

THE
CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN.

No. IV.—APRIL, 1879.

THE BIBLE A LAW FOR NATIONS.

THAT Church and State are both Divine institutions, and that each occupies a sphere, in an important sense, separate from and independent of the other, are truths that are now very generally accepted among all classes of Presbyterians.

That Christ is the Head of the Church, Her King and Lawgiver, in some sense, is universally admitted in theory, however imperfectly exemplified in practice.

That Christ is also King of kings and Lord of lords, that is, King of nations as well as of the Church; and that the Bible is the law of nations as well as the law of the Church, are truths that are now become prominent, and that seem to demand special emphasis.

As different planets revolve around the same central sun, each in its own separate sphere guided and controlled by the same law; so Church and State, having different spheres, are nevertheless both subordinate to Christ, and subject to the law which He has given for the guidance and control of each.

The Scriptures are not only a rule of faith, but a rule of practice as well. They teach us not only what to believe, but also what to do; not only our duty to God, but our duty to man. There is no sphere of human conduct exempt from their control; no relation in which man can be placed in which he may act independently of their claims.

From this it follows that all organisations of men, as such, are bound and controlled by the same law—not only the individuals composing these organisations, but the organisations themselves, as moral entities or legal personalities. A bank, a railroad, a joint-stock company of any kind, has a legal existence of its own, and, as such, is as much bound by the law of God in its corporate capacity as are the individuals composing it.

The current saying that “corporations have no souls,” is not only thoroughly false in the sense in which it is used, but embodies a principle

the epistle was more likely to attain its end when all these were included in its scope than it would have been if addressed to but one. We know that in Paul's time the Church of Ephesus, to which the first of the seven epistles is addressed, had many elders or bishops (Acts xx. 17); and one great element of power in the apostle's touching address to them lay in the fact that he made his appeal not to one only, but to the soul and conscience of each.

So far, therefore, as we have the means of knowing anything of the mind of our Lord on the government of His Church, we believe that our arrangements are adapted to carry out His will. But we revert once more to the principle with which we started. In the view of Christ, forms have no value except as the natural and suitable expressions of the living spirit within. It is the holy, generous, loving spirit of our Master that alone shows the grace of heaven; of all else we may say as the apostle said, "Though I speak with the tongues of men and angels, and have not charity, I am become as sounding brass and a tinkling cymbal."

W. G. BLAIKIE.

THE BIBLE-REVISION COMMITTEES.

NO topic can be more suitable for discussion in the pages of the new journal which aims to represent Catholic Presbyterianism, than the new revision-movement, affecting, as it does, the rights and faith of all Christians who use the authorised English version. The Editor has done well in introducing the matter into the first number. The revisers, of course, recognise the right of all English-speaking Protestants to have their convictions as to the revision respected,—so far as they are well founded; as they doubtless regard themselves as the servants, and not the masters, of the Church, in their critical labours. The writer therefore does not deem any apology necessary for recommending to their attention a few obvious points for emendation, now that the approaching completion of their work will soon end the opportunity to exercise his right. If there is to be a revision, it ought to be as near perfection as possible. It is probable, indeed, that the accurate scholarship, and impartial equity of the revisers, have already prompted their inclusion of all these points. But the suggestions will be ventured, as Solomon assures us that "in the multitude of counsellors there is safety."

1. In translating names of coins, measures and weights, the Authorised Version has sometimes transliterated the original name; as "talent" (Matt. xviii. 24). In other cases, instead of exactly translating, they have substituted the name of some English coin, supposed to be nearly an equivalent in purchasing power. They are justified in this by the fact, that had a word been found (or invented) in English, to express exactly the quantity of silver in the ancient coin, the great change in the purchasing power of the precious metals, since Bible times, would

render their accuracy inaccurate to the popular reader. Thus, their equivalent for the word *δηνάριον* is, everywhere, "a penny." In A.D. 1600, when the yield of the American mines had not yet depreciated silver, the time was recent at which the English penny had a purchasing power not so unequal to that of the *δηνάριον*. It is wholly otherwise now. The Bible coin was the usual price of a day's work of the common labourer. Now it sounds to the common reader preposterous to read of able-bodied men as freely bargaining (Matt. xx.) with a householder at "a penny a-day." If the plan of our present version is to be followed, it would be better to substitute "a shilling;" for although that coin contains more of the precious metal than the *δηνάριον*, it comes nearer expressing the state of the case.

