

stones. So he buried the books, but in the morning found them transformed into twelve precious stones, with the names of the twelve tribes of Israel engraved thereon, and later they were used in Solomon's Temple. Then, with the help of the angel Gabriel, he smote the Amorites with blindness and destroyed them with his sword.

These legends may be regarded as reflecting the prevalent belief of the Jewish people in Amorite witchcraft. But the ancient midrashic and apocryphal narratives of battles fought by the sons of Jacob with the Amorites seem likewise to rest upon the actual warfare which took place between the Jews and the surrounding nations during the second Temple. According to the Book of Jubilees, § xxxiv.; Testament of Patriarch Judah, 3-7; Midrash Wayis'u, in Jellinek, "B. H." iii. 1-5; "Chron. of Jerahmeel," ed. Gaster, §§ xxxvi., xxxvii., and Sefer ha-Yashar, xxxvii.-xl., the sons of Jacob fought with the sons of Esau, while the Amorites sided with the latter and were defeated. The battlefield described in the various sources being almost identical with the battle-place of the Maccabean heroes, it is much more likely that the story originated in the time of John Hyrcanus, when war was successfully waged against the Idumeans and other nations, than that it arose in the time of King Herod, as Gaster thinks ("Chronicle of Jerahmeel," preface and lxxxii.; compare BOOK OF JUBILEES and EDOM). K.

—**Critical View:** The monumental evidence is as follows: Egyptian inscriptions (see W. M. Müller, "Asien und Europa," p. 218) call the land east of Phenicia and north of Palestine "the land of the A-ma-ra." The Amar, or Amor, of the texts is chiefly the valley between the Lebanon and

In Monumental Inscription. Antilebanon mountains, the modern Beka'a. In the El-Amarna tablets (Winckler, Nos. 42, 44, 50), Aziru, the prince of the same region, is called "Prince of Amurru." The latter name does not seem to be much more comprehensive than in the Egyptian texts, and certainly does not apply to Palestine. Only in the later cuneiform texts the old expression Amurru (not to be read "Aharu") is used so vaguely that Phenicia and even neighboring countries are included (Delitzsch, "Paradies," p. 271). The Babylonian letter-group Im-martu, or Mar-tu for "West," hardly belongs here, but because of the similar sound in its earlier form it was written for Amurru in the Amarna tablets and still more frequently afterward in the extended signification of Amurru. At present it is not very easy to show the connection between the monumental Amorites and the Palestinian Amorites of the Bible. Winckler ("Gesch. Israels," i. 52) assumes that the Amorites, somewhere about the time of the El-Amarna tablets (after 1400 B.C.), descended into Palestine from their original northern habitations. He supports this by the fact that only those of the earlier Biblical traditions, which belong to the northern kingdom, contain the name Amorites; namely, the prophet Amos and those parts of the Pentateuch which the critics assign to E., the Elohist or Ephraimitic writer (followed by Deuteronomy). For this critical distinction in the use of the name see E. Meyer, in Stade's "Zeitschrift," i. 122. Budde, in "Richter und Samuel," xvii. ascribes Judges, i. 34, to the Judaic or Yahwistic writer, but see above on the probably indistinct and not very archaic use of the name in that passage. Wellhausen ("Die Composition des Hexateuchs," ii. 341) assumes that Amorites and Canaanites are synonymous expressions, only that the former is used of the Canaanites exterminated by Israel, the latter to distinguish

them from those living among the Israelites at the time of the kings. These conclusions are suggested by the circumstance that the territory of the Amorites as described above leaves very little room for the Canaanites in the territory occupied by Israel, and that both terms sometimes seem to be used interchangeably (compare Gen. xiv. 13 with Judges, i. 10; Num. xiv. 45 with Deut. i. 44 *et seq.*).

Thus Amorite would be the more ancient name, obscure even to the earliest writers. It is not certain that these writers were influenced by the etymology of the word. If Amorites were equivalent to "highlanders," we should have to compare the application of the name to the highland of Judah (Num. xiii. 29; Deut. i. 7, 19, 20; Josh. v. 1, x. 6, xi. 32) as a secondary use or as a mere inference from the etymology. At present, however, that etymology has been discarded, as *amir* means "summit," not "mountains" or "highland." The Egyptian inscriptions, indeed, seem to treat the name of the original country Amor as a geographical term, always connecting it with the article, while Amorite is in the Bible an ethnic name. How the Amorites, or at least their name, came to Palestine, still awaits plausible explanation.

