

THE NEW NESTORIANS

(*“Whether in Christ There Was Ignorance?”*)

In the year 431 A.D. the Council of Ephesus condemned the teaching of Nestorius, the Archbishop of Constantinople, that there were two persons in Our Lord, one human and one divine, and that Our Lady was mother only of the human person, and consequently not the Mother of God. The crowds of the faithful probably could not understand the difficult theological terms used in the proceedings, but they did realize that the beautiful title, "Mother of God," had been vindicated, and greeted the delegates, particularly Our Lady's champion, St. Cyril of Alexandria, with great joy:

“The session had lasted from early in the morning into the night, and the assembled population of Ephesus waited the whole day to hear the decision. When this was at last known, there arose a universal rejoicing; they commended the Synod, and solemnly accompanied the members, particularly Cyril, with torches and censers to their houses.”¹

St. Cyril was later declared a Doctor of the Church, but today, it is hard to believe, there is a movement within the Church to exonerate Nestorius and condemn Cyril.² Even such a purveyor of pop-atheism as Carl Sagan, in his "acclaimed" TV series *Cosmos*, does not hesitate to calumniate his memory, insinuating that he was responsible for the murder of the pagan philosopher, Hypatia, and dating the beginning of the "Dark Ages" to this event.³ It seems that some of Satan's hatred for Our Lady: "I shall put enmities between thee and the woman, between thy seed and her seed" (Genesis 3:15), has rubbed off on St. Cyril - what an honor!

Nestorius had claimed, among other things, that there was ignorance in the human intellect of Our Lord. But some years earlier in 418 the Gallic monk Leporius, in what has been called "Pre-Nestorianism in the West," also taught that there was ignorance in the soul of Christ. Leporius was converted by St. Augustine and anathematized his error in the *Libellus emendationis*⁴ which was incorporated into the decrees of the Council of Carthage, that were approved by Pope St. Zozimus.

The Provincial Council of Carthage had been called to condemn Pelagianism, and it is interesting to note that Leporius was also a Pelagian. In 431 the Ecumenical Council of Ephesus again condemned Pelagius, as well as Nestorius who was a Pelagian sympathizer.⁵ Pope St. Pius X called

Modernism, "The synthesis of all heresies,"⁶ and it is certainly significant that these two ancient heresies of Pelagianism which denied the necessity of Our Lord's Redemption, and Nestorianism which attacked the very Incarnation itself, have bubbled to the top of the Modernist cauldron in our own day. In many cases the very same men who are trying to rehabilitate Nestorius, are also trying to exonerate Pelagius.⁷

In 1931 Pope Pius XI commemorated the 1500th anniversary of the Council of Ephesus in his encyclical *Lux Veritatis*:

"9. In order that the case may be rightly understood it may be well to touch briefly on the chief points of the Nestorian heresy. For that arrogant man, thinking that two whole hypostases, namely that of Jesus which was human and that of the Word which was divine, came together in one 'prosopon' as he called it, denied that wondrous and substantial union of the two natures which are called hypostatic; and for this reason he asserted that the Only begotten Word of God was not made man but was in human flesh by indwelling, by good pleasure and by the power of operation. Wherefore he was to be called 'Theophoros,' or God-Bearer, in much the same way as prophets and other holy men can be called God-bearers by reason of the divine grace imparted to them.

"10. From these perverse novelties of Nestorius it was an easy step to recognize two persons in Christ, one divine and the other human; and it followed further by necessity that the Blessed Virgin Mary was not truly the Mother of God or Theotokos; but was rather the Mother of the man Christ, or Christotokos, or at most Theodokos; that is to say, the receiver of God."⁸

The Nestorians had claimed that there was ignorance in the human person of Our Lord, and in the year 553, in connection with the so-called "Three Chapters" which were also Nestorian, Pope Vigilius in his Constitution, *Inter innumeros sollicitudines*, anathematized several Nestorian errors, among which was:

"If anyone says that the one Jesus Christ, true Son of God and true Son of Man, was ignorant of future things, or of the day of the last judgment, and says that He could know only as much as the divinity dwelling in Him as in another made known to Him: let him be anathema."⁹

In spite of this condemnation there arose in the late fifth century a sect of the Monophysites called Agnoetae, a Greek word meaning "not knowing," which espoused the Nestorian doctrine of Our Lord's ignorance. They were led by the Deacon Themistios of Alexandria, who concentrated on a passage in the Gospel of St. Mark (13:32): "But of that day or hour no man knoweth, neither the angels in heaven, nor the Son, but the Father." He was resisted strongly by one of St. Cyril's successors, St. Eulogius, who said "Christ's humanity which was taken up in the hypostasis of the inaccessible and

substantial wisdom of Christ, cannot be ignorant of anything of the past or of the future."¹⁰ In the year 600 St. Eulogius was supported by his friend, Pope St. Gregory the Great, who wrote in the letter *Sicut aquas* concerning Mark 13:32:

“And so the knowledge He did not have according to His human nature, which made Him, like the angels, a creature, this knowledge along with the angels who are creatures, He said He did not have. Therefore He who is God and man knows the day and the hour of judgment; but the reason for this is because God is man. But the issue is most manifest, for whoever is not a Nestorian can nowise be an Agnoetae. For anyone who confesses the very incarnate wisdom of God, how can he say there is anything that the wisdom of God does not know? It is also written: ‘Jesus knowing that the Father had given Him all things into His hands.’ If He knows all things, assuredly He knows the day and the hour of judgment; therefore who is so foolish as to say that the Son received into His hands what He was ignorant of?”¹¹

Notice the line, "For whoever is not a Nestorian can nowise be an Agnoetae." This means that whoever is an Agnoetae can also be a Nestorian. Fr. Bertrand de Margerie calls the Modernists of our day, such as Karl Rahner and Raymond Brown, who still claim that Our Lord did not know the day of judgment, "Neo-Agnoetae."¹² We will see in the course of this paper that they can also be called "Neo-Nestorians."

It is the consensus of the Fathers and Doctors, and the teaching of the Magisterium, that there is a three-fold human knowledge in Our Lord, the beatific, the infused, and the acquired. Let us examine a few brief passages from the *Summa Theologica* of St. Thomas Aquinas on each of these kinds of knowledge. St. Thomas has several articles on each of these topics, so I have deliberately chosen articles that have a minimum of Aristotelian terminology. First that Our Lord had the beatific vision:

“...*On the contrary*, the knowledge of the blessed consists in the knowledge of God. But He knew God fully, even as He was man, according to John 8:55: ‘I do know Him and do keep His word.’ Therefore in Christ there was knowledge of the blessed.

“*I answer that*,...Now men are brought to this end of beatitude by the humanity of Christ, according to Hebrews 2:10: ‘For it became Him for whom all things, and by whom, are all things, who had brought many children unto glory, to perfect the author of their salvation by His passion.’ And hence it was necessary that the beatific knowledge, which consists in the vision of God, should belong to Christ pre-eminently, since the cause ought always to be more efficacious than the effect.”¹³

Because of the beatific vision Our Lord does not have faith or hope. He knows the Father, He does not believe in Him. And here is St. Thomas on Our Lord's infused knowledge, which the angels

also have, and according to the common opinion of the Fathers, Our Lady as well:

“...*On the contrary*, The Apostle says (Hebrews 2:9): ‘For we see Jesus, who was made a little lower than the angels for the suffering of death, crowned with glory and honor’; from which it is said to be lower than the angels only in regard to the suffering of death. And hence not in knowledge.”¹⁴

“*I answer that*, The knowledge imprinted on Christ's soul may be looked at in two ways: First, as regards what it has from the subject receiving it. Now with regard to the first, the knowledge imprinted upon the soul of Christ was more excellent than the knowledge of the angels, both in the number of things known and the certainty of the knowledge; since the spiritual light which is imprinted on the soul of Christ is much more excellent than the light which pertains to the angelic knowledge, in the manner of knowing that is natural to the human soul, i.e. by turning to phantasms, and by comparison and discursion.”¹⁴

And concerning Our Lord's acquired knowledge:

“...*Objection 1*. It would seem that Christ did not advance in this knowledge. For even as Christ knew all things by His beatific and infused knowledge, so also did He by this acquired knowledge as is plain from what has been said (Art. 1). But He did not advance in these knowledges. Therefore neither in this.

“...*On the contrary*, It is written (Luke 2:52): ‘Jesus advanced in wisdom and age and grace with God and men’: And Ambrose says (*De Incarn. Dom. 7*) that He advanced in human wisdom. Now human wisdom is that which is acquired in a human manner, i.e. by the light of the active intellect. Therefore Christ advanced in this knowledge.

“...*Reply Obj. 1.* Both the infused knowledge and the beatific knowledge of Christ's soul were the objects of an infinite power, which could produce the whole at once; and thus in neither knowledge did Christ advance; since from the beginning He had them perfectly. But the acquired knowledge of Christ is caused by the active intellect which does not produce the whole at once, but successively; and hence by this knowledge Christ did not know everything from the beginning but step by step, and after a time, i.e. in His perfect age; and this is plain from what the Evangelist says, viz. that He increased in ‘knowledge and age’ together.”¹⁵

And here is St. Thomas on the subject of our essay: "Whether in Christ There Was Ignorance?"

“...*On the contrary*. Ignorance is not taken away by ignorance. But Christ came to take away our ignorance; for ‘He came to enlighten them that sit in darkness and in the shadow of death’ (Luke

1:79). Therefore there was no ignorance in Christ.

