

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 Expositor* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_expositor-series-1.php

suppose that God has exhausted all the forms of love and service and self-sacrifice in *this* world, and that there are no higher forms unknown to us as yet; but the instances I have given may suffice to bring home the conviction that in the future, as in the present, Love will be the ruling energy of all life in Christ, and will find ample opportunities of service and self-sacrifice in which to exercise and develop its powers. They can hardly fail to correct the selfish and self-regarding views of heaven which have too long prevailed in the Church, and which we are all too apt to cherish.

ALMONI PELONI.

THE EXEGESIS OF THE SCHOOLMEN.

THE "MULTIPLEX SENSE" OF SCRIPTURE.

THE whole of Scholastic Exegesis was benumbed by what has been called the "narcotising influence" of one false opinion. This opinion was repeated by author after author until it came to be universally assumed. It was that there prevailed throughout Scripture a "*multiplex sensus*."

1. The root of this mistaken conception is to be found in the Rabbis and in the rules which they mnemonically indicated by the word PaRDeS, namely:—1. *Peshat*, or Explanation; 2. *Remes*, or "Hint"; 3. *Derush*, or Homily; and 4. *Sod*, or Mystery. The *Peshat* was the literal sense. The *Remes* involves the various inferences drawn by the Halachists. The *Derush* left room for the Hagada, with its legends, allegories, and moral applications. The *Sod* involved the Kabbala and all mystic deductions from the obvious statements of Scripture. By these means, accord-

ing to Rabbi Ishmael, all Scripture could be expounded in forty-nine ways, and each text broken into fragments by the expositor, as a rock is by a hammer. John Scotus Erigena used a more poetical metaphor, but he meant something of the same kind when he compared Scripture to a peacock's feather, of which the smallest particle glitters with various light.¹

This false notion filtered down to the Fathers through the Alexandrian Jews, and prevailed for many hundreds of years. It came to the Schoolmen mainly through St. Jerome and St. Augustine. The only school of commentators whose insight and genius saw its futility—the School of Antioch—had been hastily and not quite charitably condemned on grounds of supposed heresy. The Antiochene Exegetes had thus been practically silenced, and the Church lost for ages the beneficial influence which they might have exercised. If the Exegetes of the Middle Ages had been better acquainted with the views of Theodoret and of Theodore of Mopsuestia they would have been saved from nine-tenths of the error which goes so far to discredit their honest labours. Unhappily, when an erroneous principle has been accepted without full examination by a few great writers, it tends to perpetuate itself under the shadow of their authority.

St. Jerome had laid down the rule that the Scriptures are to be explained in three ways, namely:—1. Historically, that is literally. 2. Tropologically, that is morally. 3. Spiritually, that is, *a*. Allegorically, and *β*, Anagogically; that is, mystically, with reference to the unseen world and the future life. This threefold division was supposed to be mysteriously related to the doctrine of the Trinity. Origen, in his second Homily on Genesis, seems to have been the first to speak of a *threefold* sense of Scripture.

St. Augustine divided Exegesis into the two heads of

¹ *De Div. Naturae*, iii. 26.

Historic and Allegoric. He separates the Historic into Analogic (which has to prove the congruence of the Old and New Testaments), and Ætiologic (which furnishes the reasons for facts). He divides the Allegoric into Proper, *e.g.* when figures of the past refer to the present; Tropologic, or Moral; and Anagogic.¹

St. Jerome was well aware of the dangers of the "mystic sense." He complains that Origen allegorises Paradise till nothing historical is left, calling the trees "angels," the rivers "celestial virtues," and the coats of skin "human bodies," as though Adam and Eve had been previously bodiless.² In another place he says that Origen wanders in the free realms of allegory, and makes sacraments of the Church out of his own ingenuity. But Jerome, like Augustine, is often unfaithful in practice to rules which he had wisely laid down in theory.

The prevalence of the mystic mode of interpretation was greatly increased by the influence of the writings of the Pseudo-Dionysius.

Philo attributed the first development of allegoric interpretation to the Essenes, but the Fathers founded their views on the supposed practice of Christ and the Apostles.

A favourite example of the fourfold sense was that furnished by the word Jerusalem. It indicates—1. Historically and literally, a city. 2. Tropologically or morally, a faithful soul. 3. Allegorically, the Church militant. 4. Anagogically, the Church triumphant.

