

our investigation has taken us back into representations of the crucifixion, with descriptions attached to the characters represented, at least as early as the fifth century.

J. RENDEL HARRIS.

THE THUNDERS OF THE LORD IN AMOS.

It has become the fashion among commentators latterly to regard Amos iv. 13 and v. 8 as the interpolations of a later post-exilic editor. These verses are supposed to describe the greatness of God's work in creation, and we are told that such subjects did not exercise the Hebrews till a later date than that of Amos. "The germs long ago deposited by the preaching of Amos and Isaiah . . . had developed into the rich theology of Isaiah ii. and the Book of Job, . . . an ordinary reader of Amos inserted these doxologies (as we may call them) to relieve the gloom of the prophetic pictures" (Cheyne, art. "Amos," in the *Encyclopædia Biblica*).

The former passage runs in R.V. thus:—" . . . prepare to meet thy God, O Israel. ¹³ For, lo, he that formeth the mountains, and createth the wind, and declareth unto man what is his thought, that maketh the morning darkness, and treadeth upon the high places of the earth; the LORD, the God of hosts, is His name." Certainly the words of v. 13 do not at once fit into the context; the fact that God formed the mountains is about as far removed from what Amos has in hand as it can well be. At the same time the clause about making the morning dark shows that merely the creative energy of God is not uppermost in the writer's mind: it is a very definite picture which is drawn, if we could seize the right point of view.

For the first clause of v. 13 ("He that formeth the mountains") the Septuagint has *στρεφῶν βροντήν*, *i.e.* instead of

יצר רעם 'צר הרים it reads "He that formeth the thunder." I venture to think that this one change transforms the passage into a recitation of the titles of Jahwe as God of the thunderstorm, in all respects suitable in the mouth of Amos.

That the ancient Hebrews thought of their God as pre-eminently revealed in the storm-cloud needs no demonstration. The thunders and lightnings of Sinai, the whole career of Elijah both at Carmel and at Horeb, attest this clearly.¹ God speaks in the storm: "who can understand His mighty thunder?" (Job xxvi. 14). But furthermore, the conception runs through the whole book of Amos. If Jahwe has roared from Zion (i. 2), it is more than the cry of the Lion of Judah: surely nothing less than the lightning-flash which came in answer to Elijah could "make the top of Carmel wither"! "The day of the LORD is darkness and not light" (v. 18, 20); "He will cause the sun to go down at mid-day" (viii. 9)—obviously in the black thunder-clouds. If Israel is to prepare to meet its God, then God is absent, and the absence of Jahwe is shown by drought (iv. 7 ff.), for God is the withholders of rain as well as the giver. Amos tells them that when He whom they are expecting comes at last, it will be in the destructive tempest. Jahwe (says Amos), who has left you a prey to drought and mildew, is coming: "Prepare to meet thy God, O Israel; for lo, the Fashioner of the thunder and Creator of the wind, Who announceth His thought to man as at Sinai and Carmel, while darkening the dawn and making His way over the mountain tops in the storm-cloud—Jahwe, God of Hosts, is His name!"

In plain prose, no doubt, Jahwe's thunderbolts are the armies of Assyria, but the language employed is appropriate in the mouth of a Hebrew prophet of the 8th century B.C.,

¹ Compare also such Psalms as xviii. and xxix., each of which describes a Theophany under the image of a thunderstorm.

addressing his countrymen in a season of drought. So far from exhibiting the "rich theology" of which Dr. Cheyne speaks, I should think the imagery was already conventional in Amos's day.

The same considerations are to a great extent true of the expressions used in Amos v. 8. I do not think that the writer of that verse, in naming the "Seven Stars" and "Orion" (in Hebrew, *Kîmâ* and *Kësil*) was thinking of the beauties of nature, or of anything to do with mythological pre-historic Titans. The two names occur again together most significantly in Job xxxviii. 31: "Canst thou bind the sweet influences of *Pleiades*, or loose the bands of *Orion*?" That much-quoted verse occupies about the middle of a long passage (vv. 22-38), which fortunately does not require any extraordinary erudition to find out its general meaning. The question which God is asking of Job in so many varied forms, that practical question which it did not need Babylonian science to bring before men's thoughts, is: Can any one control the weather? Can any one make it rain? "Canst thou lift up thy voice to the clouds, that abundance of waters may cover thee?" There still seems to be a good deal of doubt as to which of our constellations are represented by *Kîmâ* and *Kësil*, but there can be very little doubt indeed that their influence was supposed to affect the rainfall.¹

As long as such passages as these from Amos or Job are supposed to have been prompted by mere scientific or mythological curiosity on the part of their writers, so long the tendency to reject them as late interpolations will

¹ What the "sweet influences" of *Kîmâ* practically meant may be gathered from *Berach. 58b, B. Mez. 106b*: "When the Holy One wished to bring the Flood upon the world, He took out two stars from *Kîmâ*, and the Deluge came through." Possibly *Kësil* was in the ascendant in the "Dog-days." The advent of Jahwe, before whom the clouds drop water and the hills dissolve in mist, caused the stars out of their regular courses to pour down the rain which flooded the Kishon and swept away the host of Sisera (*Judges v. 21*).

remain. No doubt the Exile added greatly to the scientific lore of the Hebrews. At the same time there is no nation, however limited its outlook, which is not vitally interested in the weather, and interest in the weather means to those who live out of doors a working knowledge of the sky. The mere naming, therefore, of stars or constellations in a Hebrew work is scarcely a proof of post-exilic date, especially if the stars named are those which were held to be connected with the wet and dry seasons. I am not here concerned to defend the loose syntax of Amos v. 8 (which I suppose is best taken as a long *nominativus pendens* resumed at י'דעתי' in v. 12), but I do suggest that the language used is not inappropriate to Amos and his times.

F. C. BURKITT.

JÜLICHER ON THE NATURE AND PURPOSE OF THE PARABLES.

JÜLICHER proceeds to draw out further the difference between simile and metaphor in a series of suggestive antitheses. Metaphor admits of interpretation; in simile, interpretation is wholly out of the question, as every word is to be taken literally. Simile is instructive; metaphor, interesting. Simile, the reader takes as it is given him; metaphor, he makes something for himself. Simile makes the understanding of the subject easier; metaphor, we might almost say, more difficult, or at any rate presupposes some understanding on the part of the reader. Simile explains; metaphor hints. Simile, increases the light; metaphor diminishes it. Simile, reveals; metaphor encourages the reader to learn for himself. Simile descends to the level of his understanding; metaphor raises him up to its own. A good simile admits of no further question; a good metaphor is intended to call forth the question, τί ἐστὶ τοῦτο;