
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

spiritually. Whatever your economic opinions may be, you will find here real enlightenment.

The Joint-Committee of Anglican and Free-Churchmen which has been conducting 'Conversations' about Church union for some years issued lately an 'Outline of a Reunion Scheme,' and the Rev. Hugh Martin has, by request of the Committee, written a brief commentary on it. His purpose is to explain the scheme, to emphasize its most important features, to point out the issues of greatest difficulty and to suggest how these can be met. He has gone over the scheme point by point, and, with a remarkable breadth of mind and a clear grasp of essentials, he commends the scheme to the consideration of the members of the churches. This little pamphlet, *Can We Unite?* (S.C.M.; 6d.) should be read and carefully considered by all interested in such a notable adventure. And who is not?

Fascism in the English Church, by a London Journalist (Henry E. Walter, London; 2s. 6d. net), is an 'exposure' of the errors to which the writer thinks the Church of England is giving itself up. Romanism and Rationalism are destroying the Church, which is being dominated by a dictatorship of the clergy. The 'Low' Church is being snuffed out. Very few of its ministers are asked to broadcast, or to serve on commissions. Romish practices are being foisted on congregations. What is wanted, the journalist thinks, is propaganda by the people who object to all this. The writer is very much in earnest, and he gives his alarms an up-to-date form by deft journalistic touches.

The volume of essays recently published in memory of Linda R. Miller contains an article by Professor Solomon Zeitlin on *The Pharisees and the Gospels,* which is available in separate form. The problem of the relations between Pharisaism and the Early Church is still far from being solved. On the one hand, we have the undeniable fact that the two had a great deal in common, and on the other the equally undeniable fact that the Pharisees of Jesus' day were bitterly hostile to Him. Professor Zeitlin's contribution to the study of the question is to take the teaching of Jesus, especially from the Sermon on the Mount, and show that it was concerned with the practical ethic of the individual, while the Pharisaic pronouncements as seen in the Mishnah and other parts of the Talmud dealt with the administration of public law. The charge of hypocrisy brought against the Pharisees by Jesus (according to the Biblical text) he explains as a later insertion in the Gospels, pointing to the use of the term Rabbi as another illustration of the tendency to insert later words and phrases into the story. Even if the main contention of the essay does not meet with general approval, it contains interesting exegeses of some New Testament passages, and its sympathetic tone is very welcome.

James Denney.[1]

By Principal Emeritus W. M. Macgregor, D.D., Trinity College, Glasgow.

To-day we are filling a blank in the visible records of our College. During its eighty-two years it has enjoyed the services of many teachers, whose renown has been much more than provincial—Lindsay, Bruce, Drummond, Smith, Orr, Denney; and it is right that somewhere on our walls their names should be inscribed. 'Let us now praise famous men and our fathers who begat us. . . . Their bodies lie buried in peace, but their wisdom still is declared, and the Church sounds forth their praise.'

[1] Address at the unveiling of a Memorial in Trinity College, Glasgow, 18th May, 1938, to Principal James Denney.

When I came up here in October 1881 Denney was entering on his third year in Divinity. He was then a shy, austere, rather formidable figure, a little older than many of us, and by no means easy of approach. In the Theological Society, where others splashed in the shallows, theorizing and talking at large, he was able to push out into deep waters as one who knew his way. He had been by far the most distinguished student of his time in the University, and to us he appeared as already a master in Classics and Philosophy, in Literature and the history of opinion within the Church. He had the most admirable gift of pregnant and witty and

often demolishing utterance. And to this rich intellectual equipment he added an overawing sense of the religious realities in their dogmatic form. Students then were much as they are to-day, and it is not surprising that in choosing a President for the Society we preferred someone nearer our own level. He was not arrogant but he was a little remote, and he was terribly impatient of words without knowledge. Thus, although he had a circle of devoted friends, the majority of us would have declared of him what Emerson said of Thoreau: 'I would no more think of taking his arm than of taking the arm of an elm-tree.' But in supplement or modification of this, I may mention a trivial incident of some years later when, for the first time, he appeared as candidate for a vacant congregation. He was one of a leet of five for the old Free Church in Troon, and an elder there afterwards told me that each of the other competitors, forgetting his own interests and ambitions, had independently advised the Troon people to choose Denney. For this was a man by himself.

