

prejudicing for the contraction of impurities, Lev. xi. 34, in six chapters; (9) *Zabim* (Lev. xv. 2-33), in five chapters; (10) *Tebul Yom* (Num. xix. 19), in four chapters; (11) *Yadayim* (purification of the hands), in four chapters; (12) *Okotsin* (stalks, peel, &c., of fruit), in three chapters.

11. *Editions*.—The editions of the *Mishnah*, whether as a book by itself or as contained in the Babylonian Talmud, are too numerous to be mentioned here. The *editio princeps* of the *Mishnah*, as a separate book, appeared (with Maimonides's commentary) at Naples in 1492 (see *MAIMONIDES*), and that as contained in the Babylonian Talmud at Venice in 1520-23, both in folio. As part of the Palestinian Talmud the *Mishnah* came out also at Venice, in 1523-24, folio. This Talmud, however, being defective, its *Mishnah* naturally is incomplete too (see p. 505); and it is, moreover, "corrected" by the scribe of 1288-89 (see Schiller-Szinessy, *Occasional Notices*, &c., i. pp. 8, 11). The syndics of the University Press of Cambridge have therefore laid the learned public under considerable obligations by publishing for the first time the complete original *Mishnah* on which the Palestinian Talmud rests, from the unique MS. preserved in the University Library.<sup>1</sup>

12. *Translations*.—There exist translations of the *Mishnah* in Latin, German, and English. (1) There is a Latin translation by the brothers Abendana (R. Ya'akov and R. Yitshak). The former was *Haham* (*Hakham*, i.e., chief rabbi) of the Sepharadim in England, and the latter was teacher of Hebrew and Rabbinic at Cambridge and Oxford successively. Both brothers, correspondents in 1660 of Buxtorf, were fine Hebrew and Latin scholars (see Schiller-Szinessy, "The Abendanas," in *Jewish World* of December 5, 1879). This translation is preserved in the Cambridge University Library MS. Mm. 1. 4-8.<sup>2</sup> (2) The Abendanas' version was before Surenhusius when he compiled, from old and new materials, his Latin translation, which appeared (with the text of the *Mishnah* and the translation also of the commentaries of Maimonides and "Bertinoro") at Amsterdam in 1698-1703, folio. The great indebtedness of Surenhusius to the Abendanas is a fact either unknown to or ignored by the bibliographers.<sup>3</sup> (3) A German translation by Rabe came out in German letters at Onolzbach in 1760-63, 4to. (4) The version last-named was in the possession of the anonymous author of the translation, printed in Rabbinic letters, in the Vienna edition of the *Mishnah* with the commentary *Kaph Nahath*, 1817-35, 8vo. This author (or editor) silently "used" the work of his predecessor. (5) Both these translations were surpassed in German diction, as well as in correctness of rendering, by that which came out in Hebrew square letters at Berlin in 1832-34, 4to, and which, no doubt, belongs to J. M. Jost the historian. (6) The English translation which came out at London in 1843, 8vo, by De Sola and Raphael, extends only over eighteen treatises.

13. *Commentaries*.—The commentaries on the *Mishnah* are almost as numerous as the editions, and cannot therefore be specially enumerated here. The principal and the oldest, however, are the following. (1) The two Talmuds themselves, of which, at present,<sup>4</sup> the Babylonian is the only (and that but comparatively) perfect one, or at all events the more extensive of the two. It ought, however, to be stated, first, that the Palestinian Talmud has *Gemara* on the whole order *Zera'im*, whilst the Babylonian has it on the first "treatise" only of that order (*Berakhoth*), and, secondly, that the *Gemara* *Shekalim* in the Babylonian Talmud is only borrowed from the Palestinian Talmud. (2) The commentaries on *Zera'im*, *Tohoroth*, &c., by Rabbenu Hai Gaon, who was the last, most learned, and in every way noblest of the Geonim.<sup>5</sup> He flourished in the 10th and 11th centuries. Part of the commentaries (viz., that on *Tohoroth*) has appeared in the collection

<sup>1</sup> See Mr W. H. Lowe's able edition of this grand work (*The Mishnah on which the Palestinian Talmud rests*, Cambridge, 1883, 8vo).

<sup>2</sup> According to Picciotto (*Sketches of Anglo-Jewish History*, London, 1875, 8vo, p. 55), R. Yitshak Abendana translated the *Mishnah* and its commentaries (Maimonides and "Bertinoro") also into Spanish.

<sup>3</sup> Surenhusius was also aided in his grand work by the books and notes of Guisius (in *Berakhoth*, *Peah*, *Demai*, *Kivayim*, *Shebith*, *Terumoth*, and *Maaseroth*, i.-iii. 3), Schmid (in *Shabbath* and *Erubin*), Houting (*Rosh Hashshanah*), Lund (*Taanith*), Otho (*Shekalim*), Wagenseil (*Sotah*), Cocceus (*Makhoth*), Fagius (*Aboth*), Arnoldi (*Tamid*), L'Empereur (*Midath*), and Ulmann (*Zebaim* and *Kerehoth*). But without the Abendanas Surenhusius could never have commenced, much less executed, the great task he had before him.

