

The distinction between *Jesus-in-his-being-in-himself* and *Jesus-in-his-meaning-for-us* is not really but only verbally different from the distinction between *the "what" of the actual Jesus* and *his "that."* Both parts of the distinction have to do with the actual Jesus, and both parts have an exclusively ontic reference, the *"that"* of the actual Jesus, and so the meaning of Jesus for us, being as much an event of the past prior to and independent of us as his *"what,"* or the being of Jesus in himself, is such a past event.

It is otherwise, however, with the distinction between *the empirical-historical Jesus* and *the existential-historical Jesus*, since in this case there is in both parts of the distinction not only an ontic reference to the actual Jesus as an event of the past, but also a noetic reference to someone for whom the actual Jesus is such an event, whether an *empirical-historical* event or an *existential-historical* event, or, possibly, both.

Spring 1991; rev. 9 October 2004