Those who knew him later will recognize in this impression of student days features and characteristics of their friend—the touch of shyness and austerity, which made others shy until they came to know him, the passionate depth of religious feeling in its Pauline form, and the amazing ease and fullness of mind which enabled him throughout his life unfailingly to answer every call. When he left his charge in Broughty Ferry he burned his sermons, and to the end he declared that he would not scorch a finger in rescuing his manuscripts from a conflagration; and why should he, when he always had himself to draw upon? His *Letters*, though written in days of overwhelming occupation, are unlaboured and delightful, full of ideas, full of wit, with stories of children interspersed; and his talk had the same enviable quality. Disraeli once said that famous wits were often the dullest of companions, because they incline to hoard up their good things for some more important occasion; but, as Denney once observed, 'it is the things a man says without thinking which have the sap of nature in them.' Certainly his good things did not come from his memory, but freshly from himself, and they were often astonishingly good. When Lord Haldane had delivered a lecture of notable energy and quite as notable obscurity in New College, Edinburgh, one of us asked Denney if he had always seen where the lecturer was going: 'No, but he was going as fast as he could.' After listening to a paper on Maeterlinck, he muttered: 'It is bad enough to be at sea, but to be at sea in a fog!'

This last example suggests another persistent characteristic of his mind—his almost fanatical love of clearness. His intellect in all its operations had a keen, cutting edge; in confessing that he never used illustrations in preaching he adds that what is needed is not illustration but lucidity, and this he always attained. He stoutly affirms that 'a poet is a man who can say what he wants to say; if he cannot say it he is not a poet, no matter how much he may stimulate critics to guess what was in his mind and say it for him.' Dr. Moffatt justly remarks on the strong hold which the eighteenth century had upon him—that age when even 'philosophy bent itself to be lucid and practical.' This appears very much in his style, which allowed him always to say great things in the most concise and simple way, and it made him bemoan the weakness of his students, not one man in a score of whom could 'say what he means, or put his mind plainly down on paper.' It also affected his attitude to practical affairs, making him impatient of those who juggled with abstract nouns: 'There is nothing that tends more to intellectual degeneration,' he said, 'than to play with words like establishment and disestablishment, and imagine that in doing so we are dealing with anything.' This eighteenth-century lucidity helped him vastly as an expositor, impelling him to clear away the litter of scholastic irrelevance of which so many commentaries are full. 'The worst of being erudite,' he asserts, 'is that a man forgets how many things are better forgotten.'

In his own use of Scripture the two sides of his nature—the scholastic and the humanist—are sometimes in conflict. In his earliest book he says as a humanist that 'the Apostles were not people speaking with the servile precision of modern science, but with what Plato calls a gentlemanly freedom in the use of words.' So when Paul's words favour the idea of a mystical union (which Denney disliked), he boldly explains the phrase as 'the language of passion, with an emotional and poetic truth, not to be translated into prose.' But where Paul's words give support to those doctrines which were most intimately sacred to Denney, no such evasion can be admitted: 'Paul not only felt this, he thought it, and thought it out articulately.' I suspect that in this case he was wrong, but, as he once said of Dr. Moffatt, 'he has a right to be wrong, for he is a master in the business.' Very markedly this passion for clearness affected his dogmatic thinking, inclining him in some points to make the world clearer than the Creator has made it. He loved the saying of Vauvenargues that 'an idea which cannot be clearly expressed is not true,' and

accordingly he was suspicious of mysticism of every degree. He charges even Calvin with 'making a mystery out of his own head about the Lord's Supper—a mystery where no mystery should be.' Any talk of the mystical union (which plays so noble a part in much Reformed Theology) annoyed him almost as much as it did Ritschl: 'There is a mystical union, if you like, between a stone and God, but the union of man with God transcends the mystical and rises into the region of the intellectual and moral.'

