

subject. We may in particular refer to his discovery of the relation of benzene to benzoic acid, of nitro-benzene, and of a considerable number of the derivatives of benzene.

In 1833 he published his *Lehrbuch der Chemie*, a student's text-book of chemistry of the most thoroughly practical and yet rigidly scientific kind, from the study of which teachers of chemistry may still derive many a valuable hint. His interest in mineralogy led him to the study of the geology of volcanic regions, and he made frequent visits to the Eifel with a view to the discovery of a theory of volcanic action. He did not, however, publish any papers on the subject, but since his death his notes have been arranged and published by Dr Roth in the *Memoirs of the Berlin Academy* (1866). In December 1861 symptoms of heart disease made their appearance, but he was able to carry on his academical work till December 1862. He died at Schöneberg near Berlin on 28th August 1863.

Mitscherlich's published papers are chiefly to be found in the *Abhandlungen of the Berlin Academy*, in *Poggendorff's Annalen*, and in the *Annales de Chimie et de Physique*. The fourth edition of the *Lehrbuch der Chemie* was published in 1844; a fifth was begun in 1855, but was not completed. (A. C. B.)

MITYLENE, or MYTILENE. See LESBOS.

MIZPAH (מִצְפָּה) and MIZPEH (מִצְפֶּה) are Hebrew words for a "place of prospect," or high commanding point. The cities of Palestine generally occupied such positions; and so in the Old Testament we find several places bearing the name of "The Mizpah" (Mizpeh). Sometimes a determining genitive is added; "The Mizpeh of Gilead" (Judg. xi. 29), "The Mizpeh of Moab" (1 Sam. xxiii. 3).

(1) The most famous of these places is that in Gilead, a noted sanctuary (Judg. xi. 11; Hosea v. 1), claiming consecration from the sacrifice of Jacob (Gen. xxxi. 54) and the *masséba* or sacred stone erected by him (ver. 45). The narrative of Gen. xxxi. 45 sq. is somewhat obscure, and not all from one hand. We gather, however, from it that another name of "The Mizpah" was Galed, i. e., Gilead. Thus Mizpah, Mizpeh Gilead, Gilead (Hos. vi. 8), Ramath Mizpeh (i. e., the height of Mizpeh, Josh. xiii. 26), and Ramoth Gilead (the heights of Gilead), or simply The Ramah (2 Kings viii. 23, 29), are almost universally taken to be one place. With this it agrees that Ramoth Gilead was a city of refuge, which points to an early sanctity. The place is prominent throughout the history. It was the seat of Jephthah (Judg. xi.), the mourning for whose daughter probably gives us a glimpse into the ancient rites of a provincial sanctuary, the residence of one of Solomon's officers (1 Kings iv. 13), and a hotly disputed frontier city in the wars between Syria and the house of Omri, before which Ahab fell (1 Kings xxii.), and in which the military revolt of Jehu was organized (2 Kings ix.). Maspha was still a strong place in the Greek period, and was taken by Judas Maccabæus (1 Mac. v. 35). Eusebius knows Ramoth as a place 15 miles west of Philadelphia or Rabbah of Ammon. It is therefore commonly identified with El-Salt, the modern capital of the Belkâ; but this cannot be said to be made out. (2) The Benjamite Mizpah or Mizpeh, also a sanctuary, is often named in the history of Samuel. It was a border fortress of King Asa (1 Kings xv. 22), and the residence of Gedaliah as governor of Judæa after the fall of Jerusalem (Jer. xl.). Its old sanctity was still remembered in the Maccabee times, and from 1 Mac. iii. 46 we conclude that it commanded a view of Jerusalem. The most probable identification is with the prominent hill-top of Neby Samwîl. There was (3) another Mizpeh in the low country of Judah (Josh. xv. 38), and (4) a land or valley of Mizpeh (Josh. xi. 3, 8) under Mount Hermon.

MNEMONICS, or artificial helps to the memory, have been employed in a more or less systematic form from a very early period. Mnemonics (τὸ μνημονικόν, sc. τέχνημα or παράγγελμα) were much cultivated by Greek sophists and philosophers, and are repeatedly referred to by Plato and Aristotle. In later times the invention was ascribed to the poet Simonides,<sup>1</sup> perhaps for no other reason than that the strength of his memory was famous. Cicero, who attaches considerable importance to the art, but more to the principle of order as the best help to memory, speaks

<sup>1</sup> Pliny, *H. N.*, vii. 24. Cicero, *De Or.*, ii. 86, mentions this belief without committing himself to it.

