

구약논단

제 16권 3호(통권 37집) 2010년 9월 30일

Cheon, Samuel(Hannam Uni.) Calvin and Calvinism's Biblical Interpretation in Korea	53
<p>본 논문은 한국의 근본주의적 성서해석의 뿌리와 역사를 고찰하고자 한다. 칼빈주의적 근본주의자들의 성서해석이 칼빈의 성서해석 방법과 내용에 일치하지 않는 이유를 제시한다. 이를 위해 개신교 스콜라주의, 스코틀랜드 현실주의, 미국 근본주의, 한국에 파송된 미국 장로교 선교사들의 신학, 그리고 한국 장로교회 성서해석의 역사 등을 살펴본다.</p>	
Cheon, Samuel Calvin and Calvinism's Biblical Interpretation in Korea	53

Calvin and Calvinism Biblical Interpretation in Korea¹⁾

Samuel Cheon
Hannam Universit

1. Introduction

The number of biblical scholars has been on the increase in Korea. They have completed their advanced degrees in North America and Europe as well as in Korea. Producing many books and articles, they have taught the Bible, biblical criticisms and interpretations through modern and post-modern interpretive methodologies. Nevertheless, biblical fundamentalism is still very strong among Korean churches. It gives influence upon teaching the Bible in their seminaries. Why is the biblical interpretation of American fundamentalism still very influential? Historically, it is very closely related to the biblical theology of Presbyterian missionaries in the early period of the Christian history in Korea.

One of the characteristics in the Korean Protestant church is that Presbyteri-

1) This paper has been supported by the 2010 Hannam University Research Fund.

anism is very influential. About 70% of Protestant population in Korea is Presbyterian. Most of them relate their identity to both John Calvin (1506-1564) and Calvinism. They consider the Protestant reformers teaching as their root and foundation. Non-Presbyterian churches in Korea cannot also disregard Calvin and Calvinism, because Presbyterian faith is dominant in Korean Christianity and their origin is directly or indirectly related to his Reformation.

Although Presbyterianism is prevailing in Korea, it is problematic whether Korean Presbyterians really follow Calvin's biblical interpretation or Calvinistic biblical fundamentalism.²⁾ While they have emphasized reading and studying the Bible, following Calvin's teaching of *Sola scriptura*, it is doubted whether they have interpreted the Holy Scripture in accordance with his interpretive method which was used in his biblical commentaries. The present article deals with a historical background of biblical fundamentalism in Korea and examines its views in the perspective of John Calvin's biblical interpretation. It also investigates in the cultural perspective of Korea the reason why Korean Christians have not easily rejected such biblical fundamentalism. This will be one of the reasons why Calvinistic biblical fundamentalism is still strong in Korean.

2. Missionaries Calvin and Calvinism

Presbyterian missionaries came from America, Australia, and Canada into Korea in the late nineteenth century. Even though they came from different churches, they cooperatively established one Presbyterian Church in Korea. They also operated one Presbyterian seminary together, participating in its faculty.³⁾ However, most of the influential faculty members in the seminary came from American Presbyterian churches. Of course, the theological tendency of other faculty members from Australia or Canada was little

2) Concerning the history of biblical interpretation in Korea, refer to Samuel Cheon, *Biblical Interpretation in Korea: History and Issues*, in *Ways of Being, Ways of Reading*, eds., Mary F. Foskett and Jeffrey Kah-Jin Kuan (St. Louis: Chalice Press, 2006), 31-44.

3) The seminary was originally founded by the Northern Presbyterians from America in 1901, but was recognized as their seminary by other three Presbyterian groups in 1905, when they organized one Presbyterian council.

different from that of Americans.

