

Sola & Tota Scriptura— Intrabiblical Phenomenology

Godina Bojan, PhD

Theologisches Seminar Schloss Bogenhofen, Austria
Social science, Theologische Hochschule Friedensau,
Möckern-Friedensau, Germany
E-mail: bojan@godina.de

ABSTRACT: The Sola & Tota Scriptura principles in Protestantism no longer have the meaning, which they had in Reformation, but have now been relativized by modern theology. The following article attempts to point out these principles as genuinely Biblical principles that show a great similarity with the fundamental aspects of Husserl's phenomenology. Comparing Biblical texts and the fundamental methodological steps of phenomenology, the Bible has requested these precise methodological steps in its intrabiblical instruction manual. The biblical statements underline the impression that the whole Bible repeatedly contains different variations of the Reformation principle. In analogy to phenomenology, the biblical references might help us to find "back to the Biblical phenomena".

KEY WORDS: Sola Scriptura, Tota Scriptura, Reformation, Phenomenology, Biblical Phenomenology

1. Introduction

Since the time of Luther's Reformation, Protestantism and its dealings with the Bible have changed considerably in Germany also. Since the Evangelical Church in Germany (Evangelische Kirche Deutschland) has described¹ itself as a "church of freedom" in 2006, there seems to be hardly any common denominator under which evangelical theology and the church can determine themselves; that is why Stengel sees it more appropriate to speak about a "Protestant discourse" instead of "Protestantism".² In the text of the Evangelical Church of Germany: "Justification and Freedom", one now quite frankly confesses a serious change in the way the Bible deals with the Reformation period:

*"Since the seventeenth century the Biblical texts have been historic-critically explored. For this reason, they can no longer be understood as "the Word of God" as this was case in the time of the Reformation. The reformers had basically assumed that the Biblical texts were really given by God himself. Considering the different versions of a text section or the discovery of different text layers, this idea cannot be held any longer."*³

It may be said that the present prevailing theological streams question the Bible to be God's Word in its self-expression and they put their own theological knowledge above the truth content of the Bible. This is, in principle, nothing new; even in the Old and in the New Testament, the scholars of that days had doubted, twisted, and even turned their knowledge to the contrary.⁴ Theological theories, constructions and interpretive paradigms are placed alongside, or even over the testimony of the Bible. It is precisely for this reason that, as in those days, it is always necessary to have the Biblical testimony itself, which by many explicit and implicit statements postulates a Sola & Tota Scriptura principle as an absolute basic condition of a proper dealing with the Word of God.

In scientific terms, this Biblical basic concern would hardly be closer to a method than to the phenomenology of Husserl. In 2012,

I developed a didactic-systematic approach to the phenomenological method of Husserl, which I will refer to in Chapter 4 in comparison with the Biblical textual statements.⁵ How powerful Biblical statements from the point of view of scientific aspects are, becomes clear only when viewed from a phenomenological standpoint.

2. Reformation discovers the *Sola & Tota Scriptura* principles

The principle of *Sola Scriptura* states that Holy Scripture is the sole, unfailing and the absolute norm for faith and thus constitutes a special feature of the Reformation theology.⁶

Luther emphasized in 1520 that the Scripture is “by itself the most certain,” moreover it is “most easily accessible,” and also “interprets itself”.⁷ Somewhat later he added, “he is not to be praised as the one who is more educated than others, but I desire that the Scriptures be the only queen (= *solam scripturam regnare*), and that it is not interpreted by my spirit or by the spirit of other people, but understood by itself and its own spirit”.⁸ In 1521, Luther was only willing to revoke his standpoints if he had been given reasons from the Scriptures.⁹ The *Sola Scriptura* principle, however, is not specific for Reformation only.¹⁰ It was applied to the church reforms of the late middle ages, e.g. by the Waldensians or Hussites.¹¹ The origin of the *Sola Scriptura* principle is established in the Bible itself. The Reformation has only rediscovered the *Sola Scriptura* principle under Luther. In the further course of the history of the Reformation, however, the principle of *Sola Scriptura* did not stop. *Sola Scriptura* was expanded in Pietism with *Tota Scriptura* and the reason for that was in the Catechism. Luther and the Lutheran orthodoxy had called the Catechism the “laity Bible” for the common people. Since the daily Bible reading was not required by the ordinary Christians, Spener had expanded the literacy and called

for the extension “Tota Scriptura” through his reform program “Pia Desideria” in the first “suggestion for improvement”¹². The reason was to bring the Word of God more abundantly amongst the Christians, so as to lead them from a Catechism Christianity to a Biblical Christianity.¹³

3. Sola & Tota Scriptura –phenomenology in the Bible?

The two principles: Sola & Tota Scriptura were indeed pointed out during the Reformation period, but they are nothing else than intrabiblical principles, which can be found in many places in the Bible. From a scientific and methodic point of view, these Biblical texts could be interpreted best as phenomenological basic principles which were most clearly described by the German-Austrian philosopher Edmund Husserl and the later phenomenologists.

