FAITHFUL TO THE WORD

Systematic Theology Series

BIBLIOLOGY

The Doctrine of the Word of God

UNIT 4: THE AUTHORITY OF SCRIPTURE

Lesson 10

THE SUPREME AUTHORITY — SOLA SCRIPTURA

Scripture Alone as the Final Rule of Faith and Practice

Key Texts: Isaiah 8:20; Matthew 15:1–9

> *"All Scripture is inspired by God and profitable for teaching, for reproof, for correction, for training in righteousness; so that the man of God may be adequate, equipped for every good work."*
>
> **2 Timothy 3:16–17, NASB 1995**

Dr. Joshua Nichols
Pastor, Theologian, Author
faithfultotheword.com

Introduction

Unit 3 established the inerrancy of Scripture: the God-breathed Word is without error in all that it affirms, this conviction is inseparable from the doctrine of inspiration itself, and the objections raised against it, though requiring careful engagement, do not overturn the solid foundation of a text authored by the God who cannot lie. With inerrancy in place, we now move to the next great doctrine of this series: the authority of Scripture.

Inerrancy and authority are closely related but distinct. A book can be truthful without being authoritative; a reliable history of ancient Rome is accurate but does not command my obedience. Authority is the right to command, the claim to govern, the power to bind conscience and direct life. The question of biblical authority asks: Over whom does the Bible rule, and by what right? Who is subject to its claims? What happens when Scripture conflicts with the traditions of the church, the conclusions of human reason, or the deliverances of personal experience? Who has the final word?

The Reformation's answer to this question is expressed in the principle of Sola Scriptura: Scripture alone is the infallible and ultimate authority for the church in all matters of faith and practice. This principle was the nerve of the sixteenth-century Reformation and it remains the nerve of any genuine evangelical Christianity today. Without it, every other doctrine we have established in this course (the inspiration, inerrancy, and self-attestation of Scripture) floats free of any practical force. A Bible that is inspired and inerrant but not ultimately authoritative is a remarkable library curiosity; only a Bible that exercises supreme and final authority over the life and teaching of the church can serve as the foundation of the edifice we have been constructing.

This lesson will define Sola Scriptura with precision, clarify what it does not mean (as important as what it does), recover its Reformation heritage, and engage the two most significant contemporary challenges to it, from Rome and from Eastern Orthodoxy, as well as the threat from within evangelicalism itself: the individualistic distortion sometimes called Solo Scriptura.

I. DEFINING SOLA SCRIPTURA: SCRIPTURE IS THE ONLY INFALLIBLE AND ULTIMATE AUTHORITY

Sola Scriptura, properly defined, is the claim that Scripture is the only infallible and ultimately authoritative norm for the faith and practice of the church. Every other authority (tradition, creeds, confessions, councils, popes, reason, experience) is subordinate to and must be evaluated by the written Word of God. When Scripture and any other authority conflict, Scripture governs. When a tradition contradicts Scripture, the tradition must yield. When a council's decree conflicts with the plain teaching of the Word, the decree is to be rejected.

This is a strong and far-reaching claim, and its strength is precisely the point. The Reformers were not making a modest academic proposal about the relative weighting of theological sources. They were making a confession of ultimate allegiance: in the last analysis, when all other authorities have been heard and weighed, the final word belongs to the God who has spoken in His written Word. No human institution, however ancient, however learned, however spiritually impressive, can stand above or alongside the Scripture in the governance of the church.

The Second London Baptist Confession of 1689 states the principle with characteristic precision in its opening chapter:

> *"The Holy Scripture is the only sufficient, certain, and infallible rule of saving knowledge, faith, and obedience, although the light of nature and the works of creation and providence do so far manifest the goodness, wisdom, and power of God, as to leave men inexcusable; yet are they not sufficient to give that knowledge of God and his will which is necessary unto salvation. Therefore it pleased the Lord at sundry times and in divers manners to reveal himself, and to declare that his will unto his church; and afterward for the better preserving and propagating of the truth, and for the more sure establishment and comfort of the church against the corruption of the flesh, and the malice of Satan and of the world, to commit the same wholly unto writing; which maketh the Holy Scripture to be most necessary, those former ways of God revealing his will unto his people being now ceased." (1689 Confession, Chapter 1, Paragraph 1)*

Three adjectives in that opening clause deserve careful attention. Scripture is the only sufficient rule: it contains everything necessary for the church's faith and practice, requiring no supplementation from extra-biblical sources. It is the only certain rule: it alone provides the certainty that infallibility brings, while all other authorities are fallible and therefore always potentially mistaken. And it is the only infallible rule; other authorities may be helpful and authoritative in a derivative sense, but they are capable of error, and Scripture is not. These three adjectives together define the specific content of the Sola in Sola Scriptura.

