

The *Mediator*



A Journal of Holiness Theology for Asia-Pacific Contexts

**ASIA-PACIFIC NAZARENE
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY**

Bridging Cultures for Christ
1 Timothy 2:5

Ortigas Avenue Extension, Kaytikling
Taytay, Rizal 1920
Republic of the Philippines

Telephone: (63-2) 658-5872
Fax: (63-2) 658-4510
Website: www.apnts.edu.ph
E-mail: mediator@apnts.edu.ph

Volume X, Number 1
December 2014

The Mediator provides a forum for dialogue about theological issues related to ministry in Asian and Pacific contexts. The views expressed in the Journal reflect those of the authors and not necessarily the views of the seminary, its administration, or the editorial committee.

The Mediator is the official journal of Asia-Pacific Nazarene Theological Seminary and has been in publication since 1996. Please send all correspondence, comments, or questions to the editor at the address below.

The Mediator
Asia-Pacific Nazarene Theological Seminary
Ortigas Ave. Ext., Kaytikling
Taytay, 1920 Rizal
PHILIPPINES

Email: mediator@apnts.edu.ph

Website: <http://www.apnts.edu.ph/resources/mediator/>

Editor: Darin Land, Ph.D., Associate Professor of New Testament, APNTS

Consulting Editor: Mitchel Modine, Ph.D., Associate Professor of Old Testament, APNTS

© Asia-Pacific Nazarene Theological Seminary, 2014. The authors retain copyright to their individual articles.

ISSN 1655-4175

Permission to quote from the Holy Bible, New International Version® (NIV). Copyright © 1973, 1978, 1984 by International Bible Society. All rights reserved.

Scripture quotations taken from the New American Standard Bible®, Copyright © 1960, 1962, 1963, 1968, 1971, 1972, 1973, 1975, 1977, 1995 by The Lockman Foundation. Used by permission. (www.Lockman.org)

Permission to quote from the Contemporary English Version® (CEV). Copyright © 1995, by American Bible Society. All rights reserved.

Table of Contents

List of Contributors	iv
Preface.....	v
A Knowledge, Attitudes, and Practices (KAP) Study on Dengue Fever among the Rowenas Community in the Philippines	1
<i>Dong-Hwan Kwon and Rey Lemuel Crizaldo</i>	
Synthesis Searching: The Continuing Influence of F. C. Baur	23
<i>Darin H. Land</i>	
Theological Poetry	
In the Tension	57
<i>Anderson Godoy S.</i>	
Kristaa Nun Thar [New Life in Christ]	58
<i>Lal Pek Mawia</i>	
When I Found You	62
<i>Josephine J. Bodegas</i>	
By the Grace of God.....	63
<i>Lee, Jung Yeol</i>	
Who Is Jesus?.....	65
<i>Ernesto Lozano Fernandez</i>	
우리의 발을 씻기셨죠 [You Washed Our Feet]	66
<i>Park, Seonmok</i>	
Call for Papers	69
Information	70

List of Contributors

Josephine J. Bodegas

M.Div. Student, APNTS

Rey Lemuel Crizaldo

Advocacy Coordinator, Micah Challenge Philippines *and*
Faculty of Social Work, Asian Seminary of Christian Ministry

Ánderson Godoy S

M.Div. Graduate, APNTS

Dong Hwan “Bill” Kwon

Adjunct Professor of Christian Communication, APNTS

Lal Pek Mawia

M.Div. Student, APNTS

Darin H. Land

Associate Professor of New Testament, APNTS

Lee, Jung Yeol

M.Div. Student, APNTS

Ernesto Lozano Fernandez

M.Div. Student, APNTS

Park, Seonmok

M.Div. Student, APNTS

Nativity A. Petallar

Assistant Professor of Christian Education, APNTS

Preface

The present issue may be regarded as an epistemological sampler. Each article takes a distinctive approach to ways of knowing.

Our first article, from professors Kwon and Crizaldo, takes a decidedly modern tack yet reaches a markedly post-modern conclusion. Using the standard tools of qualitative social sciences, they tackle the problem of knowledge, attitudes, and practices relative to dengue prevention in a community located adjacent to Asia-Pacific Nazarene Theological Seminary. The surprising conclusion is that there is no significant relationship between knowledge and practice on the variables tested.

My article follows a historical/philosophical epistemological methodology to examine the perdurability of one person's ideas, even when those ideas are widely rejected or even forgotten. Tracing the influence of F. C. Baur over a period of some 150 years, this article hints at a larger, meta-historical implication.

The final article—or better, collection of entries—departs from the previous two articles. Probing theological themes, these poems reside at the intersections of cognitive, emotive, and personal ways of knowing. The poets explore eschatology (Godoy), soteriology (Lal Pek Mawia, Bodegas, and Lee), and Christology (Lozano and Park). These poems form a fitting conclusion to the present issue, being found in an academic journal yet tracing multivalent approaches to epistemology.

Darin H. Land, Ph.D.

Editor, *The Mediator*

Associate Professor of New Testament, APNTS

A Knowledge, Attitudes, and Practices (KAP) Study on Dengue Fever among the Rowenas Community in the Philippines¹

Dong-Hwan Kwon and Rey Lemuel Crizaldo

Abstract

A survey was conducted to assess the level of knowledge, attitudes, and practices relating to Dengue Fever (DF) among an urban poor community, called Rowenas, in the Philippines from July 4-8, 2011. Out of the 50 surveys, 48 were valid for analysis. More than half (56.3%) of the participants had moderate knowledge about DF, whereas 93.8% recalled that television was their main source of information on DF. The primary respondents' attitude was negative. Half of the respondents (50%) had moderate practice, whereas 39.2% of the participants did considerable prevention practice in their everyday life. There is no significant association found between demographic information and practice relating to Dengue Fever. Nor was a significant association found between knowledge and attitudes and practice level. It is, therefore, recommended to implement level of knowledge into practices.

Background of the Study

Within the span of the past sixty years, Dengue Fever (DF) or Dengue Haemorrhagic Fever (DHF) dramatically became a major international public health concern. DF/DHF is a mosquito-transmitted disease which causes a flu-like illness that could harm a person's life. A particular mosquito, *Aedes aegypti*, carries this fatal disease. *A. aegypti* is found in tropical and sub-tropical regions around the world, predominantly in urban and semi-urban areas where the affected areas around the globe are continuously spreading heavily. For instance, by June 2013, the Department of Health (DoH) of the Philippines reported 42,027 cases and 193 cases died due to Dengue Fever (GMA News, 2013).² The disease is one of

¹ Researcher thanks Korean Food for the Hungry Int'l for funding for Dengue Prevention and Control Project. We also thank research assistants from Rowenas for collecting data in the community.

² The dengue cases have rapidly increased in the past few years. Department of Health reported 11, 915 cases in 2007; 13,014 cases in 2008; 49,319 cases in 2009; and 119,789 in 2010, which led to 724 cases of death (Uy, 2010).

the most fatal viral diseases in the world, and it is the fastest increasing mosquito-borne viral disease (WHO, 2009).

Notably, DF/DHF has been increasing due to the rapid urbanization and globalization process in the south. It has been associated with rapid expansion of urban population without proper infrastructure for living (such as inadequate potable water supply, solid waste collection system and unplanned illegal settlers). Temperature and humidity affect the rate of mosquito larval development, adult survival, vector size and gonotrophic (literally reproductive-feeding) cycle as well as extrinsic and intrinsic incubation periods (EIP) of the virus in the vector. Increased breeding and survival of vector populations can lead to rapid replication of the virus (Nerlander et al., 2011). DF/DHF, therefore, has been a general concern in developing countries, especially in the global south, that cityhood and fast urbanization most often bypassed the rigorous strategic planning of the different sectors of the local government unit (LGU) (Parks & Lloyd, 2004; WHO, 2009).

To eliminate DF/DFH, the ownership of the dengue prevention project has been in the center of discussion among medical experts and development scholars. Inspired by Brazilian social reformer and educator, Fraire (1970), and Quebral in Asia (1971) community communication for social change provides an alternative model in the social mobilization and communication approach (Melkote & Krishnatray, 2012). Compared to the scientific and linear development paradigm, it emphasizes a process of liberation and deliberation (Vargas, 1995; White, 1994) and proactive social participation for social changes (Díaz Bordenave, 1994; Nair & White, 1994a).

On the other hand, health and community development utilizes knowledge, attitudes and practices (KAP) studies as a means of understanding the cognitive and behavioral aspects of preventive intervention. The KAP research design has been widely used to diagnosis the present awareness of any kinds of diseases and practices and to test the effectiveness of any treatment or intervention program for any health-related issues. The topics include family planning (Baba, 1990), HIV/AIDS-related issues (Mishra, 1998; Atulomah & Oladepo, 2002; Crossley, 2004), travel-related infectious diseases (Van Herck et al., 2003; Van et al., 2004), and women's health issues such as breast cancer self-examination (Leslie, 2003; Seo,

2003; Tae & Kim, 2003; Jung et al, 2002) and breast feeding (Spear, 2004). KAP studies have also been utilized in order to analyze the level of status quo of community members in DF and DHF prevention and control (Ahmed et al, 2008; Santos, 2006).

The Rowenas community, located in Taytay City in the Philippines, is a typical urban poor community whose nature and composition represents the dark side of urbanization in the Philippines. Located in the outskirts of Metro Manila, a first class urban municipality of the Rizal province, Rowenas community has been formed over decades from various groups who migrated to Metro Manila for a living. The migration is ongoing, according to the Barangay officials.³ The area of Rowenas is home to an estimated 1,236 people residing in 260 houses. More than half of these households accommodate extended families. The majority of Rowenas residents are challenged in providing for their members' basic needs (i.e., education, shelter, water, and health care) since 81.5% of the households have monthly earnings of 12,000 pesos and below. Only 59 houses can afford to install the Manila Water Line, while 77.7% do not personally own access to clean water for drinking. As a result of struggles for the environment and low income, the Rural Health Unit (RHU) has reported that there were 82 cases of DF/ DHF admitted in hospitals in RHU-1, Barangay Dolores Area alone in 2010.⁴

This study, therefore, attempts to measure the Knowledge, Attitudes, and Practices of urban poor residents with DF or DHF as a preliminary understanding for the basis of "Dengue Prevention and Control Project."⁵ The purpose of this project is to create a pilot program for an effective Dengue Prevention and Control Program implementing a participatory approach in community development. The communication aspect in this

³ Taytay City reached 262,485 inhabitants in 48,620 households. The population has reached more or less 300,000 in 2011. Barangay Dolores, which is the most populated barangay among the five barangays of Taytay City, has 59, 914 (August 2007, Census). As of 2011, the barangay officials already estimated that they have about more or less 80,000 residents due to fast migration into the center barangay of the town (Personal interview with Poblacion).

⁴ This community survey was done by the project for an initial understanding of the community. Many thanks to the community youth who collected and analyzed the survey data. This survey data was compiled by Kwon and Callejo (2013).

⁵ This project was funded by Korea Food for the Hungry International (KFHI).

program is a vital part of the intervention to enhance dengue prevention and control in an urban poor community in the Philippines. The research problems are as follows:

1. What is the profile of respondents?
2. What are the levels of Knowledge, Attitudes, and Practices on Dengue Fever and prevention programs among community members?
3. Is there any significant relationship between Knowledge, Attitudes and Practices?

Review of Literature

Christian Approaches to Environmental Preservation

There is a close link between theology, poverty and concern for the environment. Lynn White (1967) called Christians accountable for today's environmental crisis. He roots the modern ecological crisis in the historic Christian doctrine of "dominion over nature." He argued that the environmental abuse committed by the Western Christian world has been staged by this "power" supposedly granted to humans. According to White, since "the roots of our trouble are largely religious, the remedy must also be essentially religious. We must rethink and refeel our nature and destiny" (White, 1967).

Nowadays, environmental degradation and mass poverty are recognized to be two of the most pressing challenges in the world. Nitschke (2007) noted that the correlation between the two is quite strong given the fact that the poor live in the most environmentally devastated places. Given the growing thrust of Christian missiology towards holistic transformation, concerns for environmental sustainability have started to be integrated in current evangelical Christian responses to addressing poverty. In 2004, a global network of evangelical denominations and relief organizations under the banner of "The Micah Challenge" adopted the framework of the United Nations Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) by 2015 (Thacker and Hoek, 2008).

Certain elements of natural life serve as barometers of environmental health. This includes the presence of butterflies, bees, birds, mosquitoes and other insects—the massive presence of mosquitoes being the negative indication of poor sanitation and poor environmental care. Among the ur-

ban poor settlers, environment has serious health consequences, with dengue infection as one of the most serious concerns.

Best Approaches in Dengue Prevention

Due to the continuous spreading of Dengue Fever (DF) or Dengue Haemorrhagic Fever (DHF) and its emergence as one of the most serious health problems, the World Health Organization (WHO) has conducted intensive studies for the prevention and control of the disease. Much of the research focuses on conceptualization of control programs (WHO, 2008; 2009; Parks & Lloyd, 2008).

Increasingly, DF/DHF prevention and control programs emphasize communication and attitude change of the community members. Will Parks and Linda Lloyd (2004) have provided every country with a step-by-step guide for DF/DHF prevention and control which highlights the significance of social mobilization and effective communication in implementing programs. That public education is necessary to address knowledge gaps is confirmed through studies such as that of Nahida Ahmed which looked into the level of knowledge, attitude, and practice among the people of Male', Maldives (2007). Her finding that knowledge had significant positive association with practice of dengue prevention was consistent with two previously conducted studies (Koenraad et al., 2006; van Benthem, et al., 2002). Both studies showed that people with knowledge of dengue reported a significantly higher use of prevention measures than people without knowledge of dengue. The study of Wan Rozita et al. (2006), among the people of Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia, also echoed a similar observation with emphasis on using mass media in designing information and education campaigns.

Evidence of successful DF/DHF prevention and control programs comes from nation-wide and top-down approaches. Some countries such as Hong Kong, Singapore, and Queensland in Australia have come up with strategic government planning and implementation (<http://www.cdc.gov>, August 2011). These countries have systematic and intensive programs on capacity building, sustainability, budget, ownership, political will, specific health legislations, law enforcements, and participatory systems which are some key elements in the success of implementation. Still many development projects used a "top-down" approach, while others

combined “top-down” and “bottom-up” approaches.

Fortunately, a community based health care approach has opened up a combination of “top-down” and “down-up” that integrate external intervention from experts, NGOs, to the participation of local beneficiaries. Some studies argued that it is imperative that the community participates in eliminating mosquito breeding with targeted awareness campaigns and community engagement strategies (DMP, 2011), with community ownership and the inclusion of grassroots organizations as a major requirement for effective long-term control of dengue (NEA, 2005). The study of Rozita et al. (2005) made strong recommendations that in cooperative community action, young people rather than adults within the community are better tapped and used for implementing control programs. In consideration with the principle of dynamic, participatory, and synergistic facilitation, the Community-Based Health Care (CBHC) system model best fits the implementation of the social mobilization and intimate communication approach (CBHC Model, WHO, 2004).

The Philippine Experience

The Philippines has done intensive “top-down” approaches and strategies in order to communicate and mobilize the community through the Department of Health (DoH). Many partnerships have also been established among the other government offices and DoH. Also, the 4S Program of the Department of Health is thoroughly promoted and well campaigned in media forms. The 4S Program includes the following processes: search and destroy, self-protection measures, seek early consultation, and say no to indiscriminate fogging. In spite of the information dissemination, campaigns, and DoH partnerships to increase knowledge and awareness, there was still a dramatic increase of DF from 2009 to 2010. Dr. Eric Tayag, the Head of the National Epidemiology Center, said that the rise of the number of dengue cases by 75 percent clearly indicated that Filipino households had gone back to old habits (Uy, 2010).

As an example of the campaign of the DoH and other sectors in the government, the month of June is the month of Awareness of Dengue, and the DoH and DepEd Secretaries visit schools and communities to remind the local people of dengue (Uy, 2010). Yet it was pointed out that the primary Philippine strategies in dengue prevention are so-called, “post-

incident measures” and compared to the “pre incident measures” (Cervantes, July 2011, 2008). The attitude of the Filipinos towards DF/DHF prevention and control has a low correlation to the extensive campaign for knowledge and awareness by the government. Failures are still evident based on the national statistics of dengue mortality.