One more of his characteristics must be noted, as it held to him from youth to age—the curious dash of paganism or, at least, of humanism in a mind so vehemently Christian. He quotes with approbation Amiel's saying: 'It is a real want in a man when his mind is always in Church.' Immediately before coming here as Professor he writes to a friend: 'I want off for a bit to bathe my lungs in air and my brain in paganism.' In one place he sighs for a touch of 'the vitriolic commonsense of Voltaire.' Of a prominent ecclesiastic he remarks: 'I do not think he will be made Moderator. . . . His virtues, for lack of a little vice of some kind, never effervesce or sparkle.' In certain moods he confesses that that blackguard of genius—Benvenuto Cellini—was more interesting to him than the Fathers or the Reformation divines. In this he resembled a Scots commentator of the late eighteenth century who excused himself for reading *Tom Jones* on the plea that 'it was grand stuff for taking the taste of the Apostle out of your mouth'; Denney would never have put it so roughly, but we cannot forget that, alongside of the scholastic and the saint in him, there was this rich element of the humanist, giving spice and savour to all that he said. Robertson Nicoll speaks of a period of Broad Churchism in Denney's career, referring, I suppose, specially to his devastating reply to Drummond's *Natural Law in the Spiritual World*. This anonymous pamphlet, which in some ways was the most significant and detached utterance in theology published in Denney's lifetime, was largely an explosion of the humanist in him, encouraged by his experience of common men and common women during his years of mission work in the east end of Glasgow. But, as Job says, 'God enlargeth a nation and straiteneth it again,' and in Denney there was a marked swing back to the scholastic in theology, as is seen in his *Atonement and the Modern Mind* and his *Death of Christ*, great as the virtues of these books may be. In the two supreme achievements of his lifetime—his Commentary on *Romans* and his *Jesus and the Gospel*—both sides of his nature find expression; and in his unrevised book on *The Christian Doctrine of Reconciliation*, published after his death, the humanist struggles hard to gain utterance.

On this endowment so various and so splendid many influences from without were playing, and of these the greatest and most penetrating was that of his wife. It was she who fully liberated in him what Nicoll calls 'his eager tenderness.' Soon after her death he wrote to Nicoll that in their twenty-one years together he had never had a thought in which she had not a part, and as long as he lived she was never absent from his mind; even a good story makes him think of how she would have enjoyed it, and of her merry laugh. She was in every way a notable woman, wholesome, direct, devout, and glad of heart, and she brought him much that in himself he lacked. She urged upon him the scantiness of pathos in his preaching, often telling him, as he confessed, to 'keep down his hand in the pulpit and be gracious.' I remember her telling my mother how she warned her husband that 'a man never knows how dull he can be until he tries to lecture through one of Paul's Epistles.' Six or seven lectures on end she might allow, but then the people ought to have a rest for a week or two. A woman so shrewd and loving and gay could not fail to humanize her husband. They never had a child of their own, but it is beautiful to see how in his *Letters* he reports the ways and words of children, for with this shy scholar—this great man—they always seemed at home.

Then he was enviably rich in friendships, some of them with very notable men. Of his class-mate, Grant of Greenock, it was said by Hugh Mackintosh: 'If all the Churches of the land were to be judged, each by the quality of a chosen representative, I would choose Alexander Duncan Grant to represent the United Free Church, and I should have no fear of the decision.' Inseparably joined to Grant was that man of sparkling genius, J. P. Struthers; and from these two heart friends Denney had no secrets. And there were others—Robertson Nicoll, Carnegie Simpson, Moffatt, and men and women of less distinction—to whom he wrote and spoke without reserve as they did to him, so that his heart and mind were never in risk of stiffening.

