

Traditionally, there have been two basic ways of asserting Jesus' decisive existential significance: *mythological* and *legendary*.

And there have been two basic ways of asserting Jesus' decisive significance mythologically: *adoptionist* and *incarnationist*.

Traditionally, the legendary way of asserting Jesus' decisive significance is not independent of the mythological ways but has its place in the context of one or the other of them.

* * * * *

Arguably, the two assertions constituting Christian witness explicitly as such have each involved a necessary presupposition—these being, accordingly, the constitutive presuppositions of Christian witness. These are (1) the *theological* presupposition that God as conceived by radical monotheism is (formally) strictly ultimate reality in its meaning for us, and, conversely, that strictly ultimate reality in its meaning for us is (materially) God as conceived by radical monotheism; and (2) the *christological* presupposition that the fully real human being Jesus is (formally) the decisive re-presentation of the meaning of God for us, God being as conceived by radical monotheism, and, conversely, that the decisive re-presentation of the meaning of God for us as so conceived is (materially) the fully real human being Jesus.

Because this is so, a priori christology is not simply thought and speech about the primal ontic source, whoever or whatever it may be, explicitly authorizing authentic existence. Although a priori christology is indeed thought and speech about just such a source, the converse statement is false: thought and speech about just such a source need not be a priori christology. For even an a priori christology further presupposes that the decisive re-presentation of the meaning of God for us is (materially) a fully real human being, even as any fully real human being about whom it could be true could only be (formally) the decisive re-presentation of the meaning of God for us, God being as conceived ~~as~~ by radical monotheism

* * * * *

According to the a priori christology presupposed by *orthodox christology*, x , for any possible value of x , can be truly asserted to be of decisive significance for human existence if, and only if, x is not only a fully real human being, but also actualizes God's unique possibility of acting decisively to save all other human (and understanding) beings.

According to the a priori christology presupposed by *traditional revisionary christology*, x , for any possible value of x , can be truly asserted to be of decisive significance for human existence if, and only if, x is not only a fully real human being, but also actualizes her or his possibility of attaining a perfect human existence in relation to God—"a perfect human existence" being the ideal or unsurpassable actualization of the authentic existence that God at least implicitly authorizes in the case of every human (and understanding) being.

According to the a priori christology presupposed by *revised revisionary christology*, x , for any possible value of x , can be truly asserted to be of decisive significance for human existence if, and only if, x is not only a fully real human being, but also decisively re-presents the meaning of God for us and, therewith, our possibility of authentic existence as human (and understanding) beings in relation to God.

11 April 2006