*“I answer that, As there was the fullness of grace and virtue in Christ, so too there was the fullness of all knowledge, as is plain from what has been said above (Q. 7, art. 9; Q. 9). Now as the fullness of grace and virtue in Christ excluded the *fomes* ["tendencies"] of sin, so the fullness of knowledge excluded ignorance, which is opposed to knowledge. Hence, even as the *fomes* of sin was not in Christ, neither was there ignorance in Him.”*¹⁶

And finally in this section on St. Thomas, let us see what he says concerning the main Scripture text (Mark 13:32) of the Agnoetae, and the Neo-Agnoetae of our day:

“Whether the Son of God Knew All Things in the Word?”

“...Objection 1. It would seem that the soul of Christ does not know all things in the Word. For it is written (Mark 13:32): ‘But of that day or hour no man knoweth, neither the angels in heaven nor the Son, but the Father.’ Therefore He does not know all things in the Word...

“Reply Obj. 1. He is said therefore, not to know the day and hour of Judgment, for that He does not make it known, since on being asked by the Apostles (Acts 1:7), He was unwilling to reveal it; and on the contrary, we read (Genesis 22:12): “Now I know that thou fearest God,” i.e., ‘Now I have made thee know.’ But the Father is said to know, because He imparted this knowledge to the Son. Hence, by saying ‘but the Father,’ we are given to understand that the Son knows, not merely in the Divine Nature, but also in the human, because as Chrysostom argues (*Hom. 78: in Matt.*), if it is given to Christ as man to know how to judge - which is greater - much more is it given to Him to know the less, viz. the time of judgment.”¹⁷

The Jesuit Bertrand de Margerie has an excellent summary of just how these three knowledges in Our Lord, the beatific, infused and acquired, work together in perfect harmony:

“...We must still mention in passing the most fruitful efforts of Catholic theologians to bring out the harmony between the three types of knowledge in the one Man-God. These efforts have particularly cast light on the necessity of infused knowledge in view of a revealing mediatization of the immediate knowledge (vision) of the unique Mediator, Revealer and Redeemer.

“Without this infused knowledge of Prophet, Jesus could not translate into human terms and concepts the knowledge of Himself and of the whole supernatural economy of the Kingdom, a

knowledge received in the vision of the Father. Without infused knowledge, Jesus could not make Himself understood by men, all the mysteries of the supernatural order, 'all that concerns our reparation' according to the word of St. Bonaventure. (51)

"...The beatific vision is the condition which makes revelation possible: the infused knowledge, together with the acquired knowledge, its means of transmission to men...Christ knew how His message corresponded to the reality of His personal mystery, to the transcendental and irreducible light of His human consciousness of Son and of seer of the divine Essence.

"The infused knowledge itself has need of acquired knowledge, taking its origin from the experience and from the language learned by Jesus. The revelation of Christ to humanity was not caused but conditioned by human language.

"The three types of knowledge in Jesus constitute the triple possession and triple act, distinct by its object, but complementary, of the unique intelligence and human consciousness of Christ, without separation."¹⁸

Let us now jump to the middle of the 19th century, to the Viennese priest, Anton Gunther, a philosopher who despised Thomistic philosophy, and tried to accommodate the Catholic faith to the evolutionary philosophy of Hegel with disastrous results. Gunther "taught that in Jesus there was only one divine person metaphysically, but this did not prevent Him from having a psychologically human 'personality' like ours."¹⁹ This distinction between "person" and "personality" has allowed the Modernists of today, to reintroduce a confusion in theological terminology, similar to that which prevailed at the Council of Ephesus, but was clarified at Chalcedon. Gunther also denied that Our Lord had the beatific vision, and claimed that He made gradual progress both intellectually and morally during the course of His life.²⁰

In 1857 these teachings were condemned by Pope Pius IX in the Brief, *Eximiam tuam*, addressed to the Cardinal Archbishop of Cologne.²¹ The attempt to accommodate Catholic teaching to Hegel's evolutionary philosophy was condemned in 1860 by the Provincial Council of Cologne,²² and finally in 1870 Gunther's ideas on creation were condemned during the first session of Vatican Council I²³ and according to the *schema* for a forthcoming session, his notion of a gradual moral progress, would also would have been condemned, but the Council was forced to adjourn.²⁴

Gunther is a good example of philosophical Modernism, the attempt to accommodate the doctrines of the faith to the philosophy of evolutionism.

"Simultaneously with the appearance of philosophical Modernism there sprang up a biblical

Modernism, the principal exponent of which was the Abbé Loisy. To his way of thinking we must distinguish between the Christ of history, who had no intention of founding a Church, but merely wished to invite men to do penance in expectation of the *parousia*, and the Christ of faith, who is God. In the course of centuries Christianity has evolved freely. These ideas were expressed in two works, *L'Evangile et L'Eglise* (1902) and *Autor d'un Petit Livre* (1903), which were enthusiastically received by liberal Protestants.”²⁵

Pope St. Pius X responded quickly to these subversive ideas, and in 1907 the Holy Office in the decree *Lamentabile*, condemned numerous propositions which were extracted from the writings of Loisy, and which are still held and taught today by biblical Neo-Modernists, such as Raymond Brown:

“27. The divinity of Jesus Christ is not proved from the Gospels; but it is a dogma that the Christian consciousness deduced from the notion of Messiah.

“28. When Jesus was carrying on His ministry, He did not speak with the intention of teaching that He was the Messiah nor were His miracles intended to prove that He was.

“29. It may be conceded that the Christ who appears in the light of history is inferior to the Christ who is the object of faith.

A30. In all the Gospel texts the title *Son of God* is simply the equivalent of the title *Messias*; but it does not by any means signify that Christ is the true, natural Son of God.

“31. The Christology taught by Paul, John and the Councils of Nicea, Ephesus and Chalcedon is not the doctrine that Jesus taught but one the Christian consciousness formed about Jesus.

“32. It is impossible to reconcile the obvious meaning of the Gospel texts with the teaching of our theologians about the consciousness and the infallible knowledge of Jesus Christ.

“33. It is evident to any unprejudiced person either that Jesus taught erroneously about the proximity of the Messianic Coming, or else that a major portion of His teaching contained in the Synoptic Gospels is not authentic.

“34. It is impossible for a critical exegete to attribute unlimited knowledge to Christ, unless he makes a supposition that is inconceivable historically and repugnant to moral sense, namely that as man Christ had God's knowledge and yet was unwilling to communicate His knowledge of so many things to His disciples and to posterity.

“35. Christ did not always have the consciousness of His Messianic dignity.”²⁷

St. Pius X's campaign against the Modernist heretics was continued by his successor Pope Benedict XV, in a decree of the Holy Office issued in 1918. Fr. John Hardon in his *The Catholic Catechism* comments:

“More fundamental was the broad charge of ignorance in Christ and the dismissal of Christ's unlimited knowledge, even as man. This touched on the core of the Incarnation and was recognized by the Church as a resurgent Nestorianism. Ten years after Pius X's censure of Modernism, Benedict XV returned to the same theme and specifically on the question of ‘the knowledge possessed by the soul of Christ,’ to make sure that there was no ambiguity. Three propositions were declared incompatible with the Catholic faith.”²⁸

“On the Knowledge of Christ...”

“I. It is not certain that during His sojourn among men the soul of Christ had the same kind of knowledge that the blessed have, that is those who have achieved their goal.

“II. Nor can the opinion be said to be certain which holds that Christ's soul was ignorant of anything but from the beginning knew in the Word all things past, present, and future, that is everything that God knows with the knowledge of vision.

“III The doctrine of certain moderns about a restricted knowledge in Christ's soul should not be any less acceptable in catholic schools than the opinion of older theologians about a universal knowledge.

*“Response. In the negative.”*²⁸

In 1939 Paul Galtier attempted to revive the condemned theory of Anton Gunther which distinguished in Our Lord between an ontological divine *Person*, and an autonomous psychological human *personality*.²⁹ Gunther had spoken in terms of philosophical psychology, while Galtier appealed to scientific psychology, in an attempt to clothe his thinly disguised Nestorianism with the prestigious names of Freud and Jung. Unlike Gunther, Galtier admitted that Our Lord had the beatific vision in His ontological divine Person, but claimed that it was inoperative in His autonomous human consciousness. This dissolving of the unity of Christ was taken up by many Modernist theologians and exegetes, who were anxious to establish *theologically*, a true ignorance in Our Lord, which they claimed was obvious from a *scientific* exegesis of the Gospels.

Louis Bouyer said of this new theory: "Our objection is that we do not see how the duality can exist without admitting the presence of a double consciousness and in keeping with the principle of the system a double personality." And later in the same work he adds: "[The current movement] is a Nestorianism that would have scandalized Nestorius himself."³⁰

Galtier's book in which he denied that Our Lord's beatific vision registered on his autonomous human consciousness, had appeared in 1939, and in 1943 Pope Pius XII in the encyclical *Mystici Corporis* upheld the traditional teaching of the Church concerning Christ's beatific knowledge:

“To Him has been given power over all flesh (see John 17:2); and He has an abundance of ‘all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge’ (Col. 2:13). He also possesses the knowledge which is called vision, and in such fullness that it surpasses the scope and clarity of the similar celestial knowledge that all the saints in heaven have.”

