

Scripture

by Michael Coors, Frederike van Oorschot

Version 1.0 | Published 1 May 2026 | DOI <https://doi.org/10.15496/publikation-119877>

Other language version: Schrift (Deutsch)

Reference to the Bible as Holy Scripture is constitutive for Christianity in both praxis and theory and it plays a particularly important role in shaping identity within Protestantism. This is evident in its prominent status as canon. Since the Reformation, Protestant churches have regarded the Bible as the “rule and norm” (Formula of Concord, Art. I) of faith, towards which ecclesial life and theological teaching must be oriented. However, the manner in which this orientation towards the Bible is to be understood in the life of the churches and in the context of theological reflection remains controversial – both within Protestantism and among other denominations. In this respect, in contemporary Protestant dogmatics, Scripture is primarily viewed in terms of crisis. The debate surrounding the so-called “crisis of the Scripture principle” is a fundamental aspect of contemporary theological reflection on Scripture. To whom does Scripture apply, how, and in what respects? How do texts that must be interpreted historically relate to contemporary challenges? How should we deal with the plurality of Scripture and its interpretation?

Table of Contents

1. History of the Problem

1.1. Reformation and Development of the Scripture Principle in Early Protestant Theology

1.2. Historical Criticism and the Beginnings of Hermeneutics

1.3 Crisis of the Scripture Principle

2. Topics of a Theology of Scripture

2.1. Validity of Scripture – For Faith and for Theology

2.2. Literal Sense and the Inspiration of Scripture

2.3. Encyclopedic Controversies

2.4. Ecumenical: Scripture – Ministry – Tradition

Recommended Literature

Citations

Citation Style

Metadata

Editorial Note

Links to other media and further information regarding this topic can be found in the German version of this article.

1. History of the Problem

1.1. Reformation and Development of the Scripture Principle in Early Protestant Theology

Against the backdrop of the significance of Scripture since the early days of the Christian Church and theology (cf. art. Canon) and in confrontation with late medieval practices of scriptural interpretation, the understanding of Scripture became a key topic of discussion during the Reformation, particularly in Martin Luther's ^{GND} theology. Luther's understanding of the Christian faith developed from his intense study of the biblical texts. Distancing himself from the doctrinal tradition of the Church at the time, he assumed that Christian faith lives solely from Scripture (*sola scriptura*).

^[1] According to Luther, everything necessary for salvation can be found in Scripture (the sufficiency of Scripture). Therefore, it is necessary to debate the content of the Christian faith before the forum of biblical texts, using the means of reason. For Luther, the Church's doctrinal teaching must be subordinate to Scripture and remain open to criticism in the light of Scripture. ^[2] However, Luther does not express this conviction of the scriptural basis of faith and theology in terms of a concept of a Scripture *principle*. The term "principium" appears only twice in Luther's "Assertio omnium articulorum" and once in "De Servo Arbitrio." ^[3] There, it can best be understood in its literal sense as "beginning" or "origin": Scripture is the beginning and origin of faith because through Scripture God himself speaks to people in the Spirit (efficaciousness of Scripture for faith; Latin: *efficacia*). Therefore, Scripture is a sufficient basis for faith (*sola scriptura*; *sufficientia*; English: *sufficiency*). Dogmatically and ecclesiastically, Luther thus distances himself from the conviction that an ecclesiastical interpretation of Scripture was necessary for the salvation of humanity.

Luther's prominent formulation of Scripture as the ultimate authority in matters of Christian faith and theology became influential for all Reformation movements. Parallel to Luther, as early as 1516, the Zurich Reformer Ulrich Zwingli ^{GND} began to understand his theology as an interpretation of Scripture and began to critically question ecclesiastical tradition on the basis of Scripture. ^[4] In terms of content, Zwingli understood the reference to Scripture as establishing theology through the proclamation of the gospel of Jesus Christ. ^[5] For the Geneva Reformer John Calvin ^{GND} the authority of Scripture relies on its function as the means by which God talks to us: the "the authority of Scripture is founded on its being spoken by God." ^[6]

In ecclesiastical praxis, the churches of the Reformation were henceforth characterized by a multifaceted reference to biblical texts, for example in German Bible translations (e.g., the Luther Bible and the Zurich Bible), public interpretation of the Bible in the Zurich Prophezeey or congregational hymns based on biblical verses.

