



Answering Roman Catholic Objections Canon & Sola Scriptura

A quick guide for live conversation. Each spot follows the same four beats: **what they say, the trick hidden in it, what you say back, and a short line to remember.** Stay calm, agree with whatever is actually true, and only push back on the one hidden assumption. Technical terms are kept in, but each is defined in plain words the first time it shows up, so the sheet works whether your opponent is a parish layman or a seminary-trained apologist.

QUICK GLOSSARY (the terms that keep coming up)

- **Sola Scriptura (Scripture alone):** the teaching that Scripture is the only *infallible* rule of faith, the final standard everything else answers to. It does not mean the only authority of any kind; creeds, councils, and teachers all have real but secondary authority.
 - **Canon:** the official list of which books belong in the Bible (from a Greek word for "measuring rule").
 - **Infallible:** unable to be wrong. **Fallible:** able to be wrong.
 - **Magisterium:** the official teaching authority of the Roman Catholic Church (the pope and bishops in union with him).
 - **Ex cathedra:** Latin, "from the chair." A pope teaching ex cathedra is making a formal, binding definition that Catholics regard as infallible.
 - **Recognition vs. constitution:** *recognizing* something means spotting a fact already true; *constituting* it means creating that fact.
 - **Material vs. formal sufficiency:** *material* sufficiency means Scripture *contains* (at least in seed form) everything needed for salvation; *formal* sufficiency means Scripture can also *function as the rule* on its own, clearly enough to be used without an outside infallible interpreter. Modern Catholics often grant the first and deny the second.
 - **Dogma:** an official teaching the Church declares binding and required to believe.
 - **Indefectibility vs. infallibility:** *indefectibility* means the Church as a whole will never completely fail; *infallibility* means a particular office cannot teach error. The first does not require the second.
 - **Deuterocanon:** the "second canon," the extra Old Testament books in the Greek Bible that Catholics accept and Protestants call the Apocrypha.
 - **Development of doctrine:** the idea (associated with Cardinal Newman) that teachings grow clearer over time while staying faithful to the original deposit.
-

START HERE: They almost always run the same play

Where the Orthodox press a "you can't account for anything without our Church" argument, the Roman Catholic move is usually an **infallibility argument**: "*Without an infallible Magisterium (official teaching authority) you have no certainty, no principled unity, and no way to know your canon or settle disputes. We supply the infallible interpreter the system requires. You don't.*" The buried premise is that the Christian faith *requires* a living infallible interpreter, and that anything less collapses into chaos or mere private opinion.

Your default reaction: Make them actually *prove* that an infallible interpreter is necessary, instead of assuming it. Then show that adding one doesn't deliver what's promised. Interpreting, disagreeing, and ordinary fallible judgment all reappear one floor up, at "which church, which rulings are ex cathedra (formally binding), what did this council mean." The infallible interpreter relocates the problem; it doesn't solve it.

Say this in your own words again and again: **"You haven't shown an infallible interpreter is even necessary. And even if you had one, you'd still have to interpret him, with your own fallible mind, to use him at all. So the certainty you're selling never actually arrives."**

SITUATION 1 - "Show me the verse that says 'Scripture alone'"

What they say: "Sola Scriptura refutes itself. If Scripture is your only rule, point to the verse that teaches that. It isn't there. By its own standard, the doctrine fails."

The trick: Getting you to hunt for one single proof-text, then declaring victory when no one sentence spells it out word for word.

What you say:

1. Deny the test is fair. No ultimate authority can validate itself with a single internal sentence without circularity. The Constitution would be the highest law even without Article VI saying so. Demanding self-proof from a foundational standard is rigged.
2. Turn the same test on them: "Show me the verse that says the bishop of Rome is infallible when he teaches ex cathedra on faith and morals." Matthew 16:18 says nothing about future popes, ex cathedra definitions, or infallibility. Papal infallibility (defined in 1870 at the First Vatican Council) is a cumulative case built from several passages plus history, exactly the kind of case they just said disqualifies you.
3. State plainly what your view actually is: Sola Scriptura is a *cumulative* case (the unique, once-for-all apostolic office; Christ's commissioning of the apostles; Scripture being "God-breathed" and equipping fully, 2 Tim 3:16-17; Jesus settling disputes with "it is

written"; the Bereans praised for checking Paul against Scripture, Acts 17:11). It was never a one-verse claim.

