

Biblical Interpretation in Catholic and Protestant Churches

Dr V. Raphael

The Catholic and Protestant approaches to Bible are different. While the Catholics have Bible, Tradition¹ and Magisterium,² the Protestants have only Bible as binding authority. This is largely due to the reformation brought by Martin Luther and others. As the Protestant Church celebrates the 500th anniversary of Martin Luther, it would be good to see some of Luther's influence on Bible and Biblical interpretation.

Nature of Biblical Interpretation

The Bible is the Word of God in the words of men. The Bible has the formation history of fourteen centuries. And the biblical interpretation has a history of about nineteen centuries. What the Jesuit priest Jean Levee wrote in 1958 is true even today. According to him a Christian exegete's "first task is concretely and objectively to situate the inspired authors in history, and the civilization of their own milieu and period. He must understand them as they were understood by their contemporaries, as they understood themselves and would have explained themselves in accordance with the ideas of their times. He must at the same time always be making an implicit comparison between our modern mentality and that of men of the past."³

D. Stuart notes that "biblical exegesis is the process of a careful, analytical study of biblical passages in their original languages or in the earliest

available form, undertaken to produce useful interpretations of those passages.”⁴

We may come to the Bible and read it with the eyes of faith, believing every word (or most of them). This response is called a “hermeneutics of faith.” This hermeneutics of faith can take many forms. But, on the whole, the Bible was read mainly in this way at least for a period of 1500 years. On the other hand, we may come to read a text with caution, even skepticism. We may be determined to test every claim and proposition against such humanly defined standards as the light of reason or the evidence of history. This is called a “hermeneutics of suspicion.” In the past three or four hundred years this “hermeneutics of suspicion” has been the character of biblical interpretation. These two attitudes of faith and suspicion are actually present in almost all acts of reading and interpretation in one way or another.⁵

The German theologian and philosopher Friedrich Schleiermacher (1768-1834), often known as the father of modern hermeneutics,⁶ described the circularity of the hermeneutic process in this way: “In order to gain an overview of the text in its completeness, we must give proper attention to the details and particulars. But we cannot appreciate the significance of these details and particulars without a sense of the whole work. We begin with the big idea, read the text clearly and in detail in the light of this, and then use the text to substantiate the initial idea.”⁷ This is *hermeneutic circle*.

While interpreting the Bible we need to take into consideration the unity of the Bible. It is because the Old Testament and the New Testament form one unit. The same God who spoke through the prophets is self revealed through Jesus Christ. At the same time we should not underestimate the diversities and particularities of the biblical texts. We should also take into consideration that revelation comes in and through history, i.e., God acts in history.⁸ In interpreting the Bible we need to note the literal sense, the spiritual sense, the deeper sense and the typical sense⁹ etc. contained in the passages.

Biblical Interpretation before Reformation

From the Patristic period to the Reformation biblical interpretation was subjected to the authority of ecclesiastical tradition. People were not allowed to approach the Bible inductively. Irenaeus (died about 202) believed that the Holy Spirit illumines the interpretation of the Scripture. At the same time he also saw that the same Spirit is working in the tradition of the Church in an equally important way. Irenaeus and Tertullian (c. 155-22) insisted on interpretation based on tradition, a *regula veritatis* (canon of truth), that is the faith that is preserved in the Church right back to the apostles themselves, true to the claim of the *apostolic succession*. In short, this was a hermeneutics based on *authority* and *continuity*, and to read Scripture was to situate oneself within the entire history and order of the Church.¹⁰ Augustine (354-430) too insisted that the basis for interpreting Scripture is the authority of the Church. Vincent of Lérins (died c. 445) subjected the meaning of Scripture to the consensus of the ecclesiastical authorities.

While this approach of having recourse to the authority of the Church for the interpretation of Scripture was growing, Origen (c. 185-253) and the Alexandrian School took to allegorical interpretation of the Scriptural texts. They could see a multiplicity of meanings in a given text in the Scripture.¹¹

Augustine, like Origen, developed sophisticated allegorical readings, as shown in Book III of the *Confessions*.¹² We know his famous allegorical interpretation of the Parable of the Good Samaritan where the man who went down from Jerusalem to Jericho is Adam and the Samaritan who helped him is Christ.¹³ Jerome objected to using allegorical method for every text of the Bible, but he could not abandon its use in his interpretation. However, he insisted that the deeper meaning of the text must be decided based on the literal sense.

The Antiochian School's hermeneutics followed local Jewish traditions of interpretation. Here the emphasis was firmly on a literal reading of the

Bible and on the historical reality of its revelation. In the later middle ages there was the renewal of interest in the Antiochian School. And hence the importance of literal sense and authority of the Church got momentum. Obedience of faith was demanded as regards interpreting the Scripture.

Medieval scholars followed the traditional methods of Church in more than one way - in basically four ways. They called them the *literal*, the *allegorical*, the *moral*, and the *anagogical*. Nicholas of Lyra (c. 1270-1349), a French Franciscan scholar, described the four ways thus: The *letter shows us what God and our fathers did*; the *allegory* shows us where our faith is hid; the *moral* meaning gives us rules of daily life; the *anagogy* shows us where we end our strife.¹⁴

Reformation and Protestant Interpretation of the Bible

Martin Luther gave a response to the question of authority regarding the interpretation of the Bible. And that was *sola scriptura*. Martin Luther was born in Eisleben, Germany, in 1483.¹⁵ He was an Augustinian monk and scholar and spent his early years in anonymity. But in 1517 he wrote a document attacking the Catholic custom of granting indulgences to absolve sin. He wrote the "Disputation on the Power and Efficacy of Indulgences," also known as "The 95 Theses," a list of questions and propositions for debate.¹⁶ The theses propounded two central beliefs. Luther propounded that the Bible is the central religious authority, which is against the Catholic contention that the Church has the authority to interpret the Bible. Luther also propounded that humans attain salvation not by their deeds but by their faith in the grace of God. Now this sparked the Protestant reformation.

Martin Luther's hermeneutical enterprise was made possible due to the advance in technology. The invention of printing press was of considerable importance. Changes in hermeneutics and technological developments often go hand in hand. It made reading the Bible a real possibility for all. John Gutenberg printed the first Bible in Latin between 1450-55. A printed book

was produced more quickly and at much lower cost. There was a greater distribution of the Bible, though it was largely restricted to the educated and the rich people. Until then people could have access to the Bible only through liturgy of the Latin Mass, sermons, sculptures and paintings in churches or the mystery plays, which took place in front of cathedrals at Christmas and Easter. That meant that the Bible was interpreted by the clergy or depicted by artists. After the printing press the Bible came to be easily available to people without the confusion of different interpretations. Indeed it was a revolution.