Now, however, in theological academic literature, one will hardly find summaries of such Biblical principles. I am, at best, aware of some few isolated pastors, who have made up themselves small guidebooks with such Biblical passages for their religious educational work. Even less, though, is known that the intrabiblical texts on the Sola & Tota Scriptura principles are very close to what was described in the phenomenology of Husserl a hundred years ago.

Since I have dealt over the past 25 years with Biblical and sociological fundamental research and often with phenomenological essential structures,¹⁴ moreover, I decided later to publish something about the methodological steps of phenomenology. For the human and social scientists I elaborated a didactic summary of the fundamental phenomenological steps and published it in the Springer Science publishing company in the German language in 2012.¹⁵ The aim of this publication was to structure the extremely valuable but

unfortunately often too complex methodological steps, a didactic systematic way into a logical and simple form for non-philosophers. At the same time, however, this approach should be more deeply rooted in phenomenology than this is the case in the current German language standards on qualitative social research.¹⁶

The similarity of some basic methodological steps of phenomenology and the Biblical methodological *Sola & Tota Scriptura* text passages and how to deal with the Scriptures is more than remarkable. The essential methodological steps of phenomenology can in principle be found in the Scriptures. In the following, some fundamental aspects of the phenomenology of Husserl are systematically shown, in order to make a parallel comparison with intrabiblical texts.

4. Phenomenological fundamental aspects in Biblical texts

To comprehend the phenomenology of Edmund Husserl is not necessarily an easy undertaking,¹⁷ in addition to that his work was apprehended and developed further by different thinkers and directions. In the present essay, only a few basic aspects of the phenomenological methods that are relevant to this Biblical discourse should be addressed.¹⁸

4.1.1. „To the things themselves“

With the expression “to the things themselves” (“zu den Sachen selbst”),¹⁹ Husserl has described his phenomenological program in its core. Klaus Held reveals the fundamental problem of Husserl’s and his phenomenology respectively at the fundamental question of acquiring the truth. Husserl was concerned about an old philosophical idealism, namely with a “radically prejudice-free

knowledge,” only in this way knowledge²⁰ can differ from meaning (Meinung). Meaning points to “according to its sense to situations in which the intended would be disclosed, fulfilled and approved. Such situations bring us immediately near to the point which is given to us only from a distance when connected to the meaning.”²¹ This means it is necessary to get to the factual proximity through experience situations. Thus the opinion is transferred by way of visualization into true knowledge.²² This means that knowledge emerges in the situation in which the human being is confronted with the fact itself (first person perspective).²³

4.1.2. „To the things themselves“ in the Bible

Even in Biblical times, the problem was known that the covenant people were tempted to preserve their religious orientation not directly from the laws of Moses or the latter Biblical writings, but from additional theological traditions and speculations. The prophet Jeremiah writes as early as the seventh century BC that the scholars of that time have twisted the Scriptures into falsehood.²⁴ The phenomenological maxim: “to the things themselves” is to be found in the Bible repeatedly as a maxim of dealing with the Scriptures in the form “to the Bible itself”. Already in the books of Moses, the covenant people were often told that they should listen directly and exclusively to the words of God without adding anything to it: “So now, Israel, give heed to the statutes and ordinances that I am teaching you to observe, so that you may live to enter and occupy the land that the LORD, the God of your ancestors, is giving you. You must neither add anything to what I command you.” (Dt 4:1-2 NRSV)²⁵

Adding to the genuine doctrine of God could falsify his doctrine, and the teacher would stand in front of God as a liar, King Solomon wrote: “Do not add to his words, or else he will rebuke you, and you will be found a liar.” (Prv 30:6 NRSV)

Jesus, on the other hand, made it clear in the Gospel of Matthew that the Pharisees and the Scribes, by their commandments of men, transgress the commandments of God, and this religion makes no sense at all: “He answered them, “*And why do you break the commandment of God for the sake of your tradition?*” (Mt 15:3 NRSV) “*In vain do they worship me, teaching human precepts as doctrines.*” (Mt 15:9 NRSV)

