

prove that instrumental praise belonged to special occasions only and to cast a doubt upon the statement of II. Chron. xxix. 25, by quoting Amos vi. 5, charging David with the sin of praising God by such means. As we have already said the arguments on that ground are not ingenious or worthy of the author. Let the use of the instruments have a typical signification by all means but do not destroy that very signification by making the use of them a human ordinance, a sinful and unwarranted act, a sacrificial ceremony and a mere secular form of rejoicing all in the same breath. If the writer says, as he seems sometimes to say, that David in singing of harp, psaltry, cymbals, &c., he meant nothing of the kind but was guilty of these symbolisms, we must throw upon him the onus of proof, which will be found no light weight even for one of Mr. Johnson's learning and ability. The last head, which is "an attempt to refute plausibilities urged for the use of instruments" is very well reasoned. Mr. Johnson rises here to the real height of his argument and rightly condemns those who ask for an organ "to make an attractive service and keep up with the improvements of the day" while he argues in the true Presbyterian spirit purity and simplicity of Gospel worship. He will find many good men and sincere earnest Presbyterians to differ with him, and the number of them we imagine will not be lessened by the attempt to prove that instrumental music was not a part of the regular temple service of praise authorized by God. Had such proof been possible Mr. Johnson's zeal and industry would surely have accomplished it. That it is not possible is no proof that instrumental music in the service of the sanctuary is either lawful or expedient. Whatever may be the side taken by the reader of this interesting and comprehensive pamphlet, he cannot rise from the perusal of it without benefit. In the preface Mr. Johnson acknowledges obligations to the "Home and Foreign Record of the Canada Presbyterian Church."

THE PRESBYTERIAN QUARTERLY AND PRINCETON REVIEW, JULY, 1872.

The first article in the present number of the Presbyterian Quarterly is by Dr. Taylor Lewis, of Union College, and deals with the Primitive Greek Religion. Dr. Lewis finds the primitive seat of the Greek religion in Dodona, and makes the worship rendered there Monotheistic, Zeus being regarded as the supreme god, alnoe worthy of the divine name. He accordingly supposes that the oracle of Dodona must have been founded by some descendant or descendants of Noah, not far removed in time from the period of the patriarch. Herodotus states most plainly the Egyptian origin of the oracle, but this statement Dr. Lewis sets aside. Ritter and other Sanscrit scholars have found resemblances between the worship at Dodona and that of the Indian Buddhists; but Dr. Lewis rejects the theory of a Buddhist colony from India settling in Greece, as he avers that no traces of such a migration can be found in the intervening countries. Dr. Lewis is doubtless acquainted with many migrations to regions far away from any original seat, that have left no trace in lands intermediate. He is, however, right in denying that from India beyond the Indus any progress of religion or civilization has set in westward. Both Indians and Greeks migrated originally in different directions from the same central region including Palestine, Arabia, and Egypt; and Herodotus is doubtless right when he gives Dodona an Egyptian original. The worship of Dodona was carried on in oakgroves and shows many points of connection with Druidism; hence Dr. Lewis supposes that Javanic pioneers settled in Gaul and Britain before the Celts, whom he makes, without any shadow of proof, descendants of Gomer, became the dominant peoples of these lands, and there set up the Druidical worship. But Druidism has been, time and again, referred to the East, and notably to India as its birthplace. Dr. Lewis, in a few words, discards all such theories, and the statements on which they are founded as "sheer gossip." The learned professor is a perfect Uhlán in the recklessness with which he urges his hobby horse over the grave objections of still more learned men. His remarks upon the statement of Plutarch that in periods of great danger men call upon God in the singular, and the many evidences he adduces of a true monotheism, underlying the ordinary polytheism of the Greek, are well worthy of attention.