<sup>4</sup> For the probability that the missing parts of the Palestinian Talmud will one day come to light somewhere in the East, see Schiller-Szinessy in the *Academy*, February 23, 1878; *He-Chatuz*, xi.; and Steinschneider, *Handschriften-Verzeichnisse der königlichen Bibliothek zu Berlin*, ii., &c. (1878, 4to), p. 65, where a passage of Palestinian *Gemara* of *Okotsin* is actually quoted.

<sup>5</sup> He was also a poet of no mean standing. See his *Musar Haschel* or *Hassekkel*, ed. princ. Fano, 1505 (?), 4to.

*Kobets Maase Yede Geonim*, &c. (Berlin, 1856, 8vo). (3) The commentary on various treatises of the B. Talmud, and indirectly on the *Mishnah*, by Rabbenu Gershom Meor Haggolah (the "Light of the Diaspora,"<sup>6</sup> flourished in the 10th and 11th centuries). Fragments of this commentary are incorporated in the ordinary Talmud editions (e.g., *Nedarim*, 22b, &c.), but the greater part lies as yet in manuscript in various libraries. (4) The commentary of Rabbenu Hananel, who lived at Kairawan (in Africa) in the 10th and 11th centuries. His commentary on the Talmud, and thus indirectly on the *Mishnah*, is now being published in the Vilna edition of the Babylonian Talmud.<sup>7</sup> (5) The commentary of Rashi (ob. 1105) in all those parts of the B. Talmud on which that "prince of commentators" wrote. Here ought to be mentioned also the separate *editio princeps* of this commentary as far as the *Mishnah* is concerned, which appeared at Leghorn in 1653-54, 8vo. (6) The supplements and additions to the commentary of Rashi by his son, Rabbenu Yehudah b. Nathan (e.g., T. B., *Makhoth*, 19b, in-law Rabbenu Yehudah b. Nathan (e.g., T. B., *Makhoth*, 19b, and by his grandsons Rabbenu Shemuel b. Meir (*vulgo* &c.), and Rabbenu Shema'yah b. Simhah of Vitri,<sup>8</sup> who interpreted the *Masseketh Middoth* before Rashi, his grandfather (see Schiller-Szinessy, *Catalogue of the Hebrew MSS.* preserved in the University Library of Cambridge, ii. p. 89). (7) The commentary on the whole *Mishnah* by MAIMONIDES (q.v.). (8) The commentary by R. Abraham b. David of Posquieres (*vulgo* Rabad) on *Eduyoth* (see editions of the B. Talmud), *Kivim* (with two other commentaries by Rabbenu Zerahyah Hallevi and R. Asher b. Yehiel, Constantinople, 1751, folio), and on many other *Mishniyyoth* of the orders *Zera'im* and *Tohoroth* (in his "strictures" on Maimonides, *Mishneh Torah*, books *Zera'im* and *Tohoroth*). (9) The commentary of R. Shimshon of Sens (who, like the foregoing, was a contemporary and opponent of Maimonides) on the orders of *Zera'im* (with supplements taken from the works of the somewhat older R. Yitshak b. Malkitsedeck) and *Tohoroth*.<sup>9</sup> (10) The commentary by R. Meir of Rothenburg (the celebrated captive of Rudolph of Hapsburg); see under (13) below. (11) The commentary by R. Asher b. Yehiel (a disciple of the foregoing, who died at Toledo in 1327) on twenty-one treatises of the orders i. and vi. (12) The commentary on the whole *Mishnah*, by Rabbenu 'Obadyah di Bertinoro (flourished in the 15th and 16th centuries), the editions of which are very numerous. (13) The commentary on the whole *Mishnah*, by R. Yomtov Lipmann Heller (flourished in 16th and 17th centuries). This famous teacher, rabbi in some of the greatest congregations of the Jews (Prague, Vladimir, and Cracow), incorporated much of the commentary of R. Meir of Rothenburg; compare under (10).

14. *Works Subsidiary and Auxiliary to the Mishnah*.—These *Math* may be summed up under the word *Mathnitho*. *Mathnitho* is *nitho* or ostensibly the Aramaic equivalent of the Hebrew *Mishnah*; in reality, however, it signifies and comprises, not merely every thing which is understood under that name, but also *Boraitoth* (in full, *Mathnitho Boraitoth*), i.e., four other works of the oral law, and many literary notices of Mishnic and pre-Mishnic times besides, which are scattered throughout the Talmuds and other early Rabbinic works.