Eucherius, in his *spirituales formulæ*, gives an illustration of the fourfold sense from the word "water."

1. Historically it means the element water, as in Genesis i. 9.
2. Tropologically it indicates "sorrow," as in Psalm lxxv.

¹ Aug., *De util. Credendi*, 3. See Sixtus Senensis, *Bibl. Sanct.*, p. 168, and Bellarmine, *De verbo Dei*, iii. 3.

² *Ep. ad Pammachium*.

9; or "wisdom" (Prov. xviii. 4); or "heresies" (Prov. v. 16); or "worldly prosperity" (John iv. 13).

3. Allegorically it refers to "baptism" (Ezek. xxxvi. 25); or "peoples" (Rev. xvii. 15); or "grace" (John vii. 38).

4. Anagogically it alludes to "eternal happiness," as in Jeremiah ii. 13; Psalm cxlviii. 4.

The example serves excellently to shew the nature of a system of which it may be said that in its worst developments "nought is everything, and everything is nought."

St. Thomas Aquinas¹ furnishes us with a specimen of the fourfold sense, in explaining "Let there be light." It may be taken, 1. Literally. 2. Allegorically, to mean "Let Christ be love." 3. Anagogically, to mean, May we by Christ be led to glory. 4. Tropologically, to mean, May we be mentally illumined by Christ.

Bellarmino says that Galatians iv. 2 is a specimen of Allegory; 1 Corinthians ix. 9, of Tropology; Hebrews iv. 3, of Anagogy.

St. Bernard compares the literal sense to the Garden in the Song of Solomon; the moral sense to the Cellars for fruit and spices; and the mystic sense to the Bridal Chamber.²

The Schoolmen in a body adopt this view of the "fourfold sense."

Thus St. Thomas Aquinas says that the sense of Scripture is Literal and Spiritual—the latter presupposing and being founded on the former. The literal sense is that in which words signify things. It is divided into Historical, Ætiological, and Analogical. The spiritual sense is that in which the things signified again foreshadow other things, and this sense is divisible into Allegory, Tropology, and Anagogy.

¹ *In Galat. iv., lect. 6.*

² *Serm. 92.* Others prefer a sevenfold, or an eightfold sense. *Hagenlach, i. 468.*

The same division, with trivial modifications, is found again and again. Thus we are told by Hugo de St. Caro that,—

“*Historia docet factum; Tropologia faciendum;
Allegoria credendum; Anagogia appetendum.*”¹

He proceeds to compare those four methods of interpretation with the four colours of the Vail of the Temple—white being the Historical; blue the Allegorical; scarlet the Anagogic; and purple the Tropological.

The sermons of Savonarola are almost always divided exegetically into these four heads.

When Bishop Longland, a friend of Dean Colet, was preaching before Henry VIII. in 1525, on Proverbs ix. 1, 2, he explained the words, “She hath also furnished her table,” to mean that Wisdom set forth in her Scriptural banquet the four courses of History, Tropology, Anagogy, and Allegory.²

Scripture was compared by Bonaventura to the river of Paradise which was parted into the four heads of History, Allegory, Tropology and Anagogy. Other Schoolmen compared the Bible to the four winds, the fourfold cherub, the tabernacle coverings, and the four legs of the table of the Lord.

Even Nicholas of Lyra writes the famous lines,—

*Littera gesta docet, quod credas Allegoria,
Moralis quid agas, quo tendas Anagogia.*

Angelo Rocca characterizes all the chief exegetes by the particular branch of interpretation, in which they excelled,—

¹ Hugo de Sto. Caro, *Prolog. in Gen.*

² See Mr. Lupton's note on his edition of Colet on the Celestial Hierarchies of Dionysius (p. 106). *Bibl. Theol. et Script. Epitomæ*, 1596. See, too, Sixt. Senensis, *Bibl. Sanct.*, p. 134.

Historiam Hebræis et Græcis fontibus haustam
 Hieronymo disces duce.
 Allegorias Anagogiasque recludent
 Origenes, Ambrosius.
 Exponent sensus formandis moribus aptos
 Chrysostomus, Gregorius.
 In dubiis altaque locis caligine mersis
 Aurelius lucem feret
 At brevis et facilis non est spernenda tironi
 Lyrensis expositio.

