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The Rechabites in the Bible and in Jewish Tradition to the Time of Rabbi David Kimhi

The first part of the thesis examines the biblical traditions about the Rechabites. After an opening chapter surveying Twentieth Century scholarly attitudes to the Rechabites, the relevant biblical texts, 1 Chronicles 2:55, 4:12, Nehemiah 3:14, 2 Samuel 4, 2 Kings 10:15f, 23 and Jeremiah 35, are examined in chapters two and three. It is concluded that only 2 Kings 10:15f and Jeremiah 35 really refer to the Rechabites, and that they depict them as a group of prophets who were closely linked with the movement represented by Elijah, Elisha and the Sons of the Prophets of 1 Kings 17 - 2 Kings 13. This conclusion is strengthened by a consideration of a number of relevant themes in chapter four, where it is shown that there are no Ancient Near Eastern parallels to the Rechabites, that the title 'Rechabite' derives from the ancient conception of the God of Israel as the divine charioteer, that the Rechabites were an Introversionist sect who originated in a schism in the prophetic circles following Elijah's death, that they lived on alms and on gifts made for prophetic services rendered, that their attitude to the cult was ambivalent, and that the only point of contact which they had with the Nazirites was the avoidance of intoxicants, which stemmed from a common belief that Yahweh's sacred servants should be abstinent.

The second part of the study shows that the biblical traditions concerning the Rechabites did not influence the Qumran community, but were popular in other Jewish writings. All the rabbinic
references until the time of Kimhi are examined, and the various ways in which the traditions were used are highlighted. It is also shown that the current approach to the Pseudepigraphon, The History of the Rechabites, is seriously flawed, and a new theory concerning its origin is proposed.

The thesis concludes with some suggestions for future research and for contemporary applications of the traditions concerning the Rechabites.
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PREFACE

Although the world of biblical studies is a very active one, there are nevertheless subjects which still have not received the full-scale investigation they deserve. The present thesis, the culmination of six years' under- and post-graduate study in the Department of Theology of the University of Durham, is an attempt to rectify this lack in the case of just one of those subjects, the Rechabites, with the hope that it will stimulate further interest and renewed research into both the biblical and the Jewish material dealing with this unique Old Testament group.

Where the source of a translation of a biblical or other text in the thesis is not given, the translation is my own. In the case of the rabbinic and patristic texts, these translations should be regarded as provisional, and not as definitive renderings of previously untranslated texts. Where the verse numbers in the Hebrew and English biblical texts differ, the former have been followed. Where a quotation from an English Bible translation (usually RSV) appears, I have substituted 'Yahweh' for 'LORD', in accordance with modern scholarly conventions. Where Semitic languages have been transliterated, the conventional method has been followed, except that _ has been used for Aleph, and ^ for Ayin. Where reference is made in the notes to another part of the thesis, underlined page numbers denote Volume II. All other references are to Volume I.

While a doctoral thesis, by its very nature, must be an individual piece of work, it is nonetheless true that no thesis is ever completed without considerable assistance from others. The present thesis is no exception, and I wish to thank the following for their help in its preparation: the British Academy, who funded the whole project; Dr Robert Hayward, who supervised the thesis with care and cheerfulness; Professor John Sawyer, of the University of Newcastle-upon-Tyne, Professor John Rogerson, of the University of Sheffield,
and Dr Douglas Davies, of the University of Nottingham, all of whom generously read and commented on portions of my work; the staff of the Durham University Library Oriental Section and Inter-Library Loans Desk, who tracked down numerous rare books that would otherwise have been inaccessible; the congregation of the parish of Cassop-cum-Quarrington with Bowburn, Co. Durham, among whom I was privileged to live and worship while this thesis was in preparation; and, above all, Cass, my wife, who not only helped with the typing and corrected many stylistic errors, but also stopped me from taking myself and my work too seriously, and made this thesis much better as a result.

All these people have played a part in the formation of this study. The views expressed in the following pages, however, remain entirely my own responsibility.

Chris Knights
Lincoln, 1988
PART ONE:

THE RECHABITES IN THE BIBLE
CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION - THE RECHABITES IN MODERN SCHOLARSHIP

The Rechabites are an often-cited, but seldom studied, Old Testament group. Most general Old Testament works - Introductions, Histories or Theologies - contain at least one reference to them and, of course, the commentaries on those biblical books in which they appear, or are thought to appear - 2 Kings, Jeremiah, Nehemiah and 1 Chronicles - contain some discussion about them, but studies on them in their own right are singularly lacking. In 1961, Roland de Vaux was only able to cite two articles on them, other than those in dictionaries, and in 1964 Paul Riemann wrote, "It is significant that so few studies of the Rechabites have been published since the turn of the century." There have been a few articles dealing with the Rechabites published since 1964 and, in addition, while de Vaux is more or less correct with his bibliography of the pre-1961 material written specifically on the Rechabites, it should also be noted that much was written on them under the auspices of the so-called 'Nomadic Ideal' theory. However, to date no full-scale systematic study of the Rechabites, as a subject in their own right, has been undertaken. Yet such a study is plainly required: the Rechabites are often cited in support of a particular theory of Ancient Israelite religion, but invariably with the unspoken assumptions that who they were and what they represented are self-evident. In addition, some of the more specialized studies of the Rechabites have either failed to use some of the scant data about them, or else have utilized other available data uncritically, thus yielding a distorted picture. The present thesis seeks to offer such a full-scale systematic
study, in the hope that it will lead to a more careful evalua-
tion of the Rechabites in future general works on the Old Testament, and that it will stimulate further research on them as a subject in their own right.

As there have been so few significant studies dealing with the Rechabites since 1895, it is possible to provide a relatively full survey and critique of those studies, prefaced by some indication of scholarly positions held prior to that date, which has been chosen as the dividing point because it is the date of the publication of Karl Budde's highly influential article, 'The Nomadic Ideal in the Old Testament' \(^5\), which may legitimately be seen as the ultimate source of such modern scholarly interest in the Rechabites as exists. It should be stressed, however, that this is a study on the Rechabites, and not on the 'Nomadic Ideal' theory, which has already been ade-
quately investigated by Riemann and Talmon \(^6\), even though, inevitably, this survey of scholarship on the Rechabites will, to a certain extent, go over the same ground as that covered by these two scholars, albeit from a different standpoint.

It is not here intended to cite all the references to the Rechabites to be found in every Twentieth Century Old Testament Introduction, History, Theology or other general work. Besides being widespread and brief, these references invariably present no opinion not found elsewhere in the more specific literature. For the same reason, it is not necessary to list the opinions of every Twentieth Century commentator on the biblical books containing material pertaining to the Rechab-
ites. Rather, the aim is to offer here a reasonably full survey of all that more specific literature, with no more than a brief mention of more general works.

At first sight, it may seem a little odd to begin an examination of the secondary literature on the Rechabites prior to Budde's article with the relevant section in John Calvin's Commentaries on the Book of the Prophet Jeremiah and the Lamentations, first published in 1565. Calvin, however, still commands respect amongst biblical scholars, and he stands as the first person, outside of the rabbinic traditions, to have written anything of any length on the Rechabites which has survived - St Jerome had only reached chapter 32 in his commentary on Jeremiah when he died. In addition, Calvin's exegesis of Jeremiah 35 - the chapter that deals with the Rechabites - is considerably longer than that offered by any other scholar, so the inclusion of Calvin in this survey is completely justifiable.

Calvin's work does need to be used with care, however, for he accepts the reading of the Massoretic Text unquestioningly. Thus, in his commentary on Jer. 35, at least, there is no reference to any of the textual variants contained in the LXX or elsewhere, whereas modern Jeremianic scholarship has shown that the LXX of the Book of Jeremiah needs to be carefully considered in any exegesis of that Book. There are also distinct polemical and apologetic currents in Calvin's writings - polemic against the Roman Catholicism of his own day, apologetic for 'Calvinist' theology and practice. Thus, Calvin regards the laws which Jonadab ben Rechab promulgated as being purely civil
and social and not religious, which seems to reveal more about the rigid Calvinist division between 'Church' and 'State' than about thought categories in Ancient Israel, where the 'sacred' and the 'secular' were not sharply distinguished.

Bearing these presuppositions in mind, an outline of Calvin's understanding of the Rechabites, as reflected by his commentary on Jer. 35, can now be given.

He opens his exegesis of the chapter with a statement of his understanding of the formation of the prophetic literature:

The prophets, after having been preaching, reduced to a summary what they had spoken; a copy of this was usually affixed to the doors of the Temple; that anyone desirous of knowing celestial doctrine might read the copy, and it was afterwards laid up in the archive, and later gathered into the canonical books as we now have them. While Calvin's statement is too sweeping in some respects, it nevertheless comes very close to what seems to be the correct understanding of the formation of Jer. 35, *i.e.* as a tract written by Jeremiah himself, for wider circulation, recounting an actual act and speech of the prophet. In seeing the prophets as tractarians, Calvin has been followed, in more recent times, by both Max Weber and Bernhard Lang.

Calvin next correctly perceives the purpose of Jeremiah's act as "a visible sign to shame the people". Although he does not use the word 'Kenite' at all, nor mention 1 Chronicles
2:55, the verse which is thought by many to connect the Rechabites with the Kenites, it is plain that he does regard the two groups as connected. The Rechabites "derived their origin from Obad and from Jethro the father-in-law of Moses", and this is proved, for Calvin, by the command that the Rechabites live as sojourners (Jer. 35:7), which Calvin thus regards as a statement of the non-Israelite origin of the Rechabites.

Calvin seems to believe that that the Rechabites had two occupations, tending sheep and building houses. These two trades seem to stand somewhat at variance with each other and, in any case, it is forced to take Jer. 35 as indicating that the Rechabites were permitted to build, but not to live in, houses. A comprehensive ban on both house-building and house-dwelling seems to be implied by the biblical text. It is possible that Calvin, again without acknowledging it, has derived his idea from Nehemiah 3:14, where Malchijah ben Rechab participates in the rebuilding of the walls of Jerusalem.

The reasons why Jonadab imposed his regulations upon his followers were, according to Calvin, because he dreaded the punishment that the Jews and Israelites would receive for despising the Law, and because he saw in the agricultural lifestyle the source of vice. By practicing such austerity, the Rechabites became detached from possessions and were easily able to move about, and thus able to endure any adversity - in particular, Calvin links Jer. 35:11 to the fall of the Northern Kingdom, and not to any invasion of Judah, despite the fact that 2 Kings 17:1-6 expressly states that Samaria fell
to Shalmaneser king of Assyria, not to Nebuchadrezzar king of Babylon, named in Jer. 35:10.

Calvin presents the contrast between the Rechabites and the Judaeans in clear, simple terms: the Rechabites obeyed a hard mortal command, the Judaeans disobeyed an easy divine command; Jonadab's precept had retained its force for nearly 300 years, while the Law of God had been continually proclaimed—without effect; Jonadab was rigid and austere, while God acted equitably and did not press too much on the Jews. 23

When he comes to deal with the Promise to the Rechabites, Jer. 35:18f, Calvin notes the discussion of Exod. 20:12 in Eph. 6:2, in order to demonstrate that there is no need to be surprised to learn that God gives rewards for obedience to the Law—the Rechabites had obeyed the fifth commandment, so they were promised long life. 24 The phrase יָתָרָא יִתְנָשֵׁד, "standing before me", Jer. 35:19, is regarded by Calvin as simply intimating that some of Jonadab's offspring would always be living and that obedience would not appear to be without its just reward. 25

While there is much of value in Calvin's commentary on Jeremiah 35, it is debatable whether he is right to ascribe such a rigid distinction between 'religious' and 'civil/social' matters in pre-exilic Israel and, even if he is, whether he is right to so firmly exclude the Rechabite discipline from the 'religious' sphere. His use of other parts of the Old Testament, in this case 1 Chron. 2:55 and Neh. 3:14, without acknowledging
their use is also open to criticism - in particular, Calvin's argument for the Kenite origin of the Rechabites is very weak indeed. He falls into the trap, like many after him, of assuming that a non-agricultural lifestyle, as practised by the Rechabites, is equivalent to a pastoral nomadic lifestyle, while the biblical text makes no such equation. His spelling out of the contrast between the Rechabites and the Judaeans under three headings is a very useful summary of the position, but his understanding of the Promise to the Rechabites seems to be mistaken: Jer. 35:7 suggests that the promise, "that you may live many days in the land wherein you are sojourners", is connected with the content of the commands, and not simply with the fact that they are parent's commands, the obedience of which - regardless of content - secures long life. In addition, it is questionable whether Calvin is correct to understand יַתְנָה יַכְשֶׁב in v.19 in the way that he does.26

The next scholar to be considered in this very brief survey of scholarship prior to Budde is Heinrich Ewald, whose massive Geschichte des Volkes Israel appeared in the period 1843-55. He regarded the Rechabites as desert-dwelling sectaries, drawing inspiration, and perhaps even descended, from the Nazirites and the Kenites - he thought that the Hammath mentioned in 1 Chron. 2:55 could have been Jonadab's grandfather. For him, 1 Chron. 2:55 also indicated that, like later monks, the Rechabites may have devoted their leisure time to learning.27 He also regarded them as forerunners of the Essenes.28 Ewald thus regarded 1 Chron. 2:55 as clearly illustrating that the Rechabites and the Kenites were linked, despite the fact that
neither Hammath nor Beth-Rechab are found elsewhere in the texts dealing with the Rechabites. He also seems to have read the traditions of the Essenes and the Christian Desert Fathers back into the Rechabites, which yields a distorted picture - there is, for instance, no evidence that the Rechabites ever lived in the desert.

Soon after the completion of Ewald's *Geschichte* in Germany, a major Bible dictionary appeared in the U.K., with an article on the Rechabites by E.H. Plumptre. He regarded 1 Chronicles 2:55 as being late and as referring to the locality occupied by the Rechabites after the return from the Exile, yet also seems to maintain the view that the Rechabites were Kenites, Yahwists and circumcised, but not bound to the Mosaic laws. He was of the opinion that 'Rechab' was a title that had become a proper name, probably pointing towards a conspicuous form of the wild Bedouin life ("the Rider"). He does mention, however, the view that 'Rechab' is in some sense linked with the title of Elijah and Elisha mentioned in 2 Kings 2:12, 13:14, "The Chariotry of Israel and its Riders". Jonadab ben Rechab, found in 2 Kings 10:15, 16, 23, imposed his rules upon the members of his clan as a reaction to the worship of Baal, with its attendant Phoenician luxury and licence, introduced by Ahab and Jezebel. The discipline was an ascetic one, a more rigid adherence than ever to the old Arab life. The customs of the Nabataeans, as recorded by Diodorus Siculus (XIX.94), form a good parallel to the Rechabites' discipline. Plumptre noticed that the Rechabites all had Yahwistic names, which indicated to him that they had maintained their ancient worship of
Yahweh. He regarded the בָּנָיִם in Jer. 35:19 as a liturgical formula, and then went on to accept the Targumic interpretation of the verse, ie. that the Rechabites became priests, as true. He cited Neh. 3:14, 1 Chron. 2:55, the heading to LXX Ps. 70 and the account by Hegesippus of the martyrdom of James the Just as historically accurate notices, indicating the continued existence of the clan.

Plumptre seems to be asking too much of 1 Chron. 2:55 by using it both as a late notice indicating the continued existence of the Rechabites after the Exile and as an indication of the ancient, Kenite origin of the clan. His idea that the Rechabites existed as a Kenite clan before the days of Jonadab, and were in some sense 'refounded' by Jonadab in the days of Jehu, is one that recurs, implicitly and explicitly, throughout the secondary literature dealing with the Rechabites, presumably as an attempt to reconcile the usual understanding of 1 Chron. 2:55 with the material contained in Jer. 35 and 2 Kings 10. Yet this creates an uneasy tension: were the practices of the Rechabites observed before the time of Jonadab? If so, why do the Rechabites in Jer. 35 honour Jonadab as their lawgiver? If not, how can his rules be seen as a more rigid adherence than ever to the old Arab life? There is a logical contradiction here, the maintenance of which in most studies of the Rechabites produced since 1863 has yielded numerous theses which rest on extremely tenuous bases. It will be shown in Chapter Two that there are good grounds for concluding that 1 Chron. 2:55 has nothing whatsoever to do with the Rechabites.
Plumptre also falls into the same trap as Ewald, in supposing, against all the evidence, that Jonadab's rules were an imposition of a strict Bedouin lifestyle - Bedouins were desert dwellers, the Rechabites were not! Plumptre is also wrong to accept the Targumic tradition about the Rechabites so unquestioningly. Chapter Five of this thesis will reveal that there is a rich diversity of Early Jewish traditions about the Rechabites - traditions which are anything but uniform. Some of them even explicitly deny that the Rechabites became priests! Thus, the Jewish traditions may not have any direct historical accuracy at all. At any rate, more care should have been exercised in claiming that a particular statement in a Jewish text is historically accurate.

It is commendable that Plumptre mentions the idea that the title 'Rechab' is somehow linked to Elijah and Elisha, but it is regrettable that he simply terms it, "ingenious enough to merit disinterment from the forgotten scholarship of the 16th Century". The suggestion was apparently made by one Boulduc, though Plumptre's claim that St Jerome's contemporary John of Jerusalem made a similar suggestion cannot now be substantiated. Chapters Three and Four of the present work will demonstrate that a good case can be made for regarding this interpretation, which, incidentally, St Jerome himself seems to have made in one of his letters to Paulinus, as the correct one.

It can be seen, from this sample of views prior to 1895, that the main features of Budde's ideas about the
Rechabites were already present in scholarship before him. Our group were generally viewed as pastoral nomads, desert lovers, connected in some way with the ancient clan of the Kenites, yet also 'refounded' by Jonadab as a reaction against the Tyrian Baal-cult.

Many, if not all, of these ideas were taken up and pushed even further by Budde, who published his article, 'The Nomadic Ideal in the Old Testament', twice - first in English, and soon afterwards in German. It was his belief that an idealisation of the nomadic life was clearly discernible in the Old Testament, beginning with Jonadab ben Rechab in 2 Kings 10, who was the founder of the Rechabites who appear in Jeremiah 35. Their lifestyle, "tent instead of house, cattle-breeding instead of agriculture, and, above all, the strict avoidance of wine", was a nomadic one, which would lead to Yahweh's blessing if practiced. Budde discovered the reason for the rejection of the settled life in 1 Chron. 2:55, which he called late, "but still entirely credible". The Rechabites were part of the nomadic clan of the Kenites. Hence, Jonadab had, "in fact, only bound his descendants to the primitive customs of their fathers".

Budde went on to trace what he believed to be instances of the 'Nomadic Ideal', albeit in a different form, elsewhere in the Old Testament, notably in the preaching of Hosea and Isaiah. As the purpose of the present survey is simply to show how Budde used the material on the Rechabites, and not to demonstrate how he understood the 'Nomadic Ideal',
a full summary of the second half of his article will not be offered here. 45

The same logical contradiction is found in Budde's understanding of the Rechabites as in Plumptre's. Two contradictory models are proposed for the 'Nomadic Ideal' of the Rechabites: it is the maintenance of the ancestral, Kenite, nomadic lifestyle; and it is a reaction against an excessive Baal-cult. Like Plumptre, Budde makes no attempt to reconcile these two models. Hence, his understanding of the Rechabites is weakened and, thus, by implication, his whole theory of the 'Nomadic Ideal' is seriously called into question.

Again in common with Plumptre, Budde is over-hasty in his claim that 1 Chron. 2:55 links the Kenites and the Rechabites. It is clear that this biblical verse has proved to be something of a lynch-pin in studies dealing with the Rechabites, yet too many scholars, Budde included, have baldly asserted that the verse does connect the Kenites with the Rechabites, without actually offering an exegesis of the verse, in order to justify such an assertion.

It is also by no means certain that the Rechabite discipline represented a nomadic lifestyle. Budde tacitly assumes that the fact that the Rechabites were non-agriculturalists indicates that they were pastoralists - an inference completely unwarranted from the biblical texts at our disposal. Like Ewald and Plumptre, Budde is also on very shaky ground
when he claims that the Rechabites were lovers of the steppe or the desert (in Hebrew, the same term, *יְבִיְרָה*, is used for each). The only geographical terms that appear in connection with the Rechabites are הָנָּרָה (Jer. 35:7) and רֹאשִׁי (35:10), both regularly used to denote the cultivated land - the complete opposite of יַסְּדָה! Part of the problem seems to lie in the fact that Budde nowhere actually offers his definition of 'nomadism' - we are left to infer how he understands it from his various remarks.

Budde's understanding of the Rechabites is thus seriously deficient. He may have been influenced by the 'décadence' prevalent in the late 19th Century Western World, as Keukens likes to think, but, in any case, his contradictions and exegetical assumptions render his position untenable. One of his opening statements is, however, praiseworthy. He argues that the narrator (or compiler) of 2 Kings 10 "did not need to tell his Jewish readers who Jonadab, the son of Rechab, was". Budde is surely right in saying that the very terseness of 2 Kings 10:15f implies reader knowledge of the characters therein depicted.

Despite Budde's theory about the Rechabites resting on very uncertain grounds, it has proved extremely popular in 20th Century scholarship, and was not seriously challenged until the 1960s. Even articles purporting to be about the Rechabites, such as Lucien Gautier's 'A propos des Récabites', turn out to have a very similar structure and theme to Budde's 'Nomadic Ideal in the Old Testament'. Gautier is evidently
more interested in religious conditions in pre-exilic Israel in general, rather than in the Rechabites per se - he uses them simply as an entry into his analysis of pre-exilic religious life. While there is nothing intrinsically wrong with this, it is surely erroneous to entitle an article 'A propos des Récabites' when the Rechabites only appear on just over half the pages of that article. The article really covers the same ground as Budde's, yet without showing any knowledge of that article.

Gautier offers little that is new in his understanding of the Rechabites. Jonadab was a fervent Yahwist who reacted against the Baal-cult by imposing Bedouin customs upon his followers, because he felt that agriculture led inevitably to the worship of the Baals, Yahweh being a desert war-god. In imposing such a discipline, Jonadab was seeking to return his followers to their past, to their origins among the Kenites, origins revealed by 1 Chron. 2:55.

For Gautier, it was crucial, for his understanding of the religious life of pre-exilic Israel, to see the Rechabites as fervent Yahwists who regarded their god as a desert deity yet, as has already been pointed out, there is no evidence that forces us to conclude that the Rechabites ever lived in the desert, let alone believed in a desert deity.

The same view of the Rechabites can be found in most works appearing in the period between 1895 and 1923, the date of John Flight's article, 'The Nomadic Idea and Ideal in the
Old Testament'. Biblical commentaries, such as those by Kittel, Streane, Cornill, Driver, Giesebrecht, Peake, Curtis and Madsen, Binns and Smith, general books and articles, such as those by Marti, Meyer, Burney, and Causse, and the articles on the Rechabites in the dictionaries and encyclopaedias, such as Hastings' Dictionary of the Bible, the Encyclopaedia Biblica, and the Jewish Encyclopaedia, all more or less followed the lines laid down by Budde, and saw the Rechabites as nomadic Kenites worshipping Yahweh, the god of the desert. Only Hugo Winckler seems to have presented any challenge to this dominant belief in the first quarter of the 20th Century. His views appeared in a book which sought to refute the developmentalist view of Israelite religion advanced by Marti in Die Religion des Alten Testaments, which had seen the Rechabites as a survival of an earlier, nomadic stage in Israel's history. Winckler propounded a diffusionist view of the origin of Israelite religion. More importantly for the present purposes, he argued that the Rechabites were a sect within Yahwism, and their way of life was not a survival of earlier nomadism, but a deliberate attempt to create an imagined ideal state of human life. Similar movements could be found elsewhere among modern Russian and American sects.

This view seems to have largely gone unnoticed, which is unfortunate because, as the present thesis will demonstrate, it in fact contains a fairly accurate interpretation of the Rechabites.
In any event, the 'Nomadic Ideal' theory seemed to become the dominant one in Old Testament studies, with the nomadic, desert-loving, Kenite Rechabites as its lynch-pin. The theory reached its fullest flowering in John Flight's 1923 article. Through nearly 70 pages, he sought to demonstrate that much of Israel's practices, customs and religious beliefs could only be explained as survivals from a nomadic period in Israel's history. His views on the Rechabites follow the by-now familiar pattern established nearly 30 years previously by Budde — they were pastoralists, but were fanatics who believed that Yahweh was the god of the desert only, and were Kenites. These views have already been discussed, and so require no further comment. What is worthy of note, however, is that at one point Flight presents a view of the nomadic life that actually reinforces the argument against seeing the Rechabites as nomads! On page 172, he writes:

The wheat and the barley for the making of bread by the nomads must either have been obtained by barter from settled peoples or caravan traders, or else raised in small quantities in fertile oases where it was possible for them to carry on slight cultivation while they halted between planting and harvest time.

Thus, nomadism, in Flight's view, was not completely non-agricultural yet, as Jer. 35:7 clearly reveals, the Rechabites were completely non-agricultural: they were forbidden to sow seed at all. This is an extremely strong indication that, regardless of the merits or demerits of the 'Nomadic Ideal' theory, the Rechabites simply cannot be viewed as nomads.
As the foregoing paragraphs have shown, the years immediately following Budde's 'Nomadic Ideal in the Old Testament' saw little challenge to the consensus view that the Rechabites were nomads who worshipped the desert god Yahweh and that they were Kenites, despite the fact that these views have been shown to have rested on very tenuous bases. The view that they were Kenites came seriously under fire for the first time in 1926, from Samuel Klein, in the first article which dealt with 1 Chron. 2:55 at any length and in any detail. Obviously, frequent reference will be made to this article when 1 Chronicles 2:55 is examined in Chapter Two, but some indication of Klein's general approach, including his understanding of the Rechabites, is in order at this point. He understands the verse to prove the existence of scribes in the pre-exilic period, and finds references to place names in South Judah in the three names, "Tirathites, Shimeathites, Sucathites". More importantly for the present purposes, he says, "Die allgemein akzeptierte Kombination von בָּנֶר מִשְׁמָתִים mit dem מִשְׁמְאֵר מִשְׁמַרְשְׁמָא(Jer. 35) ist nicht annehmbar". As he points out, the Rechabites elsewhere traced their descent from Jonadab ben Rechab, not from the Hammath called "father of Beth-Rechab" in 1 Chron. 2:55, and it is not said anywhere else that the Rechabites were Kenites, i.e. Hammath was not a Rechabite and the appellation בָּנֶר מִשְׁמָתִים must denote something else. Based on the use of בָּנֶר elsewhere in the genealogical chapters of Chronicles, Klein argues that Hammath was the founder or leader of a place called Beth-Rechab, which he equates with Beth-Marcaboth, which was probably near Beer-Sheba.
Klein is to be commended for his careful reading of 1 Chron. 2:55, and he is almost certainly right in concluding that Beth-Rechab in the verse does not refer to the Rechabites. If he is right, then there are a number of important consequences for the correct understanding of the Rechabites. There is no longer any evidence for them having been Kenites, nor any for them having existed prior to the time of Jonadab, nor any for the view that their discipline was some sort of conscious re-imposition of the clan's ancestral practices. While not all of Klein's opinions should be followed, his contribution to Rechabite studies is nevertheless highly significant indeed.

Unfortunately, Klein's views, like those of Winckler almost 20 years earlier, went virtually unnoticed. The biblical commentaries that appeared between 1926 and the outbreak of the Second World War all show themselves ignorant of Klein's article - Rothstein and Hühnel's commentary on Chronicles accepted that 1 Chron. 2:55 referred to the Rechabites, but was dubious as to whether it referred to the Kenites. The two major commentaries on Jeremiah that appeared - those of Volz and Nötscher - represent little more than a restatement of the usual position typified by Budde and Flight.

The period from the end of the War to the early 1960s saw a steady stream of general works relevant to our subject, and also two more specialized studies - one from Talmon and one from Seidensticker - but despite being so well-served in terms of quantity, nothing really new was offered in terms of ideas.
Most commentators still subscribed to the "traditional view of the Rechabites", although a growing body of opinion was coming to cast doubt on the connection between the Kenites and the Rechabites (while nevertheless maintaining that the Rechabites were nomadic), generally without any reference to the work of Klein.

Talmon's article was an attempt to reassert the link between the Kenites and the Rechabites, this time on the basis of comparative philology. He suggested that נָמוֹ in 1 Chron. 2:55 was not a proper name, but rather a construct noun meaning 'family-in-law'. While this shows commendable awareness of the fact that Hammath, as a proper name, is nowhere else connected with the Rechabites, it may wondered whether the evidence for the existence of such a noun in biblical Hebrew, as proposed by Talmon, is so flimsy as to render the idea improbable in the extreme. For further consideration of Talmon's views, see 2.1 passim.

In the portion of his article devoted to the Rechabites, Seidensticker accepts that the Rechabites' lifestyle was a nomadic one and, while he expresses some hesitation over the accuracy of the textual transmission of 1 Chron. 2:55, he nevertheless thinks that it is likely that the Rechabites were not Israelites. He further argues that there is nothing in the biblical texts concerning the Rechabites that forces us to interpret their nomadism as a reaction to Baalism. It was, rather, a conscious clinging to their thus-far maintained lifestyle, against the development of culture. He then crit-
icizes the view that sees the nomadism of the Rechabites as a binding to the desert-god Yahweh - the desert period of Israel's history does not appear ideal because it was nomadic and in the desert, but as it was the time when the relationship between Yahweh and the people was at its most pure (cf. Jer. 2:2). 86

Seidensticker's view is only tenable if the Rechabites can be shown to have existed as a 'nomadic' group prior to the time of Jonadab, i.e. if 1 Chron. 2:55 does link the Kenites and the Rechabites - an assumption which has already been questioned several times in the course of this chapter. He is also evidently of the opinion that it is possible to be a nomad without having any connection with the desert at all - a highly questionable assumption. Seidensticker has correctly perceived that there is no explicit connection between the Rechabites and the desert in the Bible, but nevertheless still wishes to call them 'nomads' - but surely nomadism and the desert are inextricably linked with each other? As was noted in the case of Budde, 87 there is a lack of terminological precision here - what exactly is meant by 'nomadism'?

Thus, by 1963, most scholars who had written anything about the Rechabites were still maintaining what has been called the "traditional view of the Rechabites", as expounded by Budde et al. They were seen as a Kenite clan, nomadic shepherds, and desert lovers, who were in some sense 'refounded' by Jonadab. There had been a few dissenting voices, notably Winckler and Klein, but they had gone largely unnoticed. The 'Nomadic Ideal' theory was also still maintaining its ground, and this served to reinforce the traditional view of the Rechab-
In 1964, however, Paul Riemann produced a devastating critique of the whole 'Nomadic Ideal' hypothesis, in his (unpublished) Ph.D. thesis, *Desert and Return to Desert in the Pre-Exilic Prophets*. He provides a useful summary of the 'Nomadic Ideal' literature, covering ground similar to, but not identical with, the present survey up to this point, but from a different standpoint. Concerning the Rechabites, he observes that,

the supposition of a Kenite ancestry for Jonadab ben Rechab - important to [Budde's] whole case - rests upon very slender support.

And dealing with their supposed love of the desert, he writes, how can one reconcile the Rechabites' doctrinaire henotheism with their abode in the land, and their conviction that they were keeping their vow in order to deserve long life in the land (Jer. 35:7)? If the desert god had no hegemony over the land, why did the Rechabites live there, and how could they imagine that this desert god could give them length of life there?

Riemann further correctly observes that we have no proof that the Rechabites were shepherds, and that we have no assurance that Budde was correct in associating [Jonadab's] oath with nomadism, since other interpretations are also possible.

He lists his reasons for caution: (1) The Rechabites are unlikely to have been herdsmen, as they fled to a fortified city in time of war, and not to the steppe; (2) There is no
evidence that teetotalism was a trait of nomadic society; (3) The purpose of the vow was to secure long life in the land. He is aware of the much quoted passage in Diodorus Siculus about the Nabataeans, but points out that the comparison is not an easy one, because of the difference in time, the somewhat dubious reliability of the Classical witnesses to the Nabataeans, the different purposes of the two rules, and the eagerness with which the Nabataeans adopted agriculture. Riemann himself suggests the following ways of viewing the Rechabites: as cultic personnel, even from the days of Jonadab - "an order, or even a family ... devoted to divine service in the Temple"; as teetotal as a reaction against the orgiastic rites of Canaan; as tent-dwellers through an interest in Holy War, or in the role of the tent shrine in the tribal league. At the conclusion of his study, one subject which he suggests requires further study and research is the Rechabites.

The questions and points which Riemann raises are very important, and his work is a significant contribution to the study of the Rechabites - even if the Rechabites were not his main area of research! The significance of his work lies not in his own, extremely tentative, suggestions about the Rechabites, but in his effective demolition of the "traditional view" of them. It is hoped that the present, full-scale, systematic study of the Rechabites will go some considerable way towards fulfilling Riemann's hope that further research would be done in this area. His arguments against the connection of the Rechabites with the Kenites or with the 'Nomadic Ideal' are cogent and convincing, and it is regrettable that his
thesis remains unpublished, and so has had only a limited impact on subsequent scholarship – as the rest of this survey will demonstrate.

In a paper published in 1966, with the title 'The Desert Motif in the Bible and in the Qumran Literature', Talmon made another offering relevant to this survey of the Rechabites in modern scholarship. He took a line very similar to that taken by Riemann, and challenged the notion that there was a desert ideal in the Old Testament, typified by the Rechabites. For him, the assumed existence in Biblical Society of a reform movement that advocated a return to the original nomad status ... is based upon historical premisses and on sociological comparisons which cannot be maintained without far-reaching qualifications.

Israel in the biblical period can never be described as a true nomad society, and there is no evidence that the Israelites ever went through a stage of true nomadism - even in Patriarchal times, Israelite society bore the imprint of the semi-settled life. The only other period that could have served as the matrix for the 'desert motif' was the period of the wandering in the Sinai peninsula, but in that period Israel is not presented in the organisational pattern of a typically nomadic society.

Talmon additionally observed that the desert life is not presented in the Bible as a social ideal - the representatives of the Bedouin in the OT are Ishmael and Esau, who are
hardly paradigms for the biblical writers. The Rechabites, he believed, cannot be adduced as evidence for a pre-supposed prophetic 'desert ideal'. Their non-agricultural mode of life was a reality, but not a motif, an occupation, but not a vocation. To support this statement, Talman cites 1 Chron. 4:38-41, 5:18-22 and 7:20-21, but whether this comparison is simply intended to show that the Rechabites were not the only non-agriculturalists in Israel, or whether it is meant to suggest that they were pastoralists (as in 1 Chron. 4:38-41) or warriors (as in 5:18-22 and 7:20f) is unclear. Talman goes on to accept that the Rechabites may have resisted the course of cultural development which affected all Israel but, he observes, we are nowhere told in the Bible of an effort to propagate their views with missionary zeal - Jeremiah commends their obedience, not their customs.  

Talman is correct to dissociate the Rechabites from the desert motif/nomadic ideal - there is no evidence to connect them with the desert or with nomadism - but he is not necessarily correct to call their lifestyle "an occupation not a vocation". If Talman is correct in arguing that the Rechabites resisted the course of cultural development, then they must be seen as having done so by observing their peculiar practices, which would then suggest that their lifestyle was a motif and a vocation. And if Talman is wrong in arguing this, there still remains the possibility that the Rechabites' lifestyle was a motif of something different and a vocation of a different sort. The subsequent chapters of this thesis will show that it is likely that the Rechabites did have such a different sort of
Almost contemporary with Talmon, another Israeli scholar published an article on the Rechabites. As Abramsky's, 'The House of the Rechabites - Genealogy and Social Character', is a long article, yet is not readily accessible to those who do not read modern Hebrew (the English summary hardly covers the whole of Abramsky's argument), a full summary of it is provided here.

One of Abramsky's opening assumptions is that the Rechabites were a clan, and he avowedly investigates them as a clan among the Kenites, Kenazzites and Calebites. He accepts that 1 Chron. 2:55 refers to both the Kenites and the Rechabites, but argues that the verse offers no evidence that the House of Rechab was ever identified with the Kenites. Rather, the two groups were associated with each other. Abramsky notes Klein's view that בֵּית לְבָנָה may refer to a dwelling place, thus becoming one of the few scholars who show any awareness of Klein's 1925 article, but thinks that it is equally possible that the whole 'house of the father', ie. the whole clan, was called בֵּית לְבָנָה, and cites the use of בֵּית לְבָנָה in 2 Kings 10:15 as a parallel. He notes the difficulties of 'Hammath', and that it is traditionally associated with Hammath in Naphtali, which would indicate that the Rechabites, just like the Kenites, wandered far from their original home in Judah - as far as Galilee, in fact. 1 Chron. 2:55 does not refer to all the Kenites, but only to that portion of them that was in close proximity to the Rechabites. The בֵּית לְבָנָה in the verse may be compared
with the use of הַמֵּאָבָה, which means 'numbered', in 1 Chron. 4:38. Thus, the reference is, according to Abramsky, to that portion of the Kenites that lived near, or else had kin-ties with, the family of Hammath the father of the clan Beth-Rechab.\(^{104}\)

For Abramsky, the closeness of the Kenites and the families of the scribes to Beth-Rechab in 1 Chron. 2:55 suggests that the dwelling place of the Rechabites was on Mount Judah, and not in the Negev. He expresses a preference for the reading of LXX\(^{BL}\) in 1 Chron. 4:12, which has "men of Rechab" for MT's "men of Recha". The men of Rechab were thus also in close proximity to the Kenazzites, who were also on Mount Judah.\(^{105}\) The date represented by these genealogical references is unclear. In them, Beth-Rechab does not yet have the character of a distinct tribe or sect, and the connections with the Kenites and the Kenazzites must date from the period of the early monarchy, or perhaps even earlier.

Accordingly, it is not impossible to think that, in the time of the United Kingdom, there was already a House of Rechab, a house of the father, with its presence upon the mountains of Judah.\(^{106}\)

In the second part of his article, Abramsky goes on to consider the evidence presented by 2 Kings 10 and Jeremiah 35. There was a change in the House of Rechab in the days of the Omrides - a change caused by Jonadab. Abramsky is of the
opinion that the rules in Jer. 35 were not the sum of Jonadab's commands, but were rather a representative sample. Jer. 35 commends the fidelity of the Rechabites, but not their customs. The prohibition on wine was the central feature of Rechabite discipline: wine is the outstanding mark of agriculture (cf. Gen. 9:20) and also of the sedentary life (cf. Ps. 107:35-38), as a vine takes more than a year to grow to maturity. The basic form of abstinence is the avoidance of wine (Am. 2:12, cf. Num. 6:2-5). Thus, by their prohibition on wine, the Rechabites were distanced not only from agriculture, but also from celebrations and social gatherings (cf. Ps. 104:16, Judg. 9:27, 21:20, Dan. 10:3) - as is fitting for a separated sect. Wine was also a regular part of the Cult. Thus, the separation of the Rechabites was a protest against all ideas of permanent dwellings, abundance, good and merriment. Thus, they stand at variance with the prophets of Israel, who stood very close to the Rechabites in the days of Elijah and Elisha, and who used wine as a symbol of peace. It is impossible to say what the attitude of the Rechabites towards the Cult was, but there are hints in the rabbinic literature that they participated in the Second Temple Cult.

The third section of the article deals with the economic occupations of the Rechabites. Abramsky is of the opinion that "dwelling in tents" (Jer. 35:7, 10) is a clue towards the correct understanding of the Rechabites' occupation. In the Bible, the 'tent' often denotes pasture and cattle, cf. Gen. 4:20-23, 25:29. Tent-dwelling is indicative of the life of the semi-nomad, not of the full nomadism of the hunter or the
The Rechabites thus dwelt alongside the settled zones as semi-nomadic pastoralists, perhaps engaging in barter. That they dwelt close to the settled zones is revealed by their appearance in Jerusalem, and also by 2 Kings 10. The Rechabites had no 'Nomadic Ideal' in the sense of dwelling in the wilderness.

In the days of Jeremiah, the Rechabites were obviously small in number, but the clan was doubtless larger in Jonadab's day. Jonadab was not only their father (בֵּן) in a genealogical sense, but also in the sense of 'teacher, counsellor' — and בֵּן is used in the same way of Elijah and Elisha also. This title could well have arisen in the time of the Omrides. The Rechabites were distinguished from the prophets in this period by their greater fanaticism and asceticism. Jonadab founded a new sect in the days of Jehu, which distanced itself, because of hatred for the Omrides, from everything in which there was any hint of the power of Baal. The precise nature of the relationship between the 'Sons of the Prophets' (בנֵי הָנְפִלִים) and Rechab is unclear, but it is to be noted that Jonadab is active alongside Jehu, whereas Elisha is not.

