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

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

way in which one of Luke's statements is squeezed into an absurd meaning, and then condemned for absurdity. Obscurity envelops the whole subject, and dogmatic negatives should be avoided until more evidence is obtained. Discoveries may be made any day. W. M. RAMSAY.

(To be continued.)

HENRY DRUMMOND.

IT was a tragically solemn moment on Thursday, March 11, when, as the mourners were gathering to the funeral of Professor Candlish in the Free College Church, Glasgow, a telegram arrived from Tunbridge Wells, announcing the death of his colleague, Professor Drummond.

Drummond had been ill for two years with a rheumatic affection which baffled the physicians; but the impression was that he would come out of it. He had this expectation himself as lately as the New Year; and last summer and autumn, those by whom he was visited expressed themselves very hopefully. He retained to the last his mental energy and the cheerfulness of his disposition. But the disease had worn out his bodily strength; and at last he slipped through the doctors' hands somewhat suddenly.

My recollections of him go far back; for I used often to see him, a bright-eyed little fellow in flannels, standing behind the wickets on the school cricket-field, acquiring the experience which he was subsequently to turn to good account, for the religious instruction of boys, in *Baxter's Second Innings*. We were at the University of Edinburgh at the same time, and entered the New College together.

He was a very young student, and ripened slowly. The first unmistakable sample of his quality which he gave his fellow-students was an essay, delivered, near the end of his course, before the Theological Society, on "Spiritual Diagnosis." In a single hour this performance inspired

his contemporaries with an entirely new conception of his possibilities; and it touched so high a mark that I was never afterwards surprised at anything which he achieved. The idea of the paper was that theological instruction ought to include, not only knowledge of books, but contact with men, and the diagnosis of spiritual disease, just as medical education includes a clinical as well as a theoretical course.

It turned out to be a kind of prophecy, because at the close of that session Mr. Moody came to Edinburgh on his first visit, and Drummond and many more of the divinity students became engaged in the very work which he had desiderated—dealing at close quarters with religious inquirers. That was a glorious time—a time of clear vision, pure motives, and spiritual power. The students went all over the country holding meetings, especially for young men, and the fire of revival burst out wherever they went.

It was then that Drummond unfolded the rare powers for which he subsequently became famous. I was a great deal with him at that time, and I have no hesitation in saying that in some respects he was, from the first, the best speaker I have ever heard. There was not a particle of what is usually denominated oratory; for this he was far too much in earnest. It was quiet, simple, without art; yet it was the perfection of art; for there was in it an indescribable charm, which never failed to hold the audience spell-bound from the first words to the last. He continued with Mr. Moody two years, holding meetings for young men all over the three kingdoms.[1] During this period he was in daily contact with religious inquirers of every description, and obtained an unparalleled knowledge

[1] The friendship between the two men was very touching. At first, of course, Drummond was the hero-worshipper; but in later years Mr. Moody did not come a whit behind in enthusiasm. He said to me, when I was in America, and when many of his associates were finding all kinds of fault with Drummond, "I have read everything he has yet published; and there is not a line with which I disagree."

both of the secrets of the human heart and of the infinite variety of the Spirit's modes of operation. If he kept his letters, there must be in his desk an amazing collection of human documents; for inquiring spirits wrote to him in hundreds. He probably had the privilege of leading more young men to religious decision than any other man of his day.

This continued throughout life to be his favourite work. In subsequent years he carried on meetings, session after session, in connexion with Edinburgh University, by which numberless students were influenced. And the excellence of his speaking and the charm of his personality opened doors for him to circles into which an Evangelist is rarely admitted. It will be remembered how in London, in more than one season, he held Evangelistic meetings, thronged by the most fashionable society of the land, in Grosvenor House, thus doing a work which no other man in the country could have done.

It cannot be denied that, to some extent, in recent years he lost the full confidence of some of those most interested in Evangelistic operations; because, they thought, he ignored too much the central mysteries of religion and went too far in the direction of the world. But, I believe, it was the Evangelistic instinct which was leading him all the time. He went as far as conscience would allow in order to meet the doubter and the man of the world on their own ground; and he spoke to them in a language they could understand, dwelling on the aspects of Christianity which they could relish, while he left to others the task of expounding the deeper things to those who were able to bear them.