II. WHAT SOLA SCRIPTURA DOES NOT MEAN

Sola Scriptura has been persistently misunderstood, both by its critics who attack a caricature of it and by some of its defenders who state it with insufficient nuance. It is as important to clarify what the doctrine does not claim as to state what it does.

A. Sola Scriptura Does Not Deny the Value of Tradition

Sola Scriptura does not mean that the church's tradition is worthless, that the creeds and confessions of historic Christianity are irrelevant, or that the accumulated wisdom of twenty centuries of biblical interpretation is to be set aside. The Reformers had enormous respect for the church fathers, the ecumenical councils, and the great theologians of the medieval church. Luther appealed to Augustine; Calvin drew extensively on Chrysostom, Ambrose, and Cyprian; the Reformation confessions were deeply rooted in the tradition they inherited.

What Sola Scriptura asserts is not that tradition has no value but that tradition has no infallible authority. The teaching of Augustine, however brilliant, is not binding on the church in the way that the teaching of Paul is binding. The decrees of the Council of Trent are not equivalent in authority to the decrees of the Council of Jerusalem recorded in Acts 15. The creeds of Nicaea and Chalcedon are extraordinarily valuable summaries of biblical teaching, but their authority is derivative, dependent on their accurate reflection of Scripture, and always subject in principle to correction by the Scripture they summarize.

B. Sola Scriptura Does Not Deny the Role of Reason

Sola Scriptura does not require the suspension of rational thought in the interpretation of Scripture or the rejection of human learning as a tool for understanding the biblical text. The Westminster Confession of Faith acknowledges that "the infallible rule of interpretation of Scripture is the Scripture itself," but this does not mean that the natural light of reason, linguistic tools, historical knowledge, and careful logical argument are irrelevant to biblical interpretation. They are essential tools, employed in the service of hearing what the text actually says.

What Sola Scriptura does assert is that when reason and Scripture conflict, that is, when the conclusions of human philosophical reasoning are incompatible with the plain teaching of the Word, Scripture governs. Reason is a servant of exegesis, not a judge over it. The conclusions of natural theology and philosophical inquiry, however legitimate in their own sphere, cannot override or supplement the teaching of the God-breathed text.

C. Sola Scriptura Does Not Mean Solo Scriptura

Perhaps the most important negative clarification is this: Sola Scriptura is emphatically not the same as Solo Scriptura. Solo Scriptura is the individualistic position, sometimes associated with certain strands of the Radical Reformation and widely prevalent in contemporary evangelical culture, that treats the individual believer's private, unmediated reading of Scripture as the sole authority, without reference to the creedal tradition, the teaching office of the church, or the interpretive wisdom of two thousand years of Christian scholarship.

Solo Scriptura ("me and my Bible") is not the Reformation position. It is, in fact, a distortion of the Reformation that the Reformers themselves would have rejected. Luther did not stand at Worms and appeal to his own private interpretation; he appealed to Scripture and to "evident reason," meaning the conclusions that careful, publicly accountable reasoning from the text produced. Calvin wrote his Institutes precisely to provide the church with a coherent framework for reading Scripture in the light of the tradition, not to encourage every believer to read the Bible without reference to any theological guide. The Reformers produced confessions precisely because they understood that right interpretation of Scripture requires community, accountability, and the accumulated wisdom of the theological tradition.

Solo Scriptura leads inevitably to theological fragmentation. When each individual's reading of Scripture is treated as equally authoritative, there is no principled basis for adjudicating between competing interpretations, and the result is the proliferation of denominations, sects, and interpretive communities that has characterized the more extreme wings of Protestantism. Sola Scriptura, by contrast, is a communal, confessional, and historically accountable principle: Scripture governs the church, and the church's best reading of Scripture is expressed in the great confessional documents that the community of faith has produced under the Spirit's guidance.

III. THE SUBORDINATE ROLE OF TRADITION, REASON, AND EXPERIENCE

Having clarified what Sola Scriptura does not mean, we can now articulate the positive relationship between Scripture and the other authorities that play a genuine role in the church's theological reflection. The key concept is the distinction between the norming norm and the normed norms (*norma normans* and *norma normata* in the Latin of the theological tradition).

