ISSN: **0799-1711**

PROFESSIONAL THEOLOGICAL JOURNAL FOR THE CARIBBEAN COMMUNITY

CJET

VOLUME 19

2020

Caribbean Journal of Evangelical Theology

CONTENTS

'SO WHAT WENT INTO THE PIGS?'

Part 1

(Mark 5:1-20)

Taneika Wedderburn

Adjunct Lecturer

JTS

INTRODUCTION

The above question began a theological journey that has found embodiment in the paper that now has your attention. It is based on the longest account of demonization anywhere in the New Testament. This passage tells the story of a man who was said to be demonized by a large number of demons until Jesus set him free. As a result of Jesus' actions, the demons who had made this poor, miserable fellow their home were cast into a herd of pigs who rushed to their deaths. The man was free, but the pig farmers' source of livelihood now lay drowned in the sea. This is the literal, and, somewhat traditional understanding of the passage.

Background

This writer had never heard this understanding challenged prior to mid-2012 when, during an exposition of his PhD. dissertation, an erudite scholar proffered an alternate understanding of the term 'Legion'. He made the point that 'Legion' was Mark's metaphorical reference to the occupying Roman forces of Palestine who was oppressing this "demoniac". What Jesus did was bring social reform. Social reform! Could this be so? Could Jesus' "setting the man free" be simply challenging the natural oppressive elements of His day? While pondering these questions in the meeting, another equally learned intellectual said: 'So, what went into the pigs?' This was a fair question since a major part of the story was the subsequent, resulting demise of the pigs after the man was set free.

The pericope under study is the longest account of the same incident of all the Synoptics, and brings into sharp focus various issues relating to the existence, nature and substance of demons. Is the demon to be understood as disembodied

spirits or fallen angels, the antithesis of good or simply metaphorical representations of conditions that fall below the ideal? Any understanding of the term has its attendant difficulties. The modern school of interpretation with its anti-supernaturalist motivation rubbishes the claim that sinister spirits can inhabit the human being or that they even exist. It takes a more allegorical approach to understanding the concept. What could be called the protestant, supernaturalist hermeneutic is one that generally takes the term at face value and understands it as spiritual beings who are antagonistic to God and His plans.

The parallel accounts which exist in Matthew and Luke all have the pigs as an important feature of the story. What of the pigs? What resulted in their demise? This writer believes that it is the answer to this last question on which hinges the veracity of either position. But, which of the two views is true?

The modern antisupernaturalist and the protestant supernaturalist understandings of 'Legion' in Mark 5:1-20 cannot both be correct in the same sense and at the same time. Since both understandings are the result of the methodologies and their attendant presuppositions, which hermeneutical approach is more valid? In other words, which hermeneutical approach is more trustworthy to lead the correct interpretation?

This paper aims to apprehend the truth concerning the nature of 'Legion' and the fate of the pigs in Mark 5:1-20. It:

1. Exegetes the text containing the 'Legion' reference in Mark 5.

2. Examines the methodology used and conclusions reached by the grammatico-historical school.

3. Examines the methodology used and conclusions reached by the socio-literary school.

4. Compares the two methodologies and conclusions.

5. And finally, makes a decision as to whether the liberal/social-justice interpretation of 'Legion' to mean the "Roman occupation" is to be preferred to the traditional interpretation of the term to mean "many demons".

Significance

For some time, the discipline of hermeneutics has been concerned with looking at a text in its original context and deriving its meaning to both its original audience and its writer and, thereafter, making applications to the life of the contemporary reader. In later times, a different understanding of interpretation has emerged,

that of examining the meaning that a text has for its readers in the contemporary setting. There is therefore an emphasis on personal experience and cultural relevance when interpreting texts. This emphasis, some may argue, allows the interpreter to disregard elements of Scripture that do not necessarily resonate with personal experience and to even introduce foreign ideas to the Scriptures in order to achieve cultural relevance. It can be said that the emergence of various theologies such as Black Theology is proof positive that there is an undue reliance on the contemporary audience in interpreting Scripture. This reliance allows one to disregard what the texts actually say. Against this backdrop, one can now expound on the significance of this work.

Firstly, some believe that hermeneutical approaches that have their genesis in the lived experience of people, rather than in the texts and in the God who inspired them, will result in undue accommodation to the culture of the contemporary reader while sacrificing the true, intended meaning of the texts. On the other hand, some may argue that the traditional method ignores the experiences of people and relegates the Bible to the position of a fabulous book with no bearing on life today. Undertaking this project will therefore allow for the two hermeneutical approaches to be honestly compared and the average Christian provided with information to make a judgment regarding which one is the more feasible.

Another equally important reason for this study is its potential of shedding light on the definition of 'demons' as discussed in Mark's Gospel. As a direct consequence of studying the pericope chosen, the true identity of 'Legion' will be ascertained. It will therefore seek to answer the question: "What does Mark mean by the term 'Legion'"?

Finally, the post modern world with its espousal of pluralistic ideals such as moral relativism is in a crisis of morality. There is no feasible, objective standard. For centuries, the Bible has served as this standard and as such the nature and authority of the Bible has come under much scrutiny. It is quite clear that hermeneutical approaches are influenced by worldviews which dictate the presuppositions one brings to the reading of the text. This study will therefore challenge some worldviews which have led to both the antisupernaturalist and supernaturalist interpretations of the text.

Delimitations of the Study

While it is true that the matter of demons is discussed, this paper is not a treatise on demonology, exploring the various facets of this discipline. It deals with those areas that are pertinent to the matters being discussed from Mark 5: 1-20. A second point that needs to be made here is the difficulty in naming the different schools of interpretation in order to accurately capture the idea of just which

methodologies are being studied. For the purposes of this paper, the two methodologies to be examined are:

1. The socio-literarist methodology characterised by an anti-supernaturalist world view and a strict reader-response approach.

2. /The grammatico-historical (or syntactical-theological) methodology characterised by a supernaturalist world view and an author-centred approach.

Definition of Terms

Antisupernaturialist – the philosophical view that miracles and other interventions of the supernatural into the natural world do not exist. This includes the intervention of angels and demons.

Author-centred interpretation – the view that the meaning of the text lies in what the author intended to convey to his/her readers. This method, however does not preclude divine intervention in determining meaning.

Demon – a fallen angel; a spirit that opposes the will and work of God and works with ill-will towards humanity.

Exegesis – derived from the Greek word transliterated 'exegeisthai', which can mean "'to lead' or 'to explain'. In biblical literature it is always used in the sense 'to explain, interpret, or describe'"[1].

