---

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

Priesthood, and all symbolism around them had been rendered provisional, and had gone. One unchangeable Priest, Jesus, enters into the life of humanity, that by the authority of One Person, the worth of One Sacrifice, the power of one endless Life, He may express for ever the ignorance and sin of man to God and the love and character of God to man. This is secured by the continuity of His life. He abides for ever the great High Priest of our profession, holy, undefiled, always there.

3. 'We have this Hope as an anchor of the soul, sure and steadfast, entering into that which is within the veil.' For the believing soul that also abides one of the things that cannot be shaken. It is not for us to judge those who cry wildly out of the dark, the maimed and ignorant who have no clear knowledge. They are not left alone. 'It is God who builds the blind bird's nest,' and He will not be less careful of maimed souls. But, if we do not judge them, we can assert our confidence in the hope that is created by the touch of God, the hope secured by the unchangeable Priesthood of Jesus. When we cast ourselves upon His mercy and trust to His forgiveness, this hope is as an anchor of the soul. It is not vain for men to trust in God. Christian hope is not a mirage, it is an anchor that holds fast by the inheritance. It is sadly true that many of us do not see far enough. Our outlook is so foreshortened. But the day will come when we shall find it necessary to throw back the boundaries of life, and to cast our anchor within the veil. And the assertion of this book is, that not in vain men do that. The anchor holds.

These, then, are some of the things that endure. We shall endure as we see and value them. That is a momentous thing to believe; for if time be the avenger, if eternal righteousness must have its way, shattering all obstacles, what shall we say of the unveiled purity of God which one day must cross our track? In deep humility we may say this. If in this life, which is so brief and precarious, these eternal things of which we have spoken find a place, to give life its true meaning and our spirit its divine bent, then, though it be with reverence and godly fear, we can face the stern and awful close. Our short-sighted plans, our self-deceptions, our chaotic readings of the Divine purpose, our sickening failures, our poor ideals, these, indeed, shall fall away at the touch of His judgment, and we need not deem ourselves poor if they do. For that will be our entrance into a life more radiant, vigorous, and joyous than we can even dream of amid the shadows of the present.[1]

[1] A. Connell, *The Endless Quest*, 174.

# Recent Thoughts on the Doctrine of the Atonement.

## II.

By the Reverend J. G. Riddell, M.A., Professor of Systematic Theology, University of Glasgow.

Not a little of the interest in recent thinking on the theory of Atonement lies in the refusal of several contemporary writers to regard the traditionally contrasted Anselmic or objective and Abelardian or subjective views as exclusive alternatives. We have already noted Brunner's attitude in regard to this, as well as the thought of Atonement in terms of sacrifice put forward by Bishop Hicks. In *Christus Victor*,[1] Dr. Aulén has given us another interpretation of the work of Christ, setting aside both Anselmic and moral influence views, and inviting us to return to the patristic or truly 'classic' view of Atonement, neglect of which, he would hold, has been detrimental to the theology of the Church. A reunion of differing branches of the Christian Church, envisaged by Dr. Hicks, is again kept in view in this theory also as being at least made more possible through the 'rediscovery of the old evangelical and catholic faith.'[2]

While it may be surprising, as Principal Franks[3] points out, to find that Dr. Aulén has still a good word to say for the doctrine of redemption from the devil, a more serious issue is raised in the argument of *Christus Victor*. Briefly stated, the thesis includes four main principles. In the first place, the doctrine of Atonement must be presented in dramatic form. Conflict and victory are at the heart of reconciliation. The triumph of Christ is

[1] Eng. tr. (S.P.C.K., 1931).

[2] P. x.

[3] *The Atonement*, 14.