of Carneades (or perhaps Charmades) of Athens and Metrodorus of Scepsis as distinguished examples of the use of well-ordered images to aid the memory. The latter is said by Pliny to have carried the art so far *ut nihil non eisdem verbis redderet auditum*. The Romans valued such helps as giving facility in public speaking. The method used is described by the author of *Rhet. ad Heren.*, iii. 16-24; see also Quintilian (*Inst. Or.*, x. 1, 2), whose account is, however, somewhat incomplete and obscure. In his time the art had almost ceased to be practised. The Greek and Roman system of mnemonics was founded on the use of mental places and signs or pictures. The thing to be remembered was localized in the imagination, and associated with a symbol which concretely represented what it was desired to retain in the memory, special care being taken that the symbols should be as vivid, pleasing, and impressive as possible. The most usual method was to choose a large house, of which the apartments, walls, windows, statues, furniture, &c., were severally associated with certain names, phrases, events, or ideas, by means of symbolic pictures; and to recall these it was only necessary to search over the apartments of the house, till the particular place was discovered where they had been deposited by the imagination. As the things to be remembered increased, new houses could be built, each set apart to a certain class of ideas or events, and these houses were again constructed into a mnemonic town. In accordance with this system, if it were desired to fix an historic date in the memory, it was localized in an imaginary town divided into a certain number of districts, each with ten houses, each house with ten rooms, and each room with a hundred quadrates or memory-places, partly on the floor, partly on the four walls, partly on the roof. Thus, if it were desired to fix in the memory the date of the invention of printing (1436), an imaginary book, or some other symbol of printing, would be placed in the thirty-sixth quadrate or memory-place of the fourth room of the first house of the historic district of the town. The success of the method depended largely on the power of the imagination to give the different houses, rooms, &c., characteristic varieties of aspect, and we may suppose that it was the effort to frame suitable images and places, giving an adventitious interest to dry details, that constituted the real advantage of the system. Except that the rules of mnemonics are referred to by Martianus Capella, nothing further is known regarding the practice of the art until the 13th century, when the system of the Romans was revived and a good many treatises were published on the subject. Among the voluminous writings of Roger Bacon is a tractate *De Arte Memorativa*, which exists in MS. at Oxford. Raymond Lully devoted special attention to mnemonics in connexion with his *ars generalis*. The first important modification of the method of the Romans was that invented by Conrad Celtes, a German poet, who, in his *Epitoma in utramque Ciceronis rhetoricam cum arte memorativa nova* (1492), instead of places made use of the letters of the alphabet. About the end of the 15th century Petrus de Ravenna awakened such astonishment in Italy by his mnemonic feats that he was believed by many to be a necromancer. His *Phœnia Artis Memorix*, published at Venice in 1491 in four volumes, went through as many as nine editions, the seventh appearing at Cologne in 1608. An impression equally great was produced about the end of the 16th century by Lambert Schenkel, who taught mnemonics in France, Italy, and Germany, and, although he was denounced as a sorcerer by the university of Louvain, published in 1593 his tractate *De Memoria* at Douai with the sanction of that celebrated theological faculty. The most complete account of his system is given in two works by his pupil Martin Sommer, published at Venice in 1619. Giordano Bruno, in connexion

with his exposition of the *ars generalis* of Lully, included a *memoria technica* in his treatise *De Umbris Idearum*.

About the middle of the 17th century Winckelmann made known what he called the "1st fertile secret" in mnemonics, namely the use of letters with figures so as to express numbers by words; and the philosopher Leibnitz adopted an alphabet very similar to that of Winckelmann in connexion with his scheme for a form of writing common to all languages. Winckelmann's method was modified and supplemented in regard to many details by Richard Grey, who published a *Memoria Technica* in 1730. The principal part of Grey's method is briefly this: "To remember anything in history, chronology, geography, &c., a word is formed, the beginning whereof being the first syllable or syllables of the thing sought, does, by frequent repetition, of course draw after it the latter part, which is so contrived as to give the answer. Thus, in history, the Deluge happened in the year before Christ two thousand three hundred forty-eight; this is signified by the word *Deletok*, Del standing for Deluge and *etok* for 2348." To assist in retaining the mnemonical words in the memory they were formed into memorial lines. The vowel or consonant which Grey connected with a particular figure was chosen arbitrarily; but in 1806 Feinaigle, a monk from Salem near Constance, began in Paris to expound a system of mnemonics, one feature of which was to represent the numerical figures by letters chosen on account of some similarity to the figure to be represented or some accidental connexion with it. This alphabet was supplemented by a complicated system of localities and signs, with the aim of expressing, by a more vivid and impressive symbol, ideas which for want of this are apt to pass from the memory, and of establishing between ideas of the same group an intimate relation, so that the mention of the one would suggest the other. Feinaigle, who published a *Notice sur la mnémonique* at Paris in 1806, came to England in 1811, and in the following year published *The New Art of Memory*. A simplified form of Feinaigle's method was published in 1823 by Aimé Paris, and the use of symbolic pictures was revived in connexion with the latter by a Pole, Jazwinsky, of whose system an account was published by J. Bem, under the title *Exposé Général de la Méthode Mnémonique Polonoise, perfectionnée à Paris*, Paris, 1839. Various other modifications of the systems of Feinaigle and Aimé Paris were advocated by subsequent mnemonists, among them being the Phrenotyping or Brain-Printing method of Beniowsky, the Phreno-Mnemonotechny of Gouraud, and the Mnemotechnik of Carl Otto, a Dane. The more complicated mnemonic systems have fallen almost into complete disuse; but methods founded chiefly on the laws of association have been taught with some success in Germany by, among others, Kothe, who is the author of *Lehrbuch der Mnemonik*, and *Katechismus der Gedächtnisskunst*, both of which have gone through several editions; and in England by Dr. Edward Pick, whose *Memory and the Rational Means of Improving it* has also obtained a wide circulation. In certain cases mnemonical devices may be found of considerable service; but all systems which have aimed at completeness have been found rather to puzzle than aid the memory. The fullest history of mnemonics is that given by J. C. F. von Aretin in his *Systematische Anleitung zur Theorie und Praxis der Mnemonik*, 1810.

MOA. See DINORNIS.

