, 1997, pp. 18-20).

Based on an analysis of biblical pericopes, American biblical scholar Raymond Edward Brown pointed to Christ's ignorance in some situations and His supernatural knowledge in others. He argued that most statements showing Christ's supernatural knowledge relate to His mission: passion, death, and resurrection. Brown analysed in detail the pericopes in which Jesus reveals supernatural knowledge concerning the future destruction of Jerusalem and the Parousia. He pointed out the lack of evidence that Jesus possessed supernatural knowledge from birth and that this knowledge was initially unavailable to Him and developed progressively. Ultimately, Brown was inclined to guarded conclusions, pointing out that Jesus' lack of omniscience resulted from the incarnation, which involved assuming full humanity (Brown, 1978, pp. 39-102, 1967, pp. 315-345). Like Brown's theory, the Anglican bishop and biblical scholar Nicholas Thomas Wright distinguished between human knowledge conditioned by Jesus' family and community experiences and knowledge based on a unique understanding of the Father's plan. Through His relationship with the Father, Christ was aware of His vocation centred on the fulfilment of the Old Testament Scriptures (Mongeau, 2005, pp. 31-33; Wright, 1996, pp. 648-653).

Joseph Ratzinger also favours concepts that attribute to Jesus an incomplete, progressive knowledge available to the degree necessary to fulfil the mission of salvation. According to Ratzinger, this enables a more comprehensible view of the Gospel, showing the true humanity of Jesus in which He grew and matured (Ratzinger, 2013, pp. 1166-1167.).

The Belgian Jesuit Jean Galot developed a fascinating theory of Christ's knowledge based on mystical experiences. He challenged the beatific vision of Jesus, believing that it reduces His human nature to an external appearance, results in the threat of monophysitism and docetism, and undermines the reality of the incarnation and redemptive sacrifice (Galot, 1986, pp. 431-432). According to Galot, Jesus acquired experiential knowledge in much the same way as any human being, along with all the limitations inherent in human nature (Galot, 1980, pp. 349-353). Christ accepted the limitations of His knowledge by not claiming more than He knew and learned from other people. The Belgian Jesuit postulated a distinction between the object of Jesus' visions and His awareness of himself, in which He could not realise the divine personality based on seeing the divine nature in the *visio beatifica* (Galot, 1984, pp. 48-49). Galot proposed to shift the experience of Jesus' beatific vision to the time of His post-resurrection glorification. However, according to the Jesuit analysing the evangelical statements of the self-defining Jesus, He had the consciousness of being the Son of God based on inner illumination, filial mystical contact. In describing Himself, Jesus uses expressions that testify to his relationship with the Father: *Son of Man* and *ego eimi*. The most important analysis is the word *Abba*, which most fully expresses Jesus' filial identity. He used this word as early as age 12, which, according to Galot, indicates that Jesus' mystical contact with the Father began as a child. Rejecting the external illumination and claiming the ontological and psychological unity of Jesus, Galot presented the concept of mystical intimacy between the Son and the Father, which is an experience of feeling the presence of God and being immersed in Him. According to the Jesuit, the mystical fusion of Jesus' life with the Father' life took place on an affective level rather than an intellectual level. Jesus recognised to recognise His divine Self in human consciousness through this experience. Equality of subjects characterised Jesus' contact with the Father that is not present in the experiences of mystics. According to Galot, mystical states of consciousness accompanied Jesus from childhood, and in this way, Jesus gradually became aware that, being human, He was the Son and, as Son, He was God. Similarly, Jesus received infused knowledge (*connaissances infuses infuses*) related to certain aspects of His salvific mission (Galot, 1994, pp. 26-66; Strzelczyk, 2006, pp. 272-181).

The American Capuchin Thomas Weinandy, like Galot, believes that Jesus experienced the traditionally understood *visio beatifica* only at the moment of glorification, after the resurrection. He cites biblical sources and proposes the hypothesis that Christ, during His earthly life, must have had the vision of the Father, but it was not a vision of the Father's being that was ontologically distinct from Jesus Himself. According to the Capuchin,

the nature of this vision was subjective and personal, whereby Jesus gradually, with His growth, gained a better knowledge of the Father and became aware of His sonship. Jesus did not obtain through this vision an objective knowledge of the divine nature, but rather the subjective revelation of the Father and the confirmation that, as Son, He is also God. Capuchin develops his concept in a Trinitarian context, claiming that this vision was available to Jesus' human nature through the mediation of the Holy Spirit, who assured Jesus of His filial identity. Weinandy avoids the risk of monophysitism by claiming that this knowledge resulted from a human, cognitive "hypostatic vision" of the person of the Son, who possessed it as a human being (Weinandy, 2014, pp. 266-285).