Following Luther, 17th-century Lutheran theology assumed that theology itself also had to be guided by Scripture because, in its efficaciousness, Scripture was the basis of faith. ^[7] Against this background, a systematic concept of a Scripture *principle* was developed, which tied in with the prevailing understanding of science at the time. According to the prevailing scientific theory of the late 16th century, ^[8] a *theoretical* science had to examine its subject matter on the basis of defined principles. Since early Lutheran theologians initially conceived of theology as a theoretical science, they understood the Bible as the principle of theology on the basis of the scriptural orientation of their time. ^[9] Later Lutheran theology conceived of theology as a *practical* science that, starting from the goal of the practice under investigation, sought the means and principles for realizing this goal. However, it still insisted on starting with the doctrine of Scripture. ^[10] In this context, early Protestant theology also assumed that the Bible was the principle of theology simply because it engenders faith in God (efficacy). In the praxis of dogmatic reflection, however, the application of the "principle" concept led to biblical passages being understood directly as theological principles (*dicta probantia*) from which doctrines were deduced. ^[11]

1.2. Historical Criticism and the Beginnings of Hermeneutics

This acute understanding of principles posed a problem during the early Enlightenment, when rationalism emerged. The revelation of the biblical texts was now measured against the standard of reason,^[12] and their theological interpretation became a special case of general hermeneutics. This was already evident in the work of Johann Konrad Dannhauer ^{GND}, who, at the beginning of the 17th century, presented a general theory of understanding, according to which anyone capable of using their intellect could understand the biblical writings.^[13] Friedrich Daniel Ernst Schleiermacher ^{GND} then made the transition from a theological doctrine of Scripture to a general hermeneutics, for which the biblical texts represent only a special case.^[14] This gave rise to the need to develop scriptural hermeneutics as an independent systematic task alongside exegesis, which was increasingly understood in historical terms.

This historical research into biblical texts formed the flip side of rationalism and called into question many long-held assumptions about the Bible that had previously been taken for granted. From a historical perspective, the Bible could no longer be considered a reliable source. Instead its texts were now seen as theological interpretations in their own right. This meant that the texts were primarily of interest as testimonies of early Christian faith, and their normative relevance for contemporary Christian faith required a new explanation. Since August Twisten ^{GND}, the conceptual distinction between Scripture as the formal principle and the doctrine of justification as the material principle of faith has become established.^[15] Identifying a material principle as the hermeneutical key to interpreting biblical texts allowed for unreserved historical criticism of those same texts. This distinction continues to have an impact on the question of the center of Scripture, or the “canon within the canon,” in the hermeneutical theology of the 20th century.^[16] The historical distancing of the texts makes the question of their theological appropriation, and thus the question of hermeneutics, a key issue in the theological approach to the Bible. However, this raises the question of whether Scripture is the norm of theology or whether theological hermeneutics is ultimately the decisive criterion by which Scripture is appropriated theologically.^[17] The idea of Scripture as a principle of theology therefore falls into crisis.

1.3 Crisis of the Scripture Principle

An essay by Wolfhart Pannenberg ^{GND} contributed significantly to coining the term “crisis of the Scripture principle.” In 1962 Pannenberg, using this title, described a “fundamental crisis of modern theology” caused by the “dissolution of the Scripture principle.”^[18] Based on his interpretation of Luther’s thesis of the perspicuity of Scripture – that the meaning of Scripture can be reconstructed from the exegetically discernible historical meaning of the words – historically oriented exegesis became highly significant for Protestant theology.^[19] According to Pannenberg, theological propositions in Lutheran theology claim to be based on exegesis.^[20] However, the development of the historical investigation of the Scriptures leads precisely to the dissolution of the Scripture principle demanded by Luther.^[21] Unlike Luther, contemporary Lutheran theology faces the challenge of addressing the gap between the historical meaning of the words and the events they describe, i.e., the gap between the historical situation and the undeniable plurality and contradictions of the writings of the canon, in a theologically responsible manner.^[22]