The first of these is *Tosephto*. As its name indicates, *Tosephto* is "Addition," i.e., to the canonical *Mishnah*. All *Mishnah* teachers from time immemorial, notably R. 'Akibah and R. Yehudah Hannasi, left out, when they taught *Mishnah*, a large mass of kindred and explanatory matter, which they only occasionally and supplementarily mentioned, i.e., when absolutely wanted. The chief collection of this additional matter, not incorporated in the system of the canonical *Mishnah*, is called *Tosephto* in Hebrew and *Tosephto* (or *Tosiphta* as some less correctly write it) in Aramaic. The Aramaic singular and the Hebrew plural occur already in the Talmuds and *Midrashim*.<sup>10</sup> *Tosephto* shares with the *Mishnah*, which it enlarges and explains, the number of orders and treatises, but not that of chapters, of which it has only 452. The oldest collection of *Tosephtic* matter, even as the oldest collection of Mishnic matter, is due to R. 'Akibah. But, whilst

<sup>6</sup> In the synod called together by Rabbenu Gershom, among several "ordinances" was also one that no Jew is allowed to marry more than one wife.

<sup>7</sup> His commentary on *Pesahim* appeared at Paris in 1868, and that on *Makhoth* at Leipzig in 1876, both in 8vo.

<sup>8</sup> These writers (together with Rabbenu Meir another son-in-law and Rabbenu Ya'akov another grandson of Rashi) are the first of the so-called *Tosaphists*, whose activity continued down to the early part of the 14th century.

<sup>9</sup> Whether the commentary on *Tamid* printed under his name, together with that of R. Asher b. Yehiel on the same treatise (Prague, 1725, 4to), is really his is still matter of dispute.

<sup>10</sup> See T. Y., *Shabbath*, viii. 1, &c.; T. B., *Synhedrin*, 86a and elsewhere; *Midrash Rabbah* on Ecclesiastes v. 8, &c. There can be little doubt that in some places the word *תוספתא* ought to be transliterated *Tosephto* (i.e., as plural).

the *Mishnah*, as a work, was first sifted by his disciple R. Meir, *Tosephto*, as a work, was first sifted by another disciple R. Nehemyah; and just as R. Meir's *Mishnah* was sifted again by *Rabbi* and others after him, and was not written down before the 6th century, so *Tosephto* was sifted again by R. Hiyya, R. Hoshayah, and others, and was not written down in its entirety before the 6th century. It is no wonder, then, that it now contains matter of a considerably later age. *Tosephto* is not merely of great help for understanding the *Mishnah*, which is, in a certain sense incomplete without it, but for the precise and exact knowledge of Jewish archeology and other sciences, and in its Agadic parts, of which there are many, for the Greek Scriptures also. Here ought also to be mentioned *Aboth de-Rabbi Nathan*, which is, no doubt, *Tosephto* to the *Mishnah* of *Aboth*. *Tosephto* used to be printed till within the last forty years<sup>1</sup> as an appendix to the *Riph*, i.e., the *Hilchoth Rab Alpha* (a compendium of the Talmud by R. Yitshak b. Ya'akov Al-Phasi, or Al-Phasi, i.e., of Fez, ob. 1103), which appeared first with this appendix at Venice, 1521-22, folio. Here, however, it was not edited critically or printed with even ordinary care. But in the Vienna edition of the Babylonian Talmud (1860-72) it came out, for the first time, worthily after a MS. till then uncollected which is preserved in the Court Library. Dr Zuckerman had since published it from the Erfurt and Vienna MSS., with collations.<sup>2</sup> A Latin translation of *Tosephto* (with the Hebrew text) is to be found under the name of *Tosaphata*, in Blasius Ugolinus's *Thesaurus Antiquitatum Sacrarum* (xvii.-xxx.). It comprises, however, only the orders *Zera'im*, *Môed*, and *Kodoshim*, and came out at Venice in the years 1755-57, folio.

