

BAREND KAMPHUIS

УДК 234.24

Doctor, professor emeritus of Systematic Theology,
Theological University of the Reformed Churches
(Broederweg 15, 8261 GS Kampen, Netherlands)
bkamphuis@tukampen.nl

THE ARTICLE BY WHICH THE CHURCH STANDS OR FALLS

Martin Luther said about the doctrine of justification: «Because if this article stands, the church stands; if this article collapses, the church collapses». Later on, this became a sort of proverb, in Lutheran and also in Reformed theology: «*justificatio est articulus stantis et cadentis ecclesiae*», «Justification is the article by which the church stands or falls». In this article I analyse and evaluate this saying. First, I discuss its context. Then I mention some other articles that were important in the history of Christian doctrine. In the third place I highlight the danger of one-sidedness. Lastly, I discuss the historicity of doctrine. Luther's focus on the doctrine of justification had its context in the specific circumstances and problems of his time. In other times the church stood or fell by other articles. The focus on one article has the danger of one-sidedness: we must be aware of other aspects of the gospel, that always has more treasures than we can comprehend. It is our task to proclaim the gospel as an answer for the questions and problems of our time.

Key words: Martin Luther, Calvin, justification, doctrine, the Gospel

БАРЕНД КАМФУИС

доктор, заслуженный профессор систематического богословия,
Теологический институт реформатской церкви
(Broederweg 15, 8261 GS Kampen, Netherlands)

bkamphuis@tukampen.nl

Артикул, которым стоит или рушится церковь

Мартин Лютер сказал о доктрине оправдания: «Потому что, если эта статья остается в силе, значит, церковь стоит; если эта статья рушится, рушится церковь». Позже это стало своего рода пословицей в лютеранском, а также в реформатском богословии: «*justificatio est articulus stantis et cadentis ecclesiae*», «Оправдание — это артикль, по которому церковь стоит или падает. «В этой статье я анализирую и оцениваю это высказывание. Во-первых, я обсуждаю его контекст. Затем я упоминаю некоторые другие статьи, которые имели важное значение в истории христианской доктрины. В-третьих, я подчеркиваю опасность односторонности. Наконец, я обсудить историчность доктрины. Сосредоточение Лютера на доктрине оправдания имело контекст в конкретных обстоятельствах и проблемах его времени. В других случаях церковь выдерживала или падала из-за других статей. Сосредоточение внимания на одной статье несет опасность односторонности: мы должны знать о других аспектах Евангелия, которое всегда имеет больше сокровищ, чем мы можем постичь. Наша задача — провозглашать Евангелие как ответ на вопросы и проблемы нашего времени.

Ключевые слова: Мартин Лютер, Кальвин, оправдание, доктрина, Евангелие

INTRODUCTION

Martin Luther said about the doctrine of justification: *quia isto articulo stante stat Ecclesia, ruente ruit Ecclesia*¹, which means «Because if this article stands, the church stands; if this article collapses, the church collapses». Later on, this became a sort of proverb, in Lutheran and also in Reformed theology: *justificatio est articulus stantis et cadentis ecclesiae* (Justification is the article by which the church stands or falls)².

In this article I analyse and evaluate this saying. First, I discuss its context. Then I mention some other articles that were important in the history of Christian doctrine. In the third place I highlight the danger of one-sidedness. Lastly, I discuss the historicity of doctrine.

THE CONTEXT OF LUTHER'S DOCTRINE OF JUSTIFICATION

At the end of his life, Luther wrote that his discovery that in the Gospel God's justice or righteousness is revealed as *iustitia-passiva* was for him the gate to paradise³. *Iustitia passiva* means: the justice that God gives to us. During many years Luther had lived in fear of God's *iustitia activa*: God's justice as an attribute of God, through which He gives to everyone what he deserves. Luther could not understand how we could be saved by this justice of God: we deserve only God's judgment. Nevertheless, the Bible has the prayer: «In your righteousness deliver me and rescue me» (Ps 71, 2)⁴. Moreover, Paul can speak about the gospel as the power of God for salvation, because in it the righteousness of God is revealed (Romans 1, 16–17). How is this possible? Only the understanding of justification as the gift of God's justice to us, could solve this mystery

¹ D. Martin Luthers Werke: Kritische Gesamtausgabe / Hrsg. von J. K. F. Knaake. Bd 40/3: Vorlesungen über die Stufenpsalmen und Ps. 90 1532; Jesaja 9 und 53 1543/1544; Hosea 13 1545. Weimar, 1930. S. 352 (In a commentary on Ps. 130, 4).

