

THE
PRINCETON REVIEW.

OCTOBER, 1846.

No. IV.

- ART. I.—1. *The Directory for the Worship of God in the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America, as amended and ratified by the General Assembly in May, 1821.*
2. *The Book of Common Prayer, and Administration of the Sacraments, and other Rites and Ceremonies of the Church, according to the use of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America.*

IF any feel amazement at the variety of forms in which the religious sentiment of Christians seeks expression in mental and bodily exercises, while, in all the cases, the God who is worshipped, the end of the worship, and the spirit which guides the worshipper are the same, they have but to consider this obvious and significant fact: That the spirit of God in the mind of man expresses itself in the various languages, and the various forms of thought and of actions familiar to the persons who are the subjects of his operation. The different forms of Christian worship are different languages employed to express one and the same sentiment of religion.

The people of different nations, under their various forms of social organization, differing from each other in their climates, their education, and their occupations, and having little assimilating intercourse with one another, have their various forms of expressing respect and disrespect, love and hatred; while the

his own denomination ; and they are equally popular with Presbyterian and orthodox Congregational ministers. We have made up our minds never to contend with any man for agreeing, in doctrinal points, with Andrew Fuller ; and it is in hope of increasing the number of those who shall read his works, that we have been induced to write this review. And in doing this, we have scarcely adverted to the fact, that Fuller was a decided antipedobaptist, and an Independent. Of course we do not agree with him on these points. But while we can so cordially agree, on every important doctrine of Christianity, we do not feel disposed to lay undue stress on a difference in matters merely external. He remained in the church in which he was brought up, and with which his family were connected for generations past. We feel, that such men as Andrew Fuller are our brethren, and belong to the same church, whatever bars to actual, external communion, may be interposed. Few men have lived, in our time, of the sincerity of whose religion we entertain a better opinion than of his. We like the unaffected humility which appears in every record, in his diary ; and we admire the calm, sober, unpretending frame of his dying hours, more than most of the obituaries which speak of extacies and raptures. In the last, and trying hour, he deeply felt his own utter unworthiness, and would not hear mention of any of his works of piety and benevolence ; but trusted for salvation, as he did during his life, simply but firmly, to the all-sufficient merits and perfect righteousness of Jesus Christ.

May we, and all our readers, have such humility, and such trust in our dying hour !

ART. IV.—*A Cyclopaedia of Biblical Literature*, edited by John Kitto, D. D., F. S. A. ; editor of the Pictorial Bible ; author of the History and Physical Geography of Palestine. Illustrated by numerous engravings. 2 vols. Svo. New York : 1846.

THE utility of Bible Dictionaries or (to use the more ambitious name now current) Cyclopaedias is attested by the frequency of their appearance, and the constant sale which they command. They are indeed indispensable aids in that minute

study of the scriptures, without which systematic treatises on Criticism and Antiquities are unavailing. While the latter afford general views and the means of synoptical comparison, the former are intended for continual reference at every step of the student's progress. So great are the facilities afforded by the alphabetical arrangement, that even the humblest and most unpretending books of this class may be used, at least occasionally, with advantage, by the ripest scholar. Those things are most likely to be soon familiar, which we know precisely where to look for. Hence the necessity of dictionaries on particular subjects, not as substitutes for systematic works, but as auxiliaries to them. A subject learned exclusively in this way, even if complete in its details, could scarcely fail to be distorted and confused in the arrangements of its parts. This evil can be obviated only by the use of systematic treatises. But when the outline has been accurately drawn in this way, there is no more certain method of filling it up than by the constant use of well constructed dictionaries as books of reference. The habitual reliance upon such books by those who use them at all, gives them, of course, an influence which makes it highly important that they should be made as correct and complete as possible. He who acquires the habit of referring to a dictionary, of whatever kind, for the solution of his doubts on any subject, is far more likely to be governed by it in his judgments than he would be by the continuous perusal of a work in systematic form. Nor is it merely upon readers that such books exert a powerful though often unsuspected influence. It extends no less to writers, and through them operates in a constantly enlarging circle. This kind of literature has a peculiar tendency to propagate itself. By an easy process, in a great degree mechanical, one dictionary may be made to furnish the materials of another, without any overt signs of plagiarism or even imitation. This facility arises from the unconnected form of such works and their want of any plan or general aspect which could give them individuality. All that they present to the continuous reader or the casual observer is a multitude of separate and minute points, without any bond of union but their common relation to a general design or subject, which makes little impression, because not embodied and made palpable by any systematic combination of the parts, but left to exist only in idea. Now as every one of these detached parts is

