

Period 1575  
UJ  
1891

51

THE  
PRESBYTERIAN QUARTERLY.

---

NO. 15.—JANUARY, 1891.

---

I. ST. JOHN'S ARGUMENT FROM MIRACLES.

1. WE are so accustomed to regard John's Gospel as a sweet, tender evangel, that we are apt to leave out of view its argumentative character. John himself, however, in his twentieth chapter, teaches us to avoid this mistake: "Many other signs truly did Jesus in the presence of his disciples, which are not written in this book; but these are written that ye might believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God."

If we understand this passage, John does not mean that the preceding part of his book is wholly occupied with an account of various miracles. They have their place along with other things—other things, and, it may be, better things; for our Lord is represented as saying (xiv. 11), "Believe ME, that I am in the Father, and the Father in me; or else believe me for the very works' sake." What emphasis is to be placed on that pronoun ME, what unfathomable depths of meaning are involved in it, no finite intellect can know. They who are most spiritually minded see in Christ, more than others do, the glory as of the only-begotten of the Father, and beholding it as in a glass, are changed into the same image from glory to glory, as by the Spirit of the Lord. Perhaps no one ever apprehended this divine glory more fully than did the beloved disciple; but he was preserved from the narrowness of depreciating, much more of despising the argument from miracles; in which, indeed, he would have been untrue to the ancient and sacred beliefs of his race. Hence, in addition to other things, we find in the first twenty chapters of his Gospel

## VI. NOTES.

---

### NEW TESTAMENT TERMS DESCRIPTIVE OF THE GREAT CHANGE.

THERE are two groups of terms in the New Testament used to express the great change which is experienced by him who enters upon the Christian life. The one of these groups includes such terms as μετανοέω, with its substantive μετάνοια and its cognate μεταμέλομαι, and ἐπιστρέφω, with its derivative ἐπιστροφή. These describe the change from the manward side, and inform us what part man himself takes in it. The other group includes such terms as ἀνακαινόω, ἀνακαινώσις, ἀνανεύω; ἀναγεννάω, or the simple γεννάω with various defining adjuncts, παλιγγενεσία; ζωοποιέω or κτίζω, with defining adjuncts, and the like. These describe the change from the Godward side, and tell us what part God takes in it. Man repents, makes amendment, and turns unto God; but it is God who renews him, begets him again, quickens or creates him into newness of life. The two groups describe the two sides of the same great occurrence, and must be combined in any complete conception of its nature and implications.

I. Archbishop Trench<sup>1</sup> states very judiciously the relations of μεταμέλομαι and μετανοέω. It is plain that the two words stood for the heathen writers as practically synonymous. Both are used for the displeasure that is felt in reviewing an unworthy past; both for the amendment that may grow out of that displeasure. Etymologically, they differ in that μεταμέλομαι lays the stress on the affliction or pain that is experienced on the contemplation of our former folly; while μετανοέω points primarily to the change of mind, issuing in amendment, which afterthought brings to us. Μεταμέλομαι is best represented, therefore, by the Latin word *poenitentia*, the etymological reference in which is to the pain one suffers who rues his past deeds, as Augustine advises us in his perfectly just definition: "*Poenitentia est quædam dolentis vindicta, semper puniens in se quod dolet commississe.*"<sup>2</sup> Μετανοέω would be better represented by the Latin word

---

<sup>1</sup> *Synonyms of the New Testament*, § lxxix.

<sup>2</sup> *De Vera et Falsa Poenitentia*, viii.

*resipiscentia*, as Lactantius, with equal justice, writes: "He who repents of what he has done understands his former error, and therefore the Greeks say better and more significantly *μετάνοια*, which we may call in Latin *resipiscentia*; for he comes to his senses and recovers his mind, as it were, from unsoundness, who is grieved for his error; and he reproves himself for madness and strengthens his mind for living better."<sup>1</sup> Starting thus with a somewhat different etymological impress, it is not strange that, although the words acquired a parallel usage, yet *μετανοέω* remained the nobler word throughout the classical period, and lent itself better to the usage of the New Testament when the breath of the Spirit began to adapt the old Greek to Christian conceptions. It is no less natural, however, that before it became fixed as a *terminus technicus* in Christian speech a period of uncertain usage should intervene.