MOAB. Moab and Ammon (children of Lot) constitute along with Edom and Israel (children of Isaac) that group of four Hebrew peoples which in early antiquity had issued from the Syro-Arabian wilderness, and settled on the border of the cultivated country eastward of the great depression which extends from the Gulf of Elath to the

Dead Sea, and up the valley of the Jordan. According to the book of Genesis, they had come out of Mesopotamia, and so were precursors of the larger wave which followed from the same quarter, forming the most southern outpost of the Aramæan immigration into the lands of Canaan and Heth. Whether the Hebrews were originally Aramæans is questionable, but it is certain that, like the Aramæans, they were distinct from the Canaanites, whose conquerors they were. Such was the relation of the old and new inhabitants, not only in Western Palestine after the Israelite occupation, but also, and from a much earlier period, in Eastern Palestine, where the aborigines were Amorites—that is, Canaanites—and where the Bne Ammon and Moab and the Bne Isaac successively settled in their lands. The old population did not disappear before the conquerors, but continued to subsist among them. In a considerable district—namely, in Gilead—the Amorites even remained unsubdued, and thus formed a gap, only imperfectly filled up by the Bne Ammon, between the Hebrew line of immigration on the south and the Aramæan line more to the north,—a gap which did not begin to close until the historical period. From this district they even endeavoured, and with some success, as will be afterwards seen, to recover the territory which had been taken from them in the south. But where they were the subjects of the Hebrews they constituted the basis of the population, the mainstock of the working and trading classes. The extent of their influence over the conquerors may be judged from the fact that it was their speech which gained the upper hand. The Moabites, and doubtless also the Ammonites and Edomites, spoke the language of Canaan as well as the Israelites. They must have learned it from the Canaanites in the land eastward of Jordan, prior to the period at which Jacob immigrated to and returned from Egypt. Our knowledge is extremely imperfect as regards other departments of the Canaanite influence; but in religion it has left a noticeable trace in the cultus of Baal-Peor, which was carried on in Moabite territory, but was certainly of Canaanite origin.

The assumption that the change of language was first brought about by the Israelites in the land which is called by preference that of Canaan, is rendered untenable by the fact that the Moabites also spoke Canaanitish. It is vain to urge against the identity of Hebrew and Canaanitish the distinction between Phœnician and Hebrew; for doubtless similar distinctions existed between the dialect of the Phœnician coast towns and that of the Hivites, Amorites, and Canaanites generally, whose language the Hebrews borrowed. That the Aramæans of Damascus, who also were compelled to mingle with the Hethites in the country of which they had taken possession, nevertheless retained their original tongue is to be explained by the circumstance that they continued to maintain direct relations with the mother-country of Mesopotamia, and moreover had greater internal cohesion. The designation Amorites, usually given in the Old Testament to the original inhabitants of Eastern Palestine, is substantially synonymous with that of Canaanites, although not quite so comprehensive. The Palestine of the Pre-Israelitic period, which in the Pentateuch is called the Land of Canaan, figures in Amos as the Land of the Amorites. While, however, the former name is bestowed chiefly upon that portion of the earlier population which had remained unconquered, the latter is given to the portion against which the Israelites first directed their attack and in whose territory they settled. This took place in the mountain district, first to the east and afterwards to the west of Jordan. For this reason the Amorites, as contrasted with the Canaanites of the cities of the level country, are a highland race, like the Hebrews themselves, but belong exclusively to the past. In the time of the Biblical narrators, the Canaanites are still living here and there in the land, but the Amorites have once lived where the Israelites now are. This explains the fact that, while in ordinary peaceful circumstances the Canaanites are named as the old inhabitants, the Amorites are immediately substituted for them wherever war and conquest are spoken of. Sihon and Og, with whom Moses does battle, are kings of the Amorites; in like manner it is with the twelve kings of the Amorites that Joshua has to deal westward of the Jordan. The Amorites as an extinct race of course assume a half-mythical character, and are represented as giants, tall as cedars and strong as oaks.

Just as Israel was the people of Jehovah, and Ammon the people of Milcom, Moab was the people of Chemosh (שִׁמְשֵׁם, Num. xxi. 29). The kingship of Chemosh was regarded as thoroughly national and political in its character, but did not on that account exclude the institution of a human king, which existed in Moab much earlier than in Israel; in the time of Moses the Moabites had a king, and the institution was even then an old one. The capitals of the kingdom were Ar Moab and Kir-Moab, south from the Arnon; these were not, however, the constant residences of the kings, who continued to live in their native places, as, for example, Mesha in Dibon. Doubtless there were changes of dynasty, and traces exist of a powerful aristocracy (Arieh Moab; 2 Sam. xxiii. 20).

The land of the Moabites, the Balak, is bounded northward and southward by Mount Gilead and Wadi 'I-Ahsá, westward and eastward by the Dead Sea and the Wilderness; it is divided into two portions by the deep bed of the Arnon, that to the north being the more level (Mishôr), and that to the south being more broken up, and constituting the proper stronghold of the nation. The soil is peculiarly adapted for sheep-farming (2 Kings iii.) and the culture of the vine (Isa. xvi.).<sup>1</sup>

The historical importance of the Moabites lies wholly in their contact with Israel, and we have no knowledge of them apart from this. After the Israelites had quitted Egypt and passed a nomadic life for about a generation in the neighbourhood of Kadesh, they migrated thence, still under the leadership of Moses, into northern Moab, dispossessing the Amorites, who had made themselves masters of that district. The interval from Kadesh to the Arnon could be passed only by a good understanding with Edom, Moab, and Ammon,—a proof that the ethnical relationships, which at a later period were expressed only in legend, were at that time still living and practical. In all probability the Moabites called the Israelites to their aid; they were not as yet aware that this little pastoral people was destined one day to become to them a greater danger than the Canaanites by whom they were threatened at the moment.<sup>2</sup>

