

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

PayPal

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for *The Expository Times* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_expository-times_01.php

pdfs are named: [Volume]_[Issue]_[1st page of article].pdf

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

WE notice with pleasure the appointment to the Principalship of St. Aidan's of the Rev. E. Elmer Harding, M.A., at present Vice-Principal of Lichfield Theological College. Principal Harding will continue his contributions to THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

On the other hand, it is with deep regret that we record the death of the Rev. T. G. Rooke, B.A., Principal of Rawdon Baptist College. One of the ripest Old Testament scholars, he was also, to our personal knowledge, a singularly modest man. He took a keen interest in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES from its very first number, and wrote more than once in hearty appreciation. Though his actual contribution was small, that also showed his unselfish interest, for it was sent at a time when he was too ill to do more than dictate it.

Professor Huxley is not yet done with the "Gadarene" miracle. *The Nineteenth Century* of December contains another article on the subject, under the title of "The Keepers of the Herd of Swine." For Professor Huxley is not a little exercised about the property of these "Gadarene Swinefolk;" and, notwithstanding his "longing for peace," feels "truly obliged to Mr. Gladstone for compelling me to place my case before the public once more."

But Professor Huxley makes little effort to conceal where his real interest in the miracle always lies. He is interested in the "morality and legality" of the story because "the authority of

the teachings of the synoptic Gospels, touching the nature of the spiritual world, turns upon the acceptance or the rejection of the Gadarene and other like stories." "It is exactly because these stories constitute the key-stone of the orthodox arch" that he is so greatly obliged for another opportunity of drawing attention to them.

There are many strange things in this article; but the most unaccountable thing is the tone of it. If all is so well with Professor Huxley's case, why such a "robustious and rough coming on"—to use his own words—in the opening pages? Is it in the best taste to refer to my own superior knowledge having given "me the uncomfortable feeling that I had my adversary (Mr. Gladstone) at a disadvantage?" and to add that "the sun of science, at my back, was in his eyes?" "I now ask my readers," he says on the fourth page, "to accompany me on a little voyage of discovery in search of the side on which the rapid judgment and the ignorance of the literature of the subject lie. I think I may promise them very little trouble, and a good deal of entertainment." Then, on the following page, we are told about "bales of reading," and "something more than a hasty glimpse of two or three passages of Josephus." Is it not enough to make the warmest sympathiser restless and even suspicious to have so much promise while the armour is being buckled on? Already, on page two, Mr. Huxley has made a glaring mistake in taunting Mr. Gladstone with not having cited a passage which actually does stand cited in Mr. Gladstone's papers in full.

Professor Huxley's objections to this keystone of the orthodox arch is that the narrators of it show no inkling of the moral and legal difficulties which arise. "Everything that I know of law and justice convinces me that the wanton destruction of other people's property is a misdemeanour of evil example." Mr. Gladstone found an answer in the supposition that the possession of the swine was unlawful, and therefore justly punishable by their loss. It is to meet this argument that Professor Huxley writes his article. "After weighing all the arguments," no doubt remains on his mind that "Gadarene" is the proper reading. Whereupon his method is simply to show that Gadara was a Gentile and not a Jewish city. This is the entertainment which he promises, and this is the entertainment which he furnishes.

The method of proof is most satisfactory. We make little account of the display of references to Josephus, since it may be seen that in reality Professor Huxley's authority is Schürer's *Jewish People in the Time of Jesus Christ*. And he could not have landed better. Schürer's "classical work" is all that he describes it. It "puts the whole evidence before serious students, with full reference to the needful authorities, and in a thoroughly judicial manner." But the serious student may well ask whether it was worth while to condense Schürer's interesting pages for this particular purpose. Is it so certain that the pig owners were really Gadarenes? And if they were, does it affect the interpretation of the miracle, or the truth of the gospels, whether they were Jews or Gentiles?

The miracle is recorded in all three synoptic gospels (Matt. viii. 28; Mark v. 1; Luke viii. 26), and it is well known that in all these places both MSS. and Versions vary between three readings, "Gadarenes," "Gergesenes," and "Gerasenes." The Authorised Version, following the *Textus Receptus*, has "Gergesenes" in Matthew, and "Gadarenes" in Mark and Luke. The Revised Version, on the other hand, gives "Gadarenes" in Matthew, and "Gerasenes" in Mark and Luke, following or at least agreeing with Westcott and Hort. We have not promised "a good deal of entertainment," but it would be too tedious to give the evidence of the

MSS. and Versions. It is enough to notice, in a sentence, the judgment of the other leading editors. Lachmann reads "Gerasenes" in all three places; Tischendorf "Gadarenes" in Matthew, "Gerasenes" in Mark, and "Gergesenes" in Luke; while Tregelles has "Gadarenes" in Matthew, and "Gerasenes" in the other two places, thus agreeing with Westcott and Hort.