Grammatico-Historical Approach – The hermeneutical method that uses the grammatical construction of the original languages of a text as well as background historical data to ascertain the meaning of text.

Meaning (of a text) – "that which the words and grammatical structures of that text disclose about the probable intentions of its author/editor and the probable understanding of that text by its intended readers[2]".

Metanarrative – "An overarching account or interpretation of events and circumstances that provides a pattern or structure for people's beliefs and gives meaning to their experiences."[3] The metanarrative provides a guide for how people view their world.

[1] Kevin Vanhoozer, ed. *Dictionary for Theological Interpretation of the Bible* (Michigan: Baker Book House, 2005), 203.
[2] William Klein, Craig Blomberg and Robert Hubbard, *Introduction to Biblical Interpretation* (Nashville: Thomas Nelson), 189.
[3] *Oxford Dictionary*, s.v. "metanarrative".

Presupposition – "a thing tacitly assumed beforehand at the beginning of a line of argument or course of action."[4]

Preuderstanding – "a body of assumptions and attitudes which a person brings to the perception and interpretation of reality or any aspect of it"[5].

Reader-centred interpretation – an approach in which the meaning of a text is created by the contemporary reader.

Socio-literary Approach – the hermeneutical methodology that presupposes that the meaning of a text is determined by the social/cultural position of the reader. It also incorporates the literary background of the text.

Supernaturalist – the philosophical view that interventions of the supernatural into the natural world are both possible and probable.

Methodology

Most of this essay analyses the guiding philosophies and methodologies of the grammatico-historical and socio-literary interpretations with the aim of comparing them. Firstly, a review of the literature pertaining to the metamorphosis in hermeneutical approaches is done, followed by the examination of material related to the understanding of the term 'Legion'. A thorough exegesis of Mark 5: 9-18 follows as well as conclusions drawn from the word studies pursuant to that process. The socio-literary method is also examined, inclusive of its presuppositions and methodology. The passage is interpreted using the grammatico-historical method and the outcome of that process compared with the outcome of the socio-literary method. The concluding portions of this paper examine the implications of the interpretation of the Legion narrative for the Caribbean church as well as conclusions and recommendations to guide proper hermeneutics.

The Gospel of Mark

Authorship

Scholars seem to agree that evidence indicates that Mark, an acquaintance of both Peter and Paul wrote the Gospel that bears his name. He has been referred to as Peter's interpreter[6], obtaining much of the information for his book from the lips of that disciple. In a remark said to have been made at the end of the first century, Papias is reported to have said of the book's author:

[4] *Oxford Dictionary*, s.v. "presupposition."
[5] D. S. Ferguson, *Biblical Hermeneutics: An Introduction* (Atlanta: John Knox, 1986), 6.
[6] Darrell Bock, *Matthew, Mark: Cornerstone Biblical Commentary.* (Illinois: Tyndale, 2005), 394.

Mark having become the interpreter of Peter, wrote down accurately, though not in order, whatsoever he remembered of the things said or done by Christ. For he neither heard the Lord nor followed him, but afterward, as I said, he followed Peter[7].

So Mark obtained second-hand information about the works and teachings of Christ from the Apostle Peter.

Date

Scholars disagree regarding the date for the writing of the book with four different decades – the forties, fifties, sixties and seventies – being proposed. For the purposes of this paper, the views that it was written in the late fifties and seventies will be examined. Carson, Moo and Morris[8] posit that the late fifties is the most plausible time for it to have been written. They argue this on the premise that Mark's writing was done based on Peter's teaching and there is evidence that Peter had been in Rome (where Mark heard him preach) circa mid-fifties. Perhaps the most compelling argument for this dating of Mark comes from a relationship between the writings of Mark and those of Luke. Carson, Moo and Morris puts it succinctly:

> The strongest case for this dating comes not from Mark directly but from the relationship of Mark to Luke-Acts. The argument assumes that Acts ends where it does, with Paul languishing in a Roman prison, because Luke published the work at that time – that is, in about A.D. 62. This would require that the gospel of Luke, the first volume of Luke's literary effort, be dated sometime before 62. If we then accept the prevailing scholarly opinion that Luke used the canonical Mark as one of his key sources, Mark must have been written by 60, at the latest[9].

Gundry concedes that "data is lacking to answer firmly the question of date[10]", but he concurs with Carson, Moo and Morris and says:

> If Luke ended Acts without describing the outcome of Paul's trial in Rome because the trial had not yet taken place, then Acts must be dated about A.D. 63, its preceding companion volume, the gospel of Luke, somewhat earlier, and – if Luke's gospel reflects Mark – Mark still earlier in the fifties or late forties[11].

[7] Ibid.

[8] D.A. Carson, Douglas Moo and Leon Morris, *An Introduction to the New Testament.* (Apollos: Leicester, 1992), 99.

[9] Ibid, 97-98.

[10] Robert Gundry, *A Survey of the New Testament*. (Michigan: Zondervan, 1981), 79.

[11] Ibid.

Modern scholars, for reasons that will be examined presently, hold to a much later date for the penning of the Marcan account. Griffith-Jones[12] places the time of writing at a later date than traditionally held – after the fall of Jerusalem in A.D. 70. This later dating is usually motivated by the presupposition that predictive prophecies do not exist. Dating Mark's Gospel after the fall of Jerusalem would then explain why an apparent allusion was made to it – "the abomination of desolation" – in Mark 13:14. Gundry[13] argues against such a position and makes the point that "there is nothing in Mark 13 that points to an "after-the-fact" prophecy. Rather, the chapter reflects the language of covenantal judgment for God for unfaithfulness". Carson, Moo and Morris concur and argue that Mark 13 shows very little evidence of being influenced by the events of A.D. 70, but rather gives general descriptions that are not unique to that passage but that "reflect stock Old Testament and Jewish imagery having to do with the besieging of cities."[14] The presence of these "stock imagery", which are also elsewhere in Scriptures, seems to point not to a retelling of the happenings of the event, but to a description of what is possible during the subsequent Fall of Jerusalem. It seems that the single most compelling argument for the later dating of Mark's Gospel is the argument that predictive prophecies do not exist, but if one grants Jesus the ability to make such prophecies, this argument appears to lose validity.