Line to remember: *"We both hold cumulative cases, not one-verse proofs. If 'show me the verse' sinks me, it sinks papal infallibility right along with me. So the real question is which case is better grounded."*

SITUATION 2 - "Without the Church you couldn't even know the canon"

What they say: "You got your table of contents from the Catholic Church. The Church gave you the Bible. So the Church's authority comes first, and you're sawing off the branch you're sitting on."

The trick: Sliding from "you learned the canon through the church" to "the church outranks Scripture and *constituted* the canon."

What you say:

1. Recognition versus constitution (spotting a fact versus creating it). The church recognized which books were apostolic. It didn't make them apostolic. A jeweler certifies a real diamond without creating its worth. A coroner identifies the body without making the man dead.
2. Epistemic dependence (needing a witness to *learn* a fact) is not the same as that witness having authority *over* the fact. You learn your birthday from your mother. She has no authority to change it.
3. The antilegomena (the long-disputed books like 2 Peter, James, Jude, Revelation) prove it: the church didn't decree the list shut by fiat. It weighed the evidence (authorship, antiquity, *catholicity* meaning acceptance across the whole church) for generations. That's fact-tracking, not fact-making. A body that truly *constituted* the canon could have ended the debate in an afternoon.
4. The non-circular ground: the books carry their weight because they are apostolic, and the church recognized that through ordinary historical tests. Athanasius listed the 27 in his Festal Letter of 367, before the councils of Hippo (393) and Carthage (397). The recognition was basically complete before any council "gave" anyone anything.

Line to remember: *"The Church didn't give the Bible its authority. Christ did, through the apostles. The Church was the witness that recognized it, the way a court recognizes a will it didn't write."*

SITUATION 3 - "Sola Scriptura caused 30,000 denominations"

What they say: "Scripture alone breeds endless division, tens of thousands of denominations, all waving the Bible. With no living Magisterium, you have no principled way to tell orthodoxy from heresy. Our unity proves our system works. Your chaos proves yours doesn't."

The trick: Two traps. First, the inflated denomination number. Second, getting you to agree that people *disagreeing about a text* proves the text can't be an authority.

What you say:

1. The number is inflated (it counts independent congregations, not distinct theologies), but don't lean on that. Grant that real disagreement exists and answer the serious version.
2. Interpretive diversity doesn't disprove a textual standard anywhere else. Lawyers argue endlessly about the Constitution. That doesn't mean it isn't the highest law. If disagreement disqualified a text as a standard, no text in any field could be a standard.
3. Their unity is overstated. Catholics disagree sharply about grace and free will, about what the Second Vatican Council meant, about the limits of papal authority, about social teaching. At that very council the bishops were openly split, and the draft document on revelation (called *Dei Verbum*) was rejected on the floor and rewritten. An infallible Magisterium didn't even produce agreement about its own documents.
4. Having a *principled* standard (a real, reasoned test) doesn't require a *procedurally final* one (a court that ends every argument). Sola Scriptura supplies a real criterion: the reading that best fits the apostolic text, coheres with the whole canon, and matches the broad early understanding. That's how Arianism (the fourth-century denial that the Son is fully God) was actually defeated, by showing what the text could and couldn't bear, not by an office silencing everyone.
5. Note where Protestants *do* converge: the ecumenical creeds and the core gospel, exactly the things most clearly grounded in the text. The divisions cluster around genuinely hard, less-clear passages, which points to interpreting being hard, not to the standard failing.

Line to remember: "An infallible interpreter hasn't given you unity. Your own theologians can't agree on what the Second Vatican Council meant. You've relocated the disagreement, not removed it."

SITUATION 4 - "You need an infallible interpreter; the Magisterium only serves the Word"

What they say: "Even granting the canon, someone must interpret it. Our own document *Dei Verbum* says the Magisterium is 'not above the word of God but serves it.' We're not over Scripture. We're its servant and authentic interpreter. You have no such interpreter, so you're left with private judgment."