essential to any complete book upon the subject, and as only some of them can be expected to exhibit much variety in different hands, the reader or the public, having no key or clew to the parts which would afford an equitable standard of comparison, is apt to take the whole for granted, and to give the writer credit for as much originality and independence as the nature of his task would allow him to exhibit. Hence it is that of all books extant, those in the dictionary form afford the most temptation to the plagiarist, because they afford the fewest facilities for his detection. Hence too the endless reproduction of the matter of such works in new forms and under new names, but without any real or material addition to the general stock of knowledge.

This unlucky facility of propagation without progress makes the class of books to which it appertains as dangerous in one view as they are useful in another, by adapting them to serve as vehicles for the indefinite perpetuation of mistake and falsehood, often wholly unintentional and even accidental in their origin. The very errors of the press may thus be treasured up or rather coined anew and thrown into circulation with a fresh stamp to authenticate and give them currency. A curious chapter in the history of printing would be one detailing or exemplifying this incidental evil, which though not created has been vastly multiplied, wherever it occurs at all, by that sublime invention. If to this accidental source of error we add those arising from the usual infirmities of authors and compilers, and connect both with the special facilities and motives to an indiscriminate imitation which exists in this class of writings, and with the continual demand for them created by their cheapness in proportion to their contents and the mechanical facility of using them, it must be owned that they are not more indispensable than dangerous and liable to abuse.

The practical conclusion to which these considerations lead, is not that such books ought to be prohibited, but that they ought to be frequently re-written. This is the only means by which the old leaven can be certainly or thoroughly purged out. However liable to error the new writer may in this case be, there is very little chance of his repeating independently the blunders of his predecessors. His resort to fresh materials and original authorities will certainly enable him to shun the most of them. His own mistakes will probably be altogether different, and even this may

be regarded as a salutary change from an inveterate monotony of error. It is like the substitution of a fresh wound for an old running sore. This would be so even on the supposition that the chances of mistake remain the same as in the first instance; how much more when they are greatly diminished by every fresh recurrence to the fountain head of information.

But besides the utility, or rather the necessity, of thorough reconstruction in this class of writings, for the purpose of correcting old mistakes and purging out inveterate corruptions, the same process is required for an equally strong and yet a wholly independent reason. Even if the old books had been faultless in their origin, and free from all deterioration in their reproduction, it would still be necessary to re-write them, in order to keep up with the advance of learning, or at least with its vicissitudes. It is no very hazardous assertion, that in reference to the subjects usually treated in such books, there is a constant movement onwards, an addition to our stores of knowledge, an enlargement of our field of vision, and a favourable change of what the Anglo-Germans call our "standing point." But even granting that there has been no such actual advance or augmentation since Bible Dictionaries came into vogue in the early part of the last century, it would be paradoxical to question that the old knowledge has assumed new forms, and entered into new combinations, of which some at least may be considered as facilitating Biblical study, or if that is too much, as necessary to the comprehension of the modern writers. If our books for elementary instruction in arithmetic, geography, and so forth, have assumed a new form, even where there has been no material change of substance, why may not such a change be equally admissible, if not unavoidable, in other and higher parts of education? We have thus a double reason for maintaining that the class of books in question should from time to time be thoroughly re-written; first, because it is the only means of purging out the errors which this kind of literature tends peculiarly to breed and to perpetuate; and secondly, because it is the only means of bringing up our popular biblical literature to the rising standard of improvement and discovery.