Mark's audience and general purpose for the book

Although the decision regarding the authorship of the book seems to be unanimous, and while the dating of Mark has some controversy as we have seen, the author's purpose seems much more controversial. His purpose for writing is central to understanding the book. While this is so, one should be careful in the attempt to ascertain such a purpose. Trying to find an author's purpose for writing often times causes the interpreter to try to squeeze the words of the author into neat categories. The result of this is often that the reader ignores the elements of the book that do not fit into these imposed designations, thus rendering the search for a true purpose futile. Also linked to the quest for determining his purpose is finding out who his audience was. The clues provided in the Account itself make for compelling evidence.

This Gospel, France argues[15], was intended to be read to an audience as seen by Mark's expansive story-telling style, inclusive of numerous instances of

[12] Robin Griffith-Jones, *The Four Witnesses: The Rebel, the Rabbi, the Chronicler, and the Mystic*. (San Francisco: HarperCollins, 2000), 45.
[13] Robert Gundry, *Mark: A Commentary on the Apology for the Cross* (Michigan: Wm Eerdmans, 1993), 1042.
[14] Carson, Moo and Morris, *An Introduction*, 98.
[15] R.T. France, *The New International Greek New Testament Commentary – The Gospel of Mark* (Michigan:Wm Eerdmans,), 9.

repetitions and recapitulations. This audience, scholars believe, was Roman[16]. Evidence of this can be seen in the fact that he translated Aramaic expressions so that his readers could understand them, and he uses Latin equivalents to explain Greek expressions, as in Mark 12:42 and 15:16[17]. Griffith-Jones asserts that Mark is writing to a Christian community in Rome after the great fire that razed the city under Emperor Nero in 64 AD. This community of believers was embattled, facing tremendous persecution and as such, "Mark is driven to disclose his enigmatic Jesus not to the comfortable and gracious, but those who will suffer as Jesus himself had at the hands of the world's elite"[18]. Diehl seems to concur and writes that Mark's is a story that touched a subjected people in their lowly position, "over and against the Roman emperor and the Roman system of authority". She goes on to stridently assert that, "more than objective history, Mark's ancient biography was intended to be an encouragement to the readers, reminding them of the solid foundations of their faith[19]". Therefore, it is argued that Mark sought to encourage his readers in the midst of persistent oppression and did not necessarily intend to write from a historical and objective standpoint.

In addition to his supposed motive of encouraging the readers, one has to examine Mark's emphasis on the miracle working power of Jesus. Any investigation into the purpose of Mark, says Carson, Moo and Morris, has to take into account Mark's emphasis on Jesus' miracles, His suffering and the cost of discipleship[20]. Notwithstanding, Carson, Moo and Morris warn against attempting to fit Mark's purpose into well-ordered categories, since he may also be writing for more general reasons as well. They highlight that Mark sought to provide the readers with a written account of Jesus' deeds and this may have had an evangelistic and apologetic thrust[21].

Mark's specific purpose in 5:1-20

Regarding the specific passage under review, Stein declares that Mark's primary purpose for conveying the account in Mark 5:1-20 is not "missiological but christological"[22]. Mark shows this, Stein argues, by relating the demoniac's confession of who Jesus is, which when taken together with other confessions by fellow sinister spirits, made elsewhere in the book, serve as compelling evidence of the identity of Jesus as the Son of God. He continues that "Mark's

[16] Carson, Moo and Morris, *An Introduction*, 99; Gundry, *A Survey*, 79; Griffith-Jones, *Four Witnesses*, 45.
[17] Gundry, A Survey, 79.
[18] Griffith-Jones, *Four Witnesses*, 45.
[19] Judith Diehl "Anti-Imperialism in the New Testament". in *Jesus is Lord Caesar is not*. Scot McKnight and Joseph Modica eds. (Illinois: Intervarsity. 2003), 47.
[20] Carson, Moo and Morris, *An Introduction*, 101.
[21] Ibid.
[22] Robert Stein, *Mark: Baker Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 2008), 261.

understanding of Jesus in this account goes far beyond such descriptions as 'prophet' or even 'Messiah'"[23]. In exorcisms, as well as in other miraculous interventions, Mark shows the supernatural, divine nature of Jesus.

It seems difficult to miss the emphasis on the miracle working power of Jesus since Mark devotes a great deal of attention to them (1:16-8:26). When one examines the book, the observation made by Bock appears to be uncontestable. He points out that: "of thirteen miracles in Mark, four are exorcisms, more than any other type of miracle narrated by Mark"[24]. So, then, one can argue not only that the writer wanted to show Jesus' power, but also to highlight his power over 'demons', whatever those are. Bock takes this further by saying that "the function of Jesus' exorcisms was to underscore Jesus' authority and the cosmic scope of his work[25]". It can be reasoned, then, that Jesus' performance of exorcisms was integral to His purpose on earth and Mark's recording of them contributed a large part to his overall aim for writing.

The setting of Mark 5:1-20

Having begun to examine Mark's specific purpose for writing 5:1-20, attention will now be turned to the setting of the account. Mark 5:1-20 evidently took place in Gentile territory. The precise setting of it has been one that has proven quite difficult to ascertain. Throughout the history of interpretation of the text, three separate possible locations of the supposed exorcism have been proffered.

Firstly, the reading 'Gerasenes' has been used in various English translations of the Bible including the popular New International and New American Standard Versions. According to Collins, this reading has strong external support and refers to modern day Jerash[26]. The major difficulty with accepting this reading is that this town is more than thirty miles from the Sea of Galilee posing obvious difficulties with explaining how the demoniac could have met Jesus *as* he exited the boat, as well as how the pigs could have rushed to their deaths in a sea that seemed, based on the language of the account, to be nearby.

The reading, 'Gergasenes', modern day El Kursi, as the site of the miracle is reputed to have been put forward by no less a stalwart than Origen, whom, Collins points out, did so without any mention of manuscript support[27]. But Origen's reason for defending it as the correct reading can possibly be found in

[23] Ibid.
[24] Darrell Bock, "Mark", in *The Gospel of Mark: Cornerstone Biblical Commentary*, ed. Philip Comfort (Illinois: Tyndale, 2005), 413.
[25] Bock, *Mark*, 413.
[26] Adela Yarbro Collins, *Hermeneia: A critical and historical commentary on the Bible – Mark* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2007), 263.
[27] Ibid, 264.

the fact that Gergasenes was near a lake and it had "a steep place abutting the lake[28]." This evidence seems compelling, especially when taken with the fact that the local people held in their tradition that swine had been cast down from that place by demons[29]. There is also present an impressive church dating back to the fifth century which, France declares, may suggest that it had a traditional association with the story of Jesus[30]. Nevertheless, Stein outlines the problems pursuant to choosing, for its geographical similarities, Gergasenes as the setting of the account by inquiring:

> How do we explain its weak textual attestation? Did someone change its relatively unknown name for the name of the better-known Gerasa? Was "Gerasenes" added by an early copyist unfamiliar with the geographical area, or by an "ignorant" Mark, to a text that originally had no city designation? Was "Gerasenes" part of the early form of the tradition, and an ignorant redactor later added the references to the sea and the drowning of the pigs? All such suggestions are highly speculative and not without their own problems[31].

