

cleared; and the Middletown district owned 83 sailing vessels and 22 steamers. Both the silver and the lead mines which were formerly worked in the vicinity have been abandoned, but cast-iron, britannia, and silver-plated goods, sewing-machines, pumps, webbing, and tape are among the local manufactures. The population of the city increased from 5182 in 1860 to 6850 in 1880. First settled in 1636, Middletown was incorporated as a town in 1654, and as a city in 1784.

MIDDLETOWN, a manufacturing village of the United States, in Wallkill township, Orange county, New York, 55 miles N.N.W. of New York, at the junction of four railroads. It is a clean well-built place, in the midst of a fine dairy-farming and stock-raising district, manufactures saws, files, felt hats, blankets, agricultural implements, printers' materials, &c., and is the seat of the State Homeopathic Insane Asylum. The population was 6049 in 1870 and 8494 in 1880.

MIDHURST, an ancient parliamentary borough and market-town of Sussex, is picturesquely situated on a gentle eminence above the south bank of the West Rother, on three railway lines, 50 miles south-west of London and 12 north from Chichester. The church of St Denis (restored in 1881-83) is chiefly Perpendicular in style, but the lower part of the embattled tower is probably Norman. At the grammar school, founded in 1672, Richard Cobden and Sir Charles Lyell were educated. A new public hall was opened in 1882. The old castle of the De Bohuns stood on a mound above the river, now overgrown with trees. In ancient times a commandery of the Knights of St John of Jerusalem had jurisdiction over the district now forming the liberty of St John. The prosperity of the town depends chiefly on agriculture. A market is held weekly, and a fair three times a year. The population of the parliamentary borough, which has an area of 26,172 acres, was 6753 in 1871, and 7221 in 1881.

Midhurst is not mentioned in Domesday, being included under Easebourne. In the reign of Henry I. it was held by the king as a minor barony. In the time of Edward I. it passed into the possession of the De Bohuns. From the time of Edward II. till 1832 it returned two members to parliament, but since then only one.

MIDIAN was one of the peoples of North Arabia whom the Hebrews recognized as distant kinsmen, representing them as sons of Abraham's wife Keturah. The word Keturah means "incense"; thus the sons of Keturah are the "incense-men," not indeed inhabitants of the far south incense-land, but presumably the tribes whose caravans brought the incense to Palestine and the Mediterranean ports. So the Midianites appear in connexion with the gold and incense trade from Yemen (Isa. lx. 6), and with the trade between Egypt and Syria (Gen. xxxvii. 28, 36). At the time of the exodus the pastures of the Midianites, or of the branch of Midian to which Moses's father-in-law Jethro or Raguel, or Hobab) belonged, lay near Mount Horeb (Exod. iii. 1); and Num. x. 29 sq. implies that the tribe was at home in the desert of the wanderings. The Kenites, who, in spite of their connexion with Amalek (1 Sam. xv. 6), had friendly relations with Israel, and ultimately coalesced with the tribe of Judah, are represented in Judg. i. 16, iv. 11 as the kin of Moses's father-in-law. The Kenites, however, can have been but one fraction of Midian which took a separate course from their early relations to Israel.<sup>1</sup> The main body appear in Judg. vi. as a powerful Bedouin confederation, invading Canaan from the eastern desert, and ravaging the land as similar tribes have done in all ages when Palestine lacked a strong

<sup>1</sup> The admixture of Midianite elements in Judah and the other border tribes of Israel is confirmed by a comparison of the names of the Midianite clans in Gen. xxv. 4 with the Hebrew genealogies (1 Chron. ii. 46, iv. 17, v. 24; Gen. xli. 9).

government. With their defeat by Gideon and another defeat by the Edomites in the field of Moab, probably about the same time (Gen. xxxvi. 35), the recorded history of Midian closes.

A place Midian is mentioned 1 Kings xi. 18, and in later times the name lingered in the district east of the Gulf of Akaba, where Eusebius knows a city Madian in the country of the Saracens and Ptolemy places Modiana. Still later Madyan was a station on the pilgrim route from Egypt to Mecca, the second beyond Aila (Elath). Here in the Middle Ages was shown the well from which Moses watered the flocks of Sho'ab (Jethro), and the place is still known as "the caves of Sho'ab." It has considerable ruins, which have been described by Ruppell (*Reisen*, 1829) and Burton (*Land of Midian*, 1879).

MIDNAPUR, a district in the lieutenant-governorship of Bengal, India, between 21° 37' and 22° 57' N. lat., and between 86° 35' 45" and 88° 14' E. long., is bounded on the N. by Bānkurā and Bardwān, on the E. by Hooghly and Howrah, on the S. by the Bay of Bengal, and on the W. by Singbhūm and Mānbhūm, with an area of 5082 square miles. Its general appearance is that of a large open plain, of which the greater part is under cultivation. In the northern portion the soil is poor, and there is little wood. The country along the western boundary, known as the Jungle Mahāls, is undulating and picturesque; it is almost uninhabited. The eastern and south-eastern portions are swampy and richly cultivated. The chief rivers of the district are the Hooghly and its three tributaries, the Rūpnārāyan, the Haldi, and the Rasulpur. The Midnapur high-level canal runs almost due east and west from the town of Midnapur to Ulubariā on the Hooghly 16 miles below Calcutta, and affords a continuous navigable channel 53 miles in length. There is also a tidal canal for navigation, 26 miles in length, extending from the Rūpnārāyan river. The jungles in the west of the district yield lac, *tasar* silk, wax, resin, fire-wood, charcoal, &c., and give shelter to large and small game.

The census of 1872 returned the population of Midnapur at 2,540,963 (1,257,194 males and 1,283,769 females), including only 122 Europeans and 157,030 Mohammedans. The aboriginal tribes belong chiefly to the jungles and hills of Chutiā Nāgpur and Bānkurā; the most numerous of them are Santāls (96,921) and Bhumijis (35,344). Of high-caste Hindus the returns show 136,500; and the number of Kāyasths is given as 101,663. Among the semi-Hinduized aborigines, the most numerous are the Bāgdis, a tribe of cultivators, fishermen, and day-labourers (76,825). Belonging to agricultural castes there are 1,018,686. The four municipalities are Midnapur (31,491), Chandrakona (21,311), Ghatal (15,492), and Tamlik (5849). Rice is the staple crop. Irrigation is effected chiefly from the high-level canal. Rent rates vary from 10½d. an acre for the poorest quality of rice land to 18s. an acre for the best irrigable lands. The district suffers occasionally from drought; floods are common, and very disastrous in their results. The principal exports are rice, silk, and sugar; and the chief imports consist of cotton cloth and twist. Salt, indigo, silk, mats, and brass and copper utensils are manufactured. Apart from the rivers, communication is afforded by 482 miles of road. The total revenue in 1870-71 was £262,578, and the expenditure £53,777. The prevailing diseases are fever, diarrhoea, dysentery, and cholera. The average mean temperature is 80° Fahr., and the average annual rainfall 66 inches.

The early history of Midnapur centres round the ancient town of Tamlik, which in the beginning of the 5th century was an important Buddhist settlement and maritime harbour. The first connexion of the English with the district dates from 1760, when Mir Kāsim ceded to the East India Company Midnapur, Chittagong, and Bardwān (then estimated to furnish one-third of the entire revenue of Bengal) as the price of his elevation to the throne of Bengal on the deposition of Mir Jafar.