Abramsky notes that there are interesting parallels between Elijah and Jonadab: the language of zeal is associated with both; both are called 'my father'; and Elijah's title, נְכֹה יָשָׁם יִשְׂרָאֵל וְרָעִים, is very similar to Jonadab's נְכֹה יָשָׁם יִשְׂרָאֵל וְרָעִים. נכוה is a symbolic expression for divine leadership, dating from the days of Elijah, Elisha,
and Jonadab. Jonadab received a similar title because the name 'Rechab' was thus interpreted in his days. The Promise to the Rechabites in Jer. 35:19 contains the same formula as is used of Elijah and Elisha, namely 'to stand before Yahweh', meaning 'unique service'. 111

Abramsky also goes on to say that Jonadab was also influential as a lawgiver, and that the Rechabites' statement of obedience in Jer. 35:10 is covenantal. He regards Jer. 35 as having a deuteronomistic style, and thinks that the conclusion to Jer. 35:7 is a phrase from the Decalogue (Exod. 20:12, Deut. 5:16). As in Deuteronomy, obedience ensures preservation. 112

The Rechabites were not 'missionaries'. They withdrew to the fringes of society, and it cannot be told for certain whether they played a part in the life of the kingdom. The sect of the Rechabites was a unique phenomenon in the Near East in the biblical period. They may have been the descendents of the Nazirites. In their social abstinence and discipline, Abramsky sees the Rechabites as forerunners of the sects which arose in Israel in the Second Temple period. 113

The broad sweep of Abramsky's article is clear, but it is also evident that he seems to have cast his net so wide that he includes what are, in fact, contradictory opinions. Thus, he seems to accept the idea that Hammath in 1 Chron. 2:55 is to be linked with the place Hammath in
Naphtali, but he also speaks of the family of Hammath the father of Beth-Rechab, *ie.* he also views Hammath as a person! He regards the Rechabites as an ancient clan, but later says that they were a new sect founded in the days of Jehu. He sees 'Rechab' as the ancient clan name, but also as a prophetic title similar to the one held by Elijah and Elisha.

As has been shown, this use of the same piece of data in more than one way, and the collection of mutually contradictory opinions within the same article, have plagued Rechabite scholarship right from the days of Calvin. In the main, it arises from a belief that 1 Chron. 2:55, which contains material at variance with that contained in Jer. 35 and 2 Kings 10, nevertheless actually refers to the Rechabites. The legitimacy of this belief has already been questioned several times in the course of this chapter, and will be worked out in detail in Chapter Two.

Abramsky's use of the tent as an indicator of semi-nomadic pastoralism is also open to question. The term 'semi-nomadic' is singularly ill-defined, and is thus even less helpful than the term 'nomadic' (itself not very well defined!) and, in any case, Norman Gottwald has convincingly shown that the tent is not an unambiguous indicator of pastoralism. 114

'The House of the Rechabites - Genealogy and Social Character' does have its merits, however.
Abramsky's spelling out of the possible links between the Rechabites and the Sons of the Prophets is to be commended, as is his contention that abstinence from wine is not simply an indication of the avoidance of agriculture.

Abramsky also wrote the article, 'Rechabites', for the Encyclopaedia Judaica, which appeared in 1971, but expressed no opinions different from those expressed in his earlier, longer article.

The beginning of the 1970s saw the emergence of one of the more significant commentators on the Rechabites, Frank Frick, who has stated his views on them no fewer than three times: in his 1970 Ph.D. thesis (published in 1977) on the city in the Old Testament; in an article in JBL in 1971; and in the article on the Rechabites in the IDB Supplementary Volume, which appeared in 1976. He seems to have been one of the first people to have made significant use of Rie mann's arguments, and his views have won some support, notably from Gottwald (who has lamented the fact that Frick's views have largely gone unnoticed). In his thesis, Frick suggested that the Rechabites were motivated by the ideology of Holy War, and practiced their discipline for that reason. In his 1971 article, however, he took a somewhat different line, and contended that the Rechabites were, in fact, a group of itinerant metalworkers.

His arguments run as follows: 2 Kings 10:15f gives no indication that Jonadab ben Rechab was a represent-
ative of a 'Nomadic Ideal', or that he lived a nomadic existence. If he had played a significant role in Jehu's coup, he would doubtless have been rewarded with a place in Jehu's administration. The name 'Jonadab' consists of the Theophoric element and the root יָוֶּה. All other holders of names using this root in the monarchical period were members of the urban nobility, which suggests that Jonadab himself was a member of this class. The rest of his name, יִּיְוֹד, suggests to Frick that Jonadab was a member (יִּיְוֹד) of a trade guild. 118 The Ugaritic phrase הֶרֶסְמְרָבִּית means 'wainwright', which suggests that Jonadab was also a chariot-maker or driver. This contention is supported by Klein's claim that 'Rechab' denotes a place name, Beth-Marcaboth, probably one of the places where Solomon manufactured and stored his chariots. 119 The narrative of 2 Kings 10 suggests to Frick, on the basis of Josephus' account of the meeting between Jehu and Jonadab, found in אנט. IX.6.6., that the two men had had a former acquaintance with each other, in the royal chariotry. 120

He went on to suggest that the cultural traits of the Rechabites, narrated in Jer. 35:6f, could be interpreted as being those of a guild of craftsmen, specifically those of a guild of metalworkers involved in the manufacture of chariots - the nature of a smith's work would have prevented him from "establishing a permanent domicile or engaging in agriculture", 121 and the injunction to teetotalism could have been designed to guard against the divulgence of trade secrets under the influence of alcohol. (Frick is not actually being original here. This idea of the Rechabites as metalworkers goes back at least as far as Gray's commentary
Frick found support for his contention in 1 Chron. 2:55 and 4:12 (LXXBL) - he regarded the Rechabites as being linked with the Kenites, whom he viewed as smiths.

Frick is to be commended for his vigorous assertions against the assumptions

(1) that abstention from intoxicants is a distinctive trait of a nomadic society;
(2) that tent-dwelling necessarily involves nomadism; and (3) that the disdaining of agriculture is a sure sign of nomadism.

He may also be commended for his observation that there is no evidence for the Rechabites having been shepherds, but his approach is open to criticism on the following grounds: his assumption that 1 Chron. 2:55 and 4:12 have to do with the Rechabites; his opinion that must be connected with chariot-manufacture - it could just as easily be understood as having a connection with the chariot imagery found in connection with Elijah and Elisha (an area not even mentioned by Frick); his uncritical acceptance of Josephus' interpretation of 2 Kings 10; and his failure to integrate the conclusion of Jer. 35:7 ("that you may live many days in the land wherein you are sojourners") into his argument.

These and other points will be taken up at the relevant points in the succeeding chapters.

None of the three articles on the Rechabites which have appeared since Frick proposed that they were metalworkers have taken up his arguments, although they have been mention-
ed, or even followed, in some of the recent commentaries, while others have tended to keep to the traditional line, or to some variant of it.

The first of those three articles on the Rechabites to appear since Frick published his proposals was a study of the form of Jer. 35:18f by J.D. Levenson in 1976. He suggested that the closest analogue to Jer. 35:18f within the Book of Jeremiah itself is to be found in the promise to the Levitical priests in 33:17f, and then went on to claim that both derive from the language of covenant, more specifically from the language of the 'Covenant of Grant', identified by Moshe Weinfeld. Levenson cited 2 Sam. 7:14f and Ps. 89:31-38 as parallel instances of this type of covenant.

In such a covenant of grant, the outstanding fidelity of one generation against a background of epidemic faithlessness wins for the clan the gift of eternal survival.

Obviously, Levenson's purpose is simply to classify the material in Jer. 35:18f, so he stands a little outside the stream of interpretation of the Rechabites themselves. Thus, he only mentions three other commentators on the Rechabites. Levenson's contribution is, however, a significant step towards a clearer understanding of the Promise to the Rechabites — and hence towards a clearer understanding of the Rechabites themselves — and his arguments will be utilised when Jer. 35:18f is examined more fully in Chapter Three.
Two years after Levenson's article appeared, J.T. Cummings read a paper entitled 'The House of the Sons of the Prophets and the Tents of the Rechabites' to the 1978 Studia Biblica conference in Oxford. His starting point was the 'Floating Axehead' story in 2 Kings 6:1-7, which he suggested reflected counter-polemics against attitudes hostile to building permanent constructions, an attitude reflected both by Nathan's oracle to David in 2 Sam. 7:4-6 and by the Rechabites. He went on to suggest that there are other indications of a connection and rivalry between the Rechabites and Elisha: both Elijah and the Rechabites were itinerant; the title 'Father', used of Jonadab, is a prophetic one; the events of Jer. 35 occur within the chamber of a 'man of God' - another prophetic title; the Promise to the Rechabites is "both reminiscent of the oath formula of Elijah and Jeremiah's own designation of his prophetic role at his re-commissioning"; and the designation of Jonadab as צַעְרָמִי, 'Son of the Rider', may be compared with the designation of Elijah and Elisha as וְהֶבֶל מִשְׁפָּט, 137

Cummings further argued that Elisha originated, or at least sanctioned, an innovation among the prophetic guilds, which resulted in a split and rivalry - and 2 Kings 6:1-7 is a story legitimising that action. There are traces of this elsewhere in the text: 2 Kings 10 depicts Jonadab playing the part that 1 Kings 19:17 leads us to expect Elisha to play. Jonadab is thus pictured in the text as a counterpart to Elijah ... a rival.
to Elisha, a rival for the prophetic leadership left vacant by Elijah, a rival in his actions as a successor carrying on Elijah's struggle against the prophets of Baal, a rival possibly even in the appellation 'Son of Rechab'.

Of course, the idea of a connection between Elijah, Elisha and the Sons of the Prophets on the one hand, and Jonadab and the Rechabites on the other, is not new - it has already come up several times in the course of this survey of the Rechabites in modern scholarship, notably in the writings of Plumptre and Abramsky - but Cummings has presented it from a fresh angle, and in a particularly cogent way. This idea will be explored in greater depth in Chapters 2-4.

The most recent article to appear on the Rechabites is 'Die Rekabitischen Haussklaven in Jeremia 35', published by Kh.H.Keukens in 1983. As the title suggests, Keukens takes a novel line. His starting point is מַכֵּנָה מַכֵּנָה in Jer. 35:5 which, on the basis of מַכֵּנָה מַכֵּנָה in Eccles. 2:7 and מַכֵּנָה מַכֵּנָה in Gen. 15:2f, he interprets as denoting persons with a lower legal status, ie. house-slaves. He links מַכֵּנָה in Jer. 35:7 with מַכֵּנָה מַכֵּנָה, Job 19:15, which he understands as strangers in the land, who are of a lower legal status, but enjoying the protection of a household. From its use in Ps. 68:6, Job 29:16, Is. 22:21, he concludes that מַכֵּנָה in Jer. 35 is to be understood as a legal term.

He further argued that מַכֵּנָה, used in Jer. 35, denotes a command where the one who gives the command is not
bound by the terms of that command himself, cf. Gen. 2:16, 28:6, 2 Chron 19:9, where the command not only prohibits, but also allows something new. Keukens applies this to the Rechabites: Jonadab allows them the status of protected burghers. For Keukens, on the basis of Deut. 28:39, Am. 5:1, Mic. 6:15, a permanent prohibition on drinking wine must be seen as being secular, and not sacred, and denoting a lower social class: Jonadab's prohibition ensures that the Rechabites will not attain the status of free burghers. Home-building and agriculture would lead to economic prosperity, and hence to emancipatory movements among the lower classes, and so they are forbidden to the Rechabites. The Rechabites complied so willingly with these conditions, because in return for them they received the status of 'protected burghers', which compared with their former misery was absolute luxury.

Keukens thinks that the Rechabites were descended from the Rechab who appears in 2 Sam. 4 and, hence, that they came from one of the southern kingdoms ruled by Judah. He views Jonadab as a Yahwistic military leader, an officer in the Judaean army who was acting as a rearguard for the Judaean mission murdered by Jehu (2 Kings 10:12-14). Jonadab avoided a similar fate because of his former friendship with Jehu, and because he joined the revolt. The phrase תְּנֵיָּב in the Promise to the Rechabites (Jer. 35:19) indicates that the Rechabites were permitted to live in Yahweh's cultivated land as burghers with rights and duties, while the
other Kenite clans had to live מִשְׁפָּרֶה (Gen. 4:16).\textsuperscript{147}

Keukens is to be commended for his ingenuity, but not for his opinions: he is unaware of the text-critical problems of גֶּרֶם בֹּרֶהֶמָּה; his interpretation of רָאָה בָּרֶהֶמָּה in Job 19:15 is not universally accepted; he makes much of the use of רָאָה + על in Jer. 35, despite his admission that in Jeremiah רָאָה + על and רָאָה + על are interchangeable; he fails to notice the permanent, 'religious' Nazirate envisaged in the stories of Samson (cf. Judg. 13:3-5) and Samuel (1 Sam. 1:11 LXX), as well as in Am. 2:12f; and there is no evidence that רָאָה לְפַרְבִּיר ever denoted "living in Yahweh's land" - whether as burghers or otherwise - in biblical Hebrew. These criticisms will be spelt out in detail in the relevant sections of the exegetical notes and, in the first case, in the text- and form-critical notes, to Jeremiah 35 (Chapter Three) but, when listed as a whole, they make Keukens' whole argument untenable and, in fact, he calls his whole argument

nur ein Spiel mit der Übersetzungs möglichkeit "hausgeborener Sklave" für מְנָהַב, die auch in Jer. 35 anzuwenden ist.\textsuperscript{148}

It is clear that no consensus of opinion exists in current scholarship concerning the Rechabites. Despite the fact that Budde's 'Nomadic Ideal' hypothesis was effectively discredited more than twenty years ago by Riemann and Talmon, the view that the Rechabites were Kenite pastoral nomads who
worshipped the desert deity Yahweh is still advocated in some commentaries and general Old Testament works today. Among the specialist articles that have appeared in the 'post-Riemann' period, there is little unity on questions concerning the origins and the nature of the Rechabites - Abramsky's views contradict themselves; Frick believes that the Rechabites were metalworkers; Cummings that they were prophets; Keukens that they were Jonadab's house-slaves. This bewildering variety of views, views which seem to have little interest in entering into dialogue with each other, arises from the fact, noted at the beginning of this chapter, that as yet no full-scale study of the Rechabites, as a subject in their own right, has been undertaken, critically examining all the available data. The following three chapters of this thesis will offer such a study of the Rechabites in the Bible, beginning where all biblical scholarship should begin, with the texts themselves, which will be the subject of study in Chapters Two and Three. Chapter Four will then focus attention on some of the more general issues raised by the study of those biblical texts, so that a picture of 'The Rechabites in the Bible' may be drawn.
CHAPTER TWO: THE RECHABITES IN THE BIBLE OUTSIDE JEREMIAH 35

The biblical texts which mention, or have been thought to mention, the Rechabites, and thus which need to be studied in depth in the course of this study, are Jeremiah 35 passim, 1 Chronicles 2:55 and 4:12, Nehemiah 3:14, 2 Samuel 4:1-12 and 2 Kings 10:15f, 23. As Jeremiah 35 is longer than all the other references put together, and as it contains more information important for the study of the Rechabites than all the other references put together, consideration of it is reserved for a separate chapter. The purpose of the present chapter is to consider the remaining biblical references. The order in which these references are examined — 1 Chron. 2:55, 4:12, Neh. 3:14, 2 Sam. 4, 2 Kings 10 — is by no means arbitrary. Rather, it reflects the conclusion, to be established as each text is investigated in turn, that only the last — 2 Kings 10:15f, 23 — preserves material that actually does deal with the Rechabites, and that the others, although the name 'Rechab' appears in all of them, have nothing, in fact, to do with the Rechabites at all.

2.1: 1 CHRONICLES 2:55

As the previous chapter has shown, most scholars have taken it for granted that 1 Chronicles 2:55 links the Rechabites with the Kenites. Budde, and those who followed his line, used the verse to support their contention that the origins of the Rechabites in Israel were very ancient.
Abramsky used it to claim that the Rechabites and the Kenites lived in close proximity to each other, while Frick, Gray, and Gottwald have all used it as part of their argument that the Rechabites were itinerant metalworkers. None of these scholars, however, have offered a full exegesis of the verse, in order to demonstrate precisely how, in their estimation, it proves that the Rechabites and the Kenites were connected. Recent commentators on the Books of Chronicles, such as Rudolph, Myers and Wiliamson, view the verse as being very difficult, and express caution about arriving at a definitive conclusion as to the verse's meaning. A very few scholars, such as Klein, have concluded that 1 Chron. 2:55 contains no mention of the Rechabites at all.

Obviously, the verse is an important one for the correct understanding of our group, who are not connected with the Kenites elsewhere in the Hebrew Bible. If 1 Chron. 2:55 does mention the Rechabites, and if it does link them genealogically with the Kenites, then the arguments of both Budde and Frick gain in force. If, however, the verse does not mention the Rechabites, or link them with the Kenites, then a serious question mark appears over any view which seeks to interpret the Rechabites by means of data proper to the Kenites.

The following, in-depth analysis of the verse will first evaluate the Text and Versions of 1 Chronicles 2:55, before moving to a word-by-word commentary, in an attempt to
elucidate its true meaning.

The Text of 1 Chronicles 2:55, according to the various Versions, is as follows:

Massoretic Text:

There is a Kethiv/Qere variant in the verse, the Kethiv reading בֶּן, the Qere בֶּן.

Septuagint:

For מֶשֶׁחָה, read by Codex Vaticanus, Codex Alexandrinus reads εἷς αἵματος. For ῥηχαθ, B reads ῥηχα.

Vulgate:

Cognationes quoque scribarum habitantium in Jabez, canentes atque resonantes et in tabernaculis commorantes. Hi sunt Cinaei, qui venerunt de Calore patris domus Rechab.

Old Latin:

... Hi sunt qui venerunt de Calore domus patris Rechab.

Peshitta: Not extant.

Targum:
The families also of the scribes that dwelt at Jabez, the Tirathites, the Shimeathites, and the Sucathites. These are the Kenites who came from Hammath, the father of the House of Rechab.

Textually, none of the Versions, with the exception of the Old Latin, presents a different text from that represented by the MT. As Talmon has shown, the LXX readings reveal a Vorlage identical with the MT, i.e., מִשְׁמַרְמַר. The omission of the final ב on כַּפַּרְפַּר by LXXב is slightly odd, especially as it is Codex B (and Lucian) that reads כַּפַּרְפַּר in 4:12, where the other LXX manuscripts read כַּפַּרְפַּר. Note, however, that in 2 Samuel 4:2, 5, 6, 9, LXXב reads כַּפַּרְפַּר throughout, whereas B, after reading כַּפַּרְפַּר in v.2, then reads כַּפַּרְפַּר in vv.5, 6 and 9. This suggests that LXXב regarded כַּפַּרְפַּר and כַּפַּרְפַּר as interchangeable variants of the same name, and not as two different names.

The Vulgate reads a preposition 'in' before 'Jabez', but this is no indication that a preposition was present in Jerome's Hebrew text at this point: כָּבָש. (following the Qere) would most naturally be rendered into Latin by 'habitantium in Jabez'.

English Translation (RSV):

The families also of the scribes that dwelt at Jabez, the Tirathites, the Shimeathites, and the Sucathites. These are the Kenites who came from Hammath, the father of the House of Rechab.
The Old Latin omission of רָכַב and the inversion of אֱלֹהִים are also slightly curious, but not inexplicable. אֱלֹהִים has been lost by Homoioarcton, the translator's eye having jumped from the initial א of רָכַב to the initial א of אֱלֹהִים. The fact that both words end in א may have facilitated this process. The translator understood אֱלֹהִים as a geographical term, correctly (as will be shown below), but then felt that אֱלֹהִים (= 'Calore', cf. Ps. 19:7) was a place name, rather than a personal name, which made the following אֱלֹהִים somewhat ridiculous, so he inverted the אֱלֹהִים and the אֱלֹהִים to make the verse say that the father of Rechab, as well as the Tirathites, Shimeathites and Sucathites, came from Hammath.

The Targum is really a piece of Midrash, so ascertaining its precise underlying Hebrew text is impossible, but it seems probable that it was identical with the MT. The text of the Targum may be explained as follows: Hebrew יָבוּלְתָּם - Targum answers the question, 'which families?' Targum יָבוּלְתָּם derives from the assonantal בְּנוֹ at the end of the verse. יָבוּלְתָּם is found in the MT at 1 Chron. 23:17, 24:21 and 26:25, where he is the son of Eliezer, the son of Moses. Targum makes Jabez into a person, and gives him disciples, in accord with the rabbinic traditions about Jabez. For Othniel, see 4:13. A pun on בְּנוֹ leads to יָבוּלְתָּם, 'his initiative'. Targum יָבוּלְתָּם לְעֹלַם for MT יָבוּלְתָּם. Salma is found in 1 Chron. 2:52, 54; Zipporah was a Kenite. The Targumist thus strengthens the supposed link between the
Kenites and the Rechabites. The Levites in the Targum appear because Rekhabiah is a Levite in 1 Chron. 23:17, 24:21, 26:25. Their appearance may also have something to do with the Targumic and rabbinic traditions that the Rechabites became priests. The Targum's 'riders and chariots' is derived from MT's סנה, but there may also be a link with the title 'the Chariotry of Israel and its Riders', held by Elijah and Elisha - Moses' merit was greater than theirs.

Having established that there are no textual variants which witness to a Hebrew text different from that found in the Massoretic Text, a word-by-word analysis of the verse may now be undertaken.

אֵלֶּה מִשְׁמַעְתֵּן: As it stands in the MT, סַעֲרֵיהּ is vocalised as סָעָרֵיהּ, 'scribes'. Klein saw this as evidence for the existence of scribes in the pre-exilic period; Kittel thought that it denoted scribes in the post-exilic sense; Richter was of the opinion that the necessary settledness of the scribal profession was incompatible with the nomadic lifestyle of the Rechabites, and emended סַעֲרֵיהּ to סִינֵရְיָא, which he rendered as 'the Abstainers', i.e. the Rechabites.

However, the Qal passive participle of the root סָעָרְיָא is generally used of being bound in prison, fetters, etc. Only in Num. 30 does סָעָרְיָא appear with a figurative meaning, denoting the obligation of an oath or vow, but the passive participle is not used there to denote one who has taken such a vow and, in any case, Num. 30 has nothing to do with the Rechabites. It seems a highly dubious exercise to emend סַעֲרֵיהּ
into a word which has a meaning otherwise unattested in biblical Hebrew. It is also hard to see how אֶלֶּה עֲרֵבִים could have become corrupted into עֲרֵבִים.

More feasible is Rudolph's proposal to read עֲרֵבִים with the meaning 'men of Kiriath Sepher', for עֲרֵבִים. It is unlikely that scribes ever lived in one single place - and a remote one at that (Jabez is only mentioned elsewhere in 1 Chron. 4:9f, where it is a personal, not a place, name). As Rudolph charmingly puts it, "Schriftgeleherte wird man nicht zuerst in einem Landheim suchen". While it is true that some occupational groups in Ancient Israel did live together as craft guilds, this cannot have been true of the scribes, for whom dispersion throughout other places of business and trade was of the essence of their craft. That עֲרֵבִים appears here without the definite article would be more readily explicable if it were a gentilic rather than the title of an occupational group. Kiriath Sepher was a Calebite city (Josh. 15:13f, Judg. 1:11f), and 1 Chron. 2:55 occurs within the context of a Calebite genealogy (cf. 2:18-20, 50a-55). Hence, Rudolph's proposed change in pointing is adopted here, and עֲרֵבִים עַמִּים is understood as 'And the clans of the Sepherites'.

It seems preferable to follow the Qere, as the Kethiv entails understanding or inserting a ב before the following קְרֵבָּנָם. קְרֵבָּנָם stands in apposition to the preceding בָּשְׁמָה.
As noted above, 'Jabez' reappears only in 4:9f, where it is a personal name. Despite the rabbinic traditions understanding יְבֵצָם as a personal name in 2:55 also, it is evident that it is intended to be a place name here, even if the place 'Jabez' is yet to be identified. Within the biblical genealogies, there is often a degree of fluidity between personal and place names. The place Jabez may have been in Judah.

None of these three names are elsewhere attested. Klein made a brave attempt to discover South Judaean place names in them, an attempt which is more ingenious than convincing. The Vulgate and Kittel both argue that they denote occupations, but in so doing they are simply following rabbinic Haggadic exegesis, which is unlikely to have had a basis in historical reality. It seems best to follow Rudolph, and to view these names as clan names and nothing more.

There is virtual unanimity among scholars that tên denotes the Kenites (usually קִנְיָטִים). As Abramsky puts it, "there is no reason for not identifying the Kinites of this text with the Kenites". The tên clearly indicates that only a portion of the tribe of the Kenites is being referred to, par. the three named clans.

Elsewhere in the Old Testament, נָבוֹז followed by יְבֵצָם seems to have had a usage that was literally spatial. It is used of individuals, e.g. of Jacob coming
from Paddan Aram (Gen. 33:18); of communities (cf. 2 Sam. 15:18); of the elements (of water, 2 Kings 3:20; of a storm, Is. 10:3; of smoke, Is. 14:31); of Yahweh, or God, in anthropomorphic imagery (cf. Is. 63:1, Hab. 3:3); and of wisdom (Job 28:20). It is used of a 'word' in 2 Sam. 15:28, but again the meaning is a spatial one - the 'word', i.e. a message, would have to be brought by someone. Deut. 32:17 should be excluded from consideration, as the sense 'recently' applies to מֵעַ as a combined preposition. Thus, there is no metaphorical use of מִבְּלָה followed by מָי elsewhere in the Old Testament, which makes it unlikely that its use in 1 Chron. 2:55 is genealogical in meaning. Abramsky compares the use of 'נָבֵא here with that of מֵעַ in 1 Chron. 4:38, and suggest that both mean the same as מְלָתָה, 'that were numbered'. Talmon, who thinks that מִבְּלָה is a construct noun meaning 'family-in-law' (see below), argues that, just as מִבְּלָה followed by בָּא in 1 Chron. 2:21, and probably also 2:24 (see LXX), denotes the establishment of marital kin-ties between the Calebites and the inhabitants of Gilead and Ephrath, by the 'male' element, i.e. the Calebites, moving into the territory of the 'female' element, so מִבְּלָה followed by מָי in 2:55 reveals that, in the case of the Calebite-Kenite alliance, the 'female' partner, i.e. the Kenites, moved into the territorial domain of the 'male' partner, i.e. the Rechabites. In the light of the usage of מִבְּלָה + מָי elsewhere in the Hebrew Bible, both of these arguments seem somewhat spurious. In particular, it is difficult to understand how "the Kenites who came from ... the father of the House of Rechab" (leaving מִבְּלָה aside for the moment)
can denote the movement of the Kenites into Rechabite territory. Also, if נָּבָא followed by בָּאָלָה may denote the consummation of a marriage, then, surely, if it did have a metaphorical meaning, נָּבָא followed by נָּבָא would have to denote the very opposite, ie. divorce? In addition, it is anything but clear what Talmon is trying to denote by 'male' and 'female' in his description of clan relationships - does 'male' denote the stronger clan, and 'female' the weaker, or does 'male' denote the moving clan, and 'female' the static one?

Usage, however, suggests that, in fact, the meaning of נָּבָא in 1 Chron. 2:55 has nothing to do with genealogy at all, but to do with geography, as in all the other cases in the Hebrew Bible where נָּבָא is followed by נָּבָא. It denotes a group of Kenites who were once in some sort of geographical proximity to נָּבָא (however that phrase is understood), but at some stage have moved to another dwelling place; hence they may be said to have 'come from' נָּבָא.

This observation, seemingly unnoticed by other commentators, that נָּבָא in 1 Chron. 2:55 has nothing to do with genealogy, but to do with geography, already renders untenable those views which have seen the Rechabites as a Kenite clan. As the verse is to do with geographical, not kinship, links, the view of Abramsky, that this verse demonstrates that the Rechabites and the Kenites lived in close proximity to each other, may perhaps seem to be the
correct one. The rest of this study of 1 Chron. 2:55 will, however, reveal that not only does the verse not link the Kenites and the Rechabites genealogically, but also that a good case can be made for arguing that it does not, in fact, refer to the Rechabites at all, but to the place from which this group of Kenites came.

The Versions and most commentators understand (ןתנ) either as a personal name, or else as a place name. Thus, LXX\(^B\) reads ἐκ μεθοριου (rendering the τον prefix twice over - translating it (ἐκ), and then transliterating it (με)), evidently understanding it as a personal name, as elsewhere in the OT, where Hammath appears as a place name, it is rendered in the Greek by εμμων or αμωθ, which is adopted by LXX\(^A\) here, evidently understanding Hammath as a place name, presumably the well-known Hammath in Naphtali (Josh. 19:35).

However, makes little sense after a place name, so Talmon seeks to derive (מותם), as a construct noun, from the root (מות), and proposes the existence of a noun (מותה), meaning 'family', especially denoting the relationship between a husband's family and his wife. He cites the use מות, meaning husband's father in relation to his son's wife, in Gen. 38:13,25, and of מותה, husband's mother in relation to her son's wife, ten times in the Book of Ruth. He also mentions that an equivalent noun can be found both Akkadian (hammutu) and Syriac (ماتא).
The NEB follows Talmon's lead, and renders this half of the verse as "these were the Kenites who were connected by marriage with the ancestor of the Rechabites". Talmon further argues that Jehonadab the son of Rechab was so well-known that the author of 1 Chron. 2:55 did not feel it necessary to mention him by name.

Objections may be raised to Talmon's interpretation. Firstly, such a noun is not attested elsewhere in the Old Testament genealogies - if it were a well-established term, its appearance elsewhere in the lists would be expected. Secondly, it has already been shown that followed by had a purely spatial meaning for the biblical writers, so it cannot have the meaning ascribed to it by Talmon. Thirdly, is it really true to say that Jonadab ben Rechab would have been so well-known that his name would not be required in such a genealogical list? While it is true, as Budde pointed out, that the author of 2 Kings 10:15f evidently believed that his readers would be already familiar with Jonadab, it is also true that what is permitted in narrative is not permitted in genealogy, where names are all-important. Talmon cites 1 Chron. 8:29, "the father of Gibeon dwelt in Gibeon, and the name of his wife was Maacah", as evidence for the omission of a father's name in a genealogy, but 1 Chron. 8:29 has a doublet in 9:35, where the name of the father of Gibeon does appear, so it has either fallen out of 8:29 by accident, or else the compiler has deliberately omitted it in 8:29, as it was going to appear in
9:25. There is no such doublet to 2:55.

**בנה**, 'father', is capable of a broad range of meanings in the Old Testament, so ascertaining its correct meaning here is by no means straightforward. However, the formula 'X the father of Y' is common in the genealogical lists in Chronicles. Particularly illuminating for the present purposes are 1 Chron. 2:52f and 4:5ff, where X is recorded as having offspring, but his offspring do not include Y:

2:52f: Shobal the father of Kiriath-jearim had other sons: Haroeh, half of the Menuhoth. And the families of Kiriath-jearim: the Ithrites, the Puthites, the Shumathites and the Mishraites ...

4:5ff: Ashhur, the father of Tekoa, had two wives, Helah and Naarah; Naarah bore him Ahuzzam, Hepher, Temeni and Haahashtani. These were the sons of Naarah. The sons of Helah: Zereth, Izhar and Ethnan. (RSV)

These two texts strongly suggest that, in the majority of instances in 1 Chron. 1–9, the formula 'X the father of Y' denotes not blood paternity, but the leader or founder of a particular geographical place or area. Other than in 2:42f and 4:11f, in the rest of the occurrences of 'X the father of Y' in the genealogical lists, the formula finishes the reference to that clan, which also strongly suggests that **embrance** is more likely to denote "Hammath the founder/leader of the place Beth-Rechab" than "Hammath the ancestor of the Rechabites". Both Klein and Rudolph understand the reference in this way.26
As just indicated, Rudolph and Klein are probably right in seeing in בֵּית וֲרֶּכָּבָות the name of a place. As Rudolph points out, this is certainly how the LXX of 4:12 understood נְרֵכי. In 2:55 - 4:12 LXXBL concludes, "these are the men of Rechab", and probably reflects the original reading. Klein suggests, with some plausibility, that Beth-Rechab is the same place as Beth-Marcaboth, known from Josh. 19:5 and 1 Chron. 4:31. In both of these references, Beth-Marcaboth occurs adjacent to Hazar-Susah/Susim, the locality of which is known, even if that of Beth-Marcaboth is not. Hazar-Susah is Khirbet Abu Suseim, a little west of Beer-Sheba. It seems reasonable to place Beth-Marcaboth in the same vicinity. The names of the two places ('House of Chariots' and 'Village of Horses') suggests that they had links with Solomon's manufacture and storage of chariots (cf. 1 Kings 9:19, 10:29). This would perhaps lend support to the idea that the Kenites were metalworkers, but it does not necessarily say anything about the Rechabites. There is no need to assert that the Rechabites must have come from Beth-Marcaboth/Rechab - Rechab could have quite easily have been a personal name throughout Israel, as well as the name of a particular place: a Benjaminit called Rechab turns up in 2 Sam. 4, but no-one has tried to associate him with the place Beth-Marcaboth/Rechab, so why should Jonadab ben Rechab necessarily be associated with it?

1 Chron. 2:55 thus presents the following picture. The Tirathites, Shimeathites and Sucathites were Kenite clans,
from the lands belonging to Hammath, chieftain of the town Beth-Rechab, in the Beer-Sheba region. At some point they moved north to Kiriath-Sepher, where they became linked in some way with the Calebites. At a later stage in their history they moved again, to Jabez, the location of which is now unknown, but may well have been in Judah. Would it be possible to suggest that this northward movement of these Kenite clans, from Beth-Rechab to Jabez via Kiriath-Sepher, was occasioned by the encroachments into Palestine from the south made by the Edomites following the Fall of Judah?

If the Versions are right in reading Caleb for נֵב in 1 Chron. 4:11f, there may be some support for this proposal to understand 2:55 as representing a movement of part of the Kenites, and its mingling with the Calebites. None of the names in 4:12 are otherwise attested, but it could be that a reference to the union of the group of Kenites from Beth-Rechab ('men of Rechab') with a particular portion of the Calebites is intended by 4:11f.

Whether this interpretation of 1 Chron. 2:55 is correct, and whether it is correct to follow Rudolph in re-pointing נֵבָּה, the fact remains that no reference to the Rechabites is to be found in the verse and, even if there was, the reference would not claim that the Rechabites were a Kenite clan. The usage of נֵב + גֶּר elsewhere in biblical Hebrew forces us to interpret the verse as referring to the geographical movement of a group of Kenites. Hammath's title, 'father', in this context, forces us to understand
Beth-Rechab as a place name, not as a title for the Rechabites, who are not called Beth-Rechab anywhere else, and who are not connected with Hammath anywhere else. The attestation of Rechab as a personal name elsewhere in Israel in the monarchical period reveals that, simply because Jonadab ben Rechab had part of the name of a town in his name, there is no need to conclude that he was necessarily associated with that town. The supposed connection between the Kenites and the Rechabites, for which the sole evidence adduced has been 1 Chronicles 2:55, needs to be rejected forthwith: the biblical Rechabites never had anything to do with the Kenites, and those views which argue that they did, or which describe the Rechabites by means of material proper to the Kenites, need to be revised accordingly.

2.2: 1 CHRONICLES 4:12

1 Chronicles 4:12 is usually mentioned with 2:55, as part of the evidence for the non-Israelite origin of the Rechabites. It is certainly correct to mention it with 2:55, as 4:11f is a postscript to 2:55b, which seeks to explain the 237 πι of 2:55 more clearly. Once 2:55 is shown to have nothing to do with the Rechabites, it follows that 4:12 has nothing to do with them either. 4:12 nevertheless merits a separate examination, which will serve to strengthen the earlier conclusion. Once again, the texts of the various Versions are gathered before evaluation is undertaken.
Massoretic Text:

Sequuntur:

For Ἱφθα, Codex Vaticanus and Lucian read ἰχθαβ.

Vulgate:

Porro Eshton genuit Bethrapha et Pesse et Tehinna patrem urbis Naas. Hi sunt viri Recha.

Old Latin: Not extant.

Peshitta:

Walton's Polyglot, the Urmia Edition and Codex Ambrosianus all have different readings for our verse. None of them include an obvious equivalent to הָלָה אֶפֶן of the MT.

Targum:

Minor Greek Versions:

Read ἱφθα for LXX πολέμου νῦν.

Translation (RSV):

Eshton was the father of Beth-rapha, Paseah and Tehinna the father of Irnahash. These are the men of Recah.

Only the Vulgate follows the MT reading completely. The various Peshitta readings remain mystifying and, in any
case, since, throughout the genealogies in Chronicles, the text of the Peshitta is considerably different from that of any other witness, it is probably of little textual value, and so need not be considered further in this examination of 1 Chronicles 4:12.

The Targum to the verse is, however, extremely interesting. It follows the MT literally throughout the verse, except that instead of the final clause מִלָּה נְאוֹשֶׁר וּכְהַ, it has מִלָּה נְאוֹשֶׁר סַדְנָדָר, 'these are the men of the Great Sanhedrin'. R. le Déaut and J. Robert admit to being unable to understand how this reading has arisen - they note that it is not dealt with by Rashi. They suggest that it is necessary to resort to the sense 'noble, aristocrat', which the Aramaic נִוֶּר can have. This is certainly the view of Levy, who thinks that נוּר is derived from the Greek ἄριστος, and cites Baba Bathra 4a, which gives this sense to נוּר.

While this explanation of the reading is perhaps possible, it would seem that no-one has yet adequately explained why the Meturgeman, if he understood the Hebrew נוּר to be equivalent to the Aramaic נוּר, should then decide to render 'these are the men of aristocracy' by 'these are the men of the Great Sanhedrin'.

Perhaps it is worth considering a different explanation of the origin of the Targumic reading. There is a rabbinic tradition that the Rechabites sat in the Sanhedrin.
For example, and further details of this and other rabbinic traditions about the Rechabites may be found in Chapter Five of the present thesis, *Sifre Numbers* 78 has a long passage about the Rechabites. In the discussion about the Promise to the Rechabites contained in Jer. 35:19, Rabbi Joshua is quoted as saying about them:

> Is it the case that proselytes enter the Temple? - do not all Israel not enter the Temple? - rather, they were sitting in the Sanhedrin and teaching words of Torah.  

Given this tradition, and the reading of LXX BL (φυλακα) for the last word of the verse, is it not possible that the Hebrew Bible with which the Targumic tradition was familiar read, in fact, גֵּרֵי, and not גְּזָר? If such were the case, the Meturgeman could have seen here in the use of גֵּרֵי a reference to the Rechabites. Then, since he was aware of the rabbinic tradition that has just been quoted, he decided to indicate it by the use of נַפְשָׁתֵר יִרְדֵּנְו. This would then suggest that the Targum joins LXX BL in witnessing to a text of 1 Chron. 4:12 that read גֵּרֵי, over against the גְּזָר of the MT.

Consideration of the Septuagint has been deliberately left until last, because it contains an addition, viz. ἀπεκθεον ἔσκελον τοῦ κενελ, *i.e.* ἶνα... ἵνα - the restoration of the Hebrew underlying ἔσκελον cannot be attempted, as the word is an LXX *hapax legomenon*. The addition must have been in the Hebrew text used by the Greek translator, as it could hardly have been inserted by him in the course of his
work of translation. Yet, if the reading of the LXX here is more original than that of the Massoretic Text, it is hard to see how the phrase could have fallen out of the MT (and the Targum and the Vulgate), so perhaps this must be accepted as a **crux interpretum**: we cannot know which reading is the original.