not merely over the devil, but over an array of adverse powers, only superficially described as satanic—the forces of evil, sin, death, and the law. Secondly, a complete continuity in the bringing of salvation to men is asserted. The whole process is wrought out by God from first to last. Incarnation and Atonement are therefore inseparable, and reconciliation is always from above, and in no sense from beneath. There is no place for man's offering anything—satisfaction, sacrifice, or even penitence to God. Thirdly, the Atonement is objective. It is not just that man's attitude to God has been changed, but the whole situation has been altered, and a new relationship, never possible before, brought into being. Finally, this conception involves a dualism, or, as Aulén would put it, a double aspect, suggested by the idea of a ransom to the devil, but much deeper in its significance than has been generally recognized. God is at once the Reconciler and the reconciled: evil and death are at once His enemies and instruments in His hand: from Him come both judgment and deliverance: it is He who pays the debt and He by whom payment is received: He provides the sacrifice and it is offered to Him. Just because of its double-sided nature the classic theory remains rationally inconsistent—full of unreconciled antitheses; yet the dualism is not ultimate, but resolved in the Cross where evil, sin, and death are overthrown and whence, at the last, victory shall come. These principles are examined in the light of actual patristic teaching, particularly that of Irenæus and Athanasius, and this examination is carried back to the New Testament and forward to the Reformation. The Synoptic Gospels, the Epistle to the Hebrews, and, particularly, Pauline literature yield evidence in favour of the thesis. It is specially noted that St. Paul's idea of law as an enemy, and yet as an instrument used by God, dropped out of sight in the patristic period, and reappears only in Luther, whose teaching in the light of recent discoveries is declared to be of deep significance and entirely favourable to the 'classic' view. Unfortunately, 'the doctrine of Lutheranism became a very different thing from that of Luther.'[1] Protestant orthodoxy, when it had the opportunity of returning to the classic view from which Anselm should never have departed, was misled, by Melancthon and others, and clung to the Latin theology which in turn led to further error, producing, by way of reaction, the no less dangerous, subjective type of theory.

The dualism on which Dr. Aulén insists is criticised, along with other points in the argument of *Christus Victor*, by Principal Franks, as involving a battle between divine mercy and divine justice. 'The Atonement is to be interpreted as a working of God upon himself,'[2] and the abandonment of a dualistic scheme of things has made this 'classic' theory impossible. On the other hand, there are noteworthy resemblances between the teaching of *Christus Victor* and that of *The Mediator*, as well as of Barthian teaching generally.[3] Both share a keen sense of man's sinfulness and of the reality of the evil which separates him from God, and both reject the idea of any merit attaching to humanity. The theme of conflict and victory is present in *The Mediator* also, as it is to be found in such a passage as this from a sermon of the Barthian school. 'It must be seen and understood that in the midst of life, even in blooming and healthy life, there is a yawning chasm, a deep pit that can not be filled by any art or power of man. Only one word is sufficient to cover this chasm, to fill this pit, and that is the word: "Jesus is victor!"—the word "resurrection."'[4] So Dr. Aulén writes of the Church's praise throughout the centuries, noting that 'the Paschal season has never ceased to be the impregnable citadel of the classic idea of the Atonement.'[5] The stress laid upon divine sovereignty in Barthian teaching is paralleled by the emphasis on continuity in the work of reconciliation, and, if the whole conception of conflict and victory seems to run counter to human reason, that, from a Barthian standpoint at least, is no valid criticism. On the other hand, Dr. Aulén maintains that there may be in *The Mediator* 'an approach to the classic idea, but Brunner falls far short of grasping that idea with full clearness.'[6] With its insistence on law as 'the granite foundation of the spiritual world' (a phrase which is quoted more than once in *Christus Victor*),[7] *The Mediator* does not escape what, for Dr. Aulén, is a common error of post-Reformation theologians—the acceptance of 'the Anselmian doctrine of the Atonement without suspicion, altogether missing the close relation between this doctrine and the theological tradition which the

[1] P. 138.

[2] P. 177.

[3] Cf. Canon F. R. Barry's criticism of the Barthian view as introducing a dualism within the divine nature. 'If God is not the Lord of the Universe He cannot give us victory in the world, but only provide an escape from it—and that is not Christianity, but paganism' (*The Relevance of the Church*; Nisbet, 1935, 113).

[4] *Come, Holy Spirit*, by Karl Barth and E. Thurneysen, 151 (T. & T. Clark, 1934).

[5] P. 149. [6] P. 162 n. [7] Pp. 100, 143.