2. But how are we to account for the popularity of this mediæval method of teaching Scripture, which prevailed universally from the days of Bede to those of Luther?

a. It originated as we have seen from Rabbinic traditions handed down through the Fathers to the Schoolmen. The influence of the Alexandrian School and especially of Origen was felt even among those who treated Origen as a heretic. It powerfully affected the mind of St. Jerome, and is perceptible to a large extent in that of St. Augustine, though to him it only came through secondary channels.

β. It was perpetuated by circumstances which we have already noticed; namely, respect for ancient authority; the deep root taken by traditions once established; and the rigid conditions imposed on mediæval exegesis by the violent enforcement of conformity to existing ecclesiastical dogma. In the general ignorance of history and grammar no room would have been left for Hermeneutics if a boundless field had not been opened for pious ingenuity in the various endeavours to elucidate the supposed *multiplex sensus*.

γ. Further, the doctrine had the utmost value for the interests of ecclesiasticism. Hugo of St. Victor, as we have seen, had with perfect naïveté laid down the rule, "Disce prius . . . quid tenendum sit . . . Quum autem postea legere cœperis libros . . . *si aliquid in-*

*veneris contrarium illi quod tu jam firmissima fide tenendum esse didicisti non tamen expedit tibi quotidie mutare sententiam . . . nisi . . . quid fides universalis quae nunquam falsa esse potest inde jubeat sentiri, agnoveris.*¹ Similarly Paul of Burgos in his reactionary work against Nicolas of Lyra says, in so many words, that no interpretation is to be accepted if it be repugnant to the authority of the Church, "however much such a sense may be in conformity with the literal meaning." The very motto of the Bernardites was *Nisi credideritis non intelligetis*. In other words they assumed that every doctrine of mediæval sacerdotalism was infallibly true, and if anything in the Bible ran counter to any crystallized dogma, so much the worse for the Bible. And thus the Papal Church had a great advantage. It could extract doctrines from Scripture in thousands of ways inconceivably remote from the intentions of the sacred writers. Thus Boniface VIII. proved that the Pope possessed both spiritual and temporal authority from the text, "Here are two swords"; and the Papal doctors defended the infamous spectacle of Spanish bishops making a holocaust of better Christians than themselves by the text about the burning of unprofitable branches.

Innocent III. deduces from Genesis i. 16 that "the sun to rule the day," means the Pontifical authority which presides over those who are spiritual, whereas the moon "to govern the night," means the temporal power which rules those who are carnal. A papal theologian interpreted 1 Samuel ii. 8 (Vulg., *Domini sunt cardines terræ*) of the cardinals. Antonius, Bishop of Florence, explained Psalm viii. 7 to mean that God put all things under the feet of the Pope: sheep, *i.e.* Christians; oxen, *i.e.* Jews and heretics; beasts of the field, *i.e.* Pagans; fishes of the sea, *i.e.* souls in Purgatory. Psalm lxxiv., 13, "Thou hast broken the heads of the dragons in the water," was ex-

¹ *Erudit. Didasc.*, vi. 4.

plained to mean that demons are expelled by baptism. The celibacy of priests was supported by the comparison of the cheeks of the beloved in Canticles to a dove—the cheeks being meant for preachers. The root of the tree in Daniel's vision (Dan. iv. 12) was adduced to prove the Immaculate Conception of the Virgin Mary. The two rods in Zechariah xi. 7 are used as types of the Dominicans and Minorites. The canonisation of saints was defended by Pope Eugenius from Matthew v. 15,—the putting of a lamp on a lamp-stand. Innocent III. explained Luke v. 4, *Duc' in altum*, to mean "Go to Rome; betake thyself to the city which has dominion over all nations, and there let down thy net." "O temerariam impudentiam," exclaims Luther of similar allegories, "et scelestam ambitionem."¹