² See about this expression: McGrath A. E. *Iustitia Dei. A History of the Christian Doctrine of Justification*. Cambridge, 1998. P. 188 and 450 (endnote 3).

³ D. Martin Luthers Werke. Bd 54: Schriften 1543/46. Weimar, 1928. S. 186 (his introduction to the edition of his Latin works from 1545).

⁴ Quotes from Holy Scripture in this article are taken from the English Standard Version.

for him. So, the article of justification became for him the article by which the church stands or falls.

Why was this so important for him? This is only understandable against the background of the medieval development of the sacrament of penance, and that of the indulgences⁵. The Fourth Lateran Council (1215) had decreed: «All believers of both sexes who have attained the age of discretion must faithfully confess their sins in person at least once a year to their own priest, and must make the effort to carry out the imposed penance according to their ability»⁶. The heart of this sacrament was the divine absolution, pronounced by the priest. But necessary conditions to receive this absolution were the contrition, confession, and satisfaction of the sinner. It became more and more clear, that it was exceedingly difficult to fulfil these conditions in the right way. For example, a distinction was developed between «attrition» (sorrow only arising from self-love) and real contrition (sorrow arising from love of God). But how could you be sure that your sorrow is attrition or contrition?

For many years Luther himself wrestled with such questions. It was his experience that no one could be sure of the integrity of his own contrition⁷. But the consequence of this was, that no one could be sure of God's forgiveness, no one could be sure of salvation. Maybe, you confessed every week all your sins to the priest, did all the satisfactions he asked, but still it was only a product of your self-love. The priest gives you absolution of your guilt, but God does not: He knows your heart. Only the discovery that God justifies us *sola fide, sola gratia* (only by faith, only by grace) could Luther free from this vicious circle.

Things became even more complicated with the development of the practice of indulgences. This was a further development of the satisfaction that was asked in the sacrament of penance.

⁵ See about this: Pelikan J. The Christian Tradition. A History of the Development of Doctrine. Vol. 4: Reformation of Church and Dogma (1300–1700). Chicago; London, 1984. P. 128–138.

⁶ Denzinger H., Schönmetzer A. Enchiridion symbolorum definitionum et declarationum de rebus fidei et morum. Barcelona; Freiburg; Roma, 1976. S. 264 (nr. 812). English translation from: Pelikan J. The Christian Tradition. Vol. 4. P. 129.

⁷ D. Martin Luthers Werke. Bd 1: Schriften, Predigten, Disputationen 1512/18. Weimar, 1883. S. 234.

This satisfaction could consist for example of prayers, alms, or pilgrimages. The priest obliged you to fulfil these: only in this way the guilt of your sin could be removed. But the temporal punishments for your sins were not yet removed in this way. To deal with that, the church had instituted indulgences: you could pay money and then for a certain time you had not to be afraid for these temporal punishments. This worked also for the punishment in purgatory, after your death: the church could grant indulgences for the living and for the departed. In fact, in Luther's time the church used the payments that people made for themselves and for their departed loved ones for the construction and ornamentation of the immense St. Peter's cathedral in Rome. So, the fears of people were exploited. The theological justification of this was the idea of the «treasure of the church»: consisting of the superabundance of the merits of Jesus Christ and the saints.

For Luther and his followers, his discovery of the free gift of God's justice brought an end to this whole system of fear, authority of the church, merits and payments. The heart of his 95 theses from the year 1517 is thesis 62: «The true treasure of the church is the most holy gospel of the glory and grace of God»⁸. Surely, in the Gospel the righteousness of God is revealed as *iustitiapassiva*, God's free gift of his own justice to men. That is why this gospel of justification is the article by which the church stands or falls.