The second of these pieces of literature is *Mekhilto*. This word is the Aramaic equivalent of the Hebrew *Middah* (measure), and hence signifies mould, form, i.e., of Scriptural exegesis, notably of part or parts of the Pentateuch. As such it might, of course, stand for any kind of commentary on any book of the Pentateuch, and have been composed by any one. And we find, indeed, that *Mekhilto* signified at one time a commentary on the books Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, and Deuteronomy, either by R. Yishmael or by R. 'Akibah,<sup>3</sup> at another time a commentary on Exodus, by R. Shime'on b. Yohai,<sup>4</sup> and at another time again a commentary on the last four books of Moses, by (Shime'on) Ben 'Azzai.<sup>5</sup> *Mekhilto* now, however, means a commentary on the greater part of Exodus, ascribed to R. Yishmael (flourished in the 1st century); although, in reality, this teacher cannot have been the author of the book, seeing that his name is more than seventy times mentioned in it. The reason why the ancients called the book by his name is, no doubt, because the first words of the real work are *Amar Rabbi Yishmael*. Like the other works of the "oral law," *Mekhilto* was not written down before the 6th century, a fact which accounts also, in part at least, for the loss of several portions of this commentary, which, at present, only extends from xii. 1 to xxv. 3, with several gaps between. That *Mekhilto* was once fuller than it is now we know, not only from a statement made by Maimonides and others, but from a MS. (Add. 394. 1, in the University Library of Cambridge, leaf 40b), where an extract is given by a Franco-German author of the 12th or 13th century. The Talmud knows the name *Mekhilto*, and actually quotes *Boraitoth* (non-canonical *Mishniyyoth*) which are to be found in our book; and yet the existing *Mekhilto* can scarcely have been known to the teachers of the Talmud. *Mekhilto* is by some called *Midrash* and by others *Mishnah*; both names are in a certain sense correct. It is *Midrash* in substance, inasmuch as it contains exegesis, and in form, inasmuch as it is subdivided into *Parshiyoth* and follows the order of the Scriptural verses. But it is *Mishnah* in substance, inasmuch as it not only deals with the groundwork of the *Mishnah*, but consists of *Boraitoth* (non-canonical *Mishniyyoth*), and in form, inasmuch as it is, like the canonical *Mishnah*, divided into *Massekhtoth*. These latter are nine in number, and are called respectively (1) *Dephsha* (with 18 *Parshiyoth* and 1 *Pethioto* or introduction); (2) *Beshallah* (with 6 *Parshiyoth* and 1 *Pethioto*); (3) *Desharetha* (with 10 *Parshiyoth*); (4) *Vayyassa* (with 6 *Parshiyoth*); (5) *Amalek* (with 2 *Parshiyoth*); (6) *Yithro* (with 2 *Parshiyoth*); (7) *Bahodesh* (with 11 *Parshiyoth*); (8) *Nezikin* and *Kaspo* (with 20 *Parshiyoth*); and (9) *Shabbetho* (with 2 *Parshiyoth*—1 in the pericope *Ki thissa* and 1 in that of *Vayyakhel*). *Mekhilto* was published first at Constantinople in 1515, under the name of *Sepher Hammekhilto*, and in 1545 at Venice as *Midrash Hammekhilto*. In 1712 it appeared at Amsterdam with a commentary. In 1744 it appeared again at Venice with a Latin translation by Blasius Ugolinus (*Thes. Antig. Sacr.*, xiv.). In 1801 it appeared at Leghorn with a different commentary. In 1844 it

<sup>1</sup> That on the order *Zera'im* came out at Vilna in 1799, 4to; but in its entirety it came only out between 1837, 1841, and 1871, folio.

<sup>2</sup> Issued at Pasewalk and Treves from 1877 to 1882, 8vo.

<sup>3</sup> See Maimonides's preface to the *Mishneh Torah*.

<sup>4</sup> See Nahmanides's commentary on the Pentateuch (on Gen. xlix. 31).

<sup>5</sup> See *Yufasin Haashalem* (ed. Filipowski, London and Edinburgh, 1857, 8vo), p. 30, col. 2.

came out at Vilna with a new commentary. All these are in folio. The best and cheapest editions with commentaries are those by Weiss (1865) and Friedmann (1870), both printed at Vienna, and in 8vo.

The third of these pieces of literature is *Siphro*. Both Leviticus itself, because it is the most difficult of all Mosiac books, and the oldest Rabbinic commentary on it, because it is the most difficult of all commentaries on the Scriptures, have been from time immemorial known under the name of *Siphro* (i.e., the Book).<sup>6</sup> This book and this commentary are also called *Torath Kohanim*, and the former is spoken of in the Talmud already as *Siphro debe Rab*.<sup>7</sup> This latter expression has led many great men (among others Maimonides)<sup>8</sup> to ascribe the authorship of this commentary to Rab (Abba Arikho, a nephew and disciple of R. Hiyya). But such a view is erroneous in the extreme, as the book is, so far as form and substance go, both older and later than Rab, paradoxical as this statement may appear. It is older in its origin and in its matter, for not merely do all the anonymous *Boraitoth* which are to be found in it belong to R. Yehudah b. Ilai, a teacher of the 1st century, but one of the sons of Rabbi (of the 2d century) had actually taught another rabbi two-thirds of a third, i.e., two-ninths, of this work.<sup>9</sup> It is later than Rab, for in it are found one "authority" and several "results" of much later date than that of this great Babylonian teacher.<sup>10</sup> The fact is, the word *Rab* in the phrase *Siphro debe Rab* is not a proper name at all, but simply stands for "teacher," and *debe Rab* thus signifies "of a school," a term used for any teacher and any school of any time. Although most of the *Boraitoth* which it contains are as old as the 1st century, this book as such cannot have been written down earlier than the 6th, in accordance with the treatment, in this respect, of all the other Halakic works of the "oral law." *Siphro*, although it bears on the pericopes and verses of Leviticus, and is on account of this fact by many called a *Midrash*, is in reality *Mishnah*,<sup>11</sup> a name borne out by the nature of its contents, which are mostly Mishnic, and sometimes represent actual canonical *Mishniyyoth*. *Siphro* exhibits a curious conglomeration of matter. It opens with the "Rules of the Interpretation of Scripture," ascribed to R. Yishmael,—a *Boraito* which, although important in itself, is not more important for this than for any other commentary on the Pentateuch. And this conglomerate nature shows itself even more strikingly in form; for *Siphro* contains as forms of division *Dibburim*, *Mekhilto*, *Parshiyoth* (some of which mean pericopes, whilst others mean chapters), *Perakim*, and *Fisotho*. All this points, of course, to various divisions of the book made at various times. Whilst none of these divisions can be later than the 12th century,<sup>12</sup> the earliest is at least as old as the 2d, and belongs perhaps to the 1st.<sup>13</sup> *Siphro* is chiefly of importance for the understanding of the *Mishnah* of the orders *Kodoshim* and *Tohoroth* (which were, no doubt, the earliest *Mishniyyoth* put into "order"); but, whilst it is a sure help for the *Mishnah*, the *Mishnah* is no sure help for it: *Siphro* is a genuine specimen of the "oral law" inasmuch as it cannot be mastered without a teacher. Owing to the difficulty of understanding it, *Siphro* has not been often studied, and consequently not often printed. The *editio princeps* is of 1645; the second edition with the commentary *Korban Aharon* is of 1609-11, both at Venice. The third edition with the just-named commentary is of 1702, and came out at Dessau. The fourth edition, with a Latin translation, is to be found in Blasius Ugolinus's *Thesaurus Antiquitatum Sacrarum*, &c., Venice, 1744 (vol. xiv.). All these are in folio. The fifth edition, with the commentary *Azarath Kohanim* (vol. i.), appeared at Vilna, 1845, 4to. The sixth edition, with the commentary *Asirith Haephah*, appeared at Lemberg, 1848, folio. The seventh edition, with the commentary *Hattorah Veham-Mitsvah*, appeared at Bucharest, 1860, 4to. The eighth edition, with the commentary of R. Abraham b. David of Posquieres, &c., appeared at Vienna, 1862; and the ninth edition, with the commentary by R. Shimshon of Sens, appeared at Warsaw, 1866, both in folio.