Scripture is the *norma normans*, the norm that norms all other norms. It is the standard by which every other standard is measured, the authority that sits in judgment over every other authority. Tradition, reason, and experience are *norma normata*, norms that are themselves normed by Scripture. They are genuinely useful and genuinely authoritative within their proper sphere, but their authority is always derivative, always conditional, always subject to correction by the Word of God.

A. The Role of Tradition

Tradition, understood as the accumulated body of the church's biblical interpretation, theological reflection, and liturgical practice across the centuries, is a genuine and valuable authority in a secondary sense. The ecumenical creeds (Apostles', Nicene, Chalcedonian) represent the church's best corporate discernment of what Scripture teaches about the Trinity and the person of Christ, and they deserve enormous respect. The great confessions of the Reformation era (Westminster, Heidelberg, Belgic, the 1689 Confession) represent careful, accountable, communal reading of Scripture, and they serve as authoritative summaries of biblical teaching for the communities that confess them.

But tradition is fallible. Councils have erred. Confessions, however excellent, are not inspired. Church fathers have contradicted one another. The accumulated consensus of the tradition is a weighty witness to the meaning of Scripture, but it is not an infallible one, and when the plain teaching of Scripture conflicts with the tradition, the tradition must yield. This is not disrespect for tradition; it is the highest form of respect, because it holds tradition accountable to the standard it claims to serve.

B. The Role of Reason

Reason is the instrument by which the church reads, interprets, applies, and argues from Scripture. Good reasoning is essential to sound exegesis: logical consistency, careful attention to the rules of language, sensitivity to genre and context, and the ability to draw valid inferences from the text are all cognitive virtues that the faithful interpreter must cultivate. The Westminster Confession acknowledges that "good and necessary consequence"

may be deduced from Scripture, which means that the conclusions of careful reasoning from the biblical text carry scriptural authority.

But reason is fallen and finite. It is capable of error, of rationalization, and of importing alien philosophical frameworks into biblical interpretation. The history of liberal theology is in large part the history of human reason sitting in judgment over Scripture and finding it wanting, a catastrophic reversal of the proper relationship. Reason must serve exegesis, not govern it. When reason and Scripture conflict, the proper response is not to revise Scripture in light of reason but to examine whether reason has been properly employed.

C. The Role of Experience

Christian experience, the personal and corporate encounter with the living God in prayer, worship, suffering, and the application of the Word, is a genuine dimension of the Christian life that has a legitimate place in theological reflection. The Psalms are full of experiential theology; Paul's letters are shot through with the experiential dimension of life in Christ; the wisdom literature of Proverbs and Ecclesiastes distills the lessons of lived experience into theological insight.

But experience, unmoored from Scripture, is the most unreliable of the subordinate authorities. Human experience is subjective, culturally conditioned, and profoundly susceptible to self-deception. The history of Christian mysticism, charismatic excess, and theological liberalism demonstrates what happens when experience is elevated to a co-equal or superior norm alongside Scripture: the content of the faith becomes whatever produces the most powerful subjective effect, and the objective teaching of the Word is progressively displaced by the authority of the felt encounter. Experience must be evaluated by Scripture, not the reverse.

IV. THE REFORMATION RECOVERY OF SOLA SCRIPTURA: LUTHER AT WORMS

The doctrine of Sola Scriptura was not invented by the Reformers; it was recovered. The principle that Scripture is the supreme authority over the church is embedded in the biblical text itself, and it was affirmed in various forms by theologians throughout the medieval period, including Wycliffe, Hus, and the late medieval conciliarists who argued that Scripture stood above the Pope. But the Reformation gave the principle its definitive confessional expression and its world-historical moment of articulation in the stand of Martin Luther at the Diet of Worms in April 1521.