Conclusion: it is clear that Luther's doctrine of justification has its background in the specific doctrinal and ecclesiastical context of the late mediaeval church. This makes it more urgent to put the question: is the article of justification always the core of the Gospel. Is it a timeless truth?

MORE ARTICLES BY WHICH THE CHURCH STANDS OR FALLS?

Some problems arise, however, if we should state that the doctrine of justification is always the one article by which the church stands or falls.

An important problem is: how can we do justice to the history of doctrine? Alister McGrath writes that the early Christian writers (that is: before Augustine) «did not choose to express their soterio-

⁸ D. Martin Luthers Werke. Bd 1. S. 236.

logical convictions in terms of the concept of justification. This is not to say that the fathers avoid the term “justification”: their interest in the concept is, however, minimal...»⁹ In this early development of Christian doctrine, the focus was on Christology and on the development of the Trinitarian dogma.

Already in the New Testament we can see the struggle with Gnosticism and especially its Docetism: the idea that Christ only seemingly had a human body and, as a consequence of that, did not really suffer and die.¹⁰ It is in the first place in the writings of the apostle John that we can see this struggle. The gospel of John starts very “high”: «In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God» (John 1, 1). But soon already John shows that this divine Word came very “low”: «the Word became flesh» (John 1, 14). Again and again he shows in his gospel story the reality of Jesus’ humanity: Jesus was tired from a journey, even more than his disciples and had to rest by Jacob’s well at Sychar (John 4, 6); Jesus wept at the tomb of Lazarus (John 11, 35); and Jesus really died on the cross, as was shown by the blood and water that came from his side after He was pierced with a spear (John 19, 34). After telling this John stresses its importance: «He who saw it has borne witness — his testimony is true, and he knows that he is telling the truth—that you also may believe» (John 19, 35). And in his letters John writes: «many deceivers have gone out into the world, those who do not confess the coming of Jesus Christ in the flesh. Such a one is the deceiver and the antichrist» (2 John 7; cf. 1 John 4, 2-3). John could have written: «the article of the coming of Jesus Christ in the flesh is the article by which the church stands or falls».

The church fathers of the second and early third century, beginning already with Ignatius, but especially the great anti-gnostic fathers Irenaeus and Tertullian, followed the line of John against Docetism: the heart of the Gospel is the reality of the incarnation, sufferings, death and resurrection of Jesus Christ. This was the great treasure of the Church in those days.

⁹ McGrath A. E. *Iustitia Dei*. P. 19.

¹⁰ Pelikan J. *The Christian Tradition. A History of the Development of Doctrine*. Vol. 1: *The emergence of the Catholic Tradition (100–600)*. Chicago; London, 1971. P. 89–90.

Later on, after the defeat of Gnosticism, new discussions arose: this time not about the reality of Jesus' humanity, but about his divinity. For Arius (at the beginning of the fourth century), Jesus Christ was a creature – admittedly, the highest creature, but nevertheless a creature. That is why he could write (with an appeal to Proverbs 8, 22–23) «Before he was begotten or created or ordained or established, he did not exist»¹¹. Against him the first ecumenical council of Nicea of 325 defended the full divinity of Jesus Christ, and his unity with God the Father: The Son is «from the *ousia* (essence) of the Father» (so not created by the will of God)» and He is «homoousios (one in essence) with the Father» (so Himself participating in the one divine essence)¹². After Nicea the discussions continued for the greatest part of the fourth century, till the second ecumenical council of Constantinople 381. But for the defenders of the Nicene orthodoxy, especially Athanasius, this confession of Jesus Christ was the core of the Gospel. Eternal life could be only founded in «the Lord who is before the ages and through whom the ages came into existence, so that, since it was in him, we also might be able to inherit eternal life»¹³. This confession was so crucial for him that he was willing to go in exile for it, not once or twice, but eventually five times. Athanasius' radical denial to accept Arianism, even in its more moderate forms, made him in the eyes of several emperors and synods a destroyer of peace, and they suspended him and banished him far away, from Alexandria in Egypt to even Trier in Germany¹⁴. But Athanasius maintained his conviction. For him, the divinity of Jesus was the article by which the church stands or falls.