The fourth of these pieces of literature is *Siphre*. *Siphre*, or *Siphre debe Rab*, which in earlier times certainly included the oldest Rabbinic commentaries on Exodus, Numbers, and Deuteronomy (and perhaps also that on Leviticus), means now the oldest Rabbinic commentary on the last two books of Moses only,

<sup>6</sup> See T. B., *Berakhoth*, 18b, and Rashi, *in loco*. The *Siphro* said here to have been studied by Benaiah the son of Jehoiada may well have been our Leviticus, though of course it cannot have been the *Siphro* with which we are here concerned.

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>8</sup> Preface to *Mishneh Torah*.

<sup>9</sup> See T. B., *Kiddushin*, 33a.

<sup>10</sup> See the pericope *Kodoshim*, vi.

<sup>11</sup> Its original founder (R. Yehudah b. Ilai) identifies *Mishnah* and *Midrash*, T. B., *Kiddushin*, 49a.

<sup>12</sup> They were known to R. Abraham b. David (Rabad).

<sup>13</sup> T. B., *Kiddushin*, 33a.



Both books are divided into *Piskoth* (paragraphs), of which *Siphre* on Numbers has 161, whilst that on Deuteronomy has 357. The ancient division into *Boraihoth* cannot now be accurately traced. The work commences now at Numbers v. 1, and goes to the end of Deuteronomy. The passages anonymously given in *Siphre* are ascribed by the Babylonian Talmud<sup>1</sup> to R. Shime'on b. Yohai, the favourite disciple of R. Akibah, and the reputed author of the *Zohar*. But although he is no doubt the virtual author of *Siphre*, seeing that most *Boraihoth* which are to be found therein are his, he cannot be, technically speaking, its author. For, in the first place, he is not only repeatedly named in the book, but several times actually contradicted by others; and, secondly, there are several passages, anonymously given, in the book, which can only be the result of "Talmudic" study, and must be consequently posterior to the composition of the Talmud. The fact is that *Siphre*, like the other works of the "oral law," was not written down before the 6th century. It ought to be mentioned here that the rabbis of the 11th, 12th, and 13th centuries, and even somewhat later, speak also of another *Siphre* which they variously designate as *Siphre Panim Sheini*, *Siphre shel Panim Sheini*, *Siphre Bemidbar Sinai*, *Siphre Zutta*, and *Siphre* simply. To judge from the extracts which have come down to us, that work must not only have been of much later date, but also of far less value than the work in our hands. *Siphre* appeared for the first time in 1545, and with a Latin translation by Blasius Ugolinus, in his *Thesaurus*, &c. (vol. xv.), in 1744,—both at Venice, and in folio. The third edition appeared at Hamburg in 1789, and the fourth at Sulzbach in 1802, both in 4to. The fifth edition, with the commentary *Zera Abraham*, appeared in two volumes, of which the first was printed at Dyhernfurt in 1811 and the second at Radawell in 1820, both in folio. The sixth and best edition is that of Friedmann (Vienna, 1864), and the seventh is that of Lemberg, 1866, both in 8vo.