Even accepting this **crux**, the LXX addition can still be used to help explain the proper meaning of קֶנֶּסִי. It is often claimed that קֶנֶּסִי means 'Copper City',\(^{39}\) and that this is further evidence that the Rechabites were metal-workers, due to the close connection of copper and 'men of Rechab' (LXX בֵּית לֶחָב) in the verse. Whether or not 'men of Rechab' denotes the Rechabites remains to be seen, but the LXX addition clearly understands קֶנֶּסִי as a personal name, not as a common noun - a 'city of copper' can hardly have a brother! It is also worth noting that the noun קֶנֶּסִי never has the meaning 'copper' elsewhere in the OT. The word for 'copper' is regularly רֵעֶן. רֵעֶן means 'serpent' so, even if the LXX interpretation of קֶנֶּסִי in 1 Chronicles 4:12 is incorrect, there is still no connection between metalworking and the Rechabites. If Nahash is not a proper name in the verse, then קֶנֶּסִי must be rendered 'Serpent City', not 'Copper City'. While certainty is impossible, on balance it seems better to follow the lead given by the LXX and regard קֶנֶּסִי as meaning 'City of the man Nahash'. As a place name, קֶנֶּסִי is otherwise unknown, but the personal name קֶנֶּסִי is found in 1 Sam. 11:1f, 12:12, 2 Sam. 10:2, 17:25, 27, 1 Chron. 19:1f.
In common with most scholars, Rudolph regards the reading \( \text{אָמַר} \), found in Vaticanus and Lucian, as representing the original reading of the LXX and of the Hebrew. As already noted, Rudolph regards 4:11f as a postscript to 2:55b, which seeks to explain the \( \text{בֵּית} \) of 2:55 more clearly. Unfortunately, as Rudolph adds, the additional details provided by 4:11f are of little help, as all the names in the verses are otherwise unknown. The phrase \( \text{בֵּית} \) in 4:12, however, is of value, because it reveals, through its use of \( \text{שֵׁם} \) rather than \( \text{עֵם} \), that Rechab in 2:55 was regarded as a place, not a personal, name: the list of returned Exiles in Ezra 2 shows that \( \text{שֵׁם} \) was regularly used with place names, \( \text{עֵם} \) with personal ones. Hence, the choice of \( \text{שֵׁם} \) rather than \( \text{עֵם} \) in 1 Chron. 4:12 provides further support for the contention that \( \text{בֵּית} \) in 2:55 denotes a place, and not the Rechabites.

It is also interesting to note that the LXX addition in 4:12 provides some support for the proposed emendation in 2:55 of \( \text{שֵׁם} \) to \( \text{עֵם} \). The addition in 4:12 refers to a Kenazzite - and it was the Kenazzite Othniel who, according to Josh. 15:17, Judg. 1:11f, took possession of Kiriath Sepher.

It is clear that 1 Chronicles 4:12 does not mention either a 'Copper City' or the Rechabites. \( \text{שֵׁם} \) must either be seen as a proper noun or, if it is seen as a common noun, then it must be understood to mean 'serpent' and not 'copper'. The original text of the verse, reflected by LXX and Targum,
read "these are the men of Rechab", but this is not a reference to the Rechabites. בחרב means "men of the place Rechab" - the Beth-Rechab named in 2:55. The genealogies in Chronicles, despite the interpretations offered by the Targum in 2:55 and 4:12, do not mention the Rechabites.

There is another verse in the genealogical chapters of 1 Chronicles where the LXX has a mention of 'Rechab' not found in the MT, namely 4:8, but here it looks as if the appearance of הַעַבָּרָה is due to interpretational activity on the part of the Greek translator.

In the Massoretic Text the verse reads, 

In the Septuagint it is rendered by,

Commentators by and large do not mention the LXX rendering לֵֽךְ לֵֽךְ הָעַבָּרָה לְוֹעָבָרָה for the same problem of the MT. The Targum reads אֲחַדָּנִים לְוֹעָבָרָה, its expansion being based on Tg. 1 Chron. 2:19, 4:4. The Peshitta for this verse is not extant. Curtis and Madsen think that some connection between 4:8 and 4:9 needs to be found, and propose that הנבְּרַה is וּבְרַע. It is not impossible that the LXX translator felt the same problem, and wrote לֵֽךְ לֵֽךְ הָעַבָּרָה לְוֹעָבָרָה for the same reason, and at the same time attempted some sort of harmonization with 2 Samuel 4. 1 Chron. 4:9f
mentions Jabez. Jabez and Rechab are mentioned in 1 Chron. 2:55, so the LXX translator replaced the בָּנוֹ of MT's בָּנוֹת with דָּנָה (regarding דָּנָה as the normal word for 'brother') to bring 4:8 and 4:9 into connection with each other. In 2 Sam. 4, a 'Rechab' appears as an inhabitant of Beeroth, one of the towns of the Gibeonite confederation (Josh. 9:23), along with Kiriath Jearim, i.e. the רֵאָפִים of LXX 1 Chron. 4:8.

Whatever the strengths and weaknesses of this interpretation, it seems most unlikely that any reference to the Rechabites can be detected in 1 Chronicles 4:8.

There are two other places in the Greek Old Testament where דָּנָה appears in a context where it is lacking in the Hebrew Bible. In 1 Kings 4:9, Lucian reads דָּנָה for Hebrew יָדָן. This will be considered along with 2 Samuel 4 in 2.4. In Judges 1:19, the LXX renders the Hebrew word בָּשָׂר, 'chariotry', by דָּנָה. Because it has been argued that this reading reflects knowledge of Jewish Haggadic exegesis, this reading will not be examined until Chapter Five, where the strange heading to LXX Ps. 70, τῇ Διανεκτ. υἱῶν Ἰσραήλ δανής καὶ τῶν πρωτῶν ἀναληπτικῶν, will also be considered.

2.3: NEHEMIAH 3:14

The appearance of Malchijah ben Rechab in Nehemiah 3:14 has often been cited as evidence that, in the post-exilic period, the Rechabites were still in existence, but had become incorporated into the rest of the people and had
abandoned their distinctive lifestyle. If the verse does indeed say this, then it becomes important evidence for the post-exilic history of the Rechabites. However, as will be shown, it is equally likely that Malchijah has nothing whatsoever to do with the Rechabites.

Massoretic Text:

Septuagint:

Vulgate:

Old Latin: Not extant.

Peshitta:

Targum: As with the books of Ezra and Daniel, it seems that no Targum to Nehemiah was ever made.

Translation (RSV):

Malchijah the son of Rechab, ruler of the district of Beth-haccherem, repaired the Dung Gate; he rebuilt it and set its doors, its
bolts, and its bars.

The textual problem lies in לְבָנָה, "he will build it", or "let him build it". Batten argues for the priority of the LXX, the Vorlage of which would have read לְבָנָה אַלְפִּיָּה, the regular gate-building formula, cf. 3:3, 6. However, this looks like a case of harmonization, either in the LXX or in its Vorlage, and so should not be followed too readily. According to Batten, Guthe reads לְבָנָה, "he built it", for לְבָנָה אַלְפִּיָּה. The simplest solution seems to be to follow the lead given by the Vulgate, and to read לְבָנָה, "he built it", as it involves the least change in the consonantal text, and no subsequent emendations.

In any event, the textual problems with לְבָנָה do not affect the part of the verse which is important for present purposes, namely נֵסָנוֹת הַבָּקָרָה שְׁלֹשָׁה בְּנֵי בֶּרֶכַח. Jer. 6:1 indicates that the locality of Beth-Haccherem was south of Jerusalem, beyond Tekoa. Whether Malchijah was connected with the Rechabites in any way is difficult to determine from the tantalizingly brief reference to him here. The text of Neh. 3:14, beyond בֵּית-בֶּרֶכַח, makes no mention of any possible connection between Malchijah and the Rechabites, and it is by no means certain that בֵּית-בֶּרֶכַח ever denoted any Rechabite other than the founder of the group, Jonadab, who is called בֵּית-בֶּרֶכַח in 2 Kings 10:15, 23, Jer. 35:6, 8, 14, 16, 19. The only other certain named Rechabite in the Bible is the group's leader in Jer. 35. He is called Jaazaniah ben Jeremiah ben Habazziniah, but not ben Rechab, which strongly suggests
that the title ben Rechab was reserved among the Rechabites for Jonadab alone. This would indeed be the case if Jonadab's blood father had had the name Rechab, and Jonadab had created a title, the Rechabites, out of that name when he founded his group, so that only Jonadab was בְּנֵי רְחָבָה; his followers were בְּנֵי רְחָבָה, Jer. 35:2, 3, 5(MT), 18, or בְּנֵי לוֹדִיקָה, Jer. 35:16. The form בְּנֵי לוֹדִיקָה is nowhere found, so it seems most unlikely that Malchijah was a Rechabite. The fact he was called בְּנֵי לוֹדִיקָה simply means that his father's name was Rechab. It is impossible not to believe that there was more than one person called Rechab in the history of Israel.

There are also two other elements in the description of Malchijah that argue against identifying him with the Rechabites. Firstly, he is said to have been ruler of מַחְוָה, 'House of the Vineyard', but Rechabite discipline proper shunned both houses and vineyards (Jer. 35:6f). Secondly, he is said to have engaged in building activities. Indeed, that is the whole point of his appearance in Neh. 3. Yet, Rechabite discipline proper shunned even building houses, let alone living in them (ibid.).

Thus, Malchijah's territory and his activities in Jerusalem suggest that he was not a Rechabite. More importantly, his title ben Rechab does not appear to have been one that the Rechabites ever used except in designating their founder, Jonadab, ie. the fact that Malchijah has the title means that his father was called Rechab, not that he was
a Rechabite.

2.4: 2 SAMUEL 4

2 Samuel 4:1-12 presents us with a character called Rechab, although it is not very common to link him with the Rechabites. He may be the ancestor of Jonadab ben Rechab (hardly the father!), but it is unlikely. More important is the question of his nationality. If it can be proved to be Israelite, then it increases the likelihood that the Rechabites were of pure Israelite stock, and if it can be proved to be non-Israelite, then it makes it more likely that the Rechabites were originally non-Israelites.

The relevant verses are 2 Sam. 4:2-3. Fortunately, there are no textual variants significant for the present purposes, but the meaning of the section is far from clear. The problem lies in vv.2b-3, an explanatory note:

For Beeroth also is reckoned to Benjamin; the Beerothites fled to Gittaim, and have been sojourners there to this day. (RSV)

Ackroyd interprets the passage as follows. Beeroth was part of Benjamin, and the assassins of Ish-Bosheth, Rechab and Baanah, were thus from Saul's own tribe. After this particular act of treachery, which would have left a stain on the whole family, the Beerothites fled elsewhere. Most other commentators point out that Beeroth was part of the Amorite
tetrarchy not subdued by the Israelites and allowed to continue to exist, Josh. 9:17. At some point, possibly connected with Saul's activities against the Gibeonites (2 Sam. 21), the Beerothites had fled to Gittaim - either in Benjamin (Neh. 11:33) or possibly in Philistia (cf. 'Gath', one of the five Philistine cities named in 1 Sam. 6:17) - and Beeroth was occupied by Benjaminites, including Rimmon and his family. Hertzberg observes that, if El-Bire is identical with Beeroth, then Beeroth was north of Benjaminite territory proper, which would agree with the statement that "Beeroth also is reckoned to Benjamin". Some commentators wish to see in the murder of Ish-Bosheth an act of vengeance for the cruelty of Saul to the Gibeonites, which would make the assassins Amorites rather than Israelites. However, as McCarter points out, the text of 2 Sam. 4 makes no connection, either explicit or implicit, with 2 Sam. 21, and does not assign a motive of vengeance to the killing. The sons of Rimmon are themselves Benjaminites, and not indigenous Beerothites, and were officers in Ish-Bosheth's army. Their treachery was born, not out of a desire for revenge, but out of sheer opportunism, and out of a hope of a reward from David. In addition, Rimmon is explicitly termed "from the sons of Benjamin", so it seems likely that he and his two sons, Rechab and Baanah, were native Israelites, not Canaanites or foreigners.

This demonstrates, not that Jonadab was originally descended from Rechab ben Rimmon, as it seems a little unlikely that he would have called his group after a renegade
Benjaminite army officer who had been executed for murder by David. Rather, it demonstrates that Rechab was an Israelite personal name. If the $\text{שֵׁש}$ in $\text{שֶׁשׁ} \text{יְהוֹשָׁע} \text{שֵׁש}$ is a patronymic, then the contention that the Rechabites were a group of Israelites, not an outside clan, or converts, or anything else, is thereby strengthened. This is another pointer, along with the evidence already adduced when 1 Chron. 2:55 was examined, away from the often claimed link between the Rechabites and the Kenites — who were non-Israelites.

As noted above, the Lucianic recension of the LXX reads $\text{δακέσιον} \text{ἀναστάσει} \text{βῆμα}$ in 1 Kings 4:9, for the $\text{γρηγορίον}$ of the Hebrew. It is unlikely that Lucian here reflects a Hebrew textual tradition, as none of the other principal Greek manuscripts read $\text{ἐνομον}$ — A has $\text{ϕακνον}$, and B $\text{ϕεκνον}$. The Lucianic reading may be interpretative, regarding the officer commanding Solomon's second district, whose actual name has been lost, as the son of the Benjaminite executed by Solomon's father in 2 Samuel 4.

2.5: 2 KINGS 10:15f, 23

Thus far, this survey of possible references to the Rechabites in the Bible, outside of Jeremiah 35, has been something of a via negativa. It has concluded that the Rechabites do not appear in 1 Chronicles 2:55, 4:12 or Nehemiah 3:14, and that the Rechab in 2 Samuel 4 has nothing to do with them either. However, despite being negative, these conclusions are nevertheless important, as most scholars have
seen, at least in the Chronicles and Nehemiah references, notices mentioning our group. The present study has indicated, however, that the Rechabites are not even mentioned, let alone linked, genealogically or otherwise, with the Kenites, in 1 Chron. 2:55, a conclusion which deals a heavy blow to most appraisals of the Rechabites that have been so far produced. It has indicated that they do not appear in 1 Chron. 4:12 either, which weakens the argument that the Rechabites were metalworkers, which used the claimed appearance of the Rechabites and 'Copper City' (itself now shown to be a dubious translation of \textit{ונִי}, \textit{ונִי}) in the verse to support its case. It has indicated that the Malchijah ben Rechab who is found in Neh. 3:14 was not a Rechabite, confounding those views which have used the verse to provide evidence for the Rechabites in the post-exilic period. It has shown that Rechab is attested as a personal, Israelite name in the biblical period, thereby increasing the likelihood that the Rechabites were Israelites, and not Canaanites or foreigners.

In 2 Kings 10:15, 16, 23, however, an actual reference to the Rechabites outside of Jer. 35 is finally discovered. It is here that we meet Jonadab (here called Jehonadab, as in some of the cases in Jer. 35) ben Rechab, in the days of Jehu, in the Northern Kingdom. In its present form, the text of 2 Kings 10 recounts how Jonadab accompanied Jehu to Samaria to assist in the latter's destruction of the Temple and worshippers of Baal. While this may be the creation of an editor or compiler of the material now contained in 2 Kings, nevertheless, as will be shown, a historical
reference to Jonadab is contained in 2 Kings 10:15f.

In what follows, the textual evidence for 2 Kings 10:15f will first be gathered and evaluated, then that for v.23, before a commentary on the three verses as a whole is offered.

Verses 15 and 16

Massoretic Text:

Septuagint:

Vulgate: Follows the MT, except that it reads a singular for יִדְמוֹנִי in v.16.

Old Latin: Not extant.

Peshitta:
Targum: Follows the MT completely literally.

Minor Greek Versions:

For LXX εἰς ἀπαντὴν αὐτοῦ καὶ εὐχομένην αὐτοῦ, Symmachus reads ἀπαντῶν αὐτῷ ἐκ εὐχομένης αὐτοῦ, and for LXX εὐθείᾳ, Symmachus has ἀπατή. For LXX ἐν ταῖς ζητήσεις με τὴν κυρίαν εὐραμώθη, Aquila, Symmachus and Theodotion have τον ζητῶν μου ἐπὶ τὴν κυρίαν. Not all LXX MSS have εὐραμώθη after κυρίαν.

Translation (RSV margin):

And when he departed from there, he met Jehonadab the son of Rechab coming to meet him, and he said to him, "Is it right with your heart, as my heart is with your heart?" And Jehonadab answered "It is". "If it is, give me your hand". So he gave him his hand. And Jehu took him up with him into the chariot. And he said, "Come with me and see my zeal for Yahweh". So they had him ride in his chariot.

Josephus also has a version of the story, in Antiquities IX.6.6:

After these, there met him a good and righteous man, whose name was Jehonadab, who had been his friend of old. He saluted Jehu, and began to commend him, because he had done everything according to the will of God in extirpating the house of Ahab. So Jehu
desired him to come up into his chariot and make his entry with him into Samaria, and told him that he would not spare one wicked man, but would punish the false prophets and the false priests, and those that deceived the multitude and persuaded them to leave the worship of God Almighty and to worship foreign gods, and that it was a most excellent and most pleasing sight to a good and righteous man to see the wicked punished. So Jehonadab was persuaded by these arguments, and came up into Jehu's chariot and came to Samaria. 55

The Targum follows the MT literally, even to the plural בְּנֵי הָאָרֶץ in v.16. The Vulgate is also a literal translation, except that, in common with LXX and Peshitta, it reads a singular for בְּנֵי הָאָרֶץ. LXX and Peshitta are both different from MT, and different from each other. LXX differs from MT as follows:

(1) Between בְּנֵי הָאָרֶץ and בְּנֵי יַעֲקֹב, LXX inserts הָאַרֶץ, i.e. ארץ.
(2) For בְּנֵי יַעֲקֹב, LXX reads בְּנֵי יַעֲקֹב. 82
(3) After בְּנֵי יַעֲקֹב, LXX-A inserts בָּנָי מִשְׁמַר. 56
(4) For בְּנֵי יַעֲקֹב, LXX reads בְּנֵי יַעֲקֹב.
(5) For רֵיחַ תַּרְפֶּה, LXX reads רֵיחַ תַּרְפֶּה.
(6) For כִּרְפָּה, some LXX MSS, but not B, A or L, read כִּרְפָּה, אַפּוֹת אַפּוֹת.
(7) For בְּנֵי יַעֲקֹב, LXX reads a singular בְּנֵי יַעֲקֹב.

The Peshitt variants are as follows:

(1) Between בְּנֵי יַעֲקֹב and בְּנֵי יַעֲקֹב, Pesh. inserts
(2) For בְּלֵיכֶנִי, Pesh. reads Aphel of בָּאָה, 'to know' = Heb. בָּאָה I, 'to inform', 'read aloud'. Hebrew here is בָּאָה II, 'to meet'.

(3) Between מְדָעַת and מִשְׁמֵרָה, Pesh. inserts מִשְׁמֵרַת אֱלֹהִים, i.e. מִשְׁמֵרַת אֱלֹהִים.

(4) For יָדִיעַת, Pesh. reads יָדִיעַת יְהוֹ, i.e. יָדִיעַת אֱלֹהִים.

(5) For יְהִ תעָבְרָה, Pesh. reads a singular, סוּכָּלָה.

(6) For יָדִיעַת, Pesh. reads סוּכָּלָה, i.e. סוּכָּלָה.

(7) At the end of v.16, Pesh. omits the 3 m. sg. suffix on 'chariot'.

The varying ways in which the Septuagint and the Peshitta deal with יַעֲרַת מַעֲרַת בְּרֵכָת לָדוֹת וַיִּמְרָה, פֶּתֶר בְּרֵכָת לָדוֹת, וַיִּמְרָה, יַעֲרַת מַעֲרַת בְּרֵכָת לָדוֹת וַיִּמְרָה, יַעֲרַת מַעֲרַת בְּרֵכָת לָדוֹת are worthy of note. The various insertions in the two Versions suggest that they were both faced with much the same text as is currently found in the MT, and that they sought to make its terse, abbreviated form intelligible to their readers. In their understanding of who is saying what, LXX and Peshitta more or less correspond, disagreeing only over שָׁמַע in שָׁמַע שָׁמַע, LXX taking it as part of Jehu's speech, Peshitta as the close of Jonadab's. Both Versions correctly interpret the MT, but the correct speaker of שָׁמַע is impossible to determine; it does not significantly affect the correct understanding of the passage. Peshitta and LXX, along with the Vulgate, agree, against MT, in reading a singular
for יִתְנַהֲלָל. They are correct to do so: while the plural could be a reference to Jehu, his driver and his armour-bearer (who is named in 2 Kings 9:25), this is unlikely, as there is no antecedent for the plural subject in this section.

It thus seems that, apart from יִתְנַהֲלָל, the MT represents the most primitive text. It is narrated in a very terse style, cf. 1 Kings 20:34, where the change of speakers is again not indicated in the Hebrew text. This explanation is preferable to arguing for a mechanical omission of יִתְנַהֲלָל between יִתְנַהֲלָל and יַיִהְיָה - the יִתְנַהֲלָל having been lost by Homoioarcton between the initial י of יִתְנַהֲלָל and יי. Such an explanation would argue for the priority of the LXX but, if this is accepted, it then becomes necessary to argue that the phrase יִתְנַהֲלָל was lost from the Hebrew after the LXX translation was made, and that the Peshitta then inserted its variant in order to make sense of the text. The argument that both LXX and Peshitta added words independently of each other, to make the sense of the terse MT text clearer, is both simpler and more probable.

Josephus' version of the verses is also interesting. It omits any reference to Jonadab's patronymic; stresses Jonadab's Yahwism in terms acceptable to Josephus' non-Jewish readers (יִיְנְרַאָבָס וְאֶקְקָאָס); says that Jonadab had been Jehu's friend from of old; says that Jonadab began to commend Jehu for his actions in destroying the house of Ahab; and substantially expands Jehu's statement, "Come with me and
see my zeal for Yahweh". Frick was of the opinion that Josephus' account reveals that Jehu and Jonadab had had a prior association, in the king's chariotry.\(^57\) Josephus' statement, however, may simply be his own inference from the compact Hebrew narrative, where Jehu begins to address Jonadab without any formal introduction, i.e. the two men must have already known each other, and need not reflect any genuine historical information preserved only by Josephus. It made no difference to the author of the biblical text whether Jehu and Jonadab were already acquainted with each other or not, so he made no mention of it. It has been observed more than once that the narrative style of these verses is extremely terse, with all extraneous detail simply being omitted. The two men may have known each other beforehand, but we cannot use the evidence of Josephus to say that they did.

Incidentally, the way that the Versions render ישב' in v.16 (LXX ὅσπις ἀναστήσεις; Targum Ḥasan; Peshitta סלאש; all 'to make sit') supports the contention of W.B. Barrick that ישב denotes vertical movement ('to mount up upon') rather than horizontal movement ('to ride along').\(^58\) The Versions express no notion of horizontal movement in their choice of words rendering ישב.

Verse 23

Massoretic Text:
Translation (RSV):

Then Jehu went into the house of Baal with Jehonadab the son of Rechab, and he said to the worshippers of Baal, "Search and see that there is no servant of Yahweh here among you, but only the worshippers of Baal".

All the Versions support the reading of the MT in the section of the verse relevant to the present study, i.e. "then Jehu went into the house of Baal with Jehonadab the son of Rechab, and he said". Note that if יְהוָה is treated as a later insertion into the text, no violence is done to the syntax of the verse by its removal, and arguably the verse's narrative flow is improved. Jehu is plainly the speaker of the speech in the verse yet, as it stands, the immediate antecedent for יְהוָה is Jehonadab. The plural subject at the beginning of v.24 is no argument against the removal of יְהוָה from v.23, as the most natural antecedent for the plural subject is the 'worshippers of Baal', mentioned at the end of v.23. Thus, the contention, made by several scholars, and examined in detail in the Commentary, to see the reference to Jehonadab ben Rechab in 2 Kings 10:23 as a later gloss, seems highly probable.

Commentary

Seemingly all commentators regard the meeting between Jehu and Jehonadab as an actual historical event, but several scholars regard it as being misplaced in its present context, being sceptical of whether Jehonadab would have accompanied Jehu
to the Baal temple in Samaria without causing serious disquiet among the Baal worshippers.\textsuperscript{60} Certainly, as was noted above, \textit{בריה הֶרְמָה} may be removed from v.23 without any change in the syntax being required, and it is probably best to delete it from the verse. Schmitt does so, regarding it as part of a pre-deuteronomistic apologetic redaction of the material, which sought to justify Jehu's activities.\textsuperscript{61} Würthwein and Jones also delete it as a gloss.\textsuperscript{62} So does Timm,\textsuperscript{63} but he dismisses Schmitt's claim that it is an early, pre-deuteronomistic, insertion. The actual date of the gloss is less important, for the present purposes, than the fact that it is a gloss.

It is hard to tell whether vv.15-16 are of a piece with vv.12-14. Admittedly, v.15 uses \textit{משן}, 'from there', at its beginning and, as Hobbs has recently noted,\textsuperscript{64} vv. 12-14 and 15-16 share the same structure: Jehu journeys (\textit{כָּל}) and then finds (\textit{נִקֵּן}) someone. He asks them a question, the reply to which brings an immediate response on the part of Jehu. However, while the two pericopae do share the same structure, they hardly share the same theme - vv.12-14 deal with Jehu's slaughter of the princes of Judah, vv.15-16 with his recruitment of Jonadab ben Rechab\textsuperscript{65} - so it is more likely that v.15f was a completely isolated fragment, which the same compiler/redactor who made the insertion in v. 23 (be he deuteronomistic, pre-deuteronomistic or post-deuteronomistic) had in his possession, and used at this juncture because he felt it appropriate:
The author probably regarded the meeting of Jehu and Jehonadab as a fitting introduction to his account of the massacre of the Baal worshippers of Samaria.\(^{66}\)

The compiler's purpose in inserting the fragment v.15f and the gloss יָוֵֽנָתָי in v.23 was to assert that which he felt to be crucial in the revolt of Jehu, namely, the religious aspect. By giving Jehu the support of the founder of a known Yahwistic group, the Rechabites, in his massacre of the Baal worshippers, the compiler has made his revolt into a purely religious act. In reality, however, it is more likely that Jehu's act was inspired more by political motives than religious ones.\(^{67}\) That Jehu's act in slaying the Baal worshippers would have rallied the 'fanatical' Yahwistic elements to his side is indisputable. If Jonadab and the Rechabites are seen as such a group, then it is credible that Jonadab joined Jehu and virtually became his chaplain.

Frick argued that the words of Jehu to Jonadab were a military formula of alliance, citing 1 Kings 22:4 and 2 Kings 3:7, both of which read "I am as you are, my people as your people, my horses as your horses", as proof parallels.\(^{68}\) However, it should be noted that both 1 Kings 22:4 and 2 Kings 3:7 explicitly mention war (יִנְחָל) and, in them, the "I am as you are etc." is quoted in reply to the request for support, not as the content of it, as in 2 Kings 10:15. In addition, a very similar formula is to be found in Ruth 1:16f, "For where you will go I will go, and where you lodge I will lodge, your people shall be my people, and your God
my God; where you die I will die", where war is most def-
initely not in mind, so Frick's conclusion, that "Jehonadab
may have become Jehu's squire or aide" is unconvincing. As
was suggested above, Josephus' statement that Jonadab had
long been Jehu's friend is more likely to have been Josephus' 
own inference from the text as we have it than evidence of an
independent, historically accurate, tradition. The same
conclusion should be drawn concerning Josephus' statement
that Jonadab began to "commend [Jehu] for having done every-
thing in accordance with the will of God in extirpating the
house of Ahab".

The following may thus be concluded concerning
2 Kings 10:15f, 23:

(1) Jonadab ben Rechab was known to be a represent-
ative of loyal, 'fanatical' Yahwism in the time of Jehu;

(2) It is, however, unlikely that he partici-
pated in the massacre of the worshippers of Baal - the frag-
ment 2 Kings 10:15-16 and the gloss יִנְעַי יִנְעַי in v.23
were placed at these places in the narrative by the compiler,
who wished to assert that Jehu's actions were essentially
religious, rather than political;

(3) V.15f nevertheless represents an actual inci-
dent, dating perhaps from after the massacre of the Baal
worshippers, indicating that Jonadab did support Jehu, but
that his support was probably more moral and religious than
political and military;

(4) If v.15f is an independent fragment, then a
precise geographical location for the event cannot be found,
beyond saying that it occurred in the Northern Kingdom;

(5) Whether Jonadab had already founded the Rechabites at the time of the incident recounted in v.15f is difficult to tell, but as he is introduced into the narrative somewhat abruptly, without any reason why he, in particular, should accompany Jehu to see his zeal for Yahweh, it is plain that the compiler expected his readers to see Jonadab as some sort of 'fanatical' Yahwist, so it is probable that Jonadab had already founded his group, perhaps even before the actual rebellion of Jehu.

The actual reasons why Jonadab founded his group will be examined in Chapters Three and Four, but it is important to note at this point two things observed by Cummings. Firstly, in the present narrative of the Books of Kings, Jonadab is fulfilling the role which 1 Kings 19:15-17 suggests should really be filled by Elisha. Secondly, in 2 Kings 10:16, Jehu says to Jonadab, "Come with me and see my zeal (יָקָרְבָּנ) for Yahweh" - language which is very similar to Elijah's claim, "I have been very zealous (יָרָסַךְ, חַפַּר) for Yahweh". These two points, along with others drawn from Jeremiah 35 (which will be examined in the following chapter) suggest to Cummings that Jonadab and the Rechabites represent alternative candidates to Elisha and the Sons of the Prophets (נְזִירֵי הַנּוֹר) for the inheritance of Elijah. This would explain why Jonadab was used by the compiler to underline the religious aspect of Jehu's revolt: like Elisha and the נְזִירֵי הַנּוֹר, Jonadab and his followers were a group of prophets, a group which had split from the נְזִירֵי הַנּוֹר, who themselves
had arisen in Israel as a protest against the socio-religious policies of the Omrides. This conclusion will be upheld and further strengthened by both the study of Jeremiah 35 in Chapter Three and the investigation of the historical and social context of the Rechabites in Chapter Four.

The Name Jonadab ben Rechab

The name Jonadab, which appears in 2 Kings 10 as Jehonadab, and in Jeremiah 35 as both Jonadab and Jehonadab, means 'Yahweh has been generous'. Stig Norin argued that, in the Hebrew Bible, theophoric names beginning with 'יוה', rather than with 'יה', were a creation of the Deuteronomists, for whom it had a more pious flavour than 'יה'. He had trouble, however, with יוה and, in any case, Alan Millard has effectively demolished Norin's overall thesis. According to Millard, the name יוה has been found on a seal of unknown provenance, dating from the 7th Century BCE.

Frick noted that all the other biblical personal names from the monarchical period that contain יוה denote members of the urban nobility, and argued that there is no apparent reason why Jonadab should be considered as an exception. If he is right, then Jonadab must be seen as a member of the urban nobility, perhaps even a member of the court at Samaria, who had decided to separate himself from the court, and join the movement gathering around Elijah, because of the effects, political, religious and social, of the introduction of the Tyrian Baal-cult into Samaria.
In the same paragraph, Frick went on to suggest that נְזָרִית here denotes a chariot-maker or driver. It does, however, seem a little unlikely that a person would have been simultaneously a member of the urban nobility and a wainwright! As has already been shown, Rechab is attested elsewhere as a personal name, and while יֶהוּדֵי, 'son of', may denote the inhabitant of a particular place or the member of a guild, it can also denote a blood son or descendent, so there is every reason to conclude that Jonadab was the blood son of one Rechab.

But that is not the end of the story. Cummings took נְזָרִית as a prophetic title, analogous to נְזַרְיָה, an appellation of Elijah and Elisha (2 Kings 2:12, 13:14, cf. 6:17). It has already been indicated that it is likely that Jonadab had close connections with Elijah and Elisha so, whatever its true etymology, it is probable that נְזָרִית did come to be seen as some sort of prophetic title. This conclusion is supported by the fact that Jonadab's supporters were called the 'Rechabites' (רְכַּבְיָה רְכָב), not the 'Jonadabites'. This does not, however, negate the conclusion that Jonadab was called נְזָרִית because he was the son of Rechab. Rather, it leads to the conclusion that there was a conscious reinterpretation of the personal name into a prophetic title, perhaps by Jonadab himself. As Abramsky put it,

the phrase נְזַרְיָה נְזָרִית is not only a literary device, but is also a symbolic expression for divine leadership, an idea which sprang up in the days
of Elijah, Elisha and Jonadab, in the circumstances of a unique strife, when the prophets were popular leaders against the king's authority ... Jeho­nadab was designated with the titles which men gave to Elijah and Elisha, perhaps because the name Rechab was interpreted symbolically in his days. 80

Conclusion

Unlike the other verses considered in this chapter, 2 Kings 10:15f certainly does mention a Rechabite; in fact, the founder of the Rechabites, Jonadab. However, the verses stand in their present position because of the activity of the compiler, so it is unlikely that Jonadab played any part in Jehu's massacre of the Baal worshippers at Samaria. His name does, however, suggest that he was a member of the Samarian urban nobility, whose father was called Rechab. His appearance in the narrative in a place where Elisha would be expected to appear, and the language common to Elijah and Jonadab, suggests that Jonadab had close connections with the movement represented by Elijah, Elisha and the Sons of the Prophets, and that he set up a group of followers and called them Rechabites, consciously reinterpreting his patronymic Rechab into a prophetic title, like that used of Elijah and Elisha.

This picture of the Rechabites and their founder, which is essentially an extension of Cummings', will be
tested - and upheld - in the succeeding chapters of this study.
CHAPTER THREE: THE RECHABITES IN JEREMIAH 35

The material examined in Chapter Two, references, or supposed references, to the Rechabites in the Bible outside of Jeremiah 35, amounted to a collection of individual verses from Samuel, Kings, Chronicles and Nehemiah. None of these texts amounted to more than a few verses. With Jeremiah 35, however, a different picture emerges. The whole chapter concerns the Rechabites. It recounts how Jeremiah, in obedience to Yahweh’s command, took the community of the Rechabites into one of the chambers of the Temple, and instructed them to drink wine. They refuse, and recount the commands of their father, Jonadab ben Rechab - not to drink wine, not to live in houses, not to sow seed, not to plant vineyard, but to live in tents - and explain why they are currently present in Jerusalem. Jeremiah then uses the fidelity of the Rechabites as an example to the faithless Judaeans, who receive an oracle of condemnation, while the Rechabites receive one of salvation: "Jonadab the son of Rechab shall never lack a man to stand before me" (Jer 35:19 RSV).

As it is the only place in the whole of the Old Testament where the Rechabites appear as the principal subjects of a complete chapter, the examination of Jeremiah 35 is obviously crucial for the understanding of the Rechabites, and in many respects this present investigation of the chapter forms the core of the whole study. As we are dealing with a complete chapter, rather than with a few isolated
verses, not only is it possible (and necessary!) to undertake textual criticism and exegesis, but also form criticism. The layout of this chapter is therefore tripartite: Textual Criticism; Form Criticism, Rhetoric and Structure; and Exegetical Notes. Textual- and form-critical problems of the Book of Jeremiah are live issues in current Old Testament scholarship,¹ so the first two sections of this chapter must, therefore, inevitably, enter into some sort of dialogue with the scholars working in these fields.

3.1: TEXTUAL CRITICISM OF JEREMIAH 35

The Massoretic Text of Jeremiah 35 presents no unintelligible readings, and is closely followed by the Vulgate, the Peshitta and Targum Jonathan to the Prophets. The Septuagint, however, presents a equally intelligible, yet in several significant respects different, text from that preserved by MT. While a full-scale investigation into the LXX of the Book of Jeremiah lies beyond the scope of the present study, and has been well-researched elsewhere,² some preliminary remarks are still in order. The LXX of Jeremiah differs from the MT in its arrangement of the material,³ and is shorter than the MT by approximately one-seventh.⁴ There are also, however, a few places where LXX has a fuller reading than MT, and sometimes "the LXX represents a different reading or interpretation in comparison with the MT".⁵

Numerous explanations for the origins of these differences have been proposed. Soderlund has classified them
under four headings: the 'abbreviation', 'editorial', 'expansion' and 'mediating' theories. The first regards the "Greek text as an abbreviated or mutilated version of the Hebrew", the abbreviation being either the work of copyists or of the original translator(s). The second argues that "the two texts derive from different editions or recensions of the book produced by Jer himself". The 'expansion' theory, popular today, as a glance at the works of Janzen, Tov and Bogaert will reveal, views the LXX version as "the best witness to the text of Jer, the MT having suffered greatly from expansion, conflation and interpolation in the course of transmission". The final theory believes that it is "impossible to generalize on the relative priority of the two texts; instead, each reading has to be evaluated on its own merits".

While the 'expansion' theory is extremely popular in current studies of the text of Jeremiah, Soderlund's detailed critique of Janzen's Studies in the Text of Jeremiah, using one chapter, LXX Jer. 29, as a control, has shown that the theory does not stand up to detailed examination. It seems best to follow Soderlund's conclusions, established as they are by a painstaking analysis, and adopt the 'mediating' theory - for chapter 35 (LXX chap. 42), all the variations between MT and LXX, and all the variations between MT and the other Versions, need to be carefully examined, and a decision as to the priority of a reading made in each individual case, without recourse to "broad generalizations that in sweep can solve a multitude of textual
conundrums, as closer investigation reveals that such broad generalizations create more problems than they solve.

Verse 1

For MT רְבָרָה, 'the word', Tg reads חֲבֵרָה, but this is evidence of the Targumist's interpretational activity, not of a variant Hebrew text: for the Targumist, any divine word spoken to a prophet could not be anything other than a 'word of prophecy'. With a desire for precision typical of the Targums, this is exactly what Targum Jonathan reads here.

LXX-A does not represent the הִנָּה-שַׁפְּרָע, 'son of Josiah', of MT. Janzen fails to comment on this omission.

Decision between the two readings is virtually impossible but, in any event, the interpretation of the passage is the same whichever reading is adopted. Jehoiakim was the son of Josiah (2 Kings 23:34). LXX-A follows MT.

Verse 2

For MT's חֲשֶׁבֶל יֵאְצָל רוֹבֵר תַּכְיָה, LXX-A reads βασίλευς ἐστι αἰχμαλωτὸς καὶ ἀξίως ἀξιωτοὺς. LXX-A again follows MT, and reads καὶ καλεσθεν ἀξιώσαν between ἀρξαμένων and κακ., as do Aquila and Theodotion, with καὶ λαλήσας ἀξιωτοὺς. It is perhaps possible that the omission of ἵσταν τοῦτο by LXX-A has been caused by Homoioteleuton between the τοῦ of ἡμῶν and the τοῦ of Ἰσραήλ, but a case can be made, on structural grounds, for the originality of
the shorter reading, as will be shown below.  

For MT אֱלֹהִיָּהּ יָדוֹ, both here and throughout the chapter, Tg reads בַּגְדָּה אֱלֹהִיָּהּ. This is not evidence that this is what appeared in the Targumist's Hebrew text. Rather, it is once again evidence of his interpretational activity, perhaps harmonising with the Targumic interpretation of 1 Chron. 2:55, 4:12.

The Targum also reads שֶׁהָיוּ לְאָדָם מֶקֶדֶשׁ בָּהַיָּהּ for הָיוּ לְאָדָם מֶקֶדֶשׁ in the verse. 'Sanctuary House' is a standard Targumic term for the Temple.

Verse 3

The LXX omits the בֵּי in MT's יִשְׂרָאֵל:כֹּל. As with יִמְשָׁל בֵּית מִשְׁמַר in v.1, a decision as to the more original text is again virtually impossible, but once more the interpretation of the passage is unaffected. Janzen feels that, in most cases in the Book of Jeremiah, the text without בֵּי is more original.  

Verse 4

Both Targum and Peshitta change MT's יֵאָדָם מֶקֶדֶשׁ to 'Prophet of Yahweh' and 'Prophet of God' respectively. This is another example of the Targum's desire for exactitude, and has this time been followed by the Peshitta: Igdaliah is viewed as a true prophet.
There is quite a variety in the spelling of the proper human names in vv.3 and 4 in the Greek and Hebrew textual traditions. This is probably due to the fact that most of these proper names are either extremely rare, or else completely unattested, elsewhere in the Old Testament. The proper names are further considered in the exegetical notes.

The Peshitta reads יָד, 'door', for יָסֳּף, 'threshold', of MT. This is a case of a substitution of a more familiar word in the Syriac, not evidence of a different Hebrew text.

Verse 5

For יָבִין יָכָר קִנָּי of MT, LXX reads καὶ ἐσώκα κατὰ προσώπων αὐτῶν, i.e. ἐσώκα κινήτω. Symmachus seems to show awareness of both these textual traditions, by reading καὶ παρέθηκα ἐμπροσθεν αὐτῶν νῦν οἰκοῦ τοῦ ἥχαβιτων. Janzen regards the original pronoun, as represented by LXX, as having been expanded in MT by the addition of the corresponding proper name. As will be shown below, the shorter text of LXX is also preferable on structural grounds.