Presbyterian missionaries from America in the early period of Protestant mission to Korea were theologically trained in their denominational schools, including Princeton and McCormick. Their theological tendency was closely related to the Calvinism of Old Princeton School, which was led by the Protestant Scholastics such as Archibald Alexander(1772-1851), Charles Hodge (1797-1878), Benjamin Breckenridge Warfield(1851-1921) and J. Gresham Machen (1881-1937). Calling their theology as Reformed Scholasticism in America, Rogers and McKim summarize it as follows:

Princeton Seminary was founded in 1812 as the first American institution to train Presbyterian clergy. Systematic theology was taught according to the post-Reformation scholastic methodology of Francis Turretin. The theory of hermeneutics (biblical interpretation) was taken from the philosophy of Scottish realism. For over 100 years, the Princeton theologians uniformly predicated the authority of Scripture on its supposed form of inerrant words. The Bible became a source book on every area of knowledge including science and history. Statements in the Bible were treated like objects in nature. No trace of the central Christian notion of accommodation affected the Princeton theologians.⁴⁾

Old Princeton theologians followed a Reformed Orthodoxy theologian Francis Turretin(1623-1687). He developed the Protestant Scholasticism and occupied the chair of theology(1653-1687) in Geneva a century after Calvin's death.⁵⁾ To strengthen his contemporary Protestantism, he rested on Aristotle's philosophy and Thomas Aquinas' scholastic theology. However, unfortunately, such ideas were strongly rejected by John Calvin.

Turretin affirmed the authority of the Bible on the claim that it was not only verbally inerrant, but also inspired even in its Hebrew vowel points.⁶⁾ Considering the authority of the Scripture as the most important subject in

4) Jack B. Rogers and Donald K. McKim, *The Authority and Interpretation of the Bible: An Historical Approach* (Eugene: Wipf and Stock Publishers, 1999), 309.

5) Concerning Francis Turretin, refer to Rogers and McKim, 172-184.

6) The vowel points of the Hebrew Bible did not exist in the original manuscripts.

theology, he also declared that the Holy Spirit had dictated the words of the original Hebrew and Greek manuscripts. It means that he emphasized the form of Scripture rather than its content in order to confirm its authority. Turretin developed such scholastic doctrine of Scripture to make a rational defense of the Protestantism against Counter-Reformation Catholicism and other threats in the late seventeenth century, but his theory was not appropriate to the Reformation theory of accommodation for the biblical interpretation. Though he certainly departed from Calvin's stance, he was more like Thomas Aquinas than like John Calvin, the Augustinian-humanist Reformer.⁷⁾

Turretin's theology heavily influenced upon Old Princeton theologians in the nineteenth and early twentieth century.⁸⁾ Even though the works of Calvin and the Westminster Divines were available in English, they used Turretin's works in Latin as their schools standard textbook until Charles Hodges *Systematic Theology* replaced it in 1872.⁹⁾ Moreover, believing that his declaration was the same with Calvin's, they developed their doctrine of Scripture into a systematic whole according to Turretin's framework. Nevertheless, they always assumed that the foundation of their theology was first Scripture and second the Westminster Confession of Faith and Catechism.¹⁰⁾

It is no wonder that these Reformed Scholastics theologically influenced upon the Presbyterian missionaries who came from America to Korea in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century. The missionaries were trained according to such theological system that was considered as the standard of Presbyterian theology in America. Moreover, they came to Korea before the theological conflict in their home church and stayed in their mission field

7) Rogers and McKim, 187. Concerning Calvin's biblical interpretation, refer to David L. Puckett, *John Calvin's Exegesis of the Old Testament* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 1995); Calvin, John (1509-1564), in *Historical Handbook of Major Biblical Interpreters*, ed., Donald K. McKim (Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press, 1998), 171-179; Samuel Cheon, *The Bible and Science* (Daejeon: Gulnuri, 2008), 71-104; Randall C. Zachman, Gathering Meaning from the Context: Calvin's Exegetical Method, *Journal of Religion* 82 (2002), 1-26.

8) Concerning these theologians, refer to Rogers and McKim, 266-379.

9) Rogers and McKim, 268.