And again in the same encyclical:

“But the knowledge and love of our divine Redeemer, of which we were the object from the first moment of His Incarnation, are more than any human intellect and heart can hope to grasp. For hardly was He conceived in the womb of the Mother of God, when He began to enjoy the beatific vision; and in that vision all the members of the Mystical Body were continually and unceasingly present, and He embraced them with His redeeming love.”³¹

In 1951 in the encyclical *Sempiternus Rex*, issued in commemoration of the 1500th anniversary of the Council of Chalcedon, Pope Pius XII condemned the new psychological theory:

“There is no objection of course to having the humanity of Christ more deeply investigated even by psychological norms and methods. In difficult studies of this nature however, there are some who are too ready to abandon what is already in possession in order to pursue things that are new. As a result they do an injustice to the definition of the Council of Chalcedon while propounding new theories. They so elevate the status and qualities of Christ's human nature, that it seems to become an autonomous subject all by itself, as though it did not subsist in the very person of the Word. But the Council of Chalcedon, in full agreement with that of Ephesus, clearly affirms that each nature of our Redeemer is ‘joined in one person and subsistence,’ and forbids postulating two individuals in Christ, as though some sort of ‘assumed being,’ having its own autonomous individuality, existed side by side with the Word.”³²

Galtier and his successors had also ignored or denied Our Lord's infused knowledge, and in 1956 in the encyclical *Haurietis aquas*, Pius XII once more reaffirmed the traditional teaching of the

Church concerning Our Lord's beatific knowledge, and also on His infused knowledge:

“64. It is moreover the symbol of that most ardent love which, infused into His soul, enriches the human will of Christ, and whose action is enlightened and directed by a twofold most perfect knowledge, namely the beatific and infused.”³³

Despite these clear signals from the Magisterium, the Modernists continued to rally to Galtier's cause, especially the Jesuit Karl Rahner, who after Vatican Council II became probably the most influential theologian in the Church. In Galtier's defense Rahner makes the never-before-heard-of distinction between a "beatific vision," and an "immediate vision" of God, which is non-beatific!

“Furthermore, is it certain that what is meant, in the tradition of theology, by the consciousness of Jesus is really intended to convey the idea of beatitude by direct union with God over and above this union itself? In view of the data provided by historical sources regarding Christ's death-agony and feeling of being forsaken by God in his death on the Cross, can one seriously maintain - without applying an artificial layer psychology - that Jesus enjoyed the beatitude of the blessed, thus making him someone who no longer really and genuinely achieves his human existence as a "*viator*"? If one may reply to these questions in the negative, then the problem occupying us at present is simply a question of determining what valid theological reasons could be brought forward to convince us that we are quite correct in attributing a direct union of his consciousness with God, a *visio immediata*, to Jesus during his earthly life, but this without qualifying it as 'beatific.'”³⁴

Bertrand de Margerie reacted in astonishment to this "immediate non-beatifying vision." "This theory seems to disregard completely the fact that the divine Essence seen face to face, *is* beatitude."³⁵ And concerning Rahner's difficulty of Our Lord enduring the suffering and death of the Cross, and at the same time being supremely happy in the vision of His Father, de Margerie says:

“The lives of the saints, the mystics and many even mothers of families give evidence of just such coexistence of a very great joy in the fine point of the soul, faced with the perfections and the love of God which dwell there, and of very acute suffering, not only of the body but of the mind, painfully wounded by the insults or by the sins of those extremely dear to them. Is it not in just such a context that Saint Catherine of Sienna understood and expressed the coexistence of the beatific vision and of the passion in the soul of Jesus crucified.”³⁶

St. Catherine of Sienna, now a doctor of the Church, had written: "The Lamb on the Cross was at the same time happy and suffering."³⁷

Father Rahner tries to make a big point out of the fact that in the encyclical, *Sempiternus Rex*, condemning the Galtier theory, the phrase *saltem psychologicæ* ("at least psychologically") which appeared in *L'Osservatore Romano*, had been deleted when it was incorporated into the *Acta Apostolicae Sedis*. The Modernists began claiming that they were now free to say that the psychological human personality of Christ, only gradually became aware of His divine Filiation. But in 1966 the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith clearly stated:

"There is afoot a certain christological humanism that would reduce Christ to the condition of a mere man, who only gradually became conscious of His divine Sonship."³⁸

But even Rahner himself admits that he cannot make much of a theological case for ignorance in Our Lord, since the weight of Tradition and the Magisterium is opposed to this view. He appeals for help to the Scripture scholars, who by their *scientific* exegesis of the Gospels have convincingly, at least to him, established the undeniable fact of ignorance in the human soul of Jesus.

Probably the foremost, at least in the eyes of the media, biblical exegete of the day is the Sulpician, Raymond Brown, who responded eagerly to Rahner's invitation. He said: "One can only admire the openness of modern theologians who had the intellectual courage to re-examine those earlier positions that seemed to foreclose any discussion of limitation."³⁹

But before examining Brown's contribution to the discussion, let us look at his claim that the biblical criticism he is practicing is "scientific," and therefore demands a respectful hearing. Biblical criticism as practiced by Modernists such as Brown is anything but scientific, but is rather an example of what is called "scientism," that is a philosophical theory masquerading as science. To illustrate my point, let us take a brief look at one of the longest running examples of scientism, the theory of evolution, examining it in just one of its many aspects, the so-called "geologic column."

The geologic column is the evolutionary interpretation of the various strata of sedimentary rocks laid down on the surface of the earth over the ages. Here is the late Wallace Johnson, an Australian Catholic layman, in his excellent *The Crumbling Theory of Evolution*:

"The geologic column has become scientifically sacred. Yet it has no physical reality. It does not exist in any part of the world. In any one place, you will find one, or two, or a few of these strata, often with strata missing, and often with the theoretic sequence reversed. The geologic column is not a column you can dig through. It is a mental image only. It is an imaginary column put together by correlating and inserting segments of the fossil record from various parts of the world."⁴⁰

According to the theory of evolution, the fossils in the column should go from simple to

complex, that is from older simpler life forms to newer more complex ones. But the reverse is often the case, so a whole geology has been invented to make the strata fit the theory. Johnson quotes a confirmed evolutionary geologist, E.M. Speiker:

"I wonder how many of us realize that the time scale was frozen in essentially its present form by 1840...? How much world geology was known in 1840? All of Asia, Africa, South America, and most of North America were virtually unknown. How dared the pioneers assume their time scale would fit the rocks in those vast areas, by far the most of the world...? The followers of the founding fathers went forth and in Procrustean fashion made fit the sections they found, even in places where the actual evidence literally proclaimed denial. So flexible and accommodating are the 'facts,' of geology." ⁴¹

Let me offer but one example from many of this "Procrustean geology" given by Johnson. On the top of Mount Matterhorn are found fossil sea shells, which according to evolutionary theory should be at the bottom, where more complex fossils are actually found. So evolutionary geologists claim that the Matterhorn must have been uplifted in another location and pushed horizontally across country for sixty miles or more, and finally come to rest on top of the younger fossils!

By analogy the Modernists exegetes have constructed what I would call a "biblical column." The Modernists begin with a philosophy, that of evolutionism, and then make up a history to fit it. By means of textual criticism they claim that they have discovered that the Gospels are in "layers," with the older layers on the bottom, and the younger more complex sections on the top. In the older layers Jesus is not God nor the Messiah, but gradually evolves in His own eyes, and especially in the view of the early Christian communities, into the Son of God and the Messiah. The age of the layers can be determined by the stage of the development in Christology. However, due to the haphazard laying down of the biblical column, there are innumerable Matterhorn-like cases where older layers have slid over the younger ones. It is the duty of the exegete by means of textual criticism, in Procrustean fashion, to make the layers fit the theory.

Pope St. Pius X in his wonderful encyclical, *Pascendi gregis*, puts the Modernist program which has not changed since the days of Loisy and Tyrell, more clearly than they do themselves. Here is analysis of what I am calling the "biblical column":

"137. The result of this dismembering of the sacred books and this partition of them throughout the centuries is naturally that the Scriptures can no longer be attributed to the authors whose names they bear. The Modernists have no hesitation in affirming commonly that the books, and especially the Pentateuch and the first three Gospels, have been gradually formed by additions to a primitive brief narration - by interpolations of a theological or allegorical interpretation, by transitions, by joining different passages together. This means briefly, that in the sacred books we must admit a vital evolution,

springing from and corresponding with the evolution of faith. The traces of this evolution, they tell us, are so visible in the books that one might almost write a history of them. Indeed, this history they do actually write, and with such an easy security that one might believe them to have with their own eyes seen the writers at work through the ages amplifying the sacred books. To aid them in this they call to their assistance that branch of criticism which they call textual, and labor to show that such a fact or such a phrase is not in its right place, and adducing other arguments of the same kind. They seem, in fact, to have constructed for themselves certain types of narration and discourses, upon which they base their decisions as to whether a thing is out of place or not. Judge if you can how men with such a system are fitted for practicing this kind of criticism. To hear them talk about their works on the sacred books, in which they have been able to discover so much that is defective, one would imagine that before them nobody even glanced at the pages of Scripture, whereas the truth is that a whole multitude of doctors, infinitely superior to them in genius, in erudition, in sanctity, have sifted the sacred books in every way, and so far from finding imperfections in them, have thanked God more and more the deeper they have gone into them for His divine bounty in having vouchsafed to speak thus to men. Unfortunately, these great doctors did not enjoy the same aids to study that are possessed by the Modernists for their guide and rule - a philosophy borrowed from the negation of God, and a criterion which consists of themselves." ⁴²

And here is his even briefer summary of the Modernist methodology:

"138. We believe, then, that we have set forth with sufficient clearness the historical method of the Modernists. The philosopher leads the way, the historian follows, and in due order come internal criticism. And since it is characteristic of the first cause to communicate its virtue to the secondary causes, it is quite clear that the criticism we are concerned with is an agnostic, immanentist and evolutionist criticism. Hence anybody who embraces it and employs it makes profession thereby of the errors contained in it, and places himself in opposition to the Catholic faith." ⁴³