The κεραμοῦν οἰκοῦ of LXX represents a Hebrew text יָבִין יָכָר, whereas MT reads יָבִין חָבוֹת. Once again, decision between the two texts is virtually impossible, and the sense is also unaffected whichever reading is adopted.
Verse 7

For דָּבֶּר צֹאֵב, וּכְרֵם צֹאֵב נַעֲשֶׂה צֹאֵב. LXX reads וְנַעֲשֶׂה צֹאֵב, which suggests a Hebrew text וּכְרֵם Ц צֹאֵב נַעֲשֶׂה צֹאֵב. Janzen concedes that the omission in the LXX could perhaps have been caused by Haplography (sic) between the נַעֲשֶׂה before אֲבָנָיו and the following אֲבָנָיו. He feels, however, that אֲבָנָיו וְנַעֲשֶׂה וּכְרֵם צֹאֵב אַל יִהְיֶה צֹאֵב, describing the fulfillment of the command, supports the reading of the LXX in v.7. If this is so, he further argues, then the MT has expanded the text by the insertion of וּכְרֵם after אֲבָנָיו, in conformity with approximately 90% of the occurrences of וּכְרֵם in the Old Testament.

Janzen is, however, incorrect in his analysis. The evidence of v.9 supports rather the reading of the MT in v.7: in v.9, וּכְרֵם וּשְׁדֵה אֹרֶב are all governed by the following לא Superintendent, which suggests that in v.7 either both וְנַעֲשֶׂה and וּכְרֵם should be governed byaupt, or else neither. The latter option is preserved in the MT of v.7, while LXX preserves a cross between the two. Hence, MT is superior to LXX here, and the variant has arisen through a simple case of Homoioteleuton.

Verse 8

The LXX of v.8 fails to represent מַרְבִּיעַ or מְפַלְפָּל of the MT. Following Janzen's principles over...
proper names, the shorter text of LXX should be regarded as more original over בר כוכב צור, note also the appearance of בר כוכב בכסות at the end of v.10 in both MT and LXX, which supports this contention. Janzen sees סמל מצור צור in the MT as an editorial expansion based on vv.10 and 14. While the similarity between v.8 MT and v.6 (MT and LXX) may argue for the priority of MT in v.8, it is more probable that the structural analogue of צור מצור צור in v.6 is not דל ומצור צור of v.8 MT, but rather ומצור צור, 'and we have obeyed', found at the beginning of v.8 in both MT and LXX. If this is so, then the shorter text represented by LXX should be seen as being more original.

Verse 9

Targum reads plural nouns (כמרים ומקים) for the singular nouns of MT (כמרים ומקים). The Hebrew nouns can have collective force in the singular, and this is reflected in the Targumist's rendering.

Verse 11

For MT, 'to the land', Pesh. reads עָלָה, 'against the land'. While the Syriac perhaps depicts Nebuchadrezzar's offensive more graphically than does the Hebrew, it does not necessarily show awareness of a text different from MT here.

For MT תַּבָּנָה, Targum reads תַּבָּנָה.
'come, let us go up', and Aquila and Symmachus εὐπτε ἐσελθὼμεν, 'come, let us enter'. The unique MT reading, 'come and let us come', is preferable, precisely because it is unique.

LXX reads Ἀσσυρῶν for MT χώρα, which is represented correctly by Aquila and Symmachus with Συρῶν. The Peshitta here reads Ἀσσυρία, i.e. Συρίαν. This is probably a simple transcriptional error, as δ and ρ were easily confused in Semitic orthography at any period.

The MT is to be preferred to the LXX. Nebuchadrezzar was king of Babylon, not of Assyria. In 2 Kings 24:2, which probably refers to the same event as that recounted in this verse, bands of Chaldaeans, Syrians (חָזַר), Moabites and Ammonites are found, closely linked with the 'coming up' of Nebuchadrezzar against Jehoiakim (2 Kings 24:1), which provides additional support for the MT reading.

For Ἰσραήλ ἐζήτω of MT, LXX reads καὶ ἀνέκτησαν ἐκκλησίαν, i.e. Ἀγίας ἐζήτω. Aquila, Symmachus and Theodotion follow MT, and this seems preferable for two reasons. Firstly, the chapter is set inside Jerusalem, and it seems unlikely that the Rechabites would have said 'we have dwelt there', when the place denoted by 'there' was the place where they were. Secondly, the sentence has a chiastic structure, in which the two references to Jerusalem surround the two references to the foreign armies, in an ABB'A' structure:
Thus, the priority of the MT may be upheld here.

Verse 12

For of MT, Targum has an expansionary phrase, which serves a similar purpose to the expansion in the Targum of v.1. The Peshitta inserts 'the prophet' between 'Jeremiah' and 'saying', but this, like the substitution 'prophet of God' for 'man of God' in v.4, is an instance of hagiographical elaboration of MT, rather than evidence of a different Hebrew text.

LXX is, however, extremely interesting here. For MT's , it reads , ie. . Other than the superscription in v.1, the whole chapter has been thus far narrated in the first person. Admittedly, there is a major break in the text between v.11 and v.12, but that is not a reason for asserting the priority of the MT. Rather, the form is precisely the same as that which is found in Jer. 18:5, where the explication of the command to go to the potter's house is recounted in the first person, cf. also Jer. 13:1-11, especially v.8. Thus, LXX is likely to reflect the original reading here. G.A. Smith plausibly suggests that the MT reading has arisen through a copyist misreading the first person suffix in as the initial
In v.18, once again MT is in the third person, LXX in the first. It will be shown that LXX is more original here also.

Verse 13

While Peshitta, Targum and Vulgate follow MT in reading the long divine title בִּטְחַנָאָה הַקֹּדֶשׁ שָׁהָרֵי, LXX does not. It reads simply ἀπεργος, ie. σιγή. A whole section of Janzen's book is devoted to a study of the divine names in Jeremiah, and of the differences between MT and LXX over them. His results may be summarised as follows: the divergence of LXX from MT over the divine names is so wide that it cannot be accounted for by inadvertent omission, אֵל כָּאָרִיא appears 82 times in the MT of Jeremiah, but only 10 times in the LXX, and הִנָּה שָׁהָרֵי is attached to שָׁהָרֵי 49 times in MT, but only 14 times in LXX. Outside the Book of Jeremiah, the divine epithet סַנֵּרַס is rendered by LXX with great regularity, so if the divine names in Jeremiah were shortened by the Greek translator, then it must have been a particular idiosyncrasy of the translator(s) of Jeremiah. The short readings of the LXX are likely to be original, as the 'omissions' are anything but consistent, and the additions to the divine names in the MT of Jeremiah reflect the same type of expansionist activity as has been found with the human names in Jeremiah. The development of these expansions is probably due to the fact that, in the vast majority of cases, the readings are linked with the prophetic cliches הָכֹּל אֲחָר and מַשְׁמַע בָּנוֹת - 65 of the 82 instances of סַנֵּרַס in the
MT of Jeremiah are linked with one or other of these formulae, and all 49 instances of בְּמַעֲרָה may are connected with חָזוּן.

The הנָחַיָה זְבַע found at the end of the verse in MT is unrepresented in LXX. Due to the very nature of the phrase הנָחַיָה זְבַע, it is impossible to decide whether the long text of MT or the short one of LXX represents the original reading: whenever הנָחַיָה זְבַע appears in the OT, which is frequently (162 times in the MT of Jeremiah, according to BDB), it is never syntactically connected with anything, so there is virtually no sure way of determining whether a text containing it is more original than one that does not. An 'open verdict' must be returned here but, as in the other cases where such a conclusion has been reached concerning the text of Jeremiah 35, the sense of the passage is unaffected.

Verse 14

For MT's הנָחַיָה זְבַע לֹא-דְּגַלְגֵל, LXX has ἀνάθεμα ἀλλήλων ἀλλήλων, which suggests a Hebrew text נָהַיָה זְבַע לֹא-דְּגַלְגֵל. The Hophal of גָּלַג, used here in MT, is very uncommon in the Hebrew Bible, being found elsewhere only in 2 Sam. 23:1 and Exod. 40:17, both of which are again in the singular form גָּלַג. LXX reads a Hiphil for the occurrence in 2 Sam. 23:1 (ἀνάθημα).
This paucity of usage of the Hophal of יָטַה, connected with the fact that מָעַיָּה in Jer. 35:14 is singular with a plural subject (תַּכָּרָה תַּכָּרָה), for which a plural verb would really be desiderated (*מָעַיָּה), suggests two things. Firstly, that LXX is correct to read דָּבָר as a singular, דָּבָר — the final — having arisen through a ditto- graphy of the following — at the beginning of דָּבָר דָּבָר. Secondly, that, apart from this, MT is, in fact, the earliest form of the text, and the LXX represents an attempt to resolve the difficulties of the unusual form of the Hebrew, by assimilating the phrase to the לֹאִיָּה לֹאִיָּה לֹאִיָּה לֹאִיָּה of v.16. The Targum, which retains the Hophal of יָטַה, but reads it as a plural, represents a similar attempt to tidy up an awkward piece of Hebrew.

As well as explaining the singular verb with plural subject, recognition that דָּבָר is a corruption of דָּבָר also brings v.14 into conformity with the rest of the chapter, in describing Jonadab's commands with a singular noun — the only other place where a plural is used is in MT v.18, where מָעַיָּה מָעַיָּה מָעַיָּה מָעַיָּה appears, but this is not found in the probably more original LXX.

Thus, the opening phrase of v.14 read מִיְּקַנְּאָתָה מִיְּקַנְּאָתָה מִיְּקַנְּאָתָה מִיְּקַנְּאָתָה, an unusual, but still perfectly legitimate, piece of Hebrew. The LXX translator, however, had trouble with the Hophal of יָטַה and the accusative particle before the subject, and rewrote the sentence so that it was
practically the same as v.16. After the LXX translation was made, a copyist's error led to the appearance of דביה יגוזב.

While Aquila and Theodotion represent the MT clause יד רוחים חותכ כ תחון אברים LXX does not. Janzen feels that MT is secondary, and has arisen through assimilation to vv.8, 10 and 16, perhaps to reinforce the contrast between the Rechabites (v.14a) and Jeremiah's hearers (v.14b). LXX v.18 would provide the perfect source for the expansion. It reads גֶּפֶן הַקָּוָן עֹלָה וּמָלוֹא יָדַע יָדוֹת אֶל הָאָרֶץ, ie. "I have set you in the midst of the nations". Janzen is probably right: the MT is to be seen as expansionary.

The אִם at the end of the verse in MT is not represented in LXX, except in Sinaiticus. A definitive decision between the longer and shorter texts is not really possible here. At the end of v.15, MT again reads נִבְּרֵי and LXX (including Codex N) simply וַאֲשֶׁר יָבֹא הַקָּוָן, but at the end of v.16 both LXX and MT read אִם אִם after יִשְׂרָאֵל, which perhaps suggests that MT in vv.14 and 15 is an assimilation to v.16, and that the shorter LXX reading is more original.

Verse 15

For the first time in our chapter, the Latin Versions present a reading different from that contained in
the MT. The Vulgate follows the MT of Jeremiah 35 completely literally, so has figured little in this text-critical study. The Old Latin citation of Jer. 35:15 in Irenaeus' *Adversus Haereses*, Book 4, Chap. 36, Part 5, however, is closer to LXX than to MT, and is probably drawn from the LXX tradition.

The LXX tradition fails to represent the בּוּ before לָכַבְר צְרוּי. This case is analogous to that found in v.3, and is to be similarly left open. LXX also fails to represent נֵסֵתְוּ, which Janzen feels has arisen in MT through assimilation to Jer. 25:4, which reads נֵסֵתְוּ נָסָתָהוּ לָכַבְר צְרוּי נָסָתָהוּ נָסָתָהוּ נָסָתָהוּ לָכַבְר צְרוּי - a verse which Rudolph suggests has itself been added from 7:25, 26. Helga Weippert has produced a table of the use of the idiom נֵסֵתְוּ Inf. Absol. followed by another Infinitive Absolute in the Old Testament, which shows that, apart from 2 Chron. 36:15 (itself dependent on Jer. 25:4), the idiom occurs only in Jeremiah, and always in the prose portions of the book. נֵסֵתְוּ is followed by רַבְר, in 7:13, 25:3 and 35:14; by לָכַבְר in 11:7; by עִנָּ in 32:33; and by נָסָתָהוּ in 7:25, 25:4, 29:14, 35:15 and 44:4. Except 29:14, which occurs in a section unrepresented by LXX, all the uses with נָסָתָהוּ, other than 35:15, are faithfully rendered by LXX, which suggests that had נָסָתָהוּ been present in the Hebrew text used by the Greek translator, he would have rendered it in 35:15 also. Thus, Janzen is correct to see MT as secondary here.
LXX reads a future, which is also rendered as an imperative in Peshitta. LXX seems preferable here, as the MT imperative is really rather awkward, and may have arisen by assimilation to the other imperatives in the verse. RSV tacitly follows LXX here, which suggests a Hebrew form.

For the at the end of the verse in MT, Targum has 'to my memra', a phenomenon typical of Targumic Bible translation and exegesis.

Verse 17

For the full divine title of MT, LXX has simply , and is probably more original. For MT's phrase, Peshitta reads , but this reflects the same text as MT - the having been lost by Haplography between the two instances of . As in vv.3 and 15, LXX does not represent the before in v.17.

The final phrase of the verse in MT, although found in Theodotion (asterisked), and used by the Targum as the basis for an expansion, does not appear in LXX. Janzen follows LXX, and sees the phrase in MT as having arisen as a result of scribal familiarity with 7:13: This conclusion is likely - MT is expansionary here in v.17.
Verse 18

For MT לֵזֵב יִרְשָׁדִים בֹּלֶת וְיָמָהּ לָעַד יִהוּדָה, the LXX reads simply διὰ τοῦτο ὁ θεὸς ἔσται ἱερός, that is, simply διὰ τοῦτο ἱερός. The shorter divine name of LXX is more likely to be original, and the first half of the phrase in MT is also likely to be secondary, probably being part of the reworking of the text resulting from הַלּוֹךְ in v.12 being seen as an abbreviation for יְהָדוּת ה' ה'.

For the rest of the verse in MT, LXX has ἡ χάρις τοῦ ἁγιάσματος τοῦ πατρὸς σου πολλὴν καθὼς ἐντελέχεια σου ὁ πατὴρ σου, which suggests a Hebrew text reading ויִשְׂאָזוּנָה צְרִיךְ בְּכָל בְּכָל הָעָמִים וּכְלַתֵּנָהּ כֶּסֶף וּכְלַתֵּנָה. Janzen once more expresses a preference for the reading of the LXX. The three clauses, וְיָמָהּ ... וְיִרְשָׁדִים of MT are not likely to be original - although וְיָמָהּ may be missing in LXX by HomoiocorDON, it is more likely that MT is a conflated variant of the previous clause. יִרְשָׁדִים is otherwise unattested in the chapter, and the plural מְשַׁמַּרָא יִרְשָׁדִים is in marked contrast to the singular מְשַׁמַּרְתָּא in MT vv.14, 16, 18.

If LXX is followed in v.18, then the opening וְיָמָהּ parallels the identical opening phrase in v.17, and the two verdicts follow chiastically on from the two indictments contained in v.16.
Verse 19

LXX does not represent the לְפָנַי הַגָּדוֹלָה הַגָּדוֹלָה כְּלֵי מְדֻרֶּשֶׁת of MT, and is superior to MT. MT is based on vv.13, 15 and 17, and LXX has a superior structure in vv. 18-19. The formula no doubt came into the text of MT v.19 along with the other expansionary reworkings that have been identified in the chapter.

For לא נָשַׂא מִלָּה MT, LXX reads חַלְּשׁ, חַלְּשׁ יָדָע בְּהַדְרָכָה. As Janzen correctly notes, it is LXX which is secondary here, its expansion deriving from v.16 and LXX v.18.

For לא נָשַׂא מִלָּה of MT, Targum reads מֵעָנָי יָדָע, 'ministering before me'. This is not evidence of a different Hebrew Vorlage. Rather, it reflects the belief, found in some rabbinic texts, that the Rechabites became priests. 48

As will be shown in the third part of the present chapter, one of the meanings that 'to stand before Yahweh's face' can have, in biblical Hebrew, is 'cultic service'.

For the final two words of the chapter, כְּלָלָה מִי מְדֻרֶּשֶׁת, LXX has כְּלָלָה מִי מְדֻרֶּשֶׁת, i.e. מְדֻרֶּשֶׁת מִי מְדֻרֶּשֶׁת, "While the earth remains, seed-time and harvest, cold and heat, summer and winter, day and night, shall not cease." (RSV)
Collationary

It will be helpful to reproduce in full the form of the most primitive text, as reconstructed in the foregoing pages, and to provide a translation of Jeremiah 35. In the following text and translation, a waved line (______) indicates an MT plus where a decision of textual priority is impossible, and the sense unaffected; a straight line (____) indicates that a reading found in LXX has been followed; a broken line (____) that MT has been followed in preference to LXX; and parentheses (( )) a reading found in MT but not in LXX, the priority of which will be ascertained below on structural grounds.51
1. בַּעֲשֵׂהּ בּוֹקֵעַ גוֹדֵר לַכְּפָדָהּ וַכָּל הָעָרָבָהּ וְזָרָה

2. וַיִּשְׁלְכוּ בּוֹדֵר בַּעֲשֵׂהּ לְשַׁבְּתֵיהּ וְכָל הָעָרָבָהּ וְזָרָה

3. אַל גְּרָא לְבַעֲשֵׂהּ וְזָרָה

4. וַיִּשָּׂא בּוֹדֵר חֲצָיוֹת וַכָּל הָעָרָבָהּ וְזָרָה

5. וַיִּשָּׂא בּוֹדֵר בַּעֲשֵׂהּ לְשַׁבְּתֵיהּ וְכָל הָעָרָבָהּ וְזָרָה

6. וַיִּשָּׂא בּוֹדֵר בַּעֲשֵׂהּ לְשַׁבְּתֵיהּ וְכָל הָעָרָבָהּ וְזָרָה

7. וַיִּשָּׂא בּוֹדֵר בַּעֲשֵׂהּ לְשַׁבְּתֵיהּ וְכָל הָעָרָבָהּ וְזָרָה

8. וַיִּשָּׂא בּוֹדֵר בַּעֲשֵׂהּ לְשַׁבְּתֵיהּ וְכָל הָעָרָבָהּ וְזָרָה

9. וַיִּשָּׂא בּוֹדֵר בַּעֲשֵׂהּ לְשַׁבְּתֵיהּ וְכָל הָעָרָבָהּ וְזָרָה

10. וַיִּשָּׂא בּוֹדֵר בַּעֲשֵׂהּ לְשַׁבְּתֵיהּ וְכָל הָעָרָבָהּ וְזָרָה

11. וַיִּשָּׂא בּוֹדֵר בַּעֲשֵׂהּ לְשַׁבְּתֵיהּ וְכָל הָעָרָבָהּ וְזָרָה

12. וַיִּשָּׂא בּוֹדֵר בַּעֲשֵׂהּ לְשַׁבְּתֵיהּ וְכָל הָעָרָבָהּ וְזָרָה

13. וַיִּשָּׂא בּוֹדֵר בַּעֲשֵׂהּ לְשַׁבְּתֵיהּ וְכָל הָעָרָבָהּ וְזָרָה

14. וַיִּשָּׂא בּוֹדֵר בַּעֲשֵׂהּ לְשַׁבְּתֵיהּ וְכָל הָעָרָבָהּ וְזָרָה

15. וַיִּשָּׂא בּוֹדֵר בַּעֲשֵׂהּ לְשַׁבְּתֵיהּ וְכָל הָעָרָבָהּ וְזָרָה

16. וַיִּשָּׂא בּוֹדֵר בַּעֲשֵׂהּ לְשַׁבְּתֵיהּ וְכָל הָעָרָבָהּ וְזָרָה

17. וַיִּשָּׂא בּוֹדֵר בַּעֲשֵׂהּ לְשַׁבְּתֵיהּ וְכָל הָעָרָבָהּ וְזָרָה

18. וַיִּשָּׂא בּוֹדֵר בַּעֲשֵׂהּ לְשַׁבְּתֵיהּ וְכָל הָעָרָבָהּ וְזָרָה
1. The word which came to Jeremiah from Yahweh in the days of Jehoiakim, the son of Josiah, king of Judah, saying,

2. Go to the house of the Rechabites, (and speak with them,) and bring them to the house of Yahweh, into one of the chambers, and give them wine to drink.

3. So I took Jaazaniah the son of Jeremiah, son of Habazziniah, and his brothers and all his sons, even the whole house of the Rechabites;

4. And I brought them into the house of Yahweh, into the chamber of the sons of Hanan, the son of Igdaliah, the man of God, which was near the chamber of the princes, above the chamber of Maaseiah the son of Shallum, keeper of the threshold.

5. And I set before them pitchers full of wine, and cups, and I said to them, Drink wine.

6. But they said, We will drink no wine, for Jonadab the son of Rechab, our father, laid a command upon us, saying, You shall not drink wine, neither you nor your sons forever;

7. And you shall not build a house, and you shall not sow seed, and you shall not plant a vineyard, nor have anything, but you shall live in tents all your days, that you may live many days in the land wherein you are sojourners.

8. And we have obeyed the voice of Jonadab our father, to drink no wine all our days, ourselves, our wives, our sons or our daughters;

9. And not to build houses to dwell in, and vineyard or field or seed we do not have;
10. But we live in tents, and have obeyed and done according to all which Jonadab our father commanded us.

11. But when Nebuchadrezzar king of Babylon came up to the land, then we said, Come, let us come to Jerusalem from before the army of the Chaldaeans, and from before the army of Aram, and we are dwelling in Jerusalem.

12. Then the word of Yahweh came to me, saying,

13. Thus says Yahweh, Go and say to the men of Judah and to the inhabitants of Jerusalem, Will you not receive instruction in order to hearken unto my words? says Yahweh.

14. The word which Jonadab the son of Rechab commanded his sons, to drink no wine, has been established, for they drink none, but I spoke to you persistently, but you did not obey me.

15. And I sent to you all my servants the prophets, saying, Turn now, every man from his evil way, and make your deeds good, and do not go after other gods to serve them, and you will dwell in the land which I gave to you and to your fathers, but you have not inclined your ear and you have not obeyed me.

16. For the sons of Jehonadab son of Rechab have established the command of their father which he commanded them, but this people has not obeyed me.

17. Therefore, thus says Yahweh, Behold I am bringing on Judah and on all the inhabitants of Jerusalem all the evil which I have
spoken against them;

18. Therefore, thus says Yahweh, because the sons of Jonadab the son of Rechab have obeyed the command of their father to do that which their father commanded them;

19. There will not lack a man to Jonadab the son of Rechab standing before me forever.

3.2: FORM CRITICISM OF JEREMIAH 35

The completion of the text-critical exercise by no means marks the end of the endeavour to arrive at the earliest form of Jeremiah 35. Rather, it marks a beginning, for once the earliest form of the text of the whole chapter has been ascertained, then a form-critical investigation must begin. Which, if any, words and phrases in the chapter as it now stands in the Book of Jeremiah stem from redactors, and which form the original unit? Is a coherent structure identifiable in the original unit? Is such a structure found elsewhere? Was the unit originally a preached sermon, a written tract, or a piece of prophetic biography? What purpose did it serve, both originally and in later forms and settings? What date should be ascribed to it and to its redactions?

This second section of the present investigation into Jeremiah 35 seeks to raise and answer these questions. This form-critical endeavour is by no means easy, however,
as there has been a wide diversity of scholarly opinion expressed concerning the nature and origin of the material in the Book of Jeremiah. As with any form-critical exercise, the present endeavour must inevitably involve a degree of subjectivity, as positive external evidence is almost completely lacking, but it is hoped that the conclusions here expressed will commend themselves as the most reasonable way of understanding the material now found in the thirty-fifth chapter of the Book of Jeremiah, and it is hoped that they will serve as a stimulus to further research, not only into the form-critical problems of the Book of Jeremiah, but also into the nature of Old Testament Prophecy in general, and into the means that the prophets of Israel used for proclaiming and disseminating their message.

A brief survey of the problems and positions held concerning the nature of the Book of Jeremiah as a whole will be provided, before the examination of chapter 35 itself is undertaken.

Critical Problems of the Book of Jeremiah

The material contained in the Book of Jeremiah as we now have it is of a disparate nature. As is the case with all the pre-exilic prophetic books, a large quantity of poetic oracles is found, contained (excluding the 'Oracles against the Nations' in MT chaps. 46-51) largely in chapters 1-25. There is also a large amount of prose - more than in any other prophetic book. This material is found mainly, but again by
no means exclusively, in chaps. 26-45, and seems to fall broadly into two classes: biography about the prophet and speeches from the prophet. The language of the speeches in particular seems to be closely akin to that of Deuteronomy, and it is often argued that the Deuteronomists played a significant role in the development (or even in the creation) of these speeches, and of the Book of Jeremiah as a whole. While there is widespread agreement among scholars that the bulk of the poetic oracles in the Book of Jeremiah stems from the prophet Jeremiah himself, there is little consensus over the prose portions. The division of the prose into biographical material and speeches has been questioned by at least one scholar. The purpose, or purposes, of the prose material is/are disputed, and so is the question of whether or not Jeremiah could have only spoken in poetry, or whether he could also have used prose on occasions. Whether Jeremiah himself ever wrote anything is another debated point, and so is the question whether oracles that were originally delivered orally in poetry could have become, in some circumstances, prosaicised in the course of being committed to writing. In the following paragraphs, a summary of the positions held by various significant twentieth century critics in respect to these questions will be offered.

B. Duhm argued that the Book of Jeremiah was the result of the gathering together of the authentic words of Jeremiah, which he limited to some 280 verses of poetry, all in Qinah rhythm (3:2), and the letter to the Exiles in chap. 29, the biographical narratives of Baruch, and a large
corpus of material representing deuteronomistic expansions from the exilic and post-exilic periods, espousing the theology of Deuteronomy and the reform of Josiah. Sigmund Mowinckel furthered Duhm's work, and designated the three types of material (poetic oracles, biography and speeches) as Types A, B and C respectively. He did not originally regard Baruch as the source of the Type B material, but he later revised his opinion. His work has been very influential on twentieth century Jeremianic scholarship, and his designation of the material has been widely accepted.

In one of the classic 'Studies in the Life of Jeremiah', John Skinner argued that Baruch was the most likely source for the biographical material now found in the Book of Jeremiah. He accepted that there was extensive deuteronomistic activity evident in the Book, but nevertheless held that the bulk of the material does go back to the prophet himself, and either represents Jeremiah's actual words, or else the gist of his proclamation.

The well-known pre-war combination of Oosterley and Robinson accepted the division of the material in the Book of Jeremiah along the lines proposed by Mowinckel. They held to the Jeremianic authorship of the bulk of the poetic portions of the Book, and felt that the biographical material bore the marks of an account made by a contemporary eyewitness, probably Baruch. Concerning the speeches, ie. Type C, they conceded that they had a distinctly deuteronomistic flavour, but ascribed this, not to a whole-scale later redaction of the Book of Jeremiah by the Deuteronomists, but
to a common sixth-century rhetorical prose style, used both by the authors of Deuteronomy and by the scribe who recorded Jeremiah's preaching, *ie.* Baruch. They also suggested that, occasionally, an oracle that was originally delivered in poetry could become prosaicised in the course of its being committed to writing, and cited Jer. 22:10-12 as an instance of the preservation of both the poetic and the prosaicised forms. They went on to conjecture that these prose portions were part of the scroll written by Baruch at Jeremiah's dictation, as recounted by Jer. 36. Thus, Oesterley and Robinson followed Skinner in wishing to see the bulk of the material in the Book of Jeremiah as stemming from Jeremiah himself.

Both in his article on the prose sermons and in his commentary on the Book of Jeremiah as a whole, John Bright followed Mowinckel's division of the material, and Oesterley and Robinson's belief that the prose sermons were couched in the common rhetorical prose of the sixth century, not necessarily reflecting Jeremiah's actual words, but certainly reflecting the gist of his preaching. He dated these sermons to within a few years of the death of Jeremiah. In addition, he cited numerous phrases in the prose sermons which he regarded as either being unique to Jeremiah, or found elsewhere only in manifestly later material.

W.L. Holladay has produced numerous articles dealing with various questions raised by the Book of Jeremiah, and is in the process of producing the *Hermeneia* commentary on
on the Book. He too is suspicious of claims that evidence of large-scale deuteronomic redactional activity can be found in the Book and, in addition, is doubtful whether the division of the prose portions into Type B and Type C, as proposed by Mowinckel, can be sustained. One of his suggestions is that the prose portions of Jeremiah contain phrases which have a 'prototype' in the poetic portions, i.e. the prose sections are very closely modelled on material that is unquestionably Jeremianic. One of his later suggestions, following Weippert, is that the prose sermons in Jeremiah should be seen as reflecting a particular style of prophetic diction, called paraenetic prose, inspired by the style of Deuteronomy and stemming from the prophet himself, who consciously modelled himself on the portrayal of Moses in Deuteronomy as a prophet who was both preacher and poet. His subscription to this theory leads him to follow Hyatt in his dating of the life of Jeremiah, taking the thirteenth year of Josiah (Jer. 1:2) to be the date of the prophet's birth (cf. 1:5), and placing the call to preach in the year of Josiah's death, 609 BCE, when Jeremiah was seventeen. An additional important point that he makes is that, in a dictation situation, poetry would, of necessity, be recorded verbatim, but with prose there would be room for considerable variation on the part of the scribe, who would use the pattern of writing to which he was accustomed. Thus Baruch's recording of Jeremiah's paraenetic prose would inevitably agree with the conventions of the prose style of the sixth century BCE.

Despite Oesterley and Robinson, Bright and Holladay,
the separation of the Deuteronomists from the development of the Jeremiah tradition is by no means universally accepted. Ernest Nicholson has reasserted their influence on the Book of Jeremiah, arguing that Bright has greatly underestimated the amount of deuteronomistic phraseology to be found in the Book of Jeremiah, and claims that

the peculiarly Jeremianic vocabulary in the sermons can be explained on the grounds that whoever composed them was working on the basis of authentic material from the prophet himself, which has been incorporated, wholly or partly, in the present sermons.

From a form-critical point of view, his contribution is also significant because, like Holladay, he is of the opinion that a division of the prose material into two types is a false division. He also believes that the prose portions of Jeremiah were fashioned and shaped by the Deuteronomists, during the Exile, in Babylon, for homiletic and didactic purposes.

Robert Carroll, both in his monograph and in his very recent commentary on Jeremiah, goes even further than Nicholson, and presents what is in effect a more highly nuanced version of the arguments of Duhm. Carroll is of the opinion that the Book of Jeremiah, in its non-poetic portions, has been so overlaid with later material, dating from both the exilic and the post-exilic periods, that 'the Quest of the Historical Jeremiah' is a largely fruitless task. The purpose of the creation and development of this tradition was to establish a theodicy, to justify the Fall of Jerusalem, and to promulgate the views of a particular group in the
early post-exilic period. Like Duhm, Carroll sees the poet-
ic portions of the Book of Jeremiah as the only material that
may be ascribed to the prophet himself. One of Carroll's
fundamental dicta is that "the prophets were poets", thereby disagreeing with Holladay's belief that Jeremiah used a
paraenetic prose form.

This review of positions on Jeremiah does not pretend to be exhaustive, but simply seeks to indicate the
breadth of opinion held among various scholars. Without
attempting to solve the form-critical problems of the Book
of Jeremiah - an endeavour which lies far beyond the scope
of the present work - a few preliminary observations are in
order, which will assist the attempt to classify and date the
material contained in Jeremiah 35. It seems somewhat un-
likely that an oracle originally delivered in poetry would be
turned into prose when it was committed to writing, so the
argument of Oesterley and Robinson, based on Jer. 22:10-12,
is to be rejected, and Carroll's explanation of these
verses is to be preferred. Given that this is so, then
the first person prose sections in the Book of Jeremiah (of
which chapter 35 is one) are either Jeremianic paraenetic
prose, either spoken or written, or else the creation of
traditionists, whether based on real events or not. The
questioning of the validity of dividing the prose material
into separate sources is also significant for an investi-
gation into Jer. 35, and Nicholson's emphasis on the positive
purposes of the shaping of the material (for 'preaching to
the Exiles!') is surely preferable to a view like that of
Bright, who regards the redaction simply as a preservation of the gist of Jeremiah's own words. Carroll's approach is very suggestive, but he may, as Berridge has noted, be asking rather too much of the data and, in fact, in his commentary, Carroll is rather more circumspect in presenting his hypothesis. Whether he is right to maintain rigidly that the prophets were poets is, however, another matter - Holladay et al may be right in believing that Jeremiah, at any rate, was capable of using prose on occasion. And what about the prophets as authors? Quite a large body of scholarship believes that the prophets were quite capable of producing tracts propounding their views. If this was the case, did they write in poetry or in prose? Finally, it seems incontrovertible that some passages in the present Book of Jeremiah stem from redactors, but whether any or all of these passages come from the Deuteronomists is a matter which, at this stage, must be left open.

With these preliminary remarks made, we may now turn to Jeremiah 35 itself.

**Form Criticism and Structure of Jeremiah 35**

The first, and most obvious, thing that should be said about the form of Jeremiah 35 is that it is in prose, i.e. if Mowinckel's analysis of the data is correct, it should be assigned to Type B (biographical narratives) or to Type C (prose sermons), or divided between the two. It is common for commentators to divide the chapter at the end of v.11,
and to assign vv.1-11 to Type B and vv.12-17 or 12-19\textsuperscript{88} to
Type C.\textsuperscript{89} The doubt expressed by Nicholson and Holladay over
the division of the material in the Book of Jeremiah immedi-
ately becomes significant. The assigning of the material in
chapter 35 to two distinct sources implies that the sections
vv.1-11 and 12-17(19) once circulated independently from each
other or, at least, that vv.12-17(19) were added to vv.1-11
at some later stage in the compilation of the material. How-
ever, vv.1-11 make little sense on their own. The narrative
is incomplete, the reader is left in 'mid-scene' at the end
of the Rechabites' speech, wondering what is going to happen
next. Theologically, it is incomplete too. One of the strong
points of Thompson's commentary on Jeremiah is its section on
prophetic symbolism,\textsuperscript{90} where the importance of the spoken
divine word accompanying prophetic acts is stressed - and
Jeremiah's dealings with the Rechabites are just such an act
of prophetic symbolism.\textsuperscript{91} For this reason, vv.1-11 must be
seen as incomplete on their own. No reason has been given
for Jeremiah's action. There has been no spoken divine word
to accompany the symbolic act, and it seems improbable that,
if Jeremiah had simply gone home at the end of the Rechabites'
speech, without saying or doing anything, his audience
would have understood the point he was trying to make - his
action would have been, at best, ambiguous and, at worst,
downright incomprehensible! The observation that vv.1-11
are incomplete on their own also holds true even if the chap-
ter is seen as a literary creation, with little or no basis
in historical fact\textsuperscript{92} - the verses are incomplete as a literary
unit also. This being so, one of three things must be assumed
about vv.12-19. Either the section comes in toto from the same source as vv.1-11, or the section comes in toto from redactors, and has completely replaced the original conclusion to vv.1-11, or else the section is an amalgam, containing the original nucleus of the conclusion to the pericope, with later editorial material, whether deuteronomistic or not, added to, and overlaying, it. The third option seems the most likely one, as there does seem to be material in vv.12-19 that is editorial, but it seems intrinsically improbable that redactors would have completely replaced the original conclusion to the passage with something of their own creation. A careful analysis of the verses will reveal which ones are likely to be original to the story about the Rechabites, and which are later editorial expansions. Some scholars have also sought to demonstrate that vv.1-11 have also undergone editorial expansion but, as will be shown, this is unlikely.

Thus, for Jeremiah 35 at least, the contention of Nicholson and Holladay, that to divide the prose material into Type B and Type C is, at best, unhelpful, is substantiated.

The overall structure of Jeremiah 35 may be defined as follows:

a. A third person opening formula: "The word which came to Jeremiah from Yahweh ... saying". Verse 1.

b. A command from Yahweh to Jeremiah. Verse 2.

c. A first person account of Jeremiah's carrying
out of that command, with the addition of further details (i.e., the speech of the Rechabites). Verses 3-11.

d. A divine explication of the act, based on those further details, introduced by "And the word of Yahweh came to me saying". Verses 12-19.

This structure is identical with that of Jer. 18:1-11, the so-called 'Parable of the Potter':

a. A third person opening formula: "The word which came to Jeremiah from Yahweh ... saying". Verse 1.

b. A command from Yahweh to Jeremiah. Verse 2.

c. A first person account of Jeremiah's carrying out of that command, with the addition of further details (in this case, the actions of the potter). Verses 3f.

d. A divine explication, based on those further details, introduced by "And the word of Yahweh came to me saying". Verses 5-11.

The structure of Jer. 13:1-11, the 'Parable of the Waistcloth', is not dissimilar to that of Jer. 35, but it is more complicated, as it includes no less than three successive divine instructions (vv.1, 3f, 6) and three accounts of Jeremiah obeying those instructions (vv.2, 5, 7a), before the further details ("The waistcloth was spoilt, it was good for nothing", v.7b), and the divine explication, introduced by "And the word of Yahweh came to me saying". Note that the opening formula in 13:1, is different from that in 18:1 and 35:1.
As will be seen in the course of the following analysis, numerous scholars have rejected certain verses and phrases in all three of these passages as redactional. Even if their conclusions are right, this overall structure, to be found in Jer. 13:1-11, 18:1-11, 35:1-19, remains unaltered.

The major structural difference between Jer. 35 on the one hand and Jer. 13 and 18 on the other is that the latter two chapters have nothing which corresponds to the Promise to the Rechabites in 35:18-19. It is common to see these verses as being separate from vv.12-17, presumably because of the opening formula contained in MT v.18 but, as the text-critical analysis showed, it is rather LXX which reflects the original text, without the opening formula, which suggests that vv.18-19 are an integral part of vv.12-19. There are only two other 'Messages of Salvation' addressed to particular persons in the Book of Jeremiah, that to Ebed-Melech the Cushite (39:16-18) and that to Baruch (chap. 45), but in form and language they are both significantly different from 35:18-19, and sufficiently like each other, to suggest that they should not be readily associated with 35:18-19.

Nicholson does not link the structure of Jer. 35 with that of Jer. 13 or Jer. 18. Rather, he links it with the structure of Jer. 7, 11:1-17, 17:19-27, 25:1-11 and 34:1-22, and sees all of them as evidence of a deuteronomistic homiletic style in the prose sermons of the Book of
Jeremiah and, hence, as evidence of a deuteronomistic re-
daction of the whole of the material. However, chap. 35 is
not the same structurally as chaps. 7, 11, 17, 25 or 34, all
of which recount a divine speech and nothing more, whereas
chap. 35 recounts a piece of prophetic symbolism. Hence, in
chap. 7 there is no account of Jeremiah obeying Yahweh's
command, and this feature is absent from the passages in
chaps. 11, 17, 25 and 34 also. Nicholson is mistaken when
he includes chap. 35 with these others. Chapters 13 and 18
are closer structural parallels than those adduced by Nichol-
son - it is surely very forced to take 35:1-12 as the 'intro-
duction' to 35:13-19, as he does. Vv.1-12 are not a unity
in this sense; the natural break in the chapter occurs after
v.11, and to impose a structure on the text that ignores this
seems quite arbitrary. As an 'introduction', 35:1-12 is six
times as long as any of the other 'introductions' that
Nicholson cites, except 34:8-12, which is still under
half the length of 35:1-12. The sections in chaps. 7, 11, 17
25 and 34 all open with "Go and say" (or variations on this),
or else "The word of Yahweh which came to Jeremiah saying",
and then launch directly into the divine speech. Jeremiah 35,
like chaps. 13 and 18, has an instruction to the prophet
to go and perform an action, and an account of him perform-
ing that action. It should also be noted that, in the present
form of the texts, the 'call to obedience' in the other texts
cited by Nicholson (7:3-7, 23, 11:3-7, 17:21-22, 25:3-6,
34:13-14) is in the indicative or the imperative, whereas in
35:13 alone is it an interrogative, and in the original form
of the text there may not have been a 'call to obedience' at
Nicholson may be right in thinking that Jer. 35 in its present form is a sermon, but structurally he is mistaken when he compares it with the material contained in chaps. 7, 11, 17, 25 and 34.

