

THE DOCTRINE OF THE SCRIPTURE

Part II: The Medieval and Reformation Church

Summary:

- I. INTRODUCTION.**
- II. THE DOCTRINE OF THE SCRIPTURE IN THE MEDIEVAL CHURCH.**
 - A. The Scriptures to the Schoolmen.
 - B. The Scriptures after the Schoolmen.
- III. THE DOCTRINE OF THE SCRIPTURE IN THE REFORMATION CHURCH.**
 - A. The Scriptures and the Dogma of Rome.
 - B. The Scriptures and the Reformation Tradition.
- IV. CONCLUSION.**

I. INTRODUCTION.

The position of the Ancient Church, excepting that of the Church Fathers, toward the Scriptures is best amplified in the views of Augustine. Polman wrote (*The Word of God According to Scripture*, 40): “Together with the entire Church of his day, St. Augustine was firmly convinced that the Bible was divinely inspired, and was greatly heartened in his belief by the unanimous witness of the Church from Apostolic times onwards.” The verbs that Augustine used to denote the mechanics of inspiration were *inspirare*, *dictare*, *sugguere*, and *gubernare*. Polman concluded (*The Word of God According to Scripture*, 51): “The Bible was both the exclusive work of the Holy Spirit alone and at the same time the exclusive work of biblical writers. Beyond that St. Augustine did not theorize.” Augustine clearly ascribed to verbal, plenary inspiration, but the issue was essentially that of the canon. This important point is made in contradistinction to recent assertions by evangelical scholars, such as Rogers and McKim (*The Authority and Interpretation of the Bible*) that the church taught, until the rise of Protestant scholasticism, an accommodation view of Scripture that included error in historic facts. It might be diagrammed as follows:

N.B. The issue of the extent, not inspiration, of the canon was a prime consideration in the Ancient Church as was the relationship of tradition to authority.

N.N.B.B. Though inspiration was affirmed, their allegorical hermeneutic, which was heavily influenced by a neo-platonic epistemology, often changed the literal meaning of the text.

Augustine elevated the *Book of Wisdom* into the canon (*Tobias* also) and held the Septuagint text, not the Hebrew original, to be inspired. This on the criteria of “time-hallowed church usage.” Jerome rejected the O.T. apocryphal books because they were written in Greek; his understanding was that Hebrew was the language of O.T. inspiration.

As one turns to the Medieval era, the not-so Dark Ages, the unresolved extent of authority continued in the church.

II. THE DOCTRINE OF THE SCRIPTURE IN THE MEDIEVAL CHURCH.

A. The Scriptures to the Schoolmen.

It becomes readily evident that the canon was not finalized (the discussion was not concluded) in the Church by the Council of Carthage (A.D. 397) and Athanasius' Festal Letter (A.D. 365/66).

1. **Gregory the Great (604d)** understood the Maccabees to be apocryphal, but elevated Tobias and Wisdom by using the term "Scripture." He also ascribed fifteen epistles to Paul, not fourteen.
2. **Isadore of Seville (636d)** placed the Apocrypha into the canon while expressing doubts about Hebrews, 2 Peter, James, and John's letters.
3. **John of Damascus (754d)**, the first Christian theologian who attempted a complete reduction of theology to systematics, rejected the O.T. apocrypha, but added the Apostolic Constitutions and I and II Clement to his N.T. corpus of sources.
4. **Nicephorus of Constantinople (828d)** added Baruch to the O.T. and rejected Revelation in the N.T. He rejected the O.T. and N.T. apocryphal literature otherwise.

N.B. The canon was not fixed by an ecumenical council and, thus, not part of "Dogmatic Theology" until the sixteenth century.

5. **The Great Carolingian Revival** in the West was significant in the development of the canon as Charlemagne sought after the purity of the Scriptures. Charlemagne appealed to Pope Adrian I who supplied him with a list of sacred Scriptures and at Aux-la-Chapelle (789), he adopted the previous findings of Laodicea (363). The emperor rejected the Apocrypha of the O.T. and the Apocalypse.

N.B. A debate was waged over inerrancy in the period (the reign of Louis the Pious) between Fredegisus of Tours and Agobard of Lyon.

6. **Hugo of St. Victor (1141d)**, the mystic, stated that the O.T. Apocrypha was read in the churches, but not written into the canon.
7. **John of Salisbury (1182d)** had the same view of the O.T. Apocrypha and ascribed fifteen epistles to Paul.

B. The Scriptures After the Schoolmen.

Reuss has argued that the church from the fourth to the fourteenth century was not settled, as in the sixteenth century, on the question of the canon (*History*, 266-67): “On this point, things were no further advanced at the end of the fourteenth century than they had been at the end of the fourth; appeal was made at one and the same time to the rules laid down at Laodicea and Carthage, which contradicted each other, and to those of Trullam [sic., Trullam Synod, 692] which assigned the same authority to them both. Exclusive use was made of the text of Jerome, who presented in a confused mass the elements of the double canon, and carefully distinguished between them in his prefaces. From the standpoint of a scriptural theology such as ours, such a state of things would have been intolerable. The reality of the fact, and the absence of all greater inconvenience which might have resulted from it, prove of themselves that the theology of the Middle Ages, or rather Christian theology at the time when official Catholicism was coming into existence, was not based on biblical teaching as such to the exclusion of all other, but on an ecclesiastical tradition sufficiently powerful in itself to have nothing to fear from the fluctuations of opinion which scarcely touched the outer fringes of the system. The Bible had its practical value; it was of use for private and common edification; in that respect it lost nothing by being enriched and extended. As to its dogmatic teaching, the elementary truths it consecrated had, from the first and quite independently, become indisputable axioms for every member of the church; and the science of the schools when it did come to discuss questions for which Holy Scripture gave no clear and direct reply, soon ceased to consult it, turning by preference to the authorities which had succeeded in deciding them, and promulgating their opinions. The discussion of the scriptural canon presented no practical interest whatever, and that explains how a question which to us seems all-important, should have remained without answer for six centuries.”

“But it also explains why this same question remained undecided even when the attempt was made to resolve it officially. Down to the close of the Middle Ages, the see of Rome had not delivered any categorical opinion of the canon of the Bible.”

N.B. In the Trullam Synod, which met at Constantinople in 692, Article two, refers to both synods Laodicea and Carthage on the question of the extent of authority.