2. A much more important amendment is, the correct rendering of the words *οἶκός* and *οἶκία*, in their tropical sense. The proper distinction is fatally slurred and lost by the promiscuous renderings of our version. In the literal meaning, the *οἶκός*, as a building, was the tenement occupied by the parents and their children proper; while the *οἶκία* was the whole premises or curtilage, inclusive of outhouses and dependants' lodgings. In the tropical sense, the *οἶκός* was the *family* proper, the parents and their own children; the *οἶκία* was the household, including the servants, retainers, &c. Thus, in Acts xvi. 31, 32, both words are translated "house." In 1 Cor. i. 16, *οἶκόν* is translated "household;" and thus Paul is made to say that he baptised Stephanas' slaves and dependents on their master's faith, a thing he never meant to say. Again, in 1 Cor. xvi. 15, *οἶκία* is translated "house;" and thus, again, the apostle is made to say what he did not say; that Stephanas' children "addicted themselves to the ministry of the saints," when, in fact, his children were probably young, and the persons who served the Christian cause were his "*household*," his converted dependants. If one would examine the exact and lucid narrative of Luke, in Acts xvi. 24-37, he would see how accurately that educated Greek scholar and inspired historian observes the discrimination. The *οἶκία*, in its architectural sense, is, all through, the premises, or prison-curtilage, containing the captain of the prison, his turnkey, slaves, and prisoners. The *οἶκία*, in its architectural sense, is the special tenement inhabited by the captain's own family; and, in the tropical sense, it is his family proper. Neither he nor Paul and Silas are outside the *οἶκία* during the whole narrative (see vers. 28, 37). Yet (ver. 29) the alarmed captain "rushed in:" whither? From his own *οἶκός* to the *οἶκία*. The gospel promise is, "Believe, and thou shalt be saved (ver. 31), and thy family" proper; his own children, *οἶκός*; and this is the body which was then baptised upon his faith. But the apostle then preaches the Gospel to all in the *οἶκία* (ver. 32); that is to say, to all the temporarily liberated prisoners, to the turnkeys, slaves, and whole inhabitants of the prison-curtilage. Then (ver. 34) the two missionaries, who had not been for one instant outside the *οἶκία*, are taken into the captain's *οἶκός*, to receive refreshments! Is

it not plain that Luke intends his special, family apartment? Let this mischievous confusion, then, be removed; let *οίκος* be always "house," and *οικία* always "household," when used in the tropical meaning.