Research Methodology

This study is quantitative and descriptive in nature, employing a survey with open-ended questions as its primary research method. The survey study was conducted at Rowenas Community, Dolores Barangay, Taytay, Rizal. It seeks to describe the current status of the knowledge, attitude, and practice of the residents of Rowenas Community with regards to dengue infection and prevention. A survey instrument was prepared to elicit answers from the residents. The team purposefully chose random samples of 50, but only 48 questionnaires were finished. Based on the later household survey data, totaling 128 households, the size of the sample is about 40% of the total population. Purposive random sampling methods were used (at least three houses interval in the community). The Rowenas community was divided into five clusters: Bungad, Harapan (community entrance area), Lower Gitna, Upper Gitna, and Purok Dos. Data gathering was done on July 4-8, 2011 at the Rowenas community. The interpretation of data relies mainly on results of descriptive statistical analysis, which include Chi-square Test and Spearman Rank Rho Correlation for inference. SPSS 14 was used to test the data.

Findings

General Knowledge about Dengue in the Community

Demographic Information about the Participants

The study was conducted at Rowenas Community, Dolores Barangay, Taytay, Rizal. There were forty-eight (48) individuals participating in the survey. As set forth in the tables below, the mean age of the participants was 38 years with a standard deviation of 11.17. The ages ranged from 18 to 61 years. Most of the participants were female (91.7%), married (77.1%), had completed secondary education (52.1%), and unemployed (60.4%), Furthermore, a great number of them had a monthly income

ranging from PhP 3,001 to PhP 5,000. Thus, the data reveal that most of the participants are economically marginalized.

	Frequency	Percent
Age (years)		
18-29	11	22.9
30-41	17	35.4
42-53	16	33.3
54 and above	4	8.3
Gender		
Male	4	8.3
Female	44	91.7
Marital Status		
Single	10	20.8
Married	37	77.1
Separated	1	2.1
Educational Attainment		
Elementary Graduate	16	33.3
Secondary Graduate	25	52.1
College Graduate	4	8.3
Graduate Level	3	6.3
Employment Status		
Employed	15	31.3
Economically Active	4	8.3
Unemployed	29	60.4
Monthly Income (PhP)		
None	13	27.1
1,500-3,000	7	14.6
3,001-5,000	16	33.3
5,001 and above	12	25.0

Table 1: Demographic Information

Information about Dengue

Among the respondents, most had received some sort of information on dengue (77.1%) through television (93.8%). Other sources of information on dengue were friends (4.2%) and radio (2.1%).

Received Information about Dengue Fever	Frequency	Percent
Yes	37	77.1
No	11	22.9
Total	48	100

Table 2: Received Information about Dengue Fever

Source of Information	Frequency	Percent
TV	45	93.8
Radio	1	2.1
Friends	2	4.2
Total	48	100

Table 3: Source of Information on Dengue Fever

Knowledge on Dengue Fever

Distribution of knowledge on Dengue Fever disclosed that more than half (56.3%) of the respondents had moderate knowledge, 43.8% had low knowledge, and none had great knowledge. Details on the correct responses of the participants are provided in Table 5.

Level	Frequency	Percent
Low (0-8 scores)	21	43.8
Moderate (9-11 scores)	27	56.3
Great (12-14 scores)	0	0
Total	48	100

Table 4: Distribution of Knowledge Level on Dengue Fever

Knowledge of Dengue Fever Answered by the Respondents (n=48)

The top five correct answers on knowledge of Dengue Fever reported by

the respondents are: empty stagnant water from old tires, trash cans, and flower pots can be breeding places for mosquitoes (96%); Dengue Fever is a severe, flu-like illness that affects infants, young children and adults (94%); dengue viruses are transmitted to humans through bites of infective female *Aedes aegypti* (90%); dengue patients have chills, headache, pain upon moving the eyes, and low backache (83%); and the only method of controlling dengue infection is to combat the vector mosquitoes (79%).

The questions least answered correctly by respondents include: mosquitoes that transmit dengue infection lay their eggs in dirty sewage water (15%); stored water containers/tanks for drinking water if not covered should be cleaned every 7 days (15%); the possibility of getting Dengue Fever if one of the family members has Dengue Fever (25%); and rainy season is the only epidemic season for dengue infection (25%).

As to the possibility and degree of infection, 48% of the respondents “agree” that everybody has a chance to be infected with the dengue virus and the majority of people (77%) disagree that a strong and healthy person will not get dengue infection. More than half (60%) “disagree” that a person who once got dengue infection cannot get dengue infection again but only 13% “strongly agree” that it is possible to recover completely from dengue infection.

As to the possibility and ways of preventing infection (Table 6), half (50%) of the respondents “agree” that Dengue Fever is a disease that cannot be prevented. Fortunately, more than half “agree” that they are important people in preventing the spread of the infection, and 66% “strongly disagree” that elimination of larval breeding sources is a waste of time and very complicated. More than half (52%) “agree” that sleeping in a mosquito net can prevent dengue infection, 45% disagree that only smogging is enough to prevent mosquitoes with no need for other preventative measures, and more than a quarter (27%) of the respondents “strongly agree” that eliminating the breeding places of the mosquitoes is the responsibility of the public health staff and health volunteers.

Item	Frequency	Percentage
The principal mosquito vector for Dengue Fever is <i>Aedes aegypti</i> .	30	62.5

Dengue Fever is a severe, flu-like illness that affects infants, young children and adults.	45	93.8
Dengue patients have chills, headache, pain upon moving the eyes, and low backache.	40	83.3
Rainy season is the only epidemic season for dengue infection.	12	25
Mosquitoes transmitting dengue infection bite only during day time.	32	66.7
The mosquito that transmits dengue infection lays its eggs in dirty sewage water.	7	14.6
Empty stagnant water from old tires, trash cans, and flower pots can be breeding places for mosquitoes.	46	95.8
Dengue viruses are transmitted to humans through bites of infective female <i>A. aegypti</i> .	43	89.6
Only method of controlling dengue infection is to combat the vector mosquitoes.	38	79.2
There is no specific treatment for dengue infection, and the drug of choice is paracetamol.	23	47.9
Abate sand can be beneficial in killing the mosquito larvae.	28	58.3
Abate sand, if put in standing water, can help prevent the mosquito breeding for 3 months.	23	47.9
Stored water containers/tanks for drinking water if not being covered should be cleaned every 7 days.	7	14.6
I am afraid of getting Dengue Fever if one of my family members has Dengue Fever.	12	25

Table 5: On Knowledge of Dengue Fever by the Respondents (n=48)

Statement	Percentage				Mean
	Disagree	Uncertain	Agree	Strongly Agree	
Positive:					
Only method of controlling or preventing dengue infection is to combat the vector mosquitoes.	10.4	14.6	31.3	43.8	3.08
Everybody has a chance to be infected with dengue virus.	6.3	18.8	47.9	27.1	2.95

It is possible to recover completely from dengue infection	35.4	35.4	16.7	12.5	2.06
Restricting and checking the availability of potential breeding habits should be conducted 1-2 times/year.	66.7	6.3	18.8	8.3	1.68
Sleeping in mosquito net can prevent dengue infection.	4.2	6.3	52.1	37.5	3.22
You are one of the important people in preventing Dengue Fever.	2.1	4.2	54.2	39.6	3.31
Negative:					
Dengue Fever is a disease that cannot be prevented.	27.1	12.5	50	10.4	2.43
Eliminating the breeding places is the responsibility of the public health staff and health volunteers.	31.3	16.7	25	27.1	2.47
Only smogging is enough to prevent mosquitoes, and there is no need for other ways.	45.8	10.4	31.3	12.5	2.10
Persons who once got dengue infection cannot get dengue infection again.	60.4	25	8.3	6.3	1.60
Elimination of larval breeding sources is a waste of time and very complicated.	66.7	12.5	16.7	4.2	1.58
Strong and healthy persons will not get dengue infection.	77.1	8.3	12.5	2.1	1.39

Table 6: Percentage of Responses on the Attitude towards Dengue Fever

Attitude towards Dengue Fever

The participants of the study answered 12 items which had a total score of 60. Distribution of attitude towards Dengue Fever indicated that 95.8% of the participants had negative attitude, 4.2% had neutral attitude, and none had positive attitude. The mean attitude score for all participants was 27.9

of the total 60 scores. The lowest score was 18, whereas the highest score was 48.

Level	Frequency	Percent
Negative (12-40 scores)	46	95.8
Neutral (41-46 scores)	2	4.2
Positive (47-60 scores)	0	0
Total	48	100
<i>Mean = 27.93 SD = 5.34 Minimum = 18 Maximum = 48</i>		

Table 7: Level of Attitudes on Dengue

Practices on Dengue Fever

Items Which Participants Have and Do Not Have in the Households

As shown in the table below, a greater number of the participants reported that they had water tanks with covers (91.7%) and flower pots (52.1%) in their houses. However, more than half of them claimed that they did not have indoor plants (66.7%) and plates supporting the flower pots (64.6%).

Item	Have		Do Not Have	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
Covers for water tanks	44	91.7	4	8.3
Water tanks	44	91.7	4	8.3
Flower pots	25	52.1	23	47.9
Indoor plants	16	33.3	32	66.7
Plates supporting flower pots	17	35.4	31	64.6

Table 8: Items Which Participants Have and Don't Have in the Households

Distribution of Practice Levels for Dengue Fever Prevention

As presented in Table 9, half of the participants (50%) had fair practice, 29.2% had good practice and 20.8% had low practice. The mean practice score for all participants was 5.45, based on the correct responses they provided vis-à-vis the eight items in Table 10.

Level	Frequency	Percent
Low (0-4 scores)	10	20.8
Fair (5-6 scores)	24	50.0
Good (7-8 scores)	14	29.2
Total	48	100
<i>Mean = 5.45 SD = 1.79 Minimum = 1 Maximum = 8</i>		

Table 9: Distribution of Practice Levels for Dengue Fever Prevention

Practice of Dengue Fever Prevention, As Answered by the Respondents

As to the items correctly answered by the respondents with regards to various practices of preventing dengue, the top five include: immediately covering water jars after use (92%), examining mosquito larvae in water containers in the toilet (88%), disposing refuse into the garbage (81%), using mosquito net/mosquito coils in the house (77%), and checking and cleaning roof gutters during rainy season (69%). The least correctly answered item was examining any discarded thing that can hold water around the house (52%).

All of the respondents say that they cover all stored water containers/tanks and water jars, 77% observe that the house environment is kept neat and tidy, and 62% observe that there is no kind of stored water containers inside the toilet. However, 71% answered negatively in observing that there is no dirty water in the flower vases or indoor plants, or forms of water collection on the plates of flower pots at home (69%), or dirty water in the drinking containers for pets (60%), or if there are coconut shells, discarded bottles, cans or anything that can hold water around the house (58%).

Item	Frequency	Percentage
Covering water jars immediately after use.	44	91.7
Examining any refuse that can hold water around the house.	25	52.1
Disposing discarded thing into the garbage.	39	81.3
Using mosquito net/mosquito coils in the house.	37	77.1
Participating in any campaigns on dengue infection prevention in the community.	27	56.3
Participating when community has been sprayed fog.	31	64.6

Examining mosquito larvae in water containers in the toilet.	42	87.5
Checking and cleaning roof gutters during rainy season.	33	68.8

Table 10: Number and Percentage of Items on Practice of Dengue Fever Prevention Answered Correctly by the Respondents (n=48)

Observation Results

Item	Yes		No	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
The house environment is kept neat and tidy.	37	77.1	7	14.6
Dirty water in the flower vases or indoor plants.	14	29.2	34	70.8
Water collection on the plates of flower pots at home.	15	31.3	33	68.8
Any kind of stored water containers inside the toilet.	30	62.5	18	37.5
There are coconut shells, discarded bottles, cans or anything that can hold water around the house.	20	41.7	28	58.3
Dirty water in the drinking containers for pets.	19	39.6	29	60.4
Stored water containers/tanks and water jars are covered.	48	100	0	0

Table 11: Observation Results

Comparison between Dengue Prevention Practice Scores and Demographic Variables of the Participants

In comparing the dengue prevention practice scores with the demographic variables of the participants, a Chi-square was employed. As provided in the table below, there was no statistically significant association established between dengue prevention practice and the various demographic variables of the participants. This implies that dengue prevention practice is independent of age, gender, civil status, educational attainment, employment status, family size, having children under 15 years of age, monthly income, dengue history in the family, and received information on den-

gued. Hence, the demographic variables do not have significant bearing nor influence on how the participants behave in preventing dengue.

Demographic Variables	Dengue Prevention Practice			
	Chi-square Test Value (X^2)	Degrees of Freedom	Probability Value	Interpretation
Age	4.07	6	.66	No significant association
Gender	6.69	4	.15	No significant association
Civil status	3.27	4	.51	No significant association
Educational attainment	5.40	6	.49	No significant association
Employment status	5.74	4	.22	No significant association
Monthly income	4.38	6	.62	No significant association
Received information about dengue	.93	2	.62	No significant association

Table 12: Comparison between Dengue Prevention Practice Scores and Demographic Variables of the Participants Using Chi-Square Test

Comparison between Prevention Practice, Knowledge, and Attitude toward Dengue Fever Using Chi-square Test and Spearman Rank Rho Correlation

Like demographic variables, knowledge on and attitude towards dengue do not have any bearing on the dengue prevention practice of the participants. This lack of significant association between knowledge, attitude, and practice is probably due to the fact that most of the participants did not really have sufficient information and full awareness on dengue at the time of the study, as evident in the low knowledge and negative attitude scores they obtained. Spearman rank rho correlation further confirmed this insignificant relation between practice, knowledge on, and attitude towards dengue.

Variables	Dengue Prevention Practice			
	Chi-square Test Value (X^2)	Degrees of Freedom	Probability Value	Interpretation
Knowledge on Dengue Fever	2.35	2	.30	No significant association
Attitude towards Dengue Fever	1.46	2	.48	No significant association

Table 13: Chi-square Test on Dengue Prevention Practice

	Dengue Prevention Practice		
	r_s Coefficient	Probability Value	Interpretation
Knowledge on Dengue Fever	.36	.80	No significant correlation
Attitude towards Dengue Fever	.17	.24	No significant correlation

Table 14: r_s Coefficient test on Dengue Prevention Practice

Conclusion and Recommendations

Based on the observation of the community, dengue vector breeding ground was found. It was due to the high percentage of storing water in containers of most houses due to lack of water access (only the water well supplies water for most of the household, more than MWSS). Furthermore, improper disposal of garbage provided dengue mosquito breeding ground. Lastly, the close presence of bamboo and forest also created ground.

Moreover, based on the data, there has been a significant difference between knowledge and practice. Through various media sources, community members have moderate knowledge about dengue, yet it has not been put into practices. Therefore, the project recommends plans to elevate moderate knowledge of dengue prevention and control into high and proposes various activities to link the knowledge into practice.

Reference List

Ahmed, Nahida. 2007. "Knowledge, Attitude and Practice of Dengue Fever Prevention among the People in Male', Maldives." M.P.H. thesis. Chulalongkorn University, Thailand.