With these prepossessions on the general subject, we are of course prepared to welcome such a work as that before us, as a timely addition to the biblical apparatus previously extant in

our language. Much must of necessity depend upon the editor, and more especially upon his views as to the only way in which the work can be constructed so as to effect its purpose. Dr. Kitto comes recommended, even to those not acquainted with his other writings, by the well-known general facts of his experience and success as a book-maker, and of his long familiarity, in this capacity at least, with biblical subjects. A feeling of more personal interest in him and his literary labours must exist in the minds of all who have read his account of the providential circumstance which transformed him from a mason's apprentice to a *helluo librorum*, to wit, the total loss of hearing by a fall from a ladder at the age of twelve. All this, however, could but raise a general presumption in his favour, and one liable to be destroyed by any indication of erroneous judgment as to the true method of constructing such a book to most advantage. We are glad to find, however, that his views on this essential point, as theoretically stated in his preface, and practically realized in the body of the work, are in a high degree enlarged and elevated, equally free from blind attachment to old errors and from wild proclivity to new ones. We shall do no more than an act of justice to a laborious and enlightened scholar by illustrating briefly this general commendation in a few particulars.

The first thing which strikes us as indicative of good sense and acquaintance with the general subject is the limitation of the ground to be occupied, as laid down in the preface. We cannot, it is true, commend either the wisdom or the good taste of inserting a lecture on *Encyclopädie*, such as are yearly delivered in the German universities, an honour which may very possibly have been enjoyed more than once by this identical performance from the pen of Dr. Credner at Giessen. Neither the doctrinal "standing point" nor the literary fame of this professor entitles him to such distinction; and even if they did, there would be something laughable in using an awkward English version of an awkward German lecture, for the purpose of apprising English readers what is meant by "Cyclopaedia" and by "Biblical Literature." All that was necessary in the way of definition has been far more clearly given in a few words by the editor himself than in Credner's elaborate distinctions and citations of his own German works. What we approve in Dr. Kitto's plan, apart from this unfortunate interpolation, is the

distinct delineation of his subject as including only Archaeology and Criticism or rather Introduction in the German sense. This affords ample matter for two volumes of the size before us, nor could any other extensive topic have been introduced without a hurtful sacrifice of fulness and precision or a very undesirable increase of price. At the same time, what is here embraced is really, as it claims to be, preparatory and auxiliary to interpretation. It may indeed be all reduced to introduction in its widest sense, as comprehending criticism, geography, natural history, and antiquities in all their branches, religious, political, social, and domestic. These are the topics upon which a faithful student of the Bible would desire to make constant use of such a work as that before us.

Another favourable symptom is the editor's avowed determination to construct the work truly and entirely *de novo*. To the grounds for this conclusion there is no need of reverting; it is enough that they are here appreciated and reduced to practice. Dr. Kitto seems particularly anxious to disclaim all direct dependence upon Calmet, and no wonder, when we take into consideration the interminable progeny of which that meritorious work has been the parent. A slight sketch of its history, as given in the preface of the work before us, may be not devoid of interest and use. Calmet's *Dictionnaire Historique, Critique, Chronologique, Géographique, et Littérale de la Bible*, containing in an alphabetic form the substance of the author's *Commentaire Littérale*, was originally published at Paris, in two volumes folio 1722, and eight years later more complete in four volumes folio. The only important work of the same kind which had appeared before it was the *Hierolexicon* of Rechenberg, published at Frankfort and Leipzig, in 1714. The first English version of Calmet was that of D'Oyley and Colson, in three volumes folio, 1732. This was the great *officina* of Bible Dictionaries, large and small, got up by various hands, to meet the wants of different denominations, until 1795, when a fresh material was afforded for this kind of manufacture by Charles Taylor's abridgment of Calmet in two volumes quarto, accompanied by two more of his own called *Fragments*, and containing a farrago of varied learning, and eccentric speculation on a vast variety of subjects, some of them having but a distant bearing on the scriptures and no tendency at all to illustrate or ex-

plain them. This foreign matter having been laboriously condensed and incorporated with the abridged Calmet by succeeding book makers, resulted in a product which can only be compared to some of the adulterated wines of the American and European liquor market. Dr. Robinson's abridged edition (1832) has been consulted in the present case only for the sake of his additions, "but more in the early than in the latter part, where the sources of such additions were rather sought in the German authorities from which they were found to be derived." Of Winer's *Biblisches Realwörterbuch* the editor professes to have made more frequent use, but in a way which shows his just appreciation of its character, viz. "rather as an index than as a direct source of materials," a most accurate description of that wonderful chef-d'œuvre in the way of multifarious and condensed citation.