1. **Pope Eugenius IV at the Council of Florence (1438–45)**, in a hopeful attempt to bring the Eastern church back into the fold, published the first papal bull regarding the canon. Eugenius’ list contained those in the Vulgate as universally inspired (Tobit and Judith are between Nehemiah and Esther; Wisdom and Ecclesiasticus between Song of Solomon and Isaiah; Baruch before Ezekiel; and Maccabees after Malachi). He

obliterated Jerome's careful distinction between books to be read in the churches (O.T. - Hebrew texts) and those to read for edification (Greek O.T. apocryphal books). Reuss wrote (*History*, 269), "There is therefore ground in saying that the Church of Rome concerned herself very little with the caprices or the theories of its great writers, and continued to walk with a firm step in a path marked out by the ancient usages of its ritual."

N.B. This did not end the debate in the West as the Apocalypse was still questioned by a few.

The opening of the sixteenth century brought a renewal of scientific and literary life as the Renaissance burst upon the clergy of the church.

2. **Thomas de Vio (Cajetan)**, bishop of Gaeta and Luther's opponent at Leipzig, evidenced reservations about the O.T. and N.T. apocrypha. He further doubted James, Jude, and 2 and 3 John; he had no trouble with 2 Peter however.
3. **Erasmus of Rotterdam**, the prince of the Humanist scholars (1536d), questioned the Apocalypse and 2 Peter, but was willing to submit to the Church ("If however the Church were to declare the titles they bear to be as canonical as their contents, then I would condemn my doubts, for the opinion formulated by the Church has more value in my eyes than human reason, whatever they may be.").

N.B. The Roman Church finally spoke to the issue at the **provincial synod at Paris in 1528**, called by the bishop of Sens (sometimes referred to as the Sens Synod), by denouncing as heretical and divisive anyone who refused to adhere to the Synod of Carthage (397) and Innocent III (the latter's list included Tobit, Judith, and the Maccabees). This declaration was provincial, not ecumenical or papal.

Of utmost importance in the mounting polarization in the church between Roman Catholics and Protestant Catholics was the fourth article of the council. "That to the Church it belongs to determine the authenticity of the canonical books, and to settle the sense of Holy Scripture."

C. Interpretation in the Early Church

1. The early church held to a mixed hermeneutic of allegorical along with literal. In their consistency of literal hermeneutic they understood that Jesus would come back prior to the Millennium. They were thus Chiliasts, a term based on the Greek for 1,000.
2. With Origen a hermeneutic was introduced based on a neo-platonic epistemology. He posited three levels of meaning, analogous to soul, spirit, and body.

The body was analogous to the literal meaning, which was not denied, but was not considered spiritually relevant.

The soul meaning was less literal, but not as spiritually significant as the third level.

The spirit meaning was completely disconnected from the literal, historical, exegetical meaning. But this was the true meaning of the text.

One of the key dictums on hermeneutics is one that today still effects much of Reformed Theology is that “while the New Testament cannot be understood apart from the Old, the converse also holds good and one must not only read the New Testament but also begin with it if one is to attain to a proper understanding of the old. (G. Bromily, “The Church Fathers and Holy Scripture,” in D. A. Carson and John D Woodbridge, *Scripture and Truth*, 213).

III. THE DOCTRINE OF THE SCRIPTURE IN THE REFORMATION CHURCH.

The advent of the Reformation brought a massive schism into European Christianity as Romanists and Protestants polarized into divergent groups, each claiming divine, apostolic authority. Each appealed to the error of the other and in that holocaust the question of ultimate authority was finally addressed.

A. The Scriptures and the Dogma of Rome.

1. The context for the calling of the first ecumenical council in the history of the Roman Church was the distress in the church due to the reformers. Hence, when the theologians of the Council of Trent decided to formulate orthodox Catholic dogma in all particulars, in order that they might have a precise system to oppose the “new heresy,” they began with articles concerning their authority base.
2. The Council of Trent was convened in December 1545 and the following was decreed.
 - a) The council decreed that the tradition of the Church was of irrefragable authority in determining truth (essentially Augustine’s “time-hallowed church usage” to the neglect of intrinsic context on the witness of the Holy Spirit). Article III of the Tridentine on Faith reads, “I also admit the Holy Scriptures, according to that sense which our Holy mother Church has held and does hold, to which it belongs to judge of the true sense and interpretation of the Scriptures; neither will I ever take and interpret them otherwise than according to the unanimous consent of the Fathers.”

- b) The council then proposed that all the books as found in the Latin Vulgate to be of equal canonical and divine authority. This obliterated Jerome's distinction of inspired books and books worthy to be read for edification. Baruch was sorely debated and was admitted because "the church sometimes uses it in her offices."
- c) The council then equaled the authority of tradition and the Scriptures, pronouncing anathemas for contrary opinions (The council followed Eugenius and the Council of Florence). The Vulgate became the official translation of the Church. The Council stated (Session 4): "The sacred and holy, ecumenical, and general Synod of Trent,—lawfully assembled in the Holy Ghost, the same three legates of the Apostolic See presiding therein,—keeping this always in view, that, errors being removed, the purity itself of the Gospel be preserved in the Church: which (Gospel), before promised through the prophets in the Holy Scriptures, our Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of God, first promulgated with His own mouth, and then commanded to be preached by His Apostles to every creature, as the fountain of all, both saving truth, and moral discipline; and seeing clearly that this truth, and discipline are contained in the written books, and the unwritten traditions which, received by the Apostles from the mouth of Christ Himself, or from the Apostles themselves, the Holy Ghost dictating, have come down even unto us, transmitted as it were from hand to hand: (the Synod) following the examples of the orthodox Fathers, receives and venerates with an equal affection of piety and reverence, all the books both of the Old and of the New Testament—seeing that one God is the author of both—as also the said traditions, as well as those appertaining to faith as to morals, as having been dictated, either by Christ's own word of mouth, or by the Holy Ghost, and preserved in the Catholic Church by a continuous succession."

N.B. Reuss wrote (*History*, 280), "Had the Protestant Reformation not taken place, the indecision regarding such questions might have continued."

B. The Scriptures and the Reformation Tradition.

The reformers saw themselves forced to break with the tradition of the church; and in order to justify their opposition and maintain the struggle with confidence and success, they were compelled to face the issue of the canon. The reformers rejected church usage as the primary test of authenticity and based canonicity upon the internal witness of the Holy Spirit ("the fundamental thesis of Protestantism").