So, the issues with simply choosing that area because it seems to have all the geographical features lead, possibly, to many more unanswerable questions.

Stein solves the problem of the actual setting of the account by saying that: "it is probably best to interpret the present form of the story using the designation "Gerasa" for the city and territory" [32]. France [33]agrees, noting that Mark probably used 'Gerasa' as a loose term referring to the whole Decapolis region of which Gerasa was a leading city. He also conceded that Mark may have simply confused it with a similar name.

Stein does not believe that the controversy surrounding the actual site bears any great weight on the interpretation of the account and sums it up in this way: "Apart from the geographical problem, the meaning of the Marcan text is clear, but the historical evaluation of the actual site, which is dependent on the original textual designation of Mark is best held in abeyance due to the textual confusion[34]". Cole agrees with Stein but seems to ignore the controversy surrounding the name when he asserts "Gerasa, or Gadara as some translations have it, is a region, not a specific village.[35]" The apparent conclusion then is that the term "Gerasa" is the name of an entire region rather that a particular village.

---

[28] Ibid.
[29] Ibid.
[30] France, *Greek New Testament*, 227.
[31] Stein, *Baker Exegetical*, 250.
[32] Ibid.
[33] France, *Greek New Testament*, 227.
[34] Ibid.
[35] Victor Babajide Cole, 'Mark', *Africa Bible Commentary*, ed, Tokunboh Adeyemo, (Nairobi: Word Alive Publishers. 2006), 1180.

Having surveyed the literature related to the book of Mark itself, it is obvious that different authors have contrasting views on almost every aspect such as the date of writing and the purpose of the book. The place name of the setting of the story at the heart of this paper also seems quite difficult to determine. An equally, if not more, labyrinthine subject now gets the attention of this paper. It is the discipline of hermeneutics.

Hermeneutics

Hermeneutics, the discipline that deals with the principles of interpretation[36], is a somewhat diverse one. Various scholars use different approaches and usually defend the suitability of theirs versus another. The interpretation of any text is affected greatly by the method used. For the purposes of this paper, the reader-response and author-centred approaches will be examined presently.

Reader Response

The reader-response method emphasizes the world "in front of the text", that is, the world of the reader and this one takes pre-eminence over that of the author. While paying much attention to the historical features important to the text, the reader-response method does not deem the hermeneutical task as complete without establishing what it means for the contemporary reader. The result appears to be that one does not arrive at an objective meaning for the particular text hence, there does not seem to be any premise on which to judge the feasibility of the outcome of this method.

Author-Centred

The aim of author centred interpretation is to find "that which the words and grammatical structures of that text disclose about the probable intention of its author/editor and the probable understanding of that text by its intended readers[37]". For this method of interpretation, the world "behind the text", that of the author, is primal in determining meaning. What the author intended to say is much more important than what the modern reader believes that the text is saying. They believe that authorial intention is the objective voice of the text that should not be ignored.

Grammatico-historical advocates do in fact argue for retelling the Gospel narratives in such a way as to meet the needs of its hearers and they contend that the Gospel writers, as evidenced by the differences in emphases amongst the writings, have different purposes. They go on to boldly assert that "the Gospels

[36] Walter Kaiser and Moises Silva, *Introduction to Biblical Hermeneutics: The Search for Meaning*. (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2007), 15.
[37] Klein et al, *Biblical Interpretation*, 186.

are already functioning as hermeneutical models for us, insisting by their very nature that we too, retell the same story in our twentieth century [*sic*] contexts[38]". It seems here that Fee and Stuart's methodology finds some resonance with the reader-response method in its insistence that the reader has to be able to apply the Word to his/her particular contexts[39].

A Comparison

The point of departure between the two methodologies seems to be the emphasis each places on objectivity, as well as the fundamental presuppositions of each model. The differences in the hermeneutical outcomes are not simply due to differences in how the passages are applied, but also the fundamental understanding of the words and terms used in the account. So, "demon" means two totally distinct things to the two different readers. These differences in meanings can be accounted for by the differences in the presuppositions and worldviews brought to the text by the reader himself. Just how fundamental presuppositions are to the outcome of the task of hermeneutics will be examined presently.

The role of Presuppositions

Osborne believes that "preunderstandings" are beliefs and ideas inherited from one's background and paradigm community. He goes on to assert, quite stridently, that "we rarely read the Bible to discover truth; more often, we wish to harmonize it with our belief system and see its meaning in light of our preconceived theological system[40]". Klein et al.[41] concurs, pointing out that many interpreters simply find in the text the meaning they expected and wanted to find. It would seem then that the path to the interpretation that one makes is already well laid out before the reader before he even opens the text. Nash puts it succinctly when he argues that once a person commits himself to a certain set of presuppositions, his direction and destination are determined[42]. How then can one get to correct interpretation? One sure way is to completely extricate himself from all things presuppositional and leave himself a vacuum ready to be filled with correct theology. But, nature abhors a vacuum and it seems as if the physical realm bears a startling resemblance to the metaphysical in this regard.

---

[38] Gordon Fee and Douglas Stuart, *How to read the Bible for all its worth* (Michigan: Zondervan, 1993), 115.
[39] Ibid, 19.
[40] Grant Osborne, *The Hermeneutical Spiral: A Comprehensive Introduction to Biblical Interpretation* (Illinois: Intervarsity, 2006), 29.
[41] Klein et al, 143.
[42] Ronald Nash, Worldviews in Conflict: Choosing Christianity in a world of ideas. (Michigan: Zondervan, 1992), 23.

Geisler and Feinberg point out the fallacious nature of approaching thought devoid of presuppositions. They point out "one objection to the phenomenological method[43] is that it is doubtful any purely presuppositionless ways of approaching the world exist. *Indeed, is not the claim that one should approach the world without presuppositions in itself a presupposition*?[44]"(emphasis mine). Such is the quandary in which one finds himself as a human being as he seeks to decipher the truths handed down to us in the Bible – he is unable to completly extricate himself from presuppositions.