There is also a fifth piece of Mishnic literature known specially by the name *Boraihoth*. Besides the *Boraihoth* constituting *Tosepho*, *Mekhilto*, *Siphro*, and *Siphre*, there are hundreds of other *Boraihoth* to be found scattered about in both Talmuds. These are, however, mere fragments of the vast *Mishnayoth* (entire Mishnic works<sup>2</sup>) composed by Bar Kappara, Rabbi Hiyya, and hundreds of other teachers, which in course of time must have perished. There is, however, enough left of the *Mishnah*, canonical and non-canonical, to prove the correctness of the cabalistic remark that *Mishnah* is the equivalent of *Neshamah* (soul). This is no mere trifling based on the fact that the two words (מִשְׁנָה נֶשְׁמָה) accidentally consist of the same letters; it is rather an enunciation of an intrinsic truth: what the soul (*Neshamah*) is to the body, the *Mishnah* is to Mosaism. The soul gives life to the body, and the *Mishnah* gives life to the Pentateuch. For the letter killeth, but the spirit giveth life!

MISKOLCZ, capital of the Cis-Tisian county of Borso, Hungary (48° 6' N. lat., 20° 49' E. long.), is picturesquely situated in a valley watered by the Szinva, 90 miles north-east from Budapest, with which, as also with Debreczen and Kassa (Kaschan), it is directly connected by railway. Miskolcz is one of the most thriving provincial towns in the kingdom, and has many fine buildings, including Roman Catholic, Greek Catholic, Lutheran, and Calvinist churches and schools, a Minorite convent, synagogue, Hungarian theatre, hospital, royal and circuit courts of law, salt and tax offices, and the administrative bureaux for the county. There are manufactories of snuff, porcelain, boots and shoes, and prepared leather, and both steam and water mills. The trade is chiefly in grain, wheat flour, wine, fruit, cattle, hides, honey, wax, and the agricultural products of the neighbourhood. The great fairs, held five times a year, are much resorted to by strangers from a distance. Not far from the town are stone quarries and iron mines. At the end of 1880 the (civil) population amounted to 24,343, of whom the majority were Magyars by nationality.

During the 16th and 17th centuries Miskolcz suffered much from the desolating hordes of Ottomans who then ravaged the country, as also from the troops of various Transylvanian princes and leaders, especially those of George Rákóczy and Emeric Tökölyi. In 1781, 1843, and 1847 it was devastated by fire, and on the 30th August 1878 a great portion of the town was laid in ruins by a terrific storm. (See HUNGARY, vol. xii. p. 374.)

MISREPRESENTATION. See FRAUD.

<sup>1</sup> *Synhedrin*, 86a.

<sup>2</sup> According to T. B., *Hagigah*, 14a, there existed at one time no less than six or seven hundred *Mishnah* orders.

MISSAL,<sup>3</sup> the book containing the liturgy, or office of the mass, of the Latin Church. This name (e.g., Missale Gothicum, Francorum, Gallicanum Vetus) began to supersede the older word *Sacramentary* (*Sacramentarium*, *Liber Sacramentorum*) from about the middle of the 8th century. At that period the books so designated contained merely the fixed canon of the mass or consecration prayer (actionem, precem canonicam, canonem actionis), and the variable collects, secretæ or orationes super oblata, prefaces, and post-communions for each fast, vigil, festival, or feria, of the ecclesiastical year; for a due celebration of the Eucharist they required accordingly to be supplemented by other books, such as the *Antiphonarium*, afterwards called the *Graduale*, containing the proper antiphons (introits), responsories (graduals), tracts, sequences, offertories, communions, and other portions of the communion service designed to be sung by the schola or choir, and the *Lecti-arium* (or *Epistolarium* and *Evangelistarium*) with the proper lessons. Afterwards missals began to be prepared containing more or less fully the antiphons and lessons as well as the prayers proper to the various days, and these were called *missalia plenaria*. All modern missals are of this last description. The *Missale Romanum ex decreto SS. Concilii Tridentini restitutum*, now in almost exclusive use throughout all the churches of the Latin obedience, owes its present form to the council of Trent, which among its other tasks undertook the preparation of a correct and uniform liturgy, and entrusted the work to a committee of its members. This committee had not completed its labours when the council rose, but the pope was instructed to receive its report when ready and to act upon it. The "reformed missal" accordingly was promulgated by Pius V. on July 14, 1570, and its universal use enjoined on all branches of the Catholic Church, the only exceptions allowed being in the case of churches having local and independent liturgies which had been kept in unbroken use for at least two centuries.<sup>4</sup>