Besides, Professor Drummond was an artist. He especially appreciated the maxim that, while in mathematics the whole is greater than the part, in art the part may be greater than the whole. He never gave his hearers or readers too much. This was shown especially

in his series of booklets — *The Greatest Thing in the World, Pax Vobiscum, The City without a Church,* etc. Great men do not stoop to write little books; but Professor Drummond had no such scruples. He was aware how seldom the average man reads a book through from beginning to end, and how delighted he is when, with less than an hour's reading, he finds himself at the end of one. Into these booklets he made no attempt to crush the whole of the Gospel, as unwise preachers attempt to do in single sermons. There is a tameness about the rounded and balanced whole of truth; the average mind is oppressed with a scheme of doctrine; it enjoys fragments of theology, in the same way as it likes selections from Browning, but dreads the entire works of that obscure poet, and enjoys single choruses of Haydn and Mendelssohn, but is bored by oratorios. In Professor Drummond's case, however, this condescension to the public taste was no trick of the populariser. It suited his own cast of mind; for he was not a logical and systematic thinker, but an intuitionalist, who saw certain detached points and aspects of truth with amazing clearness, and could present them to others in the most attractive forms.

There was another reason. His extensive acquaintance with religious experience had convinced him that conversion does not always, or even generally, conform to the conventional type. In Evangelical preaching it is taken for granted that this spiritual change is marked by certain definite stages—first, the conviction of sin, then a vision of reconciliation through the death of Christ, and then an outburst of joy and testimony. But Drummond found that in hundreds of cases nothing of the sort occurs; there is infinite variety; and he ceased to attempt to force experience into such moulds. He laid down no dogmas; he demanded no testimonies; he recommended no ecclesiastical organization. Whether by evangelization of this kind as strong character is likely to be produced

as by the old method of imposing a definite creed and a definite church-connexion may be doubtful; and it may be questioned whether he himself did not suffer by living so entirely in the more elementary truths of religion and avoiding its deeper mysteries. But it is the vocation of the evangelist to operate with a few vivid and telling convictions, while he leaves to the pastor and the professor the task of more detailed and recondite instruction; and Drummond was always before everything else an evangelist.

The other great interest of his life was Science. At the University he was medallist in Geology, and at the New College, while he did not distinguish himself in the other classes, I remember him driving home with a cabful of prizes from the class of Natural Science. On this subject he became first lecturer, and then professor in the Free Church College, Glasgow; and he visited, for purposes of scientific investigation, the Rocky Mountains, Central Africa, and other distant parts of the globe.

Carrying on his evangelistic and his scientific work side by side, he was early struck with internal correspondences between them. On the objects with which the two have to deal he saw the marks of the same Divine Hand; and it seemed to him that the same laws ruled in both worlds. He followed this thought out with great eagerness, and the result was his first book—*Natural Law in the Spiritual World.*

The idea of this book was by no means a novel one. Passages in plenty might be cited, both in prose and verse, in which it has been expressed both in ancient and modern literature. But to Drummond it was new, and he took it up very seriously. He undertook to prove that there is in the two spheres not only resemblance of phenomena but identity of law. He did not, indeed, maintain that all the laws of the one sphere are reproduced in the other; he

professed only to give a few specimens; but he believed the principle to be of very wide application.

Some of his critics objected to the principle altogether, on the ground that the material of the spiritual world is so different from that of the natural that identity of law is inconceivable. But this is a mere dogma. Who can question that a law like the following, for example, adduced by Drummond, applies equally to natural and to spiritual life — Any principle which secures the safety of the individual without personal effort or the vital exercise of faculty is disastrous to character. And many other incontestable instances might easily be given. Whether all Drummond's instances could be maintained is a question of opinion. The one most contested was the analogy which he drew between conversion through the regenerating energy of the Holy Spirit and the impossibility in nature of spontaneous generation. It was held that he took an extravagant view of what is meant in Scripture by spiritual death, and attributed to the unregenerate man absolute unsusceptibility to spiritual influence. But he had no such intention, nor did the analogy require any such extravagance. Some portions of his exposition may have been unguarded; but his position was essentially Scriptural, and had behind it the whole weight of theological opinion— Augustinian, Puritan, and Evangelical.