It seems as if we have a relic of this uncertain usage in the New Testament itself. In the Gospel of Matthew, the two words are not very disproportionally employed, and stand as practically synonymous. After the Gospels, *μετανοέω* and *μετάνοια* are frequent, while *μεταμέλομαι* almost passes out of use, and never occurs in the full sense which has become invariable with *μετανοέω* and *μετάνοια*. A comparison of Matt. xxi. 29, *et seq.*, with 2 Cor. vii. 8, *et seq.*, is very instructive in this point of view. Our Lord in this parable uses *μεταμέλομαι* throughout. "A man had two sons, and coming to the first he said, 'Son, go work to-day in my vineyard.' But he answered and said, 'I will not;' but afterwards he repented and went." Here *μεταμέλομαι* appears to be used of a repentance which issued in the amended act. And likewise in the application: "But ye did not *repent* afterwards so as to believe him." In 2 Cor. vii., on the contrary, Paul seems instinctively to confine his use of *μεταμέλομαι* to a sense not far from "regret," substituting *μετάνοια* when he speaks of "repentance," technically so called. He had made them sorry in a letter, and for this he had felt regretful pain (*μεταμέλομαι*), though he now sees that this was misplaced and consequently rather rejoices that he made them sorry, since the sorrow worked a repentance (*μετάνοια*) in them which is not to be regretted (*ἀμεταμέλητος*). Here *μεταμέλομαι* stands for the painful review of the past, and *μετάνοια* for a change to the better life. So little is *μετάνοια* mere sorrow for the past, that the sorrow is spoken of as no part of, but rather a preliminary to it, and *μετάνοια* appears as the result of a godly sorrow. "They sorrowed unto repentance;" "their godly sor-

<sup>1</sup> *The Divine Institutes*, VI., 24

row wrought out repentance unto salvation." The order is, therefore, godly sorrow, repentance, salvation, each lying at the base of the other. The growth of the word towards a purely technical sense is very observable here, and Jeremy Taylor, in the extract quoted by Trench,<sup>1</sup> is perfectly right when he tells us that a right *μεταμέλεια* is the first beginnings of *μεάνοια*.

What the *μεάνοια* consists in, as distinguished from what it grows out of, we may learn from the immediately subsequent verses to those just quoted; in these the apostle, after telling his readers that their godly sorrow wrought repentance in them, develops the meaning of the word in the special case in hand. The Corinthians had grievously sinned in permitting one of their number to commit a hideous crime, not only without rebuke, but also with entire indifference on their part. When repentance came, it came in the way of a total reversal of their indifferent attitude, or, as the apostle describes it in a series of rapid *epanorthoses*, correcting statement after statement, thus declared one after another to give insufficient expression to their change: "What earnestness did it work in you; nay, excusing; nay, indignation; nay, fear; nay, eager desire; nay, punishment." We trace the path of the sorrow working repentance here, step by step. Were they indifferent to foul sin in their midst? As repentance began in them, they became first earnestly attentive to it; then full of excuses for themselves for having neglected it; then rather indignant at the sin; then full of fear for their condoning of it; then burning with eagerness to do right; and then the repentance was fulfilled in the actual infliction of the punishment on the guilty party. The roots of it were planted in godly sorrow, its issue was amendment of life, its essence consisted in a total change of mind and heart toward their sin.

So clearly is the sense thus arrived at the standing meaning of the term, that there is but a single passage where it seems at all natural to confine its meaning to sorrow for sin, however intense: and this, perhaps characteristically, is in the Gospels. "Take heed to yourselves," said our Lord, as reported by Luke (xvii. 3, *et seq.*); "if thy brother sin, rebuke him; and if he repent (*μετανοήσῃ*), forgive him. And if seven times daily he sin against thee, and seven times turn to thee saying, 'I repent' (*μετανοῶ*), thou shalt forgive him." Here "repent" may, but need not, be restricted to the sense of "sorrow." Elsewhere it never can be. Its growth above the classical usage is evident further in that in heathen Greek the word is only used for a