Now, can any explanation be found of this variety of reading? There is a book on the Four Gospels by Principal M'Clellan of Cirencester (Macmillan, 1875), known to most serious students, though Professor Huxley betrays no knowledge of it, which we never turn to in vain on points like these. There we find that the testimony of Origen unravels the complication. "The precipitation of the swine," says Origen, "is recorded to have taken place in the country of the *Gerasenes*. But Gerasa [viz. Gerasa of Gilead] is in Arabia, near neither sea nor lake. In a few copies we have found 'into the country of the *Gadarenes*'; but Gadara is in Judea [Peræa], equally without precipices by a lake. . . . But Gergesa, whence are the *Gergesenes*, is an ancient city by the Lake of Tiberias, with a precipice. . . . It is interpreted, 'the dwelling of expellers,' as if prophetic of the act of its inhabitants towards the Saviour."

This quotation from Origen may be found, by those who have not Origen's works, in almost any commentary. But we quote it as found in Mr. M'Clellan's note, because of the clear and convincing judgment he pronounces upon it. "Origen decisively attests that *Gerasenes* was the prevalent reading, apparently in all three evangelists, in nearly all the copies known to him; that *Gadarenes* was found only in a few, and *Gergesenes*, it may be inferred, in none." Jerome confirms the existence of a village called Gergesa, as "still shown to this day, above the mountain close by the Lake of Tiberias." *But he always renders the word in the gospels "Gerasenes."* Thus the variations are easily accounted for. "Gergesa" or "Gerasa," supposing that such a place existed, was but an obscure village close by the Sea of Galilee. Gerasa, on the other hand, was an important city in Gilead (or Arabia Peræa, as Origen says), and Gadara was, perhaps, still better known as a city of the Deca-

polis. The reading in Origen's day was "Gerasenes;" but the copyists, thinking this referred to the well-known Gerasa in Gilead, and knowing that the miracle could not have occurred there, at a distance of twenty miles from the Sea of Galilee, altered it to "Gadarenes," since at Gadara there were the "tombs," and other particulars of the miracle, and it might easily be supposed that the whole district took its name from this chief city. Gadara is a little over six miles from the lake. As for the third reading "Gergesenes," we owe it either to Origen's own conjecture ("plainly a mere guess," says Keim), who had the Girgashites of the Old Testament in his mind; or else Gergesa was, as Ewald suggests, a dialectic variety of the name *Gerasa*.

The right word is "Gerasenes"—so the textual authority leads us to determine—if *there was another town called "Gerasa," so situated as to meet the demands of the narratives in the Gospels*. Says Edersheim: "The ruins right over against the plain of Gennesaret, which still bear the name of *Kersa* or *Gersa*, must represent the ancient Gerasa." It is to Dr. William Thomson that the honour belongs of identifying these ruins. The story is well told in *The Land and the Book*, and is familiar to most Biblical students. Dr. Thomson, whose acquaintance with readings was not, of course, extensive,—he speaks here of a reading "Gersa,"—rather hastily prefers the form *Gergesa*. But that is a matter of small consequence, and is probably due to a determination to keep away from the Gilead Gerasa as well as from Gadara. Both of these places he proves to be impossible. "But in this Gersa, or Chersa, we have a position which fulfils every requirement of the narratives." Few identifications have been accepted by subsequent explorers in Palestine with greater unanimity. And in such a matter these are our only authorities. Thus Dr. Tristram (*The Land of Israel*, p. 461), while seeing in the scenery of Gadara all the concomitant events of the miracle, except one, holds that exception fatal to the claims of the well-known city, for the "steep place" does not run down to the *sea*, but to the little river. He adds another objection, however. "St. Mark tells us that our Lord was met *immediately* on his coming out of the ship. But Gadara (Um Keis is the

modern name) is three and a half hours' distant from the shores of the lake. He therefore indorses the suggestion of Dr. Thomson, and describes the discovery as most interesting and important. Mr. Macgregor ("Rob Roy"), from independent observation, comes to the same conclusion. Professor Socin, also, in Bædeker's *Palästina*, accepts the identification; and the explorers of the Palestine Exploration Fund, though some of them are apparently not quite decided (see Mr. Armstrong's *Names and Places in the Old and New Testaments*, a semi-official volume), suggest this site and mention no other. And yet Professor Huxley says: "The existence of any place called Gergesa is declared by the weightiest authorities whom I have consulted to be very questionable;" and with these words he brushes aside the evidence we have produced. One would have been glad to know the names of some of his "weightiest authorities."

As for the weightiest authorities, they seem to be fairly unanimous in the opinion that the scene of the miracle was not Gadara at all, and with that Professor Huxley's whole article becomes, so far as it bears upon the morality and legality of the miracle, the vainest beating of the air.