So, a presuppostionless approach does not seem feasible, but, another option is to make one's presuppositions as free of error as he can. This, Nash contends, is possible by putting them to reasonable tests[45]. Interpreters should therefore take an active approach to Biblical interpretation. It would seem fair to argue that passivity concerning one's core beliefs and values does not make for good, fair Biblical interpretation. One, it appears, must consciously examine his beliefs continuously. Klein et al. put it well when they propose that interpreters should "discover, state, and consciously adopt only those assumptions they agree with and can defend[46]".

Changes in hermeneutics over the years

Hermeneutics as a discipline has undergone many changes. This can be seen as due to the evolution of ideas concerning the Scriptures themselves, and more specifically, their inspiration. The change in hermeneutical approaches, therefore, cannot be examined properly without adequately reviewing the changes in the ideas concerning the doctrine of inspiration.

Regarding the doctrine of inspiration

For centuries, the idea known as the orthodox view of Scriptures existed unchallenged. Burtchaell[47] puts it succinctly when he says:

> Christians early had inherited from the Jews the belief that the biblical writers were somehow possessed by God, who was thus reckoned as the Bible's proper author. Since God could not conceivably be the agent of falsehood, the Bible

[43] The Phenomenological method purports to advocate for looking at material from a presuppositionless standpoint.
[44] Norman Geisler and Paul Feinberg, *Introduction to Philosophy: A Christian Perspective* (Michigan: Baker Book House, 1980), 49.
[45] Nash, *Worldviews*, 55.
[46] Klein et al, *Biblical Interpretation*, 143.
[47] J.T. Burtchaell, *Catholic Theories of Inspiration since 1810* (Cambridge: Cambridge University,1960), 1-2, quoted in Norman Geisler and William Nix, *A General Introduction to the Bible*. (Chicago: Moody, 1986), 114.

must be guaranteed free from error. For centuries the doctrine lay dormant, as doctrine: accepted by all, pondered by few.

Things were soon to change as Geisler and Nix argue that between the posting **of** Luther's 95 Theses (1517) and Karl Barth's Commentary on Romans in 1919, there was a cataclysmic shift in the relationship between the fields of theology and intellectualism which allowed for "the emerging scientific method to be used to challenge the authority of the Word of God in the church itself[48]". What this meant is that a dialectical approach was adopted by some in order to formulate doctrines on the inspiration and authority of Scripture[49]. In other words, a middle ground was sought between scientific exploration and the claims of Scripture. Proponents therefore aimed at a non-contradictory relationship between Scripture and the emerging scientific methodology. This was to later have far reaching implications for Biblical interpretation since the long held view that the Bible was inerrant came under sustained scrutiny, beginning in the sixteenth century.

The scrutiny to which the Scriptures were subject was only in its embryotic stage in the sixteenth century as the view that the Bible was the inspired word of God held sway until prior to the First World War in the early twentieth century. What began as questions about the authority of Scripture gradually evolved into bold confrontations precipitated by Darwin's landmark work entitled *On the Origin of the Species*, as well as the historical method of interpretation.

Regarding presuppositions

Just as how the idea of the infallibility of Scriptures held sway for centuries as the 'true' idea, the grammatico-historical method of interpretation was previously agreed by the vast majority as the 'true' method of interpretation. Bleicher notes that it was hailed as the only objective, reliable method of interpretation[50]. Then came the nineteenth century when Schleiermacher sought to make hermeneutics less about a collection of rules to follow and more about engaging human thought and understanding[51]. This meant that the shift away from hard bound, objective rules to a more scientific approach that more involved the human faculties as authority to a greater degree. This move would influence Rudolf Bultmann, who is credited as changing the course of hermeneutics forever with

[48] Norman Geisler and William Nix, *A General Introduction to the Bible* (Chicago: Moody, 1986), 113.
[49] Ibid.
[50] Joseph Bleicher, *Contemporary Hermeneutics: Hermeneutics as method, philosophy and critique* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1980), 51, quoted in N. Sam Murrell. "Hermeneutics as Interpretation and the Caribbean Student: Part 1," *Caribbean Journal of Evangelical Theology*: 7-28, 17.
[51] F.D.E Schleiermacher, *Hermeneutics: The handwritten MSS*. ed Heinz Kimmerle. Translated by J. Duke and J. Frotsman. (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1986), 15-16. Quoted in N. Sam Murrell. 'Hermeneutics as Interpretation and the Caribbean Student'. *Caribbean Journal of Evangelical Theology*: 7-28, 17.

such works as: *New Testament and Mythology* (1951) and *Is Exegesis without Presupposition Possible?* (1957)[52].

For Bultmann, exegesis cannot be done free of preunderstanding. He argues that it is impossible for one to look at the Scriptures objectively, that is, allowing Scripture to interpret Scripture. He further posits that "every interpretation incorporates a particular prior understanding[53]". Indeed, Bultman's position seems quite tenable as presuppositions seem to greatly affect the outcome of the interpretation. The rise of views including materialism, naturalism, rationalism and liberalism from the 1650s onwards deeply affected human thought in general and his thoughts about the Scriptures. These have impacted significantly the core of how persons view the sacred text. They have done so because they are allowed to influence the presuppositions persons have when coming to the task of interpreting the Scriptures. These presuppositions form a framework that can be quite rigid. They can be compared to a pair of glasses with coloured lenses – dictating how one perceives everything that is viewed through them.

Changes in hermeneutical approaches are certainly due to emergent and subsequently prevailing ideologies. The hermeneut is not immune to imbibing, whether consciously or subconsciously, these ideologies which he brings to the task of interpretation. A few of those ideologies that have so influenced hermeneutics will be examined presently.

Naturalism, for example is the assumption that "all reality is located within space and can be understood exclusively by scientific method[54]". Benedict Spinoza, a foremost proponent, was a staunch antisupernaturalist and believed that miracles were impossible because they were violations of inviolable natural laws[55]. An offshoot of naturalism is materialism. A major proponent of materialism, Thomas Hobbes made a very bold remark which has significant repercussions for how passages such as Mark 5:1-20 ought to be interpreted. He says: "I see nothing at all in the Scripture, that requireth a belief, that Demoniacs were any other thing but Mad-men[56]" and views the healing of the demoniac as simply parabolic. Since materialism denies the existence of any entity apart from those existing in the material realm, one can see how such a view can impact

[52]N. Sam Murrell, 'Hermeneutics and the Caribbean'. *Caribbean Journal of Evangelical Theology. 7-28*, 17.