<sup>1</sup> *Synonyms of the New Testament*, pp. 242, 243.

specific repentance of a specific fault, while in the New Testament this is the rarer usage. In the passage from Luke which we have just quoted, the reference is to a special act of repentance for a special sin against a brother. In Acts viii. 22, Simon Magus is exhorted to repent of his simony. In 2 Cor. vii. 7, *et seq.*, we read of the repentance of the Corinthians in the matter of the incestuous man; in Heb. xii. 17, of Esau's inability to find place of repentance for his sin; and in the second and third chapters of the Apocalypse exhortations are made to the churches to specific acts of repentance.<sup>1</sup> But the prevailing usage of the word is for that great and normative act of repentance in which we turn from all wrong to all good, in which the trend of our life is altered, in which, in a word, we turn our backs on Satan and all the works of the flesh, and our face to God and his service. The repentance of the New Testament is a total change of mind and heart, not only from some sins, but from sin itself.

Such a change of mind and heart necessarily implies a perception of sin as sin, an apprehension of its sinfulness, accompanied by a suitable regret and sorrow for our participation in it. What *μετάνοια* emphasizes, however, is not this sorrow, but the change of mind and heart which it accompanies. But neither must it be confused with the *change of life* which succeeds it. Repentance is known by its fruits, but it is not its fruits. John called on his hearers to show their repentance by their deeds: "Bring forth, therefore, fruits worthy of repentance" (Luke iii. 8; cf. Matt. iii. 8); and thus distinguishes the reformed life from the reformed heart and mind, as its outgrowth and evidence. *Μετάνοια* may be used in so broad a sense as to include, on the one side, the sorrow for sin out of which it grows, and, on the other, the amendment of life into which it issues. But it may be distinguished from that sorrow as at 2 Cor. vii. 7, *et seq.*, and from that amendment as at Luke iii. 8. What it specifically means, and what it, in all cases, emphasizes as its body, no matter how widely it spreads its garments on this hand or that, is the inner change of mind and heart. In reading the parable of the prodigal son (Luke xv.), we reach a point, after the famine had arisen and he had felt the pinch of want, and before he arose and went to his father, which is signalized in the narrative by the words, "And when he came to himself" (Luke xv. 17). At this exact point we discover the *μετάνοια*. As such, our word "repentance" scarcely expresses it, its failure being part of the infelicity arising from the adoption of *poenitentia* by the Latins as the equivalent of the Greek.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. also Matt. xii. 41; Luke xi. 32; Apoc. ix. 21.

It is that inner change of mind which rests on sorrow for sin and will issue in a better life, but which is, in itself, simply "a coming to ourselves."

The New Testament word which expresses the change of life into which *μετάνοια* eventuates is *ἐπιστροφή*, translated in the English version by "conversion." The noun occurs but once, Acts xv. 3, where Paul and Barnabas declare the "conversion," the "turning to [God]" of the Gentiles; but the corresponding verb is tolerably frequent. Its relation to *μετανοέω* may be gathered from a passage in Luke, which has already been quoted (xvii. 4). Our Saviour, in commanding forgiveness of an injuring brother, says, "Even if seven times a day he sin against thee, and seven times turn (*ἐπιστρέψῃ*) saying, 'I repent' (*μετανοῶ*), thou shalt forgive him." Here the change of mind in the *μετανοῶ* is the ground of the turning to the injured brother. The same relation holds good of repentance in its fullest technical sense, as Acts iii. 17 may advise us, "Repent ye, therefore, and turn." Perhaps this is made even plainer in Acts xxvi. 20, where Paul declares that his whole ministry had been one long summons to men "to repent, and to turn to God by doing works worthy of repentance," if we may so resolve the participle. As, according to Luke iii. 8, "doing works worthy of repentance" is the fruit of repentance, so here *ἐπιστροφή*, which is identified with the former, is represented as its fruit. The external character of this turning is perhaps illustrated by its relation to faith. The order is *μετάνοια* and faith, but faith and *ἐπιστροφή*. We read, "Repent and believe in the gospel" (Mark i. 15; cf. Matt. xxi. 32), but "believe and turn to the Lord" (Acts xi. 21). We need not press such phraseology beyond its capacity for bearing, but it seems at least to suggest the order *μετάνοια*, *πίστις*, *ἐπιστροφή*; that there is first a change within, then faith, and then a corresponding change without. In any event, we must set over against *μετάνοια* as the inward word its complement in *ἐπιστροφή* as an outward word, denoting the changed course of life; *ἀναστροφή* standing for the course of life itself, *ἀποστροφή*, as in the LXX. of Isaiah xxx. 15, for that course of life as turned *away from* evil, and *ἐπιστροφή* for that course of life as turned *unto* God.

