

The Hermeneutical Frameworks of Fernando Canale and Fritz Guy: *Sola* and *Prima Scriptura* and the Science-Theology Relationship

By: Ryan Brousson, MA

For an in-depth study of these themes, see: Brousson, Ryan Nicholas Claude, "The Hermeneutical Frameworks of Fernando Canale and Fritz Guy: *Sola* and *Prima Scriptura* and the Science-Theology Relationship" (2017). *Master's Theses*. 105.

The question of biblical authority and how it relates to other authorities has been raging for millennia. Protestantism has traditionally argued for a *sola Scriptura* position since the time of Luther. Catholicism has varied its position throughout history, with its current resting place being a *sola* magisterium.

Throughout this paper, *sola Scriptura* will be classified by various traditions.¹ There are four traditions: Tradition 1 was the SS of the Magisterial Reformers and the early church. Scripture “was the sole source of revelation and the only doctrinal norm;” however, Scripture was “to be interpreted in and by the Church within the hermeneutical context of *regula fidei*.”² Tradition 2 was a two-source hermeneutic promoted by William of Ockham and held by the Roman Church starting around the 1400 century.³ Here, Scripture and tradition held equal authority. Tradition 3, which developed after the Reformation, makes the living magisterium the final source of authority and determiner of interpretation instead of Scripture or tradition.⁴ Tradition 0, started by the Radical Reformers, and passed on to modern evangelicalism through the Anabaptists and Puritans, puts sole authority in Scripture with no authority in the church,

¹ These traditions have been articulated by Keith Mathison in *The Shape of Sola Scriptura* and by Heiko Oberman in *Dawn of the Reformation*, along with others.

² Keith A. Mathison, *The Shape of Sola Scriptura* (Moscow, ID: Canon Press, 2001), 151-153. *Regula fidei* is Latin for the “rule of faith.”

³ Ibid.

⁴ Ibid.

tradition, philosophy, or science.⁵ This position could be called *solo Scriptura*. It also allows the individual to interpret Scripture as they see fit.

This section will briefly look at the Traditions held by various theologians and church fathers throughout history. It will cover Augustine and Aquinas, Luther and Calvin, Andreas Bodenstein von Karlstadt and Thomas Muntzer, and Wesley and the Wesleyans.

A brief history of *Sola Scriptura*:

Augustine and Aquinas: Augustine and Aquinas both held to a Tradition 1 position. Augustine comments in *De Civitate Dei* that the Scriptures were given to us by Christ through the prophets, Himself, and the apostles, and that the Scriptures have “preeminent authority.”⁶ Though, Augustine goes on to say, “and we put our trust in them [the Scriptures] concerning those matters of which it is not expedient for us to be ignorant but which we are incapable of knowing on our own.”⁷ It seems Augustine is saying that the Scriptures are there for those things that we cannot know without them, but they do not necessarily apply to others areas of life, the sciences for instance. Though Scripture is interpreted through *regula fidei*.

Thomas Aquinas held a similar position to that of Augustine in regards to SS. Per Erik Persson points out that for the scholastics, of which Aquinas was one, Scripture was held in the highest esteem and that the practice of theology should be “solely and exclusively centred on

⁵ Ibid.

⁶ Augustine, "The City of God," *The Works of Saint Augustine: A Translation for the 21st Century*, trans. William Babcock, vol. 7 (Brooklyn, N.Y: New City Press, 1990), 3.

⁷ Ibid.

Scripture.”⁸ However, Thomas Weinandy comments that Aquinas interpreted the Bible in harmony with and within the range of the tradition of the church.⁹

For both Augustine and Aquinas, Scripture was the “preeminent authority,” but there were other authorities that were used in non-spiritual settings and that influenced theology.

Luther and Calvin: By the time of Luther, the Roman Church had moved to a Tradition 3, away from the Tradition 1 of Augustine and Aquinas. Both Luther and John Calvin held to Tradition 1 like Augustine before them.¹⁰ Scripture is the authority, but it is interpreted by the Church through the *regula fidei*. Luther was heavily influenced by Augustine,¹¹ in that he believed Scripture had final authority, but also that there were other sources to help Scripture. Luther allowed other sources to influence theology within his *SS* framework.¹² He used other sources to help Scripture, but these other sources did not take the normative and authoritative place of Scripture since they were subjected to it. Also, Luther used the church fathers, but they were not elevated above Scripture and Luther disagreed with them when he felt they did not interpret the Bible correctly.¹³

⁸ As quoted by Persson from H Felder. Per Erik Persson, *Sacra Doctrina: Reason and Revelation in Aquinas; Translated [from the Swedish]* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1970), 10. Hilarin Felder, *Geschichte der wissenschaftlichen studien im Franziskanerorden bis um die mitte des 13. jahrhunderts* (Freiburg im Breisgau, Herder, 1904), accessed April 6, 2017, <http://archive.org/details/geschichtederwi00feldgoog>, 491.