Gen. x. 16 calls the Amorites a branch of the Canaanites. Amoritish names like Adoni-zedek (Josh. x. 3; compare verse 5) seem,

Race and Language. indeed, to point to full identity in language with those tribes. The question, why the Amorites, with the rest of the pre-Israelitic population of Palestine, are (Gen. x.) classed among the Hamites, can not be discussed here. Sayce ("Races of the Old Testament," pp. 100 *et seq.*) has tried to explain this by assuming a connection between the Amorites (and the Canaanites in general!) with the ancient Libyans, entirely on the basis of a certain similarity of the facial type in one Egyptian sculpture of Rameses III. The numerous other Egyptian pictures of these nations, however, do not confirm this, and a linguistic comparison of Canaanitish (see above on its identity with Amoritish) and Libyan is impossible. The remote relationship between all Hamites and the Proto-Semites in race and language does not belong here.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Sayce, *Races of the Old Testament*, 1891, pp. 100 *et seq.*

W. M. M.

AMOS.—Biblical Data: Jewish prophet of the eighth century B.C.; date of birth and death unknown. Among the minor prophets there is none whose personality is so familiar as that of Amos. His name occurs not only in the superscription of the book, but several times (vii. 8, 10 *et seq.*, 14; viii. 2) in the body of it. His home was in Tekoa in Judah, five miles to the south of Bethlehem. The original title of his book was merely "The Words of Amos of Tekoa"; the rest, "who was among the herdsmen," is a later addition emphasizing the fact gleaned from vii. 14, that Amos had been a herdsman before he became a prophet. From the margin this notice appears to have intruded itself into the text. The attempt has been made to discover a northern Tekoa for his home, but there is no need for that. That Amos was from Judah is the simplest interpretation of vii. 13. Amos himself tells us what his profession was: he was a

Home and Occupation. herdsman and one who tended sycamore-figs (vii. 14). At Tekoa sycamores are not grown, but Amos could very well have been the proprietor of a sycamore-grove at some distance from Tekoa, in the Shefelah, the hill country leading down to Philistia, where there were sycamore-

trees in "abundance" (I Kings, x. 27). He makes this statement of his occupation to Amaziah, the chief priest of Beth-el, who, startled by the ominous utterances of Amos, advises him to make his escape to Judah and there to earn his livelihood by his profession of prophet. Amos denies both premises involved in this rebuke. He does not need to take fees for his prophecies, because he is well-to-do, and he is no prophet either by profession or extraction, but was called by God from behind his flock by special summons. Amos' attitude marks a turning-point in the development of Old Testament prophecy. It is not mere chance that Hosea, Isaiah (ch. vi.), Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and almost all of the prophets who are more than unknown personages to whom a few prophetic speeches are ascribed, give first of all the story of their special calling. All of them thereby seek to protest against the suspicion that they are

First to Write down Prophecy. professional prophets, because the latter discredited themselves by flattering national vanities and ignoring the misdeeds of prominent men. But Amos marks an epoch in Old Testament prophecy also in another respect. He is the first of the prophets to write down the messages he has received. It is easy to understand the reason for this innovation. He feels himself called to preach in Beth-el, where there was a royal sanctuary (vii. 13), and there to announce the fall of the reigning dynasty and of the northern kingdom. But he is denounced by the head priest Amaziah to King Jeroboam II. (vii. 10 *et seq.*), and is advised to leave the kingdom (verses 12 *et seq.*). Though nothing more is learned than the answer he gave Amaziah (verses 14 *et seq.*), there is no reason to doubt that he was actually forced to leave the northern kingdom and to return to his native country. Being thus prevented from bringing his message to an end, and from reaching the ear of those to whom he was sent, he had recourse to writing. If they could not hear his messages, they could read them, and if his contemporaries refused to do so, following generations might still profit by them. No earlier instance of a literary prophet is known, nor is it likely that there was any; but the example he gave was followed by others in an almost unbroken succession. It is true, it can not be proved that Hosea knew the book of Amos, though there is no reason to doubt that he was acquainted with the latter's work and experiences. It is quite certain, on the other hand, that Isaiah knew his book, for he follows and even imitates him in his early speeches (compare Amos, v. 21-24, iv. 6 *et seq.*, v. 18 with Isa. i. 11-15; Amos, iv. 7 *et seq.* with Isa., etc., ix. 7 *et seq.*, ii. 12). Cheyne concludes with great probability that Amos wrote the record of his prophetic work at Jerusalem, after his expulsion from the northern kingdom, and that he committed it to a circle of faithful followers of YHWH residing there.