3. One of the principles laid down for their own regulation by the revisers, is the removal of such *archaisms* in our English version as have occurred in the lapse of 270 years, through the *flux* of meaning, to which some words in all languages are subject. They instance the precept, *μηδὲν μεριμνᾶτε* (Phil. iv. 6), now rendered, "be careful for nothing" [or the similar one of Matt. vi. 31: "take no thought"]. In the year 1600, the English words, "care," "thought," actually bore, as a popular meaning, that of *inordinate anxiety*, a morbid and sinful state of mind. Popularly, they do not bear it now; and the English reader is embarrassed to know whether these texts prohibit the duty of prudent forecast, which other scriptures expressly command. In this principle, the revisers are evidently right; all such misleading *archaisms* should be modified; and their fidelity and impartiality will doubtless induce them to do this consistently. Intelligent readers of the Bible will therefore confidently expect them to apply their own rule to that, which is obviously the most glaring and misleading *archaism* in the English version, the current translation of *Τῷ, δούλος*, as "servant." Every correct scholar knows that both these words, in their literal sense, mean nothing else but "bondsmen," or, in the more unambiguous phrase, "slave." In A.D. 1600, this was also the current meaning of the word "servant"; but it is so no longer. In that sense the word has become an *archaism*. Then, and for 170 years after, England was, at home and in all her dependencies, a slave-holding nation; and the word servant was the recognised equivalent of the Latin *servus*, which was, in turn, the equivalent of the *δούλος*. But now, to the common Englishman, "servant" means hired domestic, or labourer, or *employé*. Thus it has become the equivalent of what is, in the Bible, wholly another thing, the *μισθωτός*, always there distinguished from, and often contrasted with, the *δούλος*. Thus, in Luke xv. 19, the Lord represents the thoroughly-humbled prodigal as resolving to ask his father to make him as one of his *μισθίων*. To understand the exceeding expressiveness of this touch in the picture, one must apprehend what our Saviour here assumed as well known among his audience, that the condition of a hireling-servant was less privileged and happy than that of the *δούλος*, or bondsman. For the prodigal, in his contrition, proposes to himself to occupy the very lowest place in his father's household, provided he may be only pardoned and received back into it. Our Saviour thus implies that the condition of the *μισθίος* was different from, and inferior to, that of the *δούλος*. All this is now obscured to the ordinary reader by the modern but thorough change in the usage of the word servant, except in a few places where the confusion is avoided by the bungling solecism "hired servant." The true meaning of the Bible should be restored by the uniform use of the word "bondsmen," or, if it be preferred, "slave."

There is also a valuable doctrinal meaning which is fatally obscured, and lost to the ordinary reader, by this *archaism*. When the Christian is called, as in Rom. i. 1, the Lord's "servant," such a reader gets no higher meaning than this, that the Christian is *engaged in a service* for God. Now that idea is expressed in the New Testament by the word *διακόνος*. What Paul says of himself is, that he is the Lord's *δοῦλος*, the Lord's "bondsmen," which is wholly another thing. Not only is he *engaged in God's work for wages*; he is *God's property*; "bought with a price," conquered and captured, in spiritual battle, from his former master, and a "*possession for ever*" of his new Master. So the common reader, when he sees the impenitent man called the "servant of sin," or "servant of Satan," wholly misses our Lord's true meaning; that he is Satan's captured and bound slave. To be *doing some of the devil's work*, is one thing; to *belong to him*, and to be *obliged by the bond of depravity and inability* to do his work, is a very different thing. But the latter is the doctrine meant to be taught in the original.

4. The most important amendment which the revisers have it in their power to make, in the whole range of their work, is to adopt discriminative words, and use them consistently, for the two expressions, *μετάνοια*, and *μεταμελεία*. This all-important distinction is now utterly obscured by rendering them both "repentance" (in Latin, *pœnitentia*). When we consider the deplorable lack of discrimination between "godly sorrow," and that "sorrow of the world that worketh death," prevalent in Christian experience, and the multitude of souls betrayed to ruin in part by this confusion, we see that the utility of a clear separation of the two in our nomenclature can hardly be exaggerated. The Holy Spirit has certainly observed such a discrimination, and, as I believe, exactly and universally; although the occurrence of the pair of words is so frequent. (The former and its cognates occur fifty-eight times, the latter seven in the New Testament.) If I am right, the state of the fact is this, that while our version calls the two exercises by the same name, the Holy Ghost always took pains to call them by two names, widely separated in roots, etymology, and sense.

Some, who admit the general, deny the universal discrimination in the New Testament in this. The places claimed as exceptions are Matt. **xxi. 32**; Luke **xvii. 3, 4**; and Heb. **xii. 17**. In the first, Christ reproved the stubbornness of heart in the chief priests and elders, as worse than that of the publicans and harlots; because, while these believed at the preaching of John, the former "repented not afterwards, that they might believe on him;" and the verb is, *οὐδὲ μετεμελήθητη*. Their argument is, that as it is not carnal sorrow, but evangelical repentance, which is the distinctive accompaniment of faith, Christ must be here understood as using *μεταμελεία* in the sense of *μετάνοια*. I reply: No; this confusion is not only unnecessary, but destroys the real meaning and force of our Saviour's argument. Designing to show the extreme contumacy of these elders, He says, that while degraded classes of sinners were so wrought

on as to exercise faith under the preaching of John the Baptist, those decent hypocrites, in their blind self-righteousness, had not even been moved by the same preaching to that natural remorse and fear, which, while wholly short of saving effect, yet must naturally precede true *μετάνοια* and faith. Take the *μεταμελεία* in its true, exact meaning, and the argument is seen in its true point.