[53] Rudolf Bultmann, "The problem of hermeneutics", in *Essays philosophical and theological*, trans. James Greig, (London: SCM, 1955), quoted in N. Sam Murrell, 'Hermeneutics as Interpretation and the Caribbean Student', *Caribbean Journal of Evangelical Theology*: 7-28, 18.

[54] L. Russ Bush, *A Handbook for Christian Philosophy* (Zondervan: Michigan, 1991), 77.

[55]Geisler and Nix, *A General Introduction*, 138.

[56] Thomas Hobbes, *Leviathan, Or Matter, Form, and Power of a Commonwealth Ecclesiastical and Civil*, vol 23, *Great Books of the Western World*, 54. quoted in Norman Geisler and William Nix. 1986. *A General Introduction to the Bible*. Moody: Chicago, 137.

Biblical interpretation since those seemingly supernatural elements of Scripture must be looked at in light of this. 'Demons' then, simply cannot mean anything that is not a feature of the natural world, therefore the term has to refer metaphorically to something for which there is a materialist counterpart.

Adding to the melee of viewpoints that influenced the interpretation of Scripture was Schleiermacher's romanticism. He emphasized that Christianity was not simply an assent to the tenets of Scripture, arguing that "no external authority, whether it be Scripture, church or historical creedal statement, takes precedence over the immediate experience of believers"[57]. The result of this was that subjective experience gained greater prominence and received much affirmation. The authority of the Bible was greatly criticized and Schleiermacher's work for some time removed the emphasis of biblical criticism from historical to literary analysis[58]. This rise of affirmation being given to subjective experience, rather than leaving the locus of authority with the Bible, meant that there was much more room for varying interpretations than was previously possible. The emphasis on literary rather than historical analysis limited the ability of the texts to speak for themselves and seemed to have placed much more power over what the text teaches in the hands of the interpreter.

Liberalism, a very inclusive viewpoint, has also influenced human thought, and by extension, Biblical interpretation. It is basically "the attempt to harmonize the Christian faith with all aspects of human culture[59]" and is sometimes used to refer to "any Protestant religious movement that questions the basic doctrines of conservative Christianity[60]". Geisler and Nix credit Albrecht Ritschl as the founder of theological liberalism who used a dialectical method to harmonize what they call the "two focal points of the Christian faith": the concerns of society and civilization and those pertaining to personal salvation[61]. The repercussion for biblical interpretation was that it was forced to not only speak to what may be considered purely 'religious' themes, but also those of the lived experience of the readers of Scripture. Furthermore, liberalism "accepted the notion that the Bible contains errors and its advocates sought means whereby the newly discovered truths of modern thought could be harmonized with Scripture[62]."

Regarding hermeneutical approaches

[57] Ibid, 143.
[58] Harold O.J. Brown, "Romanticism and the Bible", in *Challenges to Inerrancy: A theological response*, eds. Gordon Lewis and Bruce Demarest, eds. (Chicago: Moody, 1984), 49-65, quoted in Norman Geisler and William Nix, *A General Introduction to the Bible*, (Moody: Chicago, 1986), 143.
[59] Geisler and Nix, A *General Introduction*, 145.
[60] *Ibid*.
[61] *Ibid*.
[62] *Ibid*, 146.

These emerging viewpoints seem to have provided the framework for shifts in the methodology used in Biblical interpretation. There was a departure from the traditional historical-grammatical methodology towards one that takes into consideration modern literary criticism and social scientific analysis, since many modern Biblical scholars found the old methods "sterile, limiting and misleading[63]".

Bultmann can be seen as the pioneer in expounding these views. He belongs to the neo-orthodox school, believing that the Bible becomes the word of God when one encounters God through it personally. It does not therefore contain propositional truths, but one can meet God through it in a subjective way[64]. He has made a significant contribution to the field of hermeneutics and his methodology represents a great shift and metamorphosis in the field of interpretation. He took the field of Biblical interpretation in a totally different direction when he presented his view that the Synoptic Gospels were filled with mythical stories. Murrell summarises Bultmann's views thus:

> The NT, especially the Synoptics, is filled with mythological (fanciful or unscientific) ideas like miracle stories, resurrections, Peter walking on water, Lazarus rising from the dead, etc. which reflects the wishful and pre-scientific thinking of the first century writers. In order for the twentieth century reader to get to the real truth of the life of Jesus, one must demythologize these "unscientific ideas" which were built around the sayings of Jesus[65].

This account of the demoniac would be one such account that would fit into this category. The reader's task would then be to demythologise (that is interpret the myths, not remove them as liberal theology proposes) in order to realise the kerygma, the real message[66]. Geisler and Nix add that Bultmann believes that "once the Bible is divested of these religious myths, one arrives at the real message of God's self-giving love in Christ[67]". This has enormous implications for hermeneutics, as we shall see, since it is against this background that such scholars as Roper, Belo and Myers did their interpretation of the passage under review.

Demons

Having examined presuppositions, worldviews and hermeneutical approaches that affect biblical interpretation, the attention of this paper will now be turned to

[63] William Klein, Craig Blomberg and Robert Hubbard, Jr., *Introduction to biblical interpretation*, (Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 2004), 63.
[64] Norman Geisler and William Nix, *From God to us*, (Chicago: Moody, 1974), 20.
[65] Murrell, *Hermeneutics*, 18.
[66] Stanley Grenz and Roger Olsen, *20th Century theology: God and the world in a transitional age* (Illinois: Intervarsity, 1992), 89.
[67] Geisler and Nix, *From God*, 20.

the specific passage of Mark 5:1-20. At present, attention will be turned to the matter of demons, a major part of this exorcism account. Ideas abound concerning what exactly a 'demon' is. This can be attributed to the fact that the idea of 'demon' has existed throughout world history and across many civilizations – primitive cultures not excluded. While this paper is not a treatise on the multiplicity of viewpoints, it is worth examining some of the ideas that surround this concept, especially since this is integral to understanding what took place at the Gerasenes.

The ideas on demons have two extremes, with shades in between, creating a continuum in views. On one end of the spectrum, is the view that demons are extremely pervasive and can be found behind every single indiscretion or negative action. This pervasiveness of demons can be found in both old and new cultures around the world. Lewis[68] suggests that the Israel of biblical times had neighbours who viewed the world as such – open to the caprice of demons. On the other end of the spectrum is the idea that evil is non-existent and decisions and actions result in acts to be viewed as evil. Presently, the views deemed orthodox by the church will be examined, followed by alternate ideas on the nature of demons.