Amos is undoubtedly one of the grandest personalities among the Old Testament prophets; indeed, the most imposing of all, if the fact be considered that he is the first of the writing-prophets. His lofty conception of Deity, his uncompromisingly moral conception of the order of the universe, and his superiority to all religious narrowness, are admirable indeed. Leaving the above-mentioned "doxologies" aside, YHWH is in vii. 4, ix. 2 the Ruler of the universe, and in i., ii., and ix. 7 He is the Lord of all other nations as well as of Israel. The standard by which He measures peoples is morality, and morality only. It is by His inscrutable will that Israel was chosen among the peoples, but as a result it follows that God

is doubly strict in His demands upon this nation, and doubly severe in His punishment of its transgressions (iii. 2). Ritualistic zeal and the richest burnt-offerings avail nothing in extenuation; such acts are contemptuous in the sight of YHWH, who may be served without any religious ceremonies, but not without morality (iii. 21-25, iv. 4, 5, 13). Therefore let the nation not comfort itself with the hope of the "Day of YHWH," which will be a day of terror for Israel, and not of salvation (v. 18-20). It is all over with Israel; the complete destruction is at hand (see especially ii. 5, v. 1 *et seq.*, ix. 1-4). Distinct as are these fundamental principles of his discourses, Amos must by no means be considered as an uncompromising prophet of evil; it should not be forgotten that Israel's destruction is brought about by its sinfulness, and it is only because experience appears to show an unwillingness to repent, that the hope of forgiveness is cut off. Should this experience prove false and Israel actually repent, forgiveness and national life would be by no means hopeless; and therefore utterances like v. 4 and

Repentance and Forgiveness.

14, however inconspicuous they may be in comparison with the denunciatory passages, are by no means to be overlooked, and certainly not to be held as spurious. It is certain, however, that Amos did not shrink from facing the possibility of the utter destruction of Israel.

Amos has always been admired for the purity of his language, his beauty of diction, and his poetic art. In all these respects he is Isaiah's spiritual progenitor. There is no need for astonishment that a rustic should have been capable of such diction.

The period of the prophet's activity is the reign of Jeroboam II., king of Israel, whose dynasty he mentions in one of his prophecies (vii. 9), while the narrator of vii. 10, etc. (probably not identical with Amos), clearly states that Jeroboam was reigning at the time when Amos preached at Beth-el. The superscription of the book (i. 1) mentions Uzziah, king of Judah, before Jeroboam, which is doubtless correct, inasmuch as Uzziah was a contemporary of Jeroboam; but the statement is at the same time puzzling, since it is not known that Amos was ever active in Judah.

The superscription adds that he "saw" his words two years before the earthquake. Now Amos doubtless experienced an earthquake (iv. 11),

Superscription of the Book. and an earthquake under King Uzziah is testified to in Zech. xiv. 5; but unfortunately this passage does not help us much, seeing that it is of late origin,

and may itself be taken from Amos, iv. 11, or even from the heading of the book. On the other hand, the superscription may be based on the hints contained in the book itself, and indeed G. Hoffmann in Stade's "Zeitschrift," iii. 123, has tried to offer an explanation for the phrase "two years before the earthquake" which would deprive the words of every real significance. His explanation seems to be somewhat artificial, but has been accepted by such scholars as Cheyne and Marti. Still, since the heading undoubtedly contains reliable and authentic statements, the possibility that the reference to the earthquake is also authentic must be admitted. The question, however, remains whether all the prophecies united in the Book of Amos are to be understood as uttered in this same year. Their extent would not make this impossible, nor is it likely that Amos, rebuking the sins of Ephraim so openly, would have been tolerated many years before being denounced and expelled, as we read in vii. 10. In this case the earthquake in iv. 11 must be another than that mentioned

in i. 1, because it could not be referred to two years before it actually happened. Moreover, it is unlikely that Amos should not have added new prophecies to those spoken during his stay in the northern kingdom, when he once proceeded to write down his utterances (compare Jer. xxxvi. 32). If i. 1 be admitted as authentic, the most probable conclusion is that "two years before the earthquake" was originally the date for only a part of the book, perhaps for only the introductory speech in i. 2.