As the story of Balaam indicates, the Moabites would willingly have been rid of their cousins after their service had been rendered, but were unable to prevent them from settling in the land of Sihon. The migration of the tribes of Israel into Western Palestine, however, and the dissolution of their warlike confederation soon afterwards made a restoration of the old frontiers possible. If King Eglon took tribute of Benjamin at Jericho, the territory between Arnon and Jordan must also have been subject to him, and

<sup>1</sup> There does not seem to have been any difference in this respect between the northern and southern portions; instead of Heshbon, Sibmah, and Jaazer (Isa. xvi.), the poet Hátim of Tayyi, a little before Mohammed, names Maáb and Zoar as the chief wine centres (Yákút, iv. 377, 19).

<sup>2</sup> The facts as a whole are indubitable; it cannot be an invention that the Israelites settled first in Kadesh, then in northern Moab, and thence passed into Palestine proper. The only doubtful point is whether the song in Num. xxi. 27 sqq. is contemporary evidence of these events. It is certainly not a forgery, but it is a question whether it really refers to the destruction of the kingdom of the Amorites at Heshbon. This reference rests entirely upon the words לִכְנֵי אֲמֹרֵי שִׁיחֹן, which might very well be omitted as a mere gloss, in which case the song would naturally be understood as directed against the Moabites themselves; it is in this last sense that it is taken by the author of Jer. xlviii. (Comp. E. Meyer in Stade's *Zeitschr. f. A. Thische Wissensch.*, 1881, p. 129 sqq.) As Israel got the better of the Amorites on the plain of Moab, so did Hadad king of the Edomites vanquish the Midianites on the "field" of Moab (Gen. xxxvi. 35); this took place in Gideon's time, as is borne out by the fact that between Hadad and the downfall of the ancient Edomite monarchy, i.e. to the period of David, there were four reigning princes. Confused recollections of a former settlement of the Midianites in northern Moab are seen in Num. xxii. 4, 7; xxv. 18.

Reuben must even then have lost his land, or at least his liberty. It would appear that the Moabites next extended their attacks to Mount Gilead, giving their support to the Ammonites, who, during the period of the judges, were its leading assailants. So close was the connexion between Moab and Ammon that the boundary between them vanishes for the narrators (Judges xi.).

Gilead was delivered from the Ammonites by Saul, who at the same time waged a successful war against Moab; the fact is lightly touched upon in 1 Sam. xiv. 47, as if this were a matter of course. The establishment of the monarchy necessarily involved Israel in feuds with its neighbours and kin. The Moabites being the enemies of the Israelite kingdom, David naturally sent his people for shelter thither when he had broken with Saul; the incident is precisely analogous to what happened when he himself at a later period took refuge from Saul's persecution in Philistine territory and needs no explanation from the book of Ruth. As soon as he ceased to be the king's enemy by himself becoming king, his relations with Moab became precisely those of his predecessor. The war in which apparently casual circumstances involved him with Hanun ben Nahash of Ammon really arose out of larger causes, and thus spread to Moab and Edom as well. The end of it was that all the three Hebrew nationalities were incorporated with the kingdom of Israel; the youngest brother eclipsed and subdued his seniors, as Balaam had foreseen. Through the work of Saul and David the political system of Palestine was altogether changed: the smaller peoples were no longer a match for Israel, which established a decisive preponderance, and transformed what had hitherto been jealousy on the part of Moab and Ammon as well as of Edom into bitter hatred; this hatred did not cease even after nothing but a religious shadow remained of what had once been the political supremacy of the people of Jehovah.

The struggle with Ammon which David began ultimately assumed larger dimensions, and brought the Aramæans also into the field against him. He was successful, indeed, against them also, and destroyed their most powerful kingdom; but after his death they recovered themselves, and pressed steadily on from the borders of the wilderness towards the sea; at their head were those kings of Damascus who had established themselves on the ruins of Zoba. In presence of these enemies the already fading distinction between the ruling and the subject nationality within the kingdom of Israel now completely disappeared; and even towards the Canaanites outside the relations of the kings became friendly. It is in one instance expressly stated that the common danger threatening from the East had to do with this (2 Sam. viii. 9 sqq.). But, conversely, it was natural that Ammon and Moab should make common cause with the Aramæans; such an attitude was suggested by geographical position and old connexions, but above all by their helpless fury against Israel. Both nationalities must have succeeded in emancipating themselves very soon after David's death, and only now and then was some strong king of Israel able again to impose the yoke for a time, not upon the Ammonites indeed, but upon Moab. The first to do so was Omri, who garrisoned a number of their towns and compelled the king to acknowledge Israel's suzerainty by a yearly tribute of sheep,—a state of matters which continued until the death of Ahab ben Omri. But when that brave king fell in battle with the Aramæans at Ramoth Gilead (about 850 B.C.), Mesha of Dibon, then the ruler of Moab, seized the favourable opportunity to make himself and his people independent. In his famous inscription he tells how, through the wrath of Chemosh, the land had fallen into the enemy's power and endured forty years of slavery, and how by the grace of Chemosh the yoke is now broken and the Israelites ignominiously driven off. In