Luther was a university lecturer. And due to the printing technology Luther could rely on his students having before them a text of the Bible that was standard and easily available. Now there are no longer the vagaries of scribal copying. Each text of the Bible was exactly the same as all others.

In the 4th century Augustine had written that the Bible was the supreme authority. However, Augustine thought that the Church taught the exact meaning of the text and gave the correct interpretation. In the 16th century, Cajetan, the Pope's representative who opposed Luther, wrote that interpretation should reflect Church doctrine. He also wrote that in interpretation former commentaries should be consulted. Martin Luther gave a reply. He wrote that Scripture should be interpreted according to "the conscience, bound by the Word of God." Even though everyone recognized the sovereign authority of the Bible, Luther did not accept its traditional inextricable association with its interpretation by the Church. For the Reformers, traditional interpretation of the Scriptures was a useful addition but did not have the same authority as the Bible itself.

Luther's basic interest came to be in the literal and *tropological*, or moral sense of Scripture. In his criticism of the power and corruption of the church, Luther insists that the Bible was the sole criterion and arbiter of tradition, appealing to the "plain" or "natural" meaning of the text. The concept

of *sola scriptura* became the battle cry of the Reformation and this emphasis served to advance both the methodology of interpretation and the actual practice of interpretation.¹⁷ Luther concentrated on historical and grammatical principles of interpretation and on exegesis. But Luther's regard for the traditions of the Church fathers was not because they provided any authoritative or even legal inheritance, but only insofar as they were themselves competent *hermeneuts*. The reader alone confronts the text, without the intervention of the church and its theology, and seeks to avoid "multiple" meanings.

Luther insisted on 'experience.' He wrote that "experience is necessary for the understanding of the Word. It is not merely to be repeated or known, but to be lived and felt." Martin Luther did not read the Bible primarily as a historical record. Reading the Scripture historically was an issue later in the 18th century only. But Martin Luther's reading of the Scripture was Christological. He believed that in the words of Scripture Christ spoke, even if it is Old Testament.

We need to keep in mind that for Martin Luther, Scripture interprets us as much as we interpret Scripture. Luther writes:

The Holy Scripture is the highest and best of books, abounding in comfort under all afflictions and trials. It teaches us to see, to feel, to grasp, and to comprehend faith, hope, and charity, far otherwise than mere human reason can; and when evil oppresses us, it teaches how these virtues throw light upon the darkness, and how after this poor, miserable existence of ours on earth, there is another and an eternal life.

We ought not to criticize, explain, or judge the Scriptures by our mere reason, but diligently, with prayer, meditate thereon, and seek their meaning. The devil and temptations also afford us occasion to learn and understand the Scriptures, by experience and practice.

Without these we should never understand them, however diligently we read and listened to them. The Holy Ghost must be our only

master and tutor; and let youth have no shame to learn of that preceptor. When I find myself assailed by temptation, I forth-with lay hold of some text of the Bible, which Jesus extends to me; as this: that he died for me, whence I derive infinite hope.

Martin Luther is as interested as Thomas Aquinas in theology, but for him theology *begins and ends* with the Bible alone, beyond all mere “reason.”

Ulrich Zwingli (1484-1531), the Reformer in Zurich, gave prime importance to the way in which Scripture was read: what was the right interpretation, how could one understand it correctly? He and all the other Reformers considered “sola scriptura” to be the very basis of the Reform Movement.

John Calvin (1509-1564) is known as the forefather of the Presbyterian and Reformed churches and as being the author of that massive theological work *The Institutes of the Christian Religion*. Calvin was both an exegete and a theologian. Calvin held that Scripture was written under the inspiration of the Holy Spirit and it should therefore also be interpreted under the guidance of the Holy Spirit. Thus, like Luther, Calvin held to *dynamic* theory of interpretation. It is significant to note that Calvin was educated in the humanistic tradition of the Renaissance which gave a breadth to his work not found in many others of the Reformation period.¹⁸

From the time of Calvin’s death in 1564 until the end of the 16th century the Protestants were sharply divided and involved in numerous controversies over creeds and confessions, for this was the period of creed and theological system making for the various Protestant groups. Between 1545 and 1563 the Catholic Council of Trent met and drew up a series of decrees setting forth the Catholic dogmas and canon criticizing the Protestants. The Protestants then replied in kind with their deeds, confessions, statements of faith, systems of doctrine, and numerical polemical writings. These works were often unbalanced because adequate biblical study was neglected in favour of making theological statements. Although the Protestants still held

to the principles of *sola scriptura* and refused to subject their exegesis and interpretations to the domination of tradition or the authority of the Church as formulated by the councils and popes, they fell into the danger of leading it into bondage to the confessional standards of the various Protestant churches. The result of this was that all too often the creeds and confessions became the authority so that exegesis and biblical interpretation became the handmaid of dogmatics and interpretation became a search for proof-texts to prove a particular dogmatic system of belief or confession of faith.

The Famous Texts for the Reformers

The Protestants are proud of the Reformation and they do celebrate October 31st as the Day of Reformation. They do understand Protestant Reformation as the movement of theological reform which aimed at restoring the Bible to a central place in Christian doctrine. It was also to emphasize the importance of grace, rather than good deeds in making salvation for all human beings. They encourage kids to dress like Martin Luther and Ulrich Zwingli. The reformers consider a few verses from the Bible as close to the heart of reformation:

(1) Romans 1:17: *“For in the Gospel the righteousness of God is revealed through faith for faith; as it is written, “The one who is righteous will live by faith.”*

For Martin Luther this verse became the key verse for his monumental work on justification through faith, a book which came in several volumes. Martin Luther insisted that it is through faith in the grace of God that one is justified and not through good works. He says, “Here in *it*,” in the gospel, “the righteousness of God is revealed from faith to faith, as it is written, ‘the just shall live by faith.’” It is a verse taken from the book of Habakkuk (2:4) in the Old Testament that is cited three times in the New Testament. This was the thematic verse for the whole exposition of the

gospel that Paul sets forth here in the book of Romans. Luther began to understand that what Paul was speaking of here was a righteousness that God in His grace was making available to those who would receive it passively, not those who would achieve it actively, but that would receive it by faith, and by which a person could be reconciled to a holy and righteous God.