All this, now, is man's work. Men are exhorted both to *μετάνοια* and to *ἐπιστροφή*: men are commanded to change their minds and their lives. Nevertheless, *μετάνοια* is declared to be the gift of God; Christ gives it to Israel (Acts v. 31); God to the Gentiles (Acts xi. 18); and he may give it in his grace even to those who are now opposing

his ministers (2 Tim. ii. 25). This already advertises that there is a divine side to the change described by these words, and leads us to its consideration.

II. As has been already intimated, the divine side of man's change is designated in the New Testament by a group of words which represent it as a renewing, a rebegetting, a quickening, a resurrection, and even as a re-creating of him. The Greeks had a word for "renewing," *ἀνακαινίζω*; but this occurs only once in the New Testament, and then apparently in a literal sense (Heb. vi. 6). Instead of it, Paul uses a cognate term, which he may have coined, *ἀνακαινόω*. This is once used in a quasi-literal sense, in 2 Cor. iv. 16, where Paul speaks of his outer man as being worn away by his sufferings, while his inner man is renewed daily; *i. e.*, apparently given ever new strength and vigor. Elsewhere the verb, its derivative noun, and its cognate *ἀνανεώω*, are used in the full spiritual sense of *renewal*. We learn that this renewal takes place in the mind (Eph. iv. 23; Rom. xii. 2); that it eventuates in knowledge (Col. iii. 10); and that it is brought about by the action of the Holy Ghost (Titus iii. 5), but not so as men may not be exhorted to secure it (Eph. iv. 23; Rom. xii. 2). There is thus a synergism of the Holy Spirit as efficient agent and man in his own efforts to the production of an internal effect. The result is, in the highest sense of the term, a new man (Col. iii. 10), which we are on the one hand exhorted to put on after having put off the old man, and on the other hand told is created by God in righteousness and true holiness (Eph. iv. 24, and Col. iii. 10). In virtue of the latter fact, he is called a "new creation" (Gal. vi. 15; 2 Cor. v. 7), with reference to whom old things are passed away and all things have become new (2 Cor. v. 17). It is clear that in these representations we are dealing with a somewhat wide conception<sup>1</sup>—a conception which from the divine side corollates in general with *μετάνοια* from the human. Both represent a complete inner change, which is the result of the co-activity of man and God, and which issues in a new life. But in the terms now before us we are made aware of how great a part the divine element plays in working this change, and that at some point in the line of its activity it is nothing less than creative in its potency, securing that the product is not only new, but a new creation.

In harmony with this idea of renewal the New Testament writers

---

<sup>1</sup> The dogmatists recognize the breadth of the idea of "renewal." See Dr. Charles Hodge, *Systematic Theology*, III., 217, and Dr. W. Lindsay Alexander, *Biblical Theology*, II., 429.