This is to pass no judgement on the question of whether these other speeches cited by Nicholson have a deuteronomistic structure or not. It is not the purpose of this study to prove the existence or otherwise of a deuteronomistic redaction of the Book of Jeremiah. The specific task of the present work is to deal with Jeremiah 35, which seems to have a very definite structure, but not a deuteronomistic one - at least, not as Nicholson defines a deuteronomistic structure! It is more profitable to compare the structure of chap. 35 with that of chaps. 18:1-11 and 13:1-11, and to classify these three units together, as George Adam Smith did long ago, and to seek the true understanding of chapter 35 in terms of an account of an act of prophetic symbolism.

Having rejected Nicholson's contention that a deuteronomistic structure is discernible in Jer. 35, and having identified an overall general structure, it is now necessary to move to a more detailed analysis of the text itself, in terms of the language employed and the rhetorical devices used. It is worth restating the contentions that vv.1-11 are a unity, and that vv.12-19 are an amalgam, containing the kernel of the original conclusion to vv.1-11, but overlaid
and expanded by a considerable amount of editorial expansion. In the paragraphs that follow, the two sections vv.1-11 and 12-19 will be examined separately.

While it may not be an infallible guide for determining the presence or absence of redactional expressions in a biblical text, it seems to be a reasonable working hypothesis to suggest that where particular words or phrases that are rare or unique in the Hebrew Bible, or words that are found in all the various writings of the Old Testament, occur in a particular text, then this is a sign of the 'authenticity' of that text, and that, conversely, where 'stock phrases' belonging to a particular (group of) biblical writer(s) are found, especially in large numbers in a relatively short text, then this is a sign that a redactor has been at work on the text. The following examination of Jer. 35 suggests that the former situation prevails in vv.1-11, and the latter in vv.12-19. In vv.1-11, the following rare or unique words and phrases are found:

חדר, 'chamber', found in verses 2 and 4, is not a common biblical word, being frequent only in the vision of the restored Temple in Ezekiel 40-48. The word is found twice in the deuteronomistic corpus, at 1 Sam. 9:22, where it denotes a banquet hall at a local sanctuary (חדר), and at 2 Kings 23:11, referring, as here, to a room in the Solomonic Temple. It occurs elsewhere in Jeremiah at 36:10;

שר, 'man of God', Jer. 35:4, is not in itself a rare biblical phrase, but it is found only here in the corpus of the Latter Prophets. If the phrase here had
come from a redactor, it would be expected that it would have been used as a title of Jeremiah or, at least, of another known figure, not the otherwise completely unknown Hanan ben Igdaliah. Alternatively, 'man of God' could be a designation of Igdaliah rather than Hanan, but Igdaliah is as unknown as his son!

In Jer. 35:7, the phrase יִשָּׁבֶת וְיִהְיֶה לָךְ, lit. 'that you may live many days upon the face of the earth', is found. Even without the addition of the following phrase, אשר לְאָנָבֵי הָאֵרִים שָׁם, 'wherein you are sojourners', this is a unique construction in the OT, and not a deuteronomistic addition, as Thiel thinks. The standard Hebrew formula for 'living long in the land' uses יִשָּׁבֶת, but this phrase is the equally singular יִשָּׁבֶת לְאָנָבֵי הָאֵרִים, as here, is found only nine times in the Old Testament. None of the other instances are close enough in form to posit literary
influence from them onto Jer. 35:7;\textsuperscript{110}

The all-inclusive phrase 'we, our wives, our sons and our daughters' in Jer. 35:8 is also quite singular - the closest parallel anywhere else in the Old Testament is to be found in Jer. 14:6, 'them, their wives, and their sons and their daughters';

\begin{itemize}
\item The use of \textit{נָכַּרְתָּ} \textit{תַּרְגּוּ} \textit{וֹדֶה} in 35:9 is also completely unattested elsewhere in the Hebrew Bible. Rudolph proposed reading \textit{זֶרֶת} \textit{שֶׁדֶת} \textit{שִׁל} \textit{כָּל} \textit{בֶּשֶׂדֶת} \textit{רָצִית} on the basis of Ezek. 17:5, but there seems no compelling reason to follow this emendation. Rather, it is best to accept the phrase's uniqueness;
\item The use of \textit{נֵכַּרְתָּ} \textit{נִבְּרָו} in the double formula \textit{זֶרֶת} \textit{כְּבָּאָנָה} \textit{יַרְשָׁ} \textit{רָצִית} of Jer. 35:11, is nowhere else attested in biblical Hebrew.
\end{itemize}

While this evidence is by no means conclusive, it is nevertheless sufficiently strong, especially when linked with the arguments from the rhetorical devices present in the verses, about to be detailed, to support the contention that vv.1-11 lack evidence of the hand of the redactor.

Thiel regards Jer. 35:1 as using a typically deuteronomistic form, and suggests that the dating of the incident to the time of Jehoiakim also comes from the Deuteronomists.\textsuperscript{112} That v.1 was not part of the original unit is not likely, however. V.2 hardly marks the beginning of anything, as it leaves both the speaker and the addressee unspecified, so if v.1 is redactional, then it must have
replaced something else which contained the name of both
speaker and addressee, and probably some indication of date
as well. It is surely easier to regard the present v.1 as the
original opening of the unit, rather than as a redactional
phrase.

Verses 2-5, which recount Yahweh's command to
Jeremiah, and a first person account of the carrying out of
that command, use the rhetorical device known as repetitio,
where each of the commands has a corresponding account of its
fulfilment. Thus:

In the text-critical analysis, the question of
the original text in v.2 was left open, ie. whether סרהדר
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should be read with MT, LXX¹, or omitted with LXX⁻¹, but it was suggested that it was possible to express a preference for the shorter reading on structural grounds. Here are the reasons supporting that preference. If 'go and speak to them' is omitted, then the three commands from Yahweh in v.2, 'Go ... bring ... make drink' are taken up successively in the three following verses, 'And I took ... and I brought ... and I set before them'. The narrative of the fulfillment of the command is no slavish repetition of the contents of that command in v.2, as one would expect if vv.3-5 were a redactional composition.¹¹⁴ Rather, each element in the fulfilling of the command is fuller than its counterpart in the command itself. Thus, 'house of the Rechabites', v.2a, becomes 'Jaazaniah the son of Jeremiah, son of Habazziniah, and his brothers, and all his sons', with a resumptive 'even the whole house of the Rechabites', v.3. The 'and bring them into the house of Yahweh, into one of the chambers' in v.2b becomes, in v.4, 'And I brought them to the house of Yahweh, to the chamber of the sons of Hanan etc.', with the verb plus suffix of the command becoming verb plus accusative pronoun, and the position of the chamber being given in some detail, as opposed to the vague 'one of the chambers' of the command. The 'and give them wine to drink', v.2c, becomes 'And I set before them pitchers full of wine and cups, and I said to them, Drink wine'. The fact that v.2c uses an accusative pronoun supports Janzen's contention¹¹⁵ that, in v.5, LXX προσέβασεν αὐτον (ie. καθ' ἑαυτῷ) is preferable to the MT בֵּית רָכֶבִית.
The same rhetorical features discerned in vv.2-5, namely, a command followed by an account of the fulfilling of that command, based on, but different from, the command itself, can be seen also in the 'further details', the speech of the Rechabites, in vv.6-10:
On the structural link between 'laid a command on us', v.6, and 'And we have obeyed', v.8 (a-a on the diagram), see above, page 102. V.6b is taken up by v.8b (b-b), but once again there is no slavish repetition, which one would expect to find if the verses detailing the fulfilment of the command were a redactional expansion based on the command itself. The order of the elements is different — in v.6 it is 'drink no wine — people — forever', in v.8 'drink no wine — forever — people'. The expressions used for 'forever' are different — in v.6 it is מְנַשֶּׁתֶּת and in v.8 מִצְוָה. The 'people' section is fuller in v.8 than in v.6 — in v.6 it is 'you and your sons', and in v.8 'we, our wives, our sons and our daughters'. V.7a is taken up by v.9a (c-c), but in v.9 the בְּ of v.7 becomes the plural בְּ and מִצְוָה is added. V.7b is taken up by v.9b (d-d), but again the form of v.9b is very different from that of v.7b — an extra element (הָדוּן) has been inserted, and the verbs (וַעֲדָ and בָּשְׁרָה) dropped. V.7c is taken up by v.10a (e-e), this time, uniquely, perhaps because it is the end of the passage, in a form shorter than that contained in the command, but with a closing summary notice appended, so that 'to command' (נָב, cf. v.6) and 'to obey' (וַֺּתֵּט, cf. v.8) are summarised at the end of the section to form a neat conclusion.

Verse 11, the final verse of the 'further details', stands separately from the other verses, and uses its own rhetorical device, namely chiasmus, as has been already demonstrated. The verse is needed to explain why the Rechabites, tent-dwellers, were currently residing in
Jerusalem (whether still in tents or in houses is immaterial at this stage), but this should not be taken as evidence that the verse stems from a redactor—it does include a unique grammatical construction. Rather, what we appear to have in the speech of the Rechabites in Jer. 35:6-11 is two things: the 'creed' of the Rechabites in vv.6-10, which forms a self-contained unity with a tight structure, and their own addition in v.11, justifying their presence in Jerusalem.

It is clear, from the language and rhetorical devices used, that the first eleven verses of Jeremiah 35, in the most original form of the text that can be discovered, do not contain any redactional elements. Thus, they will prove to be a vital source document for material on the Rechabites, provided that they can be dated with any certainty—an issue that will be examined after vv.12-19 have been subjected to analysis.

As has already been claimed, it seems highly likely that vv.12-19, while containing the original conclusion to vv.1-11, now also contain substantial editorial expansions, whether from a 'Jeremianic School' (for lack of a better term), or from the Deuteronomists, or from both. Stock phrases abound, and there seems to be little coherent structure in the verses as they now stand, which seem to be indications of redactional activity. However, in determining which phrases are redactional, caution is needed lest so much is ascribed to redactors that insufficient material is left to form the original conclusion.
Before moving to a verse-by-verse analysis of vv.12-19, some initial observations are in order. Firstly, it seems intrinsically unlikely that the original purpose of the event was simply to point out the obedience of the Rechabites, and to commend them for it, without drawing any contrast with the people of Judah and Jerusalem at all. It is hard to believe that Jeremiah would have performed the act if that were its sole purpose, and still harder to believe that it would have been preserved at all if it were. Some element of the drawing of a contrast between the Rechabites and the Judaeans must have been present in the original conclusion to the pericope, both in terms of their respective actions and in terms of their promised rewards, so those positions which do not include both of these have been too extreme, and are deficient because they lack any threat or promise of judgement on the people. Secondly, the parallels to chap. 35, ie. chaps. 13 and 18, as well as continuity within chap. 35 itself, demand that v.12, יוהי ברך ואני אליעזר, be retained as part of the original text. It may be felt that כי אם זה הנח in v.13a would be desired also, but 18:5f demonstrates that the presence of this phrase is not absolutely essential. Thirdly and very importantly, in the present text there is a contradiction between v.13 and v.16f. With the question, 'Will you not receive instruction in order to hearken unto my words?', in v.13, the implication is that Jeremiah's hearers are still able to amend their ways, but in v.16f it is plain that the judgement upon the people is inevitable. The analysis of redactional features
in the text must take account of this, as well as of the change of person found in the most primitive form of the original text – in vv.13-15, second person plural direct address is used, while in vv.16-19, the third person plural is found. These two changes, from conditional to definite judgement, and from direct address to the third person, cause some awkwardness, and their presence needs to be explained. Fourthly, and also importantly, it is vital that, when the extent of redactional influence on Jeremiah 35 is assessed, glib talk of a single redactor or redactional school must be avoided. Numerous possibilities for redactors and redactional methods for the Book of Jeremiah have been proposed, and it is possible that some of the varying proposals are complementary, rather than contradictory.

The initial tentative suggestion offered by the present study is that the original text in the second half of Jer. 35 consisted of vv.12, 16-19, as reconstructed in the text-critical analysis. The isolation of vv.13-15 as redactional removes the odd changes from second to third person and from a threatened judgement to a promised one, and yields a good structure. This proposal needs to be established by a careful analysis of each verse.

As indicated above, v.12 must have been part of the original literary unit, as the passage makes little sense without it.
As has already been noted, verses 13-15 contain a conditional threat of judgement couched in the second person plural, whereas vv.16-19 contain a promise of a certain judgement, couched in the third person plural. It seems improbable that both these forms were present in the original unit. In v.13, need not necessarily have been part of the original unit. could have been added from Jer. 28:13 and Is. 38:5. which is not exactly the same as the phrase in Jer. 35:17, is found six other times in the Jeremiah prose and twice in the Jeremiah poetry. Bright thinks that the phrase here is derived from the poetic occurrences of the phrase in 4:3f, but Holladay is of the opinion that 4:3f is late, and that the phrase's use in the prose portions of Jeremiah is derived from Is. 5:3, perhaps mediated by 2 Kings 23:2. In either case, it is clear that the phrase is redactional in Jer. 35:13. occurs three times elsewhere in the Jeremiah prose and twice in the poetry. Even though the phrase 'to take correction' was a current one in the wisdom literature, and was probably a ready phrase in all periods, its use in the Jeremiah prose is probably based on its use in the Jeremiah poetry, as Holladay observes, and thus stems from the Jeremianic redactors. The closing phrase of the verse, is not in LXX, and is perhaps not even part of the most primitive form of the complete text.

Just like v.13, v.14 can also be seen as the creation of the 'Jeremianic School' of redactors, using words and
phrases from elsewhere in the Book of Jeremiah. is reminiscent of the phrase in v.16, and may have been drawn from it, being slightly altered to avoid complete repetition of the same phrase within a few verses.

looks like an expansion from v.8. The use of Hiph. infinitive absolute followed by another infinitive absolute is confined to Jer. 7:13, 25, 11:7, 25:3, 4, 26:5, 29:19, 32:33, 35:15, 44:4 and 2 Chron. 36:15, which is dependent on Jer. 29:19. It is thus not a deuteronomistic expression, but one that is peculiar to the Jeremiah prose tradition. As it is a 'stock phrase' of the Jeremiah prose, it is probably a device of the Jeremianic redactors, rather than a feature of the prophet's own language. In the final phrase, is absent from LXX, and may have been added from 7:13.

Verse 15 is often held to be completely deuteronomistic, but Weippert's analysis has made this position hard to sustain. For , cf. Jer. 7:25, 25:4, 26:5, 29:19, 44:4, where it always follows . Elsewhere in Jeremiah, the prophets are never called Yahweh's servants. In fact, most of the references in Jeremiah to 'prophet(s)' are negative in connotation: other than the times appears with , those which designate Jeremiah in superscriptions and those which refer to Hananiah in Jer. 28, only 1:5 and 2:30 use the term positively. 1:5 refers to Jeremiah, this time in a speech of Yahweh to him, and 2:30 to the murder of the (true) prophets. This suggests that the phrase in Jer. 35:15 comes
from a redactor, but the identification of this redactor with the Deuteronomists cannot be sustained. ידועה חכמה is found in the deuteronomistic corpus at 1 Kings 14:18, 2 Kings 9:7, 14:25, 17:13, 23, 21:10, 24:2, and elsewhere in the OT at Ezek. 38:17, Am. 3:7, Zech. 1:6, Dan. 9:6, 10, Ezra 9:11, but only in Jeremiah is the phrase found with סנכתי Hiph. (not in the most primitive form of Jer. 35) and 'not hearing'. Elsewhere, except for 2 Kings 9:7 ('the blood of my servants the prophets') and Am. 3:7 ('for the Lord Yahweh does nothing except he discloses his counsel to his servants the prophets'), the use of ידועה חכמה with הביא is characteristic. For שבעזרת איש קדוש נסה, again see Weippert's analysis. The phrase is found also in Jer. 18:11, 25:2, 26:3 and 36:3, 7, and elsewhere only in Jonah 3:8, which is late. Similar expressions are found in Ezekiel (5 times), Zech. 1:4, Jonah 3:10, 2 Chron. 7:14 and also in 1 Kings 13:33 which as Weippert suggests, has probably been influenced by the (uniquely non-metaphorical) use of סנכתי + הביא in the preceding pericope, and in 2 Kings 17:13, which also uses הביא and ידועה חכמה. However, the linguistic context in 2 Kings 17 is different from that in Jeremiah, and the relation of the phrases is different. In 2 Kings 17:13, the 'call to return' is followed by a 'demand to keep the law', and the enjoining of the latter is the task of the ידועה חכמה. This is dealt with differently in Jeremiah. The use of ס конструкци + הביא is atypical of the deuteronomistic corpus. Usually ס конструкци is used. Thus, the phrase ידועה חכמה איש קדוש נסה in the Book of Jeremiah appears, once more not to be deuteronomistic, but rather a phrase of the Jeremianic redactors, who may, as
Holladay argues, have drawn it from the poetic use of the phrase in 23:14. The phrase is found outside Jer. 35:15 only in Jer. 7:3, 5, 18:11 and 26:13, which are all prose, and nowhere else in the Hebrew Bible, although Hiph. is used with a similar meaning in the Jeremiah poetry at 4:22 and 13:23. Brekelmans assigns 18:11b-12, which includes one of the instances of Hiph. followed by כֵּלִים, to the exilic period, but not to the deuteronomistic redaction of the Book of Jeremiah. There is no reason why his contention should not be applied to the use of the phrase in Jer. 35:15 also. The following phrase in 35:15, כֵּלִים, is found a total of 18 times in the Jeremiah prose, and some 35 times all over the deuteronomistic corpus. In the deuteronomistic writings, the phrase is always followed by 'to serve them', as in Jer. 35:15, or 'to worship them', or both. For 'to serve them', cf. Deut. 8:19, 13:3, 28:14. Hiph. follows the phrase elsewhere in Jeremiah in 11:10, 13:10, 16:11f and 25:6. While Weippert makes a brave attempt to show that the phrase is not necessarily a deuteronomistic one, it seems more likely that here, in the phrase 'and do not go after other gods to serve them', one of the few indications of deuteronomistic activity in chapter 35 appears. In Jeremiah, the phrase often fits badly into its context. It does here, in 13:10 and especially in 25:6, where the injunction not to go after other gods occurs after the promise of blessing for obedience! This awkwardness is another indication that, in 35:15, the phrase is a late insertion into the rest of the verse, itself already an insertion into the original text. The phrase
or something very similar, is found in the Jeremiah prose at 7:7, 14, 16:15, 23:29, 24:10, 30:3, and here, and in the poetry at 17:4, which is not a very close parallel. It is found in the deuteronomistic writings at Deut. 3:19, 20, 9:23, 1 Kings 9:7 and 2 Kings 21:8. As with the preceding phrase, there is no reason why it should not be ascribed to the Deuteronomists. The following phrase in the verse, however, is not deuteronomistic.

is found in the Jeremiah prose at 7:24, 26, 11:8, 17:23, 25:4, 34:14, here and 44:5, and elsewhere in the OT at Is. 55:3, 2 Kings 19:16=Is. 37:17, Dan. 9:18 and 14 times in the Psalter and Proverbs. The precise form, however, that the phrase takes in Jeremiah is found elsewhere only in Prov. 5:13, which is later than Jeremiah, so dependence on the writings of the Deuteronomists for the origin of this phrase cannot be asserted. Again it stems from the Jeremianic redactors.

Even the most radical of scholars retains v.16 as part of the original conclusion to the passage. It is couched in the third person plural, unlike vv.13-15, and the use of היעפ היפ. of one person 'establishing' another human being's word or commandment is rare, cf. 1 Sam. 15:11, 13, where Saul establishes Yahweh's covenant, Jer. 34:18, where the Judaeans establish Yahweh's covenant also, 44:25, 'what your mouth promises your hands should certainly establish', and Neh. 5:13, 'cursed be the man who does not establish this promise'. On the principle that scarcity of use is likely to indicate genuineness, there is here a sign of
the originality of v.16, and if v.16 is established as part of the original form of the text, then vv.13-15 must be seen as secondary, on quite different grounds to the arguments adduced above concerning the particular phrases in those verses: either the 3rd person material must be seen as secondary, or else the 2nd. The originality of the 3rd person v.16 forces the adoption of the latter alternative.

Moshe Weinfeld regards מִנָּה כְּבוֹזִים... בּוֹזִים-הָרָעָה in Jer. 35:17 as a deuteronomistic phrase, but he is unlikely to be correct. The use of מִנִּים דַּבָּרָה with the phrase is very uncommon, and the is not couched in exactly the same way as the other phrases in the Jeremiah prose where Judah and Jerusalem are mentioned together. 'Behold, I am bringing' is, in fact, a relatively common OT phrase, being found ten times in Jeremiah, five times in Ezekiel, and in Zech. 3:8, Gen. 6:17, Exod. 10:4, 1 Kings 14:10, 21:21, 2 Kings 21:12=2 Chron. 33:24, so it may be seen as a standard Hebrew phrase, used in every period. In addition, the only parallel which 'all the evil which I spoke against them' has in Jer. 19:15, which can hardly be advanced as conclusive evidence for it having stemmed from a redactor in 35:17. Jer. 35:17 is part of the original conclusion to the section, not a creation of the redactors.

Verses 18 and 19 are similarly part of the original conclusion to the unit. The phrase מִנָּה סַרְאֵתִים in v.19 is
sometimes seen as a late, redactional one, on the basis of its usage elsewhere in the Hebrew Bible. However, it should be noted that all the other uses of the phrase are connected with the Davidic dynasty or, in one case, in a context where they are closely linked with the Davidic dynasty, to its cultic functionaries, and not with any other group of people in Israel. This could, in fact, suggest that the phrase was first used in the Promise to the Rechabites, and was then adopted by the Deuteronomists, because they felt that it was a formula suitable for application to the Davidic succession. Once it had been appropriated as a royal phrase, it would have become regarded as sacrosanct, suitable only for the king and his servants, and not for anyone else. That this was the history of the phrase's use is more likely than the reverse, i.e. that the (late) compiler of Jeremiah 35 adopted the phrase from the Deuteronomists as, if this were the case, more occurrences of the phrase in connection with non-royal groups or individuals would be expected, and it seems intrinsically more likely that a particular phrase used to describe a certain small group would be appropriated to describe the monarchy than that a particular phrase which was used to describe the monarchy, and no-one else, would be appropriated as a suitable description for one particular small group, and no other. Thus, the appearance of in Jer. 35:19 can legitimately be seen as part of the original unit. It represents the earliest occurrence of the phrase in the biblical literature. Similarly, there is no need to regard the phrase in v.19 as redactional. As will
be shown in the exegetical notes to the verse, 'standing before Yahweh's face' is found in all the types of Old Testament literature.

Thus, it appears that the original conclusion to Jer. 35:1-11 is to be found in vv.12, 16-19, which originally read as follows:

The entire divine speech is thus addressed in the third person, and announces a definite judgement on the people. It also has a good chiastic structure:

A v.16a: The faithfulness of the Rechabites.
B v.16b: The unfaithfulness of the people.
B' v.17: Oracle of Judgement on the people, introduced by
A' v.18f: Oracle of Salvation for the Rechabites, introduced by

Verses 13-15 come from the redactors, primarily from the Jeremianic School, but also from the school of the Deuteronomists.

What are the date and provenance of this original
unit, Jer. 35:1-12, 16-19? It is to be noted that, apart from verse 1, the whole passage is autobiographical in style. Neither Carroll nor Nicholson comment on the fact that some of the prose narratives in the Book of Jeremiah are in the first person and some in the third. Presumably, they do not feel that any distinction should be made between them. However, the variation in person must be accounted for. If it were to be argued that the first person prose passages were originally in the third person, and were then recast into the first person for greater vividness, presenting Jeremiah himself as speaking to his (later) audience, then it must be asked why the process was not systematically carried out. Whatever the origins of the third person prose in the Book of Jeremiah, it seems most natural to suppose that the first person prose represents none other than the words of Jeremiah himself, either recorded by Baruch in a dictation situation, or else written by Jeremiah himself - the tradition certainly knows of the prophet as a writer, so this conclusion is not impossible. Chapter 35 cannot be ascribed to the Scroll mentioned in chap. 36, for if the date of 600-598 BCE is correct for the events recounted by chap. 35 (see below), then they would have occurred after the Scroll incident of chap. 36, but it could have formed a separate tract or have formed part of a different scroll, with a different purpose, eg. for proclamation throughout Jerusalem, or for sending to Jeremiah's home town of Anathoth, etc. It is more likely that chap. 35 was originally a separate tract, rather than part of a larger scroll, as it has its own superscription in v.1. The fact that this superscription is in the third person
is no argument against the Jeremianic authorship of the chapter - the superscriptions to the Pauline epistles are in the third person, but that does not mean that Romans or 1 Corinthians, for instance, were not written by Paul the Apostle. The date for the writing of Jeremiah 35 was probably immediately following the event itself, in order to ensure that Jeremiah's views were circulated more widely as soon as possible.

This view of Jeremiah as a tractarian, which has a respectable pedigree, entails abandoning Carroll's axiom that the prophets spoke only in poetry, in favour of Holladay's opinion that Jeremiah developed a paraenetic prose form but, as Carroll fails to provide an adequate explanation of the first person prose in Jeremiah, this conclusion is defensible. What is being proposed here is that Jeremiah 35 recounts an actual act of prophetic symbolism performed by the prophet, the account of which derives from the prophet himself, who no doubt would have been well able to remember and record what both he and the other participants in the event had said, so while it was committed to writing after the event in question, it nevertheless is an accurate account of the participants' words. Thus, Jer. 35 presents us with two separate things: an actual event, including the speeches of the participants, and the prophet's own written account of the same event, giving the background (in vv.1-5) to his act.

The dating of the event to c.599 BCE rests on the
linking of the events of Jer. 35:11 with those narrated in 2 Kings 24:2. Jer. 35:11 indicates that the events narrated in the whole of the chapter occurred while Babylonian and Syrian forces were rampaging throughout Judah. An attack by such raiding bands is briefly narrated in 2 Kings 24:1-2, as the response to a rebellion by Jehoiakim against Nebuchadrezzar, after the Babylonians had suffered a (temporary) reverse at the hands of the Egyptians in late 601 BCE. Nebuchadrezzar evidently deployed numerous raiding parties to contain Judah until he could regroup his main forces to crush the rebellion. He was not able to move against Judah with his full army until 598, so the activities of these raiding bands, and hence the Rechabite incident, may be dated to 600-598 BCE. The fact that the Rechabites say that Nebuchadrezzar had 'come up' against the land in v.10 does not contradict this conclusion. The raiding bands were acting under Nebuchadrezzar's orders, so it could be said that Nebuchadrezzar had 'come up' to Judah, in spirit if not in body, and, in any case, the inhabitants of Judah would have been unlikely to have made too much distinction between the 'coming up' of Nebuchadrezzar himself and the 'coming up' of his troops.

This yields the first definite point of historical and geographical reference for the material in Jeremiah 35, and thus also for the Rechabites themselves: Jerusalem, c.599 BCE. But what of the redactional elements, and what do they reveal?

The fact that the text was preserved at all, and
reworked in order to apply its message to a different situation, indicates that, at the times when the reactors were active, not only were Jeremiah’s words felt to be still relevant, but also that the Rechabites were still very much in existence, and in existence within the land of Israel — if they were not, then the preservation of the text, especially vv.7 and 18f, would have caused acute embarrassment, and would have provided ready ammunition to those seeking to slander the memory of Jeremiah. As will be shown in the exegetical notes to Jer. 35:18f, the implication is not only that the Rechabites were still living in the land of Israel, but also that they were still maintaining their distinctive practices outlined in v.6f.

The foregoing analysis suggests that two, or perhaps even three, groups of redactors, had a hand in shaping the material: one, or two, 'Jeremianic Schools', and the Deuteronomists. To deal with the Deuteronomists first: the existence of a deuteronomistic redaction of the Book of Jeremiah as a whole is indicated by Jer. 52, which closely parallels 2 Kings 24:18-25:30. Nicholson is probably right in his conclusions concerning the date and provenance of the deuteronomistic corpus and the deuteronomistic redaction of Jeremiah, when he places them during the Exile, in Babylon, within the life of the Synagogue, for homiletic purposes. The fact that only slight traces of the Deuteronomists can be found in chapter 35 — probably just the clause — need not cause much surprise. 1 Samuel is
undoubtedly part of the Deuteronomistic History, yet there is little trace of the hand of the deuteronomistic redactor in it. He was content to let the passages speak for themselves, within his own overall editorial framework. The injunction not to go after other gods to serve them, in order to dwell in the land that Yahweh has given, while not unintelligible if dated to the pre-exilic period, makes perfectly good sense within the context of the Exile in Babylon, as a promise of restoration to the land of Israel, provided that the people worship only Yahweh. The example of the Rechabites provided an ideal vehicle for the promulgation of this message: not only were they known to be still living in the land of Israel, their fidelity having ensured that they were not deported when Jerusalem fell, in either 597 or 587 BCE, but they also, as will be shown, had a high esteem for the 'Promised Land', a theme evidently important to the Deuteronomists also.

Turning to the intervening redaction or redactions, it is unclear whether we should speak of two sets of 'Jeremianic Redactors', one modelling itself closely on the Jeremianic poetry (Holladay's 'Prototype and Copies' model), and one using its own distinctive terminology, or whether the two are, in fact, one and the same set of redactors. Determining the date and provenance of these redactors more precisely than between the time of Jeremiah and the time of the Deuteronomists, is not really feasible. Nicholson recognises this, and uses it as an argument against the existence of a non-deuteronomistic redaction at all. However, as has been
demonstrated above with respect to Jeremiah 35, much of the language in what have been seen as redactional phrases simply cannot be called deuteronomistic. It is thus likely that there was at least one 'Jeremianic' redaction of the Book of Jeremiah, which introduced most of the material now found in Jer. 35:13-15, including the second person address and the conditional threat of judgement. This redaction probably also postdates 587 BCE. Its message is softer than Jeremiah's original proclamation, which had announced that the people stood condemned, that judgement was inevitable. The redaction is saying that a judgement has happened, in 587 BCE, but if the Exiles will now accept a chastening (יהוה, Jer. 35:13) and repent and be faithful, they will avoid further calamity, and be returned to the Land, just as the Rechabites, who had remained faithful all along, never suffered any calamity at all, and were never banished from the Land. It seems that this 'Jeremianic' redaction, like the deuteronomistic one, is to be located in Babylon.

The threads of the foregoing analysis may now be drawn together. The language, the form and the structure of Jeremiah 35 all suggest that the original form of the unit was vv.1-12, 16-19, in the form reconstructed by the text-critical analysis, and that it was a tract written or dictated by the prophet soon after the events in question, accurately recounting Jeremiah's act of prophetic symbolism and the words of both him and the Rechabites. The purpose of this tract was to disseminate Jeremiah's views to a wider audience, either in Jerusalem or beyond, and may be dated to the period
600-598 BCE. Vv.13-15 contain elements of at least two sets of redactions, inserted in order to reapply the prophet's message to the new situation pertaining among the Exiles in Babylon, and in order to exhort the people to renewed fidelity to Yahweh, with the hope of restoration. The latest of these redactions is deuteronomistic, and both it and the 'Jeremianic' redaction(s) find their date and provenance within the Exile, in Babylon, in the context of Synagogue instruction. That Jeremiah's tract was preserved and expanded by the redactors indicates that the Rechabites were able to maintain their singular mode of life through the chaos of the Fall of Jerusalem and beyond, and that they were known to be still living in the land of Israel. This analysis yields several points of solid historical reference, upon which the following exegesis of Jeremiah 35 may be based.

Excursus 1: The Function of Jeremiah 35 in its Present Position in the Book of Jeremiah

The form-critical analysis of Jeremiah 35 has marked an important step on the way towards the correct understanding of the Rechabites, the principal protagonists of that chapter. Hence, it has been important to analyze the chapter as an independent unit, disregarding its present position in the Book of Jeremiah as a whole. The position of the 'Rechabite Chapter' within the Book of Jeremiah makes no difference to the correct understanding of the material contained within that chapter. Jeremiah's tract recounting his dealings with the Rechabites was originally an independent document, with
its own superscription (v.1) and conclusion (v.19), and has been examined as such. While it is not strictly relevant to a study of the Rechabites, it is nevertheless interesting to make a few remarks about the present position of the 'Rechabite Chapter'. The purpose of this excursus, then, is to offer some such remarks.

It has often been noted that the material collected into the present Book of Jeremiah is not in chronological order, and commentators occasionally seek to rearrange the material in the Book into what they believe is the correct chronological order. The implicit assumption of these rearrangements is that the present order of the Book represents nothing much more than a haphazard jumble of originally independent units that have arrived in their present order more or less by chance. This seems to rather a dangerous conclusion, however, and other scholars accept that the 52 chapters of the Book of Jeremiah do present an overarching redactional framework of some sort, but are generally cautious about "describing the origins which gave rise to such a collection". This excursus will not attempt to deal with the redactional framework of the Book as a whole, but solely with the present position of the 'Rechabite Chapter'.

Jack Lundbom has argued that the four chapters in the Book of Jeremiah which mention king Jehoiakim, namely chaps. 25, 26, 35 and 36, can be extracted from the Book, and viewed as "an independent collection of prose narratives written and arranged by Baruch", with a chiastic struct-
ure, based on the date found in each of the superscriptions, and on the subject matter of each chapter. However, in order to do this, he has to regard 'the beginning of the reign of Jehoiakim', Jer. 26:1, as equivalent to 'the days of Jehoiakim', 35:1, which leads him to argue that chapter 35 is to be dated prior to 605 BCE. It has, however, been shown that a date of 600-598 BCE is more likely for the events narrated in chap. 35. Lundbom also argues that another important feature of chaps. 26 and 35 is that they "are both accounts of Jeremiah in the temple". It is true that both stories speak of Jeremiah being in the Temple, but only in 26 is this location of any importance. It certainly is not stressed in 35. Finally, it must be observed that chap. 35 is first person prose, and chaps. 25, 26 and 36 are all in third person prose, so it is difficult to support Lundbom's contention. It is unlikely that there was ever a cluster of Jehoiakim narratives, let alone one with a chiastic structure.

Lundbom tends to regard the present arrangement of chapters 24-36 as being something of a mistake. Carroll, who admits that his division of the text is as speculative as anyone's, is far more positive in his commentary about the present arrangement of the material, and is probably closer to the truth than is Lundbom. He believes that chaps. 26-36 should be isolated as a major unit in the Book of Jeremiah, with its unifying feature being "the word of Yahweh proclaimed by Jeremiah". Within this major unit, the 'Rechabite Chapter' performs two functions in its present position. Firstly, along with chap. 36, also set in the reign of
Jehoiakim, it forms an *inclusio* with chap. 26, another incident from the time of Jehoiakim, thereby neatly rounding off the section. Secondly, the position of the story of the Rechabites immediately following the story of Zedekiah's abrogated covenant (34:8-22) is important. As Carroll comments,

> The strange tale of the Rechabites provides a positive contrast to the infidelity of the nation and Zedekiah's community in 34.8-22. If the abrogated beti of that story accounts for the Babylonian destruction of Jerusalem and the cities of Judah, the narrative of the Rechabite fidelity to its cultural past points up the way communities could survive. 156

These comments are by no means meant to be regarded as conclusive, but they do suggest that chapter 35 of the Book of Jeremiah never formed part of any earlier collection of material. It circulated independently until it was gathered together with the rest of the material (although by whom, and when, must remain open). When it was gathered together with the rest of the material into the Book of Jeremiah, it was placed in its present position deliberately, in order to form part of the *inclusio* with chap. 26, and in order to provide an effective contrast with the tale of Zedekiah's infidelity in chap. 34.

**Excursus 2: Redactional Elements in Jeremiah 13 and 18**

As it has been suggested that a structural parallel may be drawn between Jeremiah 35 on the one hand and Jeremiah 13 and 18 on the other, it is legitimate to look to
these latter two texts for confirmation of the suggestions made by this study concerning the redactional stages in the history of the textual transmission of chap. 35. As with chap. 35, there is almost unanimous scholarly agreement that the opening sections of chaps. 13 and 18 are a unity within themselves. Most commentators, however, find some evidence of the redactor in the conclusions. As with 35:1-11, 13:1-7 and 18:1-6 must be viewed as incomplete on their own so, again as with chap. 35, the concluding sections of chaps. 13 and 18 must either stem in toto from the same source as the opening sections, or stem in toto from the redactors, who have removed the original conclusion in each case, or be amalgams, containing elements of the original conclusions, expanded by redactional features. As has already been contended, the third of these options is the most likely one, as there do seem to be elements in these concluding passages which are best viewed as redactional, but it seems intrinsically unlikely that a redactor would completely remove the original conclusion to a passage, and replace it with something of his own devising.

Virtually all scholars agree that 13:9-11 is not a unity, but there such agreement as exists concerning the conclusion to 13:1-7 ends. Carroll sees v.10f as expansionary, stemming from the Deuteronomists; Nicholson follows suit; Leslie, and probably Peake as well, sees v.9 as redactional; Hyatt sees v.11, but not v.10, as a deuteronomistic addition; Cornill argued that only 'as the waistcloth clings to the loins of a man, so I made the whole
house of Israel cling to me' in v.11 was original;\textsuperscript{165} and recently McKane has argued that v.9 and v.10f represent "two separate exegetical comments".\textsuperscript{166}

In the face of such scholarly disagreement, it is wise to proceed with caution. The following initial, and tentative, suggestions may be made. LXX does not represent \textit{הָעַרְכָּה יָשְׁרִים בְּשׁוֹרֵת לָבָשָׁה} in v.10. Given the whole question of the differences between MT and LXX in the Book of Jeremiah, it seems reasonable to conclude that this phrase is a very late harmonising gloss in MT. Despite Weippert's careful analysis, her efforts to demonstrate that הָעַרְכָּה יָשְׁרִים + הַכּל + לָבָשָׁה is not necessarily a deuteronomistic phrase are unconvincing.\textsuperscript{167} It is best to see \textit{וַיִּשְׁמַע הָעַרְכָּה יָשְׁרִים לָבָשָׁה} in 13:10 as and insertion of the Deuteronomists. If it is argued that הָעַרְכָּה יָשְׁרִים and/or לָבָשָׁה is syntactically awkward, then it may be observed that it is no less awkward if הָעַרְכָּה יָשְׁרִים לָבָשָׁה and/or לָבָשָׁה are retained. The awkwardness lies in the third masculine singular jussive of הָעַרְכָּה, 'and let it become', \textit{i.e.} the third masculine singular jussive of הָעַרְכָּה. Neither the third masculine singular, nor the jussive, is very appropriate to the context. LXX reads \textit{אֶפְקַּהֲדוּ לָבָשָׁה}, 'and they will be', which is followed by Vulgate with 'erunt'. Rudolph wonders if הָעַרְכָּה, 'and it has become' should be read.\textsuperscript{168} This retains the consonant al text and removes the jussive, but still leaves the switch from plural to singular in the verse. The noun \textit{כָּל} can take either plural or singular, but to find it taking both in the same sentence is a bit odd.
LXX may well reflect the original reading here, but it could just as easily be a simplification by the translator of an awkward Hebrew text. No answer is offered here to the problems of "?". Rather, it is noted that the problem exists whether or not the preceding two clauses are removed as editorial expansions.

V.11 on its own is inadequate as a conclusion to 13:1-7, as it includes no mention of judgement, just a statement that Yahweh made the House of Israel and the House of Judah cling to himself to be a people, but they refused to obey. A threat or statement of judgement would be expected, so if v.11 is part of the original conclusion to vv.1-7, then it must be joined with either v.9 or v.10, or both. It is, however, unlikely that v.9 and v.11 stem from the same source, as they mention two different groups of people — Judah and Jerusalem (v.9), and the House of Israel and the House of Judah (v.11).

It has been argued, by Hyatt for example,\(^{169}\) that 13:11 contains deuteronomistic phraseology. The use of the verb הָלַךְ, 'to cleave', in this verse is compared with its use in Deut. 10:20, 11:22, 13:4, 30:20, Josh. 22:5, 23:8, 2 Kings 18:6. However, in all of these passages, the reference is to the people or, in the last case, the king, cleaving to Yahweh, but in Jer. 13:11, Yahweh is the subject of לָכַח Hiph., and the people are the object. Indeed, in no other place in the Hebrew Bible do Yahweh or a girdle appear as the subject of לָכַח, in any theme. This suggests that
this particular piece of phraseology in Jer. 13:11 is not deuteronomistic.