10) Rogers and McKim, 279.

during the 1920s when it reached its peak. Though the theological war was concluded with the General Assemblies rejection of Old Princeton theologians in 1929, it was almost impossible for the missionaries in Korea, as the students and teachers of the Protestant Scholasticism, to shift their theological stance into a different position. Accordingly, unsatisfying their home churches theological change, they continued to teach their theological tendency even after 1929 and recommended students to study in the Westminster Theological Seminary which Old Princeton theologians founded, rather than in the Princeton Theological Seminary which New Princeton theologians occupied.

Following Old Princeton theologians, the early Presbyterian missionaries in Korea taught that the Scripture was the only rule for the Christian faith and life, having the infallible, inerrant and verbal inspiration.¹¹⁾ They emphasized reading the Bible and keeping the way of life presented in the Scripture. For them, the Bible could not become the object of historical criticism so-called

Higher Criticism, but only that of textual criticism so-called Lower Criticism. That is, they thought that the Divine Word could not be treated by the secular interpretive method of historical criticism. For example, William Reynolds, a professor of the systematic theology in the seminary, insisted that the followers of modern theology and Higher Criticism were anti-Christians and apostates.¹²⁾

Presbyterians pre-critical view of the Bible corresponded to some extent with the traditional manner that Korean scholars used to read the ancient sacred texts of the contemporary Buddhism or Confucianism. Considering these religious texts as the most authoritative one, they read them in order to suggest social norms and philosophical concepts for ethical behavior and daily life. Especially Confucianism, which had strongly dominated in Korea for the past five hundred years, emphasized to read and memorize its texts literally rather than to criticize and interpret them in a new way. For Confucian scholars, to criticize the sacred words of the ancient Chinese sages, including

11) William D. Reynolds, one of the missionaries, asserted verbal inspiration rather than mechanical inspiration in his article, Theological Apology, *Sin-hak-ji-nam* 3 (1920/4), 75.

12) William D. Reynolds, Modern Theologies are apostates, *Sin-hak-ji-nam* 66 (1932/11), 6-11.

Confucius and Mencius whom they highly respected, was not allowed. In this respect, when the missionaries introduced the authority of the Scripture in the way of Reformed Scholasticism, it was natural that most Korean Christians, who were accustomed to Confucian custom, could easily accept such idea of the biblical authority.

Though it is agreed that the faculty in the Presbyterian seminary followed Reformed Scholasticism, it cannot be said that all the early Presbyterian missionaries in Korea had the same or similar theological stance. For example, some Canadian Presbyterians, including William Scott(1886-1979), criticized scholastic Calvinism's insistence of biblical literalism and inerrancy, and introduced biblical criticism so-called Higher Criticism such as the documentary hypothesis of the Pentateuch, rejecting the Mosaic authorship of it. Their view of the Bible and its interpretation was generally corresponded with that of Neo-Orthodoxy. Though they did not participate in the faculty of the Presbyterian seminary, they taught such view in a Christian meeting or Bible class in secondary schools.

The Neo-Orthodox Canadians had more freedom to transmit such theological tendency and biblical criticism, when they took the leadership of their mission society after the Presbyterian Church in Canada was merged into the United Church of Canada in 1925. Because of this, there was a conflict among the Canadian missionaries. When some of them left their mission district, new Neo-Orthodox missionaries came from the UCC. Their biblical criticism strongly influenced some Korean pastors and Christians in their mission district, who later led a theological tendency against fundamentalism and actively participated in a social movement for democracy.

To summarize, there were two kinds of views for understanding the Bible among the Presbyterian missionaries in the early period of Korean Christianity. One was Reformed Scholastic and the other was Neo-Orthodox. The former can be called Calvinist, whereas the latter Calvinian.¹³⁾ The former's teaching

13) Seong-Won Park, The Social and Economic Impact of John Calvin on the Korean Church and Society, *John Calvin Rediscovered: The Impact of His Social and Economic Thought*, eds., Edward Dommen and James D. Bratt (Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2007),

of the Bible, which consisted of its majority, made Korean Presbyterian's emphasize Christian faith based on the biblical knowledge, whereas it brought about the diffusion of biblical literalism in the church. On the other hand, by virtue of the letters teaching of the Scripture, Korean Presbyterians could not only receive modern theology and biblical criticism, but also conceive the flexibility of Christian faith and the possibility of diverse biblical interpretations. However, these two perspectives produced a serious theological conflict and churches division within the Presbyterian Church in Korea.