Reformation had challenged with its watchword of *sola gratia*.'[1] The attempt to unite the patristic and the Latin theories is thus a real point of disagreement between these thinkers, who yet resemble one another in so many ways. In this connexion it may be noted that Bishop Headlam, in his F. D. Maurice Lectures,[2] while fundamentally anti-Barthian and critical of any attempt to restate an Anselmic theory, points out the possibility of believing in a victory over evil, 'even if we do not believe in the Devil';[3] and suggests, further, that the 'classic' theory might be combined, not with the 'orthodox,' but with a moral influence view—a proposal which would presumably be no more satisfactory to Dr. Aulén than the alliance of patristic and Anselmic teaching in *The Mediator*.[4]

A similar interest in the Eastern, if not in the 'classic' standpoint is to be found in the chapter entitled 'Redemption and Evil' in Nicholas Berdyaev's *Freedom and the Spirit*, published in Paris in 1927.[5] The interpretation here, however, is quite different from that of Dr. Aulén, and the thought of reconciliation as coming wholly from above is set aside. 'In Christ, as Man in the absolute sense, humanity makes a heroic effort to overcome by sacrifice and suffering both sin and death. . . . In Christ human nature co-operates with the work of redemption.'[6] Berdyaev claims to stand in the same succession as Clement of Alexandria, Origen, St. Gregory of Nyssa, Jacob Boehme, Vladimir Solovyov, and believes that 'only the great Christian mystics succeeded in cutting their way through the well-nigh impregnable defences' of official theology. He seeks, therefore, 'a higher Christian knowledge' for 'the solution of these problems of the spirit, or rather the special problem of the relations between man and God,'[7] and would hold, as against Anselmic theories, that in Christianity the central idea is that of transfiguration, not justification. 'The latter has occupied too prominent a place in Western Christianity. In Eastern Christianity, and in the Greek Fathers, on the other hand . . . the idea of transfiguration and of divinization was fundamental.'[8] Instead of the fear of perdition and the yearning for salvation and deliverance, we should speak of a search after the higher life and the transfiguration of all creation.[9] Clement of Alexandria, 'whose spirit is Hellenistic,' and who 'aspired to contemplation and union with God rather than the pardon of his sins,' may, after all, be a surer guide than St. Augustine who 'desired above all things pardon and justification.'[10]

While we may feel that the value of a mystic view of salvation through the death of Christ is overestimated in sentences like these, we must not forget that this interpretation has persisted throughout the centuries, never dominating the theology of the Church, yet never wholly absent. Dr. H. R. Mackintosh has given us a more balanced, but by no means unsympathetic, treatment of it in an essay on 'The Unio Mystica as a Theological Conception,'[11] and, again, in *The Christian Experience of Forgiveness*. In the former it was pointed out that 'if, with St. Paul, we refuse to think of Christ as one isolated person, and the Christian as another,' much of the 'difficulty of perceiving how the expiatory suffering of one person could benefit, or avail for, any other'[12] disappears. In the latter it is further emphasized that 'by making union with Christ central and determinative in this matter of forgiveness and its conditions, we do justice to a spiritual instinct which declares that by no possibility can we be saved outside ourselves.'[13] From a similar standpoint, Mr. J. S. Stewart, in *A Man in Christ*,[14] has used this conception as a clue to Paul's whole theology, including his doctrine of reconciliation. 'Everything depends on a man's union with a living, present Saviour. In the absence of that union, even the Gospel of the cross loses its saving efficacy. . . . Atonement remains impersonal and largely irrelevant until we make contact with the One who atones.'[15] There is ground here for criticism of the Barthian intolerance of mysticism—the attitude which lies behind Brunner's assertion in *The Mediator* that 'the word *Mysterium* must not serve us as an *asylum ignorantiae* . . . in which all kinds of irrational and arbitrary ideas and mystical extravagances may be concealed.'[16] 'There is a mysticism that is not sentimental,' writes Mr. Stewart in protest, 'and this school is in real danger of rejecting the true with the false. In his treatment of Paul's great doctrines of the indwelling Spirit and the fellowship of believers with Christ, Barth has nothing at all comparable to his own noble discussion of such themes as the righteousness of God.'[17]

[1] P. 108.
[2] *The Atonement* (Hodder & Stoughton, 1935).
[3] P. 11. [4] Cf. *Christus Victor*, 155 ff.
[5] Eng. tr. (Geoffrey Bles, 1935).
[6] P. 177. [7] P. xvii. ff.
[8] P. 176. [9] P. 180.
[10] P. 181.
[11] In *Some Aspects of Christian Belief* (Hodder & Stoughton, 1923).
[12] P. 117. [13] P. 226.
[14] Hodder & Stoughton, 1935.
[15] P. 227. [16] P. 436. [17] P. 149.