In the second text, Christ commands that if our brother, having sinned against us seven times in one day, come and ask pardon, professing repentance, *λέγων, μετανοῶ*, we shall forgive him. Here the argument is, that Christ must use *μετάνοια* in the sense of *μεταμελεία*, mere worldly sorrow; because it does not bear telling that a true, godly sorrow, if really felt, would give way again to the same sin, in one seventh part of a day. But this is sophistical; first, because it would represent our Saviour as teaching that we are bound to restore our Christian charity to those who do not pretend to any higher feeling about their wrongs done us than selfish remorse and fear, which is not Christ's doctrine anywhere; and second, because this exposition misses the real point and beauty of Christ's precept. It is this: no matter how much infirmity our fellow-Christian may exhibit, when he professes true, evangelical repentance (*μετάνοια*) we must give him the advantage of his profession, in our charitable judgment and forgiveness, until he discredits that profession by his conduct.

In the third text, it is said that Esau found no place for repentance, *μετανοίας τόπον*, though he sought it earnestly. The argument is, that this cannot be true repentance, but only worldly sorrow; because the promises of the Gospel engage God not to refuse saving graces to any sinner, who truly and earnestly seeks them. But I answer, Esau's repentance is not in question at all. It is not historically true that he ever showed, amidst all his grief and anger, any desire to change his own attitude or feelings at all. The change he passionately demanded was a *change of mind* in Isaac; which is the exact meaning of *μετάνοια*. But as the apostle knew that Isaac was a holy man, and any change in his action must have been a conscientious and righteous one, he used the word of him in its proper, evangelical sense. It was repentance on the part of Isaac (for what Esau deemed the unrighteous disposal of the birthright) which was in question.

The only passages furnishing a pretext are thus cleared; and I return to assert, that the two kinds of sorrow, which the English version usually confounds under a common name, the Holy Spirit *always sharply discriminates*. 2 Cor. vii. 8-10 gives us an instance in which the apostle uses the two terms with inimitable accuracy. His first epistle contained pungent rebukes. Of the necessity of these, and the pain they caused (*λίπη*), the English verse makes him say (ver. 8): "I do not repent, though I did repent." But Paul was too accurate to say that he ever had *repented*, or could *repent*, of what was a righteous act of duty. No; what he says is, *ὄν μεταμέλομαι, εἰ καὶ μετεμέλομαι*. The tenderness

of his heart had caused him *natural regret* in doing a painful *duty*; but now that regret was removed by finding that the pain he caused them had done them a saving good. Now, he rejoices in his faithfulness, because their pain had been the means of a genuine repentance. *ελυπήθητε εἰς μετάνοιαν*. Again, the English verse says: "Sorrowed to repentance," leaving us no clue to show that their evangelical *repentance for sin* was wholly another emotion from Paul's *natural regret* in doing a painful *duty*. Then, in ver. 10, "Godly sorrow (*ἡ κατὰ θεὸν λῖπη*) worketh repentance (*μετάνοιαν*) unto salvation, *not to be repented of*"—so the English verse. But Paul is too accurate to use language which could suggest the idea of a soul's having, by any possibility, a righteous regret for a righteous feeling. So he does not speak of a true repentance, "*not to be repented of*," but he calls it *ἄμεταμέλητον*, *never to be regretted* (as he had naturally regretted the necessity of a painful duty). It is hard to conceive how a discrimination could be more exactly and beautifully carried out. Our version should imitate it.