Just as the geologic column is full of evolutionary myths, for example, the so-called "hominids" or "near men," *Australopithecus*, *Homo habilis*, etc. which are not men at all, but simply the fossils of extinct apes, ⁴⁴ so the biblical column has its own evolutionary myths. Let us just look at two of many, the so-called "Q" and "Proto-Mark." The Q, from the German word *Quelle* or "source," is supposed to be the *logia* or "sayings" of Our Lord written by St. Matthew. You would never know that this imaginary document, now Modernist dogma, is based on one sentence in the writings of Papias, as related by the historian Eusebius: "Matthew wrote in the Hebrew language the sayings (*logia*) of the Lord." The Modernists claim this means that Matthew wrote a collection of the discourses of Our Lord, but it is much more likely that Papias is referring to the whole Gospel of St. Matthew. This is confirmed by the Syria translation of Eusebius which reads: "Matthew wrote in the Hebrew language a Gospel." ⁴⁵

But an even more fanciful creation is "Proto-Mark," which is supposed to be the original Gospel of St. Mark, which began with Our Lord's baptism, and ended with His death and resurrection, no ascension or final mandate of the Apostles. Q and Proto-Mark are supposed to be the first two written documents, which were later used by Matthew and Luke in the composition of their Gospels. So the chronological order of the Gospels is not the traditional Matthew, Mark, Luke, but rather Mark, Luke and Matthew, although some Modernists prefer Mark, Matthew and Luke. All of the Gospels as we have them today were completed after the destruction of the Temple in Jerusalem which occurred in the year 70 A.D.

These notions are against all the Tradition of the Church and were condemned in 1912 by the Pontifical Biblical Commission which had been set up by Leo XIII to guard the Church against the onslaughts of biblical Modernism:

"Two Source Theory - Whether what has been laid down above is to be considered as observed by those who, unsupported by any testimony of tradition or by any historical argument, lightly embrace the hypothesis commonly known as that of the >two sources,= which strives to explain the composition of the Greek Gospel of Matthew and the Gospel of Luke mainly by their dependence on the Gospel of Mark and on the so-called collection of >Sayings of the Lord=, and can they, therefore freely advocate it.

"Answer: In the negative to both parts." ⁴⁶

"Chronological order. - Whether with regard to the chronological order of the Gospels, it is lawful to abandon the opinion, supported as it is by the most ancient as well as constant testimony of tradition, which testifies that after Matthew, who first of all wrote his Gospel in his native language, Mark wrote second and Luke third; or is this opinion to be regarded as opposed to that which asserts that the second and third Gospels were composed before the Greek version of the first Gospel.

"Answer: In the negative to both parts." ⁴⁷

Also according to tradition, Matthew's Gospel was composed around the year 42 A.D., Mark around 46 A.D. and Luke around 57 A.D., give or take a few years.

"Date of Composition - Whether it is lawful to set the date of the composition of the Gospels of Mark and Luke as late as the destruction of the city of Jerusalem [70 A.D.]; or whether, from the fact that in Luke the prophecy of Our Lord concerning the overthrow of this city seems to be more definite, it can at least be held that his Gospel was written after the siege began.

"Answer: In the negative to both parts." ⁴⁸

And just as the evolutionary geologic column has its share of frauds like the Piltdown Man, Java Man, the very suspicious Peking Man, etc. ⁴⁹ so too, the constructors of the imaginary biblical column have not hesitated to resort to fraud. In his *Biblical Reflections of Crises Facing the Church*, Raymond Brown has an Appendix entitled "Some Roman Biblical and Theological Statements Which Have Opened the Church to Change." Here are Brown's comments on what he is calling a "Roman Document":

"A Declaration of Freedom with Regard to the Early decrees of the Pontifical Biblical Commission (1955). The Roman Catholic Church rarely calls attention to its changes of mind by stating openly that previous positions have been abandoned or previous statements are inoperative. It lets them die out from memory. And so it was a major concession when the Secretary and Sub-Secretary of the Pontifical Biblical Commission clarified the status of the conservative decrees issued by the Commission in the period 1905-1915 to which up to that time Catholic scholars were bound in conscience to submit. They did this by commenting on the republication of a collection of Church statements about Scripture (*Enchiridion Biblicum*)." ⁵⁰

Brown is pretending that this is an official Vatican document. Actually it was a completely unofficial book review in a German magazine in which the two secretaries were merely expressing their personal opinions.

In 1964 the liberal Abbey Press of St. Meinrad, Indiana, published *Rome and the Study of Scripture*, which purported to be a collection of Vatican documents on the study of Holy Scripture. However it does not include the extremely important, *Lamentabile, Pascendi gregis*, the Oath against Modernism, etc, all crucial Vatican documents on the study of the Bible, so I wondered why it included the decisions of the Biblical Commission from 1905 to 1915, which are the bane of the Modernists. Right at the end of these decisions, there is a single page with the heading: "Decrees of the Biblical Commission: A Recent Clarification," - Brown's "Roman Document!" Only in the small type at the bottom of the page (if you read it) do you discover that this "Roman Document" is a *book review* in a German magazine, *Benedictinische Monatschrift*. ⁵¹ I consider this a fraudulent presentation.

Even worse is another collection of Vatican documents on the study of Scripture, *Bible Interpretation*, edited by James Megivern. On page 370 of this book there is a letter of Pope Pius XII to Edwin O'Hara, the Bishop of Kansas City on promoting biblical studies. The letter continues to page 371, then after a double space and without any headings, is the book review mentioned above. If you didn't look carefully you would think that this was a document of Pius XII, since that is the only heading in large type. ⁵² If these decrees have really been abrogated as the Modernists claim, why do they have

to resort to such questionable layouts?

Msgr. John E. Steinmueller who was a consultor of the Biblical Commission at the time of these reviews, writes:

"I was a consultor of the first Pontifical Biblical Commission from 1947...to 1971, and I never heard any intimation that any decrees of the Commission were ever revoked. At most they were clarified (cf. Letter to Cardinal Suhard of Paris, 1948). Recently some Catholic scholars have asserted that the decrees were implicitly revoked by *Divino afflante Spiritu* (1943) and that this is confirmed by two articles written in 1955 by A. Miller and A. Kleinhaus, who seem to restrict the scope of the decrees to matters of faith and morals...The articles referred to were *unauthorized* and were condemned by the voting Cardinal members of the Commission. A. Miller and A. Kleinhaus were to be brought before the Holy Office because of the articles, but were saved from this ordeal through the personal intervention of Cardinal Tisserant before the Holy Father. It was my friend Father Miller, O.S.B., who told me the whole story before his return to Germany." ⁵³

The decrees of the Biblical Commission are not infallible, and theoretically they could be changed, but not if they are a reflection of the constant Tradition and the Magisterium of the Church, as are the decrees I am citing in the course of this paper. The Church is never going to say that St. Matthew did not write the Gospel of Matthew, or St. Mark, Mark or St. Luke, Luke, or that the Infancy Narratives are not historical.

Brown thinks that the four Gospels, as we have them today, are full of historical errors. He claims that we should not lightly accept the historicity of a Gospel event, especially in the Gospel of St. John, unless it is corroborated by a secular historical document. Of course this principle does not apply to his imaginary Q or Proto-Mark, etc., for which there is no confirming extra-biblical evidence. It is refreshing to hear Cardinal Paul Taguchi, the Cardinal Archbishop of Osaka, in his marvelous position paper, *The Study of Sacred Scripture*, call such notions "pseudo-scientific nonsense":

"To mention but one example: the fact that Christ was born in Bethlehem is known to us because St. Luke says so in his Gospel; and this we know for a fact regardless and independently of whether or not the same fact is confirmed by other non-biblical sources; and with a greater degree of certainty than that which the other sources can afford. It is known to us as an *historical* fact, and not as some notion contrived by the early Christian communities, or even by the very witnesses of the Resurrection who having finally believed in Christ as the Messiah, then took it for granted that He must have been born in Bethlehem in keeping with the prophecies." ⁵⁴

So much for Brown's "scientific" biblical exegesis. But speaking of science, hard science, it is an

amazing fact that the findings of the science of biblical archaeology, always confirm the traditional teachings of the Church, and rebut the false claims of the Modernists.⁵⁵ In 1955 in the famous Qumran caves, there was discovered a tiny fragment of papyrus, about the size of a postage stamp, covered with Greek letters and catalogued as "7 Q 5," meaning the seventh cave at Qumran, document 5. There were 20 Greek letters in five lines, and in 1972 by a remarkable feat of detective work, they were deciphered by the Spanish Jesuit, José O'Callaghan. There was only one complete word visible, the Greek particle *kai*, "and," but from the letters "nnes," O'Callaghan guessed it might be from the word *Gennes areth*. Also realizing that *kai*, "and," was one of St. Mark's favorite words (St. Mark writes in a pell-mell style: "And...and...and."), he thought it might be from a passage in Mark: "They understood not concerning the loaves; for their heart was blinded. *And* when they passed over they came into the land of *Gennes areth* and set by the shore. *And* when they..." (Mark 6:52,53). Callaghan arranged these sentences into five lines, and suddenly the 20 letters of the fragment popped out. O'Callaghan then ran these 20 letters through a computer to determine what were the mathematical odds, that these letters had arranged themselves into this passage from Mark by chance. The odds were so astronomical that they could be considered mathematically impossible.