We could follow further this path through the history of Christian doctrine, and we would see that time and again the focus changed. Of course, we could say: «they were wrong». We could judge them with the standard of Martin Luther and ask: «why did they not see that the article of justification is the core of the gospel?»

¹¹ In his letter to Eusebius, quoted in: Pelikan J. *The Christian Tradition*. Vol. 1. P. 193.

¹² Denzinger H., Schönmetzer A. *Enchiridion*... S. 52 (nr. 125).

¹³ Athanasius in his *Orationes contra Arianos*, quoted in: Pelikan J. *The Christian Tradition*. Vol. 1. P. 205.

¹⁴ Altaner B., Stuiber A. *Patrologie. Leben, Schriften and Lehre der Kirchenväter*. Freiburg; Basel; Wien, 1978. P. 271–272.

But would that be just? They were responsible for the defence of the truth in their own era, not in the sixteenth century, but in the second, third and fourth. Moreover, we saw already in the apostle John, the most intimate friend of Jesus Himself, a focus that was different from Luther's. My *conclusion* is also: there are more articles by which the church stands or falls than only the doctrine of justification.

THE RISK OF ONE-SIDEDNESS

The next problem is that a strong focus always carries with it the risk of one-sidedness. You can so strongly emphasize the reality of Jesus' humanity, that you tend to forget his divinity. This was for example what Paul of Samosata did in the third century¹⁵. Or you can follow Athanasius regarding the unity of Jesus and God the Father, but neglect the difference between the two, as did Marcellus of Ancyra in the fourth century¹⁶.

This risk of one-sidedness can also sometimes be seen in Martin Luther. I show this on two points. First, in his doctrine of Holy Scripture. Luther was a great defender of the *sola scriptura*. He also taught impressively the clarity of Scripture: the Bible is «in itself completely sure, easily accessible, and totally open; it explains itself and proves, judges and illuminates everything».¹⁷ But at the same time, he made in the Bible a distinction between books: some were more valuable than others. He used for that the criterion «was Christum treibet» in German language, which we can translate in English as 'what promotes Christ': «This is the good standard to judge all books, when you see if they promote Christ or not».¹⁸ That is why books like the letter to the Hebrews and the letter of James were problematic for him, the first because it seemed to deny the possibility of repentance after baptism (Hebrews 6, 8), the second because it said that Abraham was justified from his works (James 2, 21).

¹⁵ Pelikan J. The Christian Tradition. Vol. 1. P. 176.

¹⁶ Pelikan J. The Christian Tradition. Vol. 1. P. 207–209.

¹⁷ D. Martin Luthers Werke. Bd 7: Schriften, Predigten, Disputationen 1520/21. Weimar, 1887. S. 97.

¹⁸ D. Martin Luthers Werke: Kritische Gesamtausgabe. Abteilung 3 Die Deutsche Bibel. Bd 7: Das Neue Testament, Episteln und Offenbarung 1522/46. Weimar, 1931. S. 385.

Luther could even write: «When opponents use the Scripture against Christ, we promote Christ against the Scripture».¹⁹

What is happening here? In fact, Luther uses his doctrine of justification, the «article by which the church stands or falls», as a criterion inside the Bible. He thought that Hebrews and James were not clear enough about justification. And because of this he saw these letters as less valuable than for example Romans or Galatians. If you really believe in *sola scriptura* and in the clarity of Scripture, you should not do that. *Sola scriptura*, Scripture alone, also means: *tota scriptura*, all of Scripture. But a one-sided focus on one article of the Christian doctrine can blind you for other aspects of the Bible²⁰.