- Atulomah, N. O., and O. Oladepo. 2002. "Knowledge, Perception and Practice with regards to Occupational Risks of HIV/AIDS among Nursing and Midwifery Students in Ibadan, Nigeria." *African Journal of Medicine and Medical Science* 31, no. 3: 223-7. Accessed February 25, 2005. <http://www.ncbl.nlm/entrez/query/feqi?cmd=retrieve&db>.
- Baba, Y. 1990. "K.A.P. Study of Family Planning among Married Orang Asli Women of Kuala Langat District, Selangor Darul Ehsan, Malaysia." *Malaysia Journal of Reproductive Health* 8, no. 2: 72-6.
- Brown, Ed. 2008. *Our Father's World: Mobilizing the Church to Care for Creation*. Downers Grove, Illinois: InterVarsity Press.
- Cervantes, Ding. 2008. "C. Luzon Dengue Cases up 273.6%." *Philstar*, July 21. Accessed July 21, 2011. <http://www.philstar.com/nation/74261/c-luzon-dengue-cases-2736>.
- Crossley, M. L. 2004. "An Investigation of Dentists' Knowledge, Attitudes, and Practices towards HIV+ and Patients with Other Blood-Borne Viruses in South Cheshire, UK." *British Dental Journal* 196, no. 12: 749-54.
- Diaz Bordenave, J. E. 1994. "Participative Communication as a Part of Building the Participative Society." In *Participatory Communication: Working for Change and Development*, edited by S. A. White, K. S. Nair, and J. Ascroft, 35-48. New Delhi: Sage.
- Freire, Paulo. 1970. *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*. New York: Herder and Herder.
- GMA News. 2013. "DOH: 42,207 Dengue Cases, 193 Deaths from January to 1st Week of June." June 15. Accessed June 21, 2013 <http://www.gmanetwork.com/news/story/312978/news/nation/doh-42-207-dengue-cases-193-deaths-from-january-to-1st-week-of-june>.
- Hegash, Y., B. Gebre, D. Benti, and M. Bejiga. 2003. "A Community Based Study on Knowledge, Attitude and Practice (KAP) on HIV/AIDS in Gambella Town, Western Ethiopia." *Journal of Health Development* 17, no. 3: 205-213. Accessed February 25, 2005. <http://www.ncbl.nlm/entrez/query/feqi?cmd=retrieve&db>.
- Itrat, Ahmed, Abdullah Khan, Sunniya Javaid, Mahwash Kamal, Hassan Khan, Sannia Javed, Saira Kalia, Adil Haleem Khan, Muhammad Imran Sethi, and Imtiaz Jehan. 2008. "Knowledge, Awareness and Practices Regarding Dengue Fever among the Adult Population of

- Dengue Hit Cosmopolitan.” *PLoS ONE* 3, no. 7. Accessed June 20, 2011. <http://www.plosone.org/article/info%3Adoi%2F10.1371%2Fjournal.pone.0002620#references>.
- Jung, M. L., J. E. Jang, S. G. Jung, and Y. Y. Kim. 2002. “A Study of Nurses’ Knowledge, Attitudes and Practices of Breast Self-examination.” *Journal of Human Nursing Science Study*, 169-187. Accessed February 25, 2005. <http://www.riss4u.net/index.jsp>.
- Koenraadt, C. J. M., W. Tuiten, R. Sithiprasasna, U. Kijchalao, J.W. Jones, and T. W. Scott. 2006. “Dengue Knowledge Practices and Their Impact on *Aedes aegypti* Populations in Kamphaeng Phet Thailand.” *American Journal of Tropical Medicine and Hygiene* 74: 692-700.
- Kwon, Dong Hwan and Charisma Callejo. 2013. “Community Profile of Rowenas Community.” Unpublished research report. Rizal: APNTS.
- Lakhan, Ram and Manoj Sharma. 2010. “A Study of Knowledge, Attitudes and Practices (KAP) Survey of Families toward Their Children with Intellectual Disability in Barwani, India.” *Asia Pacific Disability Rehabilitation Journal* 21: 101-117.
- Leslie, N. S., P. Deiriggi, P. Gross, E. DuRant, C. Smith, and J. G. Veshnesky. 2003. “Knowledge, Attitudes, and Practices Surrounding Breast Cancer Screening in Educated Appalachian Women. *Oncology Nursing Forum* 30, no. 4: 659-67. Accessed February 25, 2005. <http://www.ncbi.nlm/entrez/query/fegi?cmd=retrieve&db>.
- Lloyd, Linda. 2003. *Best Practices for Dengue Prevention and Control in the Americas in Environmental Health Project: Strategic Report 7*. Washington: USAID.
- Melkote, S. R. and P. Krishnatray. 2012. “State of the Development Communication Field.” In *Asian Communication Handbook*, 6th ed., edited by Sundeep R. Muppidi, 67-75. Singapore: Asian Media Information and Communication Center.
- Mishra, R. (1998). “STDs and HIV/ AIDs: A KAP Study among Drug Operators.” *Health Millions* 24, no. 5: 11-13. Accessed February 25, 2013. <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/12348877>.
- Nair, K. S. and S. A. White. 1994. “Participatory Development Communication as Cultural Renewal.” In *Participatory Communication: Working for Change and Development*, edited by S. A. White, K. S. Nair, and J. Ascroft, 138-193. New Delhi: Sage.

- National Environmental Agency. 2005. Report of the Expert Panel on Dengue. Singapore. Accessed July 21, 2012. http://www.moh.gov.sg/content/dam/moh_web/Diseases%20and%20Conditions/D/Dengue/Final_Report-dengue_7_Oct_05.pdf.
- Nerlander, Lina, Tu Ngoc Chau, and Thuan Nguyen. 2011. *Study on Knowledge, Attitudes and Practices of Community Members in Tien Giang and Ho Chi Minh City with regards to Dengue Fever and Climate Change*. Hanoi: Red Cross Red Crescent Climate Centre.
- Nitschke, Peter. 2007. "A Franciscan Spirituality of Companionship with the Poor and Creation." *Phronesis* 14: 85-109.
- Parks, Will and Linda Lloyd. 2004. *Planning Social Mobilization and Communication for Dengue Fever Prevention and Control: A Step by Step Guide*. Geneva: WHO.
- Quebral, N. C. 1973. "What Do We Mean by Development Communication." *International Development Review* 15, no. 2: 25-28.
- Rozita, Wan, B. W. Yap, S. Veronica, A. K. Muhammad, K. H. Lim, and M. G. Sumarni. 2006. "Knowledge, Attitude and Practice (KAP) Survey on Dengue Fever in an Urban Malay Residential Area in Kuala Lumpur." *Malaysian Journal of Public Health Medicine* 6: 62-67.
- Santos, Matta. 2006. "Knowledge, Attitude and Practice (KAP) on Dengue Fever: A Hospital Based Study." *Indian Journal of Community Medicine* 31: 185-186.
- Seo, Y. O. 2003. The Difference of Women's Knowledge, Attitudes and Practice for Breast Self-Examination." *Journal of Adult Nursing* 15, no. 1:5-13. Accessed February 25, 2005. <http://www.riss4u.net/index.jsp>.
- Spear, H. J. 2004. "Nurses' Attitudes, Knowledge, and Beliefs Related to the Promotion of Breastfeeding among Women Who Bear Children during Adolescence." *Pediatric Nursing* 19, no. 3: 176-83. Accessed February 25, 2005. <http://www.ncbi.nlm/entrez/query/fegi?cmd=retrieve&db>.
- Tae, Y. S. and S. J. Kim. 2003. "Knowledge, Attitudes, and Practices about Breast Self-Examination of Clinical Nurses." *KoShin Journal* 18, no. 1: 128-141. Accessed February 25, 2005. <http://www.riss4u.net/index.jsp>.
- Hoek, M. and J. Thacker, eds. 2008. *Michah's Challenge: The Church's Responsibility to the Global Poor*. Milton Keynes, UK: Paternoster.
- Uy, Jocelyn. 2010. "Dengue Has Killed 429 Filipinos Since January;

- Disease up by 75%, Downed 54,659-DoH,” *Inquirer Bureaus Philippine Daily Inquirer*, September 1.
- Van Benthem, B. H, N. Khantikul, K. Panart, P. J. Kessels, P. Somboon, and L. Oskam. 2002. “Knowledge and Use of Prevention Measures Related to Dengue in Northern Thailand.” *European Journal of Tropical Medicine & International Health* 7, no. 11: 993-1000.
- Van Herek, K., J. Zucherman, F. Castelli, P. Van Damme, E. Walker, and R. Steffen. 2003. “Travelers’ Knowledge, Attitudes, and Practices on Prevention of Infectious Diseases: Results from a Pilot Study.” *Journal of Travel Medicine* 10, no. 2: 75-8. Accessed February 25, 2005. <http://www.ncbi.nlm/entrez/query/feqi?cmd=retrieve&db>.
- Van Herek, K., P. Van Damme, F. Castelli, J. Zuckerman, H. Nothdurft, A. L. Dahlgren, S. Gisler, R. Steffen, P. Gargalianos, R. Lopez-Velez, D. Overboach, E. Caumes, and E. Walker. 2004. “Knowledge, Attitudes, and Practices in Travel-Related Infectious Diseases: The European Airport Survey.” *Journal of Travel Medicine* 11, no. 1: 3-8. Accessed February 25, 2005. <http://www.ncbi.nlm/entrez/query/feqi?cmd=retrieve&db>.
- Vargas, L. 1995. *Social Uses & Radio Practices: The Use of Participatory Radio by Ethnic Minorities in Mexico*. Boulder, CO: Westview.
- WHO. 2009. *Dengue Guidelines for Diagnosis, Treatment, Prevention and Control*. Geneva: World Health Organization.
- WHO. 2008. *The Dengue Strategic Plan for the Asia Pacific Region 2008-2015*. New Delhi: World Health Organization.
- White, L. 1967. “The Historical Roots of Our Ecologic Crisis.” *Science New Series* 155: 1203-1207. Accessed July 1, 2011. http://www.drexel.edu/~media/Files/greatworks/pdf_fall09/HistoricalRoots_of_EcologicalCrisis.ashx.
- White, R. 1994. Participatory Development Communication as a Social-Cultural Process. In *Participatory Communication: Working for Change and Development*, edited by S. A. White, K. S. Nair, and J. Ascroft, 95-116. New Delhi: Sage.

Synthesis Searching The Continuing Influence of F. C. Baur

Darin H. Land

Roughly one hundred fifty years have passed since the death of Ferdinand Christian Baur.¹ If Baur was right, approximately the same length of time passed from the death of Christ to the writing of the last New Testament document.² This period, according to Baur, saw initial opposition between Petrine and Pauline Christianity, followed by a synthesis into catholic Christianity. Analogously, it is possible to regard the last 150 years as opposition between Baurian and Lightfootian (that is, bearing affinities to the work of the well-known exegete and bishop, J. B. Lightfoot) interpretation. For Baur's followers, Peter came to symbolize Jewish, particularistic, law-abiding Christianity, and Paul came to represent Gentile, universalistic, faith-justified Christianity. Similarly, Baur has become iconographic for skeptical criticism and Lightfoot for faith-affirming criticism. Yet, just as scholarship has shown early Christianity to be more complex than Baur's reconstruction suggested, so also this study of Baur will show that reaction to him has been more subtle and more nuanced than is often recognized.³

The present study begins with a survey of Baur's view of the early Church with special attention to his method and historical reconstruction.

¹ Ferdinand Christian Baur: born June 21, 1792; died December 2, 1860.

² Cf. Horton Harris, *The Tübingen School: A Historical and Theological Investigation of the School of F. C. Baur* (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Book House, 1990), 237. Baur saw the last of the New Testament documents written around 170 CE. Taking the death of Jesus to be about 30 CE, there were 140 intervening years.

³ Baur's continuing influence on the field of New Testament Studies is readily demonstrable. See, for instance, two recent studies that give much space to Baur: Andrew Dole, "The Case of the Disappearing Discourse: Schleiermacher's Fourth Speech and the Field of Religious Studies," *Journal of Religion* 88 (2008): esp. 13-16, and Dieter T. Roth, "Marcion's Gospel and Luke: The History of Research in Current Debate," *JBL* 127 (2008): 513-527.

This survey is followed by an overview of Baur's followers and critics, from the Tübingen School to Hodgson. Selection for coverage reflects the scholars' prevalence in the secondary literature or their publication of a major work that shows either reliance on, or reaction against, Baur's reconstruction.⁴ The final section discusses Baur's continuing influence in New Testament Studies, exploring why his ideas continue to surface and why there is such divergence of opinion regarding his contributions. As demonstrated below, this diversity is due largely to the presuppositions brought to the task of Biblical criticism.

Baur

F. C. Baur (1792-1860) was a man of complex faith. One commentator described his faith as "difficult to summarize.... It is... subtle and... uncommon. It does not lend itself easily to standard theological categories and descriptions."⁵ Another observer noted that Baur had an opposite religious experience to Blaise Pascal.⁶ Whereas Pascal appealed to the God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, Baur rejected the God of both the Old and New Testaments to the extent that he has been called an atheist.⁷ Nevertheless, Baur continued to participate in the life of the church until his death.⁸

Baur published works in the history of doctrine and was a prominent

⁴ Admittedly, the choice is somewhat arbitrary. Other scholars who have interacted with Baur's historical reconstruction and method include the following. *Conservative Critics*: Ernst Barnikol, Michael Baumgarten, I.A. Dorner, Einrich Ewald, William R. Farmer, Adolf von Harnack, Karl Hase, A.C. Headlam, Gotthard Victor Lechler, C. E. Lekebusch, Eduard Meyer, Heinrich August Wilhelm Meyer, Johann August Wilhelm Neander, Philip Schaff, Walther Schmithals, Matthais Schneckenburger, Bengt Sundkler, Friedrich August Gottreu Tholuck, Etienne Trocmé, Gerhard Uhlhorn, and Theodor Zahn. *Radical Critics*: Bruno Bauer, Paul Wilhelm Schmiedel, and David Friedrich Strauss. *Scholars in the Baurian Tradition*: Richard Cassels, J. Daniélou, Samuel Davidson, M. Dibelius, M. Goguel, W.L. Knox, H. Lietzmann, Arthur C. McGiffert, A.D. Nock, Klaus Scholder, and Philipp Vielhauer.

⁵ Frank Kaufman, *Foundations of Modern Church History* (New York: P. Lang, 1992), 143-144.

⁶ E. Earle Ellis, foreword to *The Tübingen School*, by Horton Harris (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1990), x.

⁷ Ellis, "Foreword," xi.

⁸ William Baird, *From Deism to Tübingen* (vol. 1 of *History of New Testament Research*; Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1992), 259.

theologian, but he is at least as well known for his contributions to New Testament Studies. Few of Baur's works have been translated into English, notably Paul, *Church History of the First Three Centuries*, and *Ferdinand Christian Baur on the Writing of Church History*.⁹ Baur's work has been praised because he consistently and rigorously applied methodological reflection. This reflection was based on Hegelian philosophy.¹⁰ It has been argued that his Hegelianism caused many errors but also allowed him to see things that others had missed.¹¹ It has been called a "lens" which helped him to see Paul, not a "procrustean bed."¹² Baur tried to retain a place for both the historical Jesus and the Christ of the Creeds, thereby interpreting Hegel in a more orthodox way.¹³ Thus, he moved beyond the historical reconstruction to place the theological assertions of the New Testament documents into a philosophical framework that he believed was palatable to modern people.¹⁴

⁹ Ferdinand Christian Baur, *Paul: His Life and Works* (ed. Eduard Zeller; trans. A. Menzies; 2 vols.; London: Willams and Norgate, 1875-1876), *Church History of the First Three Centuries* (trans. A. Menzies; 2 vols.; London: Willams and Norgate, 1878-1879), and *Ferdinand Christian Baur on the Writing of Church History* (ed. and trans. Peter C. Hodgson; New York: Oxford University Press, 1968).

¹⁰ W. Ward Gasque, "Historical Value of the Book of Acts: An Essay in the History of New Testament Criticism," *EvQ* 41 (1969): 76, n. 40. Despite the argument of Hodgson that Baur had not yet encountered Hegelianism when he published his first article on historical method and postulated Pauline/Petrine disunity (Peter C. Hodgson, "The Rediscovery of Ferdinand Christian Baur" (review of F. C. Baur, *Augsgewählte Werke*), *CH* 33 (1964): 206-208), Gasque rightly insists that Baur surely had some familiarity with Hegel early on. Even if he was not influenced directly, it is nevertheless true that he based everything on a Hegelian-like dialectic relationship between Jewish and Gentile Christianity, as we shall see below.