It is also sometimes claimed that 'that they might be a people, a name, a praise, and a glory, but they would not listen' in Jer. 13:11 is deuteronomistic, on the basis of Deut. 26:19, 'and to set you high above all the nations which he has made, in praise and in fame [lit. name] and in honour, and that you shall be a people holy to Yahweh ...'. But the supposed parallel between the two texts is not very convincing. Admittedly, the same four terms (ָע, ָכ, ָן, ַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַַּ
spoil the pride of Judah and the great pride of Jerusalem’?

is conspicuously absent from the deuteronomistic corpus: it is not a deuteronomistic word. Unfortunately, , and its derivatives, which include , have a double meaning in biblical Hebrew, both stemming from the idea 'to be high'. Firstly, it denotes the majesty of God, the justified pride of man or the glory of an object, and, secondly, arrogant pride or hubris. Kellermann is uncertain whether in Jer. 13:9 has the good sense or the bad sense. If it has the former, then this is the earliest use of the term with this meaning.

There is nothing quite like Jer. 13:9 anywhere else - Hiph. is not used with elsewhere - which would argue for its authenticity. However, as has been already observed, it does contradict v.10f, so it may be asked whether it may not be seen as secondary on theological grounds. The rest of the section has nothing particularly to do with arrogance or pride, so Leslie, Cornill and Peake may very well be right in claiming that v.9 misses the whole point of the section. Hence, it appears that the original form of Jer. 13:1-11 was vv.1-8, 10-11, except for , which is very late and harmonising, and , which is deuteronomistic. V.9 is redactional, but non-deuteronomistic.

Why was v.9 inserted? The answer depends on whether is understood pejoratively or not. If it is, then it could be highlighting Judah's obstinate refusal to hearken to
God, somewhat along the lines of Ezek. 16:56. If it is not, then it could have been inserted during the Exile in order to contrast the former greatness of Judah with her current lowly conditions in Babylon.

As with 13:1-11, there is little scholarly agreement over the presence or absence of redactional elements in the conclusion of Jer. 18:1-12. Hardly any commentator doubts that 18:5f is an integral unity with vv.1-4, but Brekelmans has demonstrated that v.5f on its own cannot form the conclusion to vv.1-4. Carroll sees vv.7-10 as deuteronomistic, and thinks that the motif of 'turning from evil' in v.11 also stems from the Deuteronomists. Skinner sees vv.7-10 as redactional. Nicholson regards vv.7-10, 11b-12 as deuteronomistic. Leslie thinks that the passage has a deuteronomistic framework, but that vv.7-10 embody the authentic view of Jeremiah. Bright argues for the unity of the whole passage, regarding vv.7-10 as developing the idea expressed in v.4, and he is followed by Weippert, who provides more detailed arguments. Peake feels that vv.7-10 present a different application of the figure from that offered in vv.1-6, and are hence redactional. Hyatt simply comments that he believes that deuteronomistic phraseology is especially evident in vv.7-12.

The most detailed analysis of Jer. 18:1-12 to have been published in recent years, however, is that of Brekelmans, and his arguments seem to be the most coherent and realistic explanation of the text. He is careful to point out
that to prove that a text in Jeremiah is non-deuteronomistic, the purpose of Weippert's *Die Prosaraden des Jeremiabuches*, is not necessarily to prove that that text is Jeremianic, which is what Weippert comes close to claiming. Brekelmans argues for the existence of other, non-deuteronomistic redactions of the Book of Jeremiah, and goes on to demonstrate the existence of material from two sets of non-deuteronomistic redactors in vv.7-12.

For Brekelmans, Jer. 18:4 indicates that Yahweh has absolute power, and hence v.6 means that Yahweh can do whatever he likes with Israel. This makes vv.1-6 incomplete on their own, as they only make an abstract statement about God's dealings with Israel, whereas in symbolic passages, there is usually a concrete interpretation of the symbol. Such a concrete interpretation must be sought for in vv.7-12. It is not found in vv.7-10, which are also non-specific, and do not apply vv.1-6 to a concrete situation, but it is found in v.11a, which contains a commission to speak to Judah and Jerusalem, the messenger formula, specific words and which makes use of the participle יָהוּ, found several times in vv.1-6.

Thus, Brekelmans sees the original passage as being vv.1-6, 11a, which was directed against those members of the people who were doubting that God would ever carry through what the prophet announced, and which reaffirmed that, when God wanted to bring disaster upon his people, no-one could hinder him, or avoid the doom.
Vv.7-10 are clearly a unity but, Brekelmans argues, they have nothing to do with the original saying. Rather, they divert attention from the judgement upon Israel to the fate of the nations. Weippert has shown that the terminology of the verses is not deuteronomistic, and Brekelmans that the 'Alternativ-Form', i.e. a speech form where blessing and curse, life and death in the preaching are put before the people, which is called to choose life and blessing, discerned by Thiel in the passage, need not have been the sole property of the Deuteronomists, and that Jer. 18:7-10 are not in the 'Alternativ-Form' anyway, as they lack the call to the people to make a choice. Brekelmans then goes on to demonstrate that it is the theology of vv.7-10, as much as their language and structure, that is the problem with assigning them to the Deuteronomists. That the nations could convert themselves and participate in the salvation offered by God was not a problem of Jeremiah's time, and is not found in the deuteronomistic texts outside Jeremiah, so there is no reason to ascribe Jer. 18:7-10 to a deuteronomistic school.

He further argues that vv.11b-12 are redactional, but from a different redaction from that which provided vv.7-10. The terminology of vv.11b-12, although perhaps characteristic of the prose of Jeremiah, is not deuteronomistic, and neither is the theology of those verses. The verses are probably exilic, the words of Jeremiah being reinterpreted as an urgent call to conversion, but simultaneously (v.12)
acknowledging that the people have failed to answer this call, thereby justifying the judgement that has come upon them.

Brekelmans suggests that vv.7-10 could well be post-exilic, as they have much in common with Trito-Isaiah and Deutero-Zechariah. 190

The views of Brekelmans have been deliberately narrated at some length, as it seems that his analysis presents the best way of understanding the redactions of Jer. 18:1-12. His conclusions do not conflict with the general thrust of the conclusions of this study concerning redactions of the Book of Jeremiah. Rather, they extend the field of vision somewhat by proposing the existence of a post-exilic redaction of the Book of Jeremiah, as well as such redactions as took place in the exilic period. The fact that he finds no evidence of the hand of the Deuteronomists in chap. 18:1-12 does not necessarily mean that there was no deuteronomistic redaction of the Book as a whole, and Brekelmans does not claim this: the stated purpose of his study is not to attempt to disprove the existence of such a deuteronomistic redaction, but to demonstrate that more prudence is required in Jeremianic studies in assigning texts to that redaction, even if they are exilic. 191

It thus appears that an analysis of Jer. 13:1-11 and 18:1-12 broadly endorses this study's conclusions concerning the redactional history of chap. 35, ie. that the original passage, a tract written by the prophet himself, has been
supplemented in its conclusion by more than one redaction, which have not removed the original Jeremianic ending to the piece. The source of these redactions was not only the Deuteronomists, but also at least one so-called 'Jeremianic School' at work in the Exile. Brekelmans' work on 18:1-12 suggests that there may also have been a post-exilic redaction. Whether the fact that a redaction is evident in chapter 18 is evidence of a post-exilic reworking of the Book as a whole cannot be proved. Hence, it would be highly speculative - and illegitimate - to attempt to suggest that the evidence of post-exilic work in chap. 18:1-12 shows that the post-exilic redactors also looked at chap. 35, and left it untouched because they knew that the Rechabites were still in existence, and still maintaining their distinctive practices, in the post-exilic period. The redactional activity evident in Jeremiah 35 suggests that the Rechabites survived the Fall of Jerusalem, and carried on living their distinctive lifestyle in Palestine during the Exile. To conclude any more than this would be to go beyond the evidence at our disposal.

3.3: EXEGESIS OF JEREMIAH 35

The previous two sections of this chapter have served to prepare the ground for this third section, the exegesis of Jeremiah 35. They have established, by means of text- and form-critical analyses, what the original document penned by Jeremiah looked like, and what words and phrases in the present form of the unit stem from later redactors and/or trans-
lators. They have also concluded that the event in question occurred c.599 BCE, and that the tract recounting it was written soon afterwards.

The present section aims to offer a verse-by-verse exegesis of Jeremiah 35, seeking thereby to build up a historical picture of the Rechabites, the principal protagonists of the chapter. The main focus of attention in the exegesis will thus be those verses that deal with the Rechabites and their practices.

At this stage, it will be helpful to provide a reminder of the conclusions of the study of those biblical verses outside Jeremiah 35 which have been thought to refer to the Rechabites, carried out in Chapter Two of the present work. It was shown that 1 Chronicles 2:55 does not mention the Rechabites and that, even if it did, it would still not link them genealogically with the Kenites so, whatever they were, the Rechabites were not Kenites. It was shown that they do not appear in 1 Chron. 4:12 either and that even if they did, they would still not be linked with copper, so the likelihood that they were metalworkers is thereby reduced. It was shown that Nehemiah 3:14 almost certainly does not refer to a Rechabite, but that 2 Kings 10:15f does refer to the founder of the group, Jonadab, who lived in the days of Jehu. This Jonadab was the son of one Rechab, but he consciously reinterpreted his patronymic into a title, probably a prophetic one. Jonadab had close connections with Elijah, Elisha and the Sons of the Prophets, and his followers were also a prophetic group.
By focussing directly on his followers and their practices, this picture of Jonadab - and of the Rechabites - will be further explored and confirmed.

Verse 1

While the formula 'The word which came to Jeremiah from Yahweh ... saying' is a common one in the Book of Jeremiah, that is no reason to conclude that it is redactional. It has already been shown that its presence is needed to open the unit, and that its third person style does not preclude Jeremianic authorship.

For 'son of Josiah', in 'in the days of Jehoiakim son of Josiah, king of Judah', see above. According to 2 Kings 23:34, Jehoiakim had been installed as king in place of his brother Jehoahaz, by the Pharaoh of Egypt. Jehoahaz had himself been made king by the 'people of the land' (2 Kings 23:30) in preference to his older half-brother (cf. vv.31,36), Jehoiakim/Eliakim. Gray summarises Jehoiakim's character neatly when he writes,

from what we know of Jehoiakim it is likely that Jehoahaz was a man of stronger character than his older brother, who seems to have been an unprincipled political adventurer, who sought his future in submission to whatever major power seemed at the moment likely to prove victorious.

Jehoiakim reigned from 608 to 598 BCE. Just as no precise date is given for the units identified as structural parallels to Jer. 35, ie. Jer. 13:1-11 and 18:1-11, no precise date is
given for the events recounted here. Jer. 35:11 and 2 Kings 24:1-2 suggest, as has already been shown, 198 a date of c.599 BCE, however.

Verse 2

The opening word of the verse, 'Go!', is, in fact, an infinitive absolute (יָהַדָּה) rather than an imperative. For this use of the infinitive absolute, see G-K 113y, aa-bb. It is common in the Book of Jeremiah with יָהַדָּה. 199

Nelson Glueck thought that 'the House of the Rechabites' here in v.2 revealed that the Rechabites lived "in a compound of their own, withdrawn from the rest of the community". 200 Robert Carroll follows this line when he says that יָהַדָּה "here ... probably refers to the house in the city to which they moved when the Babylonians entered the land". 201 The use of the same term, however, in v.3 and MT v.5, 202 indicates that nothing more than the whole Rechabite community is denoted, and that it has nothing to do with their living habits in Jerusalem. Contra Carroll, 203 it is unlikely that the same phrase would have two different meanings in two successive verses.

The term 'chamber', יָהַדָּה, used here, denotes, on the whole in biblical Hebrew, a room connected with a sanctuary. In 1 Sam. 9:22 it denotes the room at a High Place (נֶאֶבֶד) where the sacrificial meal was eaten. Here, and in Jer. 36:10, 2 Kings 23:1, 1 Chron. 23:28, 28:12, 2 Chron 31:11, it denotes various rooms in the First Temple. In
Ezekiel 40-48, it is the term used for the rooms of the priests in the vision of the restored Temple. In Ezra 8:29, 10:6, Neh. 10:38-40, 13:5, 8, it describes various rooms in the actual restored Temple. The only other meaning that has is to be found in Jer. 36:12, 20f, where it denotes a scribe's room in the royal palace. The room used by Jeremiah in the Rechabite incident and the one used by Baruch in 36:10, seem to have both been open to view.

Verse 3

The name Jaazaniah, here spelt י carrera, means 'Yahweh will hear'. Alternative spellings of the name are י carrera and (1) נ carrera. Other holders of the name are found in 2 Kings 25:23, Jer. 40:8, 42:1, Ezek. 8:1, 11:1. The fact that all the other holders of the name Jaazaniah are either quite clearly Israelites or Judaeans, or else very closely involved with Judaean politics, suggests that the Jaazaniah in Jer. 35:3 is also a native of the land of Israel. For י carrera, LXX Ἰ Χάζανιας here read ἸΧάζανιας, but this is not evidence of a different Hebrew text: LXX BA also read ἸΧάζανιας for י carrera in Ezek. 11:1. Jaazaniah is depicted here in Jer. 35:3 as the current head of the Rechabite community.

Jaazaniah's father is called Jeremiah, י carrera, the same name as the prophet. A third Jeremiah is found in Jer. 52:1. Noth is at a loss to explain the Massoretic pointing י carrera, as it has no possible etymology. He suggests
that, just as LXX ἱερεύς renders the Hebrew ירֶהֶשׁ, so LXX сєρέμυς suggests pointing יֵּלֵּד as יֵלֶדֶה, 'Yahweh will raise up'. BDB tentatively derives it from זניֵד III, from which יֵכֶד II, 'slackness', found in Prov. 10:4, 12:24, 27, 19:15, Jer. 48:10, is derived, and proposes an etymology 'Yahweh looseneth'. Noth's proposal, on balance, seems preferable, and is not negated by the fact that in Jer. 35:3, LXX-Α reads сєρέμυς, 'Jeremín', for MT's יַהֲנָרָה. The LXX reading is probably an attempt to avoid confusing this Jeremiah with the prophet Jeremiah, who has already appeared in v.1 of the chapter. In 52:1, LXX renders יַהֲנָרָה correctly by сєρέμυς, but no possible confusion with the prophet Jeremiah can arise here, as the prophet does not appear at all in chap. 52. Therefore, the LXX translator felt no need to change the name of Zedekiah's maternal grandfather, whereas he had felt a need to change that of Jaazaniah's father in 35:3.

Jaazaniah's paternal grandfather has the name Habazziniah, Hebrew חֶבְצִיָּיָה. Neither Noth not BDB offers any etymology of this name, which is found only here. It is, like Jaazaniah and Jeremiah, Yahwistic. LXX admittedly reads the name as Χαβαζινάο (ie. ὄνομα?), but the loss of the theophoric element may be as much due to assimilation to the preceding σιρενος as anything else, and not evidence of a different Hebrew Vorlage.

The fact that four of the five personal names associated with the Rechabites, ie. Jonadab, Jaazaniah, Jere-
miah, and Habazzaniah are Yahwistic, and that the fifth, Rechab itself, is attested elsewhere as an Israelite proper name, suggests very strongly that the Rechabites were an Israelite group, rather than Kenites, or some autonomous non-Israelite grouping. If they had not been Israelites, non-Israelite personal names would have been expected for them.

From the יִד in the phrase יִדָּה כְּבֵיתע-הָרֶכֶב in the phrase, it is plain that Jeremiah took all the Rechabites to the chamber of the sons of Hanan. The fact that the whole 'House of the Rechabites' fitted into a single Temple chamber suggests that the total size of their community was not very great.

Verse 4

אֶלֶם הַנַּעֲלֵימִי, 'man of God', is found only here in the whole corpus of the Latter Prophets. Why Igdaliah - or Hanan should be so termed is not stated. As has already been noted, both the Targum, with יִדָּה כַּנְיָנִי, and Peshitta, with יִדָּה כַּנְיָנִי, regard the person in question as a true prophet. There are variations among the Versions over יִדָּה כַּנְיָנִי and יִדָּה כַּנְיָנִי, but these probably just reflect the fact that we are dealing with persons otherwise completely unknown, and should not be taken as evidence of a different Hebrew text. If 'man of God' is a designation of Hanan, then the 'Sons of Hanan' could have been his disciples. Porter, however, points out that 'we cannot exclude the possibility that 'sons' were Hanan's actual
children". As 'man of God' occurs nowhere else in the Book of Jeremiah, while מְנִי and מְנִי are frequent, Porter also wonders whether something other than 'prophet' is meant by the use of 'man of God' here. He notes that the term is used of Moses in Deut. 33:1 and Josh. 14:6, and of David in 2 Chron. 8:14 and Neh. 12:24. It is, however, hard to ascertain what 'man of God' could mean if it did not denote something like 'prophet' here. If Hanan was a prophet, then he would presumably have been in sympathy with Jeremiah, but why he had a chamber in the Temple must remain a mystery.

Maaseiah son of Shallum, named in this verse, may have been the father of Zephaniah, cf. Jer. 21:1, 29:35, 37:3. This Zephaniah may in turn be identical with the Zephaniah of 52:24=2 Kings 25:18, the 'Second Priest'. In any event, the fact that he is used as the king's messenger (cf. 21:1) indicates that Zephaniah was a man of some importance. Maaseiah may have also been the cousin of Jeremiah the prophet. It is certainly true that Maaseiah's father and Jeremiah's uncle have the same name (cf. 32:7).

Maaseiah is called 'keeper of the threshold', רֹאשׁ מֹן. Jer. 52:24 indicates that the three men who held this post were extremely important cultic officials, who ranked after the two chief priests.

Unfortunately, despite the fact that the location of the chamber of the sons of Hanan is described so precisely, our knowledge of the actual layout of the First Temple is so
scanty that it is impossible to locate the site of the incident with any certainty. As Duhm comments, the detail with which the chamber's location is described strongly suggests that the author of the chapter was familiar with the layout of the Temple before its destruction. 215 Given that the present study has already concluded that Jeremiah wrote the chapter as a tract, soon after the events in question, the precision with which the chamber is located is yet another pointer towards the validity of that conclusion.

Verse 5

It has already been noted above 216 that the LXX reading ἐπ᾽ ἰσραήλ διανέμων αὐτῶν reflects the more primitive reading than the מֵאָבֹאַ הָעֲבֵדִים of MT in this verse. It is mentioned again here because, as was shown in Chapter One, the most recent article on the Rechabites, that by Keukens, on the basis of the MT reading here, argues that the Rechabites were really Jonadab's house-slaves. 217 Keukens is of the opinion that the use of מְעָבֵד here is analogous to the use of מְעָבֵד in Eccles. 2:7 and to that of מְעָבֵד in Gen. 15:2, 3, both of which seem to mean 'house-born slave(s)'. He does not even mention, let alone consider, the LXX reading. Given that the LXX reading is almost certainly here prior to that of MT, Keukens' arguments may summarily dismissed, arguments which he himself, for somewhat different reasons, admits are rather spurious. 218
Verse 6

For Jonadab ben Rechab, see the discussion of 2 Kings 10:15f, 23, in Chapter Two. Here in Jer. 35:6, the Rechabites call him 'our father', יָאָב. While יָאָב can denote blood paternity or ancestry, it can also mean 'founder', 'teacher', 'leader' and so on. It also seems to have been a prophetic title, as is revealed by 2 Kings 2:12, 13:14, and possibly also 1 Kings 13:11f. It has already been argued that the Rechabites were founded by Jonadab in the days of Jehu as a prophetic group, so the Rechabites' veneration of Jonadab as 'father' could simply denote that Jonadab was viewed as their leader and founder. However, overtones of blood ancestry cannot be completely excluded. When Jonadab founded his group, his support may have come largely from his own family. If the Rechabites also practiced endogamy, as will be argued in Chapter Four, then, in course of time, all the members of the community would be able to trace their ancestry back to Jonadab, whether or not they were originally related to him. At this stage, it is better to leave the nature of the Rechabites' association open. They may have been a clan, or a prophetic group, or even both. At this stage in the inquiry, they will be referred to as the 'Rechabite Community', 'community' being the most neutral term available. To call them a 'sect' at this stage begs the question whether they were a religiously separated group and, also, 'sect' has come to have pejorative overtones, especially in the Christian tradition. In Chapter Four, the Rechabites will be examined as a sect, but using 'sect' with its strict
The Rechabites claim that Jonadab 'laid a command' on them, *ie.* יְזִיעֵת לָךְ. Keukens argues that יָדַּר denotes a command made by a superior to an inferior, where the superior is not bound by the terms of that command himself. Keukens once again defeats his own arguments, however, by admitting that יָדַּר and בֵּית are used interchangeably after הָזֹאת Pi. in the Book of Jeremiah. As he comments,

Es ist zwar riskant, aus der Präposition בֵּית bei הָזֹאת Pi. weitere Schlüsse zu ziehen, zumal besonders im Buch Jeremia יָדַּר und בֵּית promiscue gebraucht werden.

But, he continues, "dennoch soll hier der Versuch gewagt werden". In addition to the interchangeability of יָדַּר and בֵּית in Jeremiah, it should also be noted that הָזֹאת + יָדַּר is not used again in Jer. 35. Rather, הָזֹאת + suffix is found, so it is highly unlikely that any of the nuances which Keukens claims to find in הָזֹאת + יָדַּר should be imparted to the relationship between Jonadab and the Rechabites. It is far more likely that Jonadab observed those same commands that he laid on his followers.

The first of Jonadab's commands to his followers is 'You shall not drink wine ... forever', ... יָדַּר זֶכֶר וְיָדַּר פֹּאַר. It has often been held that wine-avoidance is a symbol of nomadism. This was the position taken by Budde, when he wrote:

vine-culture is, fundamentally, only taken as the flower of the settled life.
- vines taking more than a year to reach maturity. As the Rechabites were banned not only wine, but also the planting of vineyards, it was clear - to Budde - that the Rechabites were nomads.

There are two, connected implicit assumptions behind Budde's contention. Firstly, that 'wine' in Jer. 35:6 denotes 'fermented juice of the grape' and not 'any intoxicant', and secondly, that the prohibition on planting vineyards is to be connected with the prohibition on drinking wine.

As will be shown when verse 7 is considered below, the order of the terms in the list of Rechabite prohibitions, ie. 'drink no wine' - 'build no houses' - 'sow no seed' - 'plant no vineyard' - 'have nothing' - 'live in tents', suggests that, in fact, the prohibition on drinking wine and the prohibition on planting vineyards have nothing to do with each other.

Once this conclusion is accepted, then the question whether 'wine', יָנָק, in Jeremiah 35 denotes 'fermented juice of the grape' or 'intoxicants in general' needs to be re-examined carefully.

In the chapter, the word יָנָק is used, but not either of the other Hebrew words for intoxicants (רֵכְשָׁ, שִׁמְרָה). Those who have concluded that it denotes 'fermented grape juice' have generally failed to answer, or even raise,
the question whether or not the Rechabites were permitted to consume any other form of intoxicant, such as those formed from dates, grain, etc. That such non-vine intoxicants were known in the Ancient Near East is plain from Egyptian evidence for the alcoholic fermentation of sugary fruit juices or honey;\(^{229}\) from Arabic evidence for the love of nomads for nabīdha, a fermented date juice;\(^{230}\) and possibly from Song of Songs 8:2, which may refer to a fermented pomegranate juice, although this is not entirely clear.\(^{231}\)

The use of the word נֶשְׁבָּה in Jer. 35 is in itself inconclusive. While it may legitimately be proposed, as a general rule of thumb, to understand נֶשְׁבָּה in biblical Hebrew as 'fermented grape juice' and רְכָ֫שָׁ as 'non-grape intoxicants', there are nevertheless places in the Hebrew Bible where the two terms take on a certain degree of synonymity. They are often found together,\(^{232}\) and where they are it is clear that a comprehensive reference to all intoxicants is meant. There are also places where only one of the two terms appears, yet the reference still seems to be an equally comprehensive one. In Ps. 69:13, רְכָ֫שָׁ נֶשְׁבָּה means 'drunkards' in general, not 'those who drink non-vine intoxicants' in particular, and while there are places where נֶשְׁבָּה is clearly meant to denote the fruit of the grape (14 times approx.\(^{233}\)), the vast majority of the occurrences of the word are either completely neutral (approx. 50 times), or else refer to effects of its intoxication, either for good or for bad, rather than to what it is made of (approx. 49 times). Most informative in this respect are the instances in Num. 6:3f, 20. In v.3f, the
Nazirite is prohibited \textit{יִבָּשֶׂה, רָבַּס}, vinegar from \textit{יִבָּשֶׂה}, the juice of grapes, fresh grapes, dried grapes, all that is made of the grape-vine, and the kernels (? Heb. רְבַּכָּן) and husks (? Heb. אֲדֻחַ) of grapes,\textsuperscript{234} \textit{ie.} all intoxicants and all vine products. Here, \textit{יִבָּשֶׂה} seems to denote 'fermented juice of the grape'. However, in v.20, it is said that after the completion of his or her vow, the Nazirite is permitted to drink \textit{יִבָּשֶׂה} again. It cannot be claimed that non-vine intoxicants remained barred to the Nazirites after the completion of the vow, so \textit{יִבָּשֶׂה} here must cover all intoxicants, not simply grape-wine.

Thus, it is clear that, lexically, the use of \textit{יִבָּשֶׂה}, and no other Hebrew term for intoxicants, in Jer. 35 is no argument in support of the contention that the Rechabites were only banned fermented grape juice, and not other intoxicants as well. Given that the ban on planting vineyards probably has nothing to do with the ban on \textit{יִבָּשֶׂה}, the 'wine'-prohibition in Jeremiah 35 is more likely to have been a ban on intoxicants in general, rather than on the fruit of the grape. Note that the Rechabite prohibition, unlike that of the Nazirite, makes no mention of a ban on the consumption of other vine products. Given that no such mention is made, it would be logical to assume that, as Jer. 35:6f probably represents the sum of Jonadab's commands,\textsuperscript{235} the consumption of these products was not banned to the Rechabites, but only their cultivation.\textsuperscript{236}

Incidentally, this conclusion, that the Rechabites
were banned all intoxicants, is supported by the rabbinic traditions about the Rechabites. The Mekhilta of Rabbi Sim-

yon bar Yohai to Exodus 18:27, quoted by Yalkut Shim'on to the Prophets 323, makes it clear that it regards the Rechabites as שְׁמַיִים, 'the drinkers of water', an appellation which strongly suggests that they were thought to have ab-

stained from all intoxicants, whatever their origin.237

If this line of interpretation is correct, then the view that sees the Rechabites as nomads becomes even less ten-

able. Date-wine was apparently a favourite drink among Arab nomads,238 so teetotalism is no indication of nomadism.239 Frick and Gray thought that the wine prohibition indicated that the Rechabites were itinerant metalworkers, who were banned alcohol so as to preserve their trade secrets, which could have been divulged under the influence of alcohol, a notor-

ious loosener of lips.240 However, once the supposed link with the Kenites is removed (גֶּפֶן being thought to mean 'smith') and Jonadab's appellation ben Rechab is seen as a true patronymic that was reinterpreted as a prophetic title, rather than as a description of Jonadab as a chariot-maker, what little evidence there is for seeing the Rechabites as metalworkers disappears completely. Note, also, that not only is wine prohibited to the Rechabites, but so also is the building of houses, the sowing of seed, the planting of vineyards and the 'having' of anything. If the Rechabites were metalworkers, it seems a little unlikely that the com-

mand to maintain their practices would be expressed so oblique-

ly. Positive reasons should be sought for all the commands in
the list found in Jer. 35:6f.

There are other 'teetotal' groups to be found in the Bible. Serving priests were required to be abstinent, according to Lev. 10:9 and Ezek. 44:21, but the Rechabites do not seem to have had very much to do with the Temple. Nazirites were similarly abstinent (Num. 6:3f, Am. 2:12, cf. Judg. 13: 4, 7, 14), but the differences between the Rechabites and the Nazirites are as great as, or greater than, the similarities, so it is unlikely that too close a connection should be drawn between the two. Isaiah 28:7 suggests that prophets were required to be teetotal as well, and this is probably the best background on which to see the Rechabite prohibition. It has already been noted that ben Rechab was probably a patronymic that was reinterpreted as a prophetic title similar to the of 2 Kings 2:12, 13:14. It will be shown that the rest of Jonadab's prohibitions were similarly part of the prophetic lifestyle, and that Jeremiah's Promise to the Rechabites in 35:19 also implies that they were prophets.

The motive for the prophetic avoidance of intoxicants is easy to discern. Prophets as much as priests were required to distinguish between the holy and the profane, the pure and the impure, which was why serving priests were required to be abstinent. However, unlike priests, prophets were always 'on duty', so they were required to be permanently abstinent, because alcohol would have clouded their ability to give oracles. In similar vein is the advice given in Prov. 31:4f, where wine is said to be 'not for kings', for the same reason.
The condemnation of the drunken priests and prophets in Is. 28:7 demonstrates that prophets were meant to be abstinent. Similarly, there is no evidence that Elijah, Elisha and the Sons of the Prophets, the group which is emerging as the closest parallel to the Rechabites in the Hebrew Bible, drank any intoxicants either. Elijah, like the man of God in 1 Kings 13, seems to have habitually drunk water, 1 Kings 17:4, 11, 19:6, and there is no evidence that Elisha and the Sons of the Prophets did not follow his example.

Thus, it is clear that Jonadab's command not to drink wine in Jer. 35:6 was a ban on all intoxicants, not on the juice of the grape, and that the best explanation of this prohibition is that the Rechabites were not nomads or metalworkers, but prophets, who were required to be abstinent so that they would be able to carry out the prophetic function of giving oracles.

In v.6, Jonadab lays his command on 'you and your sons', וּבָנָיו. The conclusion of v.8, however, which reads 'we, our wives, our sons and our daughters', indicates that the Rechabites were not some celibate male order, but a whole family community, men, women and children, practicing a common discipline. In his 1970 Ph.D. thesis on Ancient Israelite cities, Frick argued that the Rechabites were Israelite soldiers. While it is true that soldiers did abstain from wine, and also lived in tents, as the Rechabites did, as part of the ritual of military purifi-
cation, it is also true that abstaining from women was also part of that ritual of purification practiced by the (male!) army. Furthermore, Deut. 20:7, which grants exemption from military service if a man is recently married, indicates that while the men went off on campaign, the women and children stayed at home. Yet the Rechabites are depicted as a whole family community, living in tents, so it seems unlikely that they were soldiers. They may have had a connection with Holy War, but that connection was through the prophet’s role in Holy War, not the soldier’s.

Verse 7

John Calvin was of the opinion that the opening command of Jer. 35:7, 'and do not build a house', נָבְא בַּשָּׁם נָבְא, meant that the Rechabites were permitted to build houses for other people to live in, but this is hardly the most natural inference from the command and the account of its fulfillment in v.9. Abramsky took his cue from his observation that, unlike the other commands - not to drink wine, not to sow seed, not to plant vineyard - the prohibition on house-building includes a positive command, מֵהַבָּל תֹּאַכְל, which suggested to Abramsky that tent-dwelling was something more than a simple description of the living habits of the Rechabites. Frick, however, following Riemann, has observed that a non-agricultural lifestyle, as practiced by the Rechab-
ites, does not necessarily denote a pastoral lifestyle. Indeed, it is possible to adduce some evidence to suggest that it would be wrong to see the Rechabites as shepherds. Firstly, pastoral nomadism involves a regular leading out of the flocks to pasture on the steppes (which also denotes the desert proper). Yet, the word רָבָּן never appears in any of the material connected with the Rechabites. This strongly suggests that the Rechabites had nothing to do with shepherding. Secondly, Jeremiah 35 reveals that, when Nebuchadrezzar's armies started ravaging the land, the Rechabites fled to Jerusalem (v.10), but it seems a little odd for shepherds to have fled to a city! Cities would have been a prime target of any foreign attack, and shepherds would almost certainly have had to have abandoned their flocks to have entered one. Surely, if shepherds were seeking safety in a time of military unrest, they would have fled, with their flocks, to the steppes?

These arguments of Frick and Riemann are telling, and their conclusion, that the Rechabites were not shepherds, is warranted. An examination of Gen. 4:20 and 25:27, the two texts that Abramsky advanced for his contention that the Rechabites were shepherds, will, in fact, serve to reinforce Frick and Riemann's position, not Abramsky's.

In both Gen. 4:20 and 25:27, the phrase to 'dwell in tents', יָשֹׁ֣בָּה + , appears. In Gen. 4:20, Jabal the son of Lamech is described as בָּשִׁ֖יָּה , 'he was the father of those who dwell in tent and
cattle'. While 'dwell in tent and cattle' sounds harsh to English ears, it may be explained as an instance of the rhetorical device known as 'zeugma', and hence there is no need to emend the text. It is often argued that the text depicts Jabal as the father of nomadism. Note, however, that מקרין is a very broad term, denoting all kinds of livestock. Skinner recognises this, and says that "the whole Bedouin life is thus assigned Jabal as its progenitor", but it should be pointed out that, while sheep and goats are Bedouin livestock, cattle and oxen, also included in מקרין, are not. As Gottwald observes, in the Near East these latter animals were bred only in the settled zone, so the use of מקרין in Gen. 4:20 is ambiguous, and does not necessarily refer to the animals of the pastoral nomad, so to claim that the Rechabites were shepherds on the basis of the analogy of this verse is to claim more than Gen. 4:20 actually offers.

In Gen. 25:27, Jacob and Esau are compared as follows: אֶת הַנַּגְּרָה הָיִיתָה לָהּ, וַתִּשְׁתְּךָ שָׂדָה בְּנַגְּרָה, RSV 'When the boys grew up, Esau was a skilful hunter, a man of the field, while Jacob was a quiet man, dwelling in tents'. This is also often seen as depicting Jacob as a pastoral nomad and, hence, because Jer. 35:7 also employs צְבָא וּבֵית חוֹדֶשׁ, as implying that the Rechabites should also be seen as pastoral nomads. But this cannot be sustained. While Jacob is commanded to fetch two good kids from the flock in Gen. 27:9, the implication is that the flock is Isaac's. Isaac was thus a shepherd, but he is also depicted as an agriculturalist (26:12), as a tent-
dweller (26:17) and as a hunter (27:1-4). Jacob's stew in 25:29-34 is made from lentils (םֵרָב), and not from lamb, and 25:29 implies that Jacob and Esau lived in the same place - presumably in tents like their father. All this suggests that the contrast in 25:27 is not between the fully nomadic hunter and the semi-nomadic shepherd, as Abramsky likes to think, but between the man of action and the man who, like the women, 'stays at home'.

Not only is Abramsky on uncertain ground with his interpretations of Gen. 4:20 and 25:27, but also it appears that he is mistaken in his conclusion that 'to dwell in tents' denotes pastoral nomadism. As Gottwald further observes, pastoral nomads were not restricted to tents, but often lived for varying periods in grass or wood huts, in mud houses, with wind screens or in caves. Moreover, there were certain activities of settled communities in which the tent was often used. For example, armies on expedition customarily lived in tents, as did royal hunting parties. Agriculturalists who had considerable wealth in livestock, or who suffered a shortage of suitable building materials, occasionally lived in tents. It was not uncommon for cultivators of the soil, especially where the fields were widely spread, to spend part of the year in huts or tents, particularly during harvest ... It is apparent that the tent can only be taken as indicative of pastoral nomadism when there are other less ambiguous traits associated with it.
As Gen. 4:20, 25:27 and Jer. 35:7 do not have "other less ambiguous traits" associated with tent-residence, it is perilous to conclude that Jabal, Jacob or the Rechabites were pastoral nomads.

Groups other than semi-nomadic shepherds also regularly dwelt in tents: itinerant craftsmen, merchants, hunters, brigands - and perhaps also Elijah and the early Sons of the Prophets. Cummings has argued that 2 Kings 6:1-7 is a passage which seeks to legitimise the transition to house-dwelling made by the בָּני נֵכָר under Elisha.255 He observes that Elijah had a marked proclivity for moving about: Tishbe, Kerith, Zarephath, Carmel, Horeb and the lengthy itinerary of 2 Kings 2.256 Not even at Zarephath, where he resides in a makeshift shelter upon the flat roof of a house (1 Kings 17:19), does Elijah reside in a permanent dwelling. In this connection, it is possible that כָּרוּנִים in 1 Kings 17:1 is, contrary to most commentators, in fact correctly vocalised, with the meaning 'of the sojourners of', and is thus also an indication of the peripatetic lifestyle of Elijah. As virtually all the other appearances of כָּרוּנִים are to be found in the post-exilic collections conventionally designated by P and H, certainty cannot be attained here. The non-P/H occurrences are Ps. 39:13 and 1 Chron. 29:15, which is linked with Ps. 39:13, but whether formal dependence and, if so, in which direction, can be established, is unclear. It is dubious whether either Ps. 39:13 or 1 Chron. 29:15 originate in the pre-exilic period.257 The Encyclopaedia Judaica records that
in the opinion of some scholars the designation "the Tishbite of the inhabitants of Gilead" supports the hypothesis that Elijah did not live in one specific place in Gilead, but was a member of either the Kenites or the Rechabites, sects which led a nomadic existence. Unfortunately, EJ does not specify which scholars hold this view, one which it itself does not share:

The accounts of [Elijah's] wanderings (1 Kings 17) indicate that his withdrawal from society was a matter not of principle but of necessity (persecution, famine). It is probably wrong to divorce Elijah so rigidly from the Rechabites - which, of course, does not mean that Elijah was himself a Rechabite. That Elisha and the Sons of the Prophets dwelt in houses is unmistakeable, but it also seems established that Elijah did not. Cummings' argument, that the Rechabites under Jonadab represented some sort of 'alternative candidate' for the succession of the mantle of Elijah, seems highly likely. If Elisha occasioned a split in the prophetic community over the question of house-dwelling, then Jonadab and the Rechabites represent that group among the prophets which remained loyal to the itinerant lifestyle typified by Elijah, albeit regularising it into tent-dwelling, possibly because, unlike the solitary Elijah, the Rechabites were a whole community living the itinerant life.

In pursuing this line, of seeing the Rechabites as being in some sense connected with Elijah, Elisha and the
Sons of the Prophets, it is illuminating to ask whether the other features of Rechabite discipline, i.e. not sowing seed and not planting vineyard, are found in the Elijah-Elisha cycles. While nothing is said explicitly, and extreme caution is required when advancing an argument from silence, it seems that, like the avoidance of wine, these prohibitions were also observed by Elijah, Elisha and the Sons of the Prophets. They seem to have consumed the fruit of the earth, cf. 1 Kings 19:6, 2 Kings 4:42-44, but it is not the eating of bread that is prohibited in Rechabite discipline, but rather the sowing and the growing of the seed.

If the Rechabites and Elijah, Elisha and the Sons of the Prophets all observed a discipline in which wine was avoided, in which houses were not dwelt in (until Elisha's reforms), seed not sown nor vineyard planted, but an itinerant lifestyle followed (in tents in the case of the Rechabites), then a reason for this series of rules must be discovered.

It has already been argued that wine was avoided because the consumption of alcohol would have hindered their ability to function as prophets. The explanation of the series of commands in Jer. 35:7 is to be found in a somewhat unexpected quarter: in Ps. 107:35-38.

These verses read:
RSV:
35. He turns the desert into pools of water,
A parched land into springs of water.
36. And there he lets the hungry dwell,
And they establish a city to live in;
37. They sow fields and plant vineyards,
And get a fruitful yield.
38. By his blessing they multiply greatly;
And he does not let their cattle decrease.

The significance of these verses for the present purposes lies in the fact that, in them, agriculture, specifically sowing fields and planting vineyards (v.37), and pastoralism (v.38), are seen as arising out of a sedentary, or even an urban, life (v.36). יֶהְרָשֵׁב is not found elsewhere in the Old Testament outside of this Psalm, so its precise meaning is not clear - the English versions usually render it as 'an inhabited city', probably correctly.

Bearing this description in mind, we can now return to Jeremiah 35. In v.6f, the order of the commands of Jonadab is 'drink no wine' - 'build no houses' - 'sow no seed' - 'plant no vineyard' - 'do not have anything' - 'live in tents'. This order seems at first sight to be peculiar, as wine and vineyards are separated from each other by houses and seed, and houses and tents are separated from each other by seed, vineyard and 'anything', whereas it would
perhaps be expected that 'drink no wine' and 'plant no vineyards', and 'build no houses' and 'live in tents', would be joined directly to each other. However, given the evidence of Ps. 107:35-38, and the conclusion that the Rechabite wine-prohibition is a prohibition on all intoxicants, not simply on fermented grape juice, the order of the commands is sensible. As in Ps. 107:35-38, seed and vineyard (and 'anything') are seen in Jonadab's commands as being part and parcel of the sedentary life, ie. of the house-dwelling life. The prohibition on planting vineyards is not related to the prohibition on drinking wine, but to the prohibition on living in houses.