It is significant to notice that other modern writers, differing from those already quoted, are no less ready to admit the value of the doctrine of union with Christ. Thus Principal Franks, while pointing out the difference between the believer and his Lord, and the moral character of salvation, recognizes the implications of such a passage as Gal $2^{20}$—the 'real meaning of Pauline mysticism' is 'an identification of Christ and the Christian, whether by faith or in the sacrament, which is one of ecstatic feeling. . . . The identification with Christ is complete, the rapt ecstatic is one with his Lord.'[1] Bishop Hicks seems to go farther than this in linking the thought of sacrifice with 'the sharing of the life that has been set free in the surrender of the Cross.' 'The Christian is said to be "in Christ," and Christ is "in him." To achieve that inward and outward unity of Christ with His own is the ultimate purpose of the whole work of Redemption. . . . The ordinary man is apt to say that, for him, the idea of "mutual indwelling" is unreal. Yet . . . it is precisely in the common intercourse of life that the highest truths of religion find at once their analogy and their justification. . . . Love, as we say, takes us out of ourselves; and that is another way of saying that it takes us into the self of the person whom we love.'[2]

The danger of concentrating our attention on one aspect only of the work of Christ, however important, is pointed out by Dr. Campbell N. Moody in his recent study of the Atonement.[3] 'Christ not only comes from God to men, but stands before God as a Man,'[4] and we are 'joined to Him in His death and in the life which He now lives.'[5] It may be that only one aspect of the twofold truth can be seen clearly at a time—'the soul moves from the faith that the Lord died for us to the faith that He lives in us, and ever back again to the assurance that He who deigns to dwell in us has given Himself on our behalf'[6]—but the thought of Christ for us is never to be contrasted with that of Christ in us, as though it were a different doctrine. As the ungodly receive Christ, so 'the Saviour who died for them is becoming the Saviour *within* them.'[7] 'Sacrifice' and 'conversion,' to use the terms suggested by Dr. Kirk,[8] are each essential to the completeness of reconciliation. Dr. Moody, moreover, brings again to our notice views which have been frequently neglected in recent thought on the Atonement. In the article already mentioned, Dr. Robert Mackintosh failed to find 'any clear reference to the impressive theory of Vicarious Repentance, whether as developed . . . by Dr. R. C. Moberly, or as propounded a generation earlier . . . by John M'Leod Campbell.'[9] In *Christ for Us and in Us*, however, we have sympathetic, though not uncritical references to Jonathan Edwards and M'Leod Campbell, to the theory of vicarious penitence generally and to the need for relating the work of Christ not only to the victory of His resurrection, but to the coming of the Holy Spirit[10]—a truth emphasized by Moberly in *Atonement and Personality*. 'Through His death on the Cross and His resurrection and exaltation,' we read, 'Jesus has gained the right and power to send down the Spirit, as He promised.'[11] And again, 'There is no way by which the Holy Spirit, with the gift of repentance, may be imparted to men, except through the Cross.'[12]

A further quotation from the closing chapter of Dr. Campbell Moody's book may guide us towards one conclusion which seems to emerge from our study of these varying types of modern thought. 'Our attempts to give a reasonable explanation of Christ's work have, for a long period, been tending to reduce it to a minimum. Is it not time that we began to move in an opposite direction?'[13] We must recognize, surely, that we are dealing with a specifically Christian doctrine, however it may be approached, and that, just because of this, we cannot expect our explanations to exhaust its truth. The foolishness of Anselm's attempt to put Christ aside as though He had never been is recognized by those who see new value in his theory to-day.[14] Strangely enough, it is from the opposite standpoint, as in Principal Franks' opening chapter, that we find a plea for the retention of some 'metaphysical basis for Christian theology' such as had been proposed in the *Cur Deus Homo*.[15] But even the most sympathetic philosophical treatment must remain inadequate. It is not sufficient to say that 'for a metaphysic which has emancipated itself from physical categories, the ultimate conception of God is not that of a pre-existent Creator, but, as it is for religion, that of the eternal Redeemer of the world.'[16] From the philosophical side itself the claim of faith has recently been vindicated.