(2) Ephesians 2:8: *“For by grace you have been saved through faith, and this is not your own doing; it is the gift of God.”*

This is another key verse which the reformers celebrate. They dwell on *sola gratia*. In Latin *sola gratia* means ‘by grace alone.’ It is one of the five *solae* propounded to summarize the Lutheran and Reformed leader’s basic beliefs during the Protestant Reformation.¹⁹ The Lutheran and Reformed Churches believed that the emphasis on grace was in contradiction to the teaching of the Catholic Church, though the Catholic Church had affirmed the doctrine of *sola gratia* at the Council of Orange in the year 529. As a response to this misunderstanding the Council of Trent further clarified the Catholic doctrine. The Council of Trent explained that salvation is made possible only by grace, and that the faith and the works of humans are secondary means that have their origins in and are sustained by grace. But the Lutherans and Reformed theologians thought of the Catholic view of the means of salvation as a mixture of reliance upon the grace of God and confidence in the merits of one’s own works performed in love.²⁰

(3) 1Peter 2:5: *“...like living stones, let yourselves be built into a spiritual house, to be a holy priesthood, to offer spiritual sacrifices acceptable to God through Jesus Christ.”*

This is a crucial and controversial verse for reformers. Every Christian is considered part of the priesthood and hence there is a sharp

distinction between Catholics and Protestants in this regard. The Catholics and Eastern Orthodox Christians believe in the 'office of priesthood.' Hence they speak of common priesthood and ministerial priesthood. But for the reformers the distinction is not emphasized.

(4) 2Timothy 3:16: *"All Scripture is inspired by God and is useful for teaching, for reproof, for correction, and for training in righteousness."*

Based on this verse the Bible is considered to contain everything that is needed in order to be reconciled to God and live righteously. Hence the Latin usage *Sola Scriptura* was coined by Martin Luther. This idea elevated the Scripture above everything, including the Church and tradition.

(5) Matt 11:29-30: *"Take my yoke upon you, and learn from me; for I am gentle and humble in heart, and you will find rest for your souls. For my yoke is easy, and my burden is light."*

Jesus spoke these words against the background of the oppression of the ordinary people by religious authorities who demanded a burdensome religious life, formulating innumerable laws and precepts. There was also the oppression from political and social world of the Jews. But the Protestant reformers believed that centuries of Church tradition had placed a heavy burden on the backs of believers. They pointed to verses like this one and reminded Christians that the gospel of Christ is meant to *free* people from guilt and sin.

In all these the Protestants show their difference regarding the doctrines. They also show an attitude of approaching the Bible rather literally.

The Effects of Reformation on Bible

1. The Protestant Reformation relocated spiritual and theological authority to Scripture

Already in the 14th century John Wycliffe had challenged some of the Catholic beliefs and practices, such as, the practice of granting indulgences and the doctrine of *transubstantiation*. Martin Luther based his arguments by appealing to Scripture. He wrote: "Neither the testimony of Augustine nor Jerome nor any other saint should be accepted except in so far as it was based upon Scripture." Later, at the Diet of Worms, Martin Luther stated at the debate, "I am bound by the Scriptures I have quoted and my conscience is captive to the Word of God." As these proclamations signal, the Reformers were appealing to the revelation of God as the final arbiter of truth, against the claim of papal infallibility from Rome and the abuse of tradition insofar as it conflicted with biblical teaching.

2. The Protestant Reformation made the Bible accessible to lay people

Until the Reformation, the only Bible readily available to the Western Church was the Latin Vulgate. It was something restricting the people to read the Word of God. Besides, it had several errors of translation. For example, in Matthew 4:17, Jesus is translated as saying, "do penance" instead of "repent." The implications are obvious. Already John Wycliffe had translated the Bible into English in the 14th century. Martin Luther translated the New Testament into German. William Tyndale, inspired by Luther's work, then translated the Bible into English—the first to purportedly do so using the original Hebrew and Greek. This was congruent with the Reformers' insistence on the authority of Scripture for matters of faith and practice, and the need for individuals to feast on the Word of God for spiritual nourishment. This was Luther's dream—that people "might seize and taste the clear, pure Word of God itself and hold to it."²¹

The first Tamil Bible was translated by the Protestant Church only. It was printed at Tranquebar (Tharangambadi) in 1715. It was translated by Bartholomaeus Ziegenbalg, a Lutheran missionary of Danish Mission. The Catholic versions were mostly from the Latin Vulgate of St. Jerome, which was completed in 406. At present there is the Tamil ecumenical Bible of 1995, which is directly translated from Hebrew and Greek.

However, the Protestants have the tendency to possess only old versions. For example, even though there is the ecumenical Tamil Bible of 1995, most Tamil Protestants do use only the Bower version of the Tamil Bible. But its NT came already in 1867, and the whole Bible came in 1891. That means the Tamil used in Bower version is very old and mixed with Sanskrit words. Larson corrected its grammar and language in 1936 and Monahan corrected it in 1942. But the Protestants rejected them and they still use only the old version of 19th century. It means the language is very old and children may not understand it and it has not taken into account many of the results of the archaeological discoveries, such as the discovery of Qumran documents which took place in 1948. The advance of textual criticism is also not taken into consideration. The latest biblical scholarship is not reflected in the old translation. The Protestants have studied the Bible more and have memorized many verses and hence it is impossible for them to switch over to newer versions.

3. The Canon of the Bible Changed

The Jews had the Greek version of the Old Testament called the 'Septuagint' (LXX) which had more than 39 books. The Christians accepted this as canonical and quoted from this lavishly. Towards the end of the first century AD the Jamnia council of the Jews rejected the LXX version as uncanonical because of their anti-Christian stand. In the aftermath of the revolt against Rome in the 16th century, the Protestants rejected the LXX version of the Old Testament. They accepted only the Hebrew version of the OT

which had only 39 books. Hence the Protestant version of the Old Testament has only 39 books. The Catholics have 47 books in the Old Testament.²²

As regards the New Testament, Martin Luther placed Hebrews, James, Jude and Revelation at the end of the New Testament considering them not so Christian books but more as Jewish books.

Nowadays many of the English translations of the Bible are ecumenical, though Catholics have special editions of the same. Hence the Deutero-Canonical books are also included in the ecumenical versions of the Bible. For example, the Tamil Common Bible released in 1995 is an ecumenical venture and the Deutero-Canonical Books are kept after the Old Testament in the same, together with the Additions of Esther and Daniel.