3. Presbyterians Conflict for Biblical Interpretation

Korean Presbyterians studied in the Presbyterian seminary at Pyongyang (now in North Korea) with its faculty members who were theologically oriented by Protestant Scholasticism in order to become a pastor. Most of its graduates followed their teachers biblical interpretation and theological tendency. Such fundamentalists also influenced Presbyterian lay people, and strictly pursued biblical literalism and verbal inspiration. However, some Korean Presbyterians went to theological schools in Japan or America that positively taught Neo-Orthodox theologians such as Emil Brunner and Karl Barth. When they returned to Korea, the debate of so-called Higher Criticism was launched. This issue whether the historical criticism should be accepted for biblical interpretation or not - was hotted in the Presbyterian Church during the 1930s-1950s, for which one Presbyterian Church in Korea was divided into four Presbyterian church bodies, as it was mentioned above.¹⁴⁾

For example, supporting the opinion of Association of Presbyterian Women in the Canadian mission district that women should be ordained, Rev. Chunbae Kim (1900-1985) argued in 1934 that such view should not be rejected by the General Assembly according to the biblical teaching. He

108.

14) Concerning this debate, refer to Ohsun Kwon, A Study of the Controversies in the Presbyterian Churches of Korea over the Historical Criticism of the Old Testament, (Ph.D. Dissertation of Hannam University, 2008).

presented in an article of a Christian newspaper that Paul's suggestion in I Corinthians 14: 34 the women should keep silent in the churches should be understood as a reflection of a local culture and custom 2,000 years ago, but not be literally applied into the Korean Church. However, arguing that the Bible was the truth in every time and place, the General Assembly judged him as both a destroyer of the Bible and a follower of the trend of the times. Since this conflict in 1934, Korean Presbyterians could not officially deal with the issue of women ordination for about 20 years. Some Presbyterian Churches in Reformed Scholasticism still do not allow women the ordination for a minister or elder.

Rev. Youngjoo Kim (1896-1950) rejected the Mosaic authorship of the Genesis in the Sunday Bible Study Textbook published in 1934. He presented that the Genesis included diverse ancient traditions such as myth, legend, and narratives. It meant that Moses did not write the book, but a later redactor collected its sources for it. The Presbyterian fundamentalists could not accept this view of biblical criticism. Accordingly, the General Assembly also judged him as a destroyer of the Scripture and one who insulted the authority of the Bible and Christ. When it recommended the dismissal of him from the ministry, he officially apologized to the assembly at the end.

Rev. JaeJoon Kim (1901-1987) published in 1934 an article about historical criticism of Immanuel in Isaiah 7: 14, where he rejected its Christological interpretation.¹⁵⁾ The biblical literalists understood that such interpretation would imply the rejection of the Christian doctrine for the Christ born by the Virgin Mary. They attacked him that he was trying to destroy the Divine Word and Orthodox Christian faith. Rev. Kim also participated in the Korean translation of Abingdon Bible Commentary. This one volume Bible commentary, which had been published by Abingdon Press, was translated into Korean by some Methodists and two other Presbyterians. The General Assembly raised a question of their participation, because the commentary used historical criticism. So the assembly claimed that they should apologize

15) Concerning him, refer to Samuel Cheon, *Jaejoon Kim* (Seoul: Salim, 2003).

for their work.

The scholastic missionaries and their followers strongly controlled the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church. Such Calvinistic fundamentalism lost their power in their home church in 1929, but continued to control the assembly in Korea. When a pastor positively presented his view of historical criticism so-called Higher Criticism, they strongly rejected such critical interpretation of the Scripture. When a minister did not follow their opinion, they menaced that his office of minister should be dismissed. Because of their threat, the historical criticism for the Bible was not presented in the Presbyterian Church in Korea for a long time.