But suppose the evidence had led the other way, and Mr. Huxley's historical studies of Schürer had been more appropriate, does it follow that to prove the town of Gadara ruled by Romans then, proves these particular pig-owners Gentile? It does not seem so. Keim, whose orthodoxy can bear no taint of suspicion we presume to Professor Huxley, says that "there were many Jews settled in the district of Gadara," and gives for his statement the very authority of Josephus, whom Professor Huxley is here seen quoting so freely. Keim thinks that the impression produced by what was said favours the supposition that they *were* Jews. Ewald and Weizsäcker agree.

But it is a point not worth debating. Of far more importance is the question, Whether the morality and legality of the narratives stand in any need of this argument? Professor Huxley thinks so; and he is evidently of opinion that that is Mr. Gladstone's belief also. Let it be observed, however, that Mr. Gladstone deliberately puts aside

other, and to him higher, arguments in favour of their morality and legality, in order to reach one which might be nearer the ground occupied by the "negative school." One such argument—whether it has the sun of science in its face or at its back we leave Professor Huxley to judge—was suggested long ago by Bengel. "*Damnū dæmonibus adscribendum*," says Bengel, in his pregnant way: "the pig-owners' loss was the doing of the demons." If Jesus had the power to order the expulsion of the demons from one of God's creatures, He had the power to permit them to enter another. You cannot challenge the morality of the latter power, if you grant the former. For the authority to command evil spirits, if it existed in Jesus, at once lifts Him up to a place beyond the reach of the mere creature. It brings Him into touch with the powers and responsibilities of the Creator. And then Bengel's judgment is right: the damage was done by the devils, and you must call in question the *existence* of devils, and, finally, the existence of evil in any shape or form.

We referred recently to the words *pistis*, *pepoithesis*, and *parrhesia*. A correspondent in the

Christian considered that the Rev. H. W. Webb-Peplø, M.A., was not justified in drawing a clear distinction between them, and expressing it by *pistis*, faith; *pepoithesis*, trust; and *parrhesia*, confidence. Mr. Webb-Peplø's reply was that the distinction is Scriptural, and he referred to Eph. ii. 8; 2 Cor. iii. 4; 1 John ii. 28 and iv. 17, where the several words are rendered as above.

Mr. Webb-Peplø further adds (in a note to ourselves), that he believes that many of the practical difficulties in which Christians find themselves, arise from failing to observe the difference between these three words, and to act them out, as required to do in God's Word. "*Faith* seems to express that receptivity of the soul by which we are led to take in whatever God offers; *trust*, that passivity (or shall we say 'repose') of soul, by which we are led to calmly leave all in the hands of God; and *confidence*, or 'boldness,' that activity of soul by which we are led to step out anywhere and everywhere that God may call us, even if it be into His own immediate presence." If there is really such a difference in the meaning of these words, the distinction is surely most important, and deserves a fuller recognition.

The Indwelling of the Spirit in Individuals.

I.

BY THE REV. F. H. RINGWOOD, LL.D.

Is it scriptural to speak of any individual Christian as a "temple of the Holy Spirit?"

My impression is that so to speak is non-scriptural. What follows aims at proving this.

Before making the attempt, I must deprecate prejudice by stating that I do not, in the slightest degree, question the spiritual and moral inferences which are derived generally from the revealed fact of the indwelling of the Holy Spirit in the true followers of the Lord Jesus Christ. 1 Peter ii. 5 summarizes my view: "Ye yourselves also, as *living stones*, are being built up a *spiritual house*," which teaches that the temple of the Holy Spirit consists of the aggregate of Christian believers, each of whom is figured as a stone pervaded by the life-imparting Spirit. My opinion is that this conception of Christ's Church prevails throughout the New Testament without a single exception. If any well-established variation from this magnificent

idea of our Lord's true Church can be produced from Holy Scripture, I shall not, of course, presume to challenge it. If no such diversity of metaphor exist, I dare not acquiesce in its employment by any merely human preacher or uninspired commentator.

It will be admitted by all that the sacred structure in which the Shechina dwelt was called the temple or *vaós*. The word appears frequently in this sense in the New Testament—e.g. Matt. xxiii. 16, 17, 21, xxvi. 61, xxvii. 5, 40, 51; Mark xv. 38; Luke i. 9, 21, 22, 23, 45; John ii. 20.

Again, it will not be disputed that our Lord spoke of His own body as a temple, *vaós*—John ii. 19, 21, in connection with which may be cited the remarkable passage in Apoc. xxi. 22, and Col. ii. 9, "In Him dwelleth all the fulness of the God-head bodily (*σωματικῶς*)."

Thirdly, we find the Christian Church described as the *vaós* of God repeatedly in the Epistles of St. Paul—a conception foreshadowed, perhaps, by our Lord's language in that memorable passage in Matt. xvi. 18, *οικοδομήσω μου τὴν ἐκκλησίαν*, and