Protestant Understanding of Some Biblical Texts

The Protestants use the same New Testament with its twenty seven books. But the interpretation of some crucial texts among Protestant circles seems to be different from that of the Catholics. The reformers revolted against the Catholic tradition and many of its procedures and hence their interpretation is coloured by the doctrines which they hold differently from the Catholics. We could see three such texts of the Bible.

(1) The Institution of Papacy

Matt 16:18: *“And I tell you, you are Peter, and on this rock I will build my church, and the gates of Hades will not prevail against it.”*

This statement comes from Jesus after Peter confesses that Jesus is the Messiah and Son of the living God. Jesus congratulates Peter saying that flesh and blood have not revealed this to Peter by his Father in heaven.

Jesus does great honor to Peter when he identifies him as Rock. He also lays on him a heavy burden of responsibility. The Catholics take this statement to mean that Jesus appointed Peter as the first Pope of the Church.

But the Protestants differ in this. A traditional Protestant understanding is that the rock is Peter's confession and the reality that stands behind it – that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of the living God. When Jesus says, "You are Peter" (*petros*), meaning 'stone' or 'rock' it is masculine. When he says, "on this rock," the word *petra* is used in Greek, and that is feminine. Hence it could convey the idea of the rock foundation. And on this foundation Jesus will build the church – *ecclesia*. Hence the Protestants understand Jesus as distinguishing between the rock, that is Peter, and the rock upon which he will build the church. However, we know that while the New Testament was written in Greek, Jesus might have used the Aramaic word *Cephas*, which may not make such a distinction.

Recently there seems to be a movement towards the centre. Protestants are willing nowadays to accept Peter's special place in the early Church. But they do not believe that Peter was the first Pope of the Church.²³

Most of the Protestants believe that Jesus gave a special blessing to Peter, but they do not see any suggestion that the blessing can be passed on and they see that no succession was intended. But the Catholics do believe and accept the primacy of Peter, and they do believe and accept that there is apostolic succession.

Matt 16:19: *"I will give you the keys of the kingdom of heaven, and whatever you bind on earth will be bound in heaven, and whatever you loose on earth, will be loosed in heaven."*

Here, Peter is given the responsibility of a servant who will look after the master's household in tune with the master's wishes, but also with a responsibility and freedom of personal discernment. He receives the role of imposing and cancelling obligations. The image is taken from Is 22:15-25. In Matt 18:18 the same image applies to the specific issue of forgiving sins, and the authority is extended to the whole group of disciples.

As regards Matt 16:19, Catholics and Protestants have different viewpoints. Catholics believe that Peter's authority passed from Peter to Papacy.²⁴ But the Protestants emphasize the authority given to the group of disciples, and they do believe that any specific authority given to Peter ended up at his death.

Rather than a vertical structure, Protestants see the Church as having a horizontal structure. Dr. Szigel contrasts the role of the Catholic priest with the Protestant idea of the priesthood of all believers:

That which was reserved just for the *magisterium*, the ability to bind and loose to forgive and withhold forgiveness through the sacraments and through penance and such, that was just the role of the priest. From Luther on, we have the ability to confess our sins to one another, pronounce forgiveness as the scripture says.

(2) The Eucharistic Words of Jesus

According to many scholars the words spoken over bread and cup were a crucial part of the Lord's Supper, which we call 'the Eucharistic words of Jesus.' Different versions are given in the New Testament regarding the institution of the Eucharist, and the details are not identical. Hence it is not possible to determine what the original "words of institution" were.

The Eucharistic words are given in Matt 26:26-29: "*While they were eating, Jesus took a loaf of bread, and after blessing it he broke it, gave it to the disciples, and said, "Take, eat; this is my body." Then he took the cup, and after giving thanks he gave it to them, saying, "Drink from it, all of you; for this is my blood of the covenant, which is poured out for many for the forgiveness of sins. I tell you, I will never again drink of this fruit of the vine until that day when I drink it new with you in my Father's kingdom."* (cf. Mark 14:22-25; Luke 22:14-22; 1Cor 11:23-

26; John 6:35-59). In 1Cor 11:25-26 we have these words also: “*Do this, as often as you drink it, in remembrance of me. For as often you eat this bread and drink the cup, you proclaim the Lord’s death until he comes.*”

In all the gospels, as in 1 Corinthians, the bread and wine are connected with Jesus’ redemptive death. But the different writings reflect distinctive understandings of the Eucharist.

Most Protestants call the Eucharist as ‘The Lord’s Supper, or ‘Communion.’ There is a difference in the interpretation of the Eucharistic words of Jesus. In this, the Roman Catholic Church holds to the doctrine of *Transubstantiation*—the idea that the edible ritual elements used during the mass literally become the body and blood of Christ. Dr. Svigel explains:

At the moment that the priest says, ‘This is my body,’ the invisible, unperceivable essence that...you couldn’t see (with) an electron microscope, (is) there in a miracle. It contains the body, blood, soul and divinity of Christ. And that becomes the spiritual and physical nourishment. As you partake of it, it becomes part of you, transforms you, and makes you more and more righteous.”

The Catechism of the Catholic Church states:

At the heart of the Eucharistic celebration are the bread and wine that, by the words of Christ and the invocation of the Holy Spirit, become Christ’s Body and Blood. Faithful to the Lord’s command the Church continues to do, in his memory and until his glorious return, what he did on the eve of his Passion: ‘He took bread...’ ‘He took the cup filled with wine...’ The signs of bread and wine become, in a surpassing understanding, the Body and Blood of Christ; they continue also to signify the goodness of creation.²⁵

In contrast to this, some Protestants, like Lutherans, hold the doctrine of *Consubstantiation*. Accordingly, the body and blood are coexisting with the bread and wine. Martin Luther likened this to the idea of a red-hot iron in a fire—united, but not changed. Dr. Bock says:

I like to call it ‘the over, under, around and through’ view. Jesus Christ surrounds the elements. He’s spiritually present, but he’s not in the

elements themselves; the elements don't become the body and blood of Christ.

And, other Protestants hold to the memorial view. It is an idea that those who celebrate the Eucharistic words of Jesus commemorate Jesus' death. Here the elements are symbols which remain ontologically unaffected by the ritual.

(3) Teaching on Purgatory

Catholics believe that in addition to heaven and hell, a third plane of existence, purgatory, exists in the afterlife.