Since then, a broad discussion has been taking place in Systematic Theology under the heading coined by Pannenberg. It revolves around the tension between the plurality of biblical testimony and its normative application in the sense of *sola scriptura*, the discourse on the authority of Scripture, the Reformation’s description of a center of Scripture, and the associated discourse on the perspicuity and sufficiency of Scripture. However, the mediality and materiality of Scripture, as well as the power of speaking about Scripture as a principle, are also coming into focus. The theological significance of the biblical texts is also being debated from an exegetical perspective. The breadth and divergence of the debate on the understanding of Scripture within Protestant theology testifies, on the one hand, to the constitutive significance of the topic and, on the other hand, its complexity, which is due to both differences in position and hermeneutical upheavals. Overall, the tension between the normative and confessional significance of

Scripture, which is expressed in the discourse on the “Scripture principle,” and the aforementioned issues in realizing this significance in dogmatic reflection on Scripture and with Scripture, pose an ongoing challenge.

2. Topics of a Theology of Scripture

2.1. Validity of Scripture – For Faith and for Theology

The problems with describing Scripture as the principle of theology were already made clear in the historical introduction: Scripture is – as Luther recognized – the origin of faith and a sufficient reason for it, but it is not the sole foundation of theology, which also refers to theological traditions and experiences. Luther refers to Scripture as a principle both in the preface to *Assertio* and in *De servo arbitrio*.^[23] But Scripture is addressed as a principle of *faith* and only thereby as criterion for theology.

Here, the spirit clearly imparts enlightenment and teaches that knowledge is imparted solely through the words of God, like through a door or an opening or a first principle (as they say), from which one must begin if one wants to attain light and knowledge.^[24]

In this sense, Soteriology is undoubtedly the starting point for the discourse on *sola scriptura*.^[25] Thus, on the other hand, Luther reveals the inextricable intertwining of ecclesiastical doctrine and theology for which Scripture serves as a criterion.^[26] It should be noted that for Luther, the soteriological positioning cannot be understood separately from its fundamental theological significance. In other words, the special status of Scripture in Christianity is a soteriological category rather than a category of Fundamental Theology.^[27] This ambivalence is reflected in the positioning of the doctrine of Scripture within systematic theology: in dogmatics, Scripture is introduced both as a topic of foundational theology and a Christological, soteriological and ecclesiological topic.

In view of these plural references to the biblical text and its significance for theology, the binding nature of Scripture in Protestant theology can be described in two ways:^[28] (1) The binding nature of Scripture describes the significance of the biblical texts for theology, which has grown historically. (2) This description implies normative elements: a reference to the biblical texts is established and prescribed in Protestant tradition – regardless of how individuals relate to it. In any case, it is impossible to assume a “non-relationship” to the biblical texts as the starting point for theological reflection because Christian religious praxis, as the subject of theology, refers to Scripture as normatively relevant in its practices of scriptural reception. Thus, the validity of Scripture in theology is always indirectly mediated, resulting from its validity for the praxis of the Christian faith. This highlights the *relational structure* between Scripture, its recipients, and their communities of reception. It also highlights the processual nature of the authority of Scripture: theology’s relationship to Scripture is not static, but can only take shape through engagement with it, i.e., through interpretation. In this way, the encyclopedic dimension of the crisis of the Scripture principle, outlined below, also comes into focus in a constructive way.

2.2. Literal Sense and the Inspiration of Scripture

A central problem in referring back to the Reformation origins of Protestant theology in the current teaching on Scripture is that the concept of the literal meaning of Scripture has fundamentally changed. For Luther, and for later Lutheran theology, the literal sense (*sensus literalis*) of the biblical texts was identical to their spiritual meaning and was realized through the text’s efficacy: the *sensus literalis* was the “literal meaning according to the mind (*mens*) of the Holy Spirit.”^[29] The inspiration of the texts by the Spirit of God in this sense is evident in their ability to give rise to faith. Thus, the idea that the authors of the texts were inspired was derived from the texts’ function of inspiring faith. The efficaciousness to bring about faith was precisely what was referred to in the idea of the perspicuity of the biblical texts, which undoubtedly also contain many obscure and difficult-to-understand passages. Overall, biblical texts were thus read as a medium of communication between God and humanity: here, God communicates as the Holy Spirit through the form of the written word. The historical conditionality of the texts was subordinate to this theological

communication. For Johann Andreas Quenstedt ^{GND}, for example, this even led to the relativization of the importance of historical authorship for theology.^[30]