1. **Martin Luther** spoke of the Bible as the Word of God. Heick wrote of him (*A History of Christian Thought*. I, 347), “Scripture is the Word of God because it is the original witness to the redemptive work of God and because it participates in the nature of that which it records.” The inspiration of the canon was unquestioned because inspiration (inerrancy) and canon were terms that were held in common. Four books troubled Luther and he placed them in a secondary position in his list of books.
 - a) Jude, because it added nothing to the faith not stated elsewhere.
 - b) James, because of its apparent incompatibility with Paul’s teachings in Romans.
 - c) Hebrews, because it refuses repentance to sinners after baptism (chaps. vi, x, xii).
 - d) Revelation, “because of the images and visions, such as are found nowhere else in the Bible, and the author adds threats while no one knows what he means,” argued Luther.

2. **John Calvin** spoke to the issue of the method of determining authority, by rejecting tradition, and arguing for the witness of the Spirit (*Institutes*. I, 7.1): “A most pernicious error has very generally prevailed—viz. that Scripture is of importance only in so far as conceded to it by the sufferage of the Church; as if the eternal and inviolable truth of God could depend on the will of men. With great insult to the Holy Spirit, it is asked, Who can assure us that the Scriptures proceeded from God; who guarantees that they come down safe and unimpaired to our times, who persuades us that this book is to be received with reverence, and that one expunged from the list, did not the Church regulate all these things with certainty? On the determination of the Church, therefore, it is said, depend both the reverence which is due to Scripture and the books which are to be admitted into the canon. Thus profane men, seeking, under the pretext of the Church, to introduce unbridled tyranny, care not in what absurdities they entangle themselves and others, provided they extort from the simple this one acknowledgement—viz. that there is nothing which the Church cannot do. But what is to become of miserable consciences in quest of some solid assurance of eternal life, if all the promises with regard to it have no better support than man’s judgment? On being told so, will they cease to doubt and tremble? On the other hand, to what jeers of the wicked is our faith subjected—into how great suspicion is it brought with all, if believed to have only a precarious authority lent to it by the good-will of men?”

Calvin's ultimate basis for sustaining the authority of the Scripture as the Word from God is two-fold: the witness of the Spirit and the conscience of the godly. He wrote (*Institutes*, I, 7.5): "Let it therefore be held as fixed, that those who are inwardly taught by the Holy Spirit acquiesce implicitly in Scripture; that Scripture, carrying its own evidence along with it, deigns not to submit to proofs and arguments, but owes the full conviction with which we ought to receive it to the testimony of the Spirit. Enlightened by him, we no longer believe, either on our own judgment or that of others, that the Scriptures are from God; but, in a way superior to human judgment, feel perfectly assured—as much so as if we beheld the divine image visibly impressed on it—that it came to us, by the instrumentality of men, from the very mouth of God. We ask not for proofs or probabilities on which to rest our judgment, but we subject our intellect and judgment to it as too transcendent for us to estimate."

The extent of Calvin's canon comprises our current list, the same for Luther (although he had doubts) and all the reformers.

3. **The Reformed Confessions of the Sixteenth Century**

- a) **The First Helvetic Confession (1536)** has a brief statement that does not delineate the exact number of books in the canon. It assumed sixty-six. "The holy, divine, biblical Scripture, which is the Word of God inspired by the Holy Spirit and delivered to the world by the prophets and apostles, is the most ancient, most perfect and loftiest teaching and alone deals with everything that serves the true knowledge, love and honor of God, as well as true piety and the making of a godly, honest and blessed life."
- b) **The Gallican Confession (1559)**, Article III, lists every book in the canonical Scriptures and then states (Article IV): "We know these books to be canonical, and the sure rule of our faith, not so much by the common accord and consent of the Church, as by the testimony and inward illuminations of the Holy Spirit, which enables us to distinguish them from other ecclesiastical books upon which, however useful, we cannot found any articles of faith."

Commenting on inspiration it states (Article V), "We believe that the Word contained in these books has proceeded from God and receives its authority from him alone."

- c) **The Belgic Confession** by Guy de Bray (1561) listed the canonical books (Article IV) and then the apocryphal books "arguing of the latter that the Church may read and take instruction from, so far as they agree with the canonical books; but they are far from having

such power and efficacy as that we may from their testimony confirm any point of faith or of the Christian religion; much less to detract from the other sacred books.”

Inspiration was expressed in Article III: “We confess that this Word of God was not sent nor delivered by the will of man, but that holy men of God spake as they were moved by the holy ghost, as the Apostle Peter saith. And that afterwards God, from a special care which he has for us and our salvation, commanded his servants, the Prophets and Apostles, to commit his revealed Word to writing; and he himself wrote with his own finger the two tables of the law. Therefore we call such writings holy and divine Scriptures.”

- d) **The Westminster Confession (1647)** lists the Protestant canon book by book (Article II) and adds, “all which are given by inspiration of God, to be the rule of faith and life.” The ultimate criteria for the validity of the canon (Article V): “is from the inward work of the Holy Spirit, bearing witness by and with the Word in our hearts.” Concerning extra-canonical books Article III reads, “The books commonly called Apocrypha, not being of divine inspiration, are no part of the Canon of the Scripture; and therefore are of no authority in the Church of God, nor to be any otherwise approved, or made use of, than other human writings.”
 - e) **The Thirty-Nine Articles (1571)** represents the definitive statement of the religion of the church of England. The O.T. books are listed (Article VI) followed by certain apocryphal books with this preface, “And other Books of the Church doth read for example of life and instruction of manners, but yet it doth not apply them to establish any doctrine.”
4. **William Ames** was an English theologian, a student of William Perkins at Cambridge, wrote an excellent Systematic Theology in the early seventeenth century (1633d). He is an heir of the Reformation in regard to the integrity and extent of the Scripture. A very excellent statement on inspiration of the sixty-six books is given by Ames as follows (*Marrow of Sacred Theology*, 186):
- 3. “They received from God the command to write. This was partly outward and general, as when they were commanded to teach, and sometimes special, as when specific writings was called for (Deut. 31:19; Rev. 1:19) “Write the song.” “Write the things which you have seen.” It came partly by the inward impulse of the Spirit. 2 Peter 1:21, “For prophecy came not in former times by the will of

man, but holy men spoke as they were moved by the Holy Spirit;" 2 Tim. 3:16, "All Scripture is inspired by God."