The traditional view

The view that held sway for much of church history is that expounded by Stanley Grenz who deems them as fallen angels. He adds that demons are those spiritual beings "not fulfilling God's intent for them[69]". He therefore uses God's will as the benchmark or determining factor for what can be considered good or evil. It is therefore the fact that they miss God's intent for them that makes them sinister. This sheds considerable light on the concept of what exactly causes these beings to earn the designation 'evil'.

The orthodox view of God hinges on the idea that He is free to act in the affairs of the world, and that He is a personal being, concerned with the affairs of humanity. Packer demonstrates the link between our ideas about God and our ideas about demons. He says: "Our demonology cannot be any more true or adequate than our doctrine of God is. We can see the truth about the devil only in the light of truth about God[70]". So, then, orthodoxy seems to link the doctrine of God inextricably to the doctrine of Satan and demons, highlighting that when one understands God's personal, good and perfect character, it allows him to

[68] Gordon Lewis in John Warwick Montgomery, ed. 1976. *Demon Possession*. Minneapolis: Bethany, 36.
[69] Stanley Grenz, *Theology for the Community of God* (Michigan :Wm Eerdmans, 1994), 224.
[70] J.I. Packer, "The Devil", *Eternity* (April 1964): 8. Quoted in Gordon Lewis in John Warwick Montgomery, ed. 1976. *Demon Possession*. Minneapolis: Bethany, 38.

understand God's antithesis – evil. It is on this foundation that scholars build their demonology with Packer stridently arguing that:

> Demonology concerns one aspect – the basic aspect – of the mystery of evil; evil has to be understood as a lack, a perversion of good; and we know what good is only when we know what God is. Only through appreciating God's goodness can we form any idea of the devil's badness[71].

Demons, then, belong to the designation, evil. Interestingly, some systematic theologians place the study of demons in the category of the study of Angels. Orthodox theologians cite 2 Peter 2:4 when explaining the origin of demons. This passage reads: "God did not spare the angels when they sinned, but cast them into hell and committed them to pits of nether gloom to be kept unto the judgment". These angels, it is believed, are the ones whom we refer to as demons, with Lucifer, who led them in their rebellion, being the chief demon. Erickson sums up the idea of the nature of demons by saying that demons "are angels created by God and thus were originally good; but they sinned and thus became evil[72]."

The middle ground

David Garland adds another facet when he designates them as "the dark side of reality, which enslaves and dehumanizes human beings"[73]. For him then, demons are evil spirits whose intentions towards mankind are maleficent. Grenz concurs that demons seek to harm humans. He argues that they "always exercise a detrimental influence, seeking to harm the well-being of God's creation and to destroy community[74]". In adding that last phrase about community, he not only broadens the definition by adding an extra dimension – that of the ultimate aim of their misdeeds – but he seems to straddle the proverbial middle ground between the decidedly fundamentalist position and the liberal/social justice tradition since the latter lays much stress on the idea of "community" and the social identity of man.

Grenz, in his book, emphasizes that the overarching goal of anything maleficent is to disrupt community – the enjoyment of "fellowship with God, with each other, and with the creation around us[75]". Demons, he argues, achieve this disruption of community by manipulating "structures of existence"[76]. In an attempt to describe what he means by "structures of existence", he says that they

[71] Ibid.
[72] Millard Erickson, *Introducing Christian Doctrine* (Michigan: Baker Books, 2001), 158.
[73] David E. Garland, *The NIV Application Commentary: Mark*. (Michigan: Zondervan Publishing House, 1996), 209.
[74] Grenz, Theology, 224.
[75] Grenz, *Theology*,187.
[76] Ibid, 234.

are "those larger, suprahuman aspects or dimensions of reality" in which we operate[77]. To make it clearer, he paraphrases H. Berkhof by saying that the structures "undergird human life and society so as to preserve them from chaos[78]". Berkhof helpfully gives examples of this hazy term thus:

> We may think of the place of the clan or tribe among primitive peoples, or of the respect for ancestors and the family which for centuries gave form and content to Chinese life. We may point to Shintoism in Japan, to the Hindu social order in India, to the astrological unity of ancient Babel, to the deep significance of the *polis* or city-state for the Greeks, or to the Roman state.[79]

The work of demons, then, is to infiltrate these structures, which are not evil in and of themselves, and manipulate them for their own sinister ends.

The Antisupernaturalist view

Some thoughts on 'demons' lack the supernatural element expounded above. Kinlaw, for instance, argues that the conception of evil, and hence demons is simply an outflow of the human fascination with evil. He therefore declares that the Bible (the Old Testament in particular) is replete with evidence that God is the ultimate and every created thing exists to do His bidding. He builds his argument by first presenting word studies, indicating that the word '*shedim*', meaning "black ones" only occurs twice and another word "*secirim*", believed by some to be translatable as "satyr demon", could simply refer to "wild goat in its Isaiah references. The idea, then, is that even the words used for "demon" is dubiously translated as such. He goes quite a bit further to sum up his argument, thus:

> Before Yahweh became their God these words were loaded with mythological and supernatural significance. The impact of Yahweh was to strip them of all but their natural meaning. The Old Testament acknowledges the spirit world but seems bent upon minimizing, demythologizing, or marginalizing it. Wherever it does occur, it always has its origin in Yahweh and its role and domain determined by His sovereignty. No autonomous domain, independent of Yahweh, or outside His immediate control, exists to threaten man[80].

---

[77] Ibid, 228.

[78] Grenz, 228. Quoting Hendrikus Berkhof . *Christ and the Powers, trans. John H. Yoder* (Scottdale, Pennsylvania:Herald, 1962), 30,33.

[79]Hendrikus Berkhof, *Christ and the Powers,* trans. John H. Yoder (Scottdale, Pennsylvania:Herald, 1962),34. Quoted in Stanley Grenz, *Theology for the Community of God* (Wm Eerdmans: Michigan, 1994), 229.

[80] Dennis Kinlaw in John Warwick Montgomery, ed. 1976. *Demon Possession*. Minneapolis: Bethany, 33.

Evil then only has human origin and the many references to a rival world is simply the human being's "affinity for evil and his tendency to dramatize it[81]". Human beings, then, give their attention to the concept of evil and so construct various avenues, such as demons and exorcisms, through which they can imaginatively display the concept of evil. For Kinlaw, though, evil is not metaphysical, but moral[82].