The trick: The "servant" framing sounds humble. If you accept it at face value, the Magisterium looks like a neutral referee instead of a second authority competing with Scripture.

What you say:

1. Grant that interpretation is needed, by everyone, for every authoritative text. The real question is whether it requires one *infallible institutional* interpreter whose rulings can never themselves be checked. That has to be *argued for*, not assumed as the obvious fix.
2. Press the "servant" claim right where it breaks: that same document also reserves "the task of authentically interpreting the word of God" to the Magisterium *alone*. So the Magisterium decides both what the Word teaches *and* whether its own interpretations are faithful to it. A trustee who alone gets to say what the trust deed means is not really the deed's servant. He's its master in practice, whatever the label says. A servant nobody can ever check against the master is the master in fact.
3. The relocation point: an infallible interpreter doesn't end interpretation. Now you have to interpret *the interpreter*. Which statements are *ex cathedra* (formally binding)? What did Trent or Vatican II actually require? Catholics dispute exactly these, so the same "wax nose" problem (a ruling bent to fit whatever the reader wants) reappears one floor up, now hidden behind institutional claims instead of out in the open.
4. The very making of *Dei Verbum* shows it: the document meant to define the Scripture-and-Tradition relationship took four years and open conflict, and Catholic scholars *still* read it in opposite ways. The cure displays the disease.

Line to remember: "A servant you can never check against the master is just the master wearing a servant's name tag. And you'd still have to interpret him, with your own fallible mind, before he could help you at all."

SITUATION 5 - "The real issue is formal sufficiency, not material sufficiency"

What they say: "Careful Catholics don't deny that Scripture contains, at least implicitly, everything needed for salvation. The theologian Yves Congar granted that *material* sufficiency. What we deny is *formal* sufficiency, that Scripture can function as the rule on its own without an outside infallible interpreter. You keep attacking material insufficiency, which we've abandoned. You never establish formal sufficiency, which is the real question."

The trick: This is their sharpest move. They concede ground to look fair, then narrow the fight to a point you may not have prepped, hoping you keep swinging at the position they already dropped.

What you say:

1. Grant the distinction is real and that they've stated it well. (Material sufficiency: it's all in there. Formal sufficiency: it's clear enough to use as the rule on its own.) That earns credibility and shows you know the literature. Then pick up the actual burden: defend *formal* sufficiency directly.
2. Define formal sufficiency correctly so you're not knocking down a straw man. It does *not* mean "every verse is instantly obvious." It means the rule of faith, what must be believed and done, is reachable through the text by ordinary means: grammar, context, letting clearer passages light up harder ones, with creeds and teachers as *ministerial* (serving, secondary) guides underneath. A well-drafted statute guides conduct without a supreme court whispering in your ear, even if rare hard cases need an expert.
3. Turn their standard back on them: if formal sufficiency has to mean "settles every dispute with zero remainder," then nothing meets that bar, including the Magisterium, since Catholics *still* argue about which rulings are ex cathedra and what Vatican II settled. An infallible interpreter doesn't remove interpretation; it relocates it. So the bar they set for Scripture is one their own system can't clear.
4. History clinches it: the church actually settled its great controversies by showing what the apostolic text could and couldn't bear. Athanasius argued from Scripture against Arius. The Council of Chalcedon gave reasons drawn from the text. Councils presented themselves as declaring what Scripture already taught. That's formal sufficiency *operating*, centuries before Rome claimed an infallible interpretive office.
5. The sting: once they grant *material* sufficiency, the Marian dogmas (such as the Immaculate Conception and the Assumption) and papal infallibility get *harder* to defend, not easier. If everything needed is already in Scripture at least implicitly, then teachings the text never states, never implies, and whose denial it doesn't exclude start to look like *additions* to the deposit, not implicit content drawn out. The concession that sets up the objection tightens the noose on their own later doctrines.

Line to remember: "You've set a bar, 'resolve every dispute with nothing left over,' that your own Magisterium can't clear, since you still argue over what it has even said. Meanwhile the text did the work in the great councils long before Rome claimed to."