Such rigid biblical literalism, however, produced the division of the Presbyterian Church. One group (called Ko-shin) was first separated in 1952 for the issue of the Japanese idol worship. Following the Scholastic missionaries, its leaders strongly rejected the Japanese Shrine Worship Participation under the Japanese Colonialism in order to keep literally the first commandment of the Decalogue in the Old Testament. Some of them, including pastors and lay people, were imprisoned for this rejection. Strong fundamentalistic missionaries, who followed the Old Princeton theologian J. Gresham Machen, supported this Presbyterian group.

Another group (called Ki-jang) was separated in 1953. Their opponents called it as liberalists. As the communists occupied the northern part of the Korean Peninsula in 1945, the students of the Presbyterian Seminary in Pyongyang, whom the Scholastic faculty trained, moved into the theological school in Seoul, where Rev. Jaejoon Kim was teaching historical criticism and modern theology with other pastors. Yet the newly transferred students, who followed biblical literalism, could not accept his theological instruction, and complained to the General Assembly, attacking him as a destroyer of the Bible. The assembly in 1952 decided to dismiss the ministry of Rev. Kim and his students who graduated from his seminary. It also withdrew the assemblies recognition of his seminary. It even tried to dismiss the Canadian missionary William Scott, for which the United Church of Canada was enraged against

American missionaries. Accordingly, Rev. Kim and his followers founded another Presbyterian Church. The UCC strongly supported them. Their contribution into Korean church and society is prominent in the two areas. One is that they introduced the contemporary progressive theology into Korea. The other is that they produced Minjung Theology and actively participated in the Democratic movement of Korea during the 1970s and 1980s. Their biblical interpretation can be marked as Calvinian rather than Calvinist.

Another group (called Hap-dong) was separated in 1959, rejecting the ecumenical movement initiated by the World Council of Churches. Though they insisted that they were the true followers of the Protestant Orthodoxy, most of the missionaries did not participated in their church. Later it was divided into many independent Presbyterian bodies that claimed themselves as Calvinistic Orthodoxy. With the group of Ko-shin, this Presbyterian Church still does not allow the ordination for women, but also the historical criticism for the Scripture.

Most missionaries remained in the group so-called Tong-hap. Relating to the New Princeton School, the denomination supported the ecumenical movement of the World Council of Churches. Its seminaries allowed historical criticism and modern theology to some extent. Nevertheless, its theological atmosphere was dominated by the inheritance of the Scholastic missionaries. Accordingly, sometimes a theological conflict was appeared. For example, one Southern Presbyterian missionary, Dr. Keith Renn Crim (1924-2000), was troubled by the General Assembly in 1966, because he taught in the Presbyterian Seminary that the story in the Book of Jonah was not a historical record, but a parable. Because of this, he was compelled to return to his home country at all.

The assembly also troubled the seminaries another Old Testament professor, Rev. Dr. Cyris Hee-suk Moon, for his interpretation of the Exodus story. He argued in his book of *Salvation History of God* (in Korean), published in 1973, that the numbers in the Book of Exodus could not be literally accepted. It meant that he openly rejected the biblical inerrancy and literalism that the scholastic missionaries and their followers pursued. However, the assembly did

not make a decision to discontinue his professorship and insist an interpretation of Exodus presented by the biblical fundamentalists. Yet it did not mean that the assembly officially accepted historical criticism, rejecting the biblical fundamentalism. Still now it has not clearly presented its opinion of biblical criticism.

