

musly characteristic of the stilted conceit which animates the class of men from which it comes. What acquaintance have they with the instruments which "were known to the Babylonians in the time of Daniel"? The sound of Babylonian viols had slumbered for four and twenty centuries, we take it, before these hostile critics "muled and puked" in Germany; and we should cheerfully forgive them if, on cross examination, it transpired that they were not conversant with the Chaldeans' knowledge of the names of their musical instruments. Their argument however takes the following form:—

The Greeks used certain instruments which bore the same name as did some of those used in Babylon, therefore the Babylonians obtained their instruments from Greece! In reply to this ludicrous assertion, Professor Hirschfelder shows that as early as the reign of Solomon, the Hebrews adopted some Sanscrit and Malabar names of articles imported from India, such as *koph* an ape, *tukki* a peacock, and *algumin* the algum wood; the Professor also shows that the names of plants, spices, and other products imported by the Greeks from the East, bore with them, as might be expected, their Phœnician, or Hebrew names, and he cites the word *nether*, which in the mouths of the Greeks becomes *nitron*, and in English *nitre*; this will be more intelligible to an English reader, when he learns that the Hebrew word, as conveyed to the Greeks, would consist of but the three letters *n t r*. The Hebrew *kinna'mon*, becomes in Greek, *kinna'momon*, and in English, *cinnamon*; *mor* again in Greek is *murra*, in English, *myrrh*, the Hebrew *shushan*, a lily, Greek, *souson*, Hebrew *sak*, Greek *sakkos*, a sack, or sack-cloth; Hebrew *gamal*, Greek *kamelos*, a camel. According to the argument of the German critics and their plagiarists, the Hebrew *kinna'mon*, etc., is traceable to the English cinnamon, but some of us will be apt to conclude that the stream does not run backwards. Professor H. gives the following examples of the names of Greek musical instruments as traceable to the Hebrew—*nevel*, Greek *nabla*, a lyre, *kinno'r*, Greek *kinura*, a harp. It may be well to point out that our own word 'navel' is one of many which come directly from the Hebrew, and that the instrument (*nevel*) was so named on account of the resemblance of its form to the navel. The four names of musical instruments, which the critics allege that the Greeks originated, are *kitharis*, a kind of harp or lyre, *sambuke*, another kind of harp, *psalterion*, the psaltery, and *symphonia*, a kind of bagpipe; these, the Professor shows, are derived respectively from the Hebrew *kaithros*, or *kitares*, *sabberka*, *pesanterin*, and *sumponia*, if the critics please to affirm that the Hebrews obtained the words from the Greeks, we suppose the Professor can afford to laugh at them. It is a fact (which will be interesting to scholars) that Strabo, the Greek geographer, states that the name *sambuko* is of barbarian (i. e. Oriental) origin (Lib. x). The Professor also suggests the following etymological consideration, which appears to us to be too interesting to omit. The Hebrew noun *suph* means a reed; with the addition of the terminal *on* we have the Hebrew *siphon* a tube a siphon, from which without doubt, the corresponding word in Greek and in English is derived. The instrument would thus obtain its name from the leathern bag receiving the air by a tube. Unfortunately for the adverse critics, the Greek word *sumphonia* is never employed by classical writers as the name of a single musical instrument, but always to represent a combination of instruments or voices. Professor H. comments on the lack of integrity on the part of the critics, as evidenced by their silence with regard to such evidence of antiquity of the books of Daniel and Ezra respectively as is afforded by the peculiarity of the Chaldee employed in those books. It is so easy to repeat the

attacks of spurious learning, and real learning is so comparatively rare among those who ought to be qualified to repel such attacks, that we do not deem it necessary to apologize for adding another weighty reply from Professor Hirschfelder. The Professor observes that the Canon of the Old Testament was closed about 435 B. C., and enquires how, under such circumstances, the critics can allege that the book of Daniel was written about the time of Antiochus Epiphanes (160 B. C.) The Professor then cites Josephus, on this point, in the following fashion—"For we have not an innumerable multitude of books among us, contradicting one another, (as the Greeks have), but only twenty-two books, which contain the records of all past times, which are justly believed to be Divine; and of them, five belong to Moses, which contain his laws and the traditions of the origin of mankind till his death. This interval of time was little short of three thousand years, but as to the time, from the death of Moses to the reign of Artaxerxes king of Persia, who reigned after Xerxes, the prophets, who were after Moses, wrote down what was done in their times in thirteen books. The remaining four books contain hymns to God, and precepts for the conduct of human life. It is true, our history had been written since Artaxerxes very particularly, but hath not been esteemed of the like authority as the former by our forefathers, because there hath not been an exact succession of prophets since that time." "During so many ages as have already passed, no one has been so bold as either to add anything to them, to take anything from them, or to make any change in them;* but it becomes natural to all Jews, immediately from their very birth, to esteem those books to contain Divine doctrines, and to persist in them, and if occasion be, willingly to die for them." (Josephus against Apion, b. i, 8). Josephus gives the number of books of the Old Testament as twenty-two, to make the number correspond with the twenty two letters of the Hebrew alphabet. His classification of the books is as follows:—5 books of Moses; 4 books of hymns and ethics, namely, The Psalms, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, and Canticles. His thirteen prophetic books are: 1. Joshua; 2. Judges and Ruth; 3. Samuel I, II.; 4. Kings I, II.; 5. Job, 6. Isaiah, 7. Jeremiah and Lamentations; 8. Ezekiel; 9. The twelve minor prophets; 10. Daniel; 11. Ezra, I, II (i.e. Ezra, and Nehemiah), 12. Chronicles I, II.; 13. Esther; a similar mode of numbering the books appears to have been adopted by Jerome in Prolog. galeato, Opp. ix, 454. Jerome says: "The books of the Old Law are in like manner twenty-two—Moses, 5; the Prophets, 8; the Hagiography, 9." Josephus placed the closing of the Canon in the reign of Artaxerxes, and this was the time the prophet Nehemiah carried out his great work of reform. (Neh. xiii) About 450 B. C. Nehemiah obtained permission from Artaxerxes to visit Jerusalem, and to rebuild its walls. About 437 B. C. he returned to Artaxerxes, but two years subsequently he re-visited Jerusalem, where he remained till his death, which took place about 420 B. C., that is 260 years before the death of Antiochus Epiphanes, who died in Persia about 160 B. C. It was during Nehemiah's last visit to Jerusalem that the closing of the Canon is generally believed to have been consummated. It has always been the conviction of the Jews that the Canon of their Scriptures was closed during the period of Ezra and Nehemiah, and that all books now contained in the Hebrew Scriptures were included in the Canon.

* Josephus probably did not suspect the pious fraud which occurs in Judges xviii, 30, where, lest idolatry should attach to the family of Moses, some sacrilegious hand has substituted the name of "Manasseh" for that of the prophet.