

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. "*Damnūm 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-Pepløe, 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-Pepløe'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-Pepløe 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 *vaos*. 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, *vaos*—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 *vaos* 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

not without its anticipations in the Prophets of the elder Dispensation.

In St. Paul this revealed fact is affirmed or implied frequently; thrice in 1 Cor. iii. 16, 17. The merely English reader must bear in mind that, in the original language, there is no possibility of vagueness about the meaning of "you." Here and always the word is *ὑμεῖς* and *ὑμῖν*, utterly different in sound and appearance from the word which means "thou" or "you" in the singular, viz. *σύ*. Again, we find the same truth twice in 2 Cor. vi. 16. Similarly in Eph. ii. 21, etc., "In whom all the (*οἰκοδομή*) building fitly framed together groweth into an holy temple (*ναός*) in the Lord; in whom ye also (*ὑμεῖς*) are builded together for a dwelling-place of God in the Spirit." The sense may be the same in 2 Thess. ii. 4, which cannot possibly convey the meaning which I am combating.

Besides this use of the word *ναός* itself as referring to the Christian Church, and not to any Christian individual, there are other passages which convey the same or a similar thought. Thus in Heb. iii. 6, "But Christ as a son over his house; whose house we are." 1 Peter ii. 5, "Ye are built up a spiritual house, an holy priesthood, to offer up spiritual sacrifices, acceptable to God by Jesus Christ."

Furthermore, there are a series of passages which convey an analogous conception of the Church as the "body of Christ," which is very important in reference to this inquiry. Thus, in Rom. xii. 5, we read, "We, who are many, are one body (*σῶμα*) in Christ;" in 1 Cor. x. 17, "We, who are many, are one loaf, one body;" in 1 Cor. xii. 13, "We have all been baptized into one body;" 1 Cor. xii. 27, "Ye are the body of Christ, and severally members;" in Eph. i. 23, "The Church, which is His body;" Eph. ii. 16, "Reconcile both unto God in one body;" in Eph. iv. 4, "One body, and one Spirit;" Eph. iv. 12, "For the building up of the body of Christ;" Eph. iv. 16, "From whom the whole body," etc.; Eph. v. 23, "He Himself is the Saviour of the body;" Eph. v. 30, "We are members of His body;" Col. i. 18, "He is the head of the body, the Church;" Col. i. 24, "For His body's sake, which is the Church;" Col. ii. 19, "From whom all the body," etc.; Col. iii. 15, "To which also ye were called in one body."

It is clear, then, that the Christian Church is represented to us as being the body of Christ, and individual Christians as being severally limbs or members of that body. This figure finds its parallel in that of Christians being severally "living stones" which constitute the "spiritual house" or "temple of God," in which "the Spirit of God dwells" (1 Cor. iii. 16).

Who would not be startled if a commentator or

preacher asserted that any single believer was "the body of Christ?" And yet we have become familiar with what seems to be an equally astounding notion that every true Christian is "the temple of God!" If this be true, there must be a vast number of "temples of God." But the fact is, that this word "temple" (*ναός*) never occurs in the plural throughout the New Testament except in reference to the temples of Diana, made by the silversmith, Demetrius (Acts xix. 24), and in Acts vii. 48 and Acts xvii. 24, where it is asserted that God does not dwell in temples made by hands. Whence, then, did this notion, so opposed to the analogy of Scripture, arise? It appears to be derived exclusively from the interpretation put upon 1 Cor. vi. 19, 20. In this passage it is assumed that "your body" (*τὸ σῶμα ὑμῶν*), ad lit. "the body of you" (plur.), means "thy body" in the singular, and that "the Holy Spirit which is in you" (plur. *ὑμῖν*) means "which is in thee;" and this, although the plural is used all through in the rest of the passage, "which you (plur.) have," etc.; and so in ver. 20, "the body of you" (plur.). "and in the spirit of you" (plur.) It also appears not to have been noticed that just before—*i.e.* in the 15th verse—"the bodies" of Christians (*τὰ σώματα ὑμῶν*) are stated to be limbs or "members of Christ," from which it follows that, in the writer's thought, the aggregate of their bodies made up "the body of Christ," according to Scripture usage, as shown above. With this would agree the idea that "the body of you" (plur.)—consisting of you—"is the temple of the Holy Spirit which is in you" (plur.). It is also to be observed that "the body of you" (plur.), in ver. 19, is in sharply defined and immediate contrast with the body of an individual in the preceding verse, "sinneth against his own body"—*τὸ ἴδιον σῶμα*, ver. 18, with *τὸ σῶμα ὑμῶν*, ver. 19, with which we may compare 1 Tim. iii. 5, where *τοῦ ἰδίου οἴκου*, "his own house," is contrasted with "the Church of God," which Church is (1 Tim. iii. 15) identified with "the house of God."

