

There is agreement that Easter meant, in effect, that “the once” became “the once-for-all.” But what kind of a change is this? My answer is that it’s the same kind of change of which the predication of christological titles of the subject Jesus is the reflection. If this is correct, however, it’s important to observe what happens both to the subject Jesus and to any of the several christological predicates by virtue of this change.

Put schematically, one can say that both terms—predicate and subject—interpret each other. The predicate interprets the subject Jesus (formally) as the explicit primal ontic authorizing source of a certain self-understanding and religious faith. The subject, on the other hand, interprets the implicit primal ontic authorizing source (materially) as authorizing just the self-understanding and religious faith that the subject authorizes explicitly.

A further consequence of this mutual interpretation is crucial, although often unnoticed. If, by virtue of the predicate’s interpretation of the subject, none other than Jesus must be said to be the explicit primal ontic authorizing source of a certain self-understanding and religious faith, it must be said just as emphatically that all that is meant by “Jesus” on this interpretation is the explicit primal ontic source authorizing this self-understanding and religious faith.

In this way, “the once” that becomes “the once-for-all” becomes none other than the event *as* decisively authorizing this self-understanding and religion. Of course, one may say that “the once” must also be whatever can be shown to be necessarily implied by its being just such an explicit primal ontic authorizing source. And *reductio*, or “transcendental,” arguments are insofar entirely in order. But one must watch all such arguments very, very closely, being especially on guard that the inference from premises or warrants to conclusion doesn’t somehow involve, however subtly, the fallacy of four terms.

13 September 2003