The Apostle Paul goes a pedagogical step further in the phenomenology and asserts that the maxim “to the Bible itself” can also be learned from a model and if this pattern is obeyed, the disputes could be prevented: “*I have applied all this to Apollos and myself for your benefit, brothers and sisters, so that you may learn through us the meaning of the saying, “Nothing beyond what is written,” so that none of you will be puffed up in favor of one against another.*” (1 Cor 4:6 NRSV)²⁶

At the end of the Apocalypse, John repeats the maxim as a commandment with fatal consequences: “*I warn everyone who hears the words of the prophecy of this book: if anyone adds to them, God will add to that person the plagues described in this book.*” (Rv 22:18 NRSV) The teacher, the apostle or the prophet in the Bible is, therefore, rather a “steward” than an interpreter. “*Think of us in this way, as servants of Christ and stewards of God’s mysteries.*” (1 Cor 4:1 NRSV)

The teacher must not change the word at his own judgement as this was often the case with the scribes of the Old and New Testaments.²⁷ As can be clearly seen from these Biblical examples, the Bible is full of indications that led the faith of the covenant people to the instant Word of God, to the phenomenon of the direct revelation of God, instead of the numerous theological interpretations, commentaries and speculations about the Word of God. The reformatory “Sola

Scriptura” principle is, in this sense, nothing fundamentally new, but the rediscovery of intrabiblical phenomenology.

4.2.1. „First person perspective“ in the phenomenology

For the phenomenologist, first of all, the “first person perspective” is of importance, meaning his/her own perspective, in contrast to the so-called objectivism, which increasingly wanted to banish the human subject from science.²⁸ The phenomenologist takes a different way which initially reveals the prejudice, even that of the natural sciences in the natural consciousness. It is an “incisive discovery” when it is made a subject of discussion and can thus enter the consciousness (Bewusstsein).²⁹ Each person has his or her own awareness about the world. For Husserl, “natural consciousness” is the state of consciousness in which I meet the world. This is a world “before all theory”.³⁰ It is the world in the full richness of natural life.

4.2.2. „First person perspective“ in the Bible

A theologian one day asked Jesus what he had to do to have eternal life. Jesus answered him with the “first person perspective” by telling him: “He said to him, ‘What is written in the law? What do you read there’” (Lk 10:26 NRSV)

In other places of the Gospel, too, it is often said that Jesus did not confuse his opponents with unknown interpretations, but repeatedly confronted them with the “first person perspective” of the Scripture.³¹

Jesus questioned and thus encouraged the “first person perspective” not only with regard to dealing with his word, but also with reference to himself, in addition. When governor Pilatus asked Jesus whether he was a king, Jesus reversed the question and asked Pilatus about

the quality and the kind of his perspective, respectively. “*Then Pilate entered the headquarters again, summoned Jesus, and asked him, ‘Are you the King of the Jews?’ Jesus answered, ‘Do you ask this on your own, or did others tell you about me?’*” (Jn 18:33-34 NRSV)

Obviously, Jesus was interested in the fact that people had their own opinion out of the experience with him (first person perspective) and that they were not formed by the opinion of others who were rather polarizing.³² The “first-person perspective” is so important in the Bible that even in the event the Prophet himself did not understand the prophecy he received, he was not allowed to interpret the word from this “first person perspective” view and thus he was neither allowed to change it. He had to pass the word in this “first person perspective” even though it was not comprehensible to him.

“*I heard but could not understand; so I said, My lord, what shall be the outcome of these things?*” He said, “*Go your way, Daniel, for the words are to remain secret and sealed until the time of the end. Many shall be purified, cleansed, and refined, but the wicked shall continue to act wickedly. None of the wicked shall understand, but those who are wise shall understand.*” (Dn 12:8-10 NRSV) Only if this “first person perspective” of the Prophet is conveyed accurately, it will be understood one day by the next generations and fulfill its function, as in the case of the messianic prophecies after the resurrection of Jesus.³³

4.3.1. Intentionality and consciousness in phenomenology

The maxim “to the things themselves” is fully realized by the intentional acts. In order to understand intentionality, it is necessary to classify the terms “correlation” and “phenomenon” in accordance with the teachings of Husserl.