the Bible we find only the curt statement that Moab rebelled against Israel after the death of Ahab (2 Kings i.); on the other hand, there is a full narrative of a later attempt on the part of Joram ben Ahab to bring Mesha again into subjection—an attempt which promised very well at first, but ultimately failed completely. Joram's invasion took place not from the north but (probably very unexpectedly to the enemy) from the frontier of Edom over the Wadi 'I-Ahsá; he marched through Judah and Edom, and the kings of those countries served as auxiliaries. He defeated a Moabite army on the frontier, penetrated into the country and laid it waste; he laid siege to the fortress of Kir-Moab so closely as to reduce it to great straits. But these straits seem to have filled the besieged with a desperate courage, for the fortunes of war suddenly changed. The Israelites were compelled to retire homeward, a great wrath (of Jehovah) having come upon them, that is, a severe disaster having befallen them, which is not described, but, from the nature of the case, must have been a sudden surprise and defeat by the enemy.<sup>1</sup>

As the Moabites owed their liberation from Israelite supremacy to the battle of Ramah—that is, to the Aramæans—we accordingly find them (as well as the Ammonites) afterwards always seconding the Aramæans in continual border warfare against Gilead, in which they took cruel revenge on the Israelites. With what bitterness the latter in consequence were wont to speak of their hostile kinsfolk can be gathered from Gen. xix. 30 sqq.—the one trace of open malice in the story of the patriarchs, and all the more striking as it occurs in a narrative of which Lot is the hero and saint, which therefore in its present form is of Moabite origin, although perhaps it has a still older Canaanite nucleus. Of these border wars we learn but little, although from casual notices it can be seen (2 Kings xiii. 20; Amos i. 13; comp. 2 Kings v. 2) that they were long kept up, although not quite uninterruptedly. But when at length the danger from the Aramæans was removed for Israel by the intervention of the Assyrians, the hour of Moab's subjection also came; Jeroboam II. extended his frontier over the eastern territory, as far as to the brook of the willows (Wadi 'I-Ahsá). (Perhaps the song of Num. xxi. 27 sqq. has reference to these events.) A vivid picture of the confusion and anguish then prevalent in Moab has been preserved to us in the ancient prophecy of Isa. xvi., which indeed would have greater historical value if we were able to tell precisely what in it depicts the present, and what is prediction of the future.<sup>2</sup>

This utterance of an older prophet was repeated some

<sup>1</sup> The narrative of Mesha in his inscription has, strange to say, not unfrequently been regarded as parallel with 2 Kings iii., and the conclusion been drawn that the Biblical narrative completely inverts the true state of the case,—it is difficult to see for what motives, for there is no bragadoccio in 2 Kings iii. But it is perfectly clear that the narrative of 2 Kings iii. presupposes the revolt of Mesha as an old affair; while, on the other hand, Mesha's story on the stele in the Louvre is a narrative of this very revolt and its immediate consequences; it is accordingly to be regarded as parallel with 2 Kings i. 1. Elisha's miracle in Wadi 'I-Ahsá (2 Kings iii. 16) is explained by the locality; Ahsá means a sandy ground with moist subsoil, where, by digging trenches, water is always obtainable. The (probably compulsory) participation of the king of Edom in Joram's expedition against Moab may perhaps be brought into connexion with the fact that the Moabites burned to lime the bones of a king of Edom (Amos ii. 1).

<sup>2</sup> In Isa. xvi. xvi. it is presupposed that the attack upon Moab has been made from the north, at a time when Judah is a comparatively powerful kingdom, exercising sovereignty over Edom also, and in a position to afford shelter to the fugitive Moabites, thus not being itself at war with them. These marks taken together can only apply to the period of Jeroboam II. and Uziah. Hitzig will have it that Jonah ben Amittai wrote Isa. xv. xvi.; but according to 2 Kings xiv. 25 that prophet preached prosperity to Jeroboam, and not disaster to the Moabites.

decennia later by the prophet Isaiah, with the addition of a clause adapting it to his time, to the effect that the Assyrians would carry out in all its fulness the hitherto imperfectly-executed threat. The Assyrians actually subjugated the Moabites, as well as the other small peoples of that region; but the blow was apparently not so grave as Isaiah had predicted. They lay more out of the way than their western neighbours, and perhaps their resistance to the scourge of God was not so obstinate as to demand the sharpest measures. What made it all the easier for them to reconcile themselves to the new situation was the fact that the Israelites suffered much more severely than they. From these their deadly enemies they were henceforth for ever free. They did not on that account, however, give up their old hatred, but merely transferred it from Israel to Judah. The political annihilation of the nation only intensified in Jerusalem the belief in its religious prerogative, and against this belief the hostility of neighbours was aroused more keenly than ever. The deepest offence at the religious exclusiveness of the people of Judæa, which then first began to manifest itself, was, as is easily understood, taken by their nearest relatives, Edom and Moab. They gave terrible expression to their feelings when the Chaldeans urged them on like uncaged beasts of prey against the rebellious Jews; and they joined loudly in the general chorus of malignant joy which was raised over the burning of the temple and the ruin of the holy city.<sup>3</sup>

"Because Moab saith: Behold the house of Judah is like all the other nations, therefore do I open his land to the Bne Kedem," says the prophet Ezekiel (xxv. 8 sqq.); His threat against the Moabites as well as against the Edomites and Ammonites is that they shall fall before the approach of the desert tribes. Probably in his day the tide of Arabian invasion was already slowly rising, and of course it had first to overtake the lands situated on the desert border. At all events the Arab immigration into this quarter began at an earlier date than is usually supposed; it continued for centuries, and was so gradual that the previously-introduced Aramæizing process could quietly go on alongside of it. The Edomites gave way before the pressure of the land-hungry nomads, and settled in the desolate country of Judah; the children of Lot, on the other hand, appear to have amalgamated with them,—the Ammonites maintaining their individuality longer than the Moabites, who soon entirely disappeared.