During the Enlightenment, the development of a historical consciousness gave rise to the concept of a historically situated literal meaning, which can be distinguished from an inherent literal meaning of a text. Against this background, interpreting the doctrine of inspiration as a doctrine about the production of texts as is done, for example, in the Evangelical Chicago Statement,^[31] immediately brings the doctrine of inspiration into conflict with historical knowledge about the origin of the biblical texts. The concept of inspiration accordingly must be rendered outdated. However, the actual theological function of the Lutheran doctrine of inspiration was to attribute autonomy to the biblical text in relation to both its readers and its historical authors. Within this framework, it *can* be seen as a place where the Spirit of God is at work. Taking up this idea, it seems more productive to understand the biblical texts as inspired in the sense that they *inspire faith*. On this basis, they can then be understood as a place where the Spirit of God is active, particularly in their material form. Christian faith cannot exist without reference to the biblical texts from which it arises. This connection between faith and Scripture is interpreted theologically in the doctrine of inspiration as the work of the Holy Spirit through the text. Therefore, a theological interpretation can never replace the texts in their function as the starting point of faith, whether through a historical return to the authors' intentions or through a systematic theological interpretation of their content.

2.3. Encyclopedic Controversies

Since the Enlightenment and the emergence of historical criticism, the debate about the nature and significance of Scripture has been closely intertwined with the differentiation of theological disciplines and their methodological approaches to biblical texts. In his inaugural lecture in Altdorf, "De iusto discrimine theologiae biblicae et dogmaticae regundisque recte utriusque finibus," Johann Philipp Gabler ^{GND} formulated the idea that historical critical analysis of biblical texts should be emancipated from dogmatic constraints. This led to the development of a variety of exegetical approaches to biblical texts, each with a different emphasis.^[32] This is linked to the dual character of biblical texts in Christian reception: on the one hand, they are historical texts, sources from different times and contexts. On the other hand, as canon and Holy Scripture, these texts are considered authoritative for faith and contemporary ecclesiastical doctrine. In the confessions of the Reformation, this authority of the biblical texts was established not only with regard to the constitution of faith, but also in terms of hermeneutical and fundamental theological authority. Scripture serves as the "only rule and guide by which all teachers and learners are to be judged and evaluated"^[33] (Formula of Concord). Overall, the tension between the normative and confessional-constitutive significance of Scripture and the aforementioned problems in realizing this significance in doctrinal formation – highlighted particularly in the exegetical disciplines – represents an ongoing challenge for theology. Since the Enlightenment, historical research on biblical texts, has not only brought this tension between the texts' historical character and their normative application to the fore in terms of scriptural hermeneutics, but it has also manifested itself institutionally between the theological disciplines.

2.4. Ecumenical: Scripture – Ministry – Tradition

In theological tradition, the term "Scripture" refers to the biblical texts. Designating these texts as Scripture emphasizes their special significance as canonized texts for the Christian community in their specific compilation. Thus, in the ecumenical context of several churches with varying canons, Scripture stands in a tense relationship to tradition and ecclesiastical office.^[34]

According to a *Reformation understanding*, faith is based on the Word of God, as attested to in Scripture and proclaimed in the Church. The Spirit of God reveals this to believers as they read and listen to Scripture. Therefore, the Word of God itself cannot be handed down, but only testified to. Luther therefore describes tradition solely in the sense of human tradition. Furthermore, the Protestant tradition does not recognize any magisterium in the Roman Catholic sense, but sees itself as an interpretive community, with all believers interpreting Scripture together and

trusting in the guidance of the Holy Spirit. The Church plays a supporting role in this by promoting and maintaining the ministry of preaching.

Catholic doctrine emphasizes the importance of the unbroken apostolic tradition in the Church. The magisterium, exercised by the bishops with the pope at their head, oversees the interpretation of Scripture and the preservation of tradition. Scripture is interpreted in the context of tradition, i.e., in connection with the confessions of faith and dogmas of the Church. Both Scripture and tradition spring from the same source – the Holy Spirit – and are mutually dependent. Traditional teachings thus stand alongside Scripture, both of which should be “accepted and revered with equal love and respect” (Dei Verbum 9; German: “mit gleicher Liebe und Achtung angenommen und verehrt werden”). The relationship between the magisterium and Scripture relate to each other is one of the central points of ecumenical controversy.