In 2Macc 12:43-45 we read: "*He (Judas Maccabees) also took up a collection, man by man, to the amount of two thousand drachmas of silver, and sent it to Jerusalem to provide for a sin offering. In doing this he acted very well and honorably, taking account of the resurrection. For if he were not expecting that those who had fallen would rise again, it would have been superfluous and foolish to pray for the dead. But if he was looking to the splendid reward that is laid up for those who fall asleep in godliness, it was a holy and pious thought. Therefore he made atonement for the dead, so that they might be delivered from their sin.*"

The author of 2Maccabees sees Judas' action as evidence that those who die piously can be delivered from un-expiated sins that impede their attainment of a joyful resurrection. This doctrine, though vaguely formulated, contains the essence of what would become (with further precisions) the Christian theologian's teaching on purgatory.²⁶ The Catechism of the Catholic Church, no. 1030, says:

All who die in God's grace and friendship, but still imperfectly purified, are indeed assured of their eternal salvation; but after death they undergo purification, so as to achieve the holiness necessary to enter the joy of heaven.²⁷

The Church gives the name *Purgatory* to this final purification of the elect.

When Protestants broke away from the Catholic Church, the idea of purgatory was one of the main beliefs they rejected, and this rejection helped form the foundation of their new religion. In fact the Protestants rejected from their Canon of the Bible the books of Maccabees where we find the said text.

John Calvin explained the reasons for disputing the idea of purgatory by claiming that the Bible states that salvation is only possible through Christ. If an individual accepts Christ, he will go to heaven; if he does not, he will go to hell. According to him that a person can earn his or her place in heaven by suffering in purgatory is sacrilegious. It is because Jesus already died and paid for the sins of humanity. Furthermore, Protestants refute the idea that praying for loved ones will reduce the time they spend in purgatory.²⁸

Two Other Tendencies of Protestant Biblical Interpretation in Later Period

(1) Liberalism

Around the year 1870 a collective inter-university effort began to take shape in Germany and it spread in other countries. This gave a momentum to the modern study of the Bible. There came a movement which was based on the Protestant idea of revelation. According to this idea sacred Scripture is the only certain expression of the Word of God. Unfortunately, in the second half of the nineteenth century, the main current was often liberal and purely historical rather than religiously orthodox and theologically constructive.²⁹ It was because of a few factors. There was the discovery of the oriental background of the Old Testament. There was a need to rethink the history of Israel and the religious and literary evolution of the Old Testament. There was the development of classical philology. Semitic biblical

languages were studied more and as a result the Hebrew Text was rendered more perfectly. The biblical criticism in this period was liberal more because the intellectual movement at this period was influenced by authors who were more pagan in their approach. In France it was affected by Voltaire and in Germany by Lessing, Goethe and Schiller. Schliermacher's theology was a religious philosophy and it was not in line with Christian Christology. Strauss wrote about the life of Jesus (*Leben Jesu*) in 1835 but it lacked authentic Christian faith.

There was a constant tendency to what has been called 'historicism.' For example, they wanted to know whether the Jewish meaning of a term, before Christ, expressed accurately the Christian meaning of this term in the primitive Church. There was an excessive mistrust of writings of the evangelists and apostles and an instinctive propensity of skepticism. Liberal Protestantism, in its one-sided interpretation of the Gospels and the primitive Church, went to extremes and thereby falsified the (undeniable) eschatological standpoint of the gospels.³⁰ The controversy about the existence of Jesus³¹ claimed to push to its logical conclusion the skepticism of liberal Protestantism and ended by doubting the very existence of Jesus. But after 1918 Protestant exegesis progressed and partially corrected certain deficiencies.

(2) Fundamentalism

Since the Protestants give more importance to authority of the Bible and reject *Magisterium* and Tradition, there is a tendency to be conservative in many areas of biblical interpretation and to be fundamentalist. In fundamentalism there is a rejection of critical exegesis and there is more-than-literal interest. "Some of the early Protestant practitioners of historical critical exegesis had an anti-dogmatic bias, conservative Protestant Christians, especially at the beginning of the 20th century felt that the fundamentals of the Christian faith were being eroded (esp. creation, the virginal conception,

the bodily resurrection).”³² The fundamentalists believe that what the Bible says is always literally factual. Despite the literalism that has marked the fundamentalist approach to Scripture, it has little to do with the literal sense which the author had in mind.

Christian fundamentalism, movement in American Protestantism arose in the late 19th century in reaction to theological modernism, which aimed to revise traditional Christian beliefs to accommodate new developments in the natural and social sciences, especially the theory of biological evolution.

The fundamentalists believe that the Bible is literally true. Hence they are opposed to the theory of evolution etc. The Catholic Church does hold to the inerrancy of Scripture, but not in the literal sense.

Vatican II authoritatively states that in order to discover *the sacred authors' intention*, the reader must take into account the conditions of their time and culture, the literary genres in use at that time, and the modes of feeling, speaking and narrating then current. “For the fact is that truth is differently presented and expressed in the various types of historical writing, in prophetic and poetical texts, and in other forms of literary expression.”³³

Pope Francis expresses his view on evolution:

When we read in Genesis the account of Creation, we risk imagining God as a magician, with a wand able to make everything. But it is not so,” the Pope affirmed. “He created beings and allowed them to develop according to the internal laws that he gave to each one, so that they were able to develop and to arrive at their fullness of being. He gave autonomy to the beings of the universe at the same time at which he assured them of his continuous presence, giving being to every reality. And so creation continued for centuries and centuries, millennia and millennia, until it became which we know today, precisely because God is not a demiurge or a magician, but the creator who gives being to all things.”³⁴

But fundamentalists sometimes accuse Catholics as though they change their position regarding the creation of the world and accept the theory of

evolution in order to cope up with the world.³⁵ They taunt the Catholics as though they are not satisfied with the Word of God and that they want additional teachings from humans.

While Catholics and fundamentalists have some elements in common, they part ways on most interpretive methods and issues of the Bible. The fundamentalists believe that the Bible is the Word of God, but the Catholics hold that the Bible is the Word of God in human words. While the fundamentalists have *Sola Scriptura*, *Sola Fide* and *Sola Gratia*, the Catholics have Scripture, Tradition and *Magisterium*. Fundamentalists take to literalist reading of the Bible. They tend to view inspiration too narrowly. They do not take into consideration of the historical perspectives in interpretation of the Bible. They also take the passages of the Bible out of context. They reject the scientific historical critical methods of interpretation.³⁶

Roman Catholic Response

Historically Roman Catholic Hermeneutics has been characterized by a threefold relationship between Scripture, the Church and Tradition.

