

Clearly, Marxsen's distinction between "*Jesus in historischer Vorfindlichkeit*" and "*die unmittelbare apostolische Bezeugung Jesu durch den Glauben*" (NTBK: 82) is his—to my mind, less than adequate—way of recognizing what I call respectively "the empirical-historical Jesus," relative to whom the earliest witness is forced to play the alien role of (primary) empirical-historical source, and "the existential-historical Jesus," relative to whom that same earliest witness is allowed to play its proper role as (primary) existential-historical authority.

I say that Marxsen's way of making this distinction is, in my judgment, less than adequate because if he is right that "the beginning" that is "the norm" is "the immediate apostolic witness to Jesus through faith," then it is misleading for him to say that this makes his earlier statement that "the beginning" is Jesus himself more precise; and it is nonsense to speak, as he goes on to do in the next sentence, of "the apostolic witness to the norm," because he has just said that the apostolic witness *is* "the norm"!

Later, Marxsen speaks of "*der im Kerygma ^{begegnende} ~~bezeugende~~ Jesus*" (105). In a somewhat similar, even if also awkward, way, he could—and, arguably, should—have spoken here of "*der in der unmittelbaren apostolischen Bezeugung Jesu durch den Glauben begegnende Jesus.*"

Still later, however, Marxsen returns to his original claim that "the norm for later proclamation is Jesus," and thus to speaking about "the apostolic witness to the norm" (105 f.).

26 May 1997