Israel and Moab had a common origin, and their early history was similar. The people of Jehovah on the one hand, the people of Chemosh on the other, had the same idea of the Godhead as head of the nation, and a like patriotism derived from religious belief,—a patriotism capable of extraordinary efforts, and which has had no parallel in the West either in ancient or in modern times. The mechanism of the theocracy also had much that was common to both nations; in both the king figures as the deity's representative, priests and prophets as the organs through whom he makes his communications. But, with all this similarity, how different were the ultimate fates of the two! The history of the one loses itself obscurely and fruitlessly in the sand; that of the other issues in eternity. One reason for the difference (which, strangely enough, seems to have been felt not by the Israelites alone but by the Moabites also) is obvious. Israel received no gentle treatment at the hands of the world; it had to carry on a continual conflict with foreign influences and hostile

<sup>3</sup> Zeph. ii. 8 sq.; 2 Kings xxiv. 2, and Jer. xii. 9 sqq.; Ezek. xxv. 8 sqq. It need hardly be said that the Moabites shared the fate of all the Palestinian peoples when supremacy passed from the Assyrians to the Chaldeans, and that, notwithstanding their hatred of the Jews, they had no difficulty in seeking alliances with them, when occasions arose on which they could be made useful (Jer. xxvii. 3).

powers; and this perpetual struggle with gods and men was not profitless, although the external catastrophe was inevitable. Moab meantime remained settled on his lees, and was not emptied from vessel to vessel (Jer. xlviii. 11), and corruption and decay were the result. This explanation, however, does not carry us far, for other peoples with fortunes as rude as those of Israel have yet failed to attain historical importance, but have simply disappeared. The service the prophets rendered at a critical time, by raising the faith of Israel from the temporal to the eternal sphere, has already been spoken of in the article ISRAEL.

Sources.—The Old Testament (Ruth and Chronicles, however, being of no historical worth in this connexion), and the inscription of Mesha, on the stone of Dibon, discovered in 1868, and now in the Louvre. The Berlin *Moabitica* are valueless.—Schlottmann himself, the unshaken champion of their genuineness, conceding that they are mere scribbling, and do not even form words, much less sentences. The literature of the subject is to be found in the commentaries on the Old Testament books, and in those on the inscription of Mesha. (J. WE.)

MO'ALLAKÁT. *Al-Mo'allakát* is the title of a group of seven longish Arabic poems, which have come down to us from the time before Islam. The name signifies "the suspended" (pl.), the traditional explanation being that these poems were hung up by the Arabs on or in the Ka'ba at Mecca. The oldest passage known to the writer where this is stated occurs in the *Iká* of the Spanish Arab, Ibn 'Abd-Rabbih (A.D. 861-940), *Búlák* ed. vol. iii, p. 116 sq. We read there: "The Arabs had such an interest in poetry, and valued it so highly, that they took seven long pieces selected from the ancient poetry, wrote them in gold on rolls (?) of Coptic cloth, and hung them up (*allakát*) on the curtains which covered the Ka'ba. Hence we speak of 'the golden poem of Amraalkais,' 'the golden poem of Zohair.' The number of the golden poems is seven; they are also called 'the suspended' (*al-Mo'allakát*)." Similar statements are frequent in later Arabic works. But against this we have the testimony of a contemporary of Ibn 'Abd-Rabbih, the grammarian Nahhás (ob. A.D. 949), who says in his commentary on the *Mo'allakát*: "As for the assertion that they were hung up in [*sic*] the Ka'ba, it is not known to any of those who have handed down ancient poems." This cautious scholar is unquestionably right in rejecting a story so utterly unauthenticated. The customs of the Arabs before Mohammed are pretty accurately known to us; we have also a mass of information about the affairs of Mecca at the time when the Prophet arose; but no trace of this or anything like it is found in really good and ancient authorities. We hear, indeed, of a Meccan hanging up a spoil of battle on the Ka'ba (Ibn Hishám, ed. Wüstenfeld, p. 431). Less credible is the story of an important document being deposited in that sanctuary, for this looks like an instance of later usages being transferred to pre-Islamic times. But at all events this is quite a different thing from the hanging up of poetical manuscripts. To account for the disappearance of the *Mo'allakát* from the Ka'ba we are told, in a passage of late origin (De Sacy, *Chrestom.*, ii. 480), that they were taken down at the capture of Mecca by the Prophet. But in that case we should expect some hint of the occurrence in the circumstantial biographies of the Prophet, and in the works on the history of Mecca; and we find no such thing. That long poems were written at all at that remote period is improbable in the extreme. All that we know of the diffusion of Arabic poetry, even up to a time when the art of writing had become far more general than it was before the spread of Islam, points exclusively to oral tradition. Moreover, it is quite inconceivable that there should have been either a guild or a private individual of such acknowledged taste,

<sup>1</sup> Ernst Frenkel, *An-Nahhás' Kommentar zur Mu'allaka des Imru'ul-Qais* (Halle, 1876), p. viii.