4. "They also wrote by the inspiration and guidance of the Holy Spirit so that the men themselves were at that point, so to speak, instruments of the Spirit. 2 Tim. 3:16; Jer. 1:9, "Behold, I put my words in your mouth;" Acts 28:25, "Well indeed spoke the Holy Spirit by Isaiah the prophet."
5. "But divine inspiration was present among those writers in different ways. Some things were altogether unknown to the writer in advance, as appears in the history of past creation, or in the foretelling of things to come. But some things were previously known to the writer, as appears in the history of Christ written by the apostles. Some things were known by a natural knowledge and some by a supernatural. In those things that were hidden and unknown, divine inspiration was at work by itself. In those things which were known, or where the knowledge was obtained by ordinary means, there was added the writers' devout zeal so that (God assisting them) they might not err in writing.
6. "In all those things made known by supernatural inspiration, whether matters of right or fact, God inspired not only the subjects to be written about but dictated and suggested the very words in which they should be set forth. But this was done with a subtle tempering so that every writer might use the manner of speaking which most suited his person and condition.
7. "Therefore, Scripture is often attributed to the Holy Spirit as the author with no mention of the writers. Heb. 10:15, "Whereof the Holy Spirit also is a witness to us."

His basis for rejecting the Apocryphal is clear (*Marrow of Sacred Theology*, 189).

36. "The books commonly called among us apocryphal do not belong to the divine canon nor were they rightly joined by men in earlier times to the canonical books as a secondary canon. First, some of them contain manifest fables told and affirmed as true histories, as those of Tobias, Judith, Susannah, Bel and the Dragon, and the like. Second, they often contradict the sacred Scriptures and themselves. Third, they were not written in Hebrew or delivered to or received by the Jewish church to which God committed all his oracles before the coming of Christ, Rom. 9:4. Fourth,

they were not approved by Christ, not being among those books which he designated when he commanded his own to search the Scriptures. Fifth, they were never received by either the apostles or by the early Christian church as part of the divine canon.”

5. **James Arminius (1610d)**, though often an opponent of Calvin and Luther over the interpretation of the Bible, was in agreement with them over the nature of the Bible. He assumed the fixity of the canon and described its authority as follows (*Disputation. I, I*), “The authority of Scripture is nothing else but the worthiness according to which it merits (1) CREDENCE, as being true in words and true in significations, whether it simply declares anything; or also promises and threatens; and (2) as a superior, it merits OBEDIENCE through the credence given to it, when it either commands or prohibits anything.”

He argued that the validity of the Scriptures ultimately rested on the character of God (*Disputation. I, II*): “The authority of any word or writing whatsoever depends upon its author, as the word ‘authority’ indicates; and it is just as great as the veracity [truth] and the power, that is, the authority (truth) of the author. But God is of infallible veracity, and is neither capable of deceiving nor of being deceived; and of irrefragable power, that is, supreme over the creatures. If, therefore, He is the Author of Scripture, its authority is totally dependent on Him alone. (i) Totally, because He is the all-sufficient Author, all-true and all-powerful. (ii) On Him alone, because He has no associate either in the truth of what he says, or in the power of his right. For all veracity and power in the creature proceed from him; and into his veracity and power are resolved all faith and obedience, as into the First Cause and the Ultimate [*terminum*] Boundary. (Gal. iii, 8, 9; 1 John v, 9; Rom. iii, 4; Titus i, 2; Psalm 1, 1-23; Gal. i, 1, 7, 8; John v, 34, 36; Rom. xi, 34-46; xiii, 1.)”

His confidence in the Scriptures is clearly manifested when he wrote (*Disputation. ii, xxiv*): “We conclude, then, that all things which have been, are now, or to the final consummation will be necessary for the salvation of the church, have been of old perfectly inspired, declared and written; and that no other revelation or tradition, than those which have been inspired, declared and contained in the Scriptures, is necessary to the salvation of the church (2 Tim. 3:16; Matt. 4:3, 4; 22:29; 9 Acts 18:28). Indeed we assert, that whatsoever relates to the doctrine of truth is so perfectly comprehended in the Scriptures, that all those things which are brought either directly or indirectly against this truth are capable of being refuted, in a manner the clearest and most satisfactory, from the Scriptures themselves alone. This asseveration we take with such solemnity and yet assurance of mind, that as soon as anything has been proved not to be

contained in the Scriptures, from this very circumstance we infer that things not to be necessary to salvation; and whenever it is evident, that any sentiment cannot be refuted by the Scriptures, we judge from this that it is not heretical. When, therefore, the Papists sedulously attempt to destroy the whole perfection of Scripture by (*exempla*) specimens of articles, which they call necessary, but which are not proved from Scripture, and by those which they consider heretical but which are not confuted from Scripture the sole result of their endeavors is, that we cannot conclude with any certainty the former to be necessary and the latter heretical.

IV. CONCLUSION.

The purpose of this lesson has been to trace the development of the doctrine of the Scriptures through the Middle Ages and into the Reformation. The question of the extent of the canon (sources of authority) remained unresolved until the Reformation when Protestant pressure forced the Roman Church to solidify and dogmatize its authority base. The Roman Church determined its canon on the basis of “usage” which the reformers rejected for the witness of the Holy Spirit to consistent truth. Thus, the reformers rejected spurious tradition at odds with the testimony of the Prophets, Christ, and the Apostles. The Protestant Reformation agreed in establishing the canon (standard) at sixty-six books. This has not been aggressively questioned in the Protestant Church since the sixteenth century. While the standard was fixed, the quality of that standard was challenged by the “Enlightened” German theological world only to spill over to America in the nineteenth century. That is the story of the next lesson!

THE DOCTRINE OF THE SCRIPTURES
Part III: The Modern Church and Postmodern Church

Summary:

- I. INTRODUCTION.**
- II. THE PHILOSOPHICAL SETTING OF THE POST-REFORMATION AGE.**
- III. THE GERMAN THEOLOGIANS AND THE SCRIPTURES.**
 - A. Frederick Schleiermacher and the Scriptures.
 - B. David Strauss and the Scriptures.
 - C. Karl Barth and the Scriptures.
- IV. THE AMERICAN THEOLOGIANS AND THE SCRIPTURES.**
- V. THE POSTMODERN AUTHORITY IN THE EMERGENT CHURCH**
- VI. CONCLUSION.**

I. INTRODUCTION.

The Protestant Reformation, as the equally significant Catholic Reformation, was a period of tremendous theological activity in the area of bibliology. The authority sources of the divergent, polarized parties were dogmatized (the quality of the Scriptures had been assumed though the extent of canon had not). In the Post-Reformation era the quality of the sources was questioned as man's world view was dynamically altered; the world became viewed as a "closed-system." The philosophical shift, as well as the effect of that shift on theology (particularly bibliology) is the subject of our study.