The next thing which has favourably impressed us is the editor's not undertaking to prepare the entire work himself or only with the aid of his immediate friends and usual *collaborateurs*. Such a course might probably have saved much trouble, time and money, in the end, but it would far more certainly have lowered the literary merit of the work to an indefinite degree, and robbed the editor of all the praise now due to him for justly estimating the importance, not to say necessity, of executing such a plan at this day by an extensive division of labour. This view of the matter was already familiar to the English public, through a number of the recent examples in other works of literature, such as Smith's Dictionary of Classical Antiquities, and the Biographical Dictionary of the Society for the Diffusion of Useful Knowledge. But such examples are so often thrown away, especially on scholars of a different department, that we think the present editor entitled to much credit for the zeal with which he seems to have sacrificed his pride of authorship to this great law of learned compilation. He has boldly and faithfully acted on the principle that such a plan can be worthily executed, in the present state of learning, only by distributing its parts among many hands, and such hands too as have been fitted by anterior experience to perform them most successfully. In order to secure this advantage he was willing to forego that of entire uniformity in method, style, and even sentiment, a bold

choice but, in our opinion, under the circumstances of the case, a wise one.

Another question of some delicacy which has been judiciously decided, is the question with respect to the use which was to be made of German sources and authorities. A right decision is the more commendable in this case because error was so natural and easy, not in one but in opposite directions. A superficial sciolist, inoculated with the notion that whatever is expressed in German must be true and wise, would have made the book a parrot-like reiteration of absurd neologisms. A prejudiced alarmist, convinced that all impiety and error may be shut out by a rigorous embargo upon German books, would have put the literature of the work back half a century at least, to preserve it from all tincture of outlandish infidelity. The editor has wisely and successfully avoided both extremes, at least so far as his design and purpose are concerned, by opening the door to the results of German learning, without opening the windows to the pestilential atmosphere of what may still unhappily be called German principles. In other words, he has enriched the book with references to many valuable German works, down to the date almost of publication, and enlisted the services of writers thoroughly familiar with the modern German learning but entirely exempt from the skepticism by which it is poisoned, so that they are able to maintain sound opinions not in ignorance but in defiance of assaults upon them. The difference between this course and that which some would have pursued, is the same as that between escaping from an enemy by running and by beating him in battle.

We have no hesitation in expressing the opinion that justice cannot now be done to the subjects handled in these volumes without drawing largely upon German sources. The very fact that neological propensities have led the scholars of that country to plough up the whole field for themselves and to examine every clod and pebble with a microscopic scrutiny, makes it certain that they must have turned up something which was not upon the surface, and which others never would have found if the soil had remained undisturbed, although they may be far better qualified to estimate and use what is discovered than the discoverers themselves. The true course with respect to German labours and researches is not to look away from them or cover them

with dust, but to seize upon their valuable products and convert them to our own use in the very face and teeth of those who after bringing them to light are often utterly unable to dispose of them.