MIDNAPUR, chief town and headquarters station of the above district, is situated on the north bank of the Kasāi river, with a population in 1872 of 31,491. The town has a large *bāzār*, with commodious public offices. It is healthy, dry, and well supplied with water. An American mission maintains an excellent training school, together with a printing press, and has founded several village schools for

the district. Its efforts have been particularly successful among the Santāls, and some of the earliest and most valuable works on their language have issued from the Midnapur mission press. A brisk manufacture of brass and copper utensils takes place in the town; it is also the centre of a large indigo and silk industry.

MIDRASH. Like all nouns of a similar form *Midrash* is the equivalent of the Niph'al participle,<sup>1</sup> and as such yields as many modified meanings as the root *Darosh* (דָּרַשׁ), to search, &c., itself has. The practical significations, however, of *Midrash*, taken in historical order, are as follows:—(1) a book of records; (2) a recension of older, especially historical, materials; (3) search in and explanation of the Scriptures, notably the Pentateuch (in which case the plural is invariably *Midrashoth*); (4) theory as distinguished from practice; (5) a college for study and teaching; (6) an *Agadah* (that is, a free) explanation, in contradistinction to an *Halakhic* one; (7) a collection of such free explanations (in which case the plural is *Midrashim* and occasionally also *Midrashoth*). Of these seven significations (1) and (2) are to be found in the Bible,<sup>2</sup> (3) and (4) are mentioned for the first time in the *Mishnah*,<sup>3</sup> (5) is to be met with in the *Midrash*,<sup>4</sup> while (6) and (7) are to be found in early Rabbinic writings.<sup>5</sup>

The subject of this article will be—(1) the nature of *Midrash* in the sense of *Agadah*, to the exclusion of *Halakhah* (for which see MISHNAH), and (2) the development of this *Midrash Agadah* into books (*Midrashim*).

The thinking reader of the Scriptures cannot have failed to observe that by the side of their ceremonial element, be it negative or affirmative, permissive or jussive, there is also often to be met with (and sometimes so as to be inseparable from it) a spiritual element. This spiritual element rests chiefly on feeling or emotion, and produces pious works only indirectly. Now the explanation or application of this element, either by the Scriptures themselves or by the rabbis, is traditionally called *Midrash Haggadah* (recitation, preaching) or *Midrash Agadah*<sup>6</sup> (binding the soul to God and all that is godly).

This *Haggadah* or *Agadah* varies considerably both in nature and form. In its nature it sometimes humours, at other times threatens; it alternately promises and admonishes, persuades and rebukes, encourages and deters. In the end it always consoles, and throughout it instructs and elevates. In form it is legendary, historical, exegetic, didactic, theosophic, epigrammatic; but throughout it is ethical.

And varied as was and is the *Midrash Agadah*, so varied have been its fortunes. Whilst at times it stood very high in the estimation both of the teachers and the congregations in Israel,<sup>7</sup> it sank at other times very low indeed.<sup>8</sup> Nay, at one and the same time, whilst some

<sup>1</sup> Comp. Nehem. viii. 8, where מִדְרָשׁוֹ evidently stands for מִדְרָשׁוֹ. See also Kimhi on 2 Chron. xiii. 22, and Schiller-Szinessy, *Exposition*, &c., Cambridge, 1882, p. 11. <sup>2</sup> 2 Chron. xiii. 22 and xxiv. 27.

<sup>3</sup> See *Nedarim*, iv. 3, and *Aboth*, i. 17.

<sup>4</sup> *Beresith Rabbah*, c. lxiii. (on Gen. xxv. 22): וְהָלָא לָא הִלְכָה אֵילָא לְמִדְרָשׁוֹ שֶׁל יֵשׁוּעַ בְּבֵית בֶּתְחַמְדִּיר. *Midrash* is used in the East to this day for *Beth Hammidrash*. See MS. Oo. 6, 63 (of the University Library, Cambridge), leaf 135a, lower margin (וְהָם קָרְשׁ לְמִדְרָשׁוֹ).

<sup>5</sup> Rashi (e.g., on Gen. iii. 8) and *Tosaphoth*, *passim*.

<sup>6</sup> Those who identify this word as merely the Chaldaic form of the Hebrew *Haggadah* (and they have, certainly, some authority on their side) ought to write it *Agadah* (אַגָּדָה), which, however, is not the traditional spelling of it (אַגָּדָה). Singularly enough, the Latin *religio* is similarly derived by some from *religare* and by others from *religere*.

<sup>7</sup> *Siphre* on Deut. § 49: "If thou wishest to know Him who but spake and the world came into being, learn *Haggadah*; for by so doing thou wilt recognize the Holy One (blessed be He!) and cling to His ways!"

<sup>8</sup> T. Y., *M'asereth*, iii. 4: "And R. Ze'erah was teasing those rabbis of the *Agadah*."

rabbis exalted it to the skies,<sup>9</sup> other rabbis treated it with hatred,<sup>10</sup> or, worse still, with contempt.<sup>11</sup> There have actually been teachers whose treatment of it differed with the difference of the occasion.<sup>12</sup> The fact is the Jews liked or disliked the *Midrash Agadah* according to their political condition on the one hand and their proximity to Jewish professors of Christianity on the other. In the hour of prosperity the Jews preferred the *Halakhah*; in that of adversity they ran to hear the consoling words of the *Agadah*.<sup>14</sup> When near Judæo-Christians, whose religious strength and argument chiefly rested on *Agadah*,<sup>15</sup> the Jews disliked it; when among themselves, or when dwelling among Gentiles (heathen or Christian), they showed their wonted partiality for it.

But, whatever were the likings or dislikings of the Jews for the *Midrashoth*, it is certain that these traditions were early<sup>16</sup> committed to writing, and formed into special volumes, known as "Books of *Agadah*."<sup>17</sup> Such were first some of the *Targumim* and then the *Midrashim*. Against writing down the traditional explanations of the Mosaic ceremonial there existed a distinct law,<sup>18</sup> which was observed down to near the end of the 6th century. At an earlier period isolated disciples only, in order to refresh their memory, wrote down short Halakhic notes, which, however, they kept in secret.<sup>19</sup> The *Targumim* and *Midrashim*, on the other hand, were composed very early and were numerous, while their extensive contents were circulated in public.

The *Midrash*, from whatever point of view it may be regarded, is of the highest value. It is of the highest value, of course, to the Jew as Jew first, inasmuch as he finds there recorded the noblest ideas, sayings, and teachings of his venerable sages of early times. In the next place it has value to the Christian as Christian, since only by these ideas, teachings, reasonings, and descriptions can the beautiful sayings of the Founder of Christianity, the reasonings of the apostles, and the imagery of the sublime but enigmatic Apocalypse be rightly understood. But its importance appeals also to the general scholar, because of the inexhaustible mines of information of all kinds it contains. The philologist will find here numerous hints on lexicography and grammar, chiefly, of course, of the Semitic languages, but also of other tongues, notably Greek and Latin. The historian will gather here a rich harvest on geography, chorography, topography, chronology, numismatics, &c. The philosopher will find here abundant and

<sup>9</sup> *Ibid.*: "Then said to him R. Bo bar [son of] Kohano, Why dost thou tease them? Ask, and they will surely answer thee!"