The underlying idea of the book, of which perhaps the author himself was at the time only dimly conscious, was that religion is not merely a system of revealed truths, inaccessible to experiment, but a series of human experiences, which belong as much to the nature of things as does the stratification of rocks or the movement of planets, and call as imperatively for scientific explanation. This has been the great thought of theology at least since Schleiermacher, and it is what is behind the whole argument from experience, which is likely in future to hold the foremost place in Apologetics. Drummond's apologetic was

always honourably distinguished by this feature—that he did not appear as the champion of the exterior ramifications of religion, but conducted his readers to its very citadel.

It is curious now to know that *Natural Law in the Spiritual World* had to go begging among the publishers. The critics, too, were pretty unanimous in condemnation. But the public found out the book for themselves. Drummond was out of the country—in the depths of Africa—at the time when others were deciding its fate, and he returned to find himself famous. He used to say that he never read the book after the correction of the proofs, and he certainly outlived some of its opinions. But it will be long before such chapters as those on Reversion to Type, Parasitism and Growth, fade from the public memory.

Like every scientific man of the present age, he was fascinated with the subject of Evolution, and in his later life he conceived the gigantic project of telling the story, as a continuous whole, which had been told in portions by other scientists. His last book, *The Ascent of Man*, was the commencement of this design; but it is destined to remain a torso, as his illness came on immediately after it left the press.

On the whole he accepted Evolution; but his chief aim was to prove that there is in it a factor left out by Darwin. The evolved world, as we now see it, has not been the result, as Darwin represented, of a cruel and selfish struggle for existence, but still more of unselfish and altruistic instincts, the first beginnings of which can be traced exceedingly far back, while the perfect development of them is seen in the Cross of Christ. In fact, love is at the heart of the universe, and all history has been its revelation. I am not sufficiently acquainted with scientific works to be able to say how far this was an original idea; but certainly he gave it a prominence it had never received before, and he made it current coin.

It cannot be denied that by his scientific work, also, he

occasioned some suspicion, many finding fault with the favourable way in which he referred to Evolution. But Evolution is one of the great new objects of the intellectual world of our day, and the Church cannot get rid of it. How the new teachings are to be combined with older beliefs is a problem so difficult that latitude must be allowed to those who risk a solution, so long as they remain loyal to the things most surely believed amongst us. The great difficulty is how to account for the human consciousness of sin and to defend the Christian doctrine of redemption, if evolution, in the rigorous sense, be accepted. Professor Drummond did not reach this point, which he would have had to face in his next book; but what he did contribute will remain a permanent gain to knowledge.

I am happy to be able to quote on this subject the words of one whose opinion will carry great weight. Professor Gairdner, of Glasgow University, wrote to me immediately after Drummond's death, "The earlier book, while full of suggestive and finely expressed thought, did not convince me, or appear to me a permanent forward step in the Eirenicon between Religion and Science. The latter book has, to my mind, a far wider sweep and a much more permanent value in its marvellously lucid and at the same time profound exposition of the root principles of altruism, as evolved in the wide field of nature. Nothing that I have read on the subject of ethical theory has appeared to me to go so deep or to be so convincing as this, which makes it a fundamental part of God's universe from the beginnings, at all events, of sexual life therein."

Was Professor Drummond, however, an Evolutionist? The term has several meanings, and in some of them it might with justice be applied to him. But, in its extreme and rigorous sense, it certainly was not applicable to him when he wrote *Natural Law in the Spiritual World*; because in that book he made a great deal of the impossibility of spontaneous generation. In *The Ascent of Man*

he frequently makes use of language from which it might be inferred that he held the extremest views on the subject. But what he was really concerned with in that book was not Evolution, but the presence of altruism as one of the factors on which Evolution depends. He was in the attitude of saying to men of Science, "On your own ground I will show you that there is a spiritual side of nature which you have not been taking into account." For this reason he did not contend for the necessity of supernatural interference at the point where life or thought was introduced. But, from what I have heard him say in private, my impression is, that he never took Evolution very seriously. He esteemed it because it kindled the imagination, and had stimulated and directed research. He esteemed it most of all because it had immensely expanded our conceptions of the universe, and satisfied the craving for the unity of knowledge. But the problem, whether it is true or not, in the strict sense, did not interest him; he scarcely believed in the existence of absolute truth of this sort. Physical theories of the universe were to him merely temporary points of view, which have their day and cease to be. Evolution happens to be the providential point of view for us; and, therefore, we ought to make the most of it; but it is not final, and it is ridiculous to be fanatical either for or against it.