Like conservative Protestants, the Catholic Church officially holds to the inspiration, infallibility, and authority of the Scriptures. At the same time Catholics realize that *sola scriptura* as affirmed by the Reformers is an actual impossibility as scripture must be interpreted. The development of creeds and confessions in Post-Reformation Protestantism show that the Catholics are correct in their view. Interpretation of Scripture, the canonization of Scripture, and even the writing of Scripture, all took place within a community of faith. Thus Catholics affirm that an Infallible Church is necessary if Scripture is to be correctly interpreted and that an authoritative Church is a necessity if the truth content of the gospel is to be protected from error and heresy.³⁷

When there was reformation the Catholic Church made counter-reformation. Through the Council of Trent (1545-1563) the Church reaffirmed the authority of the Church and of its tradition regarding biblical interpretation. The Church tried to control the free and unrestricted interpretation of Scripture. Therefore, nothing of significance took place in the Roman Catholic hermeneutics for a long time. But later the door of Church authority and tradition opened. Hence sweeping changes have taken place regarding biblical studies.

Catholic hermeneutics received strong emphases from the great Biblical encyclicals of Popes Leo XIII (*Providentissimus Deus* – The Most Provident God (1893), Benedict XV (*Spiritus Paraclitus* – The Consoler Spirit (1920), and especially Pius XII (1943 – *Divino Afflante Spiritu* – Under the Inspiration of the Holy Spirit (1943)). Due to these encyclicals new perspectives are opened up.

In the encyclical *Divino Afflante Spiritu* Pope Pius XII offered innovative perspectives for Bible study in the Roman Catholic Church. Modern disciplines such as the study of the biblical languages, archaeology, biblical times and especially literary genres were to be integrated. The encyclical notes that the Church has provided official interpretations for only a few biblical texts. The encyclical insists that in addition to the Bible's literal meaning, its spiritual meaning is also important. The encyclical does not forget to state that the spiritual meaning must be clearly present in the text.³⁸

The Instruction on the Historical Truth of the Gospels by The Pontifical Biblical Commission came out in 1964. This important document recognized new methods such as Form and Redaction Criticism for the study of the Gospels.

Dei Verbum of Vatican II came out in 1965 (Dogmatic Constitution on Divine Revelation). It states that the Bible, as the source of divine revelation, is free of error, but is written by people using variety of literary genres, each of which must be evaluated for their veracity. The Constitution on Divine Revelation has given important and fruitful directions to the biblical movement in the Catholic Church.

The Interpretation of the Bible in the Church by Pontifical Biblical Commission came out in 1993. This offers an objective, balanced presentation on the present pluralism of exegetical methods, on the hermeneutical problem and on the characteristics of a Catholic interpretation of the Bible.

Verbum Domini (The Word of the Lord) by Pope Benedict XVI was released in 2010. This Apostolic Exhortation of His Holiness Pope Benedict XVI is a response to the 2008 Ordinary General Assembly of the Synod of Bishops, whose theme was The Word of God in the Life and Mission of the Church. One of the goals of the Synod was to review the implementation of the directives on Scripture found in the Second Vatican Council, especially its Dogmatic Constitution *Dei Verbum*, and to confront the new challenges of our day.

In modern times the set of concerns is often called the historical-critical method (diachronic approach). This approach takes as its primary task the understanding of the biblical text in its own time and on its own terms. The major concerns of Catholic biblical scholarship can be presented under ten headings: (1) Literary Criticism; (2) Textual Criticism; (3) The World of the Bible; (4) Word Study; (5) Source Criticism; (6) Redaction Criticism; (7) Form Criticism; (8) Historical Criticism; (9) Translations; (10) Hermeneutics.

Recent Developments

Today there is ecumenical development. The Second Vatican Council (1962-65) and the World Council of Churches have set the same in motion. Hence the use of the Bible in Protestant traditions and Catholic traditions is not discussed separately. When the *Dei Verbum* of Vatican II was formulated the process was informed to the World Council of Churches meet at Montreal. Hence there was an interchange of ideas. The interchange involved interrelated themes namely, canon and Church as well as Scripture and tradition. Both the themes deal with the relation between Bible and Church.³⁹

Due to ecumenical translations of the Bible the difference of canon of the Bible in different Churches is no longer a problem. When a Catholic edition of an ecumenical Bible is printed the deuterocanonicals are included. But there is possibility that the Protestants also read the deuterocanonical books of the Bible.

Protestants only started first the translation of the Bible into vernacular. Hence lay people could use the Bible more and more. In Dutch Protestantism Bible became the personal possession of the laity. But it had a negative effect. It led to 'Biblicism.' But due to ecumenical tendency the Bible is considered even in Protestantism as the Book of the Church.

The Protestant Churches insisted that for interpretation scripture alone was needed. But this led to individualistic appeals to the Bible and sectarianism. Hence the Protestant Churches had to write confessional statements as *summa scripturae*. As a matter of fact the Protestant Churches stood by *sola scriptura* only for a couple of decades. Thus, in the reformation Churches too, dogma and exegesis became mutually interrelated. Scriptural exegesis is considered legitimate if only it is in conformity with the dogma of the Church as *regula fidei*.⁴⁰

The modern historical critical research shows to the reformation Churches that we can no longer draw sharp lines separating Bible and tradition. There were oral and written traditions as well as post biblical traditions. Julius Wellhausen discovered that there were four written traditions (Yahwistic, Elohist, Priestly and Deuteronomistic traditions) in Pentateuch. And there were several stages in oral tradition too. Thus, the Church's essential role in biblical interpretation and the role of the traditions are realized now. The Bible always comes to us through the textual tradition of the Church. This does not mean that tradition prevails over the Bible, because the same tradition is under the authority of the Bible.⁴¹

We noted that there were different interpretations regarding Paul's teaching on justification and salvation. But now there is a change.

Paul's teaching on justification by faith in Christ (Rom 1:17; 3:21-4:25; Gal 2:15-3:14) became in the hands of Martin Luther, Calvin, and others (following Augustine) the theological basis of the Protestant Reformation. Martin Luther was convinced that people were being encouraged to expect to become acceptable to God by: fasting or performing other works of mortification; going on pilgrimages; entering religious orders and taking vows; becoming priests; confessing all their sins and receiving absolution; having the sacrifice of the Mass offered for themselves or others; as well as gaining indulgences. Luther thought this would lead to spiritual disaster. He was equally sure that the way in which human life comes to be meaningful, valuable, and acceptable in God's eyes is by grace alone, through faith *alone*, because of Jesus Christ alone. In Rom 3:28 Paul did not add the word 'alone.' Martin Luther only added '*allein*' (alone) in his German translation.