Correlation is the manner in which objects are given to us, which is different from case to case. “*There is a reciprocal relationship*

between the existence of the objects and their subjective situational way of circumstances, a correlation whose specific character depends on the kind of objectivity.”³⁴

Just as tonnes must be heard acoustically and colors must be seen visually, each object has a certain access or correlation regarding the type of the object. Thus, one can read religious writings appropriately or religious texts can be captured as something read out.

Phenomena are the “objects in its How of their appearance.”³⁵ Husserl also expresses it as follows: “Their essential character is to be “consciousness of”, “appearance of being”.”³⁶ This appearance, however, cannot happen without human consciousness. Similarly, consciousness cannot exist without the objects. There is no consciousness in itself, without an object of consciousness. “That is the ‘world’ as it is, that is only given by consciousness; And vice versa: consciousness is only in so far as it has content in so far as it is directed towards objects. This aimed-at-something is called intentionality.”³⁷

For Husserl, phenomena are the intentional objects, that is, objects to which consciousness is directed to.³⁸ In this sense, for a believer, the Bible becomes an intentional object to which his consciousness is directed to when reading or hearing the Biblical texts.

The term “Intentio” means, “to focus on.”³⁹ In Husserl’s theory, there is also a connotation to the everyday language, in the sense of “intend”, i.e. “to strive.”⁴⁰ This perception is not, however, a punctual or isolated nature, but it is embedded in a stream. For example, I can never recognize the whole “suitcase” at once (outside, inside, backside), but I only can have a certain view.⁴¹ When I see a person, for example at a bus stop, I first see how she/he is standing there or how she/he stares on the floor or stomps with her/his feet. I can also get closer, looking at her/him from different perspectives, at the front, at the back, laterally etc. Each time, only one side of this

person appears to me. To see her/him in perspective, I have to walk around her/him. However, I can also perceive different aspects of the situation, e.g. the color, the smell, the size etc.

Even though this intentionality of consciousness is viewed by some thinkers as a “trivial fact”,⁴² particularly this precise description of the intentionality is necessary in order to be able to approach the object in greater proximity and to illuminate the correlation relationship.

4.3.2. *Intentionality in the Bible*

Since the correlation is determined by the nature of objectivity, the Bible can only be made accessible in intentional acts of reading and listening as a phenomenon. This should be done in particular in the “first person perspective” as described above, meaning that readers should be in direct contact with the Bible as it was in the reformatory *Sola Scriptura* principle.

Nevertheless, the phenomenological comprehending of Biblical statements and, above all, their effect is not guaranteed. In the Bible there are several indications, which imply that the effect depends on whether you read or hear the text in the consciousness of the faith:

“We also constantly give thanks to God for this, that when you received the word of God that you heard from us, you accepted it not as a human word but as what it really is, God’s word, which is also at work in you believers.” (1 Thes 2:13 NRSV) In doing so, the intentional object is twofold. It is not sufficient to direct consciousness only to the pure content-related statements of Scripture, but this also has to be accompanied by a quality of faith. The word must be perceived as information and at the same time as the true Word of God so that it can achieve its effect.⁴³

4.4.1. Eidetic variation

In the free variation (eidetic variation) the intentionality, i.e. this consciousness-object-experience, is deliberately carried forward in its manifold possibilities or correlations, in reality or in imagination. This means the object is intentionally varied in all its possible shading. "Its starting material is its original, present, somehow visualized or freely fantasized experience of an individual, which is addressed as Something of the kind. It is firstly varied according to all the possibilities open to it as an individual of its kind".⁴⁴

The limits of variation are where the object in the variation ceases to be what it was actually seen at first.⁴⁵ This means, the boundaries are wherever the refiguration of the object through the variations exceeds the definition of the object, and in that case, it would lose its identity.

4.4.2. Eidetic variation in the Bible and Tota Scriptura

Already in the Biblical jurisdiction of the Old Testament there was the principle that one should never make a final judgment on the basis of a single witness, but should involve different witness variations. Each accusation was valid only if there were two or three witness testimonials.⁴⁶ This principle of at least two or three variations was also extended to other entities in early Christianity.⁴⁷ This means that for truth seeking certain variations (in the case of a court eyewitnesses e.g.) had to be present over a phenomenon in order to get closer to the phenomenon. The same is true with Scripture itself.