It has subsequently undergone slight revisions under Clement VIII. (1604) and Urban VIII. (1634); and various new masses, both obligatory and permissive, universal and local, have been added by the competent authority. Although the Roman is very much larger in bulk than any other liturgy, it need hardly be explained that the communion office to which it relates is not in itself inordinately long. By much the greater part of it is contained in the "ordinary" and "canon" of the mass, usually placed about the middle of the missal, and occupies, though in large type, only a few pages in any printed copy. The work owes its bulk and complexity to two circumstances. On the one hand, in the celebration of the sacrifice of the mass practically nothing is left to the impulse or discretion of the officiating priest; everything—what he is to say, the tone and gestures with which he is to say it, the cut and colour of the robe he is to wear—is carefully prescribed either in the general rubrics prefixed to the text, or in the running rubrics which accompany it.<sup>5</sup> On the other hand, the Roman, like all the Western liturgies, is distinguished

<sup>3</sup> *Missalis* (sc., *liber*), *Missale*, from *Missæ*; see vol. viii. p. 652.

<sup>4</sup> The English missal consequently continued to be used by English Catholics until towards the end of the 17th century, when it was superseded by the Roman through Jesuit influence. The Gallican liturgy held its ground until much more recently, but has now succumbed under the Ultramontanism of the bishops.

<sup>5</sup> In all the older liturgies the comparative absence of rubrics is conspicuous and sometimes perplexing. It is very noticeable in the Roman *Sacramentaries*, but the want is to some extent supplied by the very detailed directions for a high pontifical mass in the various texts of the *Ordo Romanus* mentioned below. That there was no absolutely fixed set of rubrics in use in France during the 8th century is shown by the fact that each priest was required to write out an account of his own practice ("libellum ordinis") and present it for approbation to the bishop in Lent (see Bluzé, *Cap. Reg. Fra.*, i. 824, quoted in Smith's *Dict. of Chr. Antiq.*, ii. 1521).

from those of the Eastern Church by its flexibility. Partly by conscious effort, no doubt, but partly also by happy accident, a well-marked distinctive character has been given in one or all of the above-mentioned respects to the office for each ecclesiastical season, for each fast or festival of the year, almost for each day of the week; and provision has also been made of a suitable communion service for many of the special and extraordinary occasions both of public and of private life. This richness of variety is seen not only in the collects but also in the lessons and antiphonal parts of the service, passages of Scripture in the selection and collocation of which an exquisite delicacy of religious and æsthetic instinct has been for the most part strikingly shown.

The different parts of the Roman communion office are not all of the same antiquity. Its essential and characteristic features are most easily caught, and their rationale best understood, by reference to the earliest *Sacramentaries* (particularly the Gregorian, which was avowedly the basis of the labours of the Tridentine committee), to the Gregorian *Antiphonary*, and to the oldest redaction of the *Ordo Romanus*.<sup>1</sup> The account of the mass (qualiter Missa Romana celebratur) as given by the *Sacramentarium Gregorianum* is to the effect that there is in the first place "the Introit according to the time, whether for a festival or for a common day; thereafter *Kyrie Eleison*. (In addition to this *Gloria in Excelsis Deo* is said if a bishop be [the celebrant], though only on Sundays and festivals; but a priest is by no means to say it, except only at Eastertide. When there is a litany (quando letania agitur) neither *Gloria in Excelsis* nor *Alleluia* is sung.) Afterwards the *Oratio* is said, whereupon follows the *Apostolus*, also the *Gradual* and *Alleluia*. Afterwards the *Gospel* is read. Then comes the *Offertorium*,<sup>2</sup> and the *Oratio super oblata* is said." Then follow the *Sursum Corda*, the *Preface*, *Canon*, *Lord's Prayer* and "embolism" (εμβόλισμα or insertion, *Libera nos, Domine*), given at full length precisely as they still occur in the Roman missal.

In every liturgy of all the five groups a passage similar to this occurs, beginning with *Sursum Corda*, followed by a *Preface* and the recitation of the *Sanctus* or *Angelic Hymn*. The "canon" or consecration prayer, which in all of them comes immediately after, invariably contains our Lord's words of institution, and (except in the Nestorian liturgy) concludes with the Lord's Prayer and "embolism." But within this framework there are certain differences of arrangement, furnishing marks by which the various groups of liturgies can be classified (see vol. xiv. p. 709 sq.). Thus it is distinctive of the liturgy of Jerusalem that the "great intercession" for the quick and the dead follows the words of institution and an Epiklesis (ἐπίκλησις τοῦ πνεύματος ἁγίου) or petition for the descent of the Holy Spirit upon the gifts; in the Alexandrian the "great intercession" has its place in the *Preface*; in the East Syrian it comes between the words of restitution and the Epiklesis; in the Ephesine it comes before the *Preface*; while in the Roman it is divided into two, the commemoration of the living being before, and that of the dead after, the words of institution. Other distinctive features of the Roman liturgy are (1) the position of the "Pax" after the consecration, and not as in all the other liturgies at a very early stage of the service, before the *Preface* even; and (2) the absence of the Epiklesis common to all the others.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> For the genealogical relationships of the Roman with other liturgies, the reader is referred to the article LITURGY (vol. xiv. 706 sq.), where some account is also given of the three *Sacramentaries*. For the doctrines involved in the "sacrifice of the mass," see EUCHARIST, vol. viii. p. 650 sq.