But he had also the enriching experience of intimate association with common people. A Professor of Theology who has not been a working minister is scarcely half prepared for his task. When Denney had completed his triumphant career as a student he plunged at once into mission work in the east end of Glasgow, where he spent three years; then, declining the invitation of Troon, he went to

a church in Broughty Ferry, where Bruce had been and where Moffatt was to come, and there he established himself not merely in the admiration but in the affections of his people, so that through the twenty years of his professorship he was looked to by many as still their minister. In the *Letters* it is manifest how his heart went back to the Ferry—to the men and women and the little children; and it is still more manifest that the theology which he taught to his students was the gospel which he had seen at work amongst his people, transforming the simple and building them up in character. He commends the Shorter Catechism as 'an excellent basis not for dogmatic but for evangelizing,' and late in his life he writes to a friend: 'It is my business to teach, but the one thing I covet is to do the work of an evangelist.' With Hezekiah he would have exclaimed: 'O Lord, by these things do men live, and wholly therein is the life of my spirit!'

Finally, in his last years, Denney was drawn into a heroic participation in the public life of the Church. His first appearances in the Assembly had been in defence of the evangelical Reformation doctrine of Scripture, which was threatened by outbreaks of stupid panic, and they were hilariously received, as such speaking, in the quality of it, had scarcely been heard since Robertson Smith; for, like Smith and Rainy, Denney never took part in a debate without making a contribution to the subject. When he joined the Committee for Conference with the Church of Scotland he at first, like others, was provoked by the futility of the discussions; there was so much playing for position, with strong assertions on the one side and the other lest some fragment of cherished testimony should be endangered, and it was freely muttered in the Committee that the chief causes keeping the churches apart were the Secretaries. Denney impatiently asked if the Conference really represented the churches at all, and reckoned that the loss of two working days in College in each month was an exorbitant price for him to pay for all that was done. 'The one hope of Union,' he said, 'is to leave off talking about words, and try whether we cannot agree about things and duties.' When Dr. Archibald Henderson boldly struck out in this direction, followed by Christopher Johnston (afterwards Lord Sands), Denney bade any one who prayed for the peace of Jerusalem to 'pray specially for the health of Henderson,' who was growing uncomfortably old.

This maxim—'not about words but about things and duties'—was a guiding rule in all Denney's public tasks. His work for the Central Fund carried him into innumerable manses, familiarizing him with the strain and difficulty under which much of the Church's work is done. But another maxim, in supplement of the first, increasingly laid hold upon him. Of Chalmers he had once said that 'he had the greatness of the Nation in him as well as of the Church, and it is an immense gain to a Churchman when he has such an interest in the State as keeps his ethics from becoming ecclesiastically narrow in their range.' This was magnificently evident in Denney throughout the long agony of the War, and his interest in the well-being of the State inspired him in the last campaign in which he engaged. When friends condoled with him because broken health was delaying his Cunningham Lectures, he answered: 'The things I *am* sore about are not being able to help the Temperance cause and the Central Fund.'

Under the shaping of such influences his character was unfolded and enriched. Nature had equipped him splendidly for the rôle of scholar and teacher: a profound personal experience had revealed God to him, so that in God's presence all his thinking and all his activities were conducted. But human love at its noblest, and intimate friendships, and the familiar companionship of plain folk and the discipline of large affairs, all played their part in producing the man we knew, and whom to-day we commemorate. His uniqueness was such that, as Dr. Moffatt has remarked, 'no one can be said even to put you in mind of Denney.' And thus, on this enduring brass, we have inscribed the words: 'Supreme alike as scholar, teacher, administrator, and man of God: to whom many owed their souls.' And from Bunyan we have taken what seems to fit him like a glove: 'My sword I leave to him that shall come after me in pilgrimage, and my courage and skill to him that can get it.'