In the Bible, there are few aspects or doctrines, which are described with a single sentence point by point and which can thus be finally determined. Mainly, there are content-related phenomena, which must be approached from different perspectives in order to grasp

them better. In order to apprehend Jesus in his earthly life, three synoptic Gospels and the Gospel of John were given. Even after his rise to heaven, at least two books have been given (The Epistle to the Hebrews and the Revelation of John; in addition to that numerous individual statements from other Biblical books as well) in order to make a more differentiated picture of his further work from diverse perspectives.

Jesus himself and his disciples have often applied this principle with regard to the Scripture in their confrontation with the opponents or in their proclamation. In many cases, they have used several text passages (variations) on the same object to describe the object more clearly from different directions by means of different eidetic variations.⁴⁸ One day Jesus made the assertion that everyone who “heard and learned” from the Father (through the Scriptures) comes to him.⁴⁹ To the Sadducees, on the other hand, he dared to say that they did not know the “Scriptures.”⁵⁰ This does not mean that they were not taught in the Scriptures, but that they did not know the real object of faith, the Scriptures, or their God-given objects, without prejudice in their different eidetic variations. Their interpretations of the writings came not from Scripture itself but from their own theories and speculations respectively.⁵¹ They have not generated their ideas about the “Messiah” or “servant of God” out of the numerous eidetic variations of the Scriptures, but out of their theological interpretations. The numerous eidetic variations on the “Messiah” or “servant of God” from the Scriptures were clearly fulfilled in Jesus. Jesus said to them: “*You search the scriptures because you think that in them you have eternal life; and it is they that testify on my behalf. Yet you refuse to come to me to have life.*” (Jn 5:39-40 NRSV)

After his resurrection he deepened this eidetic principle of variation by referring to Moses and all the prophets in all the Scriptures of the Old Testament and thus to himself by using different symbolically coded prophetic-messianic eidetic variations: “*Then he said to them,*

“Oh, how foolish you are, and how slow of heart to believe all that the prophets have declared! Was it not necessary that the Messiah should suffer these things and then enter into his glory?” Then beginning with Moses and all the prophets, he interpreted to them the things about himself in all the scriptures.” (Luke 24:25-27 NRSV)

To his 12 disciples he also demonstrated that the eidetic variations on his death and resurrection from the Old Testament had now been fulfilled. Thus he opened up their understanding of the object of his death and his resurrection: *“Then he said to them, ‘These are my words that I spoke to you while I was still with you- that everything written about me in the law of Moses, the prophets, and the psalms must be fulfilled. Then he opened their minds to understand the scriptures.’” (Luke 2:44-45 NRSV)*

As these examples illustrate, the Bible itself gives us hints that refer not only to the “Sola Scriptura” but also to the “Tota Scriptura” principle in the sense of the manifold variations. The search for eidetic variations referring to Messiah should be extended to the entire Scripture, especially when it comes to the center of the Scripture: Jesus Christ.

4.5.1. Eidetic reduction

The actual goal of intentionality or the eidetic variations in phenomenology should not lead to losing oneself in the infinite flow of the intentional acts, but should also reach the essence of the objects.⁵² It is then shown that by this diversity of refiguration a unity passes through that in such free variations of an archetype, e.g. of a thing, in necessity an invariant is preserved as the vital general form without which such a thing, as an example of its kind, would be completely unthinkable.”⁵³

This invariant is that “without which an object of this kind cannot be conceived.”⁵⁴ It is an “active identification of the congruent in all variants as the One and the Same; the Common to all possible modifications, as an “absolutely identical content”⁵⁵ or, as Husserl also calls it, an “identical substrate.”⁵⁶

This can be easily illustrated by an example of a triangle. There are existing probably countless variations of triangles, both in their material quality as well as in their geometrical shape. There are more pointed triangles, less pointed triangles, the equiangular ones or less equiangular triangles. Through all these runs an invariance or constant structure of the triangle, which can be called the essence of a triangle. It is a construction which nonetheless in its numerous variation forms possess the shape with three corners.