<sup>2</sup> Some editions do not mention the Offertory here.

<sup>3</sup> This was one of the points discussed at the council of Florence, and Cardinal Bessarion for a time succeeded in persuading the Greeks to give up the Epiklesis.

The words of its "canonical prayer" are of unknown antiquity; they are found in the extant manuscripts of the *Sacramentarium Gelasianum*, and were already old and of forgotten authorship in the time of Gregory the Great, who, in a letter to John, bishop of Syracuse (*Registr. Epist.*, vii. 64), speaks of it as "the prayer composed by a 'scholastic'" (precem quam scholasticus composuerat). The same letter is interesting as containing Gregory's defence, on the ground of ancient use, of certain parts of the Roman ritual to which the bishop of Syracuse had taken exception as merely borrowed from Constantinople. Thus we learn that, while at Constantinople the *Kyrie Eleison* was said by all simultaneously, it was the Roman custom for the clergy to repeat the words first and for the people to respond, *Christe Eleison* being also repeated an equal number of times. Again, the Lord's Prayer was said immediately after the consecration aloud by all the people among the Greeks, but at Rome by the priest alone.

The somewhat meagre and imperfect liturgical details furnished by the *Sacramentarium Gregorianum* are supplemented in a very full and interesting manner by the successive texts of the *Ordo Romanus*, the first of which dates from about the year 730. The ritual they enjoin is that for a pontifical high mass in Rome itself; but the differences to be observed by a priest "quando in statione facit missas" are comparatively slight. Subjoined is a précis of *Ordo Romanus I*.

It is first of all explained that Rome has seven ecclesiastical regions, each with its proper deacons, subdeacons, and acolytes. Each region has its own day of the week for high ecclesiastical functions, which are celebrated by each in rotation. [This accounts for the Statio ad S. Mariam, Majorem, ad S. Crucem in Jerusalem, ad S. Petrum, &c., prefixed to most of the masses in the Gregorian *Sacramentary*, and still retained in the "Proprium de Tempore" of the Roman missal.] The regulations for the assembling and marshalling of the procession by which the pontiff is met and then escorted to the appointed station are minutely given, as well as for the adjustment of his vestments "ut bene sedeat," when the sacristy has been reached. He does not leave the sacristy until the Introit has been begun by the choir in the church. Before the *Gloria* he takes his stand at the altar, and after the *Kyrie Eleison* has been sung (the number of times is left to his discretion) he begins the *Gloria in Excelsis*, which is taken up by the choir. During the singing he faces eastward; at its close he turns round for a moment to say "Pax vobis," and forthwith proceeds to the *Oratio*.<sup>4</sup> This finished, all seat themselves in order while the subdeacon ascends the ambo and reads [the *Epistle*]. After he has done, the cantor with his book (cantatorio) ascends and gives out the response (*Responsum*) with the *Alleluia* and *Tractus* in addition if the season calls for either. The deacon then silently kisses the feet of the pontiff and receives his blessing in the words "Dominus sit in corde tuo et in labiis tuis." Preceded by acolytes with lighted candles and subdeacons burning incense, he ascends the ambo, where he reads the *Gospel*. At the close, with the words "Pax tibi" and "Dominus vobiscum," the pontiff,<sup>5</sup> after another *Oratio*, descends to the "senatorium" accompanied by certain of the inferior clergy, and receives in order the oblations of the rulers (oblationes principum), the archdeacon who follows taking their "amulas" of wine and pouring them into a larger vessel; similar offerings are received from the other ranks and classes present, including the women. This concluded, the pontiff and archdeacon wash their hands, the offerings being meanwhile arranged by the subdeacons on the altar, and water, supplied by the leader of the choir (archiparaphonista), being mingled with the wine. During this ceremony the schola have been engaged in singing the *Offertorium*; when all is ready the pontiff signs to them to stop, and enters upon the *Preface*, the subdeacons giving the responses. At the *Angelic Hymn* (*Sanctus*) all kneel and continue kneeling, except the pontiff, who rises alone and begins the *Canon*. At the words "per quem hæc omnia" the archdeacon lifts the cup with the oblates, and at "Pax Domini sit semper vobiscum" he gives the peace to the clergy in their order, and to the laity. The pontiff then breaks off a particle from the consecrated bread and lays it upon the altar; the rest he places on the paten held by the deacon. It is then distributed while *Agnus Dei* is sung. The pontiff in communicating puts the particle into the cup, saying, "Fiat commixtio et consecratio corporis et sanguinis Domini nostri Jesu Christi accipientibus nobis in vitam æternam." Those present communicate in their order under this species also.

<sup>4</sup> Quam collectam dicunt, *Ord. Rom. II*.

<sup>5</sup> After singing "Credo in unum Deum," *Ord. Rom. II*.