

vidual linguistic phenomenon to Africa is as necessary, as it is for the most part unadduced. There existed side by side as well vulgarisms in general use as African provincialisms (comp. *Eph. epigr.*, iv. p. 520, as to the cognomina in *-osus*); but that forms like *glorificare, nudificare, justificare* belong to the second category, is by no means proved from the fact that we first meet with them in Africa, since analogous documents to those which we possess *e.g.* for Carthage in the case of Tertullian, are wanting to us for Capua and Milan."

WILLIAM P. DICKSON.

---

DR. M. M. KALISCH.

THE writer of these lines was not personally acquainted with the late M. M. Kalisch, whose decease at the early age (for a scholar) of fifty-seven, has been chronicled in the newspapers. That he came to this country as a political refugee in the fateful year 1848, and that his literary labours, facilitated by the munificence of the Rothschilds, were bravely continued to the last amidst the drawbacks of impaired health, are facts open to all, and only repeated here, because they throw a bright light on a remarkable career. Dr. Kalisch was more than a scholar, more than a Jewish theologian; he felt that there were deeper questions than the criticism of the Pentateuch, and wider interests than those even of his own oecumenical Jewish Church. But he could bear to dwell habitually in the lowlands of patient research, and to regard this assignment of work as more than a compensation for the seclusion involved in his ill-health. Few men have been bolder in their generalizations, none more unweariable in their amassment of minute philological and historical facts.

"A dry, cold rationalist, and the author of a Hebrew Grammar." Such somewhere is the obituary notice of the brave combatant who has passed away. He *did* take the

side of rationalism, and he *was* a meritorious grammarian. In so far as rationalism is a struggle for the right of critical exegesis, these two titles to remembrance—rationalism and a grammar—may not improperly be combined. Dr. Kalisch held that “the grammar is only the vestibule of the temple which enshrines the literature,” and in earnest words bids the student hasten to “the sunny elevation, where the Divine presence breathes in the eternal words of Scripture” (Preface to Part I. of his *Hebrew Grammar*). No recent Hebrew grammar, written in English, has been of such wide utility as the two parts of this grammar; the abundance of facts, the well graduated exercises, and the attention to syntax, are excellent and not too common features, partly counterbalanced, however, by an imperfect sympathy with modern scientific methods. But though the grammar is the most extensively used of his works, it is no doubt his exegetical series which Dr. Kalisch would have pointed to as his monument. His first commentary, that on the Book of Exodus, was published in 1855, and would now be reckoned orthodox and conservative; his second, that on Genesis, appeared in 1858, and distinctly recognised the principles of modern analytic criticism; the third, on the first part of Leviticus (1867), and the fourth, completing that book (1872), took up the most “advanced” position both in criticism and, unhappily, in theology. The *Exodus* and *Genesis* have not yet been superseded by any English work. Much indeed has been contributed to the study of the Hebrew *origines* since they were written, but a student unacquainted with German can hardly afford to neglect them; the *Genesis* in particular is animated by a noble idealism which reminds us forcibly of Eichhorn and Ewald. Of the *Leviticus* it were perhaps best to say nothing; in presence of a fresh grave, words of cold criticism would jar on the ear. It is important, however, to notice that independently of Christian scholars, this open-minded Jewish critic maintains the

theory, revived in our time by Graf, and developed with such brilliancy by Wellhausen, that the Levitical legislation is of post-exile origin.

Slender in form, compared with the too bulky Pentateuch commentaries, the *Bible Studies* on the Prophecies of Balaam (1877), and on the Book of Jonah (1878), are nevertheless full of important matter, especially for the historical illustration of these very peculiar and disputed portions of the Old Testament. The example set by Dr. Kalisch is worthy of being followed. The composite character of the Old Testament makes it absolutely necessary to facilitate the enjoyment of its separate parts by treating of them in separate works. The Book of Jonah is unlike any other member of the prophetic canon; its interest is not less peculiar than its difficulty. The rationalistic explanation of the story of Jonah is, of course, that of Dr. Kalisch, but there is nothing new in the form which he gives to it. The preliminary essay on the relations of Jew and heathen is however a masterly historical study, which acquires fresh significance in view of recent melancholy events. Perhaps however the *Balaam* is intrinsically a finer piece of work. The notes and illustrations are as copious as usual, and the use made of Assyriology is very creditable, considering that Assyriology was entirely a new field to the author. But the really remarkable part of the book is its treatment of the character of Balaam, which has hardly attracted the notice of Christian theologians. Even Dr. Samuel Cox seems to have overlooked it. According to Dr. Kalisch, the character of Balaam is "an inexplicable mystery to all who fail to separate between two antagonistic traditions" (one of which was favourable, the other adverse to Balaam). For his own part, believing that two views are propounded in the Bible, he thinks himself at liberty to select that which he deems the nobler. He sees in it a beautiful and enlightened recognition of God's communion with the choicer spirits of the

“Gentile” races, akin to that which a prince among the prophets expresses in the passages on Cyrus the Persian. Dr. Kalisch has evidently a strong interest in the comparative study of religions, and no object is so dear to him as the growth of mutual respect and sympathy among religionists of various schools. This leads us to notice the remarkable and well-written work which, in the form of a Platonic dialogue, discusses the old problems of the “highest good.” *Path and Goal* appeared in 1880, and only failed to obtain a merited success by its over-thoroughness, and a certain want of relief to the grave and debatable subjects of the philosophic discussion. To a student its value is great from its sympathetic exhibition of opposing points of view—Greek philosophical, modern scientific, Brahman, Brahmoist, Buddhist, Parsee, Mohammedan, Jewish liberal and orthodox, Christian liberal and orthodox. It is impossible to doubt that the host, at whose house the guests assemble, represents the opinions of Dr. Kalisch himself, and that the latter believed himself to have devised “a general view, which combined and kept in equipoise Hebrew, Greek, and modern thought, and which did justice both to the varied aspirations of human nature and the complex course of universal history” (p. 3). This reminds us of the eloquent passage which concludes Max Müller’s volume of *Hibbert Lectures*. Neither of these great scholars agrees with those who look for a universal religion composed of that which all religious men even now believe in common. Max Müller, for instance, allows that in the future each “crypt worshipper” will still have his own “pearl of great price,” and “Mondoza” almost makes the same admission. The rationalism of Dr. Kalisch is therefore neither dry nor cold, though to all whose “pearl of great price” is not merely a truth, but a complex of truths vivified in the person of Jesus, it is, and must be, unsatisfying.

T. K. CHEYNE.