¹¹ Christophe Senft, "Ferdinand Christian Baur, Methodological Approach and Interpretation of Luke 15:11-32," in *Exegesis: Problems of Method and Exercises in Reading (Genesis 22 and Luke 15)* (ed. François Bovon and Grégoire Rouiller; trans. Donald G. Miller; Pittsburg: Pickwick Press, 1978), 81.

¹² Morgan, "Biblical Classics, 2: F. C. Baur: Paul," *ExpTim* 90 (1978): 8.

¹³ Morgan, "Historical Criticism and Christology: England and Germany," in *England and Germany: Studies in Theological Diplomacy* (ed. S. Sykes; Frankfurt: Verlag Peter D. Lang, 1982), 99. Cf. Hodgson: "Thus, in saying that 'history is revelation' for Baur, we must understand that he moves *from* Jesus *to* the Church *to* history as a whole. In other words, the real clue to Baur's thought is his historically explicated Christology." Hodgson, "Rediscovery," 212-213.

¹⁴ Morgan, "F. C. Baur's Lectures on New Testament Theology," *ExpTim* 88 (1977): 204-206.

Baur applied Hegel's thesis-antithesis-synthesis view of historical processes to early church history. Yet the depth of Baur's commitment to Hegelian thought cannot be reduced to such a simple formula; Baur also borrowed the philosophical framework supporting the formula. For Baur, as for Hegel, history represented the unfolding development of divine consciousness: history is going somewhere, namely to the self-fulfillment of divine destiny.¹⁵ Thus, for Baur, the historical task is nothing less than studying the mind of God. As Käsemann said,

Historical-critical work is therefore for Baur obviously something more than a tool of the trade; rather, it has a deeply religious task and is the medium for attaining religious certainty. For it is the factual counterpart to historical revelation as an address to the man called in faith.¹⁶

For Baur, then, faith and scientific history, rather than incompatible, are mutually edifying because the object of faith is revealed in history.¹⁷ Baur's understanding of revelation, however, is not a static one. That is, truth was not revealed in a completed form in the Bible but rather develops as history moves through time.¹⁸

Given this view of history, it is not surprising that Baur fashioned a historical-critical perspective on the origins of the New Testament. Nor is it surprising that he forged a thoroughgoing historical-critical method. He viewed this method as the culmination of a four-stage developmental process from the "dogmatic phase," through the "phase of abstract criticism" and the "negative or dialectic viewpoint," to the "historic point of view."¹⁹ For Baur, historical criticism is simply a way of analyzing historic facts in a scientifically objective fashion.²⁰ The result was a methodology that was

¹⁵ Samuel Enoch Stumpf, *From Socrates to Sartre: A History of Philosophy* (rev. 5th ed.; New York: McGraw-Hill, 1993), 330-341.

¹⁶ Ernst Käsemann, *Einleitung zu Ausgewählte Werke in Einzelausgaben* (ed. Klaus Scholder; vol. 1; Stuttgart-Bad Cannstatt: Frommann, 1963), xix. Quoted in Hodgson, "Rediscovery," 209.

¹⁷ Hodgson, "Rediscovery," 207-208.

¹⁸ Harold O. J. Brown, *Heresies: The Image of Christ in the Mirror of Heresy and Orthodoxy from the Apostles to the Present* (New York: Doubleday, 1984), 24 and 26. Cf. Bruce N. Kaye, "Lightfoot and Baur on Early Christianity," *NovT* 26 (1984): 223.

¹⁹ Senft, "Baur," 86-90.

²⁰ Senft, "Baur," 83-84. It is surprising, however, that Baur sought to be objective

nevertheless neither naturalistic nor supernaturalistic.

Baur's method aimed at finding divergent accounts of one event, setting the differences in the clearest light, and assessing the intentions of the writers in shaping their statements. Thus, on the surface at least, Baur did not appeal to a philosophical theory of history to analyze the data.²¹ However, this simple method was expanded into *Tendenzkritik*, or "tendency criticism," as it is usually translated. Tendency criticism was not original with Baur, for Edward Evanson used it in 1792, the year of Baur's birth.²² Still, it was Baur who developed the method into its place in the annals of New Testament Studies. Baur set out his method in the epoch-making article, "Die Christuspartei in der korinthischen Gemeinde," in 1831.²³ Describing the impact of Baur's method, Albert Schweitzer said that while criticism prior to Baur had only been able to show that a New Testament document was inauthentic, Baur made possible a 'positive' criticism by which assertions could be made regarding the time and circumstance of writing.²⁴

Tendenzkritik is the process of evaluating the specific theological viewpoint of a New Testament author from the perspective of early Church history.²⁵ The procedure looks not only at external factors, but also especially at internal evidence. Baur admitted that the process included a subjective element that left judgments less than completely certain, but he insisted that when data are amalgamated into a comprehensive picture of early Christianity, confidence increases that one's conclusions are cor-

while at the same time seeing truth as somehow in the process of "becoming" through history. Cf. Senft, "Baur," 86.

²¹ Charles K. Barrett, "Quomodo historia conscribenda sit," *NTS* 28 (1982): 307-308.

²² Ellis, "Foreword," xi.

²³ Ferdinand Christian Baur, "Die Christuspartei in der korinthischen Gemeinde, der Gegensatz des petrinischen und paulinischen Christenthums in der ältesten Kirche, der Apostel Petrus in Rom," *TZTh* 4 (1831): 61-206.

²⁴ Albert Schweitzer, *Paul and His Interpreters: A Critical History* (trans. W. Montgomery; London: Adam and Charles Black, 1912), 13.

²⁵ W. Ward Gasque, *A History of the Interpretation of the Act of the Apostles* (Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson Publishers, 1989), 27. Cf. W. Ward Gasque, "Nineteenth-Century Roots of Contemporary New Testament Criticism," in *Scripture, Tradition, and Interpretation* (ed. W. Ward Gasque and William Sanford LaSor; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1978), 150.

rect.²⁶ Thus, according to Hans Rollmann, Baur's method was both critical and speculative: critical because he attempted to hold himself separate from the studied data and speculative because the method aimed to understand the meaning of the data. By attempting to find meaning, *Tendenzkritik* was not a "naive apriorism," yet it still left "a severe reduction... to a doctrinal specimen with a fixed position... [which] violate[d] and level[ed] impermissibly the data and processes of history."²⁷

The product of Baur's method was, in simple terms, the idea that Petrine-Jewish Christianity (thesis) combined with Pauline-Gentile Christianity (antithesis) to form Johannine Christianity and catholic Christianity (synthesis). The essential element of Christianity, its high moral principle, spread from its particularization or embodiment in Jesus, through Pauline Christianity, to universal Christianity.²⁸ Baur asserted that the early Church was not doctrinally uniform, despite appearances in the New Testament. Instead, it had Jewish and Gentile parties whose competing doctrines led to the present New Testament form. Thus, the New Testament can best be understood by analyzing the documents in light of their stance toward the Pauline-Petrine division.²⁹ Baur found support for his theory in the *Clementine Homilies* and in an Ebionite tradition, which called Paul a convert to Judaism. According to the tradition, Paul began preaching against the law after a failed bid for marriage to the Jewish high priest's daughter. Baur saw this as evidence that Paul had indeed been in conflict with Judaism. He found further evidence for disunity in documents referring to the conflict with Gnosticism, which he believed did not arise until the second century.³⁰

Baur began his historical investigation of the New Testament by locating an instance where the Pauline Epistles differed from Acts. Specifically, he became interested in the contrasting accounts in Galatians 2, where Paul talks about meeting the Apostles in Jerusalem, and Acts 15, in

²⁶ Reginald H. Fuller, "Baur Versus Hilgenfeld: A Forgotten Chapter in the Debate on the Synoptic Problem," *NTS* 24 (1978): 357.

²⁷ Hans Rollmann, "From Baur to Wrede: The Quest for a Historical Method," *SR* 17 (1988): 444-447.

²⁸ Philip J. Hefner, "Baur Versus Ritschl on Early Christianity," *CH* 31 (1962): 260-261.

²⁹ Gasque, "Roots," 149-150 and *History of Interpretation*, 27.

³⁰ Hodgson, "Rediscovery," 208.

which the Jerusalem council convenes to consider Paul's position. Of these chapters he says,

We now for the first time arrive at a point at which we can attain some positive results, as we can here compare with the story in the Acts of the Apostles, on which we can lay no great dependence, the testimony of the Apostle himself.... The two first chapters of the Epistle to the Galatians form a historical document of the greatest importance in our investigations into the true standpoint of the Apostle and his relations to the elder Apostles.³¹

Studying the two reports of what he took to be the same event, Baur concluded that the disagreement between Paul and the Apostles was much deeper and enduring than is indicated by Acts.³² These were the seeds of the conflict between Jewish and Gentile Christianity.

The conviction that a Pauline-Petrine division characterized the early Church became the basis of Baur's reading of the entire New Testament. As E. Earle Ellis said, "To maintain his highly tendentious reading of Galatians 2, Baur had to dismiss nine of Paul's letters, Acts, and most of the remaining New Testament books as later fictions."³³ For example, Baur thought the Pastorals were late and therefore not by Paul because of their anti-Gnosticism and incipient Catholicism.³⁴ Baur argued that the Pastorals were written by a later Paulinist who wanted to reclaim Paul for his own generation. They therefore are a source for second century Christianity, not first century.³⁵

Baur's test for the authenticity of the remaining Pauline Epistles was the doctrine of justification, which he took to be the quintessential figure for anti-nomistic Paulinism over against legalistic Jewish Christianity.³⁶ Since the doctrine appears only in Romans, 1-2 Corinthians, and Galatians, Baur maintained that only these four Pauline Epistles could be used as sources for primitive Christianity. Nevertheless, as Schweitzer correctly observed, Baur did not mean to imply the other Epistles were necessarily

³¹ Baur, *Paul*, 1:105.

³² Baur, *Paul*, 1:119.

³³ Ellis, "Foreword," xiv.

³⁴ Baur, *Church History*, 2:30.

³⁵ Senft, "Baur," 79.

³⁶ Senft, "Baur," 80. See Baur, *Paul*, 2:106-107.

inauthentic, only that they exhibited tendencies that rendered them of dubious authenticity and were thus to be treated with caution.³⁷

Although Baur stressed the existence of conflict in the early Church, he noted that the author of Acts minimized it. Therefore, Baur thought it important to explain why Acts presented such a picture.³⁸ Using *Tendenzkritik*, Baur argued that Acts was written late and minimized the disunity. Baur placed Acts, on a continuum between open conflict and resolution of the conflict, as written from a Pauline perspective with the aim to bring the two sides together. This Tendenz explains why Peter is made to look almost Pauline and Paul very Petrine.³⁹ Baur reasoned as follows. According to Acts 8:14, the Apostles stayed in Jerusalem despite the persecution of the Church. If they stayed, then others must also have stayed. If some were free to stay, the persecution must not have been directed toward all Christians but only toward Hellenistic Christians. Therefore, there must have been a division in the Jerusalem Church between Hellenistic and Jewish Christians, including the Apostles.⁴⁰ This reasoning is based on Baur's historical reconstruction, not on the narrative of Acts. Thus, according to W. Ward Gasque, Baur interpreted Acts by means of his theory of primitive Christianity, not on its own terms.⁴¹

The rest of the New Testament was also evaluated along the lines of *Tendenzkritik* and the conflict between Pauline and Petrine Christianity. Thus, the New Testament was divided into three segments: (1) the genuine Pauline Epistles (Romans, 1-2 Corinthians, and Galatians), (2) the fourth Gospel and the Pastorals, and (3) the rest of the New Testament.⁴² The first group represents documents written from the Pauline, antithetical perspective, while documents from the second group were written

³⁷ Schweitzer, *Paul*, 14. See Baur, *Paul*, 1:246. Baur classified the four undisputed Epistles as "Homologoumena" and the remaining nine as "Antilegomena." Cf. Peter C. Hodgson, *The Formation of Historical Theology: A Study of F. C. Baur* (New York: Harper & Row, 1966), 206-207.

³⁸ Frederik Wisse, "The Use of Early Christian Literature, as Evidence for Inner Diversity and Conflict," in *Nag Hammadi, Gnosticism, & Early Christianity* (ed. Charles W. Hedrick and Robert Hodgson, Jr.; Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 1986), 178.

³⁹ Wisse, "Early Christian Literature," 178.

⁴⁰ Kaye, "Lightfoot and Baur," 202.

⁴¹ Gasque, "Roots," 151.

⁴² Morgan, "Baur's Lectures," 203.

after the synthesis had been forged. Products of the third group represent various viewpoints on the spectrum between thesis and synthesis. For example, Baur believed James to have been written from the Jewish perspective; Hebrews and 1 Peter from the Gentile persuasion.⁴³

Baur's Followers and Critics

The Tübingen School

According to Horton Harris, the Tübingen School had eight members: F. C. Baur, Eduard Zeller, Albert Schwegler, Karl Christian Planck, Karl Reinhold Köstlin, Albrecht Ritschl, Adolf Hilgenfeld, and Gustav Volkmar.⁴⁴ For Harris, the members of the School were those who (1) accepted a “purely historical” method of interpretation and (2) made an “essential contribution to the historical development of the School.”⁴⁵ One distinguishing feature of the School is that it was the first to apply the historical-critical method from a definite historical viewpoint to the whole New Testament.⁴⁶

Harris identified three periods during the life of the School. The years 1835-1841 comprise the period of “preparation and emergence,” marked especially by the controversy surrounding Strauss’s *Life of Jesus* and the resulting disagreement between Baur and Strauss. “Formation and consolidation” distinguished the time from 1842-1846. During this period, leadership was provided by Zeller under the patronage of Baur, and the journal *Theologische Jahrbücher* began to be published. The years 1847-1860 resulted in “decline and dissolution.” After 1847 the Tübingen School’s influence diminished with the gradual dispersal of its members. During the 1850s Baur, Ritschl, Hilgenfeld, and Volkmar continued to propagate the convictions of the Tübingen School, but their individual perspectives brought disagreement to the extent that Ritschl and Hilgenfeld increasingly dissociated themselves from the School. When Baur died in 1860,

⁴³ Wisse, “Early Christian Literature,” 178-179.

⁴⁴ Harris, *Tübingen School*, xvii and v. Kümmel, however, identifies only four: A. Schwegler, E. Zeller, A. Hilgenfeld, and A. Ritschl. Werner Georg Kümmel, *Introduction to the New Testament* (trans. Howard Clark Kee; rev. ed.; Nashville: Abingdon, 1975), 30.

⁴⁵ Harris, *Tübingen School*, 247.

⁴⁶ Harris, *Tübingen School*, xxi.

the Tübingen School virtually came to an end.⁴⁷ Commenting on the decline, Moisés Silva said,

The rapid disintegration of the Tübingen School is, therefore, the clearest evidence that Baur's handling of the facts can hardly be regarded as objective—quite irrespective of whether or not Baur had an *a priori* theory and whether or not he was aware of his fitting (forcing?) pieces into the large picture.⁴⁸

Zeller

Eduard Zeller (1814-1908) has been called “the most profound critic of the school of Baur,”⁴⁹ and his writings “the ripest fruit of Baur's critical school.”⁵⁰ Zeller wrote the article, “Einige weitere Beiträge zur Einleitung in die Apokalypse,”⁵¹ in which he argued that Revelation was written from an Ebionite perspective by the Apostle John and was explicitly anti-Pauline. This result was seen as further evidence for the Baurian hypothesis of Pauline-Petrine conflict.⁵² Zeller also wrote *The Acts of the Apostles Critically Investigated*,⁵³ which has been described as “a clarified and detailed presentation of Baur's *Paul*.”⁵⁴ In conjunction with an extensive examination of the external and internal evidence for the historicity of Acts, Zeller declares, “How little reliance must be placed upon the trust-

⁴⁷ Harris, *Tübingen School*, 2-8, 248.

⁴⁸ Moisés Silva, “The Place of Historical Reconstruction in New Testament Criticism,” in *Hermeneutics, Authority and Canon* (ed. D. A. Carson and John D. Woodbridge; Grand Rapids: Baker, 1995), 130. Parenthetical comment original.