⁹ Thomas G. Weinandy, Daniel A. Keating, and John Yocum, eds., *Aquinas on Scripture: An Introduction to His Biblical Commentaries* (London; New York: T & T Clark International, 2005), ix.

¹⁰ See Mathison, *The Shape of Sola Scriptura*.

¹¹ Arthur Skevington Wood, *Captive to the Word; Martin Luther, Doctor of Sacred Scripture* (Grand Rapids: W. B. Eerdmans Pub. Co, 1969), 38-40.

¹² Norman Gulley comments on Luther’s *SS* by saying that “he applied the *sola Scriptura* principle christologically instead of canonically.” Norman R. Gulley, *Systematic Theology: Prolegomena* (Berrien Springs, MI: Andrews University Press, 2003), 548.

¹³ Mark D. Thompson, *A Sure Ground on Which to Stand: The Relation of Authority and Interpretive Method in Luther’s Approach to Scripture*, Paternoster biblical and theological monographs (Carlisle, Cumbria; Waynesboro, GA: Paternoster, 2004), 252ff. See also: Wood, *Captive to the Word; Martin Luther, Doctor of Sacred Scripture*, 32.

Calvin, in his *Institutes of the Christian Religion* writes: “[God] has from the beginning maintained this plan for his church, so that besides these common proofs he also put forth his Word, which is a more direct and more certain mark whereby he is to be recognized.”¹⁴

Calvin had some strong remarks about the authority of the Catholic Church. He writes:

Thus [sic] these sacrilegious men, wishing to impose an unbridled tyranny under the cover of the church, do not care with what absurdities they ensnare themselves and others, provided they can force this one idea upon the simple-minded: that the church has authority in all things.¹⁵

The church was important, but it was not to take the place of determining the rule of faith and practice. He argued that the church should be built on Scripture and is to approve of and lift up the authority of God’s Word.¹⁶

Karlstadt and Munzter: Karlstadt and Munzter both took a hard line on the side of SS, farther than Luther and Calvin were willing to go. Whereas Luther and Calvin included tradition and the church in their SS, Karlstadt and Munzter rejected tradition and the church as a means to interpret Scripture. They believed that the individual had the right to interpret Scripture without any interference from tradition or the church. Alister McGrath says,

The magisterial Reformers adopted a positive approach to tradition, particularly the *testimonia partum*, whereas the radicals adopted a generally negative approach. To most of the radicals, the fathers were an irrelevance: every individual had the

¹⁴ The Word of God is equivalent to Scripture. Calvin, *Institutes of the Christian Religion*., 70-71.

¹⁵ Calvin, *Institutes of the Christian Religion*, 74.

¹⁶ Ibid, 75.

unfettered right to interpret scripture in whatever manner seemed right to him or her.¹⁷

This was a very strict SS. To begin with Karlstadt did not completely reject the church, but the church and tradition only had a supporting role, they witnessed to the authority that the Bible already possessed.¹⁸ However, these supporting roles seemed to gradually diminish over time, becoming less and less influential.

Munzter held a slightly different view from Karlstadt. Michael Baylor writes, “a basic feature of his thought was that authentic faith is not dependent on scriptural revelation. Nevertheless, he prized Scripture for the evidence it provided about God’s dealings with the elect.”¹⁹ Scripture, though thought of in a slightly different manner than Karlstadt, still had the normative place in the authority structure.

In *Sermon to the Princes*, Munzter writes, 54 Sider, *Andreas Bodenstein von Karlstadt*., “they [those who support the authority of church] assert that the Christian church cannot err. But to the contrary, in order to guard against error the church should be constantly built on the word of God and thus be kept free from error.”²⁰ Munzter is clear that the church can err, and thus cannot be the final determiner of doctrine that Tradition 3 argues it can.

¹⁷ Alister E. McGrath, *The Genesis of Doctrine: A Study in the Foundations of Doctrinal Criticism* (Oxford, UK; Cambridge, MA: Blackwell, 1990), 118.