SITUATION 6 - "Sola Scriptura means Christ abandoned His Church (ecclesial deism)"

What they say: "On your view Jesus founded the Church and then let it teach error for centuries until the Reformation rode in to save the gospel. That's *ecclesial deism*, treating Christ like an absentee god who walks away. It denies the gates of hell won't prevail (Matt 16:18) and the Spirit guiding the Church into all truth (John 16:13)."

The trick: Getting you to admit you think the gospel was *lost*, or that "the Church" has to mean one visible institution.

What you say:

1. Distinguish *indefectibility* (the Church as a whole never completely fails, because a faithful remnant always holds the gospel, which you affirm) from *infallibility* (one particular office is divinely shielded from ever erring, which you deny). The first does not require the second. Matthew 16:18 promises the Church won't be destroyed, not that a particular See never errs.
2. The gospel was never lost. It was preserved, taught, and believed across the centuries even where institutional practice drifted. The promises held *through those faithful to the apostolic testimony*, not through an impeccable office. In the Arian crisis the gates didn't prevail, not because an office was infallible, but because the truth survived in the faithful even when much of the leadership had wandered.
3. *Tu quoque* (Latin for "you too," turning their objection back on them), and make it sharp: the Catholic must explain his own church's admitted centuries of grave institutional failure. The simony (buying and selling of church office) that forced the Gregorian reforms. The Avignon papacy. Above all the Western Schism, when two and then three rival men each claimed to be the true pope and excommunicated the others. Their answer, that "indefectibility doesn't mean every officeholder is preserved from grave failure," is, stated plainly, *your* distinction.
4. Get ahead of the comeback: if they say "the Council of Constance resolved the schism, so the system worked," point out that the fix required *a council to depose sitting popes*. That raises the question Catholicism never fully settled: when a council and a pope conflict, who is final? Conciliarism (the view that a council outranks the pope) said the

council; later papalism said the pope and condemned the conciliarist reading. That's improvising under crisis, not a smoothly running infallible office.

5. The forward-looking turn, your strongest ground: "If the Church could err for centuries without noticing, how does any Catholic today know his own tradition isn't off course right now? The Protestant principle of *semper reformanda* (Latin, 'always reforming') builds in the safety check: always measuring against a fixed external standard that can catch the error. Your claim that the Church can't err *right now* is the one thing that can't be checked against anything outside itself."

Line to remember: *"I'm not saying the gospel got lost. I'm saying it was preserved by the faithful, not guaranteed by an office. And your own Western Schism, three men each claiming Peter's chair, is the problem your view has to explain, not mine."*

SITUATION 7 - "You accept Nicaea but reject our developments. By what principle?"

What they say: "Doctrine develops over time. You accept the Trinity and Chalcedon, which were defined centuries later, but you reject the Immaculate Conception and papal infallibility. You have no principled way to allow the development you like and reject the development you don't. We do: the living Church." (This is Cardinal Newman's *development of doctrine* argument.)

The trick: Their strongest intellectual challenge. The trap is being forced into either rejecting *all* development (and losing the Trinity) or accepting *all* of it (and losing the debate). Don't accept that either-or.

What you say:

1. Grant that doctrine does develop, growing clearer over time. Protestants don't deny it. The real question is the *criterion* for legitimate versus illegitimate development, and you have a principled one.
2. State the criterion: a genuine development *makes clearer what the apostolic text already teaches and what the text excludes denying*; an illegitimate one *adds content the text neither states nor implies, and whose denial the text doesn't exclude*. Picture an engineer reading the blueprint correctly versus an architect adding a wing that was never in the plans.
3. Apply it. Nicaea and Chalcedon pass: the full divinity of Christ (John 1:1; 20:28; Col 2:9), his real humanity, and his pre-existence are demonstrably *in* the text, and the text excludes denying them. The councils gave their reasons *from* the text. The Marian

dogmas and papal infallibility fail: no canonical author teaches them, no early father teaches them, and the text doesn't exclude denying them.