II. THE PHILOSOPHICAL SETTING OF THE POST-REFORMATION AGE.

The roots of a philosophic shift from a theistic world view to that of a pantheistic viewpoint was not sudden, nor tragically planned by those opposed to theism. The sources of the shift ultimately were found in the emergence of the Renaissance in the fourteenth century, that give rise to both the rebirth of man in the Reformation and the reconstruction of man in the Enlightenment. Interest in the world and the human mind constituted two currents of thought that became the focus of the Post-Reformation era. Of major importance was Galileo Galilei (1564–1642), the famed mathematician and naturalist, who proposed a strictly empirical approach for the observation of the universe and Francis Bacon (1561–1626), who went beyond Galileo, to conceive of science as a means to rule nature.

- N.B.** Galileo and Bacon laid the foundation for modern science and technology in the field of natural phenomena without invading the religious sphere. The naturalistic tradition would later apply those concepts to religion with devastating effect.

- A. Rene Descartes (1596–1650).** Philosophically Descartes was a naive theist of Jesuit training who was deeply influenced by Galileo about whom he expressed surprise that he was condemned for his scientific views by the Roman Church. In his search for knowledge, Descartes began in universal doubt (not skepticism, for he knew facts existed, the famous 1618 stove and woodshed experience) that became to him a strainer for truth. Since it was impossible to doubt his own existence (self perception being perceived as an accurate judge of reality his only clear and distinct idea), he began there (*cogito ergo sum!*). The existence of God was sustained from his idea that God exists (an intuitive perception), a given beyond rational inquiry.

The basic problem with Descartes and all those after him, is they presuppose a starting point with man or the “I,” and not with God. This inevitably leads to naturalism and postmodernism.

N.B. Descartes believed that his method defended Orthodox beliefs, but after him philosophers used his system to erect entire systems on reason alone.

N.N.B.B. Deeply influenced by Descartes was Baruch Spinoza (1633–77) who carried Cartesian logic to pantheism and fatalistic determinism. Gottfried Leibnitz (1646–1716) carried Descartes in another direction to reject the possibility of that religious knowledge could be sustained from historical arguments.

- B. Thomas Hobbes (1588–1679).** The Scotsman Hobbes sought to construct philosophy on a totally rational basis beginning with sense perception, not ideas the mind discovers within itself (Cartesianism). His epistemological key was induction in the midst of change; hence a changeless God is unrelated to “true knowledge” because he is unknowable; Hobbes was a mechanistic, materialist.
- C. John Locke (1632–1704).** Although preceded by Bacon and Hobbes, Locke is usually credited with giving British empiricism (sometimes called Sensationalism) its most cogent expression. Locke rejected the concept of “innate ideas” (Cartesianism) and stated that knowledge is acquired through empiricism (revelation is not denied, but it must be experienced).
- N.B.** A theological expression of Lockeanism is Deism, which went beyond showing the reasonableness of Christianity to demonstrate the rationality of natural religion. David Hume (1711–76) showed the inadequacies of empiricism; he sounded the death for Deism.
- D. Immanuel Kant (1724–1804).** The Konigsberg philosopher proved that Deism, which was flourishing in England, was as rationally questionable as any appeal to revealed truth. Kant rejected Cartesian innateness and Lockean empiricism for a position between them. He felt that knowledge results from an interplay between

incoming sense perceptions (empiricism, sensation) and the mind (ideas). Phenomenal knowledge (things about us) is knowable; noumenal knowledge (spiritual) is not. Religion becomes little else than morality. Truth became an exclusive function of experience.

N.B. The quest for truth without revelation opened the gates for new options to ethics and religion: the so-called Kierkegaardian leap to faith; religious morality as in Ritschl; Anthro-theism as in Schleiermacher and Strauss; or Hegel's vast cosmic mind in the dialectic of progress (Baur, Strauss, Marx, and Darwin).

N.N.B.B. The point of this philosophic survey is to argue that the mind was set free from revelation and developed a world view that left God out (closed system). Man, not God, became the center or focus of meaning.

III. THE GERMAN THEOLOGIANS AND THE SCRIPTURES.

The influence of Kant's philosophy set the framework for the nineteenth century. Kant, at once, elevated both the mind and empiricism that provided the taproot for the theological quest.

A. Frederick Schleiermacher and the Scriptures.

1. His life (1768–1834). Schleiermacher was the son of a Reformed army chaplain who was connected to the Moravians (Pietism). After schooling among Moravians he went to the University of Halle where he became deeply enmeshed in Kantianism. As a Reformed pastor in Berlin, he was deeply influenced by the Romantic Movement. His major work, *The Christian Faith*, was published in 1821.
2. His thought. It was Mackintosh (*Types of Modern Theology*, 100) that summarized Schleiermacher as follows, "It would be roughly true to say that he has put discovery in the place of revelation, religious consciousness in the place of the Word of God, and the mere 'not yet' of imperfection in the place of sin." The concept of an objective, external revelation was lost, and a closed system of self-analysis became salvation.
 - a) Schleiermacher distinguished three grades of human consciousness: self, world, and God. The first is super-ceded in normal growth, the second is continuative, and the final state is that of dependence on God ("dependence" being his definition of religion). Scripture is interpreted as a-historical, though an expression of God's consciousness. Sin is a prevention of God-consciousness in the world. Through grace, sin, which is largely

environmental, is annulled.

- b) The Scripture is essentially conceived within a Kantian framework. Orr wrote (*Progress of Dogma*, 314), “Schleiermacher placed the essence of religion wholly in feeling, and subordinated knowledge to that as a secondary product.”
3. Schleiermacher’s first presupposition is that the Scriptures are not authoritative of themselves, but only as the church grants them authority by faith. “The authority of Holy Scripture cannot be the foundation of faith in Christ; rather must the latter be presupposed before a peculiar authority can be granted the Holy Scriptures (*Christian Faith*. II, 519).” He confessed that the integrity of the Bible is not self-authenticating, but reckoned subjectively, though he realized he stood alone in this opinion (*Christian Faith*. II, 591). “The polemical first part of this proposition is solely due to the fact that what we here deny is actually asserted. Possibly as a matter of fact it is more widely held than definitely stated, for all textbooks and Confessions which put the doctrine of Scripture as the source of Christian faith in the foreground seem distinctly to favour this view. Hence it is necessary thoroughly to expose the underlying misconception.”
4. Faith in Christ is antecedent to belief in the Scriptures; indeed, faith authenticates the Scripture. Thus faith comes quite apart from a belief in the Bible (*Christian Faith*. II, 592). “But where the need of redemption is really felt, the faith that makes alive may spring even from a message about Christ which is in no way bound up with the conviction that the books of Scripture possess a special character, but may rest on any other sort of witness that is accompanied by real perception of Christ’s spiritual power—may rest, that is, simply on oral tradition.” Faith results from a direct impression apart from the Bible.
5. The Bible, then, is an imperfect witness to Christ’s person and the preaching of the disciples (*Christian Faith*. II, 593). “On the contrary, faith might arise in the same way though no more survived than testimonies of which it had to be admitted that, in addition to Christ’s essential witness to Himself and the original preaching of His disciples, they also contained much in detail that had been misinterpreted, or inaccurately grasped, or set in a wrong light owing to confusions of memory.”