Thus, the Rechabite prohibitions may be broken into two: drink no wine, Jer. 35:6; and do not live in houses or practice sedentary/urban occupations, such as planting or sowing vineyards, but live an itinerant, tent-dwelling life. It thus appears that the Rechabites were 'anti-urban', and were 'anti-urban' without being 'nomadic'. They were, rather, itinerant.

Why were they so opposed to the urban lifestyle that they sought to avoid it completely? In the closing pages of his Ph.D. thesis, Frank Frick has shown that many of the Old Testament prophets whose words have been preserved spoke out against urbanization in Ancient Israel. Their proclamation seems to have been made for at least two reasons. Firstly, the construction of defensive fortifications was implying that the people were failing to place their whole
trust in Yahweh their God for their defence. Secondly, urbanization, which seems to have been heavily Canaanized in Ancient Israel, was leading to increases in the evils of society, such as the exploitation of the poor by the rich, oppression, greed and so on. Joseph Blenkinsopp has recently pointed out, in connection with the "distinctive attire .... simple diet and physical separation from the amenities of city life" of the ninth century prophets, that prophecy can consist not just in a commission to speak but in the adoption of a certain style of living that dramatises the rejection of what passes for reality in the society as a whole.

It is this style of prophecy that the Rechabites adopted. Their tent-residence was a symbol of their trust in Yahweh - in human terms, one is vulnerable in a tent in a way that one is not in a house - and a striking reminder to the urban Israelites of their own lack of trust. The Rechabites' avoidance of agriculture symbolised their criticism of oppressive economic practices and the other evils of urban society.

It might be argued that the fact that the Rechabites turn up in Jerusalem in Jer. 35, having fled there from before Nebuchadrezzar's troops (v.11), argues against this interpretation of their practices. If they were anti-urban, what are they doing in the Judaean capital? But it is possible to reside within a city without adopting a typically 'urban' lifestyle, as the shanty settlements found in and around many present-day South American and South African cities, and
the 'down and outs' to be found under the arches of Charing Cross railway station in London every night, indicate. The Rechabites could have been resident in Jerusalem, during the time of the emergency, without conforming to the urban lifestyle. Indeed, the text makes it clear that the Rechabites claimed that they had obeyed all Jonadab's commands (v.10) and that this claim is upheld (v.18). Thus, the Rechabites' residency in Jerusalem is no objection to this theory.

The foregoing explanation of the meaning of Jonadab's list of commands has worked with the implicit assumption that Jer. 35:6f represents the sum of Jonadab's commands, rather than being indicative of other laws which the Rechabites followed. Abramsky finds it difficult to decide between these two options, but it actually seems more probable that in Jer. 35:6f we have the sum of Jonadab's prohibitions on his followers, rather than a selection of them. Within the context of Jeremiah 35, where the Rechabites are simply instructed to drink wine, not to disobey any of their other rules, there is strictly no need for them to repeat the details concerning houses, seed and vineyard, which are, in fact, superfluous to the matter in hand. The fact that they do repeat them makes it seem as if they are repeating the whole teaching of Jonadab, as it had been understood and handed down through successive generations of Rechabites.

Jonadab's commands are followed by a promise, 'that you may live many days in the land wherein you are sojourners'. While
may simply mean 'ground', as the 'earth's visible surface', and while it often has this meaning when it is preceded by וָאֵּ֣שׁ, the following clause here, i.e. אֲמָרָ֣ם שֶׁאֵ֤伤亡, especially the שֶׁאֵ֣伤亡, strongly suggests that here denotes the Promised Land, Cannan. If it denoted the ground, rather than שֶׁאֵ֣伤亡 would be desiderated, yielding a meaning 'upon which you are sojourners', rather than 'wherein you are sojourners'. Along with שֶׁאֵ֣伤亡 in v.11, which there also denotes the Promised Land, שֶׁאֵ֣伤亡 is the only geographical term to occur in the material concerning the Rechabites, which leads to the conclusion that 'The Land' was important in their ideology, in some strangely paradoxical way. They were commanded to abstain from sowing seed in the land and to abstain from some of the fruits of the land, in order to live many days in that land where they were sojourners. Which is the paramount element in this promise, i.e. 'living many days' or 'in the land', is unclear - was the punishment for infidelity to Jonadab's commands seen as being premature death or expulsion from 'The Land'? Perhaps it is wrong to try to separate the two, as they could have been regarded as being equivalent by the Rechabites: to be apart from שֶׁאֵ֣伤亡 was the equivalent of death.

While Frick quotes this final clause of Jonadab's speech to the Rechabites when he cites Jer. 35:6f, he does not comment on it, so presumably he either attaches no significance at all to it, or else, as for him the Rechabites' prohibition on wine was intended to ensure that they did not divulge their metalworking secrets to others, he under-
stands the consequence clause to have some meaning like 'in order that you may not divulge your trade secrets and so lose your jobs'! This, of course, sounds somewhat ridiculous as an interpretation of 'in order that you may live many days in the land wherein you are sojourners', and it uncovers a serious problem, not only with Frick's theory, but with most theories that have been advanced concerning the Rechabites: they fail to take adequate account of all the scant data available, and so yield pictures that are, at best, distorted or partial or, at worst, completely wrong. It is important to listen to the whole text, and not just the parts of it that fit our particular theory, before forming opinions about the Rechabites, or about anything or anyone else in the Old Testament, for that matter.

It is unlikely that the distinction between the noun יָהֳּדָּה and the substantive participle יָהֳּדָּה, which is used here in Jer. 35:7, should be pressed. יָהֳּדָּה has something of a broad range of meanings in biblical Hebrew. The noun יָהֳּדָּה is frequent, usually denoting a resident alien, the status of whom is clearly indicated by the fact that he is often linked with the fatherless and the widow. By and large, the resident alien is required to keep the same laws as the native Israelites. Deut. 29:10, and its link with Joshua 9, reveals that יָהֳּדָּה was also used to denote the non-Israelite population of Canaan, and that these יָהֳּדָּה were generally employed in menial tasks. Lev. 19:34 provides the justification for the Israelite care of the יָהֳּדָּה: Israel themselves had been יָהֳּדָּה in Egypt.
This leads to the second meaning of מִשְׁרָכָה. It is used to describe the Israelites in Egypt eight times, to describe Abraham among the Sons of Heth once, and Moses in Midian twice. Once, in Jer. 14:8, it is used of Yahweh, in a passage which describes and bewails his neglect of the land.

There are also a number of cases in the Hebrew Bible where the idea of the people as sojourners in the land of Israel and/or life is found. Thus, Lev 25:23 states that 'the land shall not be sold in perpetuity, for the land is mine; for you are strangers and sojourners מִשְׁרָכָה with me'. Compare also Pss. 39:13, 119:19 and 1 Chron. 29:15. In Judg. 17:7-9, the Levite is spoken of as seeking a place to sojourn, and the laws for the protection of society often class the Levites and the מִשְׁרָכָה together.269

In Ps. 105:12=1 Chron. 16:19, the Patriarchs in Canaan are described as 'few in number, of little account and sojourners מִשְׁרָכָה in it', and in the Patriarchal Promises, Canaan is often referred as 'The Land of your Sojournings!', מִשְׁרָכָה, cf. Gen. 17:8, 28:4, 36:7, 37:1, Exod. 6:4.

This understanding of the Levites and the Patriarchs, as 'sojourners' within the land of Canaan, seems to be the best background on which to understand the use of the term in connection with the Rechabites. Like the Levites, like
the Patriarchs, the Rechabites had no land of their own, yet were living within the land of Israel. They were all landless Israelites within Israel, so they shared a common designation as 'sojourners'.

Kellermann argues, on the basis of 2 Chron. 15:9, 30:28, that יִשְׁרֵי also denoted fugitives from the Northern Kingdom, who had settled in Judah after 722 BCE, and that this explains the importance of יִשְׁרֵי in Deuteronomy.\(^{270}\)

While it is true that 2 Kings 10:15f indicates that the Rechabites originated in the north, and while it is true that they must have come south at some point, as Jer. 35 portrays them in the Judaean capital, it is unlikely that this meaning of יִשְׁרֵי is applicable here. It is quoted as part of Jonadab's speech, which was formulated in the north, long before the Fall of Samaria - the Rechabites were living as 'sojourners in the land' many years prior to 722 BCE.

Spina has recently suggested that יִשְׁרֵי originated as a term with overtones of social unrest or conflict, especially surrounding the circumstances in which people initially became יִשְׁרֵי.\(^{271}\) This suggestion does not fit the Levite in Judg. 17 or the Patriarchs in Ps. 105 very well, but it may nevertheless have a bearing on the Rechabites and on the reasons why they were described as 'sojourners'. Jonadab founded his group as a response to the socio-religious situation in Samaria in the time of the Omrides. The unrest caused by that socio-religious situation would provide an adequate background for the Rechabites becoming 'immigrants'\(^{272}\) in the land.
Keukens thinks that the use of the participle מְשַׁלְוָה here should be compared with נְשַׁלְוָה in Job 19:15 which, for him, denotes strangers living in the land who, as people of a lower legal status, enjoy the protection of a 'house'. As the 'sojourning' and the 'house' are not connected in Jer. 35, Keukens' proposed link with Job 19:15 really seems rather unlikely and, in any case, his interpretation of נְשַׁלְוָה there is probably also incorrect.

By the rabbinic period, יָשְׁלָה had also come to denote a 'proselyte', and this meaning probably underlies those rabbinic traditions which see the Rechabites as non-Israelites. Their personal names, and the conclusions reached in Chapter Two concerning 1 Chron. 2:55 and 4:12, suggest that they were, in fact, full-blooded members of Israel.

The best way to understand מְשַׁלְוָה here in Jer. 35:7 is, by analogy with the descriptions of the Levite in Judg. 17:7-9 and of the Patriarchs in Ps. 105:12, as a means of describing landless Israelites living in the land of Canaan. But having said this, it is also possible to apply Spina's overtones, of social unrest in connection with why people opted to become יָשְׁלָה, to the Rechabites and the time of their origin in the days of the Omrides.

The question of precisely how obedience to Jonadab's commands led to the Rechabites enjoying the reward of 'long life in the land' is one of some importance, and will be considered when the Rechabites are examined as a sect in Chap-
Verse 11

Abramsky perceives a stark contrast between the start of v.10, and is inclined to think, as is Carroll, that the Rechabites abandoned their tent-dwelling when they came to Jerusalem. Elliott Binns, however, thinks that there is no reason to doubt that they maintained their tent-dwelling in the city, and that they would not have been the only group so residing in Jerusalem at that time. It has already been observed above, in connection with v.7, that it is possible to reside in a city without adopting an urban lifestyle, so it is not illegitimate to conclude that the Rechabites were still maintaining their tent-residency even after their arrival in Jerusalem.

However, the fact that they did flee to the city when they were threatened by military attack does indicate that they had compromised one of the motives for their avoidance of houses, sowing seed and planting vineyard. It was shown above that the motive was two-fold: a protest against cities as fortified defences which implied a lack of trust in Yahweh, and a protest against cities as sources of societal evils. Their Jerusalem tent-residency meant that they were still maintaining their social protest, but it also meant that, when they were put to the test, they too felt more secure behind human defences than divine ones. They had main-
tained the letter of Jonadab's commands - even though they were in the city, they were not living in houses - but they had compromised the spirit of those commands.

Verse 13

As has already been shown, Jer. 35:13 is a creation of the 'Jeremianic' redactors, who sought to reapply the original oracle of judgement, found in v.16f, to the Exiles, with the message: look at the Rechabites. They survived the Fall of Jerusalem, and are still in Palestine. You were faithless, so have been judged, but if you will now accept the discipline of Exile and amend your ways, you will be restored to the land. נוטר thus here denotes discipline or correction, specifically that imposed by Yahweh on the people through the conditions of the Exile, rather than chastisement. Thus the verse holds out the hope of restoration to the Jews in Babylon.

The fact that the original Rechabite incident could not have ended at v.11 makes the opening phrase of the divine instruction in this verse, לֹא לְאֶלֶף לַאֲשֶׁר יִהְוָה עִבְרֵי צְדָקָה עִבְרֵי צְדָקָה, unnecessary as part of the original unit. Jeremiah was in the midst of the 'men of Judah and the inhabitants of Jerusalem' already, so a command to 'go and speak' to them would be superfluous, but as a message to the (later) Exiles, put in Jeremiah's mouth by the redactors, it is acceptable. The redactors make Yahweh command Jeremiah to take his message, drawn from the example of the Rechabites, to the
Jews in Babylon.

Verse 14

It has already been shown that גָּאַה Hiph. inf. absol. followed by another verb in the infinitive absolute is a feature of the Jeremiah prose tradition. Literally, גָּאַה Hiph. means 'to rise up early'. When it occurs in the infinitive absolute followed a second verb also in the infinitive absolute, it means 'persistently'. As Carroll puts it,

this graphic metaphor (used often enough in the Jeremiah tradition to border on cliche) describes the persistence with which the deity sent his prophets to the people.

Verse 15

It has already been demonstrated that the phrase 'my servants the prophets' in this verse comes from the 'Jeremianic' redactors. It is possible that the phrase was inserted here by the redactors precisely because they understood the Rechabites in the same way as this study, ie. as a prophetic group. The reference here is not only to the general sending of prophets by Yahweh, but also to the specific case of the Rechabites. The redactors thus also viewed the Rechabites as Yahwistic prophets.
Verse 16

The implication of this verse is that the Rechabites obeyed the whole teaching of Jonadab. Although מַגֶּשֶׁת here is singular, it must denote all of the instructions of v.6f. This is certainly the understanding of the MT in v.18, which reads מַגֶּשֶׁת - a correct interpretation, even though LXX is probably more primitive here.\(^{288}\) This is a further indication that the Rechabites had maintained their tent-dwelling existence within the walls of Jerusalem.

Verses 18-19: The Promise to the Rechabites

On text-critical grounds, it has been argued that the earliest form of Jer. 35:18f ran as follows:

Therefore, thus says Yahweh, because the sons of Jonadab the son of Rechab have obeyed the command of their father to do that which their father commanded them, there will not lack a man to Jonadab the son of Rechab standing before me forever.\(^{289}\)

J.D. Levenson has perceived in this Promise to the Rechabites an instance of the 'Covenant of Grant' identified by Moshe Weinfeld:

This type of covenant is different in
essence from the more familiar "treaty covenant", well-known in Biblical circles .... In nuce, whereas 'the grant is a reward for loyalty and good deeds already performed, the treaty is an inducement for future loyalty' ... 'The grant', in short, "... is an act of royal benevolence arising from the king's desire to reward his loyal servant'.

Thus, the outstanding fidelity of one generation of the Rechabites wins for the clan the gift of eternal survival, a gift which Yahweh will maintain, even if the Rechabites' descendents should fall short of their father's fidelity. As parallels to this, Levenson cites the promises to David contained in 2 Sam. 7:14-15 and Ps. 89:31-38. What he does not go on to observe is that both 2 Sam.7:14-15 and Ps. 89:31-38 expect David's descendents to maintain David's fidelity, and that both say that Yahweh will punish any backsliding from that fidelity, even though he will not withdraw his blessing. By inference, it must be asserted that the 'Covenant of Grant' made to the Rechabites (made in Jer. 35:19) is made on the expectation that the Rechabite community will continue to observe the commands of Jonadab. There is no mention of any abrogation of those commands, and the comparison with 2 Samuel 7 and Psalm 89 indicates, rather, that those rules were to still have binding force for the Rechabites. Thus, it is legitimate to claim rather more than Levenson does. He is correct to say that the purpose of ... the chapter about the Rechabites is to commend to the citizens of Judah the faithfulness this curious
group exemplified, rather than, as some have believed, to advocate a return to the nomadic or semi-nomadic existence which was the manifestation of this faithfulness.²⁹³

But he is not correct to say that here, faith and the fulfillment of commands have become worthy in the sight of YHWH, whether it is faith in him and fulfillment of his commands or not,²⁹⁴ implying that the actual content of the commands was not the will of Yahweh for the Rechabites. It seems clear, however, that the Promise to the Rechabites, with its implied continuation of the Rechabite discipline, reveals that the content of that discipline was part of Yahweh's will for the Rechabites, and for the Rechabites alone. There is no indication that the life of the Rechabites is being set up as some sort of normative Yahwism, which all the people are expected to follow, but it is regarded as an acceptable form of life and worship in Yahweh's eyes.

What of the actual content of the Promise or, more specifically, what does מַעֲשֶׂה מָצַע mean?²⁹⁵ Some of the rabbinic traditions about the Rechabites thought that it meant that they became priests.²⁹⁶ Calvin dismissed this, and thought that it simply meant that some Rechabites would always be living and would not lose their just reward.²⁹⁷ Gelin thought that one was in the presence of Yahweh when living in his territory,²⁹⁸ and that מַעֲשֶׂה מָצַע here denoted the continued presence of the Rechabites in Israel. Volz was of the opinion that it denoted the continuance of the religious peculiarity of the sect.²⁹⁹ Elliott Binns, Peake and
Feinberg all note that יִשְׂרָאֵל is usually used of priests, but express caution when it comes to claiming that this is its meaning here. Carroll thinks it denotes nothing more than survival.

What is needed is an investigation of the use of the phrase יִשְׂרָאֵל in the Hebrew Bible, before its meaning in Jer. 35:19 can be determined properly. Such an investigation is here offered.

Is used of the people, the Levites or the priests in the cultic activity of either the Tent of Meeting or the Jerusalem Temple in Lev. 9:5, Deut. 10:8, 18:7, Jer. 7:10, Ezek. 44:15, Ezra 9:19, 2 Chron. 20:9, 20:13, 29:11. Deut. 4:40 speaks of the people 'standing before Yahweh' to hear his words, again presumably within a cultic context. Judg. 20:28 speaks of Phinehas standing — the suffix could denote either the Ark or Yahweh, but in reality the two cannot be separated, cf. 1 Sam. 6:20. 1 Kings 3:15 speaks of Solomon standing before the Ark of the Covenant of Yahweh in the Temple — once again a cultic reference. The same idea is repeated in 1 Kings 8:22 and 2 Chron. 6:12.

The phrase is also used with the sense of 'resisting Yahweh', or being able to endure his presence or the presence of his acts. So 1 Sam. 6:20, Jer. 49:19, 50:44, Neh. 1:6 (standing before the indignation of Yahweh); Ps. 76:8, (before the anger of Yahweh); Ps. 107:17 (before the cold of Yahweh). It hardly needs to be said that this particular mean-
ing of \( תְּחָכַי הָנֵּחַ \) is not suitable for the instance of the phrase in Jer. 35:19!

It is also used to denote the act of intercession.

So Gen. 18:22, 19:27. Gen. 18:22 \( אֲבָרָהָם רָאָה ‏נֶּחָת ‏כָּפְכִּים \) 'but Abraham still stood before Yahweh', is generally regarded as a Tiqqun Sopherim, a scribal correction, which altered an original reading \( אֲבָרָהָם רָאָה ‏נֶּחָת... אֲבָרָהָמ \), as it was felt that this could have conveyed the 'heretical' view that Yahweh was Abraham's servant. 302 J. Skinner argued for the priority of the reading of the MT, and doubted the need to posit a Tiqqun Sopherim. He commented that the supposed original reading does not improve the sense, and the present form of MT is presupposed by Gen. 19:27. 303 To these comments may be added the observation that if the change was made, and on reverential grounds, then it has not been carried out with any consistency: in Exod. 17:6, Yahweh declares that he will 'stand before' Moses, the same idiom as is found in Gen. 18:22. Whichever is the correct original reading in Gen. 18:22, Gen. 19:27 is sufficient evidence from the pericope of the use of \( תְּחָכַי הָנֵּחַ \) to denote non-cultic intercession.

In Jer. 15:1, Moses and Samuel are said to 'stand before Yahweh'. In the context, it seems that the reference here is also to the act of intercession. 304 Jer. 18:20 explicitly asserts that 'to stand before Yahweh' means 'to intercede':

Remember how I stood before thee,
to speak good for them, 
to turn away thy wrath from them. (RSV)

Ezekiel 22:30 speaks of the righteous man who would stand in 
the breach before Yahweh to avert his wrath. That this also 
denotes the act of intercession is revealed by Ps. 106:23, 
which uses the expression of Moses at the time of the inci-
dent of the Golden Calf. Exod. 32:11-14 shows that Moses av-
erted Yahweh's wrath by the ministry of intercession — an idea 
poetically expressed in Ps. 106:23 by 'standing in the breach 
before Yahweh'. The same meaning attaches to the use of the 
phrase in Ezek. 22:30.

The fourth use of נַחַזְקָה, and it is prob-
ably wrong to separate it from the third, is as an indi-
cation of the relationship between a prophet and his God. So
1 Kings 17:1, 18:15 (Elijah), 2 Kings 3:14, 5:16 (Elisha), 
Jer. 15:19 (Jeremiah). Of particular interest in this con-
text is 1 Kings 19:11, Yahweh's command to Elijah to 'go 
forth, and stand upon the mount before Yahweh', which implies 
that the prophets had a peculiar, personal relationship with 
Yahweh, beyond that contained in the Cult. Indeed, this 
idea may be an extension of that expressed in 1 Kings 22:21-
2 Chron. 18:20, where the spirit of prophecy is said to 
stand in the presence of Yahweh, ie. in his council (and 
counsel!).

This survey of the use of נַחַזְקָה indicates 
that it never had the meanings 'being alive', 'dwelling in 
the Promised Land' or 'surviving forever' in biblical Hebrew,
so it is unlikely that any of these meanings are correct for the use of the phrase in Jer. 35:19. As already indicated, the idea of resisting Yahweh is alien to the present context, which leaves three possibilities, all 'religious' - serving God in the Cult, exercising a ministry of intercession, and standing in relation to Yahweh as a prophet. Which meaning or meanings is/are applicable here? Given that it has been shown that v.19 is part of the earliest layer of the text, and that it stems from the prophet himself, it is legitimate to suggest that it does not denote cultic service here. The only time that יוחנן does have this meaning in the Book of Jeremiah (7:10), it is pejorative in meaning. In addition, 35:19 would scarcely have been preserved by the redactors in the Exile if it had had this meaning. The Temple had fallen; whatever religious rites that were being carried out on its site were of a very haphazard and occasional nature, so it would have been a fallacy to have preserved a text that asserted that a particular group would continue to carry out the cultic functions forever. Thirdly, if it is correct to conclude that the 'Covenant of Grant' in Jer. 35:19 implies that the Rechabites were expected to continue their distinctive practices, then it may be wondered how much at home they would have felt in the Jerusalem Cult, seeing as they had had a rather ambivalent attitude towards it throughout their previous history.

It thus seems that יוחנן in Jer. 35:19 denotes either 'intercession' or 'acting as prophets', or both. The two concepts probably should not be separated. Gen. 20:7,
where Abraham is described both as a prophet and as an intercessor, has already been mentioned. In addition, Jer. 15:19, where Jeremiah's prophetic office is described as 'standing before Yahweh', and 18:20, where the same phrase is used to describe his intercession, should be noted. In Jer. 15:1, the intercession of Moses and Samuel is spoken of - yet both are depicted as prophets in the biblical tradition.

Thus, it is to be concluded that the Promise to the Rechabites is a promise that they will not cease exercising a ministry of prophecy and prayer before Yahweh.

Is the Promise granting something new, or re-affirming something already present? Syntactically, the Niphal imperfect in יְנַחְתָּא אֲדֹנָי is capable of either interpretation. In Jer. 35:7, the reward for keeping Jonadab's commands was said to be that the Rechabites would live many days in the land where they were sojourners. In v.19, the promise is that they will never cease 'standing before Yahweh' forever. It has already been shown that the list of commands in v.6f is best seen as a series of injunctions to maintain the lifestyle appropriate to Yahwistic prophets. It is also clear that the רְשֵׁי לָכֵי in v.19 also indicates that the Rechabites would continue as prophets. In that sense, the promise in v.19 is a vigorous reassertion of the validity of their present practices, and is none the less forceful for that. Perhaps what is new in the final promise is that, because of their fidelity to those commands, the Rechabites will exercise that ministry forever ( Literal form), rather than just for 'many days' ( Literal form), as in v.7. When it
is recalled that the promise in v.19 was made when Judah was being overrun by ravaging military bands and when a full-scale invasion by Nebuchadrezzar was imminent, it is clear that it would have provided hope for the Rechabites that they would survive the calamity, and not only survive it, but also remain in Israel, continuing their ministry of prophecy and prayer.

And it seems clear from the text and its redactions that that is precisely what did happen, although the Rechabites disappear from the pages of the Bible after Jeremiah 35. While it is not impossible that this group of Yahwistic prophets became incorporated into the official theocracy set up by Nehemiah, it is by no means certain that this was the case. It is not likely that the rabbinic traditions about the Rechabites reflect a subsequent history such as this. As Chapter Five of the present study will show, it is more likely that these traditions were the result of various groups in the late Second Temple period adopting the title 'Rechabite' as a self-description.

Conclusion

The argument about the meaning of the Promise to the Rechabites in Jeremiah 35:19 has been deliberately developed with as little reference as possible to the other features in the chapter which point towards an original milieu for the Rechabites as a prophetic group alongside Elijah, Elisha and the Sons of the Prophets, found in 1 Kings 17–2 Kings 13. These were: the fact that the Rechabite prohibitions seem to have been observed by Elijah and, except
for the house-building/dwelling prohibition, by Elisha and the Sons of the Prophets as well; the fact that the wine prohibition is best seen against a prophetic background - alcohol being an impediment to the prophetic function of giving oracles; the fact that the rest of Jonadab's commands are best seen as a command to shun the sedentary life and its accompaniments - the urban life signifying a lack of trust in Yahweh and a growth in social inequality, both abuses condemned by the prophets by their words and by their lifestyle; and the fact that the redactors chose to insert 'my servants the prophets' in v.15.

Now that the Promise to the Rechabites in v.18f has also been seen as a prophetic term, the internal evidence from Jeremiah 35 for seeing the Rechabites as a group of Yahwistic prophets seems overwhelming - and does more justice to the text as a whole than any view that sees them as shepherds, soldiers, metalworkers, Kenites or anything else. Once the conclusions reached in Chapter Two concerning 1 Chron. 2:55, 4:12, Neh. 3:14 and especially 2 Kings 10:15f are added to these conclusions concerning Jeremiah 35, it becomes plain that the onus is on those who seek a different explanation of the Rechabites to find convincing alternative explanations to the ones gathered here, which will be further reinforced by the material in Chapter Four.

In seeing the Rechabites as prophets, the position taken by Cummings is supported, but his line of reasoning is pushed even further. Thus, the Rechabites must be seen as
a prophetic group, who exercised this function in Israel from the time of their inception in the mid- to late-ninth century in Israel right down to the Fall of Jerusalem in 587 BCE, and beyond.
CHAPTER FOUR: THE RECHABITES IN THEIR SOCIAL AND HISTORICAL CONTEXT

The previous two chapters of this study have taken as their starting point the biblical texts which either mention, or have been thought to mention, the Rechabites: 1 Chron. 2:55, 4:12, Neh. 3:14, 2 Kings 10:15f, 23, Jeremiah 35 passim. While the analysis of the biblical texts has yielded a relatively full picture of our group, there are numerous points of detail which remain as yet unexamined, either because the biblical texts did not lead directly to a consideration of them, or else because to have examined them at the relevant points in Chapters Two and Three would have created an imbalance in the presentation of the data. The purpose of this fourth chapter, therefore, is to offer a thematic approach to the study of the Rechabites, in order to complement the foregoing textual approach. The themes selected for consideration are: possible Ancient Near Eastern parallels to the Rechabites; Chariots and riding in the Old Testament - the background to the term 'Rechabite'; the Rechabites as a sect; the Rechabites' means of sustenance; the Rechabites and the Cult; and the Rechabites and the Nazirites.

It is hoped that the study of these various themes, when coupled with the study of the biblical texts, will yield as complete a picture as it is possible to paint of the historical Rechabites. Therefore, this present chapter will finish with a conclusion to the whole of the first part of
this thesis, 'The Rechabites in the Bible'. Part Two of the present thesis, comprising Chapter Five, will examine the use of the biblical traditions about the Rechabites by the Qumran Scrolls and Community, by the rabbincic literature, and by the Old Testament Pseudepigrapha.

POSSIBLE ANCIENT NEAR EASTERN PARALLELS TO THE RECHABITES (4.1)

In pursuit of the attempt to understand the Rechabites correctly, several scholars have resorted to searching for possible parallels to them from elsewhere in the Ancient Near East. From at least the time of Plumptre onwards,¹ it has been quite common to compare the practices of the Rechabites with those of the early Nabataeans, as recounted in the work of Diodorus Siculus. More recently it has been proposed that the early Amorites should be viewed as parallels to the Rechabites. In this section these two proposals will be examined in turn and it will be shown that the early Nabataeans and the early Amorites were anything but similar to the Rechabites.

The Rechabites and the Nabataeans

The passage in Diodorus Siculus which describes the customs of the early Nabataeans, which have been thought to offer a parallel to the customs of the Rechabites, is XIX.94.2ff. Not only do Old Testament scholars cite this passage from Diodorus as a parallel to the Rechabites, but Nabataean scholars have also tended to cite Jeremiah 35:6-10
as providing a parallel to the customs of the early Nabataeans.\(^2\) This widespread acceptance, from both fields, of the viability of a positive comparison between the Rechabites and the early Nabataeans, makes it extremely important, for the purposes of this study, that this supposed link is critically investigated and evaluated, something which apparently has not been undertaken before.\(^3\)

At first sight, the comparison between the two groups appears to be a valid one. Diodorus Siculus XIX.94. 2ff reads:

\[
\text{Χρησμον δ' εστι των ἀνυστατων ἐνεκα διεξαγον τιν θομα των Ἀραβων τουτων, οις χρησμον δουκους την ἐλευθερίαν ἀποδώσαντες. έξουσι των τον βουλαν ὑπασθρον, πατρικης καλουντες την ἀνακοινών των μυτη ποτηριος ἐξουσιας μηγε κρας δερυλες ἦν ὑπω τουτων ἐξουσιας ποιημαλ ὑπερευθεςας, νομος δ' εστιν κατοικους μηγε στοχειαν μηγε
\\
\text{φυτευες μηγε φυτον καρποφορον μηγε ουγον χρησιας μηγε οικισ κατασκευαζεςν' ος δ' αν παρα τουτα ποιων εύρεσσειται, θεωτων κατω προστηγον ειναι. Χρισταλ δε τη νομιμα τουτω διαλεξαντες τους τοις κραμενοις ἀναγκασθεσσοι μερες των διων αντων ἐνεκα της τουτων χρεως ποισεν το προστασιωμενον.}
\]

For the sake of those who do not know, it will be helpful to state in some detail the customs of these Arabs, by following which, it is believed, they preserve their liberty. They live in the open air, claiming as native land a wilderness that has neither rivers nor abundant springs from which it is possible for a hostile army to obtain water. It is their custom neither to plant grain,
set out any fruit-bearing tree, nor
to drink wine, nor construct any house,
and if anyone is found acting contrary
to this, death is his penalty. They follow
this custom because they believe that those
who possess these things are, in order to
retain the use of them, easily compelled
by the powerful to do their bidding. 4

The text goes on to indicate that the Nabataeans
were pastoralists, raising both camels and sheep in the
desert, and merchants, trading in frankincense, myrrh
and spices (Diod. Sic. XIX.94.4f). Elsewhere, it is stated
that they live a life of brigandage (II.48.2).

Cohen has warned against ascribing too great a
historical reliability to the Classical references to the
Nabataeans, 5 but both Geer and Negev believe that Diodorus' 
account, written in the first century BCE, but detailing
events that occurred in 312 BCE, is based on a genuine eye-
witness report, that of Hieronymus of Cardia. 6 A recent
monograph devoted to Hieronymus of Cardia has confirmed that
Diodorus Siculus' account is that of Hieronymus and, further,
has demonstrated the essential accuracy of Hieronymus' work,
particularly in the section devoted to the Nabataeans. 7 Thus,
it may be safely concluded that our passage is an authentic
account of the Nabataeans in the fourth century BCE.

Hence, the passage in Diod. Sic. XIX.94 is a legi-
timate basis for the proper understanding of the customs of
the early Nabataeans, despite the fact that it is the only
evidence available for this period of Nabataean history. It
is most improbable that the text of Diodorus/Hieronymus has
any dependence, literary or otherwise, on the text of Jer.
35:6-10. The order of the elements is different, and a
different vocabulary is used, as a comparison between the
passage in Diodorus and LXX-Jer. 42 (= MT-Jer. 35) makes
clear:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LXX:</th>
<th>μητε ρητος α'νον</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Diod. Sic.:</td>
<td>μητε α'νον κρανςθαι</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LXX:</td>
<td>οικηαν ου μη οικοδομησαν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diod. Sic.:</td>
<td>μητε οικηαν κατασκευασαν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LXX:</td>
<td>σπερμα ου μη σπερηετε</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diod. Sic.:</td>
<td>μητε σπερνου σπερεσευ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LXX:</td>
<td>μεπελον ουκ έστιν ραβου</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diod. Sic.:</td>
<td>μητε γυτεσεν γμεν σπερναν καμπετερον</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition to the underlined differences in vocabulary,
Diodorus/Hieronymus does not explicitly state that the Nab-
taeans lived in tents, although it is clear that they did so
- "this fact, it seems, our authorities took for granted, and
for this reason they failed to mention it".

Having established that Diod. Sic. XIX.94 preserves
authentic historical material concerning the fourth century
BCE Nabataeans, and that it has no direct dependence on Jer.
35, the following features which the Nabataeans and the
Rechabites had in common may now be outlined:

(1) not planting grain;

(2) not planting vineyards - it is surely legitimate
to assume that the 'fruit-bearing trees' of the passage in
Diodorus Siculus included vines;

(3) not drinking wine;

(4) not building houses;

(5) living in tents;

- seemingly a remarkable correspondence of practice.

It should also be pointed out, however, that there were some features of Nabataean life, as recounted by our text, which either have no correspondence with Jeremiah 35, or else stand positively at variance with it:

(1) the Nabataeans were brigands and merchants. There is nothing in Jer. 35 that explicitly details the occupations of the Rechabites. Implicitly, Jer. 35 reveals that they were prophets;

(2) the Nabataeans were pastoralists. It has been demonstrated elsewhere in this study that not only is there no evidence to suggest that the Rechabites were shepherds, but also that the available data accords better with the view that this was not their occupation;¹⁰

(3) the Nabataeans were desert-dwellers - the terms ἁπάξλεκτος and ἐρημικὸς are used to describe their habitat. It has already been pointed out that the geographical terms used in connection with the Rechabites are ποιμήν and γαῖα, denoting the cultivated, Promised Land.¹¹ There is no evidence that the Rechabites ever lived in, or had any love for, the desert;

(4) Diodorus/Hieronymus states that contravention of the laws of the Nabataeans was punishable by death. It is hard to assert, on the basis of the biblical material, that
the Rechabites had recourse to similar punitive measures. Admittedly, the promise in Jer. 35:7 is "that you may live many days in the land wherein you are sojourners", but the antithesis, ie. the punishment for, or the consequence of, disobedience, cannot really be interpreted as capital punishment executed by other members of the Rechabite community. Expulsion from the community was more likely to have been the form of punishment exercised by the Rechabites against recalcitrant members. 12

The most significant contrast between the Rechabites and the Nabataeans, however, lies in the motives for their practices. Jonadab enjoined the Rechabites to keep their discipline "in order that you may live many days in the land wherein you are sojourners". The Nabataeans observed their practices in order to preserve their political freedom:

the customs of these Arabs, by following which, it is believed, they preserve their liberty.

They follow this custom, because they believe that those who possess these things are ... easily compelled by the powerful to do their bidding.

Jane Hornblower has shown that ἰδιωθερία, 'freedom', is probably a motif of Hieronymus' history, and that he used the example of the freedom-loving Nabataeans to convey a serious message to the increasingly despotic Antigonus Gonates. 13 Nevertheless, the assumption that Hieronymus has invented this motive for the Nabataean practices, in order to make his point, is unwarranted. Rather, he has used the observed
Nabataean practices, and their motive, to drive his message to Antigonus' home.

Thus, the stated motives for the Nabataean practices in Diod. Sic. XIX.94 are genuine — and they are different from the motives underlying the practices of the Rechabites. But if a valid comparison between the Rechabites and the Nabataeans is to be drawn, a similarity not only, or even primarily, of practice must be discerned, but also, and primarily, a similarity of motive, i.e. it is incumbent upon those who believe that there is a parallel between the Rechabites and the early Nabataeans to demonstrate convincingly that 'living long in the land' as prophets and 'freedom from political subjugation' in the desert are synonymous terms. To date, it appears that no scholar, either Old Testament or Nabataean, who mentions the similarity of practice even mentions the difference of motive, let alone tries to reconcile them. The two motives are not synonymous, and can only be equated by a tortuous interpretation of one, or other, or both, of them. So, while there is a certain degree — by no means exact, as the list of differences demonstrates — of similarity of practice between the two groups, the dissimilarity of motive along with the fact that the Rechabites avoided the desert while the Nabataeans lived nowhere else, is such as to render the supposed parallel untenable. The early Nabataeans thus do not form a parallel to the Rechabites, and the Rechabites do not form a parallel to the early Nabataeans.
Excursus 3: Earlier Evidence for the Nabataeans

Diodorus Siculus/Hieronymus of Cardia is our only definite source for the early history and practices of the Nabataeans. Various attempts have been made to link the Nabataeans with the biblical Nebaioth (Gen. 25:13, 28:9, 36:3, Is. 60:7, 1 Chron. 1:29) and the Assyrian Na-ba-a-a-ti and similar\textsuperscript{14} and thus to discover earlier attestations of the Nabataeans.\textsuperscript{15} The argument hinges on the spelling of Nebaioth (\textit{Nbtw}) and Nabataean (\textit{Nbtw} in the nominative), and on whether the shift from Assyrian and Hebrew \textit{t} to Nabataean \textit{t} is phonologically acceptable. That it is phonologically acceptable is contended, notably by Negev and Eph'al.\textsuperscript{16} If Bartlett and Broome are right, then presumably the practices of the Nabataeans can also be read back several centuries, so it would be unwise to build a criticism of the proposed parallel between the Rechabites and the Nabataeans on the basis of the chronological gap between Diodorus/Hieronymus and Jeremiah, as Riemann does.\textsuperscript{17} However, it is by no means certain that Bartlett and Broome are right, so it seems best to adopt a 'not proven' attitude, and follow Bowersock's view that

there is no secure basis for identifying [the Nabataeans] with the Nebaioth of the Old Testament or with peoples of similar names in Assyrian documents.\textsuperscript{18}

Excursus 4: Strabo's Witness to the Nabataeans

It is highly informative to compare what is recounted
of the Nabataeans of the fourth century BCE in Diod. Sic. XIX. 94, with what Strabo, a first century BCE eyewitness, says of them:

Diod. Sic. XIX.94.3  
Strabo, Geography, XVI.4.26  
The Nabataeans do not plant grain, or set out any fruit-bearing trees.  
"Most of the country is well-supplied with fruit".

They do not use wine.  
They hold drinking bouts (Συμπόσιον) and pour out libations (σεμπόντες) to their deity - both practices which involved the use of wine.

They do not construct any houses.  
"Their homes, through the use of stone, are costly, but, on account of peace, the cities are not walled".19

Thus, Diodorus Siculus/Hieronymus of Cardia presents a view of the Nabataeans as nomadic, Strabo sees them as sedentary. In the 200-300 years since Hieronymus made his observations, seemingly adopted by Diodorus without any regard for the actual state of affairs in the first century BCE, the Nabataeans had moved from a predominantly nomadic lifestyle to a predominantly sedentary one. This rapid transition also cautions against drawing too ready a comparison between the Rechabites and the early Nabataeans.

There are also other Classical witnesses to the Nabataeans, viz. Josephus, Antiquities XIV, 16, 80f, 362; XVII, 54, 120; War I, 125f, 159, 167, 574; Plutarch, Lives, Pompey 41, Demetrius 7; Pliny, Natural History, VI, 144 and the anonymous Periplus of the Erythraean Sea, 19. None of
these references, however, add anything to our knowledge of the early Nabataeans, as they are mainly geographical references to Petra or accounts of political and military relations between Judaea and Nabataea in the period c.100 BCE - c.100 CE.