Luther had been summoned before the Holy Roman Emperor Charles V and the assembled princes of Germany to recant the writings in which he had challenged the authority of the papacy and the teaching of Rome. The question put to him was simple: Would he recant? His answer, after a night of reflection, has echoed through the centuries:

> *"Unless I am convinced by the testimony of the Scriptures or by clear reason (for I do not trust either in the Pope or in councils alone, since it is well known that they have often erred and contradicted themselves), I am bound by the Scriptures I have quoted and my conscience is captive to the Word of God. I cannot and I will not recant anything, since it is neither safe nor right to go against conscience. Here I stand. I can do no other. God help me. Amen."*

Several features of Luther's declaration are worth noting. First, he does not appeal to his own private judgment; he appeals to the testimony of the Scriptures and to clear reason, publicly accountable standards that others can examine and evaluate. Second, his explicit ground for rejecting the authority of the Pope and councils is that they have "often erred and contradicted themselves": they are fallible human authorities. Third, his conscience is captive not to his own convictions but to the Word of God, a clear statement of the proper relationship between personal conviction and scriptural authority. The Reformer does not stand on his own judgment; he stands on the Word that has bound his conscience.

This moment crystallized the fundamental Reformation insight: the authority of the church, however ancient and imposing, is a derived and fallible authority. Only Scripture carries the unconditional authority of the God who breathed it out. Only Scripture can bind the conscience absolutely, because only Scripture is the Word of the God who is truth itself. Every other authority (pope, council, tradition, reason) is answerable to the Word, not the reverse.

V. THE ROMAN CATHOLIC OBJECTION: SCRIPTURE AND TRADITION AS CO-EQUAL AUTHORITIES

The most sustained and theologically sophisticated challenge to Sola Scriptura comes from the Roman Catholic Church, whose response to the Reformers was articulated definitively at the Council of Trent (1545–1563) and reaffirmed in the Second Vatican Council's document Dei Verbum (1965). The Roman Catholic position is that divine revelation is transmitted through two channels: Sacred Scripture and Sacred Tradition, both of which are to be "received and venerated with the same sense of loyalty and reverence."

A. The Roman Catholic Position Stated

The Roman argument proceeds as follows. Scripture and Tradition together constitute the single deposit of the Word of God entrusted to the church. The church, specifically the Magisterium (the teaching authority exercised by the bishops in communion with the Pope), is the authoritative interpreter of both Scripture and Tradition. The Magisterium does not stand above the Word of God but serves it; however, only the Magisterium can definitively determine what the Word of God means in any specific instance. On this view, Scripture alone is insufficient as a guide because it requires authoritative interpretation, and that authoritative interpretation is provided by the living tradition of the church as expressed in the Magisterium.

This position also includes the Roman Catholic claim that certain doctrines not explicitly taught in Scripture (the perpetual virginity of Mary, the Immaculate Conception, the Assumption of Mary, papal infallibility) are contained in Sacred Tradition and therefore bind the faith of all Catholics, even though they cannot be derived from Scripture alone.

B. The Evangelical Response

The evangelical response to the Roman Catholic objection operates on multiple levels.

First, the claim that Scripture requires the Magisterium for authoritative interpretation creates an infinite regress. If Scripture is unclear without Magisterial interpretation, how do we know that the Magisterium's interpretations are correct? The Roman Catholic answer is that the Magisterium is infallible in its definitive pronouncements, but this claim is itself not derivable from Scripture and must be asserted on the basis of tradition. The claim to Magisterial authority is self-referentially circular in a way that the Protestant appeal to Scripture's self-attestation is not, because Scripture's self-attestation is grounded in the character of its divine Author, while the Magisterium's self-attestation is grounded only in its own claim to authority.

Second, the claim that extra-biblical doctrines are contained in Sacred Tradition and are therefore binding on the church is historically problematic. Many of the doctrines Rome claims to derive from tradition, such as the Immaculate Conception (defined 1854), the Assumption of Mary (defined 1950), and papal infallibility (defined 1870), are not attested in the early church fathers, are disputed throughout much of church history, and were defined by the Magisterium at specific moments in response to specific controversies. The "tradition" that transmits these doctrines looks remarkably like the Magisterium's own developing teaching rather than an ancient deposit that runs alongside Scripture.

Third, and most fundamentally, Jesus Himself condemns the elevation of human tradition to a status co-equal with or superior to the Word of God. In Matthew 15:1–9, He rebukes the Pharisees for "invalidating the word of God for the sake of your tradition" (v. 6). The structure of His critique is precisely the Reformation critique of Rome: a tradition has been given a status that effectively overrides the explicit teaching of Scripture. The prophetic word of Isaiah applies with equal force: "To the law and to the testimony! If they do not speak according to this word, it is because they have no dawn" (Isaiah 8:20, NASB 1995). The test of any teaching, any tradition, any authority, is whether it speaks according to the law and the testimony: the written Word of God.