In other Protestant denominations (in Germany, referred to collectively as *Freikirchen*), which are rather diverse theologically, Scripture is central: every believer has direct access it, mediated solely by the Holy Spirit and not by tradition or ecclesiastical ministries. Scripture must be interpreted anew and situationally for life in faith. This emphasis on Scripture, among other things, means that many free churches are characterized by a critical attitude towards tradition.

In the *Orthodox Churches*, Scripture and tradition are inseparable, as they both originate from the same source. Together, they constitute the one tradition of Christ and the apostles, which is preserved by the Holy Spirit. Therefore, the question of the precedence of one authority over another is thus irrelevant. In recent theology, however, the question of the relative importance of Scripture and tradition has been –more explicitly identified as a dilemma for the Orthodox Churches in light of ecumenical debates.

Recommended Literature

Thiselton, Anthony C., *The Two Horizons. New Testament Hermeneutics and Philosophical Description with Special Reference to Heidegger, Bultmann, Gadamer, and Wittgenstein*, Grand Rapids 1980.

Paddison, Angus, *Theologians on Scripture*, London 2016.

Webster, John, “A Great and Meritorious Act of the Church?” *The Dogmatic Location of the Canon*, in: Barton, John/Wolter, Michael (Eds.), *Die Einheit der Schrift und die Vielfalt des Kanons*, Berlin et al. 2003, 95–126.

Ricœur, Paul, *The Canon Between the Text and the Community*, in: Pokorný, Petr/Roskovec, Jan (Eds.), *Philosophical Hermeneutics and Biblical Exegesis*, Tübingen 2002, 7–27.

Bockmuehl, Markus/Torrance, Alan J, *Scripture's Doctrine and Theology's Bible. How the New Testament Shapes Christian Dogmatics*, Grand Rapids 2008.

Citations

- ¹ Cf. Luther, Martin, *Assertio omnium articolorum*. LStA I, 84,1f: “solam Scripturam regnare [...] volo.”
- ² Cf. Luther, *Assertio*, 80,23–84,2.
- ³ See the references in footnotes 23 and 24.
- ⁴ Cf. Zwingli, Huldrych, *Auslegung und Begründung der Thesen oder Artikel* (1523), in: *Huldrych Zwingli Schriften Bd. II*, Zürich 1995, 172f. See also Oritz, Peter, *Ulrich Zwingli. Prophet, Ketzer, Pionier des Protestantismus*, Zürich 2015, 18.
- ⁵ Cf. Zwingli, *Auslegung*, 20–28, 172.
- ⁶ Calvin, John, *Institutes of the Christian Religion*, transl. by Henry Beveridge, Edinburgh 1846, I,7,4 (p. 74).