4.5.2. *Eidetic reduction in the Bible*

Besides the numerous eidetic variations of its phenomena, the view towards the essential (essence structures) is constantly focused in the Bible. The Bible begins with such an essential structure: “In the beginning God created heaven and earth.”⁵⁷ This summary which is eidetically reduced to the fundamental/essential, is then continued by different eidetic variations of each individual Creation Day.⁵⁸ At the end of the variations through the individual Creation Days, there is a new retrospective eidetic reduction again: “This is the genesis of heaven and earth when they were created.”⁵⁹

The prophets sometimes offered summaries which, considered from the phenomenological point of view, can be seen as eidetic reductions down to the essential. Prophet Micah reduces the good in three essential structures: “*He has told you, O mortal, what is good; and what does the LORD require of you but to do justice, and to love kindness, and to walk humbly with your God?*” (Mi 6:8 NRSV)

Probably the most famous eidetic reduction can be found with Jesus, who was asked about the first and greatest commandment (mega, lh kai. prw, th evntolh.): *“Teacher, which commandment in the law is the greatest?” He said to him, “You shall love the Lord your God with all your heart, and with all your soul, and with all your mind.’ This is the greatest and first commandment. And a second is like it: ‘You shall love your neighbor as yourself.’ On these two commandments hang all the law and the prophets.”* (Mt 22:36-40 NRSV)

By using the description “hanging” (kre, mantai) of the whole law and the prophets onto these two commandments, Jesus describes the essential structure without which everything else would become “void”.⁶⁰ With the evaluation in the law Jesus gives an interesting and clarifying eidetic reduction (baru, tera tou/no, mou): *“Woe to you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! For you tithe mint, dill, and cummin, and have neglected the weightier matters of the law: justice and mercy and faith. It is these you ought to have practiced without neglecting the others. You blind guides! You strain out a gnat but swallow a camel!* (Mt 23:23-24 NRSV)

In this text, Jesus clearly points out that caricatures or absurdities can occur ⁶¹ if the assessments through the eidetic reductions are not taken seriously. In the Bible, there are thousands of variations of faith statements, thus one can achieve fatal results, if all statements are presented as being equal, without an evaluation according to intrabiblical criteria.⁶² There are, however, also inverted approaches from the reductions to the variations. In his Corinthian letter, Paul goes the way by substantiating the essential structure of love in 16 eidetic variations. There are also eidetic reductions related to entire books of the Bible, which help us to focus on the essence of the intention; and thus the readers do not lose themselves in trivialities in the variety of what has been said.⁶³

If in the history of Christianity only these biblically explicit eidetic reductions were paid more attention to and if they were taken more seriously in the form of summaries and evaluations, Christian theology probably would not have developed in so many different directions.⁶⁴

5. Conclusion

The comparison between some methodological steps of phenomenology⁶⁵ and some Biblical self-statements about the demand for dealing with its texts reveals, firstly, that the reformist principles *Sola & Tota Scriptura* is only a rediscovery of a kind of an intrabiblical instruction manual. Already the few above mentioned selected statements underline the impression that the whole Bible repeatedly contains different variations of the Reformation principle.

Secondly, comparing these Biblical texts and the fundamental methodological steps of phenomenology, one can see that the Bible has requested these precise methodological steps in its instruction manual thousands of years ago, though in an application-oriented manner.

Thirdly, it became clear that this Biblical instruction manual was given to make sure that no splitting or content-related expansions and misinterpretations occur in the Christian succession. Hence, the question arises whether it would not be advisable in the Protestant and also in the non-Protestant Christianity to respond more strongly to this intrabiblical demand in order to strengthen the “unity” of Christianity which was such an essential idea of Christ?⁶⁶

Notes

¹ EKD: Church of Freedom, 2006.

² Stengel 2016, 9.

³ EKD: Justification and Freedom 2014.

⁴ Cf. Jer 8:8; Mt 15:1-9; 2 Pt 3:15-16.

⁵ Godina 2012.

⁶ Jochum-Bortfeld / Kessler 2015, 13.

⁷ WA 7, 97, 23f.; s.o. S. 60f. vgl. Stuhlmacher 1986, 99.

⁸ WA 7, 98, 40ff.; s.: Stuhlmacher 1986, 99.

⁹ Ibid. S. 14.

¹⁰ Kasper 2000, 703

¹¹ Cf. *ibid.*

¹² Spener 1846, 55-64.

¹³ Wallmann 2010, 295.

¹⁴ Godina 1990; 2002; 2007; 2011.

¹⁵ Godina 2012.

¹⁶ Mayring 2000; Flick 2000.

¹⁷ This is not easy even for the experts when one considers that the largest part of Husserl's estate is about 40000 pages of manuscripts written in "Gabelsberger" stenography (see Marx 1987, 11). Moreover, Husserl's works are extremely difficult to read.

¹⁸ The following steps and levels of phenomenology are strongly inspired by the didactic-systematic method book which I developed (Godina 2012).

