

which we cannot regard as having the least foundation in fact to sustain it. The testimony of Christian writers is easily attainable. If we now seek that of Jewish critics, which is, perhaps, less easily attainable to the reader, we shall find that they almost unanimously attach to *Bara*, the meaning of absolute creation. As we think that the Hebrew people should certainly know, better than others, what was the traditional and generally received meaning of certain terms in their language, we refer now to some of their chief theological and philosophical writers, and find that besides the secondary and figurative meanings they give the word, they explain *Bara* as, *המציאת היש מאין* i. e., "the production of something from nothing." This is the definition of the celebrated Maimonides, the most esteemed authority among them, in his valuable philosophical work *Moreh Nebuchim*, or Guide to the Perplexed; and we prefer this definition of the orthodox Maimonides to that which accords rather with the philosophy of the more sceptical Baruch Spinoza, though the latter be also of Jewish origin. But, ranged on the side of Maimonides are the greatest names in Hebrew literature, from Kimchi and Abarbanel, down to Moses Mendelssohn. Kimchi in his *Sepher Hushorashim* (Book of Roots) says "*Bara* means *ליש וצאתו מאין* i. e. the making of the thing newly, and its production out of nothing." This is the exposition given by the latest Anglo-Jewish commentators;* by the German translators who render the word by *erschaffen*; and by the Spanish translators, who render the word, *crio*. The latter corresponds to the *creavit* of the Vulgate; and although the Septuagint version has *ποιεῖν*, yet this word, as remarked by Parkhurst in his valuable "Greek Lexicon to the New Testament" also implies creation in its absolute sense. He quotes several examples and adds "so, in the LXX it frequently answers to the Hebrew *Bara* to create." The *Lingua Sacra* of David Levy, Newman, M. Josephs and other modern Jewish lexicographers explain it in the same way. So Stockius, Simonis, and Parkhurst. The "*Critica Sacra*" on the authority of Paulus Fagius tells us, "*Statuunt Heb. differentiam inter BARA, YATSTAR et ASAH creabit, formavit et fecit. Creare dicunt, est ex nihilo aliquid facere. Formare, enti creato figuram inducere. Facere, membra singula ordinare. Sic Esaiæ, 43, 7, 'Creavi eum, formavi eum atque feci eum.' Quem locum R. David Kimchi sic explicat. 'Creavi eum,' hoc est, produxi eum de nihilo ad esse. Dein 'formavi eum,' eo quod feci eum existere dispositione formæ. Postremò feci eum hoc est disposui seu ordinavi eum.*" We regard this passage from Isaiah xliii, and the exposition thereof by Kimchi just noticed by the "*Critica Sacra*" as very conclusive. From it, we should scarcely be disposed to admit that *Bara* and '*asah*' are, properly speaking, convertible terms; or that popular usage could deprive *Bara* of the wider meaning—that of producing something not before existing—which '*asah*' does not possess, and for which reason as we are reminded in "*Archæia*" it is applied to the operations of God the sole creator of heaven and earth. But it may be further objected that no biblical critic of modern times will say that on grammatical grounds *Bara* means the absolute creation out of nothing. To which we reply that they yet do say so very generally

* See "The Sacred Scriptures in Hebrew and English, &c.," by the Rev. D. A. De Sola, and Rev. M. J. Raphall, with notes, &c., London, Bagster, 1844.