The Qumran caves were sealed in 68 A.D. just before the Essene community was destroyed by the Romans, and papyrologists have independently established that this little fragment had to be written before 50 A.D. The Modernist Establishment hold it as dogma, that the Synoptic Gospels in the form we have them today, date after the fall of Jerusalem in 70 A.D., otherwise, even what Brown calls the "low Christology" of the Synoptics, would not have had sufficient time to develop. This little fragment then, would destroy their whole imaginary biblical column, which they had spent almost a hundred years raising up. O'Callaghan couldn't believe the abuse he received from the Modernist biblical Establishment, especially from the Dominicans of the *École Biblique* in Jerusalem, long one of their strongholds. One is reminded of the Aristotelians, the Establishment of the day, who wouldn't look through Galileo's telescope at the mountains of the moon, because they were not mentioned by Aristotle.⁵⁶

Let us now examine Brown's "scientific" exegesis on our topic, "Whether in Christ There Was Ignorance?" he will begin of course with the Agnoetae text which we have seen concerning the last days, Mark 13:32. "But of that day or hour no man knoweth, neither the angels in heaven, not the Son, but the Father." Brown has a big problem whenever the Gospel's record Our Lord's own words, whether they are *ipsissima verba*, Our Lord's very own words, or the creation of the Christian community. It would be almost amusing if it were not so pathetic, that Brown is sure that these words are *ipsissima verba*. "One is certain, however, that it ran against the grain of the Church to attribute ignorance to Jesus, and most authors would accept the saying as authentic."⁵⁷

Brown then lightly brushes off the anathematization by Pope Vigilius, which we seen, concerning

the Nestorian teaching of ignorance in Christ:

"Under Pope Vigilius in 553 there was a condemnation of an error of Nestorianism which proposed that Jesus Christ, true Son of God and true Son of Man, was ignorant of future things and of the day of the Last Judgment and could have known such things in so much as a deity dwelt in him as if in another individual. This error is so tied into the Nestorian theory of two persons or beings in Christ that its condemnation would not really effect the modern non-Nestorian problematic." ⁵⁸

Brown with Galtier, Rahner *et alia*, holds that there are two beings in Christ, two individuals, an autonomous human consciousness or personality, and a divine Person. The words might be new, but it is the same old heresy. The devil has no new tricks.

Brown, Galtier, Rahner, and other "reputable scholars" (Brown's own phrase), go far beyond the claim of ignorance concerning the last days, to postulate ignorance in matters that would have shocked the Agnoetae of old. They ask: "Did Jesus know He was God?" "Did He know He was the Messiah?" Their answer is of course, "No!" "But the simple rank and file Catholics, those to whom Jesus said the Father reveals His secrets, scorn a consensus which flouts commonsense." ⁵⁹ Here is Brown:

"If we turn to the title 'Son of God,' the question of Jesus' consciousness of a special relationship to God is not solved negatively if we cannot prove in a fully scientific manner that he claimed to be the unique Son of God. In the judgment of the later Church, "Son" was accepted as a reasonably adequate image through which to describe Jesus' relationship to Jahweh, but it is *possible* that in his lifetime Jesus never came to full use of this image. Still this does not necessarily mean that he was not conscious of the reality behind the relationship we call Sonship. In scholastic terminology concepts like 'Son' and >Messiah= are the products of the intellect, and man is said to come into the world with an intellect that is a *tabula rasa*. Against Apollinarianism the Church maintained that Jesus had a human soul and thus a human intellect (*DBS* 146). Can theology admit that this intellect was also a *tabula rasa*, activated not by infused knowledge but by means of human experiences, as are other men's intellects? In this case it would have taken Jesus time to formulate concepts, and he might have found some of the concepts of his day inadequate to express what he wanted to say. One would then be able to say that his knowledge was limited, but such limitation would not at all exclude an intuitive *consciousness* of a unique relationship to God and of a unique mission to men. The struggle of his life could have been one of finding the concepts and words to express that relationship and that mission." ⁶⁰

Brown is here implicitly denying both Our Lord's beatific and His infused knowledge. This is Galtier's "autonomous human consciousness" in action. We saw that Galtier admitted that Our Lord had the beatific vision, but claimed that it did not register on his autonomous human personality. Rahner also

admitted a beatific vision, but denied that in Our Lord's case it was beatific. Both Galtier and Rahner, like Brown, ignore Our Lord's infused knowledge. Here is Bertand de Margerie on this same topic:

"By infused knowledge, as by the knowledge of vision, one can also explain in Jesus the consciousness of divine filiation; the human awareness of this divine filiation can have no other beginning in Jesus except that of His earthly existence: 'no one had to tell Him who He was,' the Belgian bishops wrote in 1967. Jesus never had to 'search for His identity.' In that sense there is no history of the consciousness of Jesus Christ." ⁶¹

Let us return for a moment to St. Cyril of Alexandria who told Nestorius that he had made the Blessed Eucharist impossible:

"Nestorius: "I will quote the words of his which give offense. The Lord Jesus was talking with them about his flesh. 'Unless you eat the flesh of the Son of Man,' he said, 'and drink his blood, you will not have life in you.' His hearers could not take in the sublimity of what he said. They thought in their folly, that he was suggesting cannibalism."

"Cyril: Well then, how is it that this is not a matter of cannibalism? In what way is this mystery sublime, unless we say that the very Word of the Father who was sent and acknowledge the fashion of his sending to be his becoming man. Then we shall see that the flesh united with him has life-giving power; it is not an alien flesh, but flesh which belonged to him who can give life to all things...If it was a man who was born in his own separate nature; if the Word of God did not come to be in our condition; then indeed what is performed is an act of cannibalism, and participation in it is of no value at all." ⁶²

I think the Neo-Nestorians of our day are doing something similar. Do you see any connection between Raymond Brown's Christ, whose life struggle was a search for His identity, and the Christ described below by De Margerie:

"Next we can and we must say with the Church that at the Last Supper, during His agony on the Cross, as well as already in the Manger, Jesus knew and loved humanly every human person: 'The Son of God loved me and delivered Himself up for me' (Gal. 2:20). Otherwise how could He have humanly expiated my sins? How would He humanly have redeemed humanity? His *Kenosis* ['emptied Himself' Phil. 2:7] did not consist in the impossible suppression of His divine consciousness, nor in the suppression of His human knowledge of the sins and sorrows of men.

"He loved me not only in >His divine form and condition,= but in >His form and condition of slave,= in His >human form.= He loved me in spite of my sins, in order to save me from them and it is

because he knew me - and knew them - in that human form He offered Himself for me.

“The Church has never believed that the Man Jesus knew me on the Cross only as God, loved me on the Cross only with a divine love. Never has she believed that the man Jesus as man did not know my sins and my person at the moment He was dying for my salvation.

“The *neo-agnosticism of the present time* is at least indirectly contrary to Christian faith in Christ the Redeemer. Unfaithful to Revelation, to the teaching of the Church and to theological reason it saps piety and deprives the faithful of the consolation of consoling the agonizing Christ.”⁶³

References

- 1 Ferand Mouret, S.S., *A History of the Catholic Church*, Volume II, translated from the French by Rev. Newton Thompson, S.T.D., B. Herder Book Co., St. Louis, 1946, p.560.
- 2 In 1931 Pope Pius XI issued the encyclical *Lux Veritatis* in honor of the 1500th anniversary of the Council of Ephesus which had been held in the year 431

“26. We are well aware, Venerable Brethren, that some of those who, especially in the present age, devote themselves to historical research, use every effort to clear Nestorius from the stain of heresy and that they also accuse the most holy Cyril, Bishop of Alexandria, of unjust animosity, saying that, because Nestorius was obnoxious to him, he calumniated him and strove with all his strength to procure his condemnation for things which he never taught. Our most blessed predecessor Celestine, whose simplicity is said to have been abused by Cyril and the holy Synod of Ephesus also, are involved in this most grave accusation by these defenders of the Bishop of Constantinople.

“27. The Church, however, protests against this futile and temerarious attempt...”

Catholic University Bulletin, (1902), 441 ff.

- 5 Leporius's profession of faith is found in *PL* 31, 1221-30; Augustine's letter to the

Gallic bishops is *Ep.* 219. On the whole matter, see P. Glorieux *Pre Nestorianisme en Occident*, Tournai and Paris, 1959, pp.5-38. From Baus *et alia*, *History of the Church*, Volume II, translated by Anselm Biggs, Crossroad, NY, 1986, p.102, n.45.

6 Pius XI, *Lux veritatis*, II, 28, *Op. cit.*, p.469.

7 St. Pius X, *Pascendi Dominici gregis*, September 8, 1907, 145; Amanda Watlington, *Christ Our Lord*, McGrath Publishing Co., 1978, p.103.

8 Brother Thomas Mary Sennott, M.I.C.M., *On Exonerating Pelagius, Res Fidei*, Series 1, St. Benedict Center, Winchester, NH, 1991.

9 Pope Pius XI, *Lux veritatis*, 9, 10, pp.464,465.

There was a legitimate confusion of terms at the Council of Ephesus between the East and the West, and the Greek and Latin Fathers, which was clarified by the Council of Chalcedon in 451. In 1951 Pope Pius XII issued the encyclical, *Sempiternus Rex Christus*, to commemorate the 1500th anniversary of this event:

"489. If anyone asks how it is that statements of the council of Chalcedon are of such outstanding excellence in their clarity and their efficiency in the refutation of error, we reply that this arises from the fact that ambiguities have been removed and a most exact terminology was used. For in the Chalcedonian definition of the faith the same concept underlies the terms Person and 'hypostasis,' the term "Nature has a totally different sense, and its meaning is never given to other words. So that the Nestorians and Eutychians of old and certain modern writers err when they maintain that the council of Chalcedon corrected the decision of Ephesus. Rather the one perfected the other so a synthesis or composition of the main Christological doctrine was available in fuller form for the second and third ecumenical councils of Constantinople.