Among the auxiliaries whom the editor has thus enlisted, some of the most eminent are not only masters of German erudition but Germans themselves. Besides Credner, whose contributions, in our judgment, are of little value, a number of interesting and important articles are from the pen of Tholuck, Hengstenberg, and Hävernick. These names will suffice to show what class of German principles is represented in the Cyclopaedia, and how far the coincidence of modern scholarship and infidelity is from being necessary or invariable. It is indeed a curious fact that while some of the most orthodox opinions here asserted are maintained by Germans, some of the most lax and latitudinarian notions are propounded by members of the Church and Universities of England, a sufficient proof that such comparisons must rest on other data than ecclesiastical or national distinctions. Besides the German writers just enumerated, we observe in the List of Contributors, the name of Ewald, but have not detected any article with his initials during two perfunctory examinations of the work. His contributions must be very few. The editor appears to have employed means to obtain a contribution from Neander on the subject of Baptism, for the singular purpose of producing "freshness of effect" upon a topic which seemed to be exhausted in England. It rather looks as if the motive had been to admit from Germany opinions which, if written by an Englishman, might seem to be sectarian. At any rate, the excellent Neander, with a naïveté which will not appear strange to those who know him, pleads the pressure of his other labours and devolves the task upon his dear friend, J. Jacobi, of Berlin, as fully qualified to do it justice. Whatever be the merit of Jacobi or his article, the substitution must provoke a smile from English readers, who are perfectly aware that Neander's name alone would have recommended anything which he had written, a virtue not transferable even by himself to the person or the writings of his "dear friend, J. Jacobi." As to the article itself, it fully meets the editor's demand for something different from the customary exhibitions of the same theme in English, and must greatly gratify his Baptist brethren by propounding in

the boldest form Neander's doctrine as to the non-apostolicity of infant baptism.

Besides the native representatives of German learning who have now been mentioned, there are several English scholars whose numerous articles exhibit intimate acquaintance with the biblical literature of that country. Of these, the names which meet the eye most frequently are those of the Reverend J. F. Denham, M. A., St. John's College, Cambridge F. R. S.; the Rev. John Nicholson, B. A., of Oxford, and P. D. of Tübingen; the Rev. William Wright, M. A. and LL.D. of Trinity College, Dublin; and the Rev. F. W. Newman, late Fellow of Balliol College, Oxford. The last named, unless we mistake the man, is a near kinsman of the famous Newman, and seceded from the English Church before him, but in an opposite direction. In addition to these Anglican divines, the same kind of learning is apparent in the contributions of some eminent dissenters, and especially in those of the Rev. Dr. Samuel Davidson, Professor in the Lancashire Independent College, and the Rev. Dr. Alexander, a distinguished Congregational minister in Edinburgh. The editor himself displays a like familiarity with German sources, although not precisely of the same class, on account of the particular field to which he has confined himself. This observation furnishes an opportunity of briefly stating how the subjects treated in the work have been distributed.

The department which the editor reserves for himself is that of antiquities, religious, social, and political, a choice no doubt determined by his taste and by the course of his previous studies. For the same reason he has likewise contributed a large proportion of the articles on geography, in which he has made ample use of Robinson and other recent writers on that subject. The Natural History of the Bible has been treated with particular attention, in original articles expressly written for the work by two distinguished naturalists. The Botany of Scripture was entrusted to Dr. J. F. Royle, Professor of Materia Medica and Therapeutics in King's College, London. This gentleman, while resident in India, was commissioned by the medical authorities in Bengal, to investigate the medicinal plants and drugs of India, for the purpose of ascertaining how far the public service might be supplied with indigenous medicines instead of importing them from foreign countries. This even-

tually led to an extensive collation of the most celebrated oriental writers on materia medica, as well as to a careful investigation of the substances themselves. Such labours could not fail to yield many valuable fruits in reference to the Natural History of Scripture. They are not, however, without some accompanying disadvantages, arising from the circumstances of the case. It is impossible that one whose mind has thus been occupied with a certain branch of science for its own sake, and especially when it has been pursued in an original and novel manner, should be able to confine himself to that precise kind and amount of information which is necessary for an incidental purpose, not particularly interesting to the man himself. His own favourite designs will be continually getting the advantage of the object temporarily presented, and inducing him to dwell upon particulars which really contribute nothing to the immediate end in view. With this fault Dr. Royle's contributions to the work before us are unquestionably very often chargeable. The space assigned to certain subjects and to certain parts of subjects is sometimes wholly disproportioned to their practical importance as illustrative of scripture. The same remark is applicable, in a less degree, to the articles on Scriptural Zoology, by Colonel Hamilton Smith, President of the Devon and Cornwall Natural History Society. That this fault did not strike the editor is probable because in his own part of the work there is observable a disposition to push archaeological detail far beyond the point of exegetical utility. To such details there can of course be no objection in their proper place; but where economy of time and space is so important to the reader and for his sake to the writer, there is something more than a utilitarian argument against the disproportion here complained of. This mistaken view of archaeology, considered as a source of illustration to the scriptures, has been characteristic of a certain school in England and America, as may be seen in the appropriation of whole pages to huge wood-cuts of animals, plants, and musical instruments, where all the light derivable from this source could be imparted in a single sentence without any diagram at all. The abuse, however, is by no means confined to these "pictorial illustrations:" it exists no less in the superfluous descriptions of familiar or irrelevant objects and the endless extracts from oriental travellers, the insertion of which is regarded as a kind of