¹⁸ Ronald J. Sider, *Andreas Bodenstein von Karlstadt: The Development of His Thought, 1517-1525*, *Studies in medieval and Reformation thought* v. 11 (Leiden: Brill, 1974), 95-97.

¹⁹ Michael G. Baylor, “Preface” in *Revelation and Revolution: Basic Writings of Thomas Muntzer*, trans. Michael G. Baylor (Bethlehem: London; Cranbury, NJ: Lehigh University Press; Associated University Presses, 1993), 11.

²⁰ Muntzer, *Revelation and Revolution*, 99.

Munzter argued that tradition was not relevant for current interpretations of Scripture. McGrath says that Munzter, and those who thought like him, thought tradition was “a burden perpetuating the unjust social conditions of the present.”²¹

Wesley and the Wesleyans: Wesley and the Wesleyan tradition respected the authority of the Bible while at the same upholding the Church fathers and tradition. This was likely a Tradition 1 hermeneutic.

John Jewel (1522-1571) argued that the difference between the Anglican and Catholic church was the “fundamental authority of Scripture for doctrine and practice” that the Anglican Church held.²² The concern that the Anglican theologians and clergy had was that individuals would develop their own private interpretation of Scripture and as a result misuse the Bible. They thus rejected the Tradition 0 that Karlstadt and Munzter espoused. The Anglican Church felt their theology was solidly based in Scripture. Like Augustine and Luther before them, they placed tradition under the Bible while still allowing it to influence theology. Gunter comments that “the Anglicans utilized from tradition that which was not explicitly ruled out by Scripture.”²³ So Scripture was authoritative, but tradition ruled the day when Scripture was silent on the subject.

The Book of Discipline of the United Methodist Church says, “[The Church’s] preaching and teaching were grounded in Scripture, informed by Christian tradition, enlivened in experience, and tested by reason.”²⁴ Scripture was not the only source in theology and so a Tradition 1 hermeneutic seems to be appropriate.

²¹ McGrath, *The Genesis of Doctrine*, 131.

²² Stephen Gunter, ed., *Wesley and the Quadrilateral: Renewing the Conversation* (Nashville, TN: Abingdon, 1997), 31.

²³ Ibid, 34.

²⁴ United Methodist Church (U.S.), ed., *The Book of Discipline of the United Methodist Church, 2012* (Nashville, TN: United Methodist, 2012), 45.

Randy Maddox comments that, “for most Protestants [Scripture alone] ... did not mean rejecting the value of consulting some communally shared sense of central and unifying themes in Scripture when trying to interpret particular passages.”²⁵

The Views of Fernando Canale:

In his *Basic Elements of Christian Theology*, Fernando Canale says that our scientific, philosophical, and theological knowledge always depends on the presuppositions we hold when interpreting the data.²⁶ As a result, it is important to be conscious of our presuppositions in order to understand and more accurately interpret the data. Canale argues that the data with which one is working has a major influence on the outcome of the interpretation.²⁷ He writes, “Hermeneutical principles and goals depend on the sources of data that theologians choose to base their theologies upon.”²⁸ Because the source determines the outcome, Canale asserts that in order to be biblical, one must adopt a *SS* hermeneutical framework.

Canale identifies his presupposition as a Tradition 0²⁹ *SS*. He defines *SS* as the use of Scripture alone for theological data and the principles of interpretation.³⁰ His position may be summarized in the slogan: The Bible and the Bible only. In communicating to me, he wrote,

Sola is solo or Tradition 0 in the categories of Mathison. In other words, in doing theology we do not need to use any other revelation from God as source or as

²⁵ Maddox, “John Wesley” in *Wesley and the Quadrilateral*, 15.

²⁶ Fernando L. Canale, *Basic Elements of Christian Theology: Scripture Replacing Tradition* (Berrien Springs, MI: Andrews University Lithothec, 2005), 25.

²⁷ Ibid, 26.

²⁸ Fernando L. Canale, “Sola Scriptura and Hermeneutics: Toward a Critical Assessment of the Methodological Ground of the Protestant Reformation,” *Andrews University Seminary Studies* 50, no. 2 (2012): 179.

²⁹ Fernando Canale, e-mail message to author, March 17, 2017.