"490. It is indeed sad that the ancient adversaries of the council of Chalcedon (also called Monophysites) should have rejected this doctrine, so lucid, so coherent and so complete, on the strength of certain badly understood expressions of ancient writers. While they rejected the absurd teachings of Eutyches about the mixtures of natures in Christ, they obstinately clung to the well-known expression: 'One Incarnate nature of the Word of God.' This expression had been used by Cyril of Alexandria (who took it from St. Athanasius) with a perfectly correct meaning, since he used the term 'nature' to signify 'person.' For they applied the same terms as used in the theology of the Trinity, to the exposition of our Lord's Incarnation. Thus they made 'nature' and 'essence' the same, and likewise 'Person' and 'Hypostasis,' and they treated the later two names as totally different from the former two.

Pope Pius XII, *Sempiternus Rex Christus*, September 8, 1951, (489,490); Amanda

Watlington, *Op.cit.*, pp.252,253.

The Modernists today complain unceasingly about the "inadequacies of the Chalcedonian formula," (one divine Person in two natures, one human and one divine) probably because it is too simple for them; even a layman can understand it, and also because it is too difficult for a heretic to get around. For example Karl Rahner writes:

"Here we shall cease to pursue our investigations into Biblical theology, or more accurately, the transcendental hermeneutics for a Biblical Christology. We shall try to investigate the Chalcedonian formula itself, and make clearer to ourselves the problems it sets us. The formula speaks of two natures: it puts them clearly before our eyes in characters proper to each. For we have some knowledge of what a man is, and our experience in this matter grows daily. And so we can make a fair estimate of what is really involved in being a man. What God is we can only know by going beyond any information we may possess, in a *docta ignorantia* ['a learned ignorance']. But in this very way the Being whom we recognize as unknown is set apart from human nature. And now the Chalcedonian formula bids us conceive of the unconfused unity of the two 'natures.' Isn't that hard?"

Karl Rahner, S.J., "Current Problems in Christology," *Theological Investigatio*, Volume I, translated by Cornelius Ernst, O.P., the Seabury Press, NY, 1974, p.174.

In 1973 the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith issued a decree entitled *Mysterium Ecclesiae*, in response to such complaints about the "inadequacies of the Chalcedonian formula":

"The faithful must therefore shun the opinion, first that dogmatic formulas (or some category of them) cannot signify truth in a determinate way, but can only offer changeable approximations to it, which to a certain extent distort or alter it; secondly, that these formulae signify the truth only in an indeterminate way, this truth being like a goal which is constantly being sought by means of such approximations. Those who hold such opinions do not escape dogmatic relativism, and they are corrupting the concept of the Church's infallibility relative to the truth to be taught or held determinately."

Mysterium Ecclesiae, The Declaration of the Sacred Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith, June 24, 1973, part V, 1045; from James Megivern, *Bible Interpretation*, McGrath Publishing Co., Wilmington, North Carolina, 1978, p.432.

10 *Denzinger*, 419.

11 Photius, *Bibl. Cod.* 230 n. 10; cited in: Dr. Ludwig Ott, *Fundamentals of Catholic Dogma*, edited in English by James Canon Bastible, D.D. translated from the German by Patrick Lynch, PhD., Tan Books and Publishers Inc., Rockford, IL, 1974, p.166.

12 *Denzinger*, 475,476.

St. Ephrem the Deacon has an excellent commentary read in the Divine Office, on expecting the end of the world in one's own lifetime. This is from his commentary on the *Diatesseron* of Tatian, a harmony of the Four Gospels, which unfortunately has been lost.

"To prevent His disciples from asking the time of His coming, Christ said: 'About that hour no one knows, neither the angels nor the Son. It is not for you to know the time or moments.' He has kept these things hidden so that we may keep watch, each of us thinking that He will come in our own day. If He had revealed the time of His coming, His coming would have lost its savor: it would no longer be an object of yearning for the nations and the age in which it will be revealed. He promised that He would come but did not say when He would come, and so all generations await Him eagerly.

"Though the Lord has established the signs of His coming, the time of their fulfillment has not been plainly revealed. These signs have come and gone with a multiplicity of change; more than that, they are still present. His final coming is like His first. As holy men and prophets waited for Him, thinking that He would reveal Himself in their own day, so today each of the faithful longs to welcome Him in his own day, because Christ had not made plain the day of His coming.

"He has not made it plain for this reason especially, that no one may think that He whose power and dominion rule all numbers and times is ruled by fate and time. He described the signs of His coming; how could what He has Himself decided be hidden from Him? Therefore He used these words to increase respect for the signs of His coming, so that from that day forward all generations and ages might think that He would come again in their own day."

St. Ephrem Deacon, *A Commentary on the Diatesseron*, (Cap. 18, 15-17: SC 121, 325-328), Divine Office, First Week of Advent, Thursday, Office of Readings.

13 Bertrand de Margerie, S.J., *The Human Knowledge of Christ*, St. Paul Editions, 1980, p.55. Of all the books and articles I read in preparation for this paper, this little book of only 77 pages, is by far the best.

14 St. Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Theologica*, translated by the Fathers of the English Dominican Province, Benzinger Brothers Inc., 1947, III, q. 9, Art. 2, p.2083.

15 St. Thomas Aquinas, *Op. cit.*, III, Q. 12, Art. 4, p.2092.

16 St. Thomas, III, Q. 12, Art. 2, p.2095.

17 St. Thomas, III, Q. 15, Art. 3, pp.2106,2107.

St. Pius X had said in *Pascendi*:

"...They [the Modernists] recognize that the three difficulties for them are scholastic philosophy, the authority of the Fathers and tradition, and the Magisterium of the Church. For scholastic philosophy they have only ridicule and contempt. Whether it is ignorance or fear or both, that inspires this conduct in them, certain it is that the passion for novelty is always united in them with hatred of scholasticism, and there is no surer sign that a man is on his way to Modernism than when he begins to show his dislike for this system."

Pascendi, Op. cit., pp.107,108.

This hatred of scholasticism we shall see, was certainly true of Anton Gunther, and it is also true of Raymond Brown, so it comes as somewhat of a surprise to see Brown quoting from St. Thomas in what he thinks is an argument for ignorance.

"All modern Christology is based on the theory that the human knowledge of Jesus was limited. In Catholicism this theory often runs against a popular misunderstanding which would claim that since Jesus was the second Person of the Blessed Trinity, he knew, even as man, all that God would know - a misunderstanding usually accompanied with the argument that the person is the subject of knowledge and there was only one person in Jesus. Such an approach was unacceptable to the great scholastic theologians. St. Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Theologica*, III, Q. 9, Art. 1, ad 1, says: "If there had not been in the soul of Christ some other knowledge besides his divine knowledge, he would not have known anything. Divine knowledge cannot be an act of the human soul of Christ; it belongs to another nature.?"

Raymond Brown, S.S., *Biblical Reflections on Crises Facing the Church*, Paulist Press, NY, 1975, p.35, n.27.

In the first place Brown is mistranslating. It is not "he [Christ] would not have known anything," but rather "it [His soul] would not have known anything." (See: *Summa Theologica*, Fathers of the English Dominican Province, Benzinger, NY, p.2028.

If Brown really wanted to know what St. Thomas taught on "Whether in Christ There Was Ignorance?" why didn't he look him up on *this* article (III, Q. 10, Art. 3)? I am reminded of the early days of St. Benedict Center, when liberal theologians tried to use St. Thomas against us.

St. Thomas says that the sacrament of Penance is not absolutely necessary for salvation, if you made a perfect act of love of God; therefore, they argued, neither was the sacrament of Baptism under the same circumstances. But in treating of Penance St. Thomas was thinking of baptized Catholics. If they wanted to know what he taught on the necessity of Baptism for salvation, why didn't they look him up on *this* topic?

The Dominican Garrigou-Lagrance comments on this article of St. Thomas misused by Father Brown:

"Whether Christ Had Any Knowledge Besides the Divine?" It is revealed, but it is also clearly stated in the previously quoted canons of the Third Council of Constantinople ('...and His human nature is in every respect human, sin absolutely excepted.') Hence human intelligence would be for no purpose in Christ unless He could make use of it, and in this respect His soul would be more imperfect than the souls of the rest of mankind."

Reginald Garrigou-Lagrance, O.P., *Christ the Saviour*, B. Herder Book Co., St. Louis, 1950, pp.342,343.

This is hardly an argument for ignorance!

18 St. Thomas, III, Q. 10, Art. 3, pp.2086,2087.

19 De Margerie, *Op. cit.*, pp.45-47, n. 51, St. Bonaventure, *Breviloquium*, IV, 6; *Opera Omnia* (Quarrachi) v. 247a.

De Margerie thinks that the only place where one can legitimately speak of "ignorance" in Our Lord, in His acquired knowledge. But lest this be misunderstood, I prefer the term used by Lagrange, "nescience," who writes:

"There could not have been either error or ignorance in Him who said; 'I am the way, and the truth, and the life.' Ignorance is a privation of that which a person ought to have, and so it is opposed to simple nescience, or simple negation or absence of knowledge, as in a child who is not yet capable of knowing. Thus in Christ there was a certain nescience as regards His acquired knowledge, in which He made progress, as stated above.

Lagrance, *Op. cit.*, p.416.