meritorious *opus operatum*, whether any useful end is answered by the same or not. This diluted learning has been far more common among English writers than in Germany, where criticism and emulation constantly exert a restraining and inciting influence on writers of all classes. Even there, however, something of the same kind has been known, as in the case of Hendewerk who takes occasion, from Isaiah's mention of the ass, in ch. i. 3, to go into an elaborate description of that animal, with due care to discriminate between the European and the oriental asses; as if any light whatever could be thrown upon the prophecy by this impertinent parade of asinine zoology.

We are far from meaning to insinuate that Dr. Royle and Colonel Smith have done no service to the cause of scriptural interpretation by their learned contributions, or that the fault which we have mentioned is not vastly overbalanced by the scientific precision and the oriental learning of these articles. On the contrary, we reckon them among the most original and valuable elements which enter into the composition of the work, and cheaply purchased even by the sacrifice of space and symmetry, which we have mentioned only as a blemish, which in subsequent editions may be rectified, if such a process should be necessary to secure room for other matter more directly bearing on the great end of the compilation, than some of the botanical and zoological details in question.

The other great department of the work is that of Criticism in the wider sense, or what the Germans technically call Introduction, including every thing connected with the text of scripture and the genuineness of its parts. This important class of subjects has, in the work before us been committed to safe and able hands. The topics constituting General Introduction have been chiefly furnished by Dr. Davidson, who may be said to have given here the substance of his valuable lectures on Biblical Criticism, the best elementary book on the subject in the English language, as combining, more successfully than any other, ancient principles with modern learning. There are also from the same pen, special articles on Chronicles and Revelation. Those on the Pentateuch and its component parts and on the book of Daniel are by Hävernicks, who has here given the results of his valuable Introduction. Those on Job, Ecclesiastes, and Isaiah, are by Hengstenberg; on Samuel, Kings, Jonah, Zephaniah, and Zech-

ariah, by Dr. Eadie of the United Secession Church; on Esther, Canticles, Micah, Obadiah, and Nahum, by Dr. Wright of Dublin; on the Psalms and Nehemiah by Dr. Benjamin Davies; on Amos and Joel by Mr. J. E. Ryland; on Jeremiah and Ezekiel by the Rev. Mr. Gotch of Trinity College, Dublin; on Ruth by Professor Bush; with several others by contributors whose names are not included in the catalogue prefixed to the first volume.

In the New Testament, the special introduction has been chiefly furnished by Dr. Tholuck of Halle, Dr. Wright of Dublin, and Dr. Alexander of Edinburgh. The philological articles are chiefly from the pen of Messrs. Newman, Wright and Nicholson, the last of whom is well known as the English translator of Ewald's Hebrew Grammar, the authority of which work seems to be more generally recognised than that of any other in the volumes now before us.

Besides the more frequent contributors of whom we have already spoken, the editor appears to have entrusted several selected subjects to distinguished writers for special reasons which are not always obvious. This is the origin of the articles on Adam and Paradise by Dr. John Pye Smith, of those on the Creation and the Deluge by Professor Baden Powell of Oxford, and of those on Miracles and Inspiration by Dr. Woods of Andover. Occasional articles in different departments have been furnished likewise by the Rev. Dr. Doran, Secretary of the Church Missionary Society; the Rev. Mr. Jamieson, editor of Paxton's Illustrations; the Rev. N. Morren of the Church of Scotland; the Rev. Dr. Stebbing, of St. John's College, Cambridge; and the Rev. J. R. Beard, D.D. We observe upon the list of contributors, without having yet been able to identify their articles, the names of Dr. Baur of Giessen, and the late Dr. Welsh of Edinburgh, with several others, British and American, to which we are obliged, with shame, to acknowledge ourselves strangers.