When I say it is weighed that *τὰ σώματα ὑμῶν* in ver. 15, are asserted to be *μέλη χριστοῦ*, which implies that the aggregate of bodies are Christ's body, and that in this same epistle, chap. xii. 27, it is plainly stated "ye are Christ's body," *ὑμεῖς δὲ ἔστε σῶμα χριστοῦ*; and when the whole analogy of Scripture language in reference to the Christian Church being the body of Christ is considered, it appears to rise to the highest degree of probability that "your body," *i.e.* "the body of you" (plur.) in 1 Cor. vi. 19, does not mean the body of an individual Christian, but that which consists of all Christians, and is described as the body of Christ, or the body which has Christ for its Head.

This view does not in any wise diminish the force of the moral appeal made here by the

Apostle. Is it not infinitely more than sufficient for any merely human creature to become a member of Christ's body—a living portion of that universal temple in which God's Holy Spirit dwells?

---

II.

BY THE REV. PRINCIPAL H. C. G. MOULE, M.A.

I have read with care and interest Dr. Ringwood's very able paper which you have kindly sent me in proof. Its argument, and I may add its tone, commands both attention and respect, and I feel that on many points of detail it is highly instructive. But I still venture to hold that 1 Cor. vi. 19, at least includes a reference to the body of the individual Christian, and entitles us to say with proper reserve, and in remembrance of other truth, that "the body"—the physical frame, regarded in the abstract—is, in each believer's case, a temple (*ναός*) of the blessed Spirit.

My main reason is the context before and after verse 19. Just before, the Apostle has been pressing the sacred law of purity in the body (and the secret for a victorious doing of that law, by realised union with Christ); and just after, verse 20, he proceeds, "Glorify God *in your body*;" where, surely, we must understand the body in the sense of, e.g., verse 15. The whole point of the intensely practical previous argument would surely be lost if we have, in verses 19, 20, a sudden transition to the Mystical Body—a *totally* different matter under an identical term.

I would repeat, what I implied above, that "your body" is a phrase equivalent to "the body," when we use the term undistributed. "Your body," I hold, equals "The body, as you have to do with it."

Meanwhile I see no necessary contradiction between my contention about 1 Cor. vi. 19, and the great truth of the corporate life of the saints in Christ, to which Dr. Ringwood so forcibly points our attention. I seem to see running all through the Scripture imagery about the Church the principle that each *μέρος*, or *μέλος* (each part or portion), of the total is also a miniature of the total. For example, take the blessed Indwelling. We have, "I *in them* and Thou in me." We have (Eph. ii. 22) the whole Church as the Habitation of God. But *also*, "We will make our abode with *him*;" "I will come in to *him*;" "Christ dwelling in your *hearts* (surely individually) by faith." And so here (1 Cor. vi. 15) "the *members of an harlot* (i.e., the physical frame of an unhappy individual fornicator) are regarded as being by right "the members of Christ." The imagery here is not of the man's body being a *limb* but the *limbs* of Christ; suggesting the idea that, *from one point of view*, Christ *de jure* so possesses that man as to claim his frame as his Lord's *frame*.

I am compelled to write under pressure, time being scarce with me. But I trust I have at least indicated the line in which I would attempt an answer to some contentions of Dr. Ringwood's paper—of whose ability and deep reverence of tone I must again express my strong sense.

---

## The Great Text Commentary.

### THE GREAT TEXTS OF FIRST CORINTHIANS.

I COR. XII. 31.

"Desire earnestly the greater gifts" (R.V.).

---

#### EXPOSITION.

"*Desire earnestly.*"—Literally, *be envious or jealous of*. It is translated, "zealously affect," in Gal. iv. 17, 18. It perhaps implies an indirect rebuke of the envy felt by many Corinthians for those who possessed the best gifts. It is as though St. Paul had said, "If you are envious at all, be envious *for the gifts*, not of those who have received them."—*Shore*.

"*Greater.*"—The MSS. are divided between "better" (*κρείττονα*) and "greater" (*μείζονα*). The former seems to me preferable, taken in the sense of "more useful," the gifts most capable of producing the common edification.—*Godet*.

The gifts specially in view are prophecy and teaching.—*Godet*.

The touchstone is charity; choose those that most readily group themselves round that great centre.—*John Ker*.

---

#### CRITICAL NOTE.

Reuss asks, How can we *seek* gifts? He sees here an insoluble contradiction between the two elements of Paul's view: Divine gift and human pursuit. But (1) Prayer implies both pursuit and gift; (2) the gift may be a germ which is to be cultivated.—*Godet*.

He does not strike a middle course between the assertion of God's sovereignty and of man's freedom, or attempt to reconcile them, but fearlessly maintains both as the foundation of practical exhortation.—*Edwards*.

The Spirit takes account of the receptive capacity and mental tendency of the individual.—*Meyer*.