<sup>10</sup> T. Y., *Shabbath*, xvi. 1: "He who holds it forth becomes burned by it; he who listens to it gets no reward."

<sup>11</sup> *Ibid.*: "I never in my life looked into Agadic books."

<sup>12</sup> *Ibid.*: "Let the hand of him who wrote it be cut off"; and compare with this T. B., *Bobo Bathro*, 123b: "goodly pearl."

<sup>13</sup> Beginning of *Pesiktho Bahodesh Hasshelishi*: "First when the money was at hand one desired to hear the word of the *Mishnah* and the word of the *Talmud*..."

<sup>14</sup> *Ibid.*: "Now, however, when the money is not to be got, and, moreover, when we are sick in consequence of the (treatment by the) government, one pines for the word of the Bible and for the word of the *Agadah*."

<sup>15</sup> T. Y., *Shabbath*, xvi. 1, and T. B., *Shabbath*, 116a: "The *Evangelia* and other Christian writings."

<sup>16</sup> See *Tosephto Shabbath*, xiv.: "I remember that one brought before Rabban Gamliel the elder [St Paul's teacher] the book of Job (in the Chaldaic paraphrase); and T. Y., *Kilayim*, ix. 4: "At that time I ran (my) eyes through the whole Book of the Psalms (in the form) of the *Haggadah* [*Agadah* of the Psalms]." R. Hiyya *Rubbok* belonged to the middle of the 2d Christian century.

<sup>17</sup> מִדְרָשׁוֹ רֵאשִׁית. See T. B., *Berakthoth*, 23a, *Temurah*, 14b, and the *Talmudim*, *passim*.

<sup>18</sup> T. B., *Gittin*, 60b: "In the college of R. Yishmael it was taught, 'These [see Exod. xxxiv. 27] thou oughtest to write down, but thou must not write down *Halakthoth*.'"

<sup>19</sup> T. B., *Shabbath*, 6b: "I found a 'secret roll,' that is, a roll of *Halakthoth* kept secret. Comp. Rashi, *in loco*."

valuable notices on logic, psychology, metaphysics, theology, theosophy, aesthetics, rhetoric, poetry, mathematics, geometry, astronomy, zoology, botany, biology, morphology, chemistry, medicine, physics, &c. The statesman—particularly if he be inclined to follow the Psalmist's advice—"from the ancients I gather understanding" (cxix. 100)—will find here valuable information on ancient ethnography in the full sense of the term—politics, political economy, law, military science, naval affairs, &c. The true scholar will find out by the study of the *Agadah* that many a discovery thought to belong to a recent age was well known to these ancient doctors.

The sources of the *Agadah* are five:—(1) the *Targumim* and especially those on the Prophets and Hagiographa; (2) the non-canonical *Mishnah* (*Mathnitho Boraito*; see *MISHNAH*), which contains many valuable pieces, the age of which is often anterior, in essence if not in form, not only to those contained in the canonical *Mishnah*, but also to the sayings of the New Testament; (3) the canonical (officially recognized) *Mishnah*, which contains several entire treatises of an *Agadic* nature, as *Aboth*,<sup>1</sup> *Middoth*, &c.,<sup>2</sup> and numerous pieces scattered here and there among the *Halakhalah*; (4) both *Talmudim*<sup>3</sup> (the Palestinian and Babylonian), which have thousands of *Agadic* notices interspersed in their *Halakhoth*; and (5) the *Midrashim*, *see* *עֲשָׂרָה*. It is of the last alone, as represented by their principal collections, that we give an historical enumeration, here:—

- (1) *Megillath Ta'anith* is an historical *Midrash* consisting of twelve *Perakim*, and is called so on the principle of *lucus a non lucendo*, seeing that in it are enumerated the days of the year on which a Jew must not fast. The Aramaic part of it alone constitutes the real *Megillah*, and belongs to the beginning of the 2d Christian century.<sup>4</sup> The *editio princeps* came out at Mantua, 1513, 4to; but cheap editions have been printed at Warsaw and elsewhere.
- (2) *Sepher Yesirah* is a philosophico-cabbalistic *Midrash* divided into six *Perakim*, which, in their turn, are subdivided into *Mishniyyoth*. It is variously ascribed to the patriarch Abraham and to R. Akibah, the illustrious teacher, who suffered martyrdom under Hadrian. To this rabbi the book, no doubt, belongs both in substance and form.<sup>5</sup> It has gone through numerous editions, the *ed. princ.* being of 1562 (Mantua, 4to), and has been translated into Latin, German, and English (New York, 1877).
- (3) *Othiyyoth de-Rabbi Akibah* is a quasi-cabbalistic *Midrash* on the alphabet, belonging, in essence if not in form, to the aforesaid teacher and martyr. *Ed. princ.*, Constantinople, 1520, 4to.
- (4) *Massekheh Hekhaloth* is an astronomico-cabbalistic *Midrash* in seven *Perakim*. It is ascribed to R. Yishma'el the high priest.

<sup>1</sup> A valuable edition of this treatise (in Hebrew and English) has been published by Dr C. Taylor, Cambridge, 1878.  
<sup>2</sup> To these we may add, for the sake of convenience, although they do not, strictly speaking, belong to the canonical *Mishnah*, the *Perek Rabbi Meir* and the *Agadic* parts of the *Massekheh Ketannah*.  
<sup>3</sup> Two collections of Talmudic *Agadot* were made early in the 16th century:—(1) *Haggadot Hattalmud*, Constantinople, 1511, folio, of which apparently only five copies are in existence, the finest of these being preserved in the University Library of Cambridge; and (2) *En Ya'akov* (or *En Yisrael*), of which numerous and cheap editions exist, the *ed. princ.* being that of Salonika, 1516-22.  
<sup>4</sup> Almost all that the latest critics have said concerning the age of the various *Targumim* and *Midrashim* will have to be unsaid. Not only are negative statements difficult of proof; in this case they are absolutely incorrect. We shall only give two examples. The statement "Vayyitra Rabbah cannot be early, as Rashi did not know of it, since he nowhere mentions it," is doubly incorrect: Rashi does quote it (e.g., on Haggai i. 1). Again the statement "We must not omit to observe that no early Jewish commentator—Rashi, Ibn Ezra, &c.—mentions the Targum either to Proverbs or to Job and Psalms; Nathan ben Jehiel (12th century) is the first who quotes it," contains a *reductio ad absurdum* in itself. For Nathan b. Jehiel was, as is well known, a somewhat older contemporary of Rashi (ob. 1105), and lived full a hundred years before Ibn Ezra!  
<sup>5</sup> See T. B., *Synhedrin*, 65b and 67b. In the former place it distinctly speaks of the *Sepher Yesirah* (הַסֵּפֶר יְסִירָה), and, although in the latter place it speaks of the *Hilekhaloth Yesirah* (הִלְכָּלוֹת יְסִירָה), there cannot be a doubt that *Sepher* (סֵפֶר) and *Hilekhaloth* (הִלְכָּלוֹת) are there identical. Moreover, *Mishniyyoth* and *Halakhoth* are, in a certain sense, convertible terms (see *MISHNAH*); and our book (as remarked above) consists of *Mishniyyoth*.

