

I argued some time ago that "one must be careful not to mislocate [the] 'objective' component [*sc.* of the revelatory correlation] [T]he 'objective' component is not simply the something taken, but the something taken *in that particular way*—namely, as re-presenting a certain possibility of self-understanding, which itself is then taken to be the possibility of understanding oneself authentically. Accordingly, the relevant question in determining whether or not what is taken to be revelation really is so is not whether someone has *re-presented* our authentic possibility by what she or he has intended to say and do, or has, in fact, said and done, but whether the possibility that someone *is taken to re-present* is correctly taken as that authentic possibility" (Notebooks, 15 November 1999; rev. 7 December 2008).

But I must say that I had not clearly realized an important implication of this argument until relatively recently, in the course of reflecting further on my principle that meaning-for-us is, in an appropriate sense, *determined by* structure-in-itself. To apply this principle rightly in christology requires carefully distinguishing the structure-in-itself of the *empirical*-historical Jesus from that of the *existential*-historical Jesus. Why? Well, because the only structure-in-itself that is relevant to determining the truth of the christological assertion is that of Jesus re-presenting the possibility of self-understanding that he *is experienced as re-presenting*—as distinct from the structure-in-itself of the possibility that he himself re-presented by what he ~~is~~ⁱⁿ fact thought, said, and did, not to mention the possibility that he himself actualized.

This, of course, is why I can say in my entry, "Jesus Christ, systematic," that the inquiry required to establish the credibility of the christological assertion "has nothing to do with establishing irrelevant claims about either the deity of Jesus or his sinless humanity, after the fashion of the prevalent forms of traditional christology, both classical and revisionary. The only thing that has to be established if any formulation [*sc.* of the assertion] is to be validated as credible is that the possibility of self-understanding that

Jesus decisively re-presents is the authentic possibility implicitly presented to each of us by ultimate reality itself as soon and as long as we exist humanly at all."

19 January 2008; rev. 7 December 2008