ε. The Schoolmen laid down the principle that no one could interpret Scripture without the charism of spiritual illumination. If, therefore, any allegorist was able to elaborate some new defence of priestcraft or superstition by the ingenious manipulation of texts which might be even inconceivably inapposite to the matter on hand, his interpretation was hailed as "spiritual." If, on the other hand, an interpreter deduced from the most obvious passages of Scripture any view which tended to counteract the reigning dogmatism, nothing was easier than, first, to deny that he possessed the illuminating grace, and then, if desirable, to imprison, to excommunicate, or to commit him to the flames. "The Protestants," says the Jesuit Salmeron, writing on 2 Corinthians iii., "despise our arguments derived from allegories; whence we may at once understand that they are devoid of the Spirit, who would enable them to penetrate the heart of Scripture." It was of no small advantage to Papal dominance that Scripture should be a book sealed with seven Papal seals; a sort of magic volume which it required a trained Kab-

¹ See *Glass, Theol. Sacr.*, p. 193.

balism to interpret satisfactorily.¹ Hence the learned Glass compares the Scholastic exegetes to camels who, according to Pliny, cannot drink from a pool till they have made it muddy with their hoofs.²

ζ. Again, the Schoolmen had so frequently exhausted even *their* eloquent verbosity in extolling the infallibility of Scripture even in its minutest details that at last they were honestly unable to regard it as a book written by human writers, and to be interpreted in accordance with the normal laws of human logic and human speech. Every word, every letter, was to be regarded as full of ineffable mysteries, and therefore when Scripture spoke of the most ordinary facts its words and narratives could only be regarded as symbolical signs intended to shadow forth what would otherwise be incomprehensible. The mobile, not to say flaccid, character of these symbols gave room for an indefinite number of applications. Scripture became a sort of indeterminate equation. Allegorical dictionaries designed to shew how many different meanings might be attached to any given symbol became a branch of literature, from the *Clavis* of the Pseudo-Melito down to the *Liber Allegoriarum* of Rabanus Maurus; and as the permutations and combinations of the allegoric significance of words were practically infinite, there was no reason why a folio volume of double columns and hundreds of pages should not be devoted to the "elucidation" of a single chapter. Everything might stand for something else. Hugo of St. Victor illustrates the rule as holding in the

¹ Since writing this sentence I find that Bonaventura actually *did* compare the Bible to the Apocalyptic book with seven seals; and he said these seven seals were the *historic, allegoric, tropologic, anagogic, symbolic, synekdochic, and hyperbolic* methods of interpretation. The "obscurity" of Scripture became a standing dogma of the Romanists, and Bellarmine says that exegesis needs the Spirit who is only found in the Council approved by the Pope (*De Verbo Dei*, iii. 3). Cardinal Cusanus admits that Rome made her exegesis vary with her practice (*Opp.*, p. 833).

² Glass, *Philolog. Sacr.*, p. 192.

case of things, persons, numbers, places, times, actions. "Snow" in its inner nature might mean frigidty; in its outer form it might stand for purity. A person—*e.g.* Jacob—might stand as a symbol either for Christ, because he was heir of his father, or for the Gentiles. Isaac, who blessed his son, was a type of God the Father. The three Patriarchs indicate Faith, Hope, and Love. Egypt is the symbol of worldliness; the Desert, of asceticism; Babylon, of demons, and so forth.

As no one now thinks of explaining Scripture in this "fourfold sense" even in sermons, we need not enter into the strangely futile arguments by which the Schoolmen defended it. We may however give one specimen of such arguments—for as such they were regarded—from Cornelius à Lapide. On 1 Samuel xx. 20 he says that Scripture has two senses, a literal and a mystic, just as when Jonathan told the boy to fetch his arrow, his words were both a literal direction and a sign to David that he was to fly!

3. A few specimens will shew the mode of applying this doctrine about the "multiplex sense." They will illustrate St. Jerome's remark¹ "that the spiritual interpretation ought to follow the order of the history, a fact which many ignore, and so wander in the Scriptures with frenzied error."

i. Hervæus Dolensis on the narrative of Matthew ix. 18–26 says that the maiden dead in the house is the soul dead in thought. The flute-players are its flatterers. The murmuring crowd indicates pressing thoughts, fancies which have to be ejected. Jesus raises the dead with a few witnesses, which implies *private penance before a priest*. This is Tropology in the service of ecclesiastical dogma.