VI. THE EASTERN ORTHODOX OBJECTION: SCRIPTURE WITHIN THE TRADITION

Eastern Orthodoxy offers a different but equally significant challenge to Sola Scriptura. Where Rome posits two co-equal sources of revelation (Scripture and Tradition), Orthodoxy tends to treat Scripture itself as a product of the Tradition, that is, as the church's written deposit of the living, ongoing tradition of the Holy Spirit's guidance. On this view, Scripture cannot be read or interpreted apart from the Tradition that produced it, because it is only within the Tradition that Scripture has its proper context and meaning.

A. The Orthodox Position Stated

Orthodox theologians like Georges Florovsky and Alexander Schmemann argue that the New Testament was written within the church, recognized as authoritative by the church, and can only be properly interpreted within the church's ongoing liturgical and theological life. To read Scripture apart from the Tradition (to try to understand Paul without the Nicene Creed, or to interpret Revelation without the liturgical context of the Orthodox eucharist) is to tear the text from the living context that gives it meaning. Sola Scriptura, on this view, is not a principled theological position but an epistemological naivety that ignores the tradition-bound nature of all reading and interpretation.

B. The Protestant Response

The Protestant response acknowledges the genuine insight in the Orthodox position without conceding its conclusion. It is true that Scripture was written within a community, recognized as authoritative by that community, and has been interpreted within a tradition that provides important context. The Reformers did not deny this; their confessions and catechisms reflect deep immersion in the patristic and creedal tradition. The Nicene Creed is not an imposition on Scripture but a summary of what Scripture teaches.

But the Protestant insists on a crucial distinction: the church recognized the canon; it did not create it. The apostolic writings carried divine authority in themselves, by virtue of their inspiration; the church's recognition of that authority was a response to it, not its source. And while the tradition provides valuable context for biblical interpretation, it is not an infallible one, as the disagreements within the Orthodox tradition itself demonstrate. The Tradition cannot be the final authority for the interpretation of Scripture, because the Tradition is not itself a unified, consistent, or infallible witness. Scripture, as the product of the divine breath, possesses a clarity and authority that the Tradition does not.

Furthermore, the Orthodox appeal to Tradition as the necessary context for Scripture effectively insulates certain Orthodox distinctives from biblical critique. If the Tradition is the hermeneutical key that unlocks Scripture, then the Tradition can never be corrected by Scripture. Yet the biblical pattern of prophetic challenge to established religious tradition (including Jesus' challenge to the Pharisees in Matthew 15) directly contradicts that position. The *norma normans* must stand outside the tradition it norms; otherwise it cannot norm it.

VII. THE 1689 CONFESSION, CHAPTER 1: A CONFESSIONAL STATEMENT OF SOLA SCRIPTURA

The Second London Baptist Confession of Faith (1689) provides, in its opening chapter, one of the most carefully articulated confessional expressions of Sola Scriptura in the entire Protestant tradition. We have already cited the opening paragraph above; the following additional paragraphs fill out the doctrine with important nuance.

Paragraph 5 addresses the ground of Scripture's authority:

> *"We may be moved and induced by the testimony of the church of God to an high and reverent esteem for the Holy Scriptures; and the heavenliness of the matter, the efficacy of the doctrine, the majesty of the style, the consent of all the parts, the scope of the whole (which is to give all glory to God), the full discovery it makes of the only way of man's salvation, and many other incomparable excellencies, and entire perfections thereof, are arguments whereby it doth abundantly evidence itself to be the Word of God; yet, notwithstanding, our full persuasion and assurance of the infallible truth and divine authority thereof, is from the inward work of the Holy Spirit bearing witness by and with the Word in our hearts." (1689 Confession, Chapter 1, Paragraph 5)*

This paragraph is a masterpiece of precision. It acknowledges that the testimony of the church, the internal qualities of the text, and rational arguments all contribute to a "high and reverent esteem" for Scripture, and then insists that our full persuasion and assurance rests not on these arguments but on the inward witness of the Holy

Spirit. This is the testimonium internum Spiritus Sancti applied to the doctrine of Sola Scriptura: the ultimate ground of the believer's confidence in Scripture's authority is the Spirit's own witness to it.