or of such influence, as to bring about a consensus of opinion in favour of certain poems. Think of the mortal offence which the canonization of one poet must have given to his rivals and their tribes! It was quite another thing for an individual to give his own private estimate of the respective merits of two poets who had appealed to him as umpire; or for a number of poets to appear at large gatherings, such as the fair of 'Okáz, as candidates for the place of honour in the estimation of the throng which listened to their recitations. In short, this legend, so often retailed by later Arabs, and still more frequently by Europeans, must be entirely rejected.<sup>2</sup> The story is a pure fabrication based on the name "suspended." The word was taken in its literal sense; and as these poems were undoubtedly prized above all others in after times, the same opinion was attributed to "the [ancient] Arabs," who were supposed to have given effect to their verdict in the way already described. A somewhat simpler version, also given by Nahhás in the passage already cited, is as follows: "Most of the Arabs were accustomed to meet at 'Okáz and recite verses; then if the king was pleased with any poem, he said, 'Hang it up, and preserve it among my treasures.'" But, not to mention other difficulties, there was no king of all the Arabs; and it is hardly probable that any Arabian king attended the fair at 'Okáz. The story that the poems were written in gold has evidently originated in the name "the golden poems" (literally "the gilded"), a figurative expression for excellence. We must interpret the designation "suspended" on the same principle. In all probability it means those (poems) which have been raised, on account of their value, to a specially honourable position. Another derivative of the same root is *úlk*, "precious thing."

The selection of these seven poems can scarcely have been the work of the ancient Arabs at all. It is much more likely that we owe it to some connoisseur of a later date. Now Nahhás says expressly in the same passage: "The true view of the matter is this: when Hammád arráwiya (Hammád the Rhapsodist) saw how little men cared for poetry, he collected these seven pieces, urged people to study them, and said to them: 'These are the [poems] of renown.'" And this agrees with all our other information. Hammád (who lived in the first three quarters of the 8th century A.D.) was perhaps of all men the one who knew most Arabic poetry by heart. The recitation of poems was his profession. To such a rhapsodist the task of selection is in every way appropriate; and it may be assumed that he is responsible also for the somewhat fantastic title of "the suspended."

The collection of Hammád appears to have consisted of the same seven poems which are found in our modern editions, composed respectively by Amraalkais, Tarafa, Zohair, Labid, 'Antara, 'Amr ibn Kolthúm, and Hárith ibn Hilliza. These are enumerated both by Ibn 'Abd-Rabbih, and, on the authority of the older philologists, by Nahhás; and all subsequent commentators seem to follow them. We have, however, evidence of the existence, at a very early period, of a slightly different arrangement. Two of the foremost authorities in Arabic poetry are Abú 'Obaida and Mofaddal,—men who for care and accuracy in preserving the genuine text were far ahead of their much older contemporary Hammád. Both of these inserted a poem by Nábigha and one by A'shá in place of those of 'Antara and Hárith;<sup>3</sup> and, if our informant has expressed

<sup>2</sup> Doubts had already been expressed by various scholars, when Hengstenberg—rigid conservative as he was in theology—openly challenged it; and since then it has been controverted at length in Nöldeke's *Beiträge zur Kenntnis der Poesie der alten Araber* (Hanover, 1864), p. xvii. sqq. Our highest authority on Arabic poetry, Professor Ahlwardt, concurs in this conclusion; see his *Bemerkungen über die Aechtheit der alten arabischen Gedichte* (1872), p. 25 sq.

<sup>3</sup> The passage is cited by Nöldeke, *Beiträge*, p. xx. sq.

himself correctly, they also called this modified collection *Mo'allakát*. Mofaddal employs, besides, the names "the seven long [poems]" and "the necklaces." This last became afterwards a common title for the seven poems. The comparison of songs to strings of pearls is a very apt one, from the nature of the Arabic poem, composed as it is of separate loosely-connected parts. Hence it became so popular that even in ordinary prose to speak in rhythmical form is called simply *naẓm*, "to string pearls." Mofaddal expressly opposes the view of those who did not acknowledge the pre-eminence of the seven poets selected by him. This appears to be an attack on Hammád for including in his collection the works of two men who for poetic fame could certainly never enter the lists with Nábigha and A'shá. It is *prima facie* more likely that a later writer should have replaced the less famous poets by those who were universally placed in the first rank, than *vice versa*. Perhaps another fact is of some importance here. Hammád, a Persian by descent, was a client of the Arab tribe, Bakr ibn Wáil. In the heathen period this tribe was much at war with the closely-related tribe Taghlib. Now of all Arabic poems none was more famous than that in which 'Amr ibn Kolthúm celebrates in glowing terms the praises of his tribe Taghlib. If, therefore, Hammád's collection embraced this poem, it was very natural for him to gratify his patrons the Bakrites by placing alongside of it that of Hárith—a Bakrite and contemporary of 'Amr—where he extols his own tribe and assails the Taghlibites with bitter scorn. Such considerations did not affect Abú 'Obaida and Mofaddal.