ii. On Matthew x. 9, 10 he says that churchmen ought not to have gold, or silver, or money in their purse, that is, they must not have wisdom and eloquence as personal

possessions, but only as gifts of God; and this is commanded "because of private and heretical doctrines," *vel aliter*, they ought to multiply the talent committed to them. They must not have a scrip, *i.e.* must be unworldly; nor two coats, *i.e.* they must be single-minded. This is mystic and allegoric exegesis.

iii. Hugo of St. Victor illustrates the threefold sense of Scripture thus. The historic sense of Job is that he was a rich man of Uz who was reduced to sit on a dunghill in disease. The allegorical sense is the humiliation of Christ bearing our sins. The moral sense is the soul making a dunghill of its past sins, and sitting on them in weeping memory.

iv. Again, we are told in John x. 22, 23 that it was winter, and that Jesus walked in Solomon's porch. The winter, says Hugo, indicates the torpor and unbelief of the Jews. The action implies that Jesus can only come to faithful souls, for he came to Bethany, or "the House of Obedience," to raise Lazarus, *i.e.* a soul formerly dead in sins.

4. The tendency to allegorize sacred books is universal. Luther points out that Mohammedan theologians allegorized the Koran. Scholars allegorized Ovid's *Metamorphoses*; and in the *Epistolae Obscurorum Virorum* a student informs us (and perhaps, as Mr. Lupton says, with little exaggeration) that he had attended "unam lectionem in poetria," where he had heard Ovid expounded *naturaliter, literaliter, historialiter, et spiritualiter*.

But it was inevitable that commentators should be driven to find mystic senses in Scripture if they believed that every syllable of them was "written by the Triune God." How then could they treat such a book as the Song of Solomon—that favourite book of the mystics—except on the supposition that it expressed throughout a mystic sense? "In that day the mountains shall drop new wine

and the hills shall flow with milk" (Joel iii. 18). That means, says Albertus Magnus, that the *vertices* of the three Persons in the Holy Trinity, and even the *vertices* of the apostles shall distil sweetness; and the *vertices* of the angels and saints shall flow in the truth of the white and the sweetness of the most pure doctrine of the Humanity of Christ"!

"Let the bridegroom go forth from his chamber and the bride out of her closet" (Joel ii. 16). That means, says the Pseudo-Haymo, "Let Christ go forth from the bosom of the Father, and the flesh of Christ from the womb of the Virgin Mary."

To those who took all Scripture to be a Divine and supernatural enigma, such a book as Leviticus became worse than meaningless if it were not allegorized. Hence St. Prosper of Aquitaine says that the joining of the sides and ends of the tabernacle is a sign that "mercy and truth are met together;" that the curtains of goat's hair indicate the world in a state of penitence and guilt before God; and that the eleven curtains refer us to the eleventh Psalm (in one version the twelfth), which begins "Help me, oh God!"

Even Erasmus was so far unable to shake off these antique superstitions that he said it would be as valueless to read the Book of Judges as to read Livy, if we might not allegorize the wars of the Israelites.

5. It is melancholy to think that this fiction about the fourfold sense—which is repeated by all the great Schoolmen, and which lies at the basis of their voluminous commentaries—should have vitiated the exegesis of a thousand years. It received its death-blow from the Reformers. One after another all the great Reformers, Erasmus,¹

¹ Erasmus is not quite consistent; but see his Preface to Ecclesiastes and to St. John. In the latter he says: "Allegorias . . . parcius nec ultra quam satis esse judicabam, attigi." See his Expos. in Ps. lxxxvi.

Luther,¹ Melanchthon,² Peter Martyr,³ Flacius,⁴ Calvin, condemned and repudiated the fourfold sense. The latter made no use of it in his Institutes, and entirely rejects Allegory and the mystic sense from his great commentaries. But we will content ourselves with the judgments of two eminent English Reformers on the subject.

“We may borrow similitudes or allegories from the Scriptures,” says the great translator of the English Bible, and apply them to our purposes, *which allegories are no sense of the Scriptures but free things besides the Scriptures altogether in the liberty of the spirit.* . . . “Such allegory proveth nothing; it is a mere simile.” “God is a Spirit, and all his words are spiritual, and his literal sense is spiritual.”

Whitaker, the opponent of Bellarmine, says, “As to those three spiritual senses, it is surely foolish to say there are as many senses of Scripture as the words themselves may be transferred and accommodated to bear. For although the words *may be applied and accommodated tropologically, anagogically, allegorically, or any other way, yet there are not therefore various senses, various interpretations and explications of Scripture, but there is but one sense and that the literal*, which may be variously accommodated, and from which various things may be collected.”