Paragraph 10 addresses the question of who has the final word in theological controversies:

> *"The supreme judge, by which all controversies of religion are to be determined, and all decrees of councils, opinions of ancient writers, doctrines of men, and private spirits, are to be examined, and in whose sentence we are to rest, can be no other but the Holy Scripture delivered by the Spirit; into which Scripture so delivered, our faith is finally resolved." (1689 Confession, Chapter 1, Paragraph 10)*

The supremacy of Scripture as the judge of all religious controversies is stated without qualification. Councils, ancient writers, human doctrines, and private impressions are all placed under the judgment of Scripture, not alongside it as co-equal authorities. This is Sola Scriptura in its full confessional form: the norma normans that norms all other norms, the supreme judge to whose sentence all other authorities must ultimately submit.

Key Texts (NASB 1995)

> *"To the law and to the testimony! If they do not speak according to this word, it is because they have no dawn."*
>
> **Isaiah 8:20**

> *"And He answered and said to them, 'Why do you yourselves transgress the commandment of God for the sake of your tradition?... And by this you invalidated the word of God for the sake of your tradition.... But in vain do they worship Me, teaching as doctrines the precepts of men.'"*
>
> **Matthew 15:3, 6, 9**

> *"All Scripture is inspired by God and profitable for teaching, for reproof, for correction, for training in righteousness; so that the man of God may be adequate, equipped for every good work."*
>
> **2 Timothy 3:16–17**

Theological Terms and Definitions

Sola Scriptura	Latin for "Scripture alone." The Reformation principle that Scripture is the only infallible and ultimate authority for the church in all matters of faith and practice. Sola Scriptura does not deny the usefulness of creeds, confessions, tradition, or reason, but insists that all such authorities are subordinate to and must be evaluated by the written Word of God.
Solo Scriptura	The individualistic corruption of Sola Scriptura, sometimes called the "radical Reformation" position, which treats the individual believer's unmediated private reading of Scripture as the sole authority, dismissing the creedal tradition and the teaching office of the church. Solo Scriptura ("I and my Bible") is emphatically not the Reformation position and leads to theological fragmentation and interpretive anarchy.
Formal Sufficiency	The position of the Reformers: Scripture is the only infallible and ultimately authoritative norm for the church. The church's tradition, creeds, and reason are genuinely valuable but subordinate, corrigible by Scripture, and derive their authority from Scripture's teaching rather than from independent sources. Distinguished from material sufficiency, which concerns whether Scripture contains all the content necessary for salvation.
The Wesleyan Quadrilateral	A framework (developed not by Wesley himself but by later Methodists) that identifies four sources of theological authority: Scripture, tradition, reason, and experience. While these four elements do genuinely interact in theological reflection, the quadrilateral as sometimes used grants tradition, reason, and experience co-ordinate authority with Scripture, rather than treating them as subordinate norms evaluated by Scripture.
Sacred Tradition (Roman Catholic)	The Roman Catholic teaching that divine revelation is transmitted through two co-equal and co-extensive channels: Sacred Scripture and Sacred Tradition (the unwritten teachings preserved and interpreted by the Magisterium). On this view, the Magisterium (teaching authority of the church, centered in the papacy) is the authoritative interpreter of both Scripture and Tradition, effectively placing the Magisterium above both.
Magisterium	The official teaching authority of the Roman Catholic Church, residing in the bishops in communion with the Pope. The Magisterium claims the authority to interpret both Sacred Scripture and Sacred Tradition definitively and infallibly, making it in practice the supreme norm for Roman Catholic theology. The Reformers rejected this claim on the grounds that it placed a human institution above the written Word of God.
Creatura Verbi	Latin for "creature of the Word." A Reformation principle (drawn from Luther) describing the church as the creature created, sustained, and defined by the Word of God. The church did not produce the Word; the Word produced the church. This principle establishes the proper relationship: the church is always under the Word, never over it.
The Diet of Worms (1521)	The imperial assembly at which Martin Luther was called to recant his writings. Luther's refusal, which grounded his conscience in Scripture and evident reason rather than in the authority of the Pope or councils, crystallized the Reformation principle of Sola Scriptura. His declaration that his conscience was "captive to the Word of God" became the defining statement of the Reformation's approach to biblical authority.
The 1689 Confession, Chapter 1	The opening chapter of the Second London Baptist Confession of Faith (1689), which provides one of the most comprehensive and carefully articulated confessional statements of Sola Scriptura in the Baptist tradition. It affirms Scripture as the only sufficient, certain, and infallible rule of saving knowledge, faith, and obedience, and as the supreme judge of all religious controversies.