- ⁷ Cf. Coors, Michael, *Scriptura efficax*. Die biblisch-dogmatische Grundlegung des theologischen Systems bei Johann Andreas Quenstedt. Ein dogmatischer Beitrag zu Theorie und Auslegung des biblischen Kanons als Heiliger Schrift, Göttingen 2009, 135–166.
- ⁸ Cf. Zabarella, Jakobus, *Über die Methoden (De Methodis). Über den Rückgang (De regressu)*, ed. and trans. Rudolf Schicker, München 1995.
- ⁹ Cf. Hägglund, Bengt, *Die Heilige Schrift und ihre Deutung in der Theologie Johann Gerhards*. Eine Untersuchung über das altlutherische Schriftverständnis, Lund 1951, 56f.
- ¹⁰ Cf. Coors, *Scriptura*, 307–329.
- ¹¹ Cf. Coors, *Scriptura*, 224f.
- ¹² Cf. Rohls, Jan, *Protestantische Theologie der Neuzeit* Bd. I, Tübingen 1997, 297.
- ¹³ Cf. Alexander, Werner, *Hermeneutica Generalis*. Zur Konzeption und Entwicklung der allgemeinen Verstehenslehre im 17. und 18. Jahrhundert, Stuttgart 1993, 82f.
- ¹⁴ Cf. Schleiermacher, Friedrich Daniel Ernst, *Hermeneutik und Kritik*, ed. Manfred Frank, Frankfurt a. M. ⁷1999.
- ¹⁵ Cf. Twesten, August Detlev Christian, *Vorlesungen über die Dogmatik der evangelisch-lutherischen Kirche nach dem Kompendium des Herrn Dr. de Wette* Bd. I, Hamburg 1826, § 20, (277–285).
- ¹⁶ See, for example, Barton, John/Wolter, Michael (Eds.), *Die Einheit der Schrift und die Vielfalt des Kanons*, Berlin et al. 2003.
- ¹⁷ Cf. Webster, John, “A Great and Meritorious Act of the Church?” *The Dogmatic Location of the Canon*, in: Barton, John/Wolter, Michael (Eds.), *Die Einheit der Schrift und die Vielfalt des Kanons*, Berlin et al. 2003, 95–126; Ricœur, Paul, *The Canon Between the Text and the Community*, in: Pokorný, Petr/Roskovec, Jan (Eds.), *Philosophical Hermeneutics and Biblical Exegesis*, Tübingen 2002, 7–26.
- ¹⁸ Pannenberg, Wolfhart, *Die Krise des Schriftprinzips*, in: idem, *Grundfragen systematischer Theologie*. Gesammelte Aufsätze, Göttingen ³1979, 11–21, 13, translation by Jacob N. Cerone. German: “Grundlagenkrise der modernen Theologie” durch die “Auflösung des Schriftprinzips.”
- ¹⁹ Cf. Pannenberg, *Krise*, 14.
- ²⁰ In this sense, see also Ebeling, Gerhard, *Die Bedeutung der historisch-kritischen Methode für die protestantische Theologie und Kirche*, in: idem, *Wort und Glaube*, Tübingen ³1967, 1–49, 47f.
- ²¹ Cf. Pannenberg, Wolfhart, *Gibt es Prinzipien des Protestantismus, die im ökumenischen Dialog nicht zur Disposition gestellt werden dürfen?*, in: Graf, Friedrich W./Tanner, Klaus (Eds.), *Protestantische Identität heute*. FS Trutz Rendtorff, Gütersloh 1992, 79–86, 80.
- ²² Cf. Pannenberg, *Krise*, 15.
- ²³ “Cogimur primum probare illud ipsum primum principium nostrum” (WA 18, 653, 33f.; “to prove our highest principle, through which everything else can be proven.” (Translation by Jacob N. Cerone).
- ²⁴ Luther, *Assertio*, LDStA I, 81,7–11: “Hic clare spiritus tribuit illuminationem et intellectum dari docet per sola verba dei, tanquam per ostium et apertum seu principium (quod dicunt) primum, a quo incipi oporteat ingressurum ad lucem et intellectum” (WA 7,97, 26–29), translation by Jacob N. Cerone. It becomes clear that Luther does not seem to be explicitly concerned with the formulation of Scripture as a principle, but that he explicitly refers to this description as a way of speaking adopted by others.
- ²⁵ Cf. Kupsch, Alexander, *Martin Luthers Gebrauch der Heiligen Schrift*. Untersuchungen zur Schriftautorität in Gottesdienst und gesellschaftlicher Öffentlichkeit (HUTh 77), Tübingen 2019, 374.379; Schwöbel, Christoph, *Sola Scriptura*. Schriftprinzip und Schriftgebrauch, in: Heckel, Ulrich et al. (Eds.), *Luther heute*. Ausstrahlungen der Wittenberger Reformation (UTB 4792), Tübingen 2017, 1–28, 21f.
- ²⁶ See, e.g., Hartlieb, Elisabeth, “Die einzige Regel und Richtschnur...” Ist das protestantische Schriftprinzip an sein Ende gekommen?, in: Baumann, Gerlinde/Hartlieb, Elisabeth (Eds.), *Fundament des Glaubens oder Kulturdenkmal? Vom Umgang mit der Bibel heute*, Leipzig 2007, 59–88, 62f.; Leppin, Volker, *Wie legt sich nach*

Luther die Schrift selbst aus? Luthers pneumatische Hermeneutik, in: Alkier, Stefan (Ed.), Sola Scriptura 1517–2017. Rekonstruktionen – Kritiken – Transformationen – Performanzen. Unter Mitarbeit von Dominic Blauth/Max Botner (Colloquia historica et theologica 7), Tübingen 2019, 83–102, esp. 96–102; Zeller, Kinga, Luthers Schriftverständnis aus rezeptionsästhetischer Perspektive. Eine Untersuchung zu Anknüpfungspunkten, Transformationsmöglichkeiten und bleibenden Differenzen, Leipzig 2020, 140f., 145f., 149f.