Conclusion

The first symptoms of changes appeared in the thought of Reformation theologians, who more boldly undertook the problem of Christ's knowledge in the context of kenotic theology. In the Christological reflection on the knowledge of Christ, the early modern period was characterised by the consolidation of the concept of Thomas Aquinas, especially in Catholic theology. This reflection resulted in an appreciation of Christ's humanity, initiated the discussion on the possibilities of sharing God's attributes with human nature, and strengthened Catholic theologians' traditional position, which prevailed until the mid-20th century. During this time, Catholic theology also experienced a breakthrough in its approach to Jesus' knowledge through the discoveries of human sciences. The reference to the traditional concept of omniscience drawn from the *visio beatifica* in the new context of the human sciences brought an awareness of the danger of monophysitism, resulting from the rejection of the human way of acquiring knowledge by the incarnate God. This crisis encouraged theologians to revisit the Chalcedonian Creed and the clear separation between divine knowledge and human knowledge. They emphasised the integrity of Christ's human nature with knowledge in the context of Christological dogmas. Twentieth-century reflection on the extent of Christ's human knowledge and self-awareness brought a plurality of views and the development of new theories.

The most important concepts that open up new fields of research are those based on: emphasising the multidimensionality of the human psyche of Jesus (Rahner), highlighting kenosis (Lonergan), limiting Jesus' knowledge to the fulfilment of the saving mission (von Balthasar), pointing to Jesus' subjective and personal knowledge (Weinandy) and developing the hypothesis of Jesus' mystical experiences (Galot). The hypothesis of Christ's mystical states in which He may have gained knowledge and even in some way recognised the Father seems particularly developmental. The hypothesis of Christ's mystical states in which he may have gained knowledge and even in some way recognised the Father seems particularly developmental. On the one hand, it is open to contemporary anthropological research into

states of human consciousness. On the other hand, it refers to the old Christian tradition in which mystical experiences were understood and described in various ways. It is also a developmental hypothesis because it appears in contemporary attempts to defend the theory of *visio beatifica* and may constitute a new way of searching for an answer to the question: How did Jesus come to know that as a human being He is also God incarnate? It is possible that developing the hypothesis of the mystical experience of Christ could help to overcome the dialectic of contradiction between the omniscience of the *visio beatifica* and the limited cognition inherent in human nature.

Bibliography:

- Balthasar, H.U. von, (1978). *Theodramatik II. Die Personen des Spiels. T. 2: Die Personen in Christus*, Einsiedeln: Johannes Verlag.
- Borowski, W. (2001). *Chrystologia rezurekcyjna Waltera Kaspera*, Sandomierz: Wyd. Diecezjalne.
- Brown, R.E. (1967). How Much Did Jesus Know? A Survey of the Biblical Evidence, *The Catholic Biblical Quarterly*, 29(3), 315-345.
- Brown, R.E. (1978). *Jesus, God and Man: Modern Biblical Reflections*, New York: Macmillan.
- Catechism of the Catholic Church* (1994), Vaticano: Libreria Editrice Vaticana.
- Crowe, F.E. (2006). *Appropriating the Lonergan Idea*, Toronto; Buffalo; London: University of Toronto Press.
- Damon, S.W.K. (2008). Knowing the Mind of Christ: The Failure of the Liberal Protestants in the 19th century and a New Possibility. *Transformation: An International Journal of Holistic Mission Studies*, 25 (1), 43-54.
- Dupuis, J. (1996). *Introduzione alla cristologia*, Casale Monferrato: Edizioni Piemme.
- Elliot, M.W. (2015). Christology in the Seventeenth Century, (in:) F.A. Murphy (ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of Christology*, 297-314, Oxford: Oxford University Press, <https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199641901.013.18>.
- Galot, J. (1980). *Who is Christ?: a theology of the incarnation*, Rome; Chicago, Ill.: Gregorian University Press; Franciscan Herald Press.
- Galot, J. (1984). *The person of Christ: covenant between God and man: a theological insight*, Chicago: Franciscan Herald Press.
- Galot, J. (1986). Le Christ terrestre et la vision. *Gregorianum*, 67 (3), 429-450.
- Galot, J. (1994). *Wybrane zagadnienia z teologii współczesnej*, Kraków: Wyd. Naukowe PAT.
- Hegel, G.W.F. (1980). *Phänomenologie des Geistes*, Hamburg: Felix Meiner Verl.
- John Paul II (2001). *Apostolic letter Novo millennio ineunte of His Holiness Pope John Paul II: to the bishops, clergy and lay faithful at the close of the Great Jubilee of the Year 2000*, Vatican City: Libreria Editrice Vaticana.
- Kant, I. (1998). *Kritik der reinen Vernunft*, Hamburg: Meiner Verlag.
- Kasper, W. (1975). *Jesus der Christ*, Mainz: Matthias-Grünewald-Verlag.