20 Louis Bouyer, *Op. cit.*, pp.376,377. In his *Dictionary of Theology* under the entry for "Personality," Bouyer writes:

"Modern usage tends to distinguish between personality and person, reserving for the first word what corresponds to the psychological principles that characterize person, which in turn is defined as a metaphysical reality. This distinction is certainly well grounded up to a point, in the sense that the definition of person cannot be reduced to merely psychological considerations. But we cannot conclude from this that there is a radical contradistinction to the extent that person and personality could be opposed without emptying person of its concrete reality. This is why the Church has shown herself more than reticent with regard to the attempts of certain modern theologians to attribute to Christ a human personality while maintaining the unicity of his incarnate divine Person. This is one of the points aimed at by the brief of Pius IX, *Eximiam tuam*, addressed June 15th, 1857 to the Archbishop of Cologne regarding the books of Anton Gunther, in the paragraph referring to his doctrine of the Incarnation (cf. *D.B.* 1655)."

Louis Bouyer, *Dictionary of Theology*, translated by Rev. Charles Underhill Quinn, Desclee and Co., Tournai, Belgium, 1965, p.347.

21 Lagrange, *Op. cit.*, p.344.

22 *Denzinger*, 1655.

23 Dom Charles Poulet, O.S.B., *A History of the Catholic Church*, Volume II, translated by Rev. Sidney Raemers, B. Herder Book Co., St. Louis, 1949, p.590. The Council of Cologne had said:

"Manifestly those who assert that at times the progress of science, and especially that of philosophy, necessitates the interpretation of a dogma in a sense different from the one previously accepted by the Church, undermine the whole structure of the Catholic faith."

It is interesting to note that this same Provincial Council of Cologne, which condemned the philosophy of evolutionism, also condemned the so-called "scientific" theory of the evolution of man:

"Our first parents were created immediately by God (Ge. 2:7), therefore, we declare as quite contrary to Holy Scripture and the Faith the opinion of those who dare to assert that man, in respect of his body, is derived by spontaneous transformation from an imperfect nature, which improved continually until it reached the present human state."

Cited in : Ernesto Cardinal Ruffini, *The Theory of Evolution Judged by Reason and Faith*, translated by Francis O'Hanlon, Joseph F. Wagner, Inc., NY, 1959, p.113.

The decrees of the Council of Cologne were approved by Pope Pius IX.

24 *Denzinger*, 1805.

25 This *schema* read:

"It is true that Christ shares our flesh and blood, but by no means did He contract the stain of guilt when He took our weak nature; and although He was endowed with free will, He not only did not sin, but He could not sin. He was not troubled by the passions of the soul or the concupiscences of the flesh, and He did not free Himself from these gradually.

Collection Lacensis, VII, 558ff., 566. From *The Church Teaches*, by the Jesuit Fathers of St. Mary's College, St. Mary's Kansas, B. Herder Book Co., 1955, p.193.

The Jesuit Fathers then refer us to the Second Council of Constantinople of 553 A.D., which condemned the so-called "Three Chapters," especially the Nestorian writings of Theodore of Mopsuesta:

"If anyone defends the irreverent Theodore of Mopsuesta who said that God the Word is one person, while Christ is another person who was subject to disturbance by the passions of the soul and the desires of the body, but who was gradually set free from inferior inclinations; and thus being made better through the improvement of his works, and becoming irreproachable by his conduct, he was baptized, though a mere man, in the name of the Father and the Son and Holy Spirit, and was deemed worthy of adoption; and as is the case of an imperfect image, he is worshipped out of respect for the person of God the Word; and after his Resurrection he became steadfast in his purpose and wholly incapable of sin...let him be anathema.@(*Denz.* 224.)

There is also underway today a movement to exonerate Theodore of Mopsuesta, his supporters claiming that the Greek translation of his writings done under the Emperor Justinian, are a mistranslation of his original Syriac. Be that as it may, the Greek version stands condemned, and the point is that the teaching of the Greek, is remarkably similar to that of Anton Gunther, and his successors, the Neo-Nestorians of today.

26 Poulet, *Op. cit.*, p.624.

27 *Denzinger*, 1805.

28 John A. Hardon, S.J., *The Catholic Catechism*, Doubleday and Co., NY, 1975, p.147.

29 *Denzinger*, 2183-2185.

30 Paul Galtier, *L'Unite du Christ - Etre, Personne, Conscience*, 3rd ed., Beauchesne, Paris, 1939.

31 Bouyer, *Op. cit.*, p.380 and p.368.

32 Pope Pius XII, *Mystici Corporis*, June 29, 1943, Denzinger, 2287,2289.

33 Pope Pius XII, *Sempiterna Rex*, September 8, 1951, Denzinger, 2334.

34 Pope Pius XII, *Haurietis Aquas*, May 15, 1956, AAS 48 (1956) 253; Claudia Carlen, I.H.M., *The Papal Encyclicals 1939-1958*, McGrath Publishing Co., Wilmington Carolina, 1978, p.299.

35 Karl Rahner, S.J., "Dogmatic Reflections on the Knowledge and Self-Consciousness of Christ," *Theological Investigations*, Volume V, translated by Karl H. Kruger, the Seabury Press, NY, 1975, p.203.

Rahner sarcastically dismisses Our Lord's infused knowledge taught by all the Fathers and upheld in *Haurietis Aquas*, and rejects the theological note of "certain," applied to it by Dr. Ludwig Ott and other theologians. However, Bertand de Margerie, whom I consider the best on this subject, thinks it should have a much higher note. He writes:

"...I shall say that it is at least *proxima fidei* that one must exclude from the soul of Christ from the first moment of its creation all ignorance, and from the moment it enjoys the beatific vision; it is of faith that Jesus enjoyed at least at certain moments of his earthly life the infused knowledge of the Prophets; it is implicitly revealed that Jesus exercised an experimental acquired knowledge. Moreover the historian can affirm with moral certitude (not absolute) proper to his discipline, that Jesus claimed the knowledge of his Father and a knowledge of a prophet."

De Margerie, *Op. cit.* p.72, n.59.

And here is Rahner:

"What has just been said may suitably be followed by a brief remark about Christ's 'infused knowledge.' Gutwenger has tried to show that there is no constraining theological reason for assuming such knowledge to exist side by side with the direct vision of God and acquired knowledge. Hence it will be quite permissible, for instance, to refuse to accept Ott's qualification for Christ's having such infused knowledge as being *sententia certa*.

"In fact, it must be said that - if the doctrine of the true, genuine human nature of the Son as essentially similar to our own is not to be degraded into a myth of a God disguised in human appearance - such a historicity and coming from beginnings= in which what was yet to come (precisely because it was historical) was not always present must necessarily be attributed to Jesus...In this way one will also do full justice to the marginal and incidental declarations of

the Church's *magisterium* which point in this direction, without having to suppose for this reason that Jesus possessed a permanent, reflex and full-formed propositional knowledge of everything after the manner of an encyclopedia or of a huge, actually completed world-history."

Rahner, *Op. cit.*, pp.212,214.

36 De Margerie, *Op. cit.*, p. 76, n.78.

37 De Margerie, p.42.

38 St. Catherine of Sienna, *Dialogue*, Paris, 1913, t. I, ch. 78, pp.270,271; quoted in De Margerie, p.69, n.44.

39 A.A.S., 58, (1966) 660, point 5.

40 Raymond Brown, S.S., *Jesus God and Man*, The Bruce Publishing Co., Milwaukee, 1967, p.40.

41 J.W.G. Johnson, *The Crumbling Theory of Evolution*, Queensland Binding Service, Brisbane, Australia, 1982, p.54.

42 Dr. E.M. Speiker, Bulletin of the American Association of Petroleum Geologists, Vol. 40 August 1956; cited in Johnson, *Op. cit.*, p.55.

43 St. Pius X, *Pascendi Dominici gregis*, September 8, 1907; Amanda Watlington, *Christ Our Lord*, *Op. cit.* pp.96,97.

44 Pius X, *Op. cit.*, pp.97,98.

There is one final avocation of the Modernist besides that of Philosopher, historian, and textual critic, namely that of reformer. St. Pius X continues:

"It remains for us now to say a few words about the Modernist as reformer. From all that has preceded some idea may be gained of the reforming mania which possesses them: in all Catholicism there is absolutely nothing on which it does not fasten. Reform of philosophy, especially in the seminaries :the scholastic philosophy is to be relegated to the history of philosophy among obsolete systems, and the young men are to be taught modern philosophy, which alone is true and suited to the times in which we live. Reform of theology: rational theology is to have modern philosophy for its foundation, and positive theology is to be founded on the history of dogma. As for history, it must be for the future written and taught only according to their modern methods and principles. Dogmas and their evolution are to be harmonized with science and history.

In the catechisms no dogmas are to be inserted except those which have been duly reformed and are within the capacity of the people. Regarding worship, the number of external devotions is to be reduced, or at least steps must be taken to prevent their further increase, though indeed some of the admirers of symbolism are disposed to be more indulgent on this head. Ecclesiastical government requires to be reformed in all its branches, but especially in its

disciplinary and dogmatic parts. Its spirit and its external manifestations must be put in harmony with the public conscience, which is now wholly for democracy; a share in ecclesiastical government should therefore be given to the lower ranks of the clergy and even to the laity, and authority should be decentralized. The Roman congregations, and especially the Index and the Holy Office, are to be reformed. The ecclesiastical authority must change its outside political and social organization, it must adapt itself to those which exist in order to penetrate them with its spirit. With regard to morals, they adopt the principle of the Americanists, that the active virtues are more important than the passive, both in the estimation in which they must be held and in the exercise of them. The clergy are asked to return to their ancient lowliness and poverty, and in their ideas and action to be guided by the principles of Modernism; and there are some who echoing the teaching of their Protestant masters, would like the suppression of ecclesiastical celibacy. What is there left in the Church which is not to be reformed according to their principles.