The reign of Jeroboam II. lasted forty-one years, according to II Kings, xiv. 23. Though it can not be fixed with certainty, this much may be said, that its termination must be placed between 750 and 740 B.C. Marti ("Ency. Bibl." article "Chronology," p. 797) fixes his reign between 782 and 743 B.C. The activity of Amos could hardly have coincided with the close of his reign. The fact alone that Isaiah's call can not have happened later than 740, while he so evidently draws on Amos' prophecies, is sufficient ground for placing Amos not later than 750.

The first indication that a distinction must be made between the prophecies of Amos and the book that bears his name is to be found in the

The Pres- narrative, vii. 10-17. This is inserted **ent Form of** after the third of five visions which **the Book.** form a connected series. The insertion in question is simply a comment on vii. 9, and contains the threat of the overthrow of Jeroboam and his house. It is mentioned in vii. 10 that Amos' boldness resulted in his expulsion from the northern kingdom. It is not likely that Amos himself would have interrupted his series of addresses in this way. Moreover, he is not the narrator; another writer speaks of him in the third person. Hence it is clear that his book has not come to us exactly as he wrote it. But, on the other hand, vii. 10 *et seq.* must have been written soon after the event by a writer who had thoroughly trustworthy accounts of Amos. This is a fact of great importance.

The book is well arranged in its general features. There is in chaps. i. and ii. a coherent series of judgments on sinful and unrepentant peoples, aimed particularly at Israel. In chaps. vii.-ix. are the above-mentioned five visions; in chaps. iii.-vi. a series of discourses, loosely connected, whose beginning and end can not be fixed with certainty. The same problem is presented in other prophetic books; the prophet himself would scarcely lay great stress on the separation of the single discourses when he wrote or dictated them. There is no reason to doubt that this arrangement goes back to the first editors, working soon after the prophet's death or even delegated by him for this task. This does not preclude the possibility of later changes and additions. Since the investigations of Stade and Wellhausen, such changes

have been assumed in increasing proportions. The most complete and discriminating survey of those passages **Editorial and Later** whose originality hitherto has been **Additions.** doubted is given by Cheyne ("Ency. Bibl." article "Amos"). They can be grouped under the following titles: (1) Passages widening the horizon of the book, so as to include the southern kingdom of Judah. (2) Additional predictions affirming a better future than the gloomy auguries of the old prophet. (3) Additions giving expression to the loftier and more spiritual theology of a later time. (4) Glosses and explanations based on an erroneous conception of the texts.

(1) The chief passage of the first group is ii. 4, etc., the denunciation of Judah in the series of judgments against the nations. The same judgment against Edom in i. 11 and 12 is perhaps also an addition, and

the same has been surmised of the passage about Tyre in i. 9. The isolated verse i. 2, in which Zion is spoken of as the fixed seat of YHWH, is also doubtful, and the same is true of the address to Zion in vi. 1, and the expression "like David" in vi. 5.

(2) The second group is represented by ix. 8-15, canceled by Stade, Wellhausen, Cornill, Nowack, Cheyne, and many others, as spurious. These verses do not form a single whole, but are composed of different passages. Verses 10, 11, 12, 13, and 14 seem to be mere fragments or insertions in the context. The last verse, which, by virtue of its inimitable originality, is unanimously ascribed to Amos, can not have formed the concluding verse of the book, but appears to have been the beginning of a new address. If the verses 8-15 are to be taken in their entirety as a later addition, the original continuation must either have been lost through the mutilation of the manuscript, or have intentionally been stricken out on account of the too mournful survey of the future. The latter suggestion is improbable, because verse 7 would have been rejected for the same reason, and because in other passages (see verses 1-4) the most terrible predictions have been retained. If, on the other hand, the conclusion had been lost in consequence of the mutilation and then supplied at hazard, a more uniform continuation would have been expected in place of such a rugged one, with its disjointed and disconnected sentences. The possibility remains that verses 8-15 are a repeated elaboration of the original conclusion. It is erroneous to consider verse 11, concerning the restoration of the fallen tabernacle of David, as a specifically Judaic prediction; it can only assume this character through the addition of verse 12, which regards the subjection of the vassals of Judah as an essential feature of such reestablishment. The verse refers to the reestablishment of the united kingdom of Israel, founded by David and sundered after the death of Solomon. Verses 8, 9, 11, 14, and 15 may possibly contain an original prediction directed, like vii. 9, against the house of Jeroboam, and promising for the future the restoration of a united Israel, as pleasing to Jehovah. Of course, conclusive proof of this theory can no longer be secured, nor can the original text of such prediction be restored with reasonable certainty.