Also at another point this risk of one-sidedness can be seen in Luther. His focus on justification goes at the expense of sanctification. We can see this especially in the place of the law of God in Luther and Lutheran theology. Important for this theology is the opposition between Law and Gospel: the law condemns us; the gospel acquits us. That is why under the gospel the law of God has in fact no function. The law of God teaches us that we need the gospel because it accuses us of our sins (this is the first use of the law, the so-called *ususelencticus*). The law also has a function for society (the second use, the *ususpoliticus*). But the law does not have a function for us personally, if we accept the gospel (no third use of the law, no *ususnormativus*)²¹.

It is interesting to see the position of John Calvin at this point. In his *Institutes* he follows Luther by emphasizing the key function of the doctrine of justification: we have to realize that this doctrine *praecipuumessesustinendaereligioniscardinem* (the principal cornerstone to support religion) (Calvin, *Institutio*, 3, 11: 1)²². Nevertheless, he discusses the doctrine of sanctification before that of justification: Sanctification in *Institutes* 3, 3–10, justification in *Institutes*

¹⁹ D. Martin Luthers Werke. Bd 39/1: Disputationen 1533/38. Weimar, 1926. S. 47.

²⁰ Profoundly and well nuanced about this aspect of Luther's theology is: Rothen B. Die Klarheit der Schrift. Teil 1: Martin Luther: Die wiederentdeckten Grundlagen. Göttingen, 1990. P. 44–54.

²¹ The Lutheran theologian Helmut Thielicke defends again this classical Lutheran position: Thielicke H. Theologische Ethik. Bd 1: Prinzipienlehre. Tübingen, 1981. S. 187–244.

²² Joannes Calvinus. Opera Selecta / Ed. P. Barth, Wh. Niesel. Vol. 4: Institutionis Christianae religionis 1559, libros III. München, 1968. P. 182.

3, 11–18. And why does he do that? «... because it was important first to explain that the faith by which alone, through the mercy of God, we obtain free justification, is not destitute of good works» (Calvin, *Institutio*, 3, 11: 1)²³. Calvin saw the danger of one-sidedness! In his theology, the third function of the law, its *usus normativus* under the gospel, is important²⁴.

My *conclusion* is: even if we accept the principal place of the doctrine of justification, we always have to be aware of other aspects of the gospel. The message of Holy Scripture is too rich to concentrate it in one article. Otherwise the danger of one-sidedness threatens.

THE HISTORICITY OF DOGMA²⁵

«Dogma is in its concept and in its development a work of the Greek spirit on the soil of the gospel»²⁶. That is the thesis about Hellenization by Adolf von Harnack. With that statement he focuses on the two great old dogmas of Trinity and Christology. In both he sees the Greek desire for physical immortality expressed. According to him, this desire seems to have taken possession of the simple gospel of Jesus Christ. In the doctrine of the Trinity the essential divinity of Jesus Christ is laid down, because only if He is God by nature, can He communicate divine immortality to us. In Christology, the unity between Christ's divine and human nature is expressed, because only in this way can man participate in divine immortality. Central is the Person of the Son of God, Jesus Christ, our Saviour, God and man. This is all Hellenization of the simple message of Jesus. In the Gospel that Jesus proclaimed there was no place for the Son, only for the Father.

How should we evaluate this approach? First: Harnack has proved convincingly the historicity of dogma and Christian doctrine. Since Harnack, the idea that there is a straight line from biblical texts

²³ Joannes Calvinus. *Opera Selecta*. Vol. 3. P. 182.

²⁴ Cf. his profound discussion of the ten commandments in *Institutio* 2, 8: Joannes Calvinus. *Opera Selecta*. Vol. 4: *Institutionis Christianae religionis* 1559, libros III. München, 1968. P. 343–398.

²⁵ See: Kamphuis B. *The Hermeneutics of Dogma // Correctly Handling the Word of Truth. Reformed Hermeneutics Today* / Ed. by M. te Velde, G. H. Visscher. Eugene, Oregon, 2014. P. 64–67.