⁴⁹ Gotthard Victor Lechler, *The Apostolic and Post-apostolic Times: Their Diversity and Unity in Life and Doctrine* (trans. A. J. K. Davidson; 3d ed.; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1886), 1:24. Quoted in A. J. Mattill, *Luke as a Historian in Criticism since 1840* (Ph.D. diss., Vanderbilt, 1959; Photocopy, Ann Arbor, Mich.: University Microfilms International, 1981), 51.

⁵⁰ Frederic Auguste Lichtenberger, *History of German Theology in the Nineteenth Century* (trans. W. Hastie; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1889), 392. Quoted in Mattill, *Luke as Historian*, 51.

⁵¹ Eduard Zeller, “Einige weitere Beiträge zur Einleitung in die Apokalypse,” *TJ* (1842): 654-717.

⁵² Harris, *Tübingen School*, 190-192.

⁵³ Eduard Zeller, *The Acts of the Apostles Critically Investigated* (trans. Joseph Dare; 2 vols.; London: Williams and Norgate, 1875).

⁵⁴ Mattill, *Luke as Historian*, 51.

worthiness of our book.”⁵⁵ He observes that the reliability of historical documents “must be judged primarily by the trustworthiness of the witness.”⁵⁶ This trustworthiness can be assessed either by examination of the external data, which Zeller calls “literary criticism,” or by evaluation of the internal evidence, called “criticism of the contents” or “criticism of the matter.”⁵⁷ He notes, “Thus we are involved in a vicious circle: criticism of the matter is assumed by literary criticism, and literary criticism by criticism of the matter, and there is no direct outlet by which we can entirely escape from this circle.”⁵⁸ Yet he further suggests that by following literary criticism as far as it will go and then criticizing the contents, with “perhaps... repeated alternations of both methods,” a decision can be reached.⁵⁹

Overbeck

Though not a member of the Tübingen School, Franz Camille Overbeck (1837-1905) was a critic in the Baurian tradition.⁶⁰ With Baur, he saw the relationship between Paul and Peter as hostile.⁶¹ He says, “Thus far it has already been established generally that the narrative of the Acts cannot be comprehended without reference to the antagonisms of primitive Christianity.”⁶² Similarly, he concurred with Baur regarding the historical unreliability of Acts,

A historical book which, like Acts, subjects its materials to so artificial and arbitrary an arrangement, which so strongly modifies them in the direction of its particular aims, and which has likewise handled its sources with so much freedom, is in general untrustworthy, and has to prove its trustworthiness for each special case.⁶³

⁵⁵ Zeller, *Acts*, 1:257. Quoted in Mattill, *Luke as Historian*, 79.

⁵⁶ Zeller, *Acts*, 90.

⁵⁷ Zeller, *Acts*, 91.

⁵⁸ Zeller, *Acts*, 91.

⁵⁹ Zeller, *Acts*, 92.

⁶⁰ Gasque, *History of Interpretation*, 287.

⁶¹ Mattill, *Luke as Historian*, 180, n. 2.

⁶² Franz Overbeck, introduction to *The Acts of the Apostles: Critically Investigated*, by Eduard Zeller (trans. Joseph Dare; vol. 1; London: Williams and Norgate, 1875), 17.

⁶³ Overbeck, “Introduction,” 64.

Overbeck credits Zeller with the most thorough study of the aim of Acts.⁶⁴ Yet he thought its aim was to get in touch with the past and to justify Christianity to Roman officials, not to propose peace between Jewish and Gentile Christianity, as the Tübingen School suggested. Whereas the Tübingen School believed the author of Acts intentionally altered facts to support his position, Overbeck argued that he was simply ignorant and supplied what he thought happened.⁶⁵ It is for this reason that Mattill called Overbeck the founder of the “Could-Not-See” School.⁶⁶ Paraphrasing Overbeck’s position on Acts, Mattill says, “The author, who was largely innocent of conscious perversion of the truth, was led by no tendentious purpose to attribute Jewish practices to Paul. Rather, from his vantage point, it seemed impossible that Paul could have acted otherwise.”⁶⁷

Van Manen

Willem Christiaan van Manen (1842-1905) represents the Dutch Radical School. This School viewed itself as the true descendants of Baur because they followed Baur’s insights to their logical conclusions. Van Manen agreed with Baur on the Jewishness of early Christianity but thought that all the Pauline Epistles were inauthentic.⁶⁸ Thus, while van Manen agreed with Baur’s basic methodology, he reached opposite conclusions on a number of critical issues. According to Mattill, van Manen accepted Acts as a more reliable historical source than the Epistles, believed that the Epistles betray a *Tendenz* in their use of Acts, disagreed with the Tübingen School regarding the duration of the Pauline-Petrine controversy, saw in Acts the representation of Peter in the image of Paul, and believed that the historical Paul was to be found in Acts, not the Epistles. This resulted in a complex understanding of the Pauline-Petrine relationship. Van Manen believed that the historical Paul is accurately represented in Acts’ oldest source, the so-called Diary. Paul was a faithful disciple who acted as a missionary, did not disagree with the Apostles, and kept the

⁶⁴ Overbeck, “Introduction,” 18.

⁶⁵ Gasque, *History of Interpretation*, 80-86.

⁶⁶ Mattill, *Luke as Historian*, 171.

⁶⁷ Mattill, *Luke as Historian*, 173.

⁶⁸ Gasque, *History of Interpretation*, 86-87.

Jewish Law. The historical Paul differed from other Jews only in his acceptance of Jesus and His emphasis on love. After the death of the historical Paul, a legendary Paul arose who was seen as opposing the practice of the Law and as catalyzing the transformation from Jewish sect to Christianity. The Epistles were written by followers of this legendary Paul to counter the attacks of Jewish Christians. This legendary Paul was replaced by the Lukan Paul as portrayed by the final redactor of Acts. The Lukan Paul was created after the conflict was past and thus was viewed as a conciliatory cofounder of Catholic Christianity. The resulting picture of early Christianity progresses from the peace of the Apostles and the historical Paul, to the conflict between the Judaizers and the school of the legendary Paul, to the eventual peace as portrayed in the canonical Acts.⁶⁹ The Dutch Radical School has not found many adherents; Schweitzer describes them as having “come at last... to a condition of mind in which the wildest hypothesis appeals to them more than rational knowledge, if the latter demands the suppression of questioning.”⁷⁰

Lightfoot

One of the most important critics of Baur is Joseph Barber Lightfoot (1818-1889). Lightfoot has been called Baur’s “adversary in early Christian studies.”⁷¹ Indeed, Lightfoot was stringently opposed to Baur, as indicated by his statement in *Apostolic Fathers*:

No man has shown himself more ready to adopt the wildest speculations, if they fell in with his own preconceived theories... especially in his later days—speculations which in not a few cases have been falsified by direct evidence since discovered. Nothing has exercised a more baneful influence on criticism in the country of critics than the fascination of his name. While he has struck out some lines which have stimulated thought, and thus have not been unfruitful in valuable results, the glamour of his genius has on the whole exercised a fatal effect on the progress of a sober and dis-

⁶⁹ Mattill, *Luke as Historian*, 210-219.

⁷⁰ Schweitzer, *Paul*, 137.

⁷¹ Geoffrey Treloar, *Lightfoot the Historian: The Nature and Role of History in the Life and Thought of J. B. Lightfoot (1828-1889) as Churchman and Scholar* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1998), 89.

criminating study of the early records of Christianity.⁷²

Lightfoot was one of the few Englishmen of his day who was well regarded among German scholars. Geoffrey Treloar quotes a letter from Caspar Rene Gregory which indicates the positive reception by Harnack and others of Lightfoot's *S. Clement of Rome: An Appendix Containing the Newly Recovered Portions With Introductions, Notes, and Translations*.⁷³ The reverse—that Baur was well received in England—is not true.⁷⁴ Baur and Lightfoot have been contrasted in many ways. For example, Bruce N. Kaye notes that Baur interacted extensively with contemporary scholarship in his writing, while Lightfoot rarely cited except from ancient primary sources and seldom attacked his opponents overtly. More substantially, Baur's approach was "synthetic and analytical"; Lightfoot's was "descriptive and textual."⁷⁵ Similarly, Gasque views Baur as a speculative critic, but he describes Lightfoot's work as "historical in the fullest sense of the word," with close attention to detail and careful exegesis.⁷⁶ It has been said that Baur asked the right questions, as formulated from philosophy, while Lightfoot answered questions well, based on detailed study of philology and history.⁷⁷

It is often thought that Lightfoot thoroughly refuted Baur's theories. As Gasque said, Lightfoot's "nonpolemical works... demonstrated so clearly that the Tübingen reconstruction of early Christianity was simply a castle built in the sky without any real foundation in historical research."⁷⁸ Silva observed that Lightfoot rightly did not attack Baur's reconstruction point-by-point but developed his own picture of early Christianity.⁷⁹ Lightfoot proposed his alternate reconstruction in non-polemical com-

⁷² J. B. Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers* (London: Macmillan, 1889-1890), 1.1.357-8. Quoted in Treloar, *Lightfoot*, 359-60.

⁷³ Treloar, *Lightfoot*, 392-393.

⁷⁴ Barrett, "Quomodo," 308-310.

⁷⁵ Kaye, "Lightfoot and Baur," 198-199.

⁷⁶ Gasque, *History of Interpretation*, 134.

⁷⁷ Barrett, "Quomodo," 318.

⁷⁸ Gasque, "Roots," 153.

⁷⁹ Silva also noted that Lightfoot's reconstruction incorporated more insights from Baur than is generally recognized and is marked by the irony that Lightfoot held the Pauline Epistles less historically reliable than Acts. Silva, "Historical Reconstruction," 125-128.

mentaries based on careful attention to grammatical and lexicographical detail. His reconstruction generally agrees with the narrative of Acts, the historicity of which he argued for based on (1) the agreement in incidental details between Acts and the Pauline Epistles, (2) the similarities of thought and diction between the Epistles of Paul, James, and Peter as compared with the speeches attributed to them in Acts, (3) reliability of geographical and historical details, and (4) the corroboration of archaeology.⁸⁰ Lightfoot also incorporated post-canonical material into his reconstruction. He established the authenticity of the seven Ignatian Epistles, thereby disclosing faults in Baur's view of second century Christianity.⁸¹ Though it was never the driving force of his life's work, it was important for Lightfoot to refute the Tübingen School because he regarded it as a threat to his incarnational interpretation of revelation.⁸² As a result, Lightfoot's place in New Testament Studies has come to be regarded as juxtaposed against Tübingen and Baur. This in turn has led to the designation of Lightfoot as a conservative and Baur as a radical, and the two have become icons for the divergent approaches.⁸³

Yet the situation is not as clear-cut as it would seem from much of the secondary literature. Robert Morgan, for example, denies that Lightfoot destroyed Baur's reconstruction.⁸⁴ Likewise, Charles K. Barrett says, "The difference between Baur and Lightfoot was in truth small." According to Barrett, Lightfoot succeeded only in destroying the Tübingen chronology (compressing it), but he left the basic dialectic process intact.⁸⁵ As Lightfoot himself said,

I feel very confident that the historical views of the Tübingen school are too extravagant to obtain any wide or lasting hold over the minds of men. But even in extreme cases mere denunciation may be unjust and is certainly unavailing. Moreover, for our own sakes *we should try and discover the element of truth which*

⁸⁰ Gasque, *History of Interpretation*, 116-123.

⁸¹ Morgan, "Baur's Lectures," 202. Cf. Gasque, *History of Interpretation*, 116-118.

⁸² Treloar, *Lightfoot*, 382-383.

⁸³ Treloar, *Lightfoot*, 6-8. Treloar also points out that Lightfoot was not so conservative when compared with his British contemporaries.

⁸⁴ Morgan, "England and Germany," 95.

⁸⁵ Barrett, "Quomodo," 310

*underlies even the greatest exaggerations of able men, and correct our impressions thereby.*⁸⁶

Thus, Kaye rightly observes that Lightfoot did not deny the existence of conflict and problems in Apostolic Christianity.⁸⁷ In fact, Lightfoot's position has been called a "modified Baurian position" by Barrett.⁸⁸ Yet Treloar disagrees with Barrett that Lightfoot had no theory of history. He says, "Lightfoot not only had a theory of history: It was also a genuine theology of history in its recourse to an ultimately transcendent God for its meaning, means, and purpose."⁸⁹ He believed in historical continuity, which prompted him "almost instinctively" to study the early Fathers as a means of verifying and ultimately rejecting the ideas of Baur.⁹⁰ Nevertheless, Barrett rightly pointed out that Lightfoot appeals to "simplicity, straightforwardness and naturalness" for the historicity of Acts but gives no criteria for assessing these qualities.⁹¹ In the final analysis, while Lightfoot learned more from Baur than is usually acknowledged, it is still true that Lightfoot fundamentally opposed the Tübingen approach.

Schweitzer

Albert Schweitzer (1875-1965) often referred to Baur as "the Tübingen master."⁹² Whatever else this designation may imply, it seems clear that Schweitzer respected Baur. Contrasting Baur with Karl August Hase, Schweitzer says, "The name of Hase is inscribed in golden letters in the book of theology, but theology has passed beyond him to the order of the day, as he was no pioneer like Baur, and he does not meet the present age on the footing of a contemporary, offering it problems raised by him and still unsolved."⁹³ Schweitzer credits Baur with being the first to effectively demonstrate the inconsistency between the Fourth Gospel and the Synop-

⁸⁶ Lightfoot, *St. Paul's Epistle to the Galatians*. (5th ed.; London: Macmillan, 1876), xi. Quoted in Kaye, "Lightfoot and Baur," 215-216, n. 40. (Emphasis mine.)

⁸⁷ Kaye, "Lightfoot and Baur," 216-217.

⁸⁸ Barrett, "Quomodo," 314.

⁸⁹ Treloar, *Lightfoot*, 90.

⁹⁰ Treloar, *Lightfoot*, 338.

⁹¹ Barrett, "Quomodo," 313.

⁹² Schweitzer, *Paul*, 14, 25, 118, 120, and 249.

⁹³ Albert Schweitzer, *The Quest of the Historical Jesus* (trans. W. Montgomery, J. R. Coates, Susan Cupitt, and John Bowden; Minneapolis, Minn.: Fortress Press, 2001), 56.

tics and to thoroughly refute the historicity of the former.⁹⁴

Yet Schweitzer's relationship to Baur is not one of uncritical acceptance. Rather, Schweitzer disagrees with Baur in several crucial respects. Schweitzer blames Baur for failing to grasp Paulinism empirically and missing the importance of eschatology for the Apostle.⁹⁵ Following Ritschl, Schweitzer faults Baur and the Tübingen School because they failed to explain "the problem regarding the nature of the unity between Paulinism and primitive Christianity."⁹⁶ He accuses Baur of missing the "really fundamental view of the essence of Paulinism" by following the categories of the Reformation instead of empirically discovering the categories of Paul's own thought.⁹⁷ Schweitzer points out that Baur failed to appreciate the fact that Paul remained largely unaffected by Greek theology.⁹⁸ Finally, Schweitzer blames Baur for not following his own "positive criticism" to its logical end, namely that all the Pauline Epistles derive, not from Paul himself, but from a Paulinist School.⁹⁹

Given these caveats, Schweitzer insists that Paul must be understood according to his eschatological expectation. The force of Paul's reasoning depended upon the fact that he was living between the death and parousia of Christ. The expectation of Jesus' imminent return gave force to the theological constructions built on this between-times consciousness. For Ignatius and others who no longer lived with an expectation Christ's soon return, the arguments held no force. Thus, the composition dates of the Pauline Epistles can be judged internally by whether they convey a sense of imminence. Schweitzer says, "Any one who works out this solution is the true pupil of Baur, however widely he may diverge from him in his views and results."¹⁰⁰ In the closing paragraph of *Paul*, Schweitzer shows himself to be a pupil of Baur by contrasting once again the "followers of Peter" and the "followers of Paul."¹⁰¹

⁹⁴ Schweitzer, *Quest*, 498, n.4.