(3) The third group of additions are the doxologies iv. 13, v. 8, ix. 56, which invoke YHWH as the Creator and Ruler of the world. While it is not impossible that they may have been written by Amos, the style of these additions indicates a much later period, possibly later than Deutero-Isaiah. Since all three passages interrupt the context, and iv. 12 and v. 7 have inherent difficulties of their own, it may be suggested that the interpolator designed these doxologies to fill up gaps or illegible sentences in the manuscripts.

(4) To the fourth group, iii. 14 and viii. 11, and 12 may be assigned. Other passages are open to discussion, particularly the enigmatical verse v. 26 (Wellhausen, Nowack, Cheyne), the difficulty of which is hardly solved by the suggestion of its being simply a marginal gloss. Finally, there are many individual words of the text of this book which present numerous difficulties.

Concerning the problem which the severe logical attitude of Amos presents in the history of religion, compare especially F. Giesebrecht, "Die Geschichtlichkeit des Sinaibundes," p. 14; also K. Budde, "American Lectures on the History of Religions," vol. iv. lecture iv. To ascribe the whole book to another age, the pre-Deuteronomic period of Josiah (638-621), on account of this and similar difficulties,

as H. J. Elhorst, "De Profetie van Amos" (Leyden, 1900), proposes, is entirely unwarranted and impossible. See the criticism of P. Volz in Schürer's "Theol. Literatur-zeitung," May 12, 1900.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: See, besides the monographs and articles already referred to, the commentaries of Orelli, Hitzig, Steiner, Keil, Reuss. Nowack, *Handcommentar zum A. T.*, 1892, et seq.; Wellhausen, *Die Kleinen Propheten*, 1892; J. J. P. Valetan, *Amos en Hosea*, 1894; Smith, *The Book of the Twelve Prophets*, 1896; idem, *The Expositor's Bible*; Driver, *Joel and Amos*, in *Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges*, 1897; Heilprin, *Historical Poetry of the Ancient Hebrews*, 1883, ii.

K. B.

—**In Rabbinical Literature:** According to the rabbis (Lev. R. x., Eccl. R. i. 1) Amos was nicknamed "the stutterm" by a popular etymology. The people, on hearing his bitter rebukes, retorted: "Has the Lord cast aside all His creatures to let His spirit dwell only on this stutterm?"

Regarding the teachings of Amos, the following utterance of Simlai, an amora of the beginning of the third century, is noteworthy:

Six hundred and thirteen commandments were given to Moses; King David reduced them to eleven (Ps. xv.); Isaiah to six (Isa. xxxiii. 15); Micah to three (Micah vi. 8); Isaiah, a second time, to two (Isa. lvi. 1); but Amos to one: "Seek Me and Live!" (Mak. 24a). According to rabbinical tradition (Suk. 52b, Pirke R. ba-Kadosh, viii., based on Micah v. 5 [4]), Amos is one of the "eight princes among men" alluded to in Micah, v. 5.

K.

According to rabbinical tradition, Amos was killed by King Uzziah, who struck him on the forehead with a glowing iron (Gedaliah ibn Yahyah in his "Shal-shalet ha-Kabbalah," quoted by Heilprin in "Seder ha-Dorot," i. 3110, Venetian ed. of 1587, does not mention anything of this).

The story of the martyrdom of Amos, found in the pseudo-Epiphanean writings ("Vita Prophetarum"), is somewhat different; according to this version, Amos was killed by a blow on the temple struck by Amaziah, priest of Beth-el.

L. G.

AMOS, BOOK OF: This Biblical book, one of the twelve so-called "Minor Prophets," opens with the announcement of God's intention to punish evil-doers (i. 2). Damascus (i. 3-5), Gaza (i. 6-9), Tyre (i. 9, 10), Edom (i. 11, 12), Ammon (i. 13-15), Moab (ii. 1-3), and Judah are taken up in turn until Israel (ii. 6) is reached. The prophet is vehement because the crimes of the people have been committed in the face of the fact that God redeemed His people from Egypt (ii. 10), destroyed the Amorites (ii. 9), and sent prophets (ii. 11) whom, however, Israel would not allow to prophesy (ii. 12). In the third and fourth chapters the prophet addresses himself directly to the kingdom of Israel. The nations are summoned to the mountains of Samaria to witness the wrongs there practised (iii. 9). The punishment that is impending will be so severe that only few will escape (iii. 12). Because of the women of Samaria, who were cruel to the poor and the needy (iv. 1), prosperity will cease (iv. 2), and not even sacrifice will avail (iv. 4, 5). God had tried to teach Israel by affliction; but neither famine, drought, blasting of the crops, attacks of insects, pestilence, defeat in war (iv. 6-10), nor even treatment like that of Sodom could induce Israel to repent. Complete destruction, therefore, is foretold (v. 1-3).