Besides these four major Presbyterian churches, there are about 90 independent bodies that include Presbyterian in their church title. The numbers of churches that belong to these small sized Presbyterian bodies are not many, but most of them are related to the tradition of the conservative Presbyterianism. It means that majority of Presbyterians are still theologically scholastic and even fundamentalistic, although they call themselves evangelistic or evangelism. As the Presbyterian missionaries in Korea were separated into two groups, Korean Presbyterians were also divided into so-called liberal and conservative or Calvinian and Calvinist. The former followed Neo-Orthodox, but the latter the Protestant Scholasticism. Nowadays these two groups are related to the social or political ones of so-called leftists and rightists in Korean society.

4. Understanding and Misunderstanding of Calvin's Biblical Interpretation

As it is mentioned above, one of the reasons why Korean Presbyterians have been divided is related to their misunderstanding of Calvin's biblical interpretation. This incomprehension is based on the misinformation of Calvin that was delivered by scholastic missionaries. Still scholastic Presbyterians insist that the gospel and theology, delivered by the American scholastic missionaries, is the true gospel and theology. They consider their theology as Orthodoxy or conservative.¹⁶⁾ They label the historical criticism of Neo-Orthodoxy as liberalism or new theology, for which they make

16) Their arguments have been usually published in their journal of Shin-hak-ji-nam (in Korean). For example, Gyuchul Jung, Calvin's Inerrancy of the Holy Scripture 271 (2002), 186-206; Yonghwa Na, Calvinistic Evangelistic Theology and Korean Presbyterian Church, 268 (2001), 91-142. Eyhwan Kim, Calvin's View of the Holy Scripture, 152 (1971), 20-27.

confusion between the liberalism in the 19th century and the Neo-Orthodoxy in the 20th century. Why do they misunderstand Calvin's biblical interpretation?

First of all, scholastic Presbyterians identify Calvin's view of the Bible with that of Reformed Scholasticism in the seventeenth century. They think that Reformed Scholastics perspective of Calvin should not be disregarded even in this modern time. They consider the scholastics as his true interpreters and followers. Moreover, they regard Old Princeton theologians, whom American missionaries introduced, as true followers and developers of the Protestant Scholasticism. Accordingly, they believe that Calvin should be understood through the lens of such Reformed Scholasticism in order not to make a mistake or misunderstanding. They do not dare to oppose or criticize Reformed Scholasticism. They do not review its argument in a critical perspective to find out Calvin's. They just consider scholastic doctrines - biblical literalism, inerrancy and verbal inspiration - as Calvin's true instruction of the Bible. However, such doctrines are not Calvin's.

For Calvin, the Bible was not a historical or scientific book, but a book for our salvation and faith, reflecting the ancient culture and science. He indicated that some biblical statements were not agreed with his contemporary science. For example, Calvin knew that the moon was lesser than Saturn, though Genesis 1: 16 described that the former was greater than the latter. He also knew that the biblical description of the dome sky in Genesis 1: 6 - Let there be a dome in the midst of the waters, and let it separate the waters from the waters - was not coincident with his contemporary astronomy. In order to solve these problems, Calvin employed the principle of accommodation, which had been used as a theory of the biblical interpretation for a long time since Patriarchal theologians. That is, using human language and culture, God accommodated its knowledge to human beings capacity in order to deliver the message of salvation into all the peoples, including the ignorant and illiterate (*Institutes*, 1.13.1). It means that the biblical text should not be literally accepted, but interpreted in our contemporary situation, considering the

ancient authors culture and context, because the Word of God was accommodated into human beings feebleness.

Second, scholastic Presbyterians try to understand Calvin's biblical interpretation on the basis of his book, *the Institutes of the Christian Religion*, rather than on his biblical commentaries. They do not examine in detail how Calvin concretely interpreted the biblical text in his commentaries, but simply present some statements of the Bible in his *Institutes*. For example, Calvin argued in his *Institutes* 1.9.1, The author of the Scriptures cannot vary, and change his likeness. Such as he there appeared at first, such he will perpetually remain. On this basis, they emphasize that the author of the Scripture is the Holy Spirit and that it cannot change. It means that any biblical criticism cannot be applied into the biblical text, because it was perfectly written by God. They believe that the Holy Bible is inerrant. Actually, a Korean translation of that cited just above (*Institutes* 1.9.1), incorrectly presents like this, Since the author of the Scripture is the Holy Spirit, it cannot vary and change. They believe that it is well-fitted to the biblical text of 2 Timothy 3: 16: All scripture is inspired by God and is useful for teaching, for reproof, for correction, and for training in righteousness. They are using Calvin's *Institutes* and the Bible in order to confirm Reformed Scholastic faith and theology.