⁹⁵ Schweitzer, *Paul*, 16, 18, 20-21, 240-242. Schweitzer did recognize the improvement in these areas in Baur's posthumously published notes.

⁹⁶ Schweitzer, *Paul*, 17.

⁹⁷ Schweitzer, *Paul*, 33.

⁹⁸ Schweitzer, *Paul*, 81, 238-240.

⁹⁹ Schweitzer, *Paul*, 118-120.

¹⁰⁰ Schweitzer, *Paul*, 249.

¹⁰¹ Schweitzer, *Paul*, 249.

Munck

Johannes Munck (1904-1965) opposed the criticism of Baur and the Tübingen School. He demonstrated that scholarship had rejected Baur's literary theories while retaining his historical judgments—even though the conclusions ought to have been rejected also.¹⁰² One of the wrongly retained results identified by Munck is that Paul was fundamentally at odds with the Jerusalem Apostles.¹⁰³ The effect of this error was that contemporary scholarship found arguments against Judaizers everywhere in Paul's letters, even in non-polemical passages.¹⁰⁴ Yet, according to Munck, there is a “natural explanation that the Jerusalem Church's principles may not have been so different from Paul's as is generally supposed.” Scholars avoid this interpretation by “separating [early Christians'] principles from their feelings.”¹⁰⁵

Munck identifies a historical problem with Baur's reconstruction: if Paul rediscovered the universalism of Jesus that was absent in the Jewish Church, why did the Apostles submissively give Paul their blessing? Agreeing with Bengt Sundkler, Munck sees the opposition between particularism and universalism as a modern problem. He believes that Baur's reconstruction was exactly backwards: particularism did not start with the Jewish Christians over against Gentile Christians. Instead it developed later as Catholic Christianity lost its universalism. Thus, many scholars are blind to the fundamental weaknesses of Baur's position; they still see primitive Christianity as essentially Jewish, even though they admit differences of emphasis.¹⁰⁶ This blindness results from “bad method in modern Pauline research.”¹⁰⁷ It derives from the use of second century sources to establish events in the first century, from the failure to consider the *Sitz im Leben* of the various sources and recensions, and from building a picture of Paul and Acts based on “controversial passages” to the ex-

¹⁰² Johannes Munck, *Paul and the Salvation of Mankind* (trans. Frank Clarke; London: SCM, 1959), 69-70. Cf. Gasque, *History of Interpretation*, 271-272.

¹⁰³ Gasque, *History of Interpretation*, 271-272.

¹⁰⁴ Munck, *Paul*, 55-56.

¹⁰⁵ Munck, *Paul*, 75-76.

¹⁰⁶ Munck, *Paul*, 70-73.

¹⁰⁷ Munck, *Paul*, 84.

clusion of “uncontroversial ones.”¹⁰⁸ Munck insists that by rejecting the Tübingen picture of Paul and the early Church, the way is opened for a more accurate view of both. This new perspective will yield “greater riches and variety in early Christianity than [the Tübingen] tradition made possible.”¹⁰⁹

Kümmel

Werner Georg Kümmel (1905-1995) embodies the statement by Leander Keck, “Everyone ought to start with Baur at some point.”¹¹⁰ Baur features prominently in Kümmel’s discussions of the task of New Testament Introduction, the Synoptic Problem, the historicity of Acts, John, and the Pauline Epistles.¹¹¹ He notes that Baur’s influence is still felt because of the continuing idea that the New Testament must be studied in conjunction with detailed attention to “the external and internal history of early Christianity.”¹¹² He also highlights the debate over the critical issues surrounding the fourth Gospel and recognizes Baur’s contribution to the discussion by his dating the Gospel to the later second century, denying apostolic authorship, and devaluing its sources relative to the sources of the Synoptic Gospels.¹¹³

Given this prominence of Baur in his work, Kümmel does indeed seem to have “started with Baur.” Of course, this does not imply that Kümmel accepted Baur’s viewpoints uncritically. Rather, Kümmel disagrees with Baur on a number of critical judgements. Where the Baur School accepted the Griesbach hypothesis for the Synoptic relationship, Kümmel dismisses it because it “must accept too many improbabilities and misjudges the literary independence of Mark.”¹¹⁴ The Tübingen School questioned the authenticity of Philippians, but Kümmel accepts it.¹¹⁵ With respect to Phi-

¹⁰⁸ Munck, *Paul*, 77, 84.

¹⁰⁹ Munck, *Paul*, 85.

¹¹⁰ Leander Keck, statement made at the New Testament Colloquium, Fuller Theological Seminary, Pasadena, Calif.; April 10, 2002.

¹¹¹ Werner Georg Kümmel, *Introduction to the New Testament* (trans. Howard Clark Kee; rev. ed.; Nashville: Abingdon, 1975), 30-31, 48, 160-126, 197-198, 250.

¹¹² Kümmel, *Introduction*, 31.

¹¹³ Kümmel, *Introduction*, 197-198.

¹¹⁴ Kümmel, *Introduction*, 47-48.

¹¹⁵ Kümmel, *Introduction*, 332.

lemon, Kümmel says, “Only *tendenz*-criticism could doubt the authenticity of this letter.”¹¹⁶ He further notes that Baur’s reconstruction of early Christianity was “discredited,”¹¹⁷ and disagrees with Baur’s approach to canon.¹¹⁸ Kümmel also acknowledges that Baur’s approach to Acts was wrong. Still, he agrees with Baur that the task of determining the purpose and theological program of the author is important: “Only in this way could the historical value and the message of the book be grasped reliably.”¹¹⁹ Thus, while Kümmel rejected the specific results of much of Baur’s research, Kümmel still holds him in high regard, traces the roots of his own research back to him, and especially values the critical questions he raised.

Käsemann

The relationship of Ernst Käsemann (1906-1998) to Baur is unique and complex. Reflecting on his theological formation, Käsemann says, “I think that Bultmann may be called the last significant representative of that radical historical criticism founded 150 years earlier by the Tübingen scholar Ferdinand Christian Baur.”¹²⁰ The implication, of course, is that Käsemann does not count himself as a “significant representative.” Despite this apparent modesty, Käsemann does acknowledge an affinity to Baur. He writes, “Though for a long time I was not directly influenced by Baur, I studied him more and more readily. He appears to me now to be my real ancestor.”¹²¹ Somewhat surprisingly, Käsemann adds, “It was primarily careful exegesis that pushed me back through the decades into Baur’s vicinity.”¹²² This statement suggests Käsemann’s consonance with Baur’s conclusions, not merely his methods, since the phrase “careful exegesis” suggests independent examination, not methodological dependence.

Käsemann’s respect for Baur is also indicated by the fact that he wrote

¹¹⁶ Kümmel, *Introduction*, 349.

¹¹⁷ Kümmel, *Introduction*, 406.

¹¹⁸ Kümmel, *Introduction*, 506.

¹¹⁹ Kümmel, *Introduction*, 161.

¹²⁰ Käsemann, “What I have Unlearned in 50 years as a German Theologian [Eng. tr. fr. *Kirchliche Konflikte*, 1982],” *CurTM* 15 (1988): 329.

¹²¹ Käsemann, “Unlearned,” 329.

¹²² Käsemann, “Unlearned,” 330.

the introduction to the 1963 publication of Baur's *Ausgewählte Werke in Einzelausgaben*. In this introduction, Käsemann pointed out faults in Baur. Yet the criticism does not amount to rejecting Baur's reconstruction out right; rather it suggests that the situation in the early Church was more complex than Baur had realized, leaving his basic theory—that conflict formed literature as we have it—intact. Nevertheless, Käsemann goes on to note that Baur's reconstruction is no longer generally accepted without significant modifications.¹²³ Thus, on the one hand, Käsemann sees himself very close to Baur, yet at the same time he rejects much of his reconstruction.

Hodgson

Peter C. Hodgson (1934-) is perhaps the most prolific proponent of Baur in the English-speaking world. He translated significant portions of Baur's work and wrote or translated a number books and articles defending him.¹²⁴ Hodgson's interest in Baur is that he believes the questions Baur faced regarding history and hermeneutics are the same ones confronted by Hodgson's generation.¹²⁵ Hodgson agrees with Baur that the answers to such questions are to be found in speculative hermeneutics. He says,

What is required to complete the task of Church historiography is a movement beyond the abstract dualism of the older historians and the equally abstract empiricism of pragmatic rationalism to a speculative grasp of the unity and dynamism of history (against dualism) and its comprehensive meaning (against empiricism).¹²⁶

Like Baur, Hodgson affirms a Hegelian view of God and history. According to Hodgson,

The basic presupposition of speculative thinking is a coherence between Absolute Truth (the reality of which is affirmed) and *con-*

¹²³ See Hodgson, "Rediscovery," 208.

¹²⁴ Baur, *Writing Church History*; Peter C. Hodgson, "Alienation and reconciliation in Hegelian and post-Hegelian perspective." *Modern Theology* 2 (1985): 42-63; Hodgson, *Formation*; Hodgson, "Rediscovery"; and Heinz Leibing, "Historical-critical Theology," trans. P. C. Hodgson; *JTC* 3 (1967): 55-69.

¹²⁵ Peter C. Hodgson, introduction to *Ferdinand Christian Baur on the Writing of Church History*, 6. Hodgson believes this contemporary relevance was the reason for the on-going controversy surrounding Baur.

¹²⁶ Hodgson, "Introduction," 17.

sciousness of the Absolute. This coherence is grounded in the nature of the Absolute itself... Spirit accomplishes itself (becomes the Absolute Spirit) in the coming-to-consciousness of finite spirituality, which is a moment in the process of being-in-and-for-itself (*an-und-für-sich-Sein*) of Absolute Spirit.¹²⁷

Hodgson defends Baur at nearly every turn. He explicitly seeks to deflect the charge of apriorism by arguing that Baur derived his reconstruction through careful study of the sources, that he was able to modify his views over time, and that he was not yet acquainted with Hegelianism when he first proposed his theory of conflict in the early Church¹²⁸ Hodgson argues that Baur talked in terms of conflict, gradual reconciliation, and accommodation, rather than Hegelian thesis, antithesis and synthesis. Nevertheless, Hodgson himself continues to describe Baur's reconstruction using the term, antithesis. Hodgson goes on argue that Baur's basic theory was strengthened, not weakened, by the discovery of greater variety in the early Church than he had admitted.¹²⁹ Similarly, Hodgson acknowledges Baur's difficulty in describing a Jesus who perfectly embodied the Idea of Christianity, but he concludes that the difficulty exists simply because the challenge is so great.¹³⁰ Finally, Hodgson admits that Baur inherited weaknesses along with the philosophy he adopted. Yet, according to Hodgson, Baur actually gained insights from them. He says,

God and history, faith and historical knowledge, dogmatic theology and historical theology, must be internally related precisely because historical theology is one important element in the theological response to this revelation, and because the Christian Church and its founding events are fundamentally historical in character. Baur discovered and explicated these internal relationships. He probed them more intensively and creatively than any other major theologian.¹³¹

Morgan says that Hodgson “has rehabilitated Baur for the English-

¹²⁷ Hodgson, “Introduction,” 18-19.

¹²⁸ Hodgson, *Formation*, 200 and 256.

¹²⁹ Hodgson, *Formation*, 208-212.

¹³⁰ Hodgson, *Formation*, 258-259.

¹³¹ Hodgson, *Formation*, 267.

speaking world,” and it is certainly true that this was Hodgson’s aim.¹³² Nevertheless, Gasque is correct when he says that Hodgson’s work is “somewhat marred” by the need “to defend Baur almost *in toto*.”¹³³

Baur’s Influence

Reactions to Baur are extremely varied, some laudatory and others unfavorable. An examination of opinions regarding Baur’s historical reconstruction displays deep ambivalence. Christophe Senft, although usually supportive of Baur, observes that the theory of Markan priority “fundamentally calls in [*sic*] question the picture which Baur has drawn of the history of the primitive Church.”¹³⁴ According to Silva, even though Baur rightly proposed to judge as authentic those sources which are free of subjective aim, he ignored the possibility that Paul’s letters may be less trustworthy than Acts because of their polemical nature.¹³⁵ Similarly, Hefner states that Baur’s historical judgments are “frequently unreliable by current standards (but less so than we might wish!),” but he goes on to assert that “most of the issues raised are still relevant, mostly still unresolved.”¹³⁶ Furthermore, Ellis says, “That [Baur] was able to convince so many of the truth of his ‘history’ is a testimony to his brilliance as a systematic thinker,” yet he is troubled by Baur’s labeling of so many New Testament writings as forgeries and by the fact that this did not seem to bother Baur.¹³⁷ Likewise, Frederik Wisse declares that “[Baur’s] own reconstruction of this period remains one of the high points of historical analysis” and “has made the traditional view untenable.”¹³⁸ But he further notes that the largest group of Christian writings does not reflect the Baurian conflict. Baur’s reconstruction does not adequately account for the complexities of the literature, and it is not obvious that any of the writings functioned the way Baur thought.¹³⁹

¹³² Morgan, “Baur’s Lectures,” 202.

¹³³ Gasque, *History of Interpretation*, 26, n. 16.

¹³⁴ Senft, “Baur,” 81.

¹³⁵ Silva, “Historical Reconstruction,” 22.

¹³⁶ Hefner, “Baur Versus Ritschl,” 259.

¹³⁷ Ellis, “Foreword,” xiii.

¹³⁸ Wisse, “Early Christian Literature,” 179 and 182.

¹³⁹ Wisse, “Early Christian Literature,” 180-181.

There is also a divergence of opinion on the value of Baur's exegesis. Senft describes Baur as one of the most important contributors to the field of exegetical methodology.¹⁴⁰ Yet according to Gasque, Baur did little of what could be called exegesis, and he was prevented from "making any serious contribution to the cause of scientific exegesis."¹⁴¹ Morgan says that Baur based his view of Paul and Judaism on solid exegesis that "stands up surprisingly well," is "still instructive," "still worth visiting," and often "defensible."¹⁴² At the same time Morgan insists that Baur's view is too simplistic, that he failed to account for Jewish apocalyptic, and that basing his interpretation of Paul on Greek philosophy was "plainly wrong."¹⁴³ Similarly, Schweitzer sees no contradiction between his statement, "The great merit of the Tübingen critic was that he allowed the texts to speak for themselves, to mean what they said," and his observation that "detail is in fact somewhat neglected in [Baur's] treatment."¹⁴⁴

It is not easy to explain this diversity of opinion, particularly when the same person expresses both praise and criticism. Nevertheless, a number of contributing factors can be identified. First, Baur has been less accepted in the English-speaking world than in the German-speaking one, primarily because of different philosophical orientations.¹⁴⁵ Morgan observed that Germans were more influenced by the Enlightenment and the English more by ecclesiastical considerations.¹⁴⁶ To put it differently, Germany has been influenced by speculative philosophy and England by

¹⁴⁰ Senft, "Baur," 77.

¹⁴¹ Gasque, *History of Interpretation*, 40; quotation on page 54.

¹⁴² Morgan, "Baur's Lectures," 205; "England and Germany," 87; "Biblical Classics," 7, 8; respectively.

¹⁴³ Morgan, "Biblical Classics," 6-8.

¹⁴⁴ Schweitzer, *Paul*, 13 and 15, respectively.

¹⁴⁵ A simpler reason is that very few of Baur's works were translated into English, and those that were suffered from poor translation. Hodgson, "Introduction," 37, n. 84. Another reason is that one of the first attempts to popularize Baur's thesis in Britain, Cassel's *Supernatural Religion: An Inquiry into the Reality of Divine Revelation*, was attacked by Lightfoot in such a way that capable scholars no longer gave it serious consideration. Gasque, "Roots," 153.