In vain does the prophet admonish Israel to seek the Lord, not Beth-el (v. 4-6). Samaria persists in being wicked and unjust (v. 7, 8). Once more the prophet calls upon Israel to repent (v. 14); and, as before, Israel fails to do so. Besides injustice and irreligion, Israel indulges in luxurious and riotous living

(vi. 1-6). This, too, is a factor which inevitably leads to captivity (vi. 7).

With chap. vii. begins a series of visions, which continues to chap. ix. 6. A plague of grasshoppers (vii. 1-3) and a fire (vii. 4-6) are followed by a third plague; and the plumb-line is set up against the city and against the family of Jeroboam (vii. 7-9). The prophet's audacity brings upon him the hostility of the reigning house; and he is ordered to confine his prophetic activity to the land of his birth, Judah. Amos disclaims being a prophet, or the son of a prophet, and reiterates the certainty of coming misfortune (vii. 10-17). The last vision, representing God Himself standing at the altar and announcing the terrible catastrophe (ix. 1-6), emphasizes the hopelessness of escape from divine vengeance. The book ends (ix. 7-15) in words of comfort. The remnant shall return and in the future the land will yield abundantly (13-15). For critical view of the Book of Amos, see AMOS.

G. B. L.

AMOS: Father of the prophet Isaiah. See ISAAH.

AMRAM: One of the sons of Bani mentioned in Ezra x. 34, in the list of those having foreign wives (I Esd. ix. 34; Omerus; R. V., Ismarus). In the Authorized Version, "Amram" is given also in I Chron. i. 41 as the name of one of the sons of Dishon. The Revised Version, however, renders this "Hamran," which is more in accordance with the original. In this connection see HEMDAN.

J. D. P.

AMRAM, FATHER OF MOSES.—**Biblical Data:** A son of Kohath, and grandson of Levi. He married his own aunt, Jochebed, Kohath's sister, by whom he became the father of Moses, Aaron, and Miriam (Ex. vi. 18-20; Num. iii. 19, xxvi. 58; I Chron. vi. 2, 3, 18). From him were descended the Amramites, a Kohathite branch of the tribe of Levi. This family is mentioned in the record of the Mosaic census (Num. iii. 27) and in I Chron. xxvi. 23, where is given the account of the organization of the Levites in David's time (see MOSES).

J. D. P.

—**In Rabbinical Literature:** When Jochebed, daughter of Levi—born on the day when Jacob entered Egypt with his family (B. B. 120a, 123b; Gen. R. cxiv.)—was over one hundred and twenty years old, Amram, her nephew—born on the same day as she, according to the Testament of the Patriarchs (Levi, xii.)—married her (Ex. R. i.); and she bore him a daughter called Miriam (*mar*=bitterness) because of the embitterment of life which had then begun for the Jews, and a son named Aaron (derived from *harah*, to conceive) because every expectant mother feared for her child. But when Pharaoh issued the edict that every male child was to be cast into the river, Amram separated himself from his wife, saying, "Why should we beget sons that are to be killed?" His example as head of the Jewish high-court was followed by the others. Then his daughter Miriam reproached him, saying to him: "Thy cruelty exceeds even that of Pharaoh!" Whereupon Amram celebrated for a second time his wedding with his wife, who, though one hundred and thirty years old, had under the nuptial canopy become like a young maiden. Aaron and Miriam danced before her, while angels sang, "A joyous mother of children"—Psalm cxlii. 9 (Sotah, 12a). Amram's example had a good effect upon all, but upon Miriam came the spirit of prophecy, and she said: "My mother will give birth to one who will redeem Israel from bondage!" And when, at the birth of Moses, the house was filled with light as on the first day of Creation when God spoke, "Behold, it is good!" (Gen. i. 4, Ex. ii. 2), Amram exclaimed: "My daughter, thy prophecy is being