It is true that Calvin taught the divine authorship of the Bible. Through his *Institutes* and biblical commentaries, he insisted that the Spirit of God should be regarded as the author of the scripture. However, he also taught the human authorship of the Bible, in which its human authors characteristics were reflected.¹⁷⁾ For example, because of the literary style, he rejected the traditional view that Paul wrote the Epistle to the Hebrews. Calvin also indicated that there were stylistic differences among the prophets.

I confess that some of the prophets had an elegant and clear, even brilliant, manner of speaking whether you read David, Isaiah, and the like, whose speech flows sweet and pleasing, or Amos the herdsman, Jeremiah, and

17) Concerning Calvin's opinion of the biblical authorship, refer to David L. Puckett, 26-29.

Zechariah, whose harsher style savors of rusticity, that majesty of the Spirit of which I have spoken will be evident everywhere (*Institutes* 1.8.2).

He also mentioned that the intentions of the human authors were reflected in the Bible. For example, commenting on Genesis 1: 16, he argued that it reflected Moses' intention for teaching the ignorant people. If the astronomer inquires respecting the actual dimensions of the stars, he will find the moon to be less than Saturn; but this is something abstruse, for to the sight it appears differently, Moses, therefore, rather adapts his discourse to common usage.

It means that Calvin argued the dual authorship of the Bible. That is, the author of the scripture is not only the Spirit of God, but also human beings. For example, though Paul wrote his epistles in the New Testament, his writings ultimately came from God. Though the prophets in the Old Testament spoke their oracles, their messages ultimately came from the Spirit of God. Yet he did not explain how this dual authorship of the scripture could be true. He just held them in tension.¹⁸⁾

Third, Calvin has been usually dealt with by Presbyterian scholastic systematic theologians in Korea. They have presented Calvin's view of the Scripture in the perspective of systematic theology, emphasizing its divine authority and authorship. Though Calvin tried to become a biblical interpreter, they have attempted to present him as a systematic theologian. Their main text for understanding Calvin and his view of the Bible is his *Institutes*, but not his biblical commentaries. They are not concerning about his interpretive method that was used in his commentaries, but his some argumentations in his *Institutes* for the authority of the Bible as the Word of God. Because of this, it is misunderstood that Calvin would attempt a doctrinal interpretation of the Bible. Actually, most Presbyterian pastors think that Calvin supported Christological or Trinitarian interpretation of the biblical text.

However, Calvin rejected such biblical interpretation, because he thought it disregarded the literary and historical context of the text. For example, Genesis

18) David L. Puckett, 140.

3:15 (I will put enmity between you and the woman, and between your offspring and hers) was considered as the first prophecy of the Messiah since the period of the Church Fathers, who regarded the woman as Mary the mother of Jesus and hers as Christ. However, Calvin rejected such Christological interpretation of the text, presenting that hers meant the posterity of the woman generally. He considered such biblical interpretation as an ignorance of its literary context. He also rejected the traditional Christian view that the Hebrew language of *Elohim*, the plural form of *El*, should mean the Trinitarian God. Calvin also rejected many other examples that Korean Presbyterian pastors have used as doctrinal biblical interpretations in their preaching.