Again, he wrote (*Christian Faith*. II, 596) implying that inspiration continues in each age: “Such authority we do not ascribe uniformly to every part of our Holy Scriptures, but only in proportion as the writers attained to the condition just described, so that casual expressions and what are merely side-thoughts do not possess the same degree of

normativeness as belongs to whatever may at each point be the main subject. Nor is it meant that every late presentation must be uniformly derived from the Canon or be germinally contained in it from the first. For since the Spirit was poured out on all flesh, no age can be without its own originality in Christian thinking. Yet, on the one hand, nothing can be regarded as a pure product of the Christian Spirit except so far as it can be shown to be in harmony with the original products; on the other hand, no later product possesses equal authority with the original writings when it is a question of guaranteeing the Christian character of some particular presentation or of exposing its unchristian elements.”

N.B. It is the individual’s “God consciousness” that sits in authority over and gives credibility to the Word of God! Barth summarized his methodology thusly (*From Rousseau to Ritschl*, 313), “Perhaps after all he transformed pistis (faith) into gnosis (knowledge).”

B. David Strauss and the Scriptures.

1. His life (1808–74). Strauss was educated at Tübingen University after preparatory training at Blaubeuren. He afterwards became a curate at Klein-Ingersheim. As a disciple of Hegel, he went to the University of Berlin where he heard Schleiermacher with discomfort and formed a close friendship with Wilhelm Vatke (the mentor of Julius Wellhausen). Afterwards he lectured at Tübingen and in that context wrote *Leben Jesu* (1835). After his dismissal from Tübingen, he became a private scholar.
2. His *Leben Jesu* (1835) clearly reveals the view of the Enlightenment for the Scriptures—the lofty statements of Orthodox Catholic and Protestant confessionalism are not even dim echoes! Harris wrote (*David Fredrich Strauss and His Theology*, 42): “The presupposition on which the whole life of Jesus was written was a denial of the miraculous and supernatural in the world. The traditional supernatural interpretations of the events of the Gospels had no place in Strauss’ view of the world, and God’s activity was possible only indirectly through laws of nature.” The Scriptures of the New Testament were conceived as myths (legends). Strauss wrote (*Leben Jesu*, 46), “We leave the writers in undisturbed enjoyment of their miracles; but we ourselves regard them as mere myths.” The resurrection of Christ is “nothing other than a myth” needing a mythological interpretation. In fact, not only does Strauss find it egotistic of Jesus to insist upon his divine nature, he concluded that if Jesus had really uttered such assertions, then he must have been out of his mind (*Leben Jesu*. III, 255): “But quite apart from any references to an alleged pre-existence, Jesus’ own utterances about himself in the fourth Gospel are of a kind which makes it difficult to determine his own personal self-consciousness from them. Whether a God who had become man would behave as the

Johannine Jesus does, whether in his speeches he would insist upon his divinity so strongly and incessantly, continually challenging the opposition of men to whom a divine ‘I’ speaking out of human lips is intolerable, whether a God who had become man would not find it wiser and more becoming to let his divinity shine forth more indirectly through the radiance of his humanity—about all this nothing definite can be said since the presupposition belongs solely to the sphere of the imagination. But a man, whoever he may have been, could never have uttered the speeches about himself, as are put into the mouth of Jesus in the fourth Gospel—quite apart from those high-points which even pass over into a pre-temporal, other worldly realm—if his head and heart were sound.”

Therefore, our understanding of Christ is dream fabrication (383): “The more the disciples became convinced of this necessity, the more they made themselves believe that Jesus must have performed miracles . . . And so in their *enthusiastic fancy* (italics mine) without intending to deceive, they began to adorn the simple picture of Christ with a rich garland of miraculous tales, especially applying to him all the characteristics of the Messiah . . . till at length the real history was entirely covered, and in fact, destroyed by the ‘parasitic plants.’”

N.B. Strauss was not the philosophical thinker that Kant and Hegel were; he was practical, revealing the root results of the Enlightenment approach to religion. The Bible was discounted!

3. His influence. *Leben Jesu* had enormous influences upon theological progress in the nineteenth century in that it ushered in an era of the critical evaluation of the Bible in a manner that was not possible earlier. Orr wrote (*Progress of Dogma*, 42): “Three-quarters of a century ago an able and determined *assault* (italics mine) was made upon the Gospels, first by Strauss, in his *Life of Jesus*, then by what is known as the Tübingen school of criticism (under Baur). The result of this assault was, in Strauss’ case, to resolve the whole content of the Gospels into myth, and, in the hands of Baur and his followers, to carry down most of the literature of the New Testament to the second century, and to discredit its historical worth. Then came the reaction, till step by step, the Gospels and Epistles were reinstated in their place of honor, and the Tübingen school and its methods were themselves discredited.”
 - a) Strauss set in motion the famed “quest” for the historical Jesus (a portrait obtained by the so-called scientific method).
 - b) Strauss occasioned a great critical re-examination of biblical sources since they were non-apostolic and a-historical. First the Gospels came under scrutiny and then Baur and his disciples

encompassed the entire N.T. It was because Strauss and Baur rendered the sources so uncertain that theology sought to flee from history and take refuge in ethical or existential categories.

- c) Strauss also plunged the O.T. under the same critical evaluation through his friend Wilhelm Vatke who disciplesd Julius Wellhausen (JEPD theory, a source document approach to collecting and dating sources).

N.B. Demythologizing the Scriptures did not begin with Bultmann, although he is the twentieth century expression of that approach. Strauss was the first to carry out a consistent demythologization of the Gospels.

