

Marxsen recommends that the term, "the historical Jesus," be used and defined in keeping with Reimarus's use and definition—according to which it refers to Jesus as he actually was *before anyone ventured any interpretation of him* (cf., e.g., *Jesus and Easter*: 16).

My problem with this recommendation is that it collapses the—for certain purposes—important distinction between "Jesus as he really was" and "the historical Jesus," i.e., "the actual Jesus" and "the Jesus that is now recoverable by historical means" (cf. Van A. Harvey, *The Historian and the Believer*: 266).

Accordingly, I use and define "the historical Jesus" (more exactly, "the *empirical*-historical Jesus," as distinct from "the *existential*-historical Jesus") to mean "the actual Jesus of the past insofar as he is knowable to us today by way of empirical-historical inquiry using the writings of the New Testament as sources" (*The Point of Christology*: 44).

21 February 2000