make use of other terms, which describe God's act as a restoring of man to life. Thus both John and Paul employ the term *ζωοποιεῖν* in this connection. Parallel with it, the term "resurrection" is used in the same sense; for the quickening is always a quickening of what has died, and is therefore a revivification. It is along with Christ that we are made alive or raised again from our death in sin, and the conception seems to be that of reviving dead powers of well-doing within us consequent upon our union with him. His work furnishes the meritorious ground of our quickening, so that it is only as that work is made ours that his dying may be at the same time our dying, and his rising again our revival unto good works (2 Cor. v. 14, *et seq.*; Rom. vi. 8, *et seq.*). Faith is, therefore, the condition of our reception of life (Gal. iii. 22). No man can quicken himself; this is a thing the law is incapable of, and hence no good deed can obtain it for us (Gal. iii. 21). It is the Holy Ghost who is the efficient agent in the work (2 Cor. iii. 6; John vi. 63), but only as the efficient of the Father's will (Rom. viii. 11). Who are quickened is sovereignly determined by the Son (John v. 21); and the power involved in the act is the almighty power of God, such as was exerted in raising Christ from the dead (Eph. i. 20); for we were dead in trespasses and sins, and it is God who has quickened us and raised us up together with Christ (Eph. ii. 5, 6). Accordingly, again, we are even said to be "created" anew by God in this great change. The new man, which we are exhorted to put on, is not one which we can frame by our own powers, but one created by God in righteousness and holiness springing from the truth (Eph. iv. 24). And so little do we make for ourselves the change of life that is required of us by doing good works, that our salvation is in no sense the product of our acts, but as saved souls we are the workmanship, the made-product (*ποίημα*) of God, created in Christ Jesus *unto* good works which God has afore prepared that we should walk in them (Eph. ii. 10). Thus along this line of advance also we come to see the Christian as a new creation (2 Cor. v. 17), in so radical a sense that the old things are gone, and all things have become new.

This re-creation of man is given further expression under the figure of "regeneration," and that primarily in such a way as to emphasize the initial stages of "renewal." We have been rebegotten, says Peter (1 Pet. i. 3, 23), not out of corruptible seed, but incorruptible, by means of the word of the living and enduring God,<sup>1</sup> who has begotten us unto a living hope by means of the resurrection of Jesus

---

<sup>1</sup> Or "by means of God's living and enduring word."

Christ from the dead. Here is a renewal of which the efficient agent is God, the means his word, including the proclamation of the resurrection of Christ, and the result, the awakening in the soul of the graces of the Christian life, hope and love. Again we are looking at the divine act in the gift of *μετάνοια*, and are made pointedly aware of the intensity of the divine action necessary to its gift by its comparison to a rebegetting, issuing in a new birth. Hence we become the children of God, God's sons—a prevailing Pauline locution (Rom. viii. 14, 19; ix. 26; 2 Cor. vi. 18; Gal. iii. 26; iv. 6, 7,)—by the inner operation of the Spirit and the exercise of faith. We learn most of this divine sonship, however, in the aspect in which it is now before us, from the writings of John.<sup>1</sup> We are told that it is the result of a true begetting from God, independent of the activity of the human will, “not from blood, nor from the will of the flesh, nor from the will of man, but from God” (John i. 13; cf. 1 John iii. 9). It is the indispensable condition, not only of doing righteousness (1 John ii. 29), but also of the birth of Christian love (1 John iv. 7), and even of faith in Christ (1 John v. 1,) in the heart; while, on the other hand, it inevitably produces in its recipient righteous conduct (1 John iii. 9; v. 18), and the overcoming of the world through faith (1 John v. 4). In the conversation with Nicodemus, Jesus himself reveals to us the essential nature of the new birth. It is the indispensable prerequisite to entrance into the kingdom of God (John iii. 5), without which no one can “see” that kingdom (John iii. 3). Its source is defined as “water and the Spirit” (John iii. 5), by which is perhaps meant, not “baptism and the Holy Ghost,” but the Holy Spirit in his purifying activities symbolized by water. It eventuates in the spiritualizing of our antecedently fleshly nature, so that, as born of the Spirit, we are no longer flesh, but spirit (John iii. 6). And its advent upon the soul is unobserved, its process inscrutable, and its reality only to be known as an inference from its effects; it is like the wind, of which we know nothing, except lo! it is here! (John iii. 8.) It is very evident that in these statements we are brought much nearer to an understanding of how God gives us that change of mind and heart which, on the human side, we call *μετάνοια*, and on the divine, broadly, “renewal.” No doubt he is active all through the process—the passages before considered leave no room to doubt that—but clearly he is active in an especial way at its inception; and it is the character of his activity here which gives most fully to the process the right to be called a new birth, a regeneration, and