Harris concluded (*Strauss*, 281-82): “Strauss’ *Life of Jesus* was the most intellectually reasoned attack which has ever been mounted against Christianity. There have been other assaults more radical and bitter, others expressed in more vituperative language—one needs only to think of Voltaire, Bruno Bauer and Beuerbach, Kalthoff and Drews, Nietzsche and Overbeck, or on the more absurd explanations proposed in our own day, which are usually written either in the hope of gaining public attention, or alternatively, money—but no one since Strauss has so acutely concentrated on the crucial cardinal issues which must be dealt with. Strauss confronted theology with an either/or: either show that the Christian faith is historically and intellectually credible, or admit that it is based on myth and delusion. That was the alternative. Nothing less was and is at stake than the whole historical and intellectual basis of Christianity. If Strauss cannot be convincingly answered, then it would appear that Christianity must slowly but surely collapse.”

N.B. After Strauss, the Bible was no longer viewed as being divine, was trampled in the dust of the nineteenth century religious “rationalism”.

PARENTHESIS: The History of Religions School has a direct linkage to Strauss through Bauer at Tübingen University. Of the importance of the Tübingen School Harris has written (*The Tübingen School*, xvii), “It was the most important theological event in the whole history of theology from the Reformation to the present day.” Its major advocates were Herman Gunkel, Wilhelm Bousset and Adolph von Harnack. Von Harnack is most widely known to American audiences by his *History of Dogma* (7 vols.) and *What is Christianity?* Von Harnack reduced the essence of Christianity to a “kernel” (the central irreducible revelation) which he thought was Jesus in the synoptics—all else in the Bible is errant Hellenism (others argued the mythology of Babylon). From that “kernel,” he deduced things, facts as true revelation.

1. A kingdom of God as taught by Jesus (individualized).
2. The fatherhood of God.
3. The brotherhood of men.

C. Karl Barth and the Scriptures.

1. His life (1886–1968). Barth was raised in the Reformed Church (liberal wing) and after several universities, sitting under Hermann and Von Harnack, he settled in a small pastorate at Safenwil. There he became increasingly discontent with Liberalism and wrote his *Romerbrief* (1919), the greatest theological shock since *Leben Jesu*. In 1921 he accepted a call to teach at Gottingen, then Munster, Bonn, and Basel.
2. Barth's theological framework or perspective is important to grasp. First, he believed that God is unknown unless he takes the initiative to reveal Himself (He is wholly other). Second, man is without the knowledge of God (even if he has the Bible) until he is directed to the place that God reveals himself (i.e., in the Christ event, Theology of Crisis). Third, the self revelation of God is always in the Christ event. Brown wrote (*Philosophy and the Christian Faith*, 251-52): "Barth's big point was that there was what Kierkegaard called an 'infinite qualitative distinction' between eternity and time, heaven and earth, and God and man. God was Wholly Other. In a sense Barth's position was the exact opposite from John Robinson's in *Honest to God*. Whereas the latter rejects the idea of God 'out there' and wants to find him in the processes of nature and human life, Barth sees God as utterly transcendent. He is not to be identified directly with anything in the world, not even the words of Scripture. Revelation comes to men in the same way as a vertical line intersects a horizontal plane, or as a tangent touches a circle. Because it is contact with the Wholly Other we cannot even describe it. All we can do (and all that the biblical writers can do) is to describe what they felt like after it."
3. Barth and the Bible. Barth was a helpful corrective to the anthro-theism of the nineteenth century, but yet this view of Scripture was not entirely void of the devastating effect of Kant and Ritschl.
 - a) Inspiration. Barth traces the doctrine of inspiration to the Reformers stating that they held to verbal, plenary views (*Doctrine of the Word*, 517f). Barth holds to verbal inspiration, but only in the self-authenticating Christ event. At once (and for a moment) the word of man becomes the Word of God. He wrote (*Doctrine*, 533): "Verbal inspiration does not mean the infallibility of the biblical word in its linguistic, historical and theological character as a human work. It means the fallible and faulty human word is as such used by God and has to be received and heard in spite of its human fallibility."

When asked how his view differs from the fundamentalists, Barth

replied (Godsey, ed. *Karl Barth's Table Talk*, 26): "For me the Word of God is a happening, not a thing. Therefore the Bible must become the Word of God, and it does this through the word of the Spirit. Inspiration is not an attribute of Scripture but an event in which God uses the Scripture to communicate revelation."

- b) Fallibility. Barth describes the authors of Scripture as "fallible, erring men like ourselves." This, he argues, presupposes his case for errancy. He wrote (*Doctrine of the Word*, 529), "The prophets and apostles as such, even in their office, even in their functions as witnesses, even in the act of writing down their witnesses, were real, historical men as we are, and therefore sinful in their action, and capable and actually guilty of error in their spoken and written word."

N.B. Barth has no problem living with a fallible Bible because of his view of revelation. Since the Bible is only a witness to revelation, and not revelation itself, errancy makes no difference. The importance of Holy Scripture is its use by the Holy Spirit in an encounter to communicate the Word of God. As long as the Bible becomes the Word of God, the question of errancy remains irrelevant.

- c) Authority, since the Bible is not equated with the Word of God in a strict sense, is not in the Scriptures but broadened to three spheres: "the church, the Bible, and Christ."

IV. THE AMERICAN THEOLOGIANS AND THE SCRIPTURES.

A. Nineteenth Century German Liberalism

1. The Influence of Tübingen biblical criticism became discernible in this country as early as 1850 as New England Congregationalists and Unitarians questioned the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch. By the 1890s such views had swept into the major seminaries precipitating the heated Modernist-Fundamentalist clash of the 1920s. Under the leadership of men such as Shailer Matthews (*Faith of a Modernist* and *New Faith For Old*), Walter Rauschenbush, William N. Clarke, and Harry E. Fosdick, the theological fabric of American theology was rent through a manner reminiscent of Strauss and Bauer.
2. The optimism of Old Liberalism was blunted by two world wars, but revived in the 1940s as Neo-Liberal—a somewhat chastened Old Liberalism under Walter Horton (*Liberalism Old and New*), John C. Bennett and H. P. Van Dusen.

B. Twentieth Century German Thought

1. Barthian thought has penetrated America since 1945 through the writings of Emil Brunner, Reinhold Niebuhr and (most recently) Dietrich Bonhoeffer; It has allowed many liberal institutions to use traditional terms but turns devoid of traditional content.
2. Barthian thought has more recently made large inroads into the Evangelical seminaries of our country leading to a denial of infallibility and inerrancy as integral to the construction and defense of the Faith. Recent example of this struggle in traditionally inerrantist circles.