¹⁹ In "Introduction" Logical Investigations: "We want to go back to the 'things themselves'". Cf. also Edmund Husserl: Philosophy as a Strict Science, Logos 1 (1910-11), 305: "Away with the high word analyzes. We have to ask the things themselves".

²⁰ 1998a, 13.

²¹ *Ibid.*

²² *Ibid.*

²³ Cf. Zahavi, 2007, 17-20.

²⁴ Jer 8:8.

²⁵ New Revised Standard Version Bible, 1989.

²⁶ Crüsemann even sees in this text a kind of "principle of Paulin hermeneutics (2015, 27-32).

²⁷ Jer 8:8; Mt 15:3.

²⁸ Zahavi 2007, 17-21.

²⁹ Ibid. 21.

³⁰ Husserl 1998a, 136.

³¹ Lk 6:3; Mt. 22:31.

³² Jn 7:40-42.

³³ Cf. Lk 24:25-27; 44-47; Acts 2:25-30; 3:22-24; 4:25; 8:34-36; 13:32-33; 35-41; 18:28; 26:22-23; 28:23.

³⁴ Held, 1998a, 15.

³⁵ Ibid. 16.

³⁶ Husserl 1998a, 198.

³⁷ Danner 1998, 125-126.

³⁸ Ibid. 125.

³⁹ Szilasi 1959, 15.

⁴⁰ Held 1998a, 24.

⁴¹ Zahavi 2007, 18.

⁴² Bernet / Kern / Marbach 1996, 85.

⁴³ Cf. Heb 4:2. Logically, one must first examine and recognize that it is actually God's Word.

⁴⁴ Janssen 1976, 97. *ibid.* the eidetic variations of Husserl with a tone (Husserl, 1998b, 90).

⁴⁵ Cf. Janssen 1979, 97.

⁴⁶ Dt 19:15.

⁴⁷ Mt 18:15-20; 2 Cor 13:1-2.

⁴⁸ Cf. Mt 12:3-5; Acts 2:14-36; 7:1-53; 9:22; 18:28.

⁴⁹ Jn 6:45.

⁵⁰ Mt 22:29-31.

⁵¹ They did not believe e.g. into resurrection (Mt 22:28).

⁵² Held 1998a, 25-26; Mayer 2009, 92f.

⁵³ Husserl 1972, 411.

⁵⁴ Ibid.

⁵⁵ Janssen 1976, 97.

⁵⁶ Husserl 1972, 417.

⁵⁷ Gn 1:1.

⁵⁸ Gn 1:2-2:3.

⁵⁹ Gn 2:4.

⁶⁰ Paul, James, and Solomon also show similar eidetic reductions in the law (Rom 13:9, Jas 2:8) or love (Song 8:6).

⁶² The criteria result, on the one hand from the ever recurring statements which, as in the case of love for God or for fellow human beings, are always normative (eg, 10 commandments, Lv 19:34, Dt 11:1; Gal 5:14) or narrative (Enoch, Abraham, Joseph, Moses, David), or parables (Lk 10:30-36). There are, however, also criteria, which can help the reader to classify the difficulty level of the statements. Regarding the content structure in the Bible, for example, a well-known image of a baby is taken who can only drink milk in the beginning, but later it can consume “solid food” (1 Pt 2:2-3; Heb 5:13-14; Jn 16:12). Both, the criteria and the contents of milk and solid food are precisely formulated (Heb 5:11-6:4; 1 Cor 3:1-5).

⁶³ Ecc. 12:13-14; Heb. 8:1.

⁶⁴ Ecc. 12:13-14; Heb. 8:1.

⁶⁵ For the Epoché of Husserl, too, one can find examples in the Bible. However, this is not necessary for this comparison and would go beyond the scope of this work.

⁶⁶ Jn 17:11; Eph 4:11-16.

References

Bernet, R. & Kern, I. & Marbach E. *Edmund Husserl*. Hamburg: Felix Meiner Verlag, 1996.

BibleWorks 10. Bible software program for Biblical exegesis & research. Norfolk , 2014.

Crüsemann, Frank. *Grundsatz Paulinischer Hermeneutik*. Aus: Jochum-Bortfeld, Carsten and Kessler, Rainer (Hrsg.): *Schriftgemäß. Die Bibel in Konflikten der Zeit*, 27-32. Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus, 2015.

Danner, Helmut. *Methoden geisteswissenschaftlicher Pädagogik*. (Vierte überarb. Auflage). München: Ernst Reinhardt Verlag, 1979.