The word *repentance*, which custom has thus far obliged me to use, was originally of bad antecedents. It is one of the evil legacies to our translators from that inaccurate version, the Latin Vulgate. Correct etymology would never have selected *pœnitentia*, as the equivalent of *μετάνοια*. The two had nothing in common. The Latin is formed on *pœna*, whose rudimental idea may be seen in *ποινή*, *penal suffering*. Thus, in the *Iphigenia in Aulis*, the Greeks find themselves compelled to make *ποινήν* to the offended gods by a human sacrifice, before the winds will permit their sailing. But the essential idea in *μετάνοια* is change of spiritual principle as to past sin. Thus the two words differ as far as the poles. Here, by the way, was the inlet through which the blunder crept in, which has made Rome substitute "doing penance" for *μετάνοια*. The very word *pœnitentia* has been an unlucky legacy to theology. It befooled Augustine as to the expiatory nature of the grace; which the Scripture teaches has no expiatory effect. ("Quasi sit *punitentia*.") It is said that Lactantius, the accuracy of whose Latinity is celebrated by the critics, saw the error, and proposed a better word. (See *Forcellini et Facciolati*.) "Ideoque Græci melius et significantius *μετάνοιαν* dicunt, quam nos possumus *resipiscentiam* dicere." [Therefore the Greeks better and more correctly call that *μετάνοια* which we may call *resipiscentia*.] *Resipisco* is an equivalent of *μετανοέω*.

But "repentance" is now naturalised, not only in the English version, but in our theology and our catechisms, as the technical equivalent of *μετάνοια*. It may be too late to expel it. I reply, that at least it is not too late to distinguish the two kinds of sorrow for sin in our revision. This may be done either—

1. By retaining "repentance," notwithstanding its erroneous original etymology, as the exclusive and uniform rendering for *μετάνοια*, and using the word "sorrow" or "pain," as the equally uniform rendering for *μεταμέλεια*.

2. Or, we might remove the whole confusion, by adopting the rendering of Jer. xxxi. 18, 19, "to turn," and "turning," for *μετανοέω* and *μετάνοια*; as plain, vernacular, and expressive English words. Or,

3. We might introduce to popular use the word "resipiscence," which is classical, though unusual English.

The first method is probably the most feasible.

R. L. DABNEY.

CHURCH-PLANTING IN TEXAS.

A PIONEER SKETCH.

THERE lies in the south-westernmost corner of the American Union a region which is not a State merely, but a realm in itself. In 1685, La Salle led thither the first European settlers; and, in the course of time, it became a portion of the Mexican Republic—"the noblest leaf," General Almonte declared, "of that cactus which typifies our nation." Moses Austin, a native of Connecticut, took, in 1821, the steps which led to the settlement of a colony of 300 families from the United States. One condition of the grant to him of lands was that the colonists should be, or should become, Roman Catholics. The compliance of the emigrants with this regulation was, as may be supposed, a mere formality. When the priests appointed by the Mexican Government arrived, the men and women, married years before, would group themselves, with their children around them, to be conformed to the Church, and remarried. Clad in their robes, and standing with censer, crucifix, and wafer in the centre of the circle, the officials went through a species of wholesale service, more to the amusement than the edification of the new converts. Of course the whole thing, in a political as well as religious sense, could be a merely temporary arrangement; and in 1836, by its victory at San Jacinto under General Houston, Texas achieved its independence. In 1845, it was annexed to the United States. Not long afterwards, it sold to the Federal Government a goodly portion of its territory.

To-day Texas contains over 274,000 square miles. We have some idea of its area when we consider that England, Holland, the German Empire, and two States each larger than Rhode Island could be contained within it. The population is not far from 2,000,000 already, and is being increased by emigration from Europe, and especially from the other States, at the rate of several hundred thousand a-year. But it matters little to say that it is thirty times as large as Massachusetts, if it could not be added that the day is swiftly coming when, with the blessing of Heaven, it will also be the equal of any State in the Union, or in the world, in things of greater importance than mere dimensions. One assurance of this consists in its soil and climate. The soil lies in belts, running east and west. First, and bordering upon the Gulf of Mexico, is a region suited to the cultivation of sugar and cotton;