³⁰ Canale, *Basic Elements of Christian Theology*. 23.

presupposition for interpretation as Tradition 1 affirms. This does not mean there is no other information that [is] biblical.³¹

Scripture is the only revelation for theology.

According to Canale, this single-source hermeneutic is not used by other Christian theologies and he argues that they use a multiple-sources hermeneutic.³² In a Tradition 0 framework, sources of knowledge other than Scripture (such as science, philosophy, tradition, and culture) are not allowed to have any influence when interpreting the Bible. The principles of interpretation should be derived directly from Scripture and not from any other source. Canale says, “*sola Scriptura* means that all other sources of knowledge must be tested by this unerring standard,”³³ with the other sources being critiqued by the biblical Source.

Canale argues that a “*sola-tota-prima Scriptura* principle (the Scripture only, in all its parts, and as the first principle of interpretation of natural revelation and the human sciences).”³⁴ The *prima* and *tota Scriptura* principles are subordinate to the *SS* principle. He describes *PS*, in connection with *SS*, in the following way:

Under the *sola scriptura* principle, the *prima scriptura* procedure means that theologians give hermeneutical and interpretive priority to the truth of Scripture over the truths we arrive at using philosophical and scientific methodologies. Moreover, we criticize and understand the latter in light of the former.³⁵

³¹ Canale, e-mail message to author, March 17, 2017.

³² Canale, *Basic Elements of Christian Theology*, 26. And even some Adventists, prominent among them would be Fritz Guy.

³³ Ibid, 198.

³⁴ Canale, “Sola Scriptura and Hermeneutics,” 192.

³⁵ Canale, *Basic Elements of Christian Theology*, 24.

Scripture is the source that critiques all other sources of knowledge. In “The Eclipse of Scripture,” Canale more clearly describes the relationship between *sola* and *prima*. He writes,

Sola (Scripture only) means that we recognize Scripture as the only specific cognitive revelation from God on which all our beliefs should be grounded and tested. *Tota* (Scripture as an indivisible whole) means Adventists see Old and New Testaments as an indivisible whole of divine revelation they need to understand God. Finally, *Prima* (Scripture first) means that the principles and doctrines we discover in the whole Scripture will be applied as hermeneutical presuppositions to judge human philosophy, science, politics, morals, worldviews, religions, and actions.³⁶

Thus, the hermeneutical principles for the other sources are determined and derived from Scripture, which has the normative role in theology. Nothing else should be allowed to impact theology. Thus, Canale argues for a Radical Reformation like *SS* instead of the traditional Protestant variety.

The Views of Fritz Guy:

³⁶ Fernando L. Canale, “The Eclipse of Scripture and the Protestantization of the Adventist Mind: Part 1: The Assumed Compatibility of Adventism with Evangelical Theology and Ministerial Practices,” *Journal of the Adventist Theological Society* 21, no. 1–2 (2010): 144.

Fritz Guy advocates for a *PS* hermeneutical framework. He writes, “While the theological priority of scripture is recognized, in one way or another, by almost all Christians, what is not so well recognized is the fact that scripture is not the *only* ingredient in Christian, including Adventist, interpretations of faith.”³⁷ The *PS* hermeneutical framework, as Guy describes it, is a framework which has more than one ingredient or source of theology with Scripture as the primary source.

For the grounds of the theological system, the interpretation of faith, Guy lists “three complimentary sources: scripture, secular knowledge, and religious experience.”³⁸ Scripture is the “narratives and interpretations of revelatory events.”³⁹ Secular knowledge includes everything that we can learn from the world around us, both natural (science) and social (culture and society).⁴⁰ Religious experience is the “spiritual awareness of acceptance, forgiveness, and freedom in Christ as a solution to the problems of mortality, guilt, and meaninglessness;” it also includes God’s “voice” in Scripture and “the sense of God’s presence in private reflection and corporate worship, as well as the experiential consequences of religiously motivated behavior and of life in a community of faith.”⁴¹

In further explaining his *PS* position, Guy writes, “The theological priority of scripture must be maintained over every subsequent Christian theological tradition, including Adventist tradition.” He continues, “The ground of this priority is the fact that it is in and through the documents of scripture—namely, especially the Gospels—that we come closest to the revelation of God in Jesus the Messiah.”⁴²

³⁷ Fritz Guy, *Thinking Theologically: Adventist Christianity and the Interpretation of Faith* (Berrien Springs, MI: Andrews University Press, 1999), 137.

³⁸ *Ibid.*, 98.