Judging from internal evidence on the one hand, and from what is known of R. Yishma'el in the *Talmudim* and *Midrashim* (*Babli Berakhoth*, 7a and elsewhere) on the other hand, there seems to be no valid reason for doubting that he is the author of this small but sublime book. This *Midrash* is printed in the collection *Areze Lebanon* (Venice, 1601, 4to) under the title of "*Pirke Hekhaloth*" and "*Massekheh Hekhaloth*," and a MS. of it is preserved in the University Library of Cambridge (Dd. 10. 11. 7. 2). The work, however, called "The Greater and the Lesser *Hekhaloth*," in thirty *Perakim*, printed in this century, somewhere in Poland, contains, besides the ancient literature, a good deal of matter which is of much later date.

(5) *Sefer 'Olam* (the Greater and the Lesser) are two historical *Midrashim*, the former of which belongs to the 2d century, whilst the latter (which is a mere extract of the former) belongs to a late age indeed (the Gaonic). They have been repeatedly printed, always together, the *ed. princ.* being Mantua, 1513, 4to.  
 (6) *Haggadah shel Pesah* is a liturgical *Midrash* of the middle of the 2d century, as far as its main portions go. It exists now in three principal and several minor recensions in accordance with the various rituals (see *MAZZOT*), and is recited at the domestic service of the first two Passover evenings. The editions are too numerous to be mentioned, the *ed. princ.* being Constantinople, 1505, folio.  
 (7) *Megillath Antiokhos* treats ostensibly, as its name indicates, of the sufferings of the Jews under Antiochus Epiphanes, and their deliverance from his tyranny, but in reality of their sufferings under Hadrian and their deliverance under Antoninus Pius. The Aramaic text, with the exception of a few interpolations, belongs to the middle of the 2d century. This little "roll" was for the first time published by Filipowsky (London, 1851, 32mo). A MS. copy of the Hebrew is preserved in the University Library of Cambridge (Dd. 8. 34).

(8) *Zohar* (*Midrash Hazohar*, *Midrasho shel Rabbi Shim'on b. Yohai*, *Midrash Yehi Or*, &c.) is a cabbalistic *Midrash* on the Pentateuch, Canticles, Ruth, and part of Lamentations. It is variously ascribed to the famous R. Shim'on (disciple of R. Akibah, &c.) and to R. Mosheh b. Shemto b. Leon (a second-rate cabbalist of the time of Nahmanides and Ibn Adereth). The *Zohar* belongs, strictly speaking, to neither of these, whilst, in a certain sense, it belongs to both. The fact is—the nucleus of the book is of Mishnic times, and R. Shim'on b. Yohai was the author of the *Zohar* in the same sense that R. Yohanan was the author of the Palestinian Talmud, i.e., he gave the first impulse to the composition of the book. But R. Mosheh of Leon, on the other hand, was the first not only to copy and disseminate it in Europe, but also to disfigure it by sundry explanatory interpolations. For more details see Lumby, "Introduction to the Epistle of Jude," in the *Speaker's Commentary*, vol. iv, p. 388. The first two editions of the *Zohar* on the Pentateuch came out simultaneously (Mantua, 1558-60, 4to, and Cremona, 1558, folio), and the *ed. princ.* on Canticles, Ruth, and part of Lamentations came out at Salonika (1597, 4to). The best, though by no means critical, edition on the Pentateuch is that of Brody, 1873, 8vo. Of translations, such as they are, there exist those of Knorr v. Rosenroth, *Kabbala denudata* (vol. i., Sulzbach, 1877, and vol. ii., Frankfurt, 1884, 4to), and Tholuck, *Wichtige Stellen*, &c. (Berlin, 1824, 8vo), &c.<sup>6</sup>

(9) *Pesikotho*<sup>7</sup> (commonly, but by mistake, called *Pesikta*) *derab Kohano* is a homiletic *Midrash* consisting of thirty-two *Pesikoth* for the principal festivals and fasts, and the historically noted sabbaths and other days. It is of the end of the 3d or the beginning of the 4th century. Having been but rarely quoted since the 12th century, so that most scholars knew of it only

<sup>6</sup> R. Mosheh of Leon is a fair sample of the mediocrity of his time in cabbalistic lore, and combined, as is usual, with his mediocrity an illimitable vanity; see MS. Dd. 11. 22 (Cambridge University Library), leaf 2a: "And I adjure every one who should deeply study this book, or who should copy it, or read it, that he do not blot out my name from my property (inheritance), for I have composed it. . . ." This statement alone would suffice to prove that R. Mosheh of Leon could never have ascribed a book composed by himself to anybody else.  
<sup>7</sup> The *Zohar*, cleared of the main works by which it is surrounded, and of the interpolations by which it has been disfigured both by its first European copyist and by others down even to our own days, was begun in Palestine late in the 2d or early in the 3d century, and finished, at the latest, in the 6th or 7th century. It is impossible that it should have been composed after that time and before the Renaissance, as both language and contents clearly show.  
<sup>8</sup> Whilst the principal editions of the many textual extracts made from the *Zohar* (as the *Iddereth*, &c.) need not be specified here, those of the following supplementary and kindred works ought to be mentioned:—(1) *Tikkune Hazohar* (*ed. princ.* Mantua, 1557, 4to), and (2) *Zohar Hadash* (*ed. princ.* Cracow, 1603). Nor should the *Kotres mssespher Hazohar*, *Hiburo Tinoyo* (by the otherwise very learned Yitshak b. Mosheh of Satanow) be passed over. It is a mere imitation of the *Zohar*,—an imposition of a kind which is a disgrace to literature.  
<sup>9</sup> For the three *Midrashim*—*Mekhilto*, *Siphro*, and *Siphre*—see under *MISHNAH*.

indirectly, it was long considered lost, till, in 1868, Salomona Buber of Lemberg, a man of learning, wealth, and love for the ancient literature of his nation, edited it from four MSS., one of which (formerly in possession of Carmoly) is now preserved in the University Library of Cambridge (Add. 1497). The printed edition appeared at Lyck, 8vo.

- (10) *Pesikto Rabbathi*, consisting in the latest edition of eighty-four *Pesikoth*, is a *Midrash* of the same nature, and, in its main part, almost of the same date, as (9). Both drew from the same sources. This *Midrash* has been edited five times,—the latest, best, and cheapest edition being that of Friedmann (Vienna, 1880, 8vo).
- (11) *Tanna debe Eliyyahu* consists of two parts, the Greater (*Rabbo*) and the Lesser (*Zutto*).—The former in thirty-one and the latter in twenty-five *Perakim*. It is an exegetical *Midrash*, the name of which is already known to the *Bereshith Rabbah* (c. liv.) and the Babylonian Talmud (*Kethuboth*, 106a). It is only uncritical criticism that can declare it a Gaonic work, although, like all other old books of the Jews, it is not without later additions. *Ed. princ.*, Venice, 1598, 4to. There are modern and cheap Polish editions.
- (12) *Midrash Rabbah* (רַבָּה) or *Rabbath* (רַבּוֹת) is chiefly an exegetical and homiletical *Midrash* on the Pentateuch and the "Five Rolls" (*Hamesh Megilloth*, i.e., Canticles, Ruth, Lamentations, Ecclesiastes, and Esther). It is called *Rabbah* either from the third (the first distinctive) word of its beginning (רַבִּי הוֹשִׁיעַ . . . רַבָּה) or from its being the most voluminous *Midrash*; hence also *Rabbo* (רַבָּה). The *Midrash* on Canticles (and Ecclesiastes) is now and then also called *Midrash Hazitha* (from the first distinctive word of the beginning לוֹוִיתִי). These ten *Midrashim*—7, certainly, of various styles and ages; yet none of them is, inter- polation excepted, later than the beginning of the 5th century.<sup>8</sup> It is remarkable that, although the *Megilloth* themselves had been early attached to the Pentateuch (since they were long before the 10th century, and still are, read through the synagogal year, even as was and still is the Pentateuch itself), the *Rabbath* had no common *editio princeps*<sup>9</sup>—that on the Pentateuch appearing for the first time