V. THE POSTMODERN AUTHORITY IN THE EMERGENT CHURCH

The Emergent Church (EC) Movement is a reaction to what they see as the marketing of the church to unbelievers, and the failure of the “Modern” Church to communicate to postmoderns who need the gospel. At the very core of this movement is a shift in authority from external authority of the Bible to an internal authority of mysticism. The Bible, exegesis, biblical, and systematic theology are secondary to mystical insights and the pragmatic needs of reaching postmoderns with a neoChristianity.

In Modernism, the center of authority shifted from outside of man, to inside. In Modernism this authority was based on rationalism, empiricism, or a combination of the two. The method used still recognized logical coherence, but the logic was autonomous, divorced from any Scriptural control. In the Emergent Church conversation, Modernism’s method is rejected. The authority is still “internal” to man, but the internal intuition of mysticism. Irrationalism thus replaces logic and reason.

- A. Emergent leaders use traditional terminology which sounds as if they affirm the Bible, but in reality, they treat the Bible as “another book” of revelation alongside “the book of Tradition” or the “book of reason” as did Moderns.

Though Marcus Borg is not a key emergent church leader, he has exerted influence on emergent leaders like Rob Bell. Walter Brueggemann, O.T. scholar at Columbia Theological Seminary call Marcus Borg, “a key force in the emerging ‘new paradigm’ of Christian faith.” Borg says of the Bible:

I let go of the notion that the Bible is a divine product. I learned that it is a human cultural product, the product of two ancient communities, biblical Israel and early Christianity. As such, it contained their understandings and affirmations, not statements coming directly or somewhat directly from God... I realized that whatever “divine revelation” and the “inspiration of the Bible” meant (if they meant anything), they did not mean that the Bible was a divine product with divine authority.” Marcus Borg, *The God We Never Knew*, 25

B. Emergent authority looks back to the early medieval mystics. When they use the jargon “ancient-future” they mean going back to an ancient view, but not far enough back to the Scriptures. They see the future in a selective return to early Christian mysticism.

1. In all mysticism truth is determined by an inner experience which cannot be validated or invalidated by objective criteria. This inner experience is assumed to be the Holy Spirit.

Mysticism, once cast to the sidelines of the Christian tradition, is now situated in postmodernist culture near the center... Too many people are nothing, as our shouting to us, because we give them neither an energy-fire experience of Christ nor the Christ of an energy-fire experience. We may help them apprehend reality through the rudiments of mystical speculations, but not the rapture of flow experiences... Mysticism (which Einstein called “cosmic religiosity”) is metaphysic arrived at through mind body experiences. Mysticism begins in experience; it ends in theology.

~Leonard Sweet, *Quantum Spirituality*

Preachers speak of the Bible as an instruction book or as the only data necessary for spiritual living. But this diminishes some critical elements of theological knowledge... Sola Scriptura also tend to downplay the role of God’s Spirit in shaping the direction of the Church.

~Will Sampson, *An Emergent Manifest of Hope*

2. All mysticism rejects the sufficiency of Scripture.

In the EC the Bible is not enough, it cannot stand on its own, but must be adjusted to fit culture, ethnicity, history. In the EC the Bible is merely descriptive rather than prescriptive. The Bible is only a pattern for doing theology, not the exclusive source of theology.

3. In the EC the content of the message is changed, however slightly, with the change of medium.

It has been fashionable among the innovative pastors I know to say, “We’re not changing the message; we’re only changing the medium.” This claim is probably less than honest... in the new church we must realize how medium and message are intertwined. When we change the medium, the message that’s received is changed, however subtly, as well. We might as well get beyond our naiveté or denial about this.

~Brian MacLaren, *Church on the Other Side*, 68

4. Whenever experience is joined with Scripture, experience becomes the interpreter of Scripture rather than Scripture the interpreter of experience.

A spiritual tsunami has hit postmodern culture. This wave will build without breaking for decades to come. The wave is this: People want to know God. They want less to know about God or know about religion than to know God. People want to experience the “Beyond” in the “Within.” Postmoderns want something more than new products; they want new experiences, especially new experiences of the divine.

~Leonard Sweet, *Quantum Spirituality*

Faith is not simply intellectual understanding, or an act of human intention, or following some salvation “how to” manual, or assent to creedal formulations. Faith is not a matter of doing or even being, but an experience of becoming. Experiencing is faith’s most fundamental activity.

~Leonard Sweet, *Quantum Spirituality*

The old paradigm taught that if you had the right teaching, you will experience God. The new paradigm says that if you experience God, you will have the right teaching.

~Leith Anderson, current president of the NAE

Postmoderns want a God they can feel, taste, touch, hear and smell—a full sensory immersion in the divine.

~Leonard Sweet, *Spiritual Tsunami*

Faith comes not by hearing the Word of God, but by feeling, smelling, tasting, and touching God. Empiricism internalized with mysticism becomes the norm for truth.

The power of the preached word is being augmented, and occasionally outpaced, by the impact of the visual. The primacy of music as an essential expression of worship is being challenged by congregations hungry for more direct means of engagement.

~Chuck Fromm, “The Impact of the Image”
Worship Leader Magazine, Jan-Feb, 2005

The Word of God alone isn’t enough, it is being added to and replaced by a sense-based spirituality.

The primary source [ed. note: but not the only source!] of spiritual reading is the Bible. But we now recognize that in our love of Scripture we dare not avoid the mystics and the activists. Exposure to the great devotional literature of the church is essential. More and more people are turning to the great work of the mystics.

Richard Foster has called us to recover Augustine's *Confessions*,
Bernard of Clairvaux's *The Steps of Humility*....

~Robert Webber, *Ancient-Future Faith*

To immerse ourselves in these great works is to allow our vision to
be expanded by a great treasure of spirituality.

~Robert Webber, *Ancient-Future Faith*.

The value of all these books as well as many not mentioned are
indispensable to spirituality. Those who neglect these works do so
to their harm, and those who read them do so for their inspiration
and spiritual growth.

~Robert Webber, *Ancient-Future Faith*

VI. CONCLUSION.

The purpose of this lesson has been to trace the doctrine of Scriptures in the Post-Reformation era in a setting when the entire philosophical world view has been both secularized and rationalized within the "closed system." From Schleiermacher to Barth the Bible ceased to be the inerrant, infallible, verbal-plenary, self-authenticating Word of God and has become a subjective witness to religious experience. Barth's understanding of the Scriptures was an attempt to explain the relationship of a transcendent God to human communication (revelation) but the Word, while elevated, still was subject to existential authentication. The influence of nineteenth century German thought penetrated America precipitating the Fundamentalist clashes of the 1920s while Barth's influence is now increasingly seen in American Evangelicalism.