Even Dean Colet, though he admits the fourfold sense, yet says that the New Testament has for the most part “the sense that appears on the surface; nor is one thing said and another meant, but the very thing is meant which is said and the sense is wholly literal. Still inasmuch as

¹ See Luther's Comments on Gen. iii. xv. xxx; Matt. xvi., etc, and *Fabricius Loci Communes D. M. Lutheri*, 1651. “*Allegoriæ sunt inanes speculationes et tamquam spuma sacræ Scripturæ,*” etc.

² Melanchthon, *De Rhetorica*, and *De officio concinatoris*. See Flacius, *Clavis*, ii. 65.

³ *Loci Communes Theologici*.

⁴ Flacius, *Clavis*, ii. 899 seqq (ed. 1617).

the Church of God is figurative conceive always an *anagoge* in what you hear in the doctrine of the Church, the meaning of which will not cease till the figure has become the truth. From this moreover conclude that where the literal sense is, there the allegorical sense is not always along with it; but on the other hand that where there is the allegorical sense the literal sense is always underlying it."¹

At this point I must stay my hand. I will only remind the reader that I have been speaking exclusively of the *Exegesis* of the Schoolmen, not of their philosophy or their writings generally. And if I have had little or nothing to say in praise of their exegesis, it is only because there is little in it which deserves praise. The science of exegesis was never at a lower ebb than it was throughout the entire Scholastic epoch. I have furnished abundant indications of its want of originality; of its want of independence; of its subservience to dogma and tradition; of its vague views of inspiration; of its neglect of philology and history; of its tendency to *vaniloquium*; of its barbarous technical language; of its futile speculations; of its baseless theory of a *fourfold sense*. The merits of these theologians as exegetes are never due to the system and method they adopt, but solely to their individual piety and genius. They make pious remarks and valuable homiletic reflections, but I am not aware of a single new principle discovered, or a single new and valuable fact elicited by their thousand years of commentary. Their merits must be sought for in other regions of thought.

Let me part from them with the remark of a hostile Reformer and of a favourable Pope.

"I read the Schoolmen with judgment," says Luther in a letter to Staupitz, "not with my eyes shut. . . . I

¹ Colet, On the Hierarchies of Dionysius, p. 107 (ed. Lupton).

do not reject all their opinions, but neither do I approve of them all indiscriminately."

The present Pope, Leo XIII., in the Encyclical *Æterni Patris*,¹ pronounces a glowing eulogium on Thomas Aquinas, and recommends the whole Christian world to study his writings. But, he adds, "we refer to the *wisdom* of St. Thomas; for whatever in the Schoolmen savours of over-subtlety or over-rashness, and whatever is little in accordance with the demonstrated doctrines of a later age, or whatever lastly is improbable, it is by no means my purpose to recommend to the imitation of our age."

F. W. FARRAR.

NOTE ON ST. JAMES i. 9, 10.

I SHOULD be glad of space for a brief note on the above verses, having special reference to the admirable papers recently contributed to the *EXPOSITOR*² by Dr. R. W. Dale. The interpretation of the verses that is given in those papers is, in my judgment, entirely trustworthy, and indeed the only one that the words can reasonably be made to bear; and it may be hoped that Dr. Dale's complete statement and defence of it will do much towards disposing of the "savage," "artificial," and other untenable interpretations to which Huther, Alford, and other commentators have been driven in their endeavour to escape the imagined difficulty of understanding ἀδελφός to belong to both verses. This difficulty, which I take to be wholly imaginary, is really at the root of all the perplexity that the commentators have felt and occasioned in their treatment of this passage.

The only object of this note is to claim a closer connexion than Dr. Dale seems willing to allow between these verses (9, 10) and the verses that immediately precede them (6-8). In reference to this latter passage Dr. Dale writes: "The words which follow:— 'Let him ask in faith, nothing doubting; for he that doubteth is like the surge of the sea, driven by the wind and tossed. For

¹ Aug. 4, 1879.

² *EXPOSITOR. Second Series*, vol. v. pp. 321ff. and 426ff.