<sup>1</sup> The *Rabbah* on Genesis has 100 *Parshiyoth*, that on Exodus 52, that on Leviticus 37, that on Numbers 23, and that on Deuteronomy 11. These five *Midrashim* are quoted according to their chapters. The *Rabbah* on Canticles accommodates itself to the sacred text, and is quoted accordingly. Ruth has 8 *Parshiyoth*, and is quoted according to these. Lamentations has 1 chapter consisting of 33 introductions (*Pethiatho Dehakkime*), accommodating itself, for the rest, to the sacred text. Ecclesiastes has 3 *Sedarim*, and Esther has 6 *Parshiyoth*. At various times various modes of quoting these *Midrashim* are current,—the most common and most expedient, however, being that of quoting them according to the verses of the Bible.  
<sup>2</sup> Here might with advantage be mentioned some pieces of literature which are kindred in nature, although some of them are of much earlier date, whilst others are much later, than the ten *Midrashim* just mentioned:—(1) *Agadath Bereshith* on Genesis, in eighty-three chapters,—edited for the first time by R. Menahem de Lonsano in his *Shete Yadoth*, Venice, 1618, 4to; (2) *Midrash Vayyisa'u* on Genesis xxxv. 5, in one chapter,—to be found in Jellinek's *Bet ha-Midrash*, Leipsic, 1855, 8vo; (3) amplifications of chapter lxx. of our *Midrash Rabbah*, on Genesis xxviii. 22, by the incorporation of the whole Apocryphon *Tobit* in Aramaic, &c. (see *The Book of Tobit*, &c., Oxford, 1878, 8vo); (4) *Midrash Vayyosha'* on Exodus xiv. 30, xv. 1-18,—printed at Constantinople, 1519, 4to; a MS. of this *Midrash* is preserved in the University Library, Cambridge (Add. 854); (5) *Midrash Asereth Haddibberoth* on Exodus xx.,—printed in Jellinek's *Bet ha-Midrash*, Leipsic, 1853, 8vo; (6) *Midrash Petirath Aaron* on Numbers xx. 23-29; (7) *Midrash Petirath Mosheh* on Deuteronomy on Numbers xx. 23-29; (8) *Midrash Abbo Gvuron* on Esther; the last three are to be found in the before-mentioned *Bet ha-Midrash*; (9) *Midrash Shemuel*, also called, from its beginning, *Eth la'asoth Ladonai*, Constantinople, 1517, folio; (10) *Midrash Yonah*, Prague, 1595, 4to; (11) *Midrash Tullim* (*Tevullim*), 1512; (12) *Midrash Mishle*, 1517; the last two are printed at Constantinople, and in folio; (13) *Sepher Hayyashar* are printed at Constantinople, and in folio; although it is, (in which a good many old traditions are preserved, of the Bible), of course, not the one mentioned in various books of the Bible), Venice, 1625, 4to; (14) *Dibere Hayyanim shel Mosheh*, Constantinople, 1616, 4to; a fragment of this is to be found in MS. Add. 532. 4 in the University Library of Cambridge; (15) *Yosephon* (or *Josippon*), various works of Flavius Josephus worked up rather freely, Mantua, 1480, folio,—translated into Latin (German and Spanish) several times; (16) *Zerubbabel*, Constantinople, 1519, 8vo; (17) *Elleh Ekerah* on the "Ten Martyrs." For several other smaller *Midrashim* see Jellinek's *Bet ha-Midrash*, i. and ii., 1853, iii., 1855, iv., 1857, all at Leipsic; v., 1878, and vi., 1877, both at Vienna; and comp. also Horowitz, *Sammlung Kleiner Midrashim*, i., ii., Frankfurt, 1881-82. The *Midrashim* on Isaiah and on Job seem now irretrievably lost.  
<sup>8</sup> As if to compensate for this drawback, the well-known Cornelio Adelkind brought out at Venice, in 1545, two editions of the *Rabbath* on the Pentateuch and *Megilloth*, the one at Bomberg's house and the

in 1512 (Constantinople, folio), and that on the *Megilloth* in 1519 (somewhere in Italy, בְּכַוֵּינָה אִיטָלְיָה, also in folio).<sup>4</sup> The latest and best edition is that of Vilna, 1880, folio. A translation in German is now coming out at Leipsic, by Dr A. Wünsche.

(13) *Pirke de-Rabbi Eli'ezer* (also called *Boraito de-Rabbi Eli'ezer*) is an astronomico-theosophical *Midrash* consisting of fifty-four *Perakim*. It goes through the so-called "eighteen benedictions," the signs of the zodiac, &c., but is unfinished. It belongs, no doubt, to the 5th century. The fact that the name "Fatima" occurs in it is no proof whatever that the book is post-Mohammedan, as that name must have been already known to the idolatrous Arabs. *Ed. princ.*, Constantinople, 1514, and with a Latin translation, Leyden, 1644, both editions being in 4to. There are also now to be found cheap editions (Lemberg, Warsaw).

(14) *Tanpuma* is an exegetical and homiletical *Midrash* on the whole Pentateuch. It is quoted according to the *Parshiyoth* of the week. Although originally of the end of the 5th or the beginning of the 6th century, it has now two principal additions, which form part of the book:—(1) several of the *Sheetloth* of R. Aha! Gaon (of the 8th century), and (2) several pieces of the *Yesod* of R. Mosheh Haddarshan, of Narbonne (of the 11th century). On its relation to the "*Yelammedenu*" (often quoted in the 11th century, but supposed to be lost) light will soon be thrown by the before-mentioned Salomona Buber, who is now preparing a critical edition of it. The *ed. princ.* of the *Tanpuma* is Constantinople, 1522, folio; and a very valuable MS. copy of it is in the Cambridge University Library (Add. 1212).

(15) *Bahir* is a small cabbalistic *Midrash* ascribed to the pre-Mishnic teacher, R. Nehunyah b. Hakkana,—no doubt from its beginning with the words . . . רַבִּי נְהוּנְיָה בֶּן חֲקֵנָה. Nahmanides (ob. c. 1268) quotes this book often in his commentary on the Pentateuch, under the names of *Sepher Habbahir*, or of *Midrasho shel Rabbi Nehunyah b. Hakkana*. Some have pronounced this work a late fabrication, but others, who have thoroughly studied it, justly describe it as "old in substance if not in form." *Ed. princ.*, Amsterdam, 1651, 4to. A cheap edition appeared at Lemberg (1865, 8vo), and a MS. of this work is preserved in the University Library of Cambridge (Dd. 10. 11. 4).