Norma Normans / Norma Normata	Latin phrases distinguishing between the norming norm (Scripture) and the normed norms (creeds, confessions, tradition). Scripture is the norma normans, the norm that norms all other norms. Creeds and confessions are norma normata, norms that are themselves normed by Scripture. This distinction captures the Reformation's nuanced position: creeds and confessions are genuinely authoritative summaries of biblical teaching, but their authority is always derivative and always subject to correction by the Word they summarize.

Practical Application

A. *For the Mind: What Must We Believe?*

We must believe that Scripture alone is the infallible and ultimately authoritative norm for the faith and practice of the church. This does not mean that tradition, reason, and experience have no role in theological reflection; it means that their role is always subordinate, always derivative, and always subject to correction by the Word that stands over them. The 1689 Confession's formulation is the target: Scripture is the "only sufficient, certain, and infallible rule," three adjectives that together define the content of the Sola.

We must also understand and be able to articulate the crucial distinction between Sola Scriptura and Solo Scriptura. The individualistic distortion of the Reformation principle is not only a theoretical error; it is a practical and ecclesiological one that destroys the community, accountability, and confessional tradition through which Scripture is rightly read and applied. Sola Scriptura is a communal, confessional, historically accountable principle. It is the principle by which the church reads Scripture together, under the Spirit's guidance, in continuity with the great tradition of biblical interpretation, not the principle by which each individual bypasses that tradition to encounter the text alone.

B. *For the Heart: What Must We Feel and Desire?*

Sola Scriptura, properly understood, should produce in us a profound freedom: the freedom of those who know that no human institution, however ancient or impressive, can bind their conscience in the place of God's own Word. This is the freedom Luther experienced when his conscience was set free from the authority of Rome and bound instead to the Word of God. It is the freedom that every believer may know when they realize that their ultimate authority is not their pastor, their denomination, their tradition, or their own feeling, but the living and active Word of the God who cannot lie.

At the same time, Sola Scriptura should produce in us a deep respect for the tradition. This is not the idolatry of tradition but the respect that is due to the accumulated wisdom of two thousand years of the church's engagement with the Word. The creeds are not Scripture, but they are the church's best corporate reading of Scripture on the most fundamental questions. When we affirm the Nicene Creed, we are not submitting to a human authority; we are aligning ourselves with the church's faithful rendering of what the Word itself teaches.

C. *For the Hands: What Must We Do?*

1. Make Scripture the governing norm of your personal theology. Regularly audit your theological convictions against the Scripture itself, not merely against the tradition you have inherited. The tradition may be right (it often is), but its authority is derivative and must be tested by the Word it claims to summarize.

2. Read the great confessions. The Westminster Confession, the 1689 Baptist Confession, the Heidelberg Catechism, and the Belgic Confession are not obstacles to Sola Scriptura; they are models of it, careful, communal, accountable readings of Scripture that provide the church with a reliable guide to its teaching. To read them is to practice Sola Scriptura properly, not to abandon it for Solo Scriptura.

3. Resist the pull of Solo Scriptura in evangelical culture. When you encounter the attitude that "just me and my Bible" is sufficient, and that the tradition, the creeds, and the theological heritage of the church can be safely

bypassed, gently challenge it. The history of the church demonstrates that this approach produces not theological clarity but theological chaos, as each reader's private interpretation proliferates without accountability.

4. Test all teaching by Scripture. When you encounter a theological claim, whether from your pastor, your denomination, your favorite author, or your tradition, bring it to the bar of Scripture. This is what the Bereans did (Acts 17:11), and it is what Sola Scriptura calls every believer to do. The test is not whether the claim sounds traditional or impressive or emotionally resonant, but whether it speaks according to the law and the testimony (Isaiah 8:20).

5. Know the objections. Be able to articulate the difference between the Roman Catholic and Eastern Orthodox challenges to Sola Scriptura, and be able to explain why the Reformation response is theologically sound. These are not obscure academic debates; they are live questions in a world where Roman Catholicism and Eastern Orthodoxy present themselves as alternatives to evangelical Protestantism, and your people need to be equipped to engage them.

D. *For Every Season of Life*

For the new believer learning to read Scripture: You are not alone with the text. The church has been reading this Book for two thousand years, and the fruits of that reading in creeds, confessions, commentaries, and sermons are available to you as resources for understanding it well. Use them. But never allow any human resource to stand between you and the text itself; always go back to the Word, and let the tradition serve your reading of it rather than replace it.