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Candlish, *Fatherhood of God*, (ed. 5, 1870,) pp 151, et seq.

the product the right to be called a son of God. Paul does not use the phrase *γεννάω ἄνωθεν*, which John so fully explains by the record of Christ's conversation with Nicodemus, nor yet Peter's cognate term *ἀναγεννάω*; but in one place he employs a somewhat similar term, *καὶ ἡγγενεσία*, in the phrase, "Not out of works *done* in righteousness, which we did ourselves, but according to his mercy he saves us, by means of the washing of regeneration and renewing from the Holy Ghost" (Titus iii. 5). As the word occurs nowhere else in the New Testament, it is impossible confidently to fix its exact shade of meaning. But whether it refers to the initiation or to the whole course of renewal, it at least emphasizes God's hand in man's great change to the exclusion of man's. That we are saved does not spring out of our works done in righteousness. It is a matter of mercy, of grace, of the rich outpouring of the Holy Spirit, whose work is an again-begetting and a renewal.

If now we bring these results together in recapitulation, it is plain that *ἀνακαίνωσις* expresses both a broad and a radical process; it is broad enough to cover the whole process of our inner renewing, inclusive of what we now technically speak of as regeneration, conversion and sanctification, all of which it ascribes to God; and it is radical enough to represent this process as resulting in a totally new creature, full of good works. *Ἀναγεννήσις* is narrower, but no less radical; it apparently includes only the opening stages of *ἀνακαίνωσις*, inclusive of what we now should call regeneration and conversion, which it represents as a work of God begetting us into a new conscious life by the word, "of his own will bringing us forth by the word of truth" (James i. 18). It is thus a sovereign act, as well as an efficacious one. It is also a composite act, including an action on the soul and an action of the soul. John's record of our Lord's discourse to Nicodemus cuts to the roots here, and analyzes this composite act still further, speaking of the originating act of the new birth, separate even from its first conscious results, as an action on the soul prerequisite to its own holy activity, a direct and sovereign and inscrutable act of the Spirit as the precondition of the influence of the word.

The scriptural phraseology thus lays before us as its account of man's great change a process, and a process which has two sides. It is on the one side a change of heart and mind issuing in a new life. It is on the other a renewing from on high issuing in a new creation. There is thus a true synergism indicated. Man works out his own salvation with fear and trembling, knowing it is God who is working

in him both the willing and the doing according to his own good pleasure. But an enabling act of God is required at the basis of all the human activities. From that moment of the first divine contact the work of the Spirit never ceases, and while man is changing his mind and his life, it is God that is renewing him in true righteousness and holiness. Considered from God's side, the renewal results in the production of a new creature, God's workmanship, with new activities, newly directed. Considered from man's side, the new heart and mind exhibit themselves in new activities. We obtain thus a regular series. At the root lies an act seen by God alone, and mediated by nothing, a direct, creative act of the Spirit, the new birth. This new birth pushes itself into man's own consciousness through the call of the word, and his conscious possession of it is thus mediated by the word. It becomes visible to his fellow-men in a turning to God in external activities. A man must be born from above to become God's son. He must be born anew by the word to recognize himself as such. His renewal must pass into works meet for the new heart he has received to be recognized by his fellow-men as such.

*Princeton.*

BENJAMIN B. WARFIELD.

#### ON LICENSURE.

It is a significant fact, that, in the face of the clear statements of our Book of Church Order, and the uniform practice of the church, one of our Synods still thought it worth while to send up to the Chattanooga Assembly this overture: "Is the formal licensure of a candidate for the ministry a prerequisite for ordination?" Evidently, the real utility of licensure has been seriously called in question, and, if we mistake not, there is an increasing tendency to look upon it as a form which, in many cases at least, may be safely dispensed with.

If we inquire as to the end contemplated in the licensure of a candidate, our Form of Government gives a clear and explicit answer: "Presbyteries shall license probationers to preach the gospel, in order that, after sufficiently trying their gifts and receiving from the church a good report, they may, in due time, ordain them to the sacred office." (*Book of Church Order*, Par. 129.)

It is required of a minister that he should be a man of piety; and the candidate's fitness in this respect may be ascertained, with at least