[1] *Op. cit.*, 180 f.
[2] *The Fullness of Sacrifice*, 341 f.
[3] *Christ for Us and in Us* (Allen & Unwin, 1935).
[4] P. 18. [5] P. 71. [6] P. 68.
[7] P. 66. [8] in *Essays Catholic and Critical*, 266.
[9] THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, xxxvii. 201.
[10] P. 34 ff. [11] P. 22. [12] P. 57.
[13] P. 88 f. [14] Cf. Brunner, *op. cit.*, 472 n.
[15] *Op. cit.*, 22.
[16] Pringle-Pattison, *The Idea of God*, 412.

The first Christians, writes Professor A. E. Taylor, were persuaded that 'Christ died *for our sins*, and rose *for our justification*, . . . because they were first convinced that they had in themselves the actual experience of a new kind of life with God as its centre.'[1] In other words, the power of the Cross is not to be rationalized, but to be felt in its impact upon our lives. As Dr. H. R. Mackintosh has put it, 'The man to whom Jesus means nothing will inevitably find the Cross a superfluous mystery; he cannot see what it is for. And his first duty is not to excogitate a theory of Atonement, but to make up his mind for God.'[2] Almost all the writers whose contributions we have considered are agreed about this. As—on the analogy with which we began—the vast cathedral fills the worshipper's mind with awe and reverence, so we feel ourselves in the presence of something too great for us, which dwarfs our minds. But, to quote the well-known words of Principal Denney, 'we shall not for that imagine that we have lost our way. By these things men live, and wholly therein is the life of our spirit. We cast ourselves on them because they outgo us; in their very immensity we are assured that God is in them.'[3]

A second conclusion seems to follow inevitably. Surely the one wrong attitude—if we are within a cathedral so vast—is that of the Pharisee who, in another temple, gave thanks that he was better than his neighbour. Bishop Headlam deplores the distressing fact that dogmatism still obsesses so many theologians. 'Does it not seem rather strange that the advocates of the different theories should be so completely confident that they are right, and that every one else is wrong?'[4] To believe that we are standing in the only place from which the truth can be discerned must be fatal to our thought. Our theories may, at best, reflect part of the truth and each may prove to be incomplete. 'In actual fact,' writes Bishop Hicks, 'one individual cathedral may lack this part, and that another, or the nave may be the glory here, and the choir there, or again, in a third the Lady Chapel,' yet beyond all these imperfections and differences there is 'a single idea . . . of a complete Gothic cathedral.'[5] So it would seem to be with the doctrine of Atonement. Within its ancient, cathedral-like structure we see men still standing. Some are looking East, and some West; some listen for the Word of God from above, and some are rapt in inward contemplation. All of them may be under the shadow of the Cross that rises high above their heads. The preacher will not confine himself to one complete, exclusive theory of Christ's death—he will proclaim it, like St. Paul, from the different viewpoints of his 'missionary theology,' since the New Testament itself gives more than one interpretation. For the worshipper also the same truth seems to hold. Just as there is diversity in theology and in the presentation of the gospel, so also in sacramental worship there is not one narrow and exclusive thought of the death of Christ. Mr. D. H. Hislop has called attention to this truth in a passage in his recent book, where, after describing the varied forms of observance and their significance, he writes: 'The rich content of this Last Supper is too great for any one interpretation, and its full breadth is given not in any one of these forms, but in their united testimony to the width and depth of meaning that the early believers found in this worship.' Yet 'every type of eucharistic worship goes back to Jesus; His memory is enshrined in it; His Personality dominates it; His presence is vouchsafed by it, and His coming is looked for through it.'[6] Some discover in the declaration of divine love the fullest meaning of the sacrament. Thus Principal Franks suggests that 'we can see in the Lord's Supper a representation of Christ's sacrifice . . . as the means of God's revelation of Himself. . . . It is, as it were, a crucifix with the legend, Behold how He loved.'[7] Others find in the thought of Christ's redemptive sacrifice the deepest truth, or follow the Western tradition which speaks of what Christ does for men and of salvation through His death. Again, from the earliest days of Christianity, some have found that 'the parallel to the Eucharist is more the mystery of the Incarnation than the sacrifice of the Passion.'[8] Thought of victory has at times been uppermost, as in the minds of those who carved the triumph-crucifixes in the Middle Ages, or kept alive in the Passion hymns of the post-Reformation period the note of divine conflict and triumph.[9] Mysticism, too, can trace its heritage back to St. Paul and St. John, and a doctrine of union with Christ through the sacraments,[10] however strange may be the thought of the bloodless sacrifice of love by which 'we have inner mystical communion with Christ and participate in the