¹⁴⁶ Morgan, "England and Germany," 96. See also Barrett, who notes that Lightfoot and Baur represent "different philosophical and theological traditions." Barrett, "Quomodo," 318.

pragmatism. Schweitzer's description of Baur, as a result, sounds contradictory to English ears:

The Tübingen scholar, in fact, uses the language of Paul in order to set forth an imposing philosophy of religion instinct [*sic*] with Hegelian influence. He gives no authentic account of the Apostle's thought. Nevertheless this book breathes the spirit of Paul the prophet of freedom more fully than almost any other which has been devoted to him. That is what gives it its remarkable attractiveness.¹⁴⁷

By contrast, Gasque notes that "British biblical scholarship was never the handmaid of philosophy," a deliberate and pejorative evaluation of the difference between British and German scholarship.¹⁴⁸ Nevertheless, Kaye rightly points out that, while Germany has been overtly conscious of its ties to philosophy, British scholarship relies on its own kind of philosophy. Baur may have been a "Hegelian idealist," but Lightfoot was a "commonsense empiricist," and both were committed to a particular view of revelation in history.¹⁴⁹

A second factor contributing to the difference of opinion is the faith commitments of both Baur and those who have evaluated him. Frank Kaufman concluded that Baur's complex faith caused the disagreement.¹⁵⁰ Indeed, some scholars perceive Baur as heterodox and as undermining true Christian faith. Those who take this view understandably seek to discredit him and to interpret the New Testament along traditional lines. Other scholars see in Baur a legitimate modernization of Christianity and thus find him compelling. The result, as Gasque pointed out, is that "two parallel streams of criticism begin to emerge, one of them from within Christian orthodoxy and the other in conscious reaction to it."¹⁵¹

A final cause of the divergence of opinion is that individuals come with different presuppositions. To put it in broadest terms, Baur is judged

¹⁴⁷ Schweitzer, *Paul*, 16.

¹⁴⁸ Gasque, *History of Interpretation*, 108. Gasque also says that criticism in Germany was built on the Tübingen viewpoint but British scholarship was founded on philology and Graeco-Roman history. Gasque, *History of Interpretation*, 105-106, 108.

¹⁴⁹ Kaye, "Lightfoot and Baur," 217-220. Cf. Hodgson, "Rediscovery," 206.

¹⁵⁰ Kaufman, *Foundations*, 143-144.

¹⁵¹ Gasque, "Roots," 149.

according to an interpretive framework, which Silva defines as a person's "network of mental associations."¹⁵² If one's mental framework can understand and accept Baur's reconstruction, then he is evaluated favorably. More specifically, Baur's interpretation of the data from early Christian writings is compared to a prior understanding of the meaning of those data. Baur's reconstruction is praised when (1) it can be assimilated into one's own interpretive framework and (2) it better accounts for more of the data than one's own interpretation. Wisse, therefore, correctly observed that Baur's success is due largely to his development of a "comprehensive framework" for interpreting early Christian literature and Church history.¹⁵³ Baur understood that a framework was necessary to interpret biblical data, and he provided that framework by positing the importance of conflict in the early Church. Specific details, according to Baur, can be misplaced without damaging the whole; yet Silva correctly warns, "According to Baur's thoroughgoing application of this method, the facts seem to count for very little."¹⁵⁴

Whether or not one agrees with Baur, it can be agreed that he exerts a continuing influence on New Testament research, though not everyone will agree that the impact has been positive. According to Gasque, Baur's impact is felt in six areas: (1) the on-going goal to create a comprehensive theory to explain all New Testament data, (2) the commitment to explicating a non-supernatural origin of Christianity, (3) the prevalent view of a split between Petrine/Jewish and Pauline/Gentile Christianity, (4) the widespread belief that Acts is not reliable as a history of the primitive Church, (5) the skepticism regarding the theology of Luke-Acts, and (6) the propensity for creating schools of thought, especially in Germany.¹⁵⁵

Ellis argues that Baur's greatest influence in New Testament Studies stems from his philosophy of history.¹⁵⁶ Senft would agree. He says Baur made a significant step forward by showing that both the biblical truth and theology proper are simply stages in the unfolding of divine truth.¹⁵⁷

¹⁵² Silva, "Historical Reconstruction," 124-145.

¹⁵³ Wisse, "Early Christian Literature," 177-179.

¹⁵⁴ Silva, "Historical Reconstruction," 125.

¹⁵⁵ Gasque, "Roots," 152.

¹⁵⁶ Ellis, "Foreword," xi.

¹⁵⁷ Senft, "Baur," 95, n. 8.

Similar considerations led Morgan to say, “Baur raises the ‘purely historical’ discipline of New Testament theology on to a theological plane, and by daring to speak of God in what seemed to him the best available language, showed New Testament scholars the way to become theologians.”¹⁵⁸ Likewise, Harold O. J. Brown says that “after Baur it became more or less taken for granted in academic circles that theology has always been in process and that there never was a ‘faith once delivered.’”¹⁵⁹

Baur’s methodology has also been influential. As we noted above, Senft values Baur’s contribution to exegetical methodology. Likewise, G. Wayne Glick says, “Baur’s significance lies in the fact that he was the first historian to apply seriously the methods of critical empirical investigation to the history of the Church.”¹⁶⁰ Morgan asserts that Baur’s tendency criticism “was the most significant antecedent of redaction criticism prior to Wrede’s *Messianic Secret*.”¹⁶¹ Fuller notes that despite the ultimate rejection of *Tendenzkritik*, it did supply a criterion for the Synoptic problem, namely when a writer carried over a *Tendenz* that differed from his own,

¹⁵⁸ Morgan, “Baur’s Lectures,” 206. Morgan elsewhere describes Baur as “the greatest single pioneer and practitioner in the field of historical theology.” Morgan, “Biblical Classics,” 4.

¹⁵⁹ Brown, *Heresies*, 26. Cf. Hefner, “Baur has made it impossible to raise the question of meaning in history without at least raising the concomitant question of theological and philosophical frameworks which will permit the historian to utilize their insights and still remain an historian. It is for this reason that Baur’s *Epochen*, for all its shortcomings, has never been superseded as a treatise on the methodology of writing church history.” Hefner, “Baur Versus Ritschl,” 277. Cf. also Hodgson: “Baur’s greatness consists in his recognition of the radically historical quality of the Christian Church and Christian faith, and in his concomitant development of an historical method appropriate to a critical *and* theological study of the Church and its founding events, a study which he understood to be an intrinsically proper and necessary theological discipline” Hodgson, “Rediscovery,” 206.

¹⁶⁰ G. Wayne Glick, “Nineteenth Century Theological and Cultural Influences on Adolf Harnack.” *CH* 28 (1959):167. He went on to say, “What remained as his enduring contribution, however, was his understanding that Christianity must be viewed as a historical phenomenon, and investigated by a historical-critical method.” Glick, “Influences,” 167.

¹⁶¹ Morgan, “Baur’s Lectures,” 203. Fuller also compared *Tendenzkritik* with redaction criticism, but noted that Baur himself was far removed from the modern redaction-critical approach. Fuller, “Baur Versus Hilgenfeld,” 362, 364.

dependency is present.¹⁶² Finally, as Gasque observed, the importance of Baur is not so much his method, but rather that he raises the right questions, which continue to influence New Testament Studies to this day.¹⁶³

Conclusion

Baur can be faulted from a number of angles. The critics of Tübingen demonstrated that Baur was wrong because the early Church was both more diverse and more unified than Baur admitted. Moreover, there was less of a rift between the Paul of Acts and the Paul of the Epistles than Baur thought.¹⁶⁴ Similarly, the idea can be challenged that ultimate truth undergoes development through history, that the Apostolic Faith is only one expression of unfolding reality.¹⁶⁵ It is better to say with Wolfhart Pannenberg that the meaning of history is known only from its end—but that end is known proleptically in Christ.¹⁶⁶ It is for this reason that the New Testament is the authoritative interpretation of history.

Because of such criticism, Baur's conclusions have been largely modified. Yet a Baurian kernel is still visible in many areas of New Testament Studies. The reason for this enduring presence is that Baur's reconstruction has not been entirely rejected but rather synthesized into fuller descriptions of early Christianity. Thus, it is not entirely accurate to say, as in the introduction, above, that a synthesis is still wanting. For a synthesis brings together aspects of the all theories being supplanted. Thus, as scholarship has progressed through consecutive syntheses, remnants of former theories never entirely disappear. One consequence of this approach, however, is that conclusions brought forward can be dislodged from their foundations and placed uncritically into a new setting where their validity is dubious. Such is the case with a number of the ideas of Baur, as we have seen.

There remains, nevertheless, a significant body of scholarship that has

¹⁶² Fuller, "Baur Versus Hilgenfeld," 369-370.

¹⁶³ Gasque, *History of Interpretation*, 52.

¹⁶⁴ Gasque, *History of Interpretation*, 70-72.

¹⁶⁵ Brown, *Heresies*, 38.

¹⁶⁶ Wolfhart Pannenberg. *Systematic Theology* (trans. Geoffrey W. Bromiley; vol. 3; Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1998), 595-607, esp. 605.

not made its peace with Tübingen. This cadre is comprised largely of English speaking scholars who remain opposed to Baur. Between the speculative-critical and the confessional-critical ways of thinking, there remains no synthesis. The divide between Baurian criticism and Light-footian criticism still seeks a synthesis after a century and a half. If this can serve as an example, it follows that Baur's vision of conflict and resolution must be deemed unrealistic.

Works Cited

- Baird, William. *From Deism to Tübingen*. Vol. 1 of *History of New Testament Research*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1992.
- Barrett, Charles K. "Quomodo historia conscribenda sit." *New Testament Studies* 28 (1982): 303-320.
- Baur, Ferdinand Christian. *Ausgewählte Werke in Einzelausgaben*. Edited by Klaus Scholder. Vol. 1. Stuttgart-Bad Cannstatt: Frommann, 1963.
- _____. *The Church History of the First Three Centuries*. Translated by A. Menzies. 2 vols. London: Williams and Norgate, 1878-1879.
- _____. "Die Christuspartei in der korinthischen Gemeinde, der Gegensatz des petrinischen und paulinischen Christenthums in der ältesten Kirche, der Apostel Petrus in Rom." *Tübinger Zeitschrift für Theologie*, 4 (1831): 61-206.
- _____. *Ferdinand Christian Baur on the Writing of Church History*. Edited and Translated by Peter C. Hodgson. New York: Oxford University Press, 1968.
- _____. *Paul, The Apostle of Jesus Christ: His Life and Work, His Epistles and His Doctrine*. Translated from the 2d German ed. by A. Menzies. 2 vols. London: Williams and Norgate, 1879.
- Brown, Harold O. J. *Heresies: The Image of Christ in the Mirror of Heresy and Orthodoxy from the Apostles to the Present*. New York: Doubleday, 1984.
- Ellis, E. Earle. Foreword to *The Tübingen School: A Historical and Theological Investigation of the School of F. C. Baur*, by Horton Harris. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1990.
- Fuller, Reginald H. "Baur Versus Hilgenfeld: A Forgotten Chapter in the Debate on the Synoptic Problem." *New Testament Studies* 24 (1978): 355-370.

- Gasque, W. Ward. "Historical Value of the Book of Acts: An Essay in the History of New Testament Criticism." *Evangelical Quarterly* 41 (1969): 68-88.
- _____. *A History of the Interpretation of the Act of the Apostles*. Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson Publishers, 1989.
- _____. "Nineteenth-Century Roots of Contemporary New Testament Criticism." Pages 146-156 in *Scripture, Tradition, and Interpretation*. Edited by W. Ward Gasque and William Sanford LaSor. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1978.
- Glick, G. Wayne. "Nineteenth Century Theological and Cultural Influences on Adolf Harnack." *Church History* 28 (1959): 157-182.
- Harris, Horton. *The Tübingen School: A Historical and Theological Investigation of the School of F. C. Baur*. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1990.
- Hefner, Philip J. "Baur Versus Ritschl on Early Christianity." *Church History* 31 (1962): 259-78.
- Hilgenfeld, Adolf. *Das Urchristentum*. Jena: F. Mauke, 1855.
- Hodgson, Peter C. "Alienation and Reconciliation in Hegelian and Post-Hegelian Perspective." *Modern Theology* 2 (1985): 42-63.
- _____. Introduction to *Ferdinand Christian Baur on the Writing of Church History*. Edited and Translated by Peter C. Hodgson. New York: Oxford University Press, 1968.
- _____. *The Formation of Historical Theology: A Study of F. C. Baur*. New York: Harper & Row, 1966.
- _____. "The Rediscovery of Ferdinand Christian Baur" (review of F. C. Baur, *Augsgewählte Werke*). *Church History* 33 (1964): 206-214.
- Käsemann, Ernst. Einleitung to *Ausgewählte Werke in Einzelausgaben*. Edited by Klaus Scholder. Vol. 1. Stuttgart-Bad Cannstatt: Frommann, 1963.
- _____. "What I have Unlearned in 50 Years as a German Theologian [Eng. tr. fr. *Kirchliche Konflikte*, 1982]." *Currents in Theology and Mission* 15 (1988): 325-335.
- Kaufman, Frank. *Foundations of Modern Church History*. Vol. 115 of *Theology and Religion, American University Studies, Series VII*. New York: P. Lang, 1992.
- Kaye, Bruce N. "Lightfoot and Baur on Early Christianity." *Novum Testamentum* 26 (1984): 193-224.

- Klijn, H. F. J. "Study of Jewish Christianity." *New Testament Studies* 20 (1974): 419-431.
- Kuhn, Thomas S. "Revolutions and Changes of World View." Pages 111-135 in *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1962.
- Kümmel, Werner Georg. *Introduction to the New Testament*. Translated by Howard Clark Kee. Rev. ed. Nashville: Abingdon, 1975.
- Latourette, Kenneth Scott. *The Nineteenth Century in Europe: The Protestant and Eastern Churches*. Vol. 2 of *Christianity in a Revolutionary Age: A History of Christianity in the Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries*. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1959.
- Lechler, Gotthard Victor. *The Apostolic and Post-apostolic Times: Their Diversity and Unity in Life and Doctrine*. Translated by A. J. K. Davidson. 3d ed. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1886.
- Leibing, Heinz. "Historical-Critical Theology." Translated by P. C. Hodgson. *Journal for Theology and the Church* 3 (1967): 55-69.
- Lichtenberger, Frederic Auguste. *History of German Theology in the Nineteenth Century*. Translated by W. Hastie. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1889.
- Lightfoot, Joseph Barber. *Apostolic Fathers*. London: Macmillan, 1889-1890.
- _____. *St. Paul's Epistle to the Galatians*. 5th ed. London: Macmillan, 1876.
- Mattill, A. J. *Luke as a Historian in Criticism since 1840*. Ph.D. diss., Vanderbilt, 1959. Photocopy, Ann Arbor, MI: University Microfilms International, 1981.
- Morgan, Robert. "Biblical Classics, 2: F. C. Baur: Paul." *Expository Times* 90 (1978): 4-10.
- _____. "F. C. Baur's Lectures on New Testament Theology." *Expository Times* 88 (1977): 202-206.
- _____. "Historical Criticism and Christology: England and Germany." Pages 80-112 in *England and Germany: Studies in Theological Diplomacy*. Edited by S. Sykes. Frankfurt: Verlag Peter D. Lang. 1982.
- Munck, Johannes. *Paul and the Salvation of Mankind*. Translated by Frank Clarke. London: SCM Press, 1959.
- Neill, Stephen and Tom Wright. *The Interpretation of the New Testament 1861-1986*. 2d ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1988.
- Overbeck, Franz. Introduction to *The Acts of the Apostles: Critically In-*

- vestigated*, by Eduard Zeller. Translated by Joseph Dare. Vol. 1. London: Williams and Norgate, 1875.
- Pannenberg, Wolfhart. *Systematic Theology*. Translated by Geoffrey W. Bromiley. Vol. 3. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998.
- Pascal, Blaise. *The Essential Pascal*. Translated by G. F. Pullen. Toronto: The New American Library of Canada Limited, 1966.
- Planck, Karl Christian. "Das Princip des Ebionitismus," *Theologische Jahrbücher* (1843): 1-34.
- Ritschl, Albrecht. *Das Evangelium Marcions und das kanonische Evangelium des Lucas*. Tübingen: Ostander, 1846.
- _____. *Die Entsehung der altkatholischen Kirche*. Bonn: A. Marcus, 1850.
- Rollmann, Hans. "From Baur to Wrede: The Quest for a Historical Method." *Studies in Religion* 17 (1988): 443-454.
- Schwegler, Albert. *Der Montanismus und die christliche Kirche des zweiten Jahrhunderts*. Tübingen: L.F. Fues, 1841.
- Schweitzer, Albert. *Paul and His Interpreters: A Critical History*. Translated by W. Montgomery. London: Adam and Charles Black, 1912.
- _____. *The Quest of the Historical Jesus*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2001.
- Senft, Christophe. "Ferdinand Christian Baur, Methodological Approach and Interpretation of Luke 15:11-32." Pages 77-96 in *Exegesis: Problems of Method and Exercises in Reading (Genesis 22 and Luke 15)*. Edited by Dikran Y. Hadidian. Translated by Donald G. Miller. Pittsburg: Pickwick Press, 1978.
- Silva, Moisés. "The Place of Historical Reconstruction in New Testament Criticism." Pages 105-133 in *Hermeneutics, Authority and Canon*. Edited by D. A. Carson and John D. Woodbridge. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1995.
- Stumpf, Samuel Enoch. *From Socrates to Sartre: A History of Philosophy*. Rev. 5th ed. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1993.
- Treloar, Geoffrey. *Lightfoot the Historian: The Nature and Role of History in the Life and Thought of J. B. Lightfoot (1828-1889) as Churchman and Scholar*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1998.
- Wisse, Frederik. "The Use of Early Christian Literature as Evidence for Inner Diversity and Conflict." Pages 177-190 in *Nag Hammadi, Gnosticism, & Early Christianity*, ed. Charles W. Hedrick and Robert Hodgson, Jr. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1986.