²⁶ Harnack, A., von. *Lehrbuch der Dogmengeschichte*. Bd 1: *Die Entstehung des kirchlichen Dogmas*. Tübingen, 1909. S. 20.

to dogmatic statements is impossible. The terminology of the doctrine of church is historically determined. Terms like *ousia*, *hypostasis*, *prosōpon*, *phusis* don't have their origin in the Bible, but in Greek philosophical terminology, and even if they are used in the Bible, they have a different meaning than in the dogma (e.g., *hypostasis* in Heb. 1,3). Not only that, but the problems also that are answered in the doctrine are given within their historical context: the characteristic Greek ontological questions have had a significant influence on the development of doctrine. We could think, for example, of questions about the relation of divine and human being, the relations of mutability and immutability, of death and life. And the moment that you come into a different climate, the questions change.

So far Harnack is right. But he is also wrong. Indeed, the dogmas of Trinity and of Christology are influenced by their context. But was there any other realistic possibility? The Church Fathers could not take a place outside of their times. They were called to proclaim the gospel in their own times. Should Athanasius have formulated Luther's doctrine of justification? Then maybe he would not have been sent into exile so many times. But then he would also have had little importance for his own times and consequently for our times. He became a Church Father by asking the questions of his time. So, this is an important conclusion: historicity is not a stain on the dogma that should be removed. On the contrary, historicity is the power of dogma. The gospel could be confessed, not only in the first century in Jerusalem, but also in the fourth century in Alexandria; not only in the discussions with Pharisees and Sadducees, but also against Gnostics and Neoplatonic philosophers. For a great part, the value of dogma and doctrine is precisely in its historical determination.

This is also true for Martin Luther. It was his task to defend the message of the Gospel in his time, not in that of Athanasius. About Trinity and Christology there was no disagreement. But he had to preach and to explain the message of justification. This was decisive in his days: the article by which the church stands or falls.

Now we live in the twenty first century. We have to proclaim the same gospel as Athanasius did, and Luther. But we must do more than just repeat their words. We have to face the problems of our

time. We live in a world where God is forgotten by many people. They do not experience his presence; many do not even know what we mean by the word «God», in any case in Western Europe. We have to preach the gospel in this context. We want to be faithful to the same gospel as Athanasius and Augustine and Luther. But in our times, it is especially necessary to give expression to the reality and presence of God.

So, my *conclusion* is that we cannot say that justification is always the one article with which the church stands and falls. It is a doctrine to which we always have to be trustful. Nevertheless, we must preach the gospel for our world and our age, and find new words for that great task.

CONCLUSIONS

To summarize my conclusions: Luther's focus on the doctrine of justification had its context in the specific circumstances and problems of his time. In other times the church stood or fell by other articles. The focus on one article has the danger of one-sidedness: we must be aware of other aspects of the gospel, that always has more treasures than we can comprehend. It is our task to proclaim the gospel as an answer for the questions and problems of our time²⁷.

REFERENCES

Altaner B., Stuiber A. (1978) *Patrologie. Leben, Schriften and Lehre der Kirchenväter*, Freiburg; Basel; Wien: Herder, 672 p.

Denzinger H., Schönmetzer A. (1976) *Enchiridion symbolorumdefinitionum et declarationum de rebus fidei et morum*, Barcelona; Freiburg; Roma: Herder, 954 p.

Harnack, A., von. (1909) *Lehrbuch der Dogmengeschichte*, Tübingen: Mohr, vol. 1, xvi, 538 p.

Joannes Calvinus, Barth P., Niesel Wh (1968) *Opera Selecta*, München: Kaiser, vol. 3, 582 p.; vol. 4: 468 p.

Kamphuis B. (2014) *The Hermeneutics of Dogma, Correctly Handling the Word of Truth. Reformed Hermeneutics Today* (Eds. te Velde M., Visscher G. H.), Eugene, Oregon: Wipf & Stock, pp. 62–74.

Martin Luther, Knaake J. K. F. (1883, 1887, 1930, 1926, 1928, 1931) *D. Martin Luthers Werke: Kritische Gesamtausgabe*, Weimar: Böhlau,

²⁷ I thank Mr. Aart Plug, Armadale, Australia for correction of the use of English language in this article.

vol. 1, 768 p.; vol. 7, 926 p.; vol. 39/1, 611 p.; vol. 40/3, 800 p.; vol. 54, 529 p.; DB, vol. 7, 748 p.