²⁷ Cf. Oorschot, Frederike van, Schriftlehre, Schriftauslegung und Schriftgebrauch. Eine Untersuchung zum Status der Schrift in der und für die Dogmatik (Dogmatik in der Moderne 40), Tübingen 2022 and Coors, Scriptura.

²⁸ Cf. Focken, Friedrich-Emanuel/Oorschot, Frederike van (Eds.), Schriftbindung evangelischer Theologie. Theorieelemente aus interdisziplinären Gesprächen (Forum Theologische Literaturzeitung 37), Leipzig 2020.

²⁹ Quenstedt, Johann Andreas, Theologia didactico polemica sive Systema Theologicum, Pars I, IV/2, q. XIII, Thesis: “sensus literalis [...] iuxta mentem Spiritus Sancti” (translation by Jacob N. Cerone). German: “wörtliche Sinn gemäß dem Verstand (*mens*) des Heiligen Geistes.” For Luther, it was a matter of interpreting Scripture “through itself and its own spirit” (Assertio, StA 83,8f., translation by Jacob N. Cerone). German: “durch sich selbst und ihren eigenen Geist.”

³⁰ Cf. Quenstedt, Theologia, Pars I, IV/2, q. VIII, FS VII.

³¹ Cf. International Council on Biblical Inerrancy, The Chicago Statement on Biblical Inerrancy, Oakland 1978 (https://library.dts.edu/Pages/TL/Special/ICBI_1.pdf), accessed on 22.04.2026.

³² Cf. Gabler, Johann Philipp, Von der richtigen Unterscheidung der biblischen und der dogmatischen Theologie und der rechten Bestimmung ihrer beider Ziele (De iusto discrimine theologiae biblicae et dogmaticae regundisque recte utriusque finibus), in: Strecker, Georg (Ed.), Das Problem der Theologie des Neuen Testaments (WdF 367), Darmstadt 1975, 32–44.

³³ Dingel, Irene et al. (Eds.) Die Bekenntnisschriften der Evangelisch-Lutherischen Kirche, Göttingen 2014, 1216, translation by Jacob N. Cerone. German: “einige Regel und Richtschnur, nach welcher zugleich alle Lernen und Lerer gerichtet und geurteilt werden sollen”.

³⁴ Cf. Oorschot, Frederike van, Art. Schrift und Tradition, in: Konfessionskunde. Das ökumenische Wissensportal (<https://konfessionskunde.de/themen/begriff/schrift-und-tradition>), accessed on 22.04.2026.

Citation Style

Coors, Michael, Oorschot, Frederike van: „Scripture“, Version 1.0, in: Online Lexicon for Systematic Theology, ISSN 3052-685X, 1 May 2026. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.15496/publikation-119877>

Metadata

DOI	https://doi.org/10.15496/publikation-119877
Creative Commons Licence	Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivs CC BY-NC-ND (4.0)
Type	
peer reviewed by	Elisabeth Maikranz
Translator(s)	Jacob N. Cerone

Collection of Articles	Ecclesiology , Prolegomena
Index Theologicus (IxTheo)	Authority , Canon , Church , Confession , Exegesis , Faith , Gospel , Hermeneutics , Historical Criticism , Holy Spirit , Jesus Christ , Magisterium , Rationalism , Revelation , Tradition
Subject Headings (LOC)	Authority , Canon , Church , Confession , Exegesis , Faith , Gospel , Hermeneutics , Historical Criticism , Holy Spirit , Jesus Christ , Magisterium , Rationalism , Revelation , Tradition
Keyword	Authority , Canon , Church , Confession , Exegesis , Faith , Gospel , Hermeneutics , Historical Criticism , Holy Spirit , Jesus Christ , Magisterium , Rationalism , Revelation , Tradition
Mentioned People	John Calvin , Johann Konrad Dannhauer , Johann Philipp Gabler , Martin Luther , Wolfhart Pannenberg , Johann Andreas Quenstedt , Friedrich Daniel Ernst Schleiermacher , August Twesten , Ulrich Zwingli

KEYWORDS

