

I have argued that "[t]aking something to be revelation actually involves a *double taking*," i.e., the subject receiving revelation "first takes something as re-presenting a certain possibility of self-understanding; and only then does (or can) the subject also take this possibility to be our authentic possibility as human beings" (Notebooks, 15 November 1999; rev. 7 December 2008).

But this, clearly applies the same distinction Bultmann makes when he distinguishes between "understanding [or translating] the text," which "can take place only by methodical [historical] interpretation," even as "the conceptuality guiding such interpretation can be acquired only by the kind of profane reflection that is the business of a philosophical analysis of existence," and "hearing God's word in faith," which "can only be the work of the Holy Spirit" (*NTM*: 106 f.; cf. also *K. Barth-R. Bultmann Briefwechsel*: 173 f., where he makes the same distinction by contrasting "understanding the question of decision addressed to me in the text," which is identical with translating the text, with "the believing yes" to this question, which is *not* identical with translating the text and "can be understood only as the gift of the Holy Spirit [*donum Spiritus Sancti*]").

7 February 2001; rev. 8 December 2008