(16) *Yalkut* is the only existing systematic if not exhaustive collection of the *Agadot* on the whole Bible. Its author drew not only from most of the *Midrashim* named in this article, but also from the *Boraitoth* (see *MISHNAH*), both *Talmudim*, and the *Midrashic* works now lost (as the *Abkhir*, *Hashekhem*, or *Hashkem*, &c.).<sup>5</sup> This fact constitutes one of the principal points of its value. The author was R. Shim'on, brother (and not son) of R. Helbo, and father of the distinguished grammarian, critic, and divine R. Yoseph Kara. He lived somewhere in the north of France in the 11th century. The *ed. princ.* of the *Yalkut* on Ezra, Nehemiah, and the books of Chronicles came out at Venice, 1511, folio (in the first Rabbinic Bible); that on the Prophets and Hagiographa in 1521, and that on the Pentateuch in 1526-27, both at Salonika, and in folio. An English translation of the whole work has been undertaken by a band of Rabbinic scholars in Cambridge. The first instalment, "The Yalkut on Zechariah," by E. G. King, B.D., Hebrew lecturer of Sidney Sussex College, appeared in 1882. This specimen, besides giving a correct translation, contains many valuable notes.

(17) *Lekah Tob* is a *Midrash* on the Pentateuch and the five *Megilloth*, by R. Tobiyahu b. Eli'ezer of Greece, who lived during the crusade of 1096. This work draws, certainly, upon the old and well-known *Midrashim*, and as such it would have thoroughly deserved the censure passed upon it by the witty but somewhat irreverent Abraham Ibn Ezra (in his preface to his commentary on the Pentateuch). But the *Lekah Tob* has also most valuable explanations both by the collector himself and by his father (R. Eli'ezer), a fact passed over by Ibn Ezra in silence. The *Lekah Tob* on Leviticus, Numbers, and Deuteronomy came out for the first time at Venice, in 1546, folio, under the title of *Pesikto Zuttario* (see leaf 93b in the postscript by the editor, הַפְסִיקְתָּה וְזוּטָרְתָּה, which explains the somewhat vague title on the title-page וְזוּטָרְתָּה וְזוּטָרְתָּה אֵי רַבְרָה). In 1753-54 it was republished at Venice, with a Latin translation, by Blasius Ugolinius in his *Thesaurus Antiquitatum Sacrarum* (xv.-xvi.) under the name of *Pesiktha*. The *Lekah Tob* on Genesis and Exodus was

other at Giustiniani's. These two editions differ in nothing but in the title-pages, &c., and the vignettes of the various books. The former edition is in possession of Dr W. Aldis Wright, and the latter in that of Dr C. Taylor. The fact of these editions having appeared simultaneously is, apparently, unknown to the bibliographers.  
<sup>5</sup> It is noteworthy that in this edition *Ashaverosh*, i.e., Esther, stands between Lamentations and Ecclesiastes, with which latter the *Midrash* on the *Megilloth* ends.  
<sup>6</sup> We may mention here the *ed. princ.* of three cabbalistic *Midrashic* collections which go under the name of *Yalkut*:—(1) *Yalkut Hadash*, Lublin, 1613, 4to; (2) *Yalkut Rubeni Hakbatan*, Prague, 1660, 4to; and (3) *Yalkut Rubeni Haggadol*, Wilhermsdorf, 1681, folio.

published, with a critical commentary, at Vilna, by Salomon Buber (1880, 8vo), where also simultaneously a third edition of this Midrash on the last three books of Moses, with a short commentary on it, came out by Aharon Mosheh Padova, of Carlin. The *Leḥafṭa Tob* on the five Megilloth is as yet unpublished; there exist, however, several good MSS. of it, both in public and private libraries, the finest copy in every respect being that preserved in the University Library, Cambridge (Add. 378. 1).

(18) *Menorath Hammar* is a scientific, though incomplete, collection of the principal *Agadoth* of the *Talmudim* and *Midrashim*, by R. Yizhak Abohab the elder (flourished 13th century). The editions, with and without translations, are very numerous, — the *ed. princ.* being Constantinople, 1514, folio. There are translations in Spanish, Judæo-German, and German, but not in English.

We append two specimens of *Midrashim*, — the first from *Pesikotho*, leaf 127b, and the second from *Midrash Shemoth Rabbah*, cap. ii.

FIRST SPECIMEN.—The Holy One (blessed be He!) said to the Prophets, Go ye and comfort ye Jerusalem!

Then went HOSEA to comfort her and said, The Holy One (blessed be He!) sent me to thee to comfort thee. She said, What hast thou in thine hand to comfort me? The Prophet said (iv. 6 [5]), "I will be as the dew unto Israel!" But Jerusalem said to him, Only yesterday thou toldest me (ix. 16), "Ephraim is smitten, their root is dried up, they shall bear no fruit; yea, though they bring forth, yet will I slay even the beloved fruit of their womb!" and now thou speakest to me thus. Which shall we believe, the first or the second prophecy?

Then went JOSHUA to comfort her and said, The Holy One (blessed be He!) sent me to thee to comfort thee. She said to him, What hast thou in thine hand to comfort me? The Prophet said (iv. 18), "And it shall come to pass in that day that the mountains shall drop down new wine, and the hills shall flow with milk, &c." But Jerusalem said to him, Only yesterday thou toldest me (i. 5), "Awake, ye drunkards, and weep; and howl, all ye drinkers of wine, because of the new wine; for it is cut off from your mouth!" and now thou speakest to me thus. Which shall we believe, the first or the second prophecy?

Then went AMOS to comfort her and said, The Holy One (blessed be He!) sent me to thee to comfort thee. She said to him, What hast thou in thine hand to comfort me? The Prophet said (ix. 11), "In that day will I raise up the tabernacle of David that is fallen!" But Jerusalem said to him, Only yesterday thou toldest me (v. 2), "The Virgin of Israel is fallen; she shall no more rise!" and now thou speakest to me thus. Which shall we believe, the first or the second prophecy?

Then went MICAH to comfort her and said, The Holy One (blessed be He!) sent me to thee to comfort thee. She said to him, What hast thou in thine hand to comfort me? The Prophet said (vii. 18), "Who is a God like unto Thee, that pardonest iniquity by the transgression of the remnant of His heritage?" But Jerusalem said to him, Only yesterday thou toldest me (i. 5), "For the transgression of Jacob is all this, and for the sins of the house of Israel, &c." and now thou speakest to me thus. Which shall we believe, the first or the second prophecy?

Then went SAHUM to comfort her and said, The Holy One (blessed be He!) sent me to thee to comfort thee. She said to him, What hast thou in thine hand to comfort me? The Prophet said (l. i. [l. 15]), "For the wicked shall no more pass through thee!" But Jerusalem said to him, Only yesterday thou toldest me (i. 11), "There is one come out of thee that imagineth evil against the Lord, a wicked counsellor!" and now thou speakest to me thus. Which shall we believe, the first or the second prophecy?