Kinlaw's views, however, seem to also incorporate a certain supernaturalist element making it a little unclear as to what his position on the matter really is. In discussing demons in the New Testament, he makes this assertion, demonstrating astute scholarship:

> It is to be noted that hell, Satan and the demonic are most fully treated in the Gospels and the Apocalypse of John. Could it be that God is content to let us see that negative world in the presence of the incarnate Christ? The veil is never parted to show us Moses and Satan, Elijah and Satan, or Paul and Satan. Satan and the demonic appear with clarity and definition only when Jesus is present. And at his point fallen imagination finds their susceptibility to be enchanted by the demonic broken and an ability to see things as they are[83].

What is unclear is whether the demons were dealt with by the incarnate Christ, or were the ideas, conjured by man's "fallen imagination" defeated. If it is the latter, how was man able to "see things as they are"?

Wink is a bit clearer in his attempt to define the demonic. He calls it: "a will to power asserted against the created order". He continues that, it is the psychic or spiritual power emanating from organizations or individuals or subaspects of individuals whose energies are bent in overpowering others[84]". So then, Wink's definition of what is to be considered demonic is inextricably linked to the idea of oppression and the maleficent use of power. This use of power is in opposition to God's created order and it causes the belittling of other persons. So, by this definition, a demon cannot be a being (like a fallen angel), but is organizational or it emanates from the actions of humans.

Rudolf Bultmann is seen as the father of demythologization, arguing that such ideas as demons were mythical since "reality was exhausted in a closed continuum of cause and effect which leaves no room for divine or demonic

[81] Ibid, 35.
[82] Ibid.
[83] Kinlaw, "The Demythologization", 35.
[84] Walter Wink, *Unmasking the Powers* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1986), 59.

activity[85]". He, therefore believes that it is, in Lewis' words, "impossible to use electric light and modern medical and surgical discoveries and at the same time believe in the biblical world of spirits and miracles". It is therefore 'anti-contemporary' to believe in demons and any other divine insertions. Bultmann's pronouncements betray a tone of rationalistic thought which Koch believes guides much of the ideology on demons. He clearly articulates the understanding of some modern thinkers:

> on the theological front, liberal and neorationalistic theologians continue to deny the existence of not only Satan, but of demons as well. As they see it the demonic is merely the reflection of either the sub or superconscious within man. It is therefore, rather an immanent problem than a transcendental or metaphysical one. To such people the stories in the New Testament concerning those who are demon possessed, simply mean that Jesus was a child of his own times, holding the primitive concepts of those around him[86].

Belo[87] who divides Mark's writing into specific codes, places such elements as demonic possession, as belonging to the mythological code of first century Palestine. In other words, myth is interspersed throughout the Gospel narrative, and these myths are simply those held in Palestine during the first century. Mark's Gospel, Belo would argue, is replete with myths, reminiscent of those held by the writer (Mark) and those in the original setting of the book. This writer therefore concludes with Koch that:

> Reports of possession are uncomfortable for our modern liberal scholars. They do not quite fit into their rationalistic scheme of the world. Bultmann, for example, could do no more than describe the story of the possessed Gadarene as 'a terrible account'[88].

So, the conclusion, then, is that the rationalistic mindset of some scholars seem to preclude the supernaturalistic interpretations of the passage.

Exorcisms and Demonic Possession

As we conclude the review of literature pertinent to the matters being discussed, we turn to the examination of the whole matter of exorcism and demon possession. As mentioned previously, this topic will not be examined extensively, but a cursory look is warranted. Exorcism in the New Testament, in Wink's words, is "the act of deliverance of a person or institution or society from

[85]Rudolf K. Bultmann, *Jesus Christ and Mythology* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1958), 65. Quoted in Gordon Lewis in John Warwick Montgomery, ed. *Demon Possession* (Minneapolis: Bethany, 1976), 36.
[86] Kurt Koch, *Demonology past and present* (Grand Rapids: Kregel, 1973), 31-32.
[87] Belo, *Materialist*, 94.
[88] Koch, *Demonology*, 31-32.

its bondage to evil, and its restoration to the wholeness intrinsic to its creation"[89]. In defining the term as such, Wink precludes any understanding that exorcism is confined to the personal sphere, resulting only in deliverance of individuals. He presents an interesting explanation for why demoniacs "manifested" in Jesus' presence. He believes that it was in reaction to seeing a fully human being, much unlike the morbid existence that they had come to know as normative. He asserts:

> In the Gospels it is the presence of Jesus that precipitates demonic seizures. This is because the demonic is not merely a cluster of pathological symptoms, but a radical rejection of God and a state of estrangement from God, from one's own higher self (the *imago Dei*), and from full social being. Because this atrophied form of existence has become normative in human societies, most people are unaware of what they have surrendered until they see it resplendent in a fully human being[90].

So, the characteristic convulsions and features of the typical demoniac are due, not to the movement and contortions caused by beings foreign to the individual, but to human responses when confronted with the personhood of Jesus.

Michaels calls the book of Mark the "primary source of descriptions of actual exorcisms"[91]. He goes on to argue that driving out demons was one of Jesus' "characteristic acts"[92]. For some, exorcism refers to the extrication of the demonic spirit from the spirit of a human being. This is usually done by the power of God working against the powers of darkness.

Summary

Much research has been done regarding the historicity of the Marcan document. The Gospel of Mark was written by Mark, a follower of Peter. Conservative scholars date it in the late fifties while liberals prefer a later dating to account for the presence of the prophecy regarding the Fall of Jerusalem in A.D. 70. Mark's purpose for writing was to tell of Jesus to his audience who were undergoing persecution in Rome.

Regarding the setting of Mark 5:1-20, there is some disagreement regarding the correct name of the place or its location. Some scholars do not necessarily think that Mark was attempting to give a specific location, but rather to convey the

[89] Wink, *Unmasking*, 59.
[90] Ibid.
[91] J. Michaels Ramsay in John Warwick Montgomery, ed. 1976. *Demon Possession*. Minneapolis: Bethany,41.
[92] Ibid.

idea that he was in Gentile territory. Others believe that he did want to give a specific place name, not necessarily of a particular town, but of a region.

Hermeneutics is heavily influenced by presuppositions and has been constantly changing over the years. Traditionally held ideas regarding the doctrine of inspiration, nature of the Bible as well as hermeneutical approaches have continued to increase in number and old ones have been replaced thereby. Finally, writing concerning the nature of demons reveals that there are varying viewpoints regarding the nature of demons, with one school proclaiming that humans are solely responsible for all the negative in the world. Others believe that demons have substance and work against the plans of God