For the believer attracted to Rome or Orthodoxy: The appeal of an ancient, authoritative, sacramentally rich tradition is real and should not be dismissed. But the question that Sola Scriptura presses on you is this: When the tradition teaches something that Scripture does not clearly teach, or that clearly contradicts what Scripture teaches, what governs? The evangelical answer is that Scripture governs, always. The cost of accepting co-equal or superior authority for any human tradition is that the tradition can never be corrected by the Word it claims to serve. That cost is too high.

For the church leader: Your authority in the pulpit and the elder's chair is derived from Scripture, not from your office, your eloquence, or your tradition. The moment you begin teaching your own ideas rather than the Word, or allowing your church's tradition to override the clear teaching of Scripture, you have reversed the proper relationship, and you no longer have any authority worth having. Preach the Word. Teach the Word. Let your conscience be captive to the Word. That is the only authority the church has, and it is more than enough.

Study and Discussion Questions

Opening Question

1. Before studying this lesson, how would you have described the relationship between the Bible and church tradition in your own theological thinking? Has the lesson sharpened, challenged, or confirmed your previous understanding?

Observation Questions (What Do the Texts Say?)

2. Read Isaiah 8:19–20. What is the context of the command "To the law and to the testimony"? What test does Isaiah prescribe for evaluating any teaching or teacher, and what happens to those who fail it?
3. Read Matthew 15:1–9. What specific tradition are the Pharisees observing, and what commandment of God does it override? What does Jesus' response reveal about the proper relationship between Scripture and human tradition?
4. Read 2 Timothy 3:14–17. What does Paul say Scripture is "sufficient" for? How does this passage's claim about Scripture's sufficiency relate to the doctrine of Sola Scriptura?

Interpretation Questions (What Does It Mean?)

5. Explain the distinction between Sola Scriptura and Solo Scriptura. Why is this distinction so important? What are the practical and ecclesiological consequences of confusing the two?
6. The lesson argues that the Roman Catholic position creates an infinite regress: Scripture requires Magisterial interpretation; but the Magisterium's claim to authority must itself be established. Trace this argument in your own words. Do you find it persuasive?
7. What is the norma normans / norma normata distinction, and how does it capture the Reformation's nuanced position on the relationship between Scripture and tradition? Give a concrete example of how this distinction would play out in a specific theological disagreement.
8. What genuine insights does the Eastern Orthodox position contain? Where does the Protestant response acknowledge those insights, and where does it depart from the Orthodox conclusion?

Application Questions (What Does It Demand of Us?)

9. Luther declared that his conscience was "captive to the Word of God." What would it mean for your conscience to be genuinely captive to Scripture rather than to your tradition, your culture, or your own preferences? Are there areas of your life or theology where you need to bring your conscience into greater captivity to the Word?
10. Read Acts 17:10–11. The Bereans tested Paul's teaching against the Scriptures. What does it look like, in practice, to apply this same discipline in your church context? Are there structures, habits, or cultures in your church that make this easier or harder?
11. The lesson argues that Sola Scriptura is a communal, confessional, and historically accountable principle, not the individualistic Solo Scriptura. How does your church embody or fail to embody this communal dimension? What changes might make the principle more fully operative in your church's life?
12. Isaiah 8:20 prescribes that if a teaching does not "speak according to this word, it is because they have no dawn." Apply this test to one teaching you have encountered that seemed compelling but may not have been grounded in Scripture. What was the teaching, and what did the test reveal?

Prayer Focus

Spend time in prayer as a group, thanking God for the gift of the supreme authority of His Word, so that no human institution, however ancient or impressive, can bind your conscience in the place of the God who has spoken. Thank Him for the Reformation's recovery of Sola Scriptura and for the faithful men and women who have held and defended this principle at great cost. Ask the Lord to give your church a deep, communal, and confessionally grounded confidence in the supreme authority of Scripture: the kind of confidence that engages tradition with respect without submitting to it as infallible, that uses reason as a servant of exegesis, and that tests every teaching by the law and the testimony. Pray for those in your congregation who are drawn to Rome or Orthodoxy by the appeal of ancient authority, that the Spirit would show them the sufficiency, certainty, and infallibility of the Scripture that stands over every tradition.

Soli Deo Gloria

To God Alone Be the Glory

FAITHFUL TO THE WORD

Dr. Joshua Nichols

josh@faithfultotheword.com | faithfultotheword.com