Then went HABAKKUK to comfort her and said, The Holy One (blessed be He!) sent me to thee to comfort thee. She said to him, What hast thou in thine hand to comfort me? The Prophet said (iii. 13), "Thou wentest forth for the salvation of Thy people, even for the salvation with Thine Anointed One!" But Jerusalem said to him, Only yesterday thou toldest me (l. 2), "O Lord, how long shall I cry and Thou wilt not hear, even cry out unto Thee of violence and Thou wilt not save!" and now thou speakest to me thus. Which shall we believe, the first or the second prophecy?

Then went ZEPHANIAH to comfort her and said, The Holy One (blessed be He!) sent me to thee to comfort thee. She said to him, What hast thou in thine hand to comfort me? The Prophet said (l. 12), "And it shall come to pass at that time that I shall search Jerusalem with lights!" But Jerusalem said to him, Only yesterday thou toldest me (l. 15), "A day of darkness and gloominess!" and now thou speakest to me thus. Which shall we believe, the first or the second prophecy?

Then went HAGGAI to comfort her and said, The Holy One (blessed be He!) sent me to thee to comfort thee. She said to him, What hast thou in thine hand to comfort me? The Prophet said (ii. 19), "Is the seed yet in the barn? Yea, as yet the vine and the fig tree and the pomegranate and the olive tree hath not brought forth from this day will I bless you!" But Jerusalem said to him, Only yesterday thou toldest me (i. 6), "Ye have sown much and bring in little, &c." and now thou speakest to me thus. Which shall we believe, the first or the second prophecy?

Then went ZACHARIAH to comfort her and said, The Holy One (blessed be He!) sent me to thee to comfort thee. She said to him, What hast thou in thine hand to comfort me? The Prophet said (ii. 13), "And I am very sore displeased with the heathen that are at ease, for I was but a little displeased and they helped forward the affliction!" But Jerusalem said to him, Only yesterday thou toldest me (i. 2), "The Lord hath been sore displeased with your fathers!" and now thou speakest to me thus. Which shall we believe, the first or the second prophecy?

Then went MALACHI to comfort her and said, The Holy One (blessed be He!) sent me to thee to comfort thee. She said to him, What hast thou in thine hand to comfort me? The Prophet said (ii. 12), "And all nations shall call you blessed, for ye shall be a delightful land!" But Jerusalem said to him, Only yesterday thou toldest me (l. 10), "I have no delight in you!" and now thou speakest to me thus. Which shall we believe, the first or the last prophecy?

Then went all the Prophets to the Holy One (blessed be He!) saying to Him, Lord of the Universe, Jerusalem will not accept consolation at our hands. Then the Holy One (blessed be He!) said to them, "I and you will together go to comfort her, and this is why it says (Isaiah xl. 1), Comfort ye, comfort ye, ye people, comfort her who is desolate, comfort her, ye celestial ones! comfort her, ye terrestrial ones! comfort her, ye living ones! comfort her, ye dead ones! Comfort her in this world; comfort her in the world to come!"

1 Comp. *Pesikto Rabbathi*, ed. Friedmann, leaf 132b.  
2 See *Pesikto Rabbathi* (ed. Friedmann, leaf 138b), where it says (before the paragraph on *Nahum*), "Obayah prophesied for Edom, and Yonah for Nineveh." This, it is true, is a mere gloss; but it is the true reason why these two prophets are left out.

3 There is a play here upon the meaning of the Hebrew *Ami*, which may be read either *Ammi* ("my people") or *Immi* ("with me").

SECOND SPECIMEN.—And whom does He try? The righteous one; for it says (Ps. xl. 5), "The Lord trieth the righteous." And by what does He try him? By the feeding of sheep. David He tried by sheep and found him a good shepherd, for it says (Ps. lxxviii. 70), "And He took him from the 'restorants' of sheep." What is the meaning of *'Mimmikkiloth*? The root is the same as that of *'ayyik-kate* (*thaggeshem*) (Gen. viii. 2), "And the rain was restrained." David restrained the big sheep in favour of the small ones. He brought out first the young ones, so that they should feed on the tender herbs; then he brought out the old ones so that they should feed on the less tender herbs; and, finally, he brought out the strong sheep that they should feed on the coarser herbs. Upon this the Holy One (blessed be He!) said, He who understandeth to feed sheep according to their strength, let him come and feed My people! And this it is that is written (Ps. lxxviii. 71), "From following the ewes great with young He brought him to feed Jacob His people!" And the same was the case as regards Moses, whom the Holy One (blessed be He!) tried by sheep. Our rabbis say, When Moses our teacher (peace be upon him) was feeding the sheep of Jethro in the wilderness, a kid ran away from him, and Moses ran after it till they came to a mountain-hollow. When it had reached the mountain-hollow there was a pool of water, and the kid stood still in order to drink. When Moses reached the kid he said to it, I did not know that thou didst run away from me because thou wast thirsty and faint. Thereupon he put it on his shoulders and walked back with it to the flock. Then said the Holy One (blessed be He!), Thou art compassionate in the feeding of sheep belonging to mere flesh and blood (man); as thou livest, thou shalt feed My flock, even Israel! Behold, this it is that is written (Exod. iii. 1), "And Moses was feeding the flock, &c." (S. M. S. S.)

MIEDZYRZECZ PODLASKI (Russian, *Mejiryeczic*), a district town of Russian Poland, in the government of Siedlec, 16 miles to the east of the government capital, on the railway between Warsaw and Brest-Litovskiy. It is first mentioned in the year 1390 as a feudal dominion of King Yaghello. After frequently changing hands it became the property of the Czartoryski, and afterwards of the Potocki family, whose palace is still to be seen in the town. Its 10,000 inhabitants—half of whom are Greek nonconformists, and half Jews and Poles—carry on some trade in bristles, and pursue minor industries.

MIERIS, the name of a family of artists who practised painting at Leyden for three generations in the 17th and 18th centuries.

I. FRANS VAN MIERIS, the elder, son of Jan van Mieris, a goldsmith and diamond setter, was born, according to Houbraken, at Leyden on the 16th of April 1635, and died there on the 12th of March 1681. His father wished to train him to his own business, but Frans preferred drawing to chasing, and took service with Abraham Torenvliet, a glazier who kept a school of design. As often happens, the youth's style was influenced by his earliest surroundings. In his father's shop he became familiar with the ways and dress of people of distinction. His eye was fascinated in turn by the sheen of jewellery and stained glass; and, though he soon gave up the teaching of Torenvliet for that of Gerard Dow and Abraham van den Tempel, he acquired a manner which had more of the finish of the exquisites of the Dutch school than of the breadth of the disciples of Rembrandt. It should be borne in mind that he seldom chose panels of which the size exceeded 12 to 15 inches, and whenever his name is attached to a picture above that size we may surely assign it to his son Willem or to some other imitator.