Flick, U. & von Kardorff, E. & Steinke, I. (Hrsg.). *Qualitative Forschung*. Reinbek bei Hamburg: Rowohlt Taschenbuch Verlag, 2000.

Godina, Bojan. *Die Drei-Kategorien-Erkenntnis als Verständnisversuch des Gewissensphänomens. Unveröffentlichte Diplomarbeit*. Darmstadt: Theologisches Seminar, 1990.

Godina, Bojan. *Wesensstrukturen der Moralkonstitution. Eine interdisziplinäre Untersuchung zum Erlangen eines Magister Artium*. Friedensau: Theologische Hochschule, 2002.

Godina, Bojan. *Unsichtbare Religion des subliminalen Marketings in den Medien. Ein epochaltypischer Beitrag zur Medienbildung bei Kindern und Jugendlichen*. Heidelberger Dissertation. Berlin: Verlag Pro Business, 2007.

Godina, Bojan. *Theoretische Grundlagen der werteorientierten Medienpädagogik*. S. 15-64. In: Godina, B. & Grubele, H. & Schönherr, K.W. *Werteorientierte Medienpädagogik*. Wiesbaden: VS-Verlag, 2011.

Husserl, Edmund. *Philosophie als strenge Wissenschaft*. Zeitschrift: Logos 1, Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1910-11.

Husserl, Edmund. *Logische Untersuchungen. Prolegomena zur reinen Logik*. Halle: Niemeyer, 1913.

Husserl, Edmund. *Erfahrung und Urteil*. Hamburg: Felix Meiner Verlag, 1972.

Husserl, Edmund. *Die Phänomenologische Methode*. Stuttgart: Philipp Reclam jun., 1998a.

Husserl, Edmund. *Phänomenologie der Lebenswelt*. Stuttgart: Philipp Reclam jun., 1998b.

Held, Klaus. *Einleitung* (S. 5-51). In E. Husserl, *Die phänomenologische Methode*. Stuttgart: Philipp Reclam jun., 1998.

Janssen, Paul. *Edmund Husserl: Einführung in seine Phänomenologie*. Freiburg, München: Alber Kolleg, 1976.

Jochum-Bortfeld, Carsten und Kessler, Rainer. *Schriftgemäß – zur Einführung*, aus: Jochum-Bortfeld, Carsten / Kessler, Rainer (Hrsg.): *Schriftgemäß. Die Bibel in Konflikten der Zeit*. Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus, S. 13-25, 2015.

Kasper, Walter (Hrsg.). *Lexikon für Theologie und Kirche*. Bd. 9. Herder Verlag. Freiburg im Breisgau, 2000.

Kirche der Freiheit. Ein Impulspapier des Rates der EKD. Perspektiven für die evangelische Kirche im 21. Jahrhundert. Hannover, 2006. <https://www.ekd.de/download/kirche-der-freiheit.pdf> (09.04.2016).

Marx, Werner. *Die Phänomenologie Edmund Husserls*. München: Wilhelm Fink Verlag, 1987.

Mayer, Verena. *Edmund Husserl*. München: Verlag C.H. Beck., 2009.

Mayring, Phillip. *Einführung in die qualitative Sozialforschung* (vierte Auflage). Weinheim: Psychologie Verlags Union, 2000.

Nestle-Aland. *Novum Testamentum Grace*. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2013.

Spener, Phillipp Jakob. *Pia Desideria. Herzliches Verlangen nach Gottesfälliger Besserung der wahren evangelischen Kirche samt einigen einfältig dahin abzweckenden christlichen Vorschlägen*. Überarb. V. Ludwig Feldener. Niesky bei Görlitz, 1846.

Stengel, Freidemann. *Sola scriptura im Kontext. Behauptungen und Bestreitung des reformatorischen Schriftprinzips*. Leipzig, evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 2016.

Stuhlmacher, Peter. *Vom Verstehen des Neuen Testaments: Eine Hermeneutik*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1986.

Szilasi, Wilhelm. *Einführung in die Phänomenologie Edmund Husserls*. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag, 1959.

Rechtfertigung und Freiheit. 500 Jahre Reformation 2017. Ein Grundlagentext des Rates der Evangelischen Kirche in Deutschland (EKD). 2014. Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus. https://www.ekd.de/download/2014_rechtfertigung_und_freiheit.pdf (from 01.04.2017).

Wallmann, Johannes. *Pietismus und Orthodoxie*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010.

Zahavi, Dan. *Husserls Phänomenologie*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck UTB, 2009.