McGrath A. E. (1988) *Iustitia Dei. A History of the Christian Doctrine of Justification*, Cambridge: University Press, 464 p.

Pelikan J. (1971) *The Christian Tradition. A History of the Development of Doctrine*, Chicago; London: University of Chicago Press, vol.1, 442 p.

Pelikan J. (1984) *The Christian Tradition. A History of the Development of Doctrine*, Chicago; London: University of Chicago Press, 478 p.

Rothen B. (1990) *Die Klarheit der Schrift*, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, part 1, 261 p.

Thielicke H. (1981) *Theologische Ethik*, Tübingen: Mohr, vol. 1, 746 p.

ИСТОЧНИКИ И ЛИТЕРАТУРА

Altaner B., Stuiber A. *Patrologie. Leben, Schriften and Lehre der Kirchenväter.* — Freiburg; Basel; Wien: Herder 19788. — 672 s.

D. Martin Luthers Werke: Kritische Gesamtausgabe / Hrsg. von J. K. F. Knaake. Bd 1: Schriften, Predigten, Disputationen 1512/18. Weimar: Böhlau, 1883. — 768 s.; Bd 7: Schriften, Predigten, Disputationen 1520/21. — Weimar: Weimar H. Böhlau, 1887. — 926 s.; Bd 39/1: Disputationen 1533/38. — Weimar: Hermann Böhlau Nachfolger, 1926. — 611 s.; Bd 40/3: Vorlesungen über die Stufenpsalmen und Ps. 90 1532; Jesaja 9 und 53 1543/1544; Hosea 13 1545. — Weimar: Weimar H. Böhlau, 1930. — 800 s.; Bd 54: Schriften 1543/46. — Weimar: Hermann Böhlau Nachfolger, 1928. — 529 s.; Abteilung 3 Die Deutsche Bibel. Bd 7: Das Neue Testament, Episteln und Offenbarung 1522/46.— Weimar: Hermann Böhlau Nachfolger, 1931. — 748 s.

Denzinger H., Schönmetzer A. *Enchiridion symbolorum definitio-num et declarationum de rebus fidei et morum.* — Barcelona; Freiburg; Roma: Herder, 1976. — 954 p.

Harnack, A., von. *Lehrbuch der Dogmengeschichte.* Bd 1: Die Entstehung des kirchlichen Dogmas. — Tübingen: Mohr 1909. — xvi, 538 s.

Joannes Calvinus. *Opera Selecta / Ed. P. Barth, Wh. Niesel.* Vol. 3: *Institutionis Christianae religionis 1559, libros I et II continens.* — München: Kaiser, 1968. — 582 p.; vol. 4: *Institutionis Christianae religionis 1559, libros III.* — München: Kaiser, 1968. — 468 p.

Kamphuis B. *The Hermeneutics of Dogma // Correctly Handling the Word of Truth. Reformed Hermeneutics Today / Ed. by M. te Velde, G. H. Visscher.* Eugene, Oregon: Wipf & Stock, 2014. P. 62–74.

McGrath A. E. *Iustitia Dei. A History of the Christian Doctrine of Justification.* — Cambridge: University Press 1998. — 464 p.

Pelikan J. The Christian Tradition. A History of the Development of Doctrine. Vol. 1: The emergence of the Catholic Tradition (100–600). — Chicago; London: University of Chicago Press, 1971. — 442 p.

Pelikan J. The Christian Tradition. A History of the Development of Doctrine. Vol. 4: Reformation of Church and Dogma (1300–1700). — Chicago; London: University of Chicago Press, 1984. — 478 p.

Rothen B. Die Klarheit der Schrift. Teil 1: Martin Luther: Die wiederentdeckten Grundlagen. — Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1990. — 261 s.

Thielicke H. Theologische Ethik. Bd 1: Prinzipienlehre. — Tübingen: Mohr, 1981. — 746 s.