But some scholars insist that justification by faith should not be considered the centre of Paul's theology. It should not be also considered as an unessential doctrine. Justification by faith appears only in connection with

some controversy concerning the law and only where Paul bases an argument on the priority of Abraham's righteousness to his circumcision.

The teaching of Paul appears to be contradicted by James 2:18-26, which, like Paul, argues from the experience of Abraham and emphasizes Gen 15:6. James asserts that faith lacking works is dead (Jas 2:17). The contradiction is only apparent; Paul and James address different issues. James 2:18-26 was apparently written to counteract a misunderstanding of Paul's teaching which separated 'faith' from any moral obligation.

It's often stated that Catholics, by contrast to Protestants, believe that a mixture of faith and works is necessary for salvation. It should be noted, however, many Catholics believe their objection to "faith alone" has been misunderstood. They would say true faith can't actually be separated from works, and that Catholics agree that it is grace that gives salvation.

Pope Benedict XVI spoke about Luther's beliefs in 2008:

Luther's phrase 'faith alone' is true, if it is not opposed to faith in charity, in love. Faith is looking at Christ, entrusting oneself to Christ, being united to Christ, conformed to Christ, to his life. And the form, the life of Christ, is love; hence to believe is to conform to Christ and to enter into his love. So it is that in the Letter to the Galatians in which he primarily developed his teaching on justification, St Paul speaks of faith that works through love.⁴²

Protestants and Catholics have been able to find common ground on this issue in recent years. In 1999, Lutherans and Catholics officially reached a consensus on much of their beliefs about salvation.

Conclusion

Martin Luther and his followers of Reformation have contributed to the biblical interpretation that exists today not only in Protestantism but also in Catholicism. At a time when allegory was in its heights, the reformation

made the Bible to be understood in the right sense. But yet it went too far to hold the view that Scripture alone interprets itself. Catholics and Protestants agree on who Jesus is, but there are seven key issues which continue to distinguish their beliefs and practices: (1) The Magisterium; (2) Tradition; (3) Salvation and Grace; (4) The Eucharist; (5) Justification; (6) Priesthood of All Believers; (7) Veneration of the Saints and the Virgin Mary. Today due to ecumenical undertakings some of the differences are slowly vanishing, as we have noted. The role of the Church is recognized more regarding textual tradition. Question is asked if Dei Verbum expresses the critical function of Scripture in respect to every tradition of the Church in sufficiently unambiguous terms.⁴³ The Catholics have now learned to give more importance to Bible and to read the same. The Protestant way of spreading the Bible and Biblical knowledge is followed by Catholics too. For example, more copies are printed and almost all the Catholic families do have copies of Bible now. The Vacation Bible School (VBS) of Protestants is conducted by the Catholics too now. Several interactions are made between Catholics and Protestants regarding Bible. Besides ecumenical Bibles, most of the commentaries are now ecumenical ones. The Tamil ecumenical Bible came for the first time in 1995 and it is used till now, and immediately after the publication of the same the Tamil ecumenical Bible Commentary series is launched. All these show that there is a lot of exchange between Catholics and Protestants these days regarding Bible. There is 'give and take' between Catholics and Protestants. In fact Martin Luther himself developed the idea of *Sola Scriptura* regarding biblical interpretation from Church fathers such as St. Augustine, though St. Augustine thought that the Church gave the exact meaning of the text.

Footnotes

1. While Protestants only view the Scriptures as authoritative, the Catholic Catechism clearly states that “the Church, to whom the transmission and interpretation of Revelation is entrusted, does not derive her certainty about all revealed truths from the Holy Scriptures alone. Both Scripture and tradition must be accepted and honored with equal sentiments of devotion and reverence.” See Catechism of the Catholic Church (Bangalore: Theological Publications in India, 2012) no. 82; p. 22; DV no. 9.
2. The Magisterium of the Catholic Church is the Church’s authority or office to establish teachings.
3. Jean Levee, *The Bible, Word of God in Words of Men* (London & Dublin: Geoffrey Chapman, 1966) vii.
4. D. Stuart, “Exegesis” in *Anchor Biblical Dictionary*, Vol. 2 (New York: Doubleday, 1992) 682-688, 682.
5. Cf. David Jasper, *A Short Introduction to Hermeneutics* (Louisville & London: Westminster John Knox Press, 2004) 9-10.
6. “The word ‘hermeneutics’ comes from the Greek word *hermeneuô* which means ‘to explain, interpret, and translate.’” See Sebastian Kizhakkeyil & Kurian Ammanathukunnel, *A Guide to Biblical Studies* (Mumbai: St. Paul’s, 2008) 261. “Hermeneutics, then, is about ‘interpretation’ or even ‘translation,’ and especially the interpretation of sacred texts, which believers may understand as in some sense divinely inspired or ‘the word of God.’” See David Jasper, *A Short Introduction to Hermeneutics* (Louisville & London: Westminster John Knox Press, 2004) 7.
7. Quoted from David Jasper, *A Short Introduction to Hermeneutics* (Louisville & London: Westminster John Knox Press, 2004) 21.
8. Cf. Armando J. Levoratti, “How to Interpret the Bible” in *The International Bible Commentary*, eds. William R. Farmer et. al. (Bangalore: Theological Publications in India, 2000) 9-35.
9. “Typical sense is the deeper meaning of the “things” written about in the Bible when they are seen to have foreshadowed future “things” in God’s work of salvation.” See Raymond E. Brown & Sandra M. Schneiders, “Hermeneutics” in *The New Jerome Biblical Commentary*, eds. Raymond E. Brown et. al. (Bangalore: Theological Publications in India, 2011) 1146-1165, 1156.
10. David Jasper, *A Short Introduction to Hermeneutics* (Louisville & London: Westminster John Knox Press, 2004) 35-36.
11. Origen wrote: “The Scriptures contain the ultimate mystery which can never be expressed other than in symbols and symbols can never be properly understood when taken literally. Therefore only an allegorical approach can provide the key, which is needed to unlock the mystery hidden in the text.” Origen *Peri Archon* IV 2, 6, in Jeanrond, *Theological hermeneutics: Development and Significance* (London: Macmillan, 1991).