³⁹ *Ibid.*

⁴⁰ *Ibid.*

⁴¹ *Ibid.*

⁴² *Ibid.*, 120.

The *SS* principle according to Guy was and is a “polemical exaggeration.”⁴³ Instead of being a principle that should be practiced as usually defined, its purpose was to oppose the authority of ecclesiastical tradition (Tradition 3) that the Roman Catholic Church argued should be the interpreter of Scripture.⁴⁴ The Roman Church did not want the individual interpreting Scripture, whereas the Reformers, especially the Radical Reformers, argued that individuals should be allowed to interpret Scripture for themselves, at least to some degree.⁴⁵

Guy argues that more recently the *SS* principle has been used to avoid questions posed by secular knowledge,⁴⁶ which he says is relevant for theology. Guy instead says, “Historically and experientially, a more accurate motto is *prima scriptura*, ‘by scripture first of all.’”⁴⁷ Guy argues that the *SS* principle does not take into account the complexity of Scripture and the process of interpretation.⁴⁸ According to Guy, other knowledge does influence theology and this fact needs to be noted so that any harmful influences can be limited in their effects.⁴⁹ Guy also comments that the Wesleyan Quadrilateral, with some modification, namely the removal of tradition as a source, could be an even better option than *PS* as our hermeneutical framework. Thus, Guy argues for a *PS* hermeneutical framework instead of the Protestant *SS*.

Comparison, Contrast, and Analysis:

As can be seen from the above discussion, Canale and Guy sit on opposite sides of the *SS* hermeneutical debate. Canale takes a very strong *SS* position, whereas Guy takes a very weak *SS* position (i.e. *PS*).

⁴³ Ibid, 137.

⁴⁴ Ibid.

⁴⁵ Ibid. 124.

⁴⁶ Ibid, 137.

⁴⁷ Ibid.

⁴⁸ Ibid.

⁴⁹ Ibid, 138-139.

Guy argues that SS does not take into account the complexity of Scripture and the process of interpretation.⁵⁰ Other sources of data do influence theology by default and in the Adventist context Ellen G White is a prime example. This is because, as Guy suggests, there are different levels of explanation and different disciplines, each describing and explaining a different part of the theological picture.⁵¹ Scripture's "function is to provide content that is beyond the competence of the research, artistic, and theoretical disciplines."⁵² Scripture's purpose is not to describe the part of reality that science can explain.

Canale strongly disagrees with Guy in this. He argues that changing the data of theology, adding data, results in a change in theology itself.⁵³ "Hermeneutical principles and goals depend on the sources of data that theologians choose to base their theologies upon."⁵⁴ Thus, according to Canale, having multiple sources in theology results in an unbiblical hermeneutic. He says that "scientific faithfulness to the sola Scriptura principle should replace any humanly originated interpretation of philosophical issues by one of biblical origin."⁵⁵

Canale does argue for a *PS* within his *SS* hermeneutical framework, but this takes a back diminished role within the framework. Part of this principle is a concept called deconstruction. According to Canale, other sources of information need to be deconstructed. He writes, "deconstruction, then, works not as a criticism of the Bible from postmodern assumptions, but as

⁵⁰ Ibid, 138.

⁵¹ Ibid, 142-144.

⁵² Ibid, 146.

⁵³ Canale, *Basic Elements of Christian Theology*, 26.

⁵⁴ Canale, "Sola Scriptura and Hermeneutics," 179.

⁵⁵ Fernando L. Canale, *Back to Revelation-Inspiration: Searching for the Cognitive Foundation of Christian Theology in a Postmodern World* (Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 2001), 56.

a criticism of classical, modern, and postmodern theological constructions from the Bible.”⁵⁶ For Canale, everything that is not Scripture should be deconstructed from the grounds of Scripture.⁵⁷

Guy on the other hand does not deconstruct the other sources. Guy does not deconstruct the other sources within the hermeneutical framework from Scripture. This idea is seen in his levels of explanation concept and the idea that Scripture is to provide knowledge that the other sources of learning cannot provide.¹⁸ This is also seen in Guy’s transfer of evolutionary theory into his theology. Guy also argues that our culture raises questions that theology needs to answer, concerning our origins for example.⁵⁸

A New Model:⁵⁹

I agree with Canale and Guy in that Scripture has a special place that science cannot take. “Scripture holds a cognitive privilege that entitles it to become the authoritative source of theological data.”⁶⁰ Scripture describes what the God-head has done in history, generally, and in saving the human race specifically. Without Scripture, this information would not be known and humanity would be lost. So, Scripture does have the normative role, as in a SS hermeneutical framework. However, science is also needed to have a complete picture of reality; true science and Scripture will not be in conflict, but this lack of conflict does not mean they are separate like

⁵⁶ Fernando L. Canale, “Deconstructing Evangelical Theology?” 44, no. 1, Andrews University Seminary Studies (2006): 124.