5. Conclusion

Calvin and his biblical interpretation were introduced into Korea by Presbyterian missionaries. On the one hand, American scholastic missionaries brought that of Old Princeton theologians. They considered the biblical literalism and inerrancy of the Protestant Scholasticism as Calvin's. They emphasized a strict legalistic Christian life, rejecting so-called secular things. Combining with Confucian legalism, Korean Calvinistic Presbyterians that followed such scholastic missionaries, tried to keep their instruction. That is, they prohibited alcohol, tobacco, popular songs in their daily life and they tried to maintain a pietistic and abstemious life style. They also tried to apply such biblical legalism into their social life. One of its examples was not to participate in Japanese Shrine Worship which Japanese imperialism compelled. It became a protest against Japanese colonialism upon the Korean Peninsula. However, such strict legalism caused Presbyterian churches division.

On the other hand, some Canadian Presbyterian missionaries introduced Calvin and biblical interpretation that Neo-Orthodox theologians presented. Rejecting the scholastic fundamentalism, they considered the historical criticism and modern biblical hermeneutics as a continuation of Calvin's tendency. Their fellow Korean Presbyterians, who followed their theological tendency, actively

participated in the democratic movement, the reunification movement of the Korean Peninsula, and the production of Minjung Theology, which were the result of their active biblical interpretation for their context. However, such Korean Presbyterians are not many.

Though Korean Presbyterian churches have been seriously divided for their biblical interpretation, they are not seriously struggling with the issue. Rather, seemingly they are avoiding a serious discussion of this problem because of their historical experience. Some believe that an open discussion of it would make another serious conflict among Presbyterian churches. Some believe that a conservative tendency of biblical interpretation would help the growth of their church. However, the facing problem is that the seventeenth century Protestant scholastic biblical interpretation cannot be maintained by the younger generation who are critically educated in a college or university. It is very difficult for them to accept biblical contents as a historical record or a scientific fact. In the perspective of a biblical scholar, a decline of the Protestant population in Korea is deeply related to its churches biblical interpretation.

6. Bibliography

- Cheon, Samuel, *Jaejoon Kim* (Seoul: Salim, 2003) (in Korean).
- Foskett, Mary F. and Jeffrey Kah-Jin Kuan, eds., *Ways of Being, Ways of Reading* (St. Louis: Chalice Press, 2006).
- _____, *The Bible and Science* (Daejeon: Gulnuri, 2008), p. 71-104 (in Korean).
- Dommen, E./J. D. Bratt(eds.), *John Calvin Rediscovered: The Impact of His Social and Economic Thought*, (Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2007).
- Jung, Gyuchul, Calvins Inerrancy of the Holy Scripture *Sin-hak-ji-nam* 271 (2002), p. 186-206 (in Korean).
- Kim, Eyhwan, Calvins View of the Holy Scripture, *Sin-hak-ji-nam* 152 (1971), p. 20-27 (in Korean).
- Kwon, Ohsun, *A Study of the Controversies in the Presbyterian Churches of Korea over the Historical Criticism of the Old Testament* (Ph.D.

- Dissertation of Hannam University, 2008) (in Korean).
- McKim, D. K.(ed.), *Historical Handbook of Major Biblical Interpreters* (Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press, 1998).
- Na, Yonghwa, Calvinistic Evangelistic Theology and Korean Presbyterian Church, *Sin-hak-ji-nam* 268 (2001), p. 91-142 (in Korean).
- Puckett, D. L., *John Calvins Exegesis of the Old Testament* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 1995).
- Reynolds, W. D., Theological Apology, *Sin-hak-ji-nam* 3 (1920/4), p. 75 (in Korean).
- _____, Modern Theologies are apostates, *Sin-hak-ji-nam* 66 (1932/11), p. 6-11 (in Korean).
- Rogers, J. B. and Donald K. McKim, *The Authority and Interpretation of the Bible: An Historical Approach* (Eugene: Wipf and Stock Publishers, 1999).
- Zachman, R. C., Gathering Meaning from the Context: Calvins Exegetical Method, *Journal of Religion* 82 (2002), p. 1-26.

Key word

Calvin
Calvinism
Fundamentalism
Biblical Interpretation in Korea
Protestant Scholasticism

투고일: 2010년 7월 2일
심사일: 2010년 7월 15일
게재확정일: 2010년 8월 1일