Professor Drummond's writings carried his fame round the world. From personal observation I can testify that in America he was, if possible, more popular even than in this country. There was a time when a new book on him and his writings was published nearly every week in Germany. He once told me that one of the strongest impulses he had ever felt was to devote his whole life to the evangelisation of Japan, so enthusiastic was the welcome he received from the educated natives of that interesting country. But behind a great reputation and a literary

success there is sometimes found only a rather small and shabby personality; the artistic gift being a kind of virtuosity without root in personal character. All who knew Professor Drummond, however, would say that, in his case, the man was greater and finer than the work. I have seldom, if ever, seen any one so Christ-like.

He was remarkable for the resoluteness with which he stuck to his own work. With such a reputation, he was asked, of course, to do hundreds of things, in which his time and strength would have been consumed. But, even when they were good things, he put them away, because they were not his things. He knew what God intended him to do; and to this he confined himself, however much disappointment it might cause to others. This was a feature of the life of Christ—He would not allow the wishes of even His nearest and dearest to interfere with His plans.[1]

Another respect in which he resembled his Master was Humility. He had not much of that humility which consists in a lowly or penitential estimate of self; but he had a great deal of the humility which forgets self because the mind is habitually and intensely occupied with other subjects. His successes would have turned many a head; but he never spoke of them. He rarely even mentioned to his most intimate friends the work he was doing. He took the utmost pains, but he said nothing about it; and he had habitually the attitude of being disengaged.

[1] Drummond was by no means a book-made man; but Emerson had at one time a very great influence on him; and Emerson's most charcteristic note is self-sufficiency and self-reliance, with the corollary that a man must on no account allow himself to be made a hack or drudge by yielding to the claims of others or the conventions of society. In another American writer there is a passage in the same key, which is a pen portrait of Drummond: "Is reform needed? is it through you? The greater the reform needed, the greater the personality you need to accomplish it. Do you not see how it would serve to have eyes, blood, complexion, clean and sweet? Do you not see how it would serve to have such a body and soul that, when you enter the crowd, an atmosphere of desire and command enters with you, and every one is impressed with your personality?"

One more Christlike trait was Simplicity. The world was full of bright things to him, but they were common things, which others pass by unnoticed. Religion especially appeared to him the simplest thing of all; and it was his constant endeavour to disentangle it from the envelopes which prevent its beauty from being appreciated. His own intercourse with God was so direct and constant that he was impatient of the ritual and formality of institutional religion. This sometimes led him to speak of forms of worship in words which had a tone of exaggeration. But on this subject Jesus also was paradoxical.

Much might be said of his courtesy and kindness. But there was in Henry Drummond something for which there is no name—something original and unique, something starry and serene. He was full of magnetism; young men eagerly sought his acquaintance, and in every home where he was known he was the idol of the children and the servants. His death will remind many of another man of genius, who was his intimate friend—Robert W. Barbour. In some respects they were extremely unlike, yet they had the same unselfishness, the same passion for the welfare of their fellow-creatures, the same beauty of holiness. Both have been taken away in the midst of their days—Barbour at thirty-seven, Drummond at forty-seven. Both, after a life of extraordinary brightness and usefulness, suffered long before entering into rest, that patience might have her perfect work, and that they might be perfect and entire, wanting nothing. But it is from such lives that we derive the strongest assurance of immortality; for they are an inspiration of Christ, from whose love they cannot be separated; their activity has only begun, and it is an imperative necessity to believe that it is still going on; we see in this world only a brief arc of the curve which will round elsewhere to the perfect circle.

JAMES STALKER.