⁵⁷ Ibid, 118.

⁵⁸ Guy, *Thinking Theologically*, 159-160.

⁵⁹ In the discussion here, science will take the main focus. However, the principles apply to other sources as well.

⁶⁰ Fernando L. Canale, “Interdisciplinary Methods in Christian Theology? In Search of a Working Proposal,” *Neue Zeitschrift für Systematische Theologie und Religionsphilosophie* 43, no. 3 (January 2001): 384.

Guy suggests. So, in this sense, the hermeneutical framework for the science-theology relationship should also include PS.

Hanna writes that “Scripture alone defines the roles of other manifestations of divine revelation including their roles in illuminating Scripture.”⁶¹ In addition, “the unique primacy of each revelation complements the unique primacy of the others.”⁶² Similarly, I propose that Scripture is unique (SS) and primary (PS); it is the lens through which science (general revelation) is viewed and used in theology. I would then argue that this position that Scripture holds does not discount science and does include it as a theological source or resource, while recognizing its self-imposed hermeneutical principles. However, theology need not accept macro-evolutionary theory. Each revelation (Scripture and nature) rightly interpreted is in agreement with the other. This is similar to how Jennings suggests science and Scripture should relate, though here I suggest a SS-PS twist to Timothy Jennings’ framework of *PS*.

Thus, a combination of SS and PS is likely the best option when approaching the science and theology relationship. I would strongly suggest that the hermeneutical framework for the science and theology relationship should be SS. Scripture has a unique place in transmitting and describing salvation and its history and the hermeneutical principles for itself and the other manifestations of revelation. Science does not give us this information. However, Scripture does not tell us everything about reality, so science is also needed to have a complete picture, thus the framework should be PS as well. SS and PS then must work together.

John Peckham has convincingly argued that the Bible writers, prophets and apostles, held their writings and teachings to be authoritative above other sources, because the prophet or

⁶¹ Martin Frederick Hanna, *The Cosmic Christ of Scripture: How to Read God’s Three Books, Comparing Biblical Perspectives with the Writings of Ellen G. White* (Berrien Springs, MI: Cosmic Christ Connections, 2006), 36.

⁶² *Ibid.*

apostle was commissioned by God Himself, the revelation was consistent with past canonical revelation, and the writings were self-authenticating.⁶³ Scripture thus had the authority to be the rule of faith and practice. Science does not have these three criteria; thus, Scripture is unique. However, this does not remove the need for other sources, as Peckham writes,

Canonical sola Scripture should not be understood to mean that: (1) Scripture is the only source of knowledge; (2) Scripture excludes reason, requires no interpretation, or is subject to private interpretation; (3) interpretive communities and traditions past and present should be ignored or dismissed; or (4) all theological doctrine requires a direct biblical statement (or statements).⁶⁴

From this formulation of the SS hermeneutical framework, non-macro-evolutionary science could be allowed to have a prominent place in helping Scripture to explain the world.

As Peckham points out, Scripture is not the only source of information. As described above, Scripture has its unique place, but it is not the only source to be taken into account when doing theology. In agreement with what has been said here, Peckham writes, “Whereas Scripture may be illuminated by extracanonical factors, it should never be subjected to or judged by any external standard.”⁶⁵ Science influences theology (PS), but as has been stated, Scripture is the genesis of the hermeneutical principles and thus holds a unique place above science (SS) within theological methodology.

⁶³ John Peckham, *Canonical Theology: The Biblical Canon, Sola Scriptura, and Theological Method* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2016), 28-39.

⁶⁴ Ibid, 142. Italics on original.

⁶⁵ Ibid, 143.

Conclusion:

Scripture holds the sole place of determining its hermeneutical principles and the overall direction of theology. However, it is not the only source that influences theology. These other sources must not determine how Scripture is interpreted. When they attempt to do that, they must be rejected. Scripture is the lens through which the world should be viewed. Thus, the hermeneutical framework that I propose here is *SS-PS*.