[1] *The Faith of a Moralist*, 130 (Macmillan, 1931).
[2] *Op. cit.*, 194.
[3] *The Death of Christ*, 45.
[4] *Op. cit.*, 25.
[5] *Op. cit.*, 213.
[6] *Our Heritage in Public Worship*, 72 (T. & T. Clark, 1935).
[7] *Op. cit.*, 172 f.
[8] D. H. Hislop, *op. cit.*, 74.
[9] Cf. Aulén, *op. cit.*, 116, 148 f.
[10] Cf. Franks, *op. cit.*, 70, 76.

work which He has accomplished.'[1] If the true attitude, in the end, is that not of the theologian but of the preacher, and still more of the worshipper, in penitent faith, at the Lord's Table, then we must beware of claiming, for any theory, a monopoly of the truth. If no single form of exposition, no one type of Eucharistic worship, can express the full meaning of what God has done for men, no theoretical explanation that we can offer will make fully clear the mystery of the Cross. We do well to 'look with suspicion on theories of atonement which are only too complete. . . . If atonement be the act of God, it has in it the unfathomable quality of God Himself.'[2]

[1] Berdyaev, *op. cit.*, 180.

[2] H. R. Mackintosh, *op. cit.*, 195.

# Discernment.

By Edward Grubb, M.A., Letchworth, Herts.

'This I pray, that your love may abound yet more and more in knowledge and all discernment; so that ye may approve the things that are excellent' (Ph $1^{9.10}$, R.V.).

St. Paul prays for his friends at Philippi that their love may be accompanied by 'knowledge and discernment'—no blind emotion, but a love enlightened and directed by a true perception of spiritual values. The word translated 'discernment' is that from which we derive the term 'æsthetic'; its meaning is obvious from the words that follow, which point to an inward power of distinguishing true from false, and preferring the excellent to the base. St. Paul had used these words before, when writing to the Romans about the moral advantage enjoyed by the Jew through his knowledge of the Law. We know from the letters to the Corinthians the kind of moral difficulties that confronted his converts from paganism, and we can appreciate his desire that they should meet such difficulties with a clear understanding of 'the mind of Christ.' This is why he couples 'discernment' with 'knowledge.'

It is for '*all* the saints at Philippi,' not only for 'the bishops and deacons,' that he thus prays. The humblest Christian shares with the ablest the gift of the Spirit, which brings to him or her not only life but light—a power of discernment which he must use and not neglect. In the same way, Jesus Himself (quite naturally and unobtrusively) had required from His disciples the use of their own power of discernment. 'Why even of yourselves judge ye not what is right?' And, again, 'If I say truth, why do ye not believe me?' St. Paul treats the inward power of discerning truth and right as a gift from God rather than as an endowment of the 'natural' (or 'psychic') man—to whom, he says, the things of the Spirit are 'foolishness.' He had just been pointing out that the deepest truths of life are not seen by the eye, or heard by the ear, or demonstrated by the 'heart' (or understanding) of man, but are *revealed* to him by the Spirit. Just so Jesus had given thanks that, whereas the truths of the Kingdom are hidden from the wise and understanding, they are 'revealed to babes.'

Yet there is in St. Paul's mind no rigid division between natural and supernatural gifts and powers. He prays for the Ephesians that they may have given to them 'a spirit of wisdom and revelation, having the eyes of their heart (or understanding) enlightened.' We shall be near to his thought if we regard the supernatural as shining in and through the natural—taking it up, transforming and using it, as life transforms, and expresses itself in, matter. The Christian experience, he believes, is able to raise the whole being of man to a new level of power, efficiency, and insight.

It is clear that the Apostle envisaged two ways of apprehending truth; and in this respect his philosophy appears to be still valid. In modern speech we might distinguish them as intellectual and intuitional. When we are dealing with the phenomenal world, which is open to observation, we use our senses and our intellect. The senses bring us the raw material of knowledge, which the reasoning intellect works up into a coherent system of scientific truth. When, on the other hand, we have to deal with the world of supra-sensible reality, which lies behind phenomena, our senses fail us. The intellect can still work; but, in the absence of sensuous material, it is apt to spin fancies. In this region its conclusions cannot well be checked by the more accurate observation of