Zeller, Eduard. *The Acts of the Apostles Critically Investigated*. Translated by Joseph Dare. 2 vols. London: Williams and Norgate, 1875.
_____. "Einige weitere Beiträge zur Einleitung in die Apokalypse," *Theologische Jahrbücher* (1842): 654-717.

Theological Poetry

[Editor's Note: The following poems were produced by students in the New Testament Theology class at Asia-Pacific Nazarene Theological Seminary, March 2014.]

In the Tension

Anderson Godoy S

Will the day come, the day I'm waiting?
For even though I fight my sadness
Sometimes it really seems like madness
That you gave all but I'm still aching.

Where is the logic in your kingdom?
Why do we hurt as we grow old?
I don't see pearls or streets of gold...
Yet I believe and trust your wisdom

Since we are dwelling in the tension,
Please help me see the "here" you've given
When this "not yet" turns cumbersome.

Out of your mouth there's been no mention
Of all my sins you have forgiven...
I'll pray again, "thy kingdom come."

Kristaa Nun Thar [New Life in Christ]*Lal Pek Mawia*

Khua chuan ila, kan zo tlang hi,
 A mawi mange, khuanu kut chhuak;
 Tuk loh ram dai, sa va tin reng,
 Tu ngai lo a, tual an chaina;
 Aw zoram, dam reng ang che!

I mawi na a, nun rawng hluan e,
 Suih lung mawl luat vang em ni le;
 In-lu-lakna, i chhungah cham,
 Thim rorelna, an zar hliah che;
 I sak hming, tlangrel thang e.

A khi raltiang, tuipui piah an,
 I suihlung mawl, puan ang chul hnu;
 Krista thui loh kawra tuam'in,
 Mi lula hnam, thlarau manah,
 Mingo val'in, a siam ta che.

Sakhaw tharah, sa phun thar'in,
 Zu no aiah, chhandamna no;
 Famkhaw lawina Rihlipui khi;
 Jordan a ti, a sakhmingan,
 Hnam nun tan, Krista a pe.

Glancing yonder, our Chin Land,
 How beautiful, *Khuanu*¹ handiwork;
 A virgin Land, full of animals,
 O green pastures, without concerns;
 O Chin Land, live forever!

O such beauty, it makes you rude,
 Ignorant heart beats foolish now;
 Head-hunting there, your local yard,
 That is darkness, which shadows you!
 O bad name, O known to all.

Beyond horizons, beyond oceans,
 Ignorant mind, shabby as cloth;
 Covered with Christ, as unsown cloth,
 Headhunting warrior, soul-winning
 warrior;
 The white man, thus make you be!

Being proselyte, it's new *sakhua*²
 From rice beer cup, salvation crown;
 Lo! *Rihlipui*,³ dead spirit abode,
 Called it Jordan, as its new name;
 Christ is giv'n for your culture.

(Continued...)

¹ God's

² An object of worship

³ Rih Lake

Rihdil aiah, Galilee dil,
 Zawlbuk aiah, Kohhran a pe;
 Hringlang tlang kha, Kros-in vui liam,
 Pawla sai hlah, thlarau an bang,
 I sakhming, Kristian tiin.

Tlawmngaihna ro, Hmanngaihna nen,
 Mihlui thim fa, eng fa mi thar,
 Hming hlui boin, sakhming thar nen;
 Sualna senduk, Kristaah phum,
 Thawhle hna, i chan lo ni.

Ngai ru! Chatuan, khua a lo var!
 Thil hlui a ral, a lo thar ta!
 Lei famchanna, chatuanin thlak;
 Dai tawh lo tur, Pa hmangaihna,
 Kristaah, kan lo chang ta.
 Amen!

Galilee Lake, for *Rihlipui*,
 Church is given, *Zawlbuk*⁴ instead;
 O *Hring-lang-tlang*,⁵ faded by Cross,
 No more spirits that fear *Pawla*,⁶
 O new name, called Christian.

*Tlawmngaihna*⁷ treasure, Agape love,
 Darkness old son becomes new man;
 The old name gone, the new name
 come,
 The sinfulness buried in Christ;
 Resurrection, it is yours now!

Behold, behold! There comes eternity
 The old has gone, the new has come;
 This earth death place, eternal life,
 Unconditional, the love of God;
 Be our own in Jesus Christ.
 Amen!

⁴ Community house

⁵ Humanity mountain

⁶ Guard

⁷ Altruism

Glossary

Khuanu: This name is used for god. And the name itself is feminine gender as well; in short, this is regarded as blessing giver, the most superior authority holder. People respected this name because they thought that all blessing is in her hand and all are comforted with this. However, the very reason why the suffix *-nu* (female gender) was added is that this god is female.⁸

Rihlipui: This is one of the lakes in Myanmar. It is located near the village called *Rihkhawdar*, which was named after this lake in Chin Land, Myanmar. In the early culture, the belief was that all dead spirits were unable to avoid this lake; so all dead spirits must go to it. That is why to say “dead people” used related words such as *Rih tlang Mual Liam*, which means one dead spirit is gone but ready to pass from the lake to the mountain (see *Hringlang Tlang*, below).⁹

Sakhua: An object of worship, a god who presides over the house or household.¹⁰

Zawlbuk: This is a community house located in the midst of the village, for all villagers. This is used for communal decision-making, communal action, and security for the community. The young men are to sleep in this house for village security and other uses. It is not far from the village chairman’s house. It is especially used for such things as war and security from wild animals or enemies. People never abandon this house; rather they always stay there, especially at night.¹¹

Tlawmngaihna: This is a Mizo term, which literally means resistance to being helped by others, but instead helping others who are in need. The emphasis is on a denial of self rather than an effort to be independent. The purpose of this self-denial is to serve the community and any person in the community who is really in need of help. It is an act of charity wherein self-interest is subordinated to the interest of community, and self-sacrifice for the need of others is to come spontaneously as a natural part

⁸ James Dokhuma, *Hmanlai Mizo Kalphung* (Aijal: J. D. Press, 1992), 28.

⁹ Dokhuma, *Hmanlai Mizo Kalphung*, 34.

¹⁰ Lawmsanga, “A Critical Study on Christian Mission with Special Reference to Presbyterian Church of Mizoram” (PhD diss., University of Birmingham, 2010), vii, accessed December 17, 2014, <http://etheses.bham.ac.uk/767/1/Lawmsanga10PhD.pdf>.

¹¹ Dokhuma, *Hmanlai Mizo Kalphung*, 184.

of one's life. Without the principle of *tlawmngaihna*, communitarian societies like the Mizo community cannot function. It would not be possible to build a harmonious society where members of the community practiced "decision by consensus," sharing their joy and sorrows and caring for one another.¹²

Hringlang Tlang: In Mizo belief, after the dead spirit arrived at a place that was called the porch of the village of the dead, they arrived at the mountain called *hringlang tlang*. *Hringlang tlang* means they could still feel the human climate or atmosphere. They stand alone on that mountain, missing the living and watching the human world. Only after this will they arrive at the village of the dead.¹³

¹² Lawmsanga, "Critical Study," 283.

¹³ Dokhuma, *Hmanlai Mizo Kalphung*, 35.

When I Found You*Josephine J. Bodegas*

Comes a time to see the light
Things around me seem so bright
In all its perfectness
In the absence of life's darkness

There in life moving forward into
Comes a question where to go
For travel without you
Is no better than straying through

All the ways are so dim
So weary in finding claims
Where to go, where to find you
Oh so afraid what a crushing into

In the corner of brokenness
Here comes a door for the hopeless
A gentle Savior from a manger
Who laid a life, a gift for a dear

Thy shed blood heals
Thy voice so sweetly tells
How precious and loved you are
That I came from afar

You heard a wordless prayer but tears
You count no wrong but cares
For a lost treasure in you embrace
For a troubled heart, joy and peace

Oh, Jesus how sweet is your saving
Found a Truth we are searching
The heavenly way awaiting
The Life we are living.

By the Grace of God

Lee, Jung Yeol

I have handicap.
It is Tourette Syndrome.
I call it a friend.
It is my inseparable friend.
I remember the day when I meet the friend.

My body trembled and my voice cried out continuously.
My body was wet with perspiration and voice became husky.
But I still trembled and cried out.
I had a sore throat. Body had tension in muscle.

Younger brother asked me, "What's wrong with you?" My mom asked me,
"Why...?"
My father said, "If you are going to act like that, I will bind you and stop
your mouth."
At that moment, something invisible crashed on me.

I went to school. Friends asked me, "What are you doing? Are you ok?"
I tried to repress trembling of body, but there was more trembling.
I must repress crying out, I must repress the trembling of my body, so I
was always tired.
I was nervous if someone observed me.

I thought Tourette Syndrome is a curse to me. I feel I cannot do anything.
I have no confidence. I was afraid to face people.
I thought no one liked me.
Even my family does not understand me; who will love me?

(Continued...)

I wanted to commit suicide.
If I commit it, I might go to hell...
God does not want me to do it.
But, I am so depressed and there is no way.
Oh God, why did you give me this great thorn?
Did You give Apostle Paul epilepsy to trust You more?
You told him, “My grace is sufficient for you.”

But look at me. I cannot do anything because of Tourette Syndrome. How
can I live?
But You let me commit my life to you in darkness and despair.
And You have been leading me until now.
Tourette might be your love for me;
Because of this, I love You more and I desire You more.
Thank You, Lord.

Who Is Jesus?

Ernesto Lozano Fernandez

Jesus, is my Savior, my redeemer, my hope,
Example to follow, He is also my
Strength, in which I trust
Under every moment and circumstance. He is a
Servant and model to me.

Image of the invisible God,
Sovereign over all things,

Lord of Lords, seated
On the Glorious throne.
Visible are His Blessings
Every day He is with me; He will never leave me alone.

우리의 발을 씻기셨죠 [You Washed Our Feet]

Park, Seonmok

설날 대명절
아버지께서
말씀하시길
형님을 도우라 하셨죠

Happy New Year
My father
Blessed me
To help my brother

절망과 눈물
형님네 가족
신통농장에
두 손길 도움 내밀었죠

Hopeless, melted snow
How they are
For his burden spirit in piggery
I gave my hands

이 엄청난 일
한 가족으로
받아들이는
내 두 손 더럽혀야 했죠

How wondrous it is
As my family
Into my concern
My hands became dirty

유월절전야
당신께서는
더러운 우리
우리의 발을 씻기셨죠

In the Feast of Passover
How you are
Unclean we are
You washed our feet

형님과 누님
눈물과 위로
그 때 그 날에
한 가족이 되었는데

My brother my sister
Their tears their comfort
That moment that day
We became one family

내 손 내밀어
내 손 더럽혀
형님네 식구
사랑으로 섬기겠어요

With my humble hands
With my dirty hands
My beloved family
I will love and serve

(Continued...)

당신을 믿고
당신의 말씀
순종하는 것
사랑으로 섬기는 삶이죠

생사화복
우리를 위해
당신께서는
십자가에 그 손 못 박혔죠

By believing in you
By obeying you
By your words
I will love and serve

Life and death
Good and bad
You are for us
By your nailed hands on the cross

Call for Papers

The Mediator provides a forum for dialogue about theological issues related to ministry in Asian and Pacific contexts. In keeping with this purpose, the editorial committee seeks quality papers related to Bible, theology, missions, evangelism, and church growth. Also welcome are reviews of publications, including books and music. Contact the editor for more information.

Guidelines for Submission

1. Please submit all proposed articles to the editor in electronic form (Microsoft Word is preferable). Please put “Mediator Submission” in the subject line.
2. Articles must be written in standard international English.
3. Authors must provide complete bibliographical information either in citations or in a bibliography at the end. Citation style may be either parenthetical or footnote style, but must be consistent within each article. If used, format as footnotes rather than endnotes.
4. Articles must conform to the latest edition of Kate Turabian, *A Manual for Writers*.
5. Papers may be of any length, although authors may be asked to condense longer papers.
6. A list of non-standard abbreviations should be provided.

Information

Mission

Asia-Pacific Nazarene Theological Seminary, a graduate school in the Wesleyan tradition, prepares men and women for Christ-like leadership and excellence in ministries.

Vision

Bridging cultures for Christ, APNTS equips each new generation of leaders to disseminate the Gospel of Jesus Christ throughout Asia, the Pacific, and the world.

Strategic Objectives

1. Provide solid biblical, historical, and theological foundations and encourage lifelong learning.
2. Demonstrate the power, spiritual formation, and transformation possible within a multi-cultural community of committed believers.
3. Create a dynamic environment that reinforces spiritual gifts and graces, and the call to ministry.
4. Challenge to reach across ethnicity, culture, gender, class and geographical region for the sake of the Gospel.

The seminary exists to prepare men and women for ministry in the Asia-Pacific region and throughout the world by developing personal and professional attitudes and skills for analytical reflection upon Christian faith and life, and competencies in the practice of ministry. Since its founding in 1983, APNTS has trained men and women for a wide range of vocations. Today, over 350 graduates serve as pastors, teachers, Bible college presidents, missionaries, and various other church and para-church workers.

Degrees and Programs

APNTS offers the following academic courses:

- **Master of Divinity (90 units)**
- **Master of Arts in Religious Education (48 units)**
- **Master of Arts in Christian Communication (48 units)**
- **Master of Science in Theology (48 units)**
- **Doctor of Philosophy in Holistic Child Development (60 units)**

English is the language of instruction in the classrooms. Students must pass the Test of English as a Foreign Language (TOEFL) or the APNTS English Proficiency Exam to register. A score of 500 is required for the M.Div., 510 for the M.S.T. (Pastoral Ministry) degree and 550 for the M.A., M.S.T. (Biblical Studies, Faith and History, Intercultural Studies), and Ph.D. degrees.

Faculty

The well-qualified teaching staff upholds a high level of education. Adjunct and visiting professors from both within and outside the Asia-Pacific region help expand students' worldviews.

Accreditation

APNTS is accredited by the Philippines Association of Bible & Theological Schools (PABATS), Asia Theological Association (ATA), and the Association for Theological Education in Southeast Asia (ATESEA), and is recognized by the Philippines Commission for Higher Education (CHED).

Contact

For further information or for an application, please write to the address below:

Asia-Pacific Nazarene Theological Seminary

Ortigas Avenue Extension, Kaytikling
Taytay, Rizal 1920
Philippines

Fax: (+63) 2-658-4510
E-mail: apnts@apnts.edu.ph
Website: www.apnts.edu.ph