12. It is an elaborate allegorical interpretation of the first chapter of Genesis. Here, for example, the darkness, which God divided from the light (Gen 1:4), represents the soul still without God's light, while the plants given to humans for their food (v. 29) represent works of charity that nourish the soul.
13. Augustine's interpretation of the parable of the Good Samaritan from Luke's Gospel is found in *Questiones Evangeliorum*, II, 19: A certain man went down from Jerusalem to Jericho; Adam himself is meant; Jerusalem is the heavenly city of peace, from whose blessedness Adam fell; Jericho means the moon, and signifies our mortality, because it is born, waxes, wanes, and dies. Thieves are the devil, and his angels... The priest and Levite who saw him and passed by, signify the priesthood and ministry of the Old Testament, which could profit nothing for salvation. Samaritan means Guardian, and therefore the Lord Himself is signified by this name... The inn is the Church... The innkeeper is the Apostle (Paul)..."
15. Martin Luther was born on 10th November 1483 and he died on 18th February 1546. Luther studied at the University of Erfurt and in 1505 decided to join a monastic order, becoming an Augustinian friar. He was ordained in 1507, began teaching at the University of Wittenberg and in 1512 was made a doctor of Theology.
16. According to popular legend, Martin Luther nailed a copy of his "95 theses" to the castle church door of Wittenberg.
17. For Martin Luther the principle of sola scriptura (Scripture alone) is firmly established. Ultimately no other commentary is necessary, for Scripture is its own interpreter – scriptura scripturae interpres (Scripture the interpreter of Scripture) - and it is the source of all interpretation.
18. Other Reformers who were also significant interpreters and exegetes include Bucer, Oecolampadius, Heinrich, and Bullinger. All were similar in their exegetical principles to Luther and Calvin.
19. The message of the Lutheran and Reformed theologians has been codified into a simple set of five Latin phrases: Sola Scriptura (Scripture alone), Solus Christus (Christ alone), Sola Fide (faith alone), Sola Gratia (by grace alone) and Soli Deo Gloria (glory to God alone).
20. According to the reformers, salvation is entirely comprehended in God's gifts, dispensed by the Holy Spirit according to the redemptive work of Jesus Christ alone. According to them a sinner is not accepted by God on account of the change wrought in the believer by God's grace. The believer is accepted without any regard for the merits of his works, for no one deserves salvation.
21. It is said that Martin Luther worked two weeks in a butcher's shop before translating the book Leviticus, as it has several details of cutting the animals and birds for sacrifice.
22. Besides the 39 proto-canonical books the Catholics also have Judith, Tobith, Wisdom of Solomon, 1 & 2 Maccabees, Baruch and Sirach. Besides these they also have some additions in Esther and Daniel. These additions were perhaps written first in Greek.

23. See Brunner, 574; Long, 185-86; Gardner, 250-251. At least one author holds the view that Peter was perhaps a leader in the early Church till the events reported in Acts 12 and after which we hear about him only once in Acts (15:7). From chapter 13 of Acts Paul seems to be ascendant. But Peter went to Rome and died only after a decade.
24. In the history of the Church no other Pope was elected as long as the existing Pope lived, except in three instances, as in the case of present Pope who was elected as Pope Benedict XVI resigned. Again, the bishops all over the Catholic Church are appointed by the Pope only and they are not elected by other diocesan bishops, though they are normally consecrated by them.
25. See Catechism of the Catholic Church (Bangalore: TPI, 1994) no. 1333; p. 258.
26. Cf. Neil J. McEleney, "1-2 Maccabees" in the New Jerome Biblical Commentary, 446.
27. See Catechism of the Catholic Church (Bangalore: Theological Publications in India, 2012) 204.
28. Protestant thinkers argue that sanctification is completed or consummated by the moment of death. John Wesley, for example, taught that the perfection we seek in life is completed at "the instant of death, the moment before the soul leaves the body" (Brief thoughts on Christian perfection, 1767). This is backed up by such Biblical references as 1 Corinthians 15, where the raising of the dead in their already-perfected bodies is essentially instantaneous, and Jesus' words to the thief on the cross, "Today you will be with me in paradise" (Luke 23:43).
29. Jean Levie, *The Bible, Word of God in Words of Men*, 21-22.
30. See Jean Levie, *The Bible, Word of God in Words of Men*, 38.
31. See J. M. Robertson, 1900; P. Jenson, 1906; W. B. Smith, 1906; A Drews, 1909.
32. Raymond E. Brown & Sandra M. Schneiders, "Hermeneutics" in *The New Jerome Biblical Commentary* (Bangalore: TPI, 2011) p. 1156.
33. Vat II, "Divine Revelation," no. 11.
34. [Http://www.Catholicnewsagency.com/news/](http://www.Catholicnewsagency.com/news/). In 1950, Pope Pius XII proclaimed there was no opposition between evolution and Catholic doctrine. In 1996, St. John Paul II endorsed Pius' statement.
35. Someone goes to the extent of saying that the Catholics may in some decades reject Jesus as God.
36. The Bible speaks of offering tithes and Protestants seem to give much emphasis to the same. The Bible also forbids making idols for Yahweh. Hence some of the Protestants identify Catholics as idol worshippers as Catholics keep statues. But the Catholics have different viewpoints regarding such biblical texts. They take them in the historical perspective. There is a broader understanding among Catholics regarding these texts as they were historically conditioned.
37. Daniel Harrington, "Catholic Interpretation of the Bible" in *The Bible in the Churches*, eds. Kenneth Hagan et. al., (Collegeville: The Liturgical Press, 1985).

38. See Franz Van Segbroeck, "Two Centuries of Catholic Biblical Exegesis" in *The International Bible Commentary*, eds. William R. Farmer et. al., (Bangalore: Theological Publications in India, 2000) 70-72, 72.
39. Martien Brinkman, "Use of Bible in Catholic and Protestant Tradition" in *The International Bible Commentary*, eds. William R. Farmer et. al., (Bangalore: Theological Publications in India, 2000) 66-69.
40. Cf. J. Koopmans, *Het oudkerkelijk dogma in de Reformatie, bepaaldelijk bij Calvijn* (Amsterdam, 1983) 108.
41. Martien Brinkman, "Use of Bible in Catholic and Protestant Tradition" in *The International Bible Commentary*, eds. William R. Farmer et. al., (Bangalore: Theological Publications in India, 2000) 66-69. 68.
42. Pope Benedict XVI, Wednesday Audience, 19th November, 2008.
43. Martien Brinkman, "Use of Bible in Catholic and Protestant Tradition" in *The International Bible Commentary*, eds. William R. Farmer et. al., (Bangalore: Theological Publications in India, 2000) 66-69. 68.