4. Turn Newman's own seven criteria against the later doctrines. His "conservative action on the past" requires that a development not contradict what came before, yet Augustine's view that Mary was not sinless cuts against the Immaculate Conception rather than preparing for it. His "chronic vigour" (sustained, lasting strength) requires steady universal conviction, yet both Marian dogmas were defined only after centuries of *Catholics themselves* disputing them. Run Newman's framework honestly and it embarrasses the doctrines it was built to defend.
5. On papal infallibility specifically: the early church saw bishops of Rome corrected by councils and other bishops. Cyprian, backed by the African and Asian bishops, openly opposed Rome's Bishop Stephen over rebaptism and plainly did not treat him as infallible.

Line to remember: *"My principle is simple: does the apostolic text teach it, and does the text exclude denying it? Trinity yes, Marian dogmas no. That's not arbitrary. And Newman's own criteria, applied honestly, hurt those doctrines more than they help them."*

SITUATION 8 - "You changed the Bible: the Deuterocanon"

What they say: "You removed seven Old Testament books at the Reformation, books Christians had used for over a thousand years. You're the innovators. Yours is the truncated Bible."

The trick: Casting you as the one who *changed* a settled canon, and conflating the disputed Old Testament *Deuterocanon* (the extra Greek-Old-Testament books, which Protestants call the Apocrypha) with the New Testament, which everyone shares.

What you say:

1. Separate the New Testament from the Old. The 27 New Testament books are shared across all three traditions. The dispute is only about the Old Testament Deuterocanon, a genuine historical question, not a crisis for Scripture itself.
2. Reverse the "innovator" charge. Rome made the Deuterocanon binding *dogma* (required, official teaching) at the Council of Trent in 1546, *reacting to the Reformation*. That was the first dogmatic settlement of the question. Before Trent the books held a recognized but secondary status. Jerome (who produced the Vulgate, the standard Latin Bible) called them useful "for edification" but not "for confirming the authority of ecclesiastical dogmas," and classed them as apocrypha. Rufinus said the same. The Reformers sided with Jerome and the Hebrew canon against a later expansion. So the dogmatic *change* ran toward Rome, not away from it.

3. Jesus endorsed the Hebrew canon's own structure: "the Law of Moses, the Prophets, and the Psalms" (Luke 24:44). That tracks the Hebrew Bible, not the larger Greek collection. The Deuterocanon falls outside that structure.
4. If they cite the councils of Hippo (393) and Carthage (397) affirming the longer Old Testament: grant it candidly, but note those same councils were mostly registering the New Testament consensus that already existed. On the Old Testament they endorsed regional practice over the Hebrew canon, which is exactly why it stayed genuinely disputed until Trent had to make it dogma. Consistency means applying the same criteria, not rubber-stamping every single conciliar decision wholesale.

Line to remember: *"We kept the Old Testament Jesus used. Rome made the longer list binding dogma in 1546, reacting to us. If anyone 'changed' the canon, the dogmatic change ran your direction."*

HOW TO CARRY YOURSELF (drill this rhythm)

When you feel cornered, come back to the same anchors every time:

1. **Recognition, not constitution.** The Church found the canon. It didn't found it.
2. **Necessity unproven.** They have to *show* an infallible interpreter is required, not assume it. They never discharge that burden.
3. **The problem relocates, it doesn't resolve.** Add an infallible interpreter and you must still interpret *him*, which councils, which definitions, what they meant, with the same fallible judgment. Catholics dispute exactly these. The certainty gets promised, then deferred.
4. **Their own concession costs them.** Granting material sufficiency makes the later doctrines look like additions. Granting their admitted institutional failures (the Western Schism) hands you the very distinction you've been making between indefectibility and infallibility.

The one key under all of it: **Roman Catholicism sells certainty, but the certainty never actually arrives, because you reach the Church by fallible reasoning, and then you apply its rulings by fallible interpretation, at every step. An infallible interpreter you must still interpret on your own is not the cure for private judgment. It's private judgment with an extra layer on top.**

Stay relaxed. Freely concede what's true: texts need interpreting, the church genuinely bore witness, doctrine does develop, Scripture is meant to be read in the company of the church. Refuse exactly one thing: the unproven premise that the faith *requires* a living, infallible interpreter. That one premise is the whole Roman case.