The authority of these men has so far prevailed that the poems of their favourites Nábigha and A'shá often appear in the manuscripts, not indeed instead of those of 'Antara and Hárith, but after the other seven. Thus we sometimes read of *nine* *Mo'allakát*. The first author in whom the writer has observed this is the great philosophic historian Ibn Khaldún (A.D. 1332-1406); he mentions instead of Hárith the far more celebrated 'Alkama; whether relying on ancient authority, or by an oversight, we cannot tell. In an excellent collection of forty-nine long poems by Abú Zaid al-Korashí (date unknown) Mofaddal's seven poems appear in the first class, "the necklaces;" but Nábigha and A'shá are each represented by a different piece from that usually reckoned among the *Mo'allakát*. By this editor the name "golden poems," which, as we have seen, sometimes occurs as a synonym of "Mo'allakát," is applied to seven quite distinct songs.<sup>1</sup> This uncertainty as to the selection and the titles may serve as an additional proof that the "suspension," on the Ka'ba or anywhere else, is a fable.

The lives of these seven (or nine) poets were spread over a period of more than a hundred years. The earliest of them, according to the common and probably correct opinion, was AMRAALKAIS (pronounced also Imrookais, Imraalkais, &c.), regarded by many as the most illustrious of Arabian poets. His exact date cannot be determined; but probably the best part of his career fell within the first half of the 6th century. He was a scion of the royal house of the tribe Kinda, which lost all its power at the death of King Hárith ibn 'Amr in the year 529.<sup>2</sup> The poet's royal father, Hójr, by some accounts a son of this Hárith, was killed by Bedouins. The son led an adventurous life as a refugee, now with one tribe, now with another, and appears to have died young. The anecdotes related of him—which, however, are very untrustworthy in detail—as well as his poems, imply that the glorious

<sup>1</sup> See Nöldeke, *Beiträge*, p. xxi., and the catalogue of the Arabic coll. in the British Museum, p. 480 sqq.

<sup>2</sup> See *Tabarí's Geschichte der Perser und Araber . . . übersetzt von Th. Nöldeke* (Leyden, 1879), p. 171.

memory of his house and the hatred it inspired were still comparatively fresh, and therefore recent.

The *Mo'allaka* of 'AMR hurls defiance against the king of Hira, 'Amr son of Mundhir, who reigned from the summer of 554 till 568 or 569, and was afterwards slain by our poet.<sup>3</sup> This prince is also addressed by HÁRITH in his *Mo'allaka*. Of TARAFÁ, who is said to have attained no great age, a few satirical verses have been preserved, directed against this same king. This agrees with the fact that a grandson of the Kais ibn Khálid, mentioned as a rich and influential man in Tarafa's *Mo'allaka* (v. 80 or 81), figured at the time of the battle of Dhú Kár, in which the tribe Bakr routed a Persian army. This battle falls between A.D. 604 and 610 (Nöldeke's *Tabarí*, p. 311).

The *Mo'allaka* of 'ANTARA and that of ZOHÁIR contain allusions to the feuds of the kindred tribes 'Abs and Dhobyán. Famous as these contests were, their time cannot be ascertained. But the date of the two poems can be approximately determined from other data. Ka'b, son of Zohair, composed first a satire, and then, in the year 630, a eulogy on the Prophet; another son, Bojair, had begun, somewhat sooner, to celebrate Mohammed. 'Antara killed the grandfather of the Ahnaf ibn Kais who died at an advanced age in A.D. 686 or 687; he outlived 'Abdalláh ibn Simma, whose brother Doraid was a very old man when he fell in battle against the Prophet (early in A.D. 630); and he had communications with Ward, whose son, the poet 'Orwa, may perhaps have survived the flight of Mohammed to Medina. From all these indications we may place the productive period of both poets in the end of the 6th century.<sup>4</sup> The historical background of 'Antara's *Mo'allaka* seems to lie somewhat earlier than that of Zohair's.

To the same period appears to belong the poem of 'ALKAMA, which, as we have seen, Ibn Khaldún reckons amongst the *Mo'allakát*. This too is certainly the date of NÁBIGHA, who was one of the most distinguished of Arabic poets. For in the poem often reckoned as a *Mo'allaka*, as in many others, he addresses himself to the above-named No'mán, king of Hira, who reigned in the two last decades of the 6th century. The same king is mentioned as a contemporary in one of 'Alkama's poems.

The poem of A'SHÁ, which Mofaddal placed among the *Mo'allakát*, contains an allusion to the battle of Dhú Kár (under the name "Battle of Hinw," v. 62). This poet, not less famous than Nábigha, lived to compose a poem in honour of Mohammed, and died not long before A.D. 630.

LABID is the only one of these poets who embraced Islam. His *Mo'allaka*, however, like almost all his other poetical works, belongs to the pagan period. He is said to have lived till 661 or even later; certainly it is true of him, what is asserted with less likelihood of several others of these poets, that he lived to a ripe old age.

We have already mentioned that the old Arabic poetry was transmitted not by manuscripts but simply through oral tradition. Many pieces, especially the shorter ones, may have owed their preservation to their hold on the popular memory. But, fortunately, there was a class of men who made it their special business to learn by rote, and repeat, the works either of a single poet or of several. The poets themselves used the services of such rhapsodists (*rúwis*). The last representative of this class is Hammád, the man who formed the collection of *Mo'allakát*; but he, at the same time, marks the transition from

<sup>3</sup> See Nöldeke's *Tabarí*, pp. 170, 172.

<sup>4</sup> This evidence might be supplemented from a poem in Zohair's name, whose author describes himself as a man of ninety years, and in which the downfall of King No'mán of Hira (A.D. 601, see *Tabarí*, p. 347) is spoken of as a not very recent event. But the genuineness of this poem is more than doubtful (see Ahlwardt, *op. cit.* p. 64, and C. J. Lyall in the *Academy*, March 13, 1880, p. 192).