Unlike Gerard Dow when he first left Rembrandt, or Jan Steen when he started on an independent career, he never ventured to design figures as large as life. Characteristic of his art in its minute proportions is a shiny brightness and metallic polish. The subjects which he treated best are those in which he illustrated the habits or actions of the wealthier classes; but he sometimes succeeded in homely incidents and in portrait, and not infrequently he ventured on allegory. He repeatedly painted the satin skirt which Terburg brought into fashion, and he often rivalled Terburg in the faithful rendering of rich and highly-coloured woven tissues. But he remained below Terburg and Metz, because he had not their delicate perception of harmony or their charming mellowness of touch and tint, and he fell behind Gerard Dow, because he was hard and had not his feeling for effect by concentrated light and shade. In the form of his composition, which sometimes represents the framework of a window enlivened with

4 Who, on reading this, does not think of such passages in the New Testament as Matt. xviii. 12, xxv. 21, and John x. 14?

greenery, and adorned with bas-reliefs within which figures are seen to the waist, his model is certainly Gerard Dow. It has been said that he possessed some of the humour of Jan Steen, who was his friend, but the only approach to humour in any of his works is the quaint attitude and look of a tinker in a picture at Dresden, who glances knowingly at a worn copper kettle which a maid asks him to mend.

It is a question whether Houbraken has truly recorded this master's birthday. One of his best-known pieces, a party of ladies and gentlemen at an oyster luncheon in the hermitage at St Petersburg, bears the date of 1650. Celebrated alike for composition and finish, it would prove that Mieris had reached his prime at the age of fifteen. Another beautiful example, the Doctor Feeling a Lady's Pulse in the gallery of Vienna, is dated 1656; and Waagen, in one of his critical essays, justly observes that it is a remarkable production for a youth of twenty-one. In 1657 Mieris was married at Leyden in the presence of Jan Potheuck, a painter, and this is the earliest written record of his existence on which we can implicitly rely. Of the numerous panels known to the writer of these lines, twenty-nine at least are dated,—the latest being an allegory, long in the Rahl collection at Cologne, illustrating the kindred vices of drinking, smoking, and dicing, in the year 1680.

Mieris had numerous and distinguished patrons. He received valuable commissions from Archduke Leopold, the elector-palatine, and Cosmo III., grand-duke of Tuscany. His practice was large and lucrative, but never engendered in him either carelessness or neglect. If there be a difference between the painter's earlier and later work, it is that the former was clearer and more delicate in flesh, whilst the latter was often darker and more livid in the shadows. When he died his clients naturally went over to his son Willem, who in turn bequeathed his painting-room to his son Frans. But neither Willem nor Frans the younger equalled Frans the elder.

II. WILLEM VAN MIERIS (1662-1747), son of Frans. His works are extremely numerous, being partly imitations of the paternal subjects, or mythological episodes, which Frans habitually avoided. In no case did he come near the excellence of his sire.

III. FRANS VAN MIERIS the younger (1689-1763) also lived on the traditions of his grandfather's painting-room.

The pictures of all the generations of the Mieris family were successfully imitated by A. D. Snaphaan, who lived at Leipzig and was patronized by the court of Anhalt-Dessau. To those who would study his deceptive form of art a visit to the collection of Worlitz near Dessau may afford instruction.

MIGNARD, PIERRE (1610-1695), called—to distinguish him from his brother Nicholas—Le Romain, was the chief French portrait-painter of the 17th century. He was born at Troyes in 1610, and came of a family of painters. In 1630 he left the studio of Simon Vouet for Italy, where he spent twenty-two years, and made a reputation which brought him a summons to Paris. Successful with his portrait of the king, and in favour with the court, Mignard pitted himself against Le Brun, declined to enter the Academy of which he was the head, and made himself the centre of opposition to its authority. The history of this struggle is most important, because it was identical, as long as it lasted, with that between the old guilds of France and the new body which Colbert, for political reasons, was determined to support. Shut out, in spite of the deserved success of his decorations of the cupola of Val de Grace (1664), from any great share in those public works the control of which was the attribute of the new Academy, Mignard was chiefly active in portraiture. Turenne, Bossuet, Maintenon (Louvre), La Vallière, Sévigné, Montespan, Descartes (Castle Howard), all the beauties

and celebrities of his day, sat to him. His readiness and skill, his happy instinct for grace of arrangement, atoned for want of originality and real power. With the death of Le Brun (1690) the situation changed; Mignard deserted his allies, and succeeded to all the posts held by his opponent. These late honours he did not long enjoy; in 1695 he died whilst about to commence work on the cupola of the Invalides. His best compositions have been engraved by Audran, Edelinck, Masson, Poilly, and others.

MIGNONNETTE, or MIGNONNETTE (i.e., "little darling"), the name given to a popular garden flower, the *Reseda odorata* of botanists, a "fragrant weed," as Cowper calls it, highly esteemed for its delicate but delicious perfume. The mignonette is generally regarded as being of annual duration, and is a plant of diffuse decumbent twiggly habit, scarcely reaching a foot in height, clothed with bluntnish lanceolate entire or three-lobed leaves, and bearing longish spikes—technically racemes—of rather insignificant flowers at the ends of the numerous branches and branchlets. The plant thus naturally assumes the form of a low dense mass of soft green foliage studded over freely with the racemes of flowers, the latter unobtrusive and likely to be overlooked until their diffused fragrance compels attention. The native country of the original or typical mignonette has sometimes been considered doubtful, but according to the best and latest authorities it has been gathered wild on the North African coast near Algiers, in Egypt, and in Syria. As to its introduction, a MS. note in the library of Sir Joseph Banks records that it was sent to England from Paris in 1742; and ten years later it appears to have been sent from Leyden to Philip Miller at Chelsea. Though originally a slender and rather straggling plant, there are now some improved garden varieties in which the growth is more compact and vigorous, and the inflorescence bolder, though the odour is perhaps less penetrating. The small six-petalled flowers are somewhat curious in structure: the two upper petals are larger, concave, and furnished at the back with a tuft of club-shaped filaments, which gives them the appearance of being deeply incised, while the two lowest petals are much smaller and undivided; the most conspicuous part consists of the anthers, which are numerous and of a brownish red, giving the tone of colour to the inflorescence. In a new variety named Golden Queen the anthers have a decided tint of orange-yellow, which imparts a brighter golden hue to the plants when in blossom. A handsome profliferous or double-flowered variety has also been obtained, which is likely to be a very useful decorative plant, though only to be propagated by cuttings; the double white flowers grow in large massive panicles (profliferous racemes), and are equally fragrant with those of the ordinary forms.

What is called tree mignonette in gardens is due to the skill of the cultivator. Though practically a British annual, as already noted, since it flowers abundantly the first season, and is utterly destroyed by the autumnal frosts, and though recorded as being annual in its native habitat by Desfontaines in the *Flora Atlantica*, the mignonette, like many other plants treated in England as annuals, will continue to grow on if kept in a suitable temperature. Moreover, the life of certain plants of this semiannual character may be prolonged into a second season if their flowering and seeding are persistently prevented. In applying these facts to the production of tree mignonette, the gardener grows on the young plants under glass, and prevents their flowering by nipping off the blooming tips of the shoots, so that they continue their vegetative growth into the second season. The young plants are at first supported in an erect position, the laterals being removed so as to secure clean upright stems, and then at the height of one or two feet or more, as may be desired, a head of branches is encouraged to develop itself. In this way very large plants are produced.

For ordinary purposes, however, other plans are adopted. In the open borders of the flower garden mignonette is usually sown in spring, and in great part takes care of itself; but, being a favourite either for window or balcony culture, and on account of its fragrance a welcome inmate of town conservatories, it is also very extensively