- Kasper, W. (1982). *Der Gott Jesu Christ*, Leipzig: St. Benno-Verlag GMBH.
- Klein, D. (2011). Reimarus, the Hamburg Jews, and the Messiah, (in:) M. Mulsow (ed.), *Between Philology and Radical Enlightenment: Hermann Samuel Reimarus (1694–1768)*, 159-182, Leiden, Boston: Brill.
- Law, D.R. (2013). *Kierkegaard's kenotic Christology*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, <https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199698639.001.0001>.
- Lonergan, B. (2002). *The ontological and psychological constitution of Christ*, Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Lonergan, B.J.F. (1964). *De verbo incarnato*, Romae: Pontificia Universitas Gregoriana.
- McCornak, B. (2015). Kenoticism in Modern Christology, (in:) F.A. Murphy (ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of Christology*, 444-456, Oxford: Oxford University Press, <https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199641901.013.26>.
- McDermott, J.M. (1986a). The Christologies of Karl Rahner, *Gregorianum*, 67 (1), 87-123.
- McDermott, J.M. (1986b). The Christologies of Karl Rahner - II. *Gregorianum*, 67 (2), 297-327.
- Moloney, R. (1999). *The Knowledge of Christ*, London: New York: Continuum.
- Mongeau, G. (2005). The Human and Divine Knowing of the Incarnate Word, *Josephinum Journal of Theology*, 12 (1), 30-42.
- Pannenberg, W. (1976). *Grundzüge der Christologie*, Gütersloh: G. Mohn.
- Rahner, K. (1966). *Theological Investigations, T. 5: Later Writings*, London: Darton, Longman & Todd.
- Ratzinger, J. (2013). *Jesus von Nazareth: Beiträge zur Christologie. Beiträge zur Christologie. T. 2*, Freiburg, Basel, Wien: Herder.
- Rosenberg, R.S. (2010). Christ's Human Knowledge: A Conversation with Lonergan and Balthasar. *Theological Studies*, 71 (4), 817-845, <https://doi.org/10.1177/004056391007100403>.
- Schaff, P., Wace, H. (eds.) (2012). *The seven ecumenical councils of the undivided Church: their canons and dogmatic decrees: together with the canons of all the local synods which have received ecumenical acceptance*, Peabody: Hendrickson Publishers.
- Schleiermacher, F.D.E. (1960). *The Christian faith*, Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark.
- Sesboüé, B. (1997). *Jésus Christ à l'image des hommes: brève enquête sur les représentations de Jésus à travers l'histoire*, Paris: Desclée de Brouwer.
- Sharkey, M. (ed.) (1989a). The Consciousness of Christ Concerning Himself and His Mission (1985), (in:) *International Theological Commission: Texts and Documents 1969-1985*, 305-316, San Francisco: Ignatius Press.
- Sharkey, M. (ed.) (1989b). Theology, Christology, Anthropology (1981), (in:) *International Theological Commission: Texts and Documents 1969-1985*, 207-223, San Francisco: Ignatius Press.

- Stefano, T.A. (2015). Christology from Lessing to Schleiermacher, (in:) F.A. Murphy (ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of Christology*, 347-361, Oxford: Oxford University Press, <https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199641901.013.45>.
- Strzelczyk, G. (2006). Wiedza Jezusa a hipoteza doświadczenia mistycznego, *Śląskie Studia Historyczno-Teologiczne*, 39 (2), 272-281.
- Strzelczyk, G. (2016). Problem wiedzy Jezusa w wybranych monografiach posoborowych. Przyczynek do dziejów problematyki. *Roczniki Teologiczne*, 63 (2), 247-262, <https://doi.org/10.18290/rt.2016.63.2-13>.
- Thomas de Aquino. (1888). *Pars prima Summae theologiae. A quaestione I ad quaestionem XLIX*, (Vol. 4), Romae: Ex Typographia Polyglotta S. C. De Propaganda Fide.
- Thomas de Aquino. (1903). *Tertia pars Summae theologiae. A quaestione I ad quaestionem LIX*, (Vol. 11), Romae: Ex Typographia Polyglotta S. C. De Propaganda Fide.
- Thompson, T.R. (2010). Nineteenth-Century Kenotic Christology: The Waxing, Waning and Weighing of a Quest for a Coherent Orthodoxy, (in:) C.S. Evans (ed.), *Exploring kenotic Christology: the self-emptying of God*, 74-111, Vancouver: Regent College Pub.
- Tortorelli, K. (2005). *Christology with Lonergan and Balthasar*, Ely, Cambridgeshire: Melrose Books.
- Ullrich, L. (1990). *Ciencia y conciencia de Jesucristo*, (in:) W. Beinert (ed.), *Diccionario de teología dogmática*, 111-114, Barcelona: Herder.
- Weinandy, T.G. (2014). *Jesus: essays in Christology*, Ave Maria: Sapientia Press of Ave Maria University.
- Wright, N.T. (1996). *Christian origins and the question of God. T. 2: Jesus and the victory of God*, Minneapolis: Fortress Press.
- Ziegler, P.K. (2015). The Historical Jesus and Christology from David Friedrich Strauss to Käsemann, (in:) F.A. Murphy (ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of Christology*, 328-344, Oxford: OUP, <https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199641901.013.20>.