from the fact that Dr. Ellicott has made certain alterations and corrections for our pages.

The Expository Times for March will contain an article of great value, by Principal Charles Chapman, M.A., LL.D., on “The Present Position of the Evolution Theory.” A request having been received to know how the theory at present stood in the light of recent modifications by leading men of science, it was sent to Principal Chapman, who has made a special and very capable study of the subject (see his excellent book recently published, *Pre-Organic Evolution*), and this article is his reply. It is beyond the scope of the ordinary “Requests and Replies,” and is all the more valuable on that account.

---

**Two Old Testament Scholars.**

By the Rev. Professor A. B. Davidson, LL.D., Edinburgh.

Students of the Old Testament will feel that the year 1891 has left them poorer than it found them. By the death, at the age of sixty-three, of Professor Abraham Kuenen, of Leiden, one of the most prominent figures in Old Testament learning has been removed. Few men have filled a larger place in this department at any time, and none so large a place in recent years. Those who differed from him most widely will be the readiest to offer their tribute of admiration for his eminent learning, and his singularly estimable character. Kuenen’s mind was clear and logical, with great independence, and a remarkable power of seizing the crucial points in any question under investigation. Perhaps—though this may have been partly due to self-restraint—he seemed rather to want the ideal element; and fuller exegetical sympathy with the contents of an Old Testament passage might sometimes have led him to a different conclusion from that which he reached on purely critical considerations. His mind, however, was singularly honest and straightforward, and his investigations were all characterised by judicial fairness. Towards his opponents he always showed the greatest courtesy, particularly towards those who differed from him in fundamental principles; if he ever betrayed irritation or spoke sharply, it was not of those who were orthodox, but of those who, belonging to what might be thought his own school, seemed to him to misuse his principles, and push them to an unhistorical excess. His religious position is stated by himself in the opening sentences of his work on the *Religion of Israel*, which appeared as one of a number of monographs on the Principal Religions: “For us the Israelitish religion is one of those religions; nothing less, but also nothing more.” This, however, was a mere theoretical judgment; the superiority of the religion of Israel to others, in truth and power to elevate human life, was felt by him as much as by others.

Kuenen’s people were not wealthy, and his early studies suffered some interruptions; but from the time that he entered the University of Leiden he was never allowed to leave it, one appointment after another being conferred on him till, in 1855, he was raised to an ordinary Chair. His literary activity was enormous. His principal works are: his *Historical-Critical Inquiry; or, Introduction to the Old Testament*, in 3 vols. 1861–65, of which a second edition remains without the third volume. The first volume has been translated under the title, *The Hexateuch*. This Introduction is the most exhaustive and complete that exists. His greatest work is his *Religion of Israel*, which is a positive construction of the history of Israel, so far as its religious thought and worship is concerned. His other works but form the scaffolding to this, or are reproductions on a larger scale of some of its parts, such as his work on the Prophets, written at the instance of the late Dr. John Muir. His last important work was his Hibbert Lectures, read in London in 1882, on *National Religions and Universal Religions*. Besides these works, Kuenen was editor of the Leiden *Theological Review*, to which he contributed many important papers and critical reviews. Some of his occasional essays
were masterpieces of critical investigation; such as those on the Massoretic Text, on the Composition of the Sanhedrim, and on the Men of the Great Synagogue, subjects on which he is allowed to have said the last word.

The death of Kuenen has been followed, at nearly the same time of life, by that of Professor Paul de Lagarde, Ewald's successor at Gottingen. Lagarde's own name was Boetticher, which he changed probably on his marriage. Educated at Berlin and Halle, he was for a time privat docent at the latter place, and, after filling various posts, he was called to occupy the Chair left vacant by Ewald in 1869. In most things Lagarde was a great contrast to Kuenen. While the work of the latter was always strictly inductive, Lagarde's was often brilliantly intuitive. But instead of being a man of courtesy and peace, he was rarely out of some personal warfare, in which his chief weapons were sarcasm and contumely. It might not be easy to say whether his most important philological work, his "Uebersicht" of the Formation of Nouns in Semitic, contains most vituperation or philology. His anti-Semitism was rabid, and extended not only to the modern Semite,—whom, no doubt, it needs religion to love,—but also to the ancient; and he has permitted himself to say things of the Old Testament writers which lack wisdom. Lagarde's linguistic acquirements were astonishing; the fruits of his studies have appeared in a number of works under various names,—Semitica, Symmicta, Mittheilungen, etc. A number of useful editions were also superintended by him, e.g. the Didascalia of the Apostles, the Targum to the Prophets and Hagiographa from the Reuchlin Codex, the Syriac version of the Old Testament Apocrypha, Jerome's version of the Psalter which was not adopted into the Vulgate, and others. All scholars owe Lagarde a debt of gratitude for his labours on the Septuagint. His edition of Lucian's Recension, partly published, was discontinued for want of support, but it was understood that a subsidy had been guaranteed sufficient to enable him to complete it. It is to be hoped that his literary remains will fall into some pious hands, and that the edition will be completed in memory of a great and brilliant scholar.

My Most Useful Books.

BY THE REV. PRINCIPAL ELMER HARDING, M.A., ST. AIDAN'S COLLEGE.

1. The editor of The Expository Times has asked me to write an article on "My Most Useful Books," with some notes about them. On first receiving his letter, I at once turned to a small companion that is always by my side, List of Books worth Reading, with its excellent motto, "Read, try, judge, and speak as you find." It is by the editor of List of Plays worth Seeing, etc., and is published by Joseph Mead, London. But what does it contain? A few blank pages with spaces for the name of the book, the name of the author, the time when the book was read, and notes upon it. You make your own list. And yet, on looking through my own list of books (read during the past four or five years), interesting as it may be to myself, I felt that it was not exactly what the editor wanted. Writing to one whose work consists in trying to teach theology to young men preparing for the ministry of the Church, the editor evidently wanted a list of the books found "most useful" in first learning and then teaching this queen of sciences, this scientia scientiarum.

2. But here another difficulty presented itself, and demanded an answer; "my most useful books" on theology, well and good. But which of the many fields of theology? For theology covers a vast area. (1) There is the field of Holy Scripture, divided into Old Testament and New Testament, and again into Pentateuch and Joshua (or rather Hexateuch as we are now taught to describe it), Later Historical books and Prophets, Psalms and other books of the so-called Hagiographa, Synoptists, St. John, Acts, and Epistles, etc. On which little portion of this field am I to fix my attention in giving a list of "my most useful books"? (2) There is the field of Dogmatic