St. Pius X, *Pascendi*, 144, *Op. cit.*, pp.102,103.

Is there anything left today in this Modernist agenda, that the Neo-Modernists of today have not implemented?

45 Cf. Rev. Patrick O'Connell, *Science of Today and the Problems of Genesis*, Christian Book Club of America, Hawthorne, CA, pp.102,103.

46 Cf. Msgr. Steinmueller, *A Companion to Scripture Studies*, Volume II, Joseph F. Wagner Inc., for Lumen Christi Press, Houston, 1969, pp.46-50, 117,118.

47 A.A.S., 4 (1912) 465.

48 A.A.S., 4 (1912) 463-465.

49 A.A.S., 4 (1912) 463-465.

50 Cf. O'Connell, *Op. cit.*, pp.87-142.

51 Raymond Brown, S.S., *Biblical Reflections on Crises Facing the Church*, Paulist Press, NY, 1975, pp.110,111.

Brown has an Appendix entitled, "Some Roman Biblical and Theological Statements Which Have Opened the Church to Change," all of which he claims, support his position, namely that the Bible is only inerrant in matters of faith and morals, and not in matters historical. His technique is to extract a weak or ambiguous sentence from a document which on the whole, strongly upholds the historicity and inerrancy of the Gospels and then boldly claim on the basis of this one sentence, that the document supports his position. Exactly the opposite is the case.

In the early days of St. Benedict Center we became familiar with this technique of the liberals. They would take a weak or ambiguous sentence out of context from an encyclical of Pius IX, and claim that the Pope was teaching that there is salvation outside the Church.

Let me give just one example of Brown's technique. On April 21, 1964, the Pontifical Biblical Commission issued an "Instruction on the Historical Truth of the Gospels." Cardinal Bea, who was then the Cardinal Prefect of the Commission, supplied an extensive commentary in *La Civiltà Cattolica* (Nos. 2735-6, 1964). The Cardinal, who must have been writing from the charisma of his office, said:

"The Instruction affirms that the Gospels are subject to the criteria of historical writing and at the same time are inspired by the Holy Spirit and therefore immune from error...There is no question of a group of enthusiastic fanatics but of a strictly organized society whose very order derived from the precision of its message regarding the person and teaching of Jesus. That is shown for instance, by the introduction of St. Luke's Gospel. He was not concerned to collect every possible story that may have been current regarding Jesus, but with what eyewitnesses had handed down. The term 'witness,' 'testimony' and 'bear witness' occur more than 150 times in the New Testament and mean speaking from personal experience... From this it can be seen what is to be thought of the alleged creative activity of the original community in matters of doctrine. To the extent that there was any such activity at all, it was regarded as sectarian. Christian faith, on the other hand, rested on the testimony of the Apostles on whatever Christ had said and done.

"...There is an apparent way of solving difficulties which must be resisted as a temptation. It is certainly not permissible to say that all that is necessary is to maintain the essential, the religious content, what concerns faith and morals; that the rest is only the mode of presentation...and therefore is not comprised in the inerrancy of Holy Scripture...Christian faith does not consist in abstract principles and a theoretical doctrine, but chiefly historical facts."

Cited in John McKee, *The Enemy Within the Gate, The Catholic Church and Renascent Modernism* Lumen Christi Press, Houston, pp.258-260. This book is an excellent popular presentation of the history of Modernism from its beginnings to the present times.

Yet in spite of Cardinal Bea, Brown boldly sums up this Instruction: "Note the Roman Catholic Church has gone on record stating that the Gospels are not *literal* or chronological accounts of the words and deeds of Jesus" (*Biblical Reflections on Crises Facing the Church*, p.112.)

- 52 *Rome and the Study of Scripture*, Abbey Press, St. Meinrad, IN, 1964, p.175.
- 53 James J. Megivern, *Bible Interpretation*, McGrath Publishing Co., Wilmington, North Carolina 1978, pp.370,371.
- 54 Msgr. John E. Steinmueller, *The Sword of the Spirit*, Stella Maris Books, Ft. Worth, TX, 1977, pp.370,371.
- 55 Cardinal Paul Taguchi, *The Study of Sacred Scripture*, *L'Osservatore Romano*, May 15, 1975. This wonderful position paper appears in its entirety in an Appendix of Monsignor Steinmueller's *The Sword of the Spirit*, cited above.
- 56 For anyone who wishes to examine further the fact that biblical archaeology always confirms the traditional interpretation of Scripture and rebuts the false claims of the Modernists, see *The Stones and the Scriptures*, by the Protestant biblical archaeologist, Edwin Yamauchi, J.B. Lippincot Company, Philadelphia.
- 57 The whole issue of *30 Days*, June 1991, is devoted to this discovery.
- 58 Raymond Brown, S.S., *Jesus, God and Man* Bruce Publishing Co., Milwaukee.
- 59 Brown, *Op. cit.*, pp.77,78, n.59.
- 60 McKee, *The Enemy Within the Gate*, *Op. cit.*, p.4.
- 61 Brown, pp.94,95. In a later book, *Biblical Reflections on Crises Facing the Church*, Brown again comments on whether Our Lord knew that He was God and Messiah:

"Popular understanding of this problem is not helped by those (often polemicists) who tell people that scholars are now doubting whether Jesus knew he was the Messiah. The question is whether 'Messiah,' as that title was understood in his lifetime, satisfactorily described who he was...

"It is another false simplification that Catholic scholars are now doubting whether Jesus knew he was God. Once more Jesus was intuitively aware who he was; the question whether 'God' as understood by a first century Jew (namely, as the Father in heaven) could have described who Jesus was. Christians found 'God' a satisfactory designation, but only after they had enlarged their understanding of the term to include the Son on earth."

Brown, *Biblical Reflections on Crises Facing the Church*, *Op. cit.*, pp.36,37, n.28,29.

In the early days of St. Benedict Center we would find extremely frustrating the answer the liberals would give to the question: "Can anyone be saved outside the Catholic Church?" Answer: "It depends on what you mean by 'Church.'" We never thought it would come to: "Did Jesus know He was the Messiah?" Answer; "It depends on what you mean by 'Messiah.'" "Did Jesus know He was 'God'?" Answer: "It depends on what you mean by 'God.'" But Brown carries it even further:

"We objected above to the question "Did Jesus know he was God?" on the grounds that it does not take into account the semantic problem of what God meant in Jesus' time ('Father'). It is also objectionable because of the ambiguity possible in the word 'know' - one must ask if the questioner is speaking about intuitive consciousness of divinity or express knowledge which involves the ability to find a meaningful formulation of consciousness."

Brown, *Jesus, God and Man*, p.95, n.88.

So, " Did Jesus know He was God?" "It depends on what you mean by 'know '."

62 De Margerie, *Op. cit.*, pp.53,54; Pastoral Letter of the bishops of Belgium on *notre foi en Jesus-Christ*. par. 17, *Nouv. Rev. Theolo.*, 90 (1968), 18.

It probably never occurred to St. Thomas Aquinas that anyone would ask the question so repugnant to common sense, "did Jesus know He was God?" so he does not treat of it in the *Summa* under the knowledge of Christ, but he does discuss how the soul knows itself, in the section on Man, which I will try to apply to Our Lord. For the sake of simplicity, I have deleted as much as possible the Aristotelian terminology, and I have enclosed my own comments in brackets within the body of the article:

"How the Soul Knows Itself

"Whether the Intellectual Soul Knows Itself by Its Essence?"

"...Therefore it is that the Essence of God, the pure and perfect act, is simply and perfectly in itself intelligible; and hence God by His own essence knows Himself, and all other things also. [It is in a similar manner that Jesus knows Himself in the beatific vision, but not completely, since His finite human soul cannot completely comprehend the infinite divine Essence.] the angelic essence belongs, indeed to the genus of the intelligible things as act, but not *pure act*, or a *complete act*, and hence the angel's act of intelligence is not completed by his essence. For although an angel understands himself by his own essence, still he cannot understand all other things by his own essence; for he knows things other than himself by their likeness. [Our Lord's infused knowledge is similar to that of the angels, but superior to them. The angels of course, know who they are, and I can't imagine God not infusing into the soul of His Son, a knowledge of His Divinity and of His mission as Messiah.] Now the human intellect is only a potentiality in the genus of intelligible beings...and hence it is called passive...There the intellect knows itself not by its essence but by its act."

St. Thomas, I, Q. 87, Art. 1.

This is how Our Lord knows who He is by His acquired knowledge, not immediately or directly as He knows Himself by His beatific and infused knowledges, but indirectly by reasoning discursively. A baby certainly doesn't know who he is or what his vocation is; he knows only what is appropriate for his stage in life. So Our Lord in His acquired knowledge had a certain nescience (a word I prefer to ignorance, as we saw above) as to His identity proper to His age. Certainly by the time He was 12, as we read in the Finding in the Temple, "How is it that you sought me? did you not know that I must be doing my Father's work?" (Luke 2:49), Jesus understood even by His acquired knowledge that He was the Son of God and the Messiah.

63 St Cyril of Alexandria, *The Later Christian Fathers*, edited and translated by Henry Bettensen, Oxford University Press, London, 1970, p.257.

64 De Margerie, pp.54,55.