The particulars already stated will suffice to show the scale on which the work is projected, and the extent to which the editor has availed himself of the division of labour in its execution. They will also show the pains which he has taken to avoid either sectarian or national restrictions and to levy contributions upon every accessible province in the republic of letters. As many of his applications may have been unsuccessful, it is proba-

ble that what we have stated gives but an imperfect view of the praiseworthy efforts made to render this new Dictionary worthy of the subject, and of the advanced state of biblical learning.

To this account of Dr. Kitto's plan we have little to add in the way of criticism on its execution. A particular estimate of the contents would be forbidden by our limits, even if not precluded by the cursory nature of the only examination which we have as yet made of the work in its complete form. As to style and manner, we can only say, that the German contributors fare worst, as might have been expected from the fact that they appear in the disguise of a translation, often awkward and unskilful, sometimes even ludicrous in consequence of its retaining German idioms for which there are perfectly good English equivalents. In some cases too, the sense is wholly obscured by this gratuitous adherence to the form of the original, as it is in others by evident mistake upon the part of the translator. This is the more to be regretted as the originals are not accessible, and as these articles, in some respects, are the most interesting part of the collection. The best written articles, in reference to style alone, appear to be those of the Anglican contributors, who, for some reason, have an ease and refinement in the use of their own language, which is often wanting even in Dissenters of great learning, such as John Pye Smith and Samuel Davidson. The editor himself is a good writer, and the body of the work does credit to its authors, as a specimen of skilful book-making and correct composition.

It is a much more serious question how far the opinions broached in this work can be reckoned sound and healthful in their influence on that class of readers who are most likely to make use of it. That the general spirit of the work is good, and that its principles are in the main both orthodox and evangelical, may be asserted even on the ground of a perfunctory perusal. But it is equally certain that its character, in this as in other respects, cannot be uniform. This was distinctly foreseen by the editor as an incidental evil inseparable from the enlarged plan upon which the work has been constructed. It is for this reason that the initials of the authors are appended to the articles, in order that the responsibility may rest upon themselves. In this arrangement there is no doubt something unsatisfactory, a want

of unity and even homogeneousness, which in a systematic work would be intolerable, and which even here can be regarded in no better light than that of a necessary evil. That it is necessary seems to us however no less clear than that it is an evil. Between such a work, with all the disadvantages arising from this cause, and the consistent uniform production of a single individual or *clique*, without the benefit of varied labour, no enlightened student of the word of God can hesitate. All that is necessary to prevent the evils which may be anticipated, is to bear in mind the general fact that this work owes its literary merit, in a great degree, to the number and variety of its compilers, who belong to different nations, churches, schools, and parties, and that every part must therefore be received with due consideration of its source, although, as we have said, the exceptions to the general harmony of principle and spirit will probably be found few in number and by no means of an aggravated character.

With this qualification we are free to recommend the Cyclopaedia of Dr. Kitto, as a marked improvement upon all preceding works of the same kind, and as the most convenient means, accessible to English readers, of securing the valuable fruits of modern biblical investigation. If this be so, the variety of pens employed upon it rather adds to its value than detracts from it, by justifying the assertion of the editor, that the English language has no other book which eminent foreign scholars have co-operated with our own in producing, and certainly no other which embodies the combined labour of writers who are of different communions here, and are known by different names among men, but have the same hope in this world and but one name in heaven.

ART. V.—1. *Historical Sketch of the Evangelical Alliance*, by Rev. David King, L. L. D.

2. *On the Evangelical Alliance*, by Rev. Dr. Chalmers. Edinburgh.

WE propose to give in the present article a brief historical