The Rechabites and the Amorites

In 1974, M.S. Seale proposed that the customs of the Amorites of the Ur III period (c.2000 BCE), as recounted in various Sumerian literary texts, formed a parallel to the customs of the Rechabites and, since, in Seale's opinion, the Amorites were nomads, it was hence evident that the Rechabites were also nomads, providing "a valuable clue to what the whole people were like before they became sedentary".

The customs of the Amorites thus need to be examined to see if they do, in fact, reflect a nomadic culture, and whether they do form a parallel to the customs of the Rechabites. In addition, the whole understanding of the concept of nomadism needs to be appraised at this point.

The texts that have been thought to reveal the nomadic character of the Amorites have been conveniently gathered together by Buccellati. They describe the Amorites as:

'a tent dweller (buffeted?) by the wind and rain';
'the one who does not know city(-life)';
'the Amorite of the mountains';
'the awkward man living in the mountains';
'the one who does not know (ie. cultivate) grain';
'the one who digs up mushrooms at the foot of the mountain';
'who eats uncooked meat';
'who, on the day of his death, will not be buried';
'the Amorite, a ravaging people, with canine instincts, like wolves ...'.

In addition, two texts from Drehem depict the Amorites as pastoralists, bringing their sheep and goats into the commercial centre.23

Superficially, these texts again, like that of Diodorus Siculus on the Nabataeans, do seem to offer certain parallels to the customs of the Rechabites. But they must be carefully evaluated. Seale accepts them as reflecting the true nature of the Amorites,24 but it is to be noted that the evidence

is neither direct nor impartial testimony concerning the way of life and the technological and cultural baggage of the Amorites, but simply a vivid picture of how they were seen by the Mesopotamians. It is a picture subject to all the misunderstandings and generalisations that go with the descriptions of the 'foreigner' in strongly ethno-centric civilisations.25

Indeed, in following this line, Haldar went so far as to assert that this Sumerian description of the foreign Amorites was simply a derisory and contemptuous account of the sedentary Amorites in Mesopotamia, by the culturally superior
Sumerians but, as Kay Prag comments, it seems "unnecessary to treat the few texts that are available in such devious fashion". Rather, the line taken by Liverani and Prag should be followed. Some of the Sumerian statements, such as 'the Amorite who lives in a tent', are undoubtedly based on direct experience. Others have become drastically generalised, such as the claim that the Amorite is one 'who does not know grain', while still others can only be seen as having originated either in Sumerian ignorance of Amorite customs, or else in sheer prejudice against them. The descriptions of the Amorite as one 'who has no tomb' and 'eats raw meat' fall into this category. As Prag puts it, "it would be surprising if these people practiced no burial rites of any kind".

It would also be surprising if people in the Intermediate Early Bronze-Middle Bronze Age (c.2350-1900 BCE) ate meat without first cooking it.

Seale's outlook can thus already be shown to be deficient, because of his uncritical acceptance of the Sumerian texts about the Amorites. His understanding of nomadism may also be subjected to a radical critique. It is illuminating to observe that in the same year that Seale published his *The Desert Bible*, a devastating critique of the Pastoral Nomadic model for the origins of Ancient Israel, by Norman Gottwald, appeared. Seale, following Moscati et al, worked with what may be termed the 'developmental concept of nomadism', in which the Arabian Desert was viewed as the original home of the pastoral nomads, who in successive waves invaded the settled zone, dispossessed the settled agricult-
uralists, and then settled down and became agriculturalists themselves. This developmentalist view had the implicit assumption that desert/nomadism = prior/culturally lower and sown land/agriculture = later/culturally higher, thereby presenting pastoralism and agriculture as radically opposed and conflicting socio-economic modes. This model, however, has been shown to be in error. Not only is it unlikely that the Arabian Desert could have ever housed the numbers of people required for the model to work, particularly before the domestication of the camel around 1200 BCE, but it has also been demonstrated that pastoralism in fact developed as a socio-economic marginal specialisation from the agricultural village. Pastoral, or transhumance, nomadism is a socio-economic mode of life based on the intensive domestication of livestock. This requires a regular movement of both animal and breeder. With his primary need for pasturage and water for his herds, the pastoral nomad is, in fact, closely linked to the settled zone, only leading his herds out to the steppes, in the Ancient Near East at any rate, during the winter rainy season. There is thus, in reality, a close symbiosis between the nomads and the settled peoples - during the summer dry season, the nomad brings his flocks back to the settled zone to find pasturage and water, often grazing his animals on the stubble of harvested fields, which benefits the agriculturalist, whose fields are thereby fertilised for the coming season. It is clear that pastoral nomadism and agriculture were often carried on within the same human community in the Ancient Near East. Indeed, they were no doubt sometimes engaged in by the same person.
Once this radically altered perception of nomadism is appropriated, it is clear that the former view of pastoral nomadism, as being independent of, chronologically prior to, and culturally lower than, sedentary agriculturalism, is completely untenable. Thus, the central thesis of Seale's book, that the Hebrews began as a nomadic people, collapses. 32

Returning to the Amorites, there are indications that this understanding of agriculture and pastoral nomadism may also be applied to them. Liverani observes that in Bronze Age Syria there was an ethno-linguistic unity between nomadic and sedentary peoples, Amorite being the only language attested in the region in the period 2300-1600 BCE, and that the area had several fully developed cities in the third millennium BCE, such as Ibla and Gubla. 33 Kay Prag's extensive investigation of the area concluded that EB.MB [i.e. Intermediate Early Bronze-Middle Bronze Age] society includes a sedentary element in the population with people inhabiting both permanent villages and well-established camp-sites, with clear evidence ... for the practice of at least seasonal agriculture. There is evidence for herds of sheep or goats ... which may represent the mainstay of the economy. 34 Archaeology has thus substantiated the conclusion that EB.MB society was essentially 'dimorphic' in character in the Ancient Near East. Agriculture and pastoralism were not opposing poles, but complementary parts of the same society. J.T. Luke has pointed out that the Mari text ARMT XIII 39
depicts the Iaminites, an 'Amorite' tribe, as "semi-nomads who combined sheep pasturing with village agriculture on a seasonal basis". Finally, mention may also be made of the Egyptian story of Sinuhe, which dates from much the same period. When he flees from Egypt, Sinuhe comes to the land of Upper Retenu, which seems to have been in the highlands somewhere to the east of Byblos, ie. in Amorite country. Its ruler, at any rate, has an Amorite name, Ammi-enshi. Sinuhe describes it as

a good land, named Yaa. Figs were in it, and grapes. It had more wine than water. Plentiful was its honey, abundant its olives. Every (kind of ) fruit was on its trees. Barley was there, and Emmer. There was no limit to any (kind of) cattle.

Once again, the land is depicted as being both agricultural and pastoral. Presumably, pastoral transhumance was practiced.

If, as the previous paragraphs have shown, there is evidence to suggest that the Amorites were agriculturalists as well as pastoralists, where does this leave the Sumerian texts? It is likely that the Sumerians had only had contact with various itinerant groups of Amorites - not only pastoral nomads operating far from their native settled zone, but also raiding parties, merchants, silversmiths, fugitives and the like, none of whom would have been practicing agriculture at the point at which the Sumerians came into contact with them. Given that Sumerian ignorance and prejudice had led to the
unlikely conclusion that the Amorites did not bury their dead, is it not equally possible that the same ignorance and pre-judice led them to assert that the Amorites were non-agriculturalists? These various itinerant groups may also have been tent-dwellers, confirming the observation made earlier, that the tent is no certain sign of pastoral nomadism.  

Thus, the Amorites of the Ur III period do not form a parallel with the non-agricultural Rechabites. Given the close symbiosis between agriculture and pastoral nomadism, it is unlikely that the Rechabites formed part of that socioeconomic matrix – they were avowedly non-agricultural, and there are strong indications that they were non-pastoral as well. The quoted extract from Sinuhe indicates that the Amorites did not practice teetotalism, so there is no parallel with the Rechabites there either. The fact that the Hebrew people did not have a nomadic origin makes those views which see the Rechabites either as 'survivals' of a nomadic age or as a conservative returning to that former age as a reaction to present evils untenable. The discipline of the Rechabites was something new, something revolutionary, and their socioeconomic location needs to be sought for elsewhere. Frick proposed that they were Kenite metalworkers, but it has already been shown that this view has little to commend it. As argued in Chapters Two and Three of the present study, the least unsatisfactory location for the Rechabites is as a prophetic group, similar to Elijah, Elisha and the Sons of the Prophets. It is to this latter group and its leaders that the Rechabites should be compared, and not to the early Nabataeans.
or the Amorites - or any other group in the Ancient Near East. The next section of this chapter will pursue this comparison.

4.2: CHARIOTS AND RIDING IN THE OLD TESTAMENT - THE BACK-GROUND TO THE TERM 'RECHABITE'

It should be immediately obvious that רֹכַב, and its plural רֹכָבִים are derived in some way from רָכַב, 'to mount, ride'. The ideas expressed by this root are widespread in both literal and metaphorical senses in the Hebrew Bible. The purpose of this section is to examine the meaning of רָכַב, to attempt to ascertain what part of speech רֹכַב represents, to investigate chariots and riding in Ancient Israel, and then to go on to explore the references to Yahweh riding upon a chariot, with special reference to the occurrences of this concept in the Elijah-Elisha stories. On the basis of this background, the attempt will be made to answer the question 'What did the title Rechabite mean?'

The Root Meaning of רֹכַב

For the verb רֹכַב Qal, BDB offers a meaning 'mount and ride, ride', and for the Hiphil, 'cause to (mount and) ride'. Thus, it views the action conveyed by רָכַב as being essentially horizontal - 'riding along', rather than 'mounting up'. S. Mowinckel asserted that, while the basic meaning of רָכַב was 'to mount', its usage in the Old Testament is about (mounting and) riding upon
a horse (or any other animal) and of (mounting and) driving a chariot. Thus, he too sees the horizontal movement, whether riding or driving, as paramount, with the vertical movement simply being the necessary preliminary to the horizontal - one has to 'mount', either onto a horse or into a chariot, before one can 'ride along'. Thus, the Hebrew words מַעַרְכָּה, מְקַלָּה and נָסַף, all derived from מַעַרְכָּה, denote 'a vehicle for travelling along', and not 'something which holds you up'.

W. Boyd Barrick, expressly drawing on the work of de Langhe and Moran, has recently, however, argued that מַעַרְכָּה contains no hint of horizontal movement, but denotes vertical movement alone. It only means 'to mount', not 'to ride along' as well.

He begins by pointing out that in 1 Kings 13:13-14, 2 Sam. 13:29, 2 Sam. 22/Ps. 18:11, 2 Kings 9:16, 1 Kings 1:38 and 2 Sam. 6:3, "horizontal vehicular movement follows the action of מַעַרְכָּה and is expressed by a second verb". מַעַרְכָּה differs from מָלַל, 'to go up', in that the latter simply implies vertical movement, whereas the former includes the relationship of the traveller to his destination, מָלַל means 'to go up', מַעַרְכָּה 'to mount upon'. Thus the participle מַעַרְכָּה designates not a 'rider' (ie. someone who moves forward while upon a vehicle) but someone who 'mounts' or is 'mounted' upon a vehicle. - Barrick makes it clear that both animal and wheeled trans-
portation are denoted by his choice of the noun 'vehicle'.

He compares the English noun 'Mountie', thereby betraying his American origin - 'Mountie' may be acceptable English west of the Atlantic, but hardly east of it!

Barrick dismisses Ullendorff's argument that the meaning 'to join together', attested for ṭābā in Arabic, Syriac, Ethiopic and post-biblical Hebrew, is the original meaning of the root. As he comments,

the underlying concept is the superimpositionality of the act of 'mounting'... a ṭākēḇ is an equestrian, a man 'joined' to a horse or other vehicle. The act of 'placing upon' (Ṭāḇ in the Hiphil) becomes the act of 'joining together' and not the reverse.

He goes on to demonstrate that the meaning 'to mount' for ṭāḇ, without any necessary notion of horizontal movement, fits the vast majority of the instances of the word in biblical Hebrew, whether used of men or of Yahweh. The only three exceptions he finds in the MT, leaving out the crux interpretum Hos. 10:11, are 2 Kings 9:28, 23:30a and 1 Chron. 13:7a. In interpreting these passages, Barrick follows Moran.

From the fact that in each passage the transport of an inanimate object is involved (a dead body, the Ark), Moran deduces that ṭāḇ in Hiphil 'has been assimilated to verbs with similar denotations (carry, etc.)'.

Thus, the fundamental meaning of ṭāḇ as 'to mount' is
sustained.

Barrick's analysis is thorough and convincing, and is adopted here. The root יְבָרֵךְ denotes 'to mount up' onto an animal or a wheeled vehicle, and not 'to ride along'. Whatever form of speech יְבָרֵךְ is, it is to do with mounting, or being mounted upon, something, not to do with riding or driving something along.

The Precise Meaning of יְבָרֵךְ

BDB correctly regards יְבָרֵךְ as being invariably a proper name, and tentatively suggests that its meaning is 'band of riders'. Gesenius claims that its meaning is 'horseman', but Noth is unable to offer an etymology for the name. Leaving aside those names such as יָבָרֵךְ, יָבְרֵךְ, and יָבַרְכְּנָא, where the יָבָרֵךְ form represents a diminutive affix, Sere-Qames pointing is not common in proper names in the Hebrew Bible. Apart from יָבָרֵךְ, יָבָרֵךְ, 'Esau', יָבָרֵךְ, 'Kedar', and יָבָרֵךְ, 'Teman' are about the only ones, but none of these names exhibits a plural form analogous to יָבָרֵךְ, which is the only plural form of יְבָרֵךְ to be attested. The lexicons usually derive יָבָרֵךְ from a proposed gentilic יָבָרֵךְ, but it should be noted that members of a particular blood grouping are usually denoted by יָבָרֵךְ + gentilic in singular. In those cases, such as יָבָרֵךְ, 'Edomites', where the plural form of the gentilic is found, it is usually not preceded by anything. The form יָבָרֵךְ seems to be completely unique, both because it uses 'house of', rather
than 'son(s) of' and because יְהוָהַבֶּטֶן is preceded by the definite article. It should also be noted that Jonadab is called בֶּטֶן, and not בֶּטֶן. These points make it likely that בֶּטֶן in בֶּטֶן יְהוָה is, in fact, not a gentilic, but rather represents a proper name that has been reinterpreted into a title. This conclusion is supported by the fact, already observed, 59 that the Rechabites venerated Jonadab as their 'father' and founder, yet were called 'Rechabites', and not 'Jonadabites'.

It is important to attempt to ascertain the meaning of this proper name. One line of approach would be to compare it with those Hebrew common nouns, such as יְהוָהַבֶּטֶן, בֶּטֶן, יְהוָהַבֶּטֶן, בֶּטֶן, יְהוָהַבֶּטֶן, בֶּטֶן and בֶּטֶן, which have the שֵׁמֶש pointing but, unfortunately, these nouns display no common relationship to their respective roots, so they shed little light on the meaning of 'Rechab'. Perhaps the way forward is to compare בֶּטֶן with the personal name which uses this pointing with the same three letters as its root, הָבֶּטֶן, 'Kedar'. 60

Most of the times that 'Kedar' appears in the Hebrew Bible, it simply denotes the Bedouin tribe, 61 or its eponymous ancestor. 62 In Ps. 120:5, dwelling among the 'tents of Kedar' is used as a poetic expression for living among foreign peoples.

In all of these references, the name 'Kedar' seems to have no definite etymological link with בֶּטֶן, 'to be dark',
and it is probable that it originally had no etymological meaning at all. In Song of Songs 1:5, however, the woman describes herself as 'very dark ... like the tents of Kedar'. Here, the idea of darkness inherent in קדר is important to the analogy. 'Kedar' seems to be here understood as meaning something like 'swarthy' or 'black', as well as still denoting the Bedouin tribe, ie. it was thought to have a meaning not very different from that of the Qal participle of קדר, used substantively.

By analogy with this, it may be suggested that the proper name 'Rechab', like the proper name 'Kedar', originally had no meaning at all but, again like 'Kedar', was later invested with a meaning, a meaning that was not much different from that of the Qal substantive participle of קדר. The instances of the name 'Rechab' in 2 Samuel 4 and in Jonadab's patrynomic reflect its use without any specific meaning, while its use in יג in Jer. 35 reflects its use with a meaning - if it was still neutral, one of the forms הב or הב would be expected, not הב. The meaning with which 'Rechab' was invested was very close to the meaning of הב, ie. 'he who mounts something, or is mounted upon something'. Thus, the Rechabites were 'The House of the Mounted Ones'. 'Rechab' was probably invested with this meaning by Jonadab himself, for a specific reason. Before that reason can be ascertained, it is necessary to investigate the concepts surrounding קדר in biblical Hebrew more closely.
Chariots and Riding in Ancient Israel

What could one mount up on to, be mounted on (both בֶּן Qal) or cause someone to mount up on to (בִּכְתָח Hiphil) in Ancient Israel? Firstly, and most obviously, one could mount those things represented by the cognate nouns בֶּן, בֶּן, לַכּוֹר, and גּוֹרָה. לַכּוֹר is found only once, in Ps. 104:3, where it denotes Yahweh's vehicle. בֶּן is also rare, being found only in 1 Kings 5:6, where it means 'chariot', Lev. 15:9 ('a saddle') and Song of Songs 3:10 ('the seat of a litter'). By far the most common of these words are בֶּן and גּוֹרָה. The former usually functions as a collective noun, and is best rendered into English as 'chariotry', but this is not invariable. In 1 Kings 22:35, 38, 2 Kings 9:21, 24, 10:16 and 2 Chron 35:24, for instance, בֶּן is used to denote a single chariot. In 1 Kings 22:35, the same vehicle, the chariot of the king of Israel, is termed both בֶּן and גּוֹרָה. גּוֹרָה is the usual term for an individual chariot.

On the form of the word, G-K 85e: the mem-preformative is a mem-instrumental. The plural גּוֹרָה is occasionally found in parallel with בֶּן, as in Judg. 5:2.

In the Ancient Near East, the chariot seems to have had a two-fold function, but in societies where military prowess and social status were closely intertwined, the distinction between the two functions, that of a machine of war and that of a sign of high social status, should not be pressed absolutely. Evidence for the second function is provided from the Old Testament by Gen. 41:43, where Joseph's status as
Pharaoh's right-hand man is indicated by his being mounted in Pharaoh's second chariot; by 2 Sam. 15:1, where Absalom prepares a chariot and runners (cf. 1 Sam. 8:11), in order to indicate his aspirations for the throne, and not in order to stage a military coup d'etat; by 1 Kings 1:5, where Adonijah imitates Absalom's act, for the same reason; and by Jer. 17:25, 22:4, where the kings and princes of the Davidic line enter into Jerusalem mounted upon chariots.63

The military function of the chariot was, however, the primary one. Indeed, it was the main mobile combat weapon in the Ancient Near East for much of the biblical period, horsemen being used as scouts and messengers but not as cavalry, until late in the period. The early Israelites did not possess any chariots at all, as is revealed by the Exodus and Reed Sea traditions in Exodus 14-15; by the texts which speak of the Canaanite 'chariots of iron', Josh. 17:16, 18, Judg. 1:19; by the Song of Deborah in Judges 5; and by the traditions which speak of the Philistine chariotry, with the implication that Israel had none, 1 Sam. 13:5, 2 Sam. 1:16.64 David obviously must have had a few chariots for Absalom and Adonijah to have each used one, but 2 Sam. 8:4 (cf. Josh. 11:6) indicates that the weapon, even when it was captured in battle, was not generally adopted: hamstringing the horses and, presumably, the burning of the chariots was the preferred way of dealing with the unfamiliar weapon.65

It was only under Solomon that the chariot was really adopted as a military weapon by Israel. 1 Kings 10:26 sugg-
ests that there were some 1400 chariots in Solomon's army, compared with just a hundred in David's. Solomon even built chariot cities. It does seem, however, that the manufacture of chariots was never practiced to any great extent within Israel itself. 1 Kings 10:29=2 Chron. 1:17 indicates that, in general, they were imported from Egypt. Hence, Israel's chariotry became symptomatic of her trust in foreign nations, rather than in Yahweh, cf. Is. 31:1, Ps. 20:8, where the reference is once again to 'chariotry and its span-horses'.

After the division of the Kingdom following the death of Solomon, the principal chariot cities, Hazor, Megiddo and Gezer, fell to the Northern Kingdom, but 2 Kings 3:7, 8:21, Is. 2:7, 31:1, Mic. 1:13, 5:9 indicate that a chariot force was maintained, and even increased, in Judah. However, the Judaeans seem to have never completely mastered the weapon. At any rate, it is clear that Sennacherib's invasion of Judah in 701 BCE, when everything but Jerusalem fell, was accomplished without fighting a single battle in which chariots were engaged. There is evidence for the use of chariots in Judah after this date as the means of royal transportation, but not for the existence of a whole chariot-corps.

In the Northern Kingdom, the chariotry prospered somewhat. 1 Kings 16:9 suggests that during the time of Elah, the force was large enough to be spilt into two corps. It says in Shalmaneser's annals that King Ahab deployed 2000 chariots against him at the Battle of Qarqar in 853 BCE. Even allow-
ing for the usual exaggeration, the sum is still considerable. However, the wars between Israel and Aram seriously depleted this branch of the army, as 2 Kings 7:6 and 13:7 suggest. It was never rebuilt: Sargon of Assyria captured only 50 chariots when he conquered Samaria, compared with some 300 at Hamath.73

Thus, the chariot was never an indigenous weapon in Ancient Israel. Most of the references to it in the Hebrew Bible are to the chariots of foreign armies. It was popularised by Solomon, largely through wholesale importation, but neither the Israelites nor the Judaeans ever seem to have completely mastered it as a battle weapon.

Of course, the chariot was not the only vehicle, wheeled or animal, upon which one could 'mount' (יָשָׁע). In the Old Testament, the verb is used of mounting upon camels,74 asses or mules,75 horses76 and, once, a cart.77 The verb is also used in connection with a number of Mythopoetic ideas, mainly describing Yahweh mounted upon clouds, Cherubim, etc. These will be dealt with below. As has already been pointed out, cavalry as an organised military force was not found in the Ancient Near East at all until late in the period - the warrior on horseback was not introduced into the Assyrian army until the days of Ashurnasipal II (883-859 BCE)78 and, in Israel, the first use of cavalry seems to have been under Simon in 136-135 BCE.79

Militarily, horses were used for scouting, and for
carrying messages, but the usual mounts in the Ancient Near East prior to the Persian period were the ass, the she-ass and the mule. The latter particularly was the mount of royalty and nobility, cf. 1 Kings 1:33, 38, 44. Mowinckel thinks that the beast referred to in Zech. 9:9 is also a mule. 80

Thus, in biblical Hebrew, $\text{ם לוח}$ is used to express the idea of mounting, or being mounted on, chariots, horses, asses, mules, camels and - in one case - a cart. All this presents a wide range of possibilities - military, royal, noble, etc. - for the 'Mounted Ones', ie. the Rechabites, depending upon what they regarded themselves as being mounted upon, and depending upon why they thought they were mounted upon it. However, this question cannot be addressed until the mythopoeic uses of $\text{ם לוח}$, and especially its uses in the Elijah-Elisha stories in 2 Kings 2-13, have been examined. The succeeding sections will be devoted to these subjects.

Chariots and Riding Imagery: $\text{ם לוח}$ used in connection with Yahweh

There are a number of places in the Hebrew Bible where the God of Israel appears as the subject of $\text{ם לוח}$, or where the chariots of God are spoken of. Apart from the references in 2 Kings 2-13, which will be dealt with separately, these verses are the subject of the present section.

These references are all poetic, and are to be found in Deut. 33:26, 2 Sam. 22/Ps. 18:11, Is. 19:1, 66:15,
Hab. 3:8, Pss. 68:5, 18, 34, 104:3. Although it does not use רכבות with God as its subject, or speak directly of God's chariots, Psalm 20:8 will also be considered here.

A number of these verses have been identified as being very ancient, by F.M. Cross, D.N. Freedman et al. These are Deut. 33:26, Ps. 68:5, 18, 34, Hab. 3:8 and 2 Sam. 22/ Ps. 18:11. These texts, along with various others that speak of Yahweh as the divine warrior, but do not use רכבות, have been gathered together by P.D. Miller, Jr. As he comments, while the fact that all these references are ancient is important, the precise dating of them is not essential for the present purposes. Each of these texts will be examined in turn, to see what light they shed on the concept of the heavenly 'Mounted One' in Ancient Israel.

Deuteronomy 33:26

There is none like God, O Jeshurun, אלל יֶשׁוֹעַ יִשְׂרָאֵל
Who rides through the heavens to your help הנה תֵּחֹלָת הַצְּבְיָהוֹת
And in his majesty through the skies. (RSV) ובאלים שַׁחֵק מִלְמָה

The textual difficulties of this verse are widely recognised. Cross and Freedman restore a consonantal הבכשֵׁם for lines 2-3, and render it '(he) who rides the heavens mightily, who rides gloriously the clouds'. Barrick, however, objects that the 'heavens' are not a vehicle upon which one either 'rides' or 'mounts'; conceptually שָׁמַעְיִם must refer to where the verbal action
takes place or to where the deity performing that action is located. He proposes reading יָהָֽעַזְּרָן, i.e. 'he who is mounted (upon a vehicle) in the heavens in power, mounted (upon a vehicle) in majesty in the clouds'.

It should be noted that both Cross and Freedman and Barrick are adopting an easier reading when they emend יָהָֽעַזְּרָן to יָהָֽעַזְּרָן. However, Barrick's contention that the 'heavens' are not a vehicle seems valid, and יָהָֽעַזְּרָן can sustain the meaning 'who is mounted (upon a vehicle) in the heavens' by assuming one of three things: the final י on יָהָֽעַזְּרָן is serving as a 'double duty consonant', representing also the preposition י at the beginning of יָהָֽעַזְּרָן; or there is an 'implicit preposition' at the beginning of יָהָֽעַזְּרָן; or the י at the beginning of יָהָֽעַזְּרָן has been lost by atmospheric. Whichever of these options is adopted, there is no need to emend the rest of the text of the verse in order to yield the same idea as will be found in the other texts to be considered here, namely, of God being mounted on a chariot, or some other vehicle, riding through the heavens to the aid of Israel.

Deut. 33:26 forms part of a hymn, consisting of Deut. 33:2-5, 26-29. A hymn of praise to Yahweh, describing the conquest of Canaan in terms of a theophany of Yahweh and his heavenly host leading the armies of Israel. Given that this is the context of v.26, it is clear that the vehicle upon which Yahweh is mounted is viewed as a military
vehicle, even if the precise nature of that vehicle is not specified here.

Psalm 68:5

Sing to God, sing praises to his name,
Cast up a highway for him who rides through the deserts;
His name is Yahweh, exult before him!

Psalm 68 is once again a war poem or poems, cf. vv.2, 8. Most scholars are inclined to argue that is to be either equated with the epithet 'rider of the clouds', used of Baal in the Ugaritic texts, or else emended to to make the correspondance exact.

Notice should be taken, however, of John Day's recent discussion, which argues that is well attested in Hebrew with the meaning 'desert', which make good sense in the context of Ps. 68:5, and that is used in the same stich as is found elsewhere in the Old Testament with the meaning 'cast up a highway', cf. Is. 40:3. Nevertheless, Day concludes that it is still likely that Yahweh is here conceived of as riding on a cloud (cf. Ps. 68:34 ...), ie. it is thinking of him as riding on a cloud through the deserts. It is also possible, perhaps even probable, that the expression is a deliberate distortion of the epithet 'rider of the clouds'.

(RSV margin)
Thus, if he is right, the verse reveals that Yahweh the divine warrior was mounted upon a cloud to come to the help of his people. This conclusion is not contradicted by the remaining texts to be examined.

Psalm 68:34

To him who rides in the heavens, the ancient heavens; Lo, he sends forth his voice, his mighty voice. (RSV)

Barrick's rendering of the relevant line is to be preferred to that of the RSV: '(he) who is mounted (upon a vehicle) in the most ancient heavens'. That a cloud is envisaged as Yahweh's vehicle is strongly suggested by the use of בּוֹז in the second half of the verse, which can mean 'thunder' as well as 'voice'.

Psalm 68:18

With mighty chariotry, twice ten thousand, Thousands upon thousands, The Lord among them, Sinai in the holy place (RSV margin)

Miller, following Albright, has argued that lines 2–4 should be emended and understood as meaning

A thousand warriors/archers of the Lord, When he came from Sinai with the holy ones.
If he is right, then the military imagery in the verse becomes even more marked. A discussion of the legitimacy of these proposed emendations is not undertaken here, however, as the primary present concern is with נקטר יolulu 'chariot-ry of God'. Given that the hymn is very ancient, and given that the chariot was not introduced into Israel until the time of the monarchy, the term 'chariotry of God' cannot refer to Israel's own army. "It is obviously the divine army which here marches forth to fight for Israel". As Israel had no chariots at all at this time, it is legitimate to ask from where she derived the ideas of God as a charioteer and of God's chariotry. The answer seems to be that these concepts have a Canaanite background, cf. Ugaritic rkb crpt, and the discussion of Ps. 68:5 above. This Canaanite background will be examined more fully below.

Habakkuk 3:8

Was thy wrath against the rivers, 0 יוהי?
Was thy anger against the rivers, אַלְכְּנַהֲנָה יָהוּ? Or thy indignation against the Sea, יָהְיָה יָהוּ? When thou didst ride upon thy horses, יָהוּ? Upon thy chariot of victory? (RSV)

The RSV has emended the last line of the verse. Literally, it reads 'Thy chariots are victory'.

Hab. 3:3-15, while heavily imbued with mythopoeic imagery, such as 'the rivers' in our verse, nevertheless depicts Yahweh's military intervention against Israel's enemies.
As Miller puts it, whereas in the other texts examined, the focus has been upon the conflict of Yahweh's hosts against the enemies of Israel with the chaos battle brought in as part of that conflict, in Habakkuk 3 the chaos battle dominates, but its motive is for historical deliverance of the נַחֲצָה. The result is the same - the theophany of Yahweh and his various forces to fight the historical enemies of Israel. 97

On the antiquity of the Psalm, see also Miller. 98

Mowinckel has shown that the reference in Hab. 3:8 is not to Yahweh riding horses and driving chariots, but that the mention of horses in the verse refers to the span horses of the chariotry, and not to cavalry. The horses and chariots in the verse are divided because of what Mowinckel terms "the rhetoric-poetic rules of the bipartite line, the thought rhyme". 99 Thus, the picture is once again of Yahweh coming to the rescue of his people mounted in his heavenly chariot, an image reinforced by the mention of Yahweh's horses in Hab. 3:15.

2 Samuel 22/Psalm 18:11

וַיֵּרֶכֶב עַל-כַּרְרוּב וַיִּפְלֵ֖ו
He rode upon a cherub and flew,

וַיִּרָֽאֶה-וַיְאָמַ֖ר עַל-כנִֽפְיָּ֗ו
He was seen/came swiftly upon the wings of the wind. (RSV)

Again, it is better to render לֹֽא as 'and he
mounted', rather than as 'and he rode'. From the point of view of parallelism, the נֹֽדֶּה of Ps. 18:11 is probably preferable to the נֹֽדֶּה of 2 Sam. 22:11, but י and י were always easily confused in Hebrew orthography. Mowinckel was of the opinion that the בְּרֵכָּה here was a reference to the 'Cherub-chariot', an idea linked with the vision of the throne wagon/Cerub wagon in Ezekiel 1. Barrick supports this view, but additionally cites Ps. 104:3, where the phrase נַעֲרֵךְ-בִּי occurs in connection with a cloud-chariot (בְּרֵכָּה), but without any mention of a Cherub, ie. the figure in 2 Sam. 22/Ps. 18:11 is again of a cloud chariot. Like the other texts we have been considering, the Psalm is a military one, recounting the intervention of the divine warrior in his people's affairs.

This group of texts reveals a conception of Yahweh as the divine warrior, coming to save his people mounted upon his heavenly chariot, a chariot made up of the clouds and the wind. Thus, there are really two motifs present, not only that of the divine warrior, but also that of the storm god. It has already been observed that the idea of Israel's divine charioteer could not have been an extension of the chariots of Israel's earthly army, as the texts which refer to Yahweh as a charioteer predate the introduction of the chariot into Israel. The contention here is that there was a fusion of the Canaanite storm/military god imagery with Israel's historical experience of Yahweh's miraculous intervention in battle by means of climatic changes. The probability of this contention will be demonstrated by an examination
of the relevant Canaanite material, and by an examination of
the divine charioteer motif in Israel.

The Canaanite Background

The weather-god mounted upon a cloud-chariot was
a widely held concept in the Ancient Near East. There is a
Mesopotamian seal, dated to the period 2360-2180 BCE, which
shows

the weather-god mounted in a four-wheeled
chariot drawn by a lion-griffin, on which
stands a goddess holding bundles of rain or
lightning. 103

In the Mesopotamian Creation Epic, Marduk is described as
follows: 'he mounted the storm-chariot ... he harnessed it to
a team of four'. 104 Weinfeld also mentions the occurrence of
the image in the Assyrian recension of Atrahasis, and in
Hurrian and Ugaritic myths. 105 In these Hurrian and Ugaritic
myths, the storm-god also appears as the divine warrior.

It is at this point that Baal's epithet, rkb
\textit{crpt}, found in the Ugaritic texts, needs to be examined.
This title is normally rendered 'rider of the clouds', but
Ullendorff and Brock have both argued that rkb here means 'to
gather', as it does in post-biblical Hebrew, Ethiopic and
other Semitic languages, 106 and that the epithet should be
translated as 'gatherer of the clouds'. It must be emphasized
that there is no evidence from Ugaritic itself for the meaning
'to gather' for rkb. The instances of the epithet rkb \textit{crpt}
do not demand that rkb be rendered as 'gatherer' in any of
them, and the other, admittedly very few, instances of the
root in Ugaritic demonstrably have the meaning 'to mount'.
Text 14.2.73ff107 reads

\[ \text{Text 14.2.73ff 107 reads} \]
\[
\begin{align*}
\text{c} & \text{l l}zr. \ [\text{mg}]d\text{l} \\
(74) \text{w} & \text{c}^\text{l} lzr. [\text{mg}]d\text{l} \\
rkb & (75) \text{nkmm. hmt} \\
\end{align*}
\]
Go up onto the tower
And
Mount the shoulder of the wall.

And 14.4.165ff
\[
\begin{align*}
\text{w} & \text{c} \text{ly (166) l}zr. \text{ mgdl} \\
rkb & (167) \text{nkmm. hmt} \\
\end{align*}
\]
And he did go up onto the tower,
Did mount the shoulder of the wall.

In both cases, the root rkb appears in parallel with cly,
'to go up'. It has already been observed that the meaning 'to
gather, join together' can be shown to be a semantic develop-
ment from an original meaning of 'to mount',108 but as the
meaning 'to gather' is not attested for rkb in either bibl-
ical Hebrew or Ugaritic other than in rkb crpt, it seems most
unlikely that it has this meaning in rkb crpt. The epithet
must be rendered as 'he who mounts upon the clouds'. The
image is the same as the one in Ps. 104:3, where Yahweh is
said to make the clouds his chariot.109

As Kapelrud observes, the epithet rkb crpt is a
'decidedly poetic expression',110 and is only found in poetic
texts. It is hardly ever found on its own, but usually
appears in parallel with bcl, allyn bcl or, once, zbl bcl.
This fact should be of some help in seeking to elucidate the
precise meaning of rkb crpt, except that it occurs both in


texts which speak of Baal as a warrior and in those in which
his fertility side is spoken of. Thus, 2.4.7ff reads

\[ w^c_n. \text{ker. whss} \]

But Kothar-and-Khasis
answered (him)

\[ lrqmt (8) \text{ 1k. lzbl. b}^c_l \]

'Truly, I tell you, O
prince Baal,

\[ \text{nt. lrkb. c}\text{rpt} \]

'I repeat (to you), O
rider of the clouds,

\[ \text{ht. } \text{lbk (9) b}^c_{1m} \]

'Now (you must smite) your
foes, O Baal.'

And 2.4.27-29,

\[ ygt \text{ b}^c_{1} \text{ wyt. } \text{ym} \]

Baal dragged out Yam and
laid him down,

\[ \text{ykly } \text{rpt. nhr} \]

He made an end of judge
Nahor,

\[ (28) \text{ bsm. tg } \text{rm. c}\text{etr} \]

Ashtart rebuked the Name
(saying),

\[ \text{b} \text{t l}^2\text{lyyn. }[\text{b}^c_1] \]

'Scatter (him), O mighti-
est [Baal]!

\[ (29) \text{ b} \text{t. lrkb. c}\text{rpt.} \]

'Scatter (him), O rider
of the clouds!

\[ \text{k}^\text{y} \text{byn. zb[1. ym.]} \]

'For prince [Yam] is our
captive'.

\[ \text{rkb c}\text{rpt also occurs in parallel with aliyn b}^c_{1} \]
in
4.3.11, 4.5.122, 5.2.7 and 10.1.7. The term \( \text{aliyn} \) is derived
from the root \( \text{ly} \), which means 'to prevail, be strong', and
thus has the meaning 'the one who prevails', which is pres-
umably a term with overtones of warfare. This supposition is
borne out by the contention of Albright and Virolleaud that
\( \text{aliyn} \) is an abbreviation of \( \text{al'iyu qurâdîma qâriyêya ba'arsi}
malhamati}, 'I prevail over the heroes who meet me in the land
of battle'. If \( \text{aliyn b}^c_{1} \) is a military term, it seems
fair to contend that \textit{rkb} \textit{c_rpt} is also a military term.

This contention is supported by 3.3.35, 3.4.48 and 3.4.50, where \textit{rkb} \textit{c_rpt} appears in parallel with \textit{b^c_1}, but there are also places where the epithet is used of Baal in his function as a storm and fertility god. Thus, 3.2.38ff reads,

\begin{align*}
[t] & \text{hspn. mh. wtrhs} \\
(39) [t]\text{l. smm. smn. árs} & \text{She [sc. Anat] scooped up water and washed (herself),} \\
\text{rbb (40) rkb} & \text{Dew of heaven and oil of earth,} \\
\text{th. smm. tskh} & \text{Showers of the rider of the clouds,} \\
\text{Dew that the heavens poured upon her.}
\end{align*}

And 19.1.42ff,

\begin{align*}
\text{sb}^c. \text{snt (43) yrsrk. b^c_1} & \text{For seven years shall Baal fail,} \\
\text{tmm. rkb (44) c_rpt} & \text{For eight the rider of the clouds,} \\
\text{bl. tl. bl. rbb} & \text{Without dew, without showers.}
\end{align*}

These two ideas, warrior in a chariot and fertility god are not, in fact, irreconcilable. Baal's activities as a divine warrior in the Ugaritic texts are confined entirely to the mythical sphere. He fights against Yam/Nahar and Mot, the forces of chaos, but not against the earthly enemies of the inhabitants of Ugarit. But the myth of the battles of the gods is a fertility ritual, corresponding to the cycle of the seasons upon earth. Baal's success against
his divine enemies produces plenty, his failure dearth. Hence, Baal is both a weather god and a war god, and his epithet ṭkb ṭpt reflects this two-fold nature.

The great difference between Baal as a weather god/divine charioteer and Yahweh as the same lies in the very fact that the former's activities are limited to the mythical sphere. Baal battles against the monsters of the deep, which threaten the fertility of the land. Hence, the image of Baal as divine warrior and the image of him as weather god fuse quite naturally together. The activities of Yahweh, however, although described in very similar terms, are invariably directed against Israel's earthly enemies, as the examination of the relevant biblical data revealed. The image of the storm god/divine charioteer was appropriated and transformed by Israel.

The Divine Charioteer in Israel

How did this image of God as the divine warrior who comes in his cloud-chariot to save his people from their enemies become appropriated into the faith of Israel? After all, the normative Israelite understanding of fertility did not view it as being the result of Yahweh's successful battle with the primordial beasts of the deep. The suggestion made here is that this appropriation occurred because Israel's experience of divine salvation in her most formative battles, notably the Exodus from Egypt, was of a salvation wrought through dramatic changes in the climatic conditions, the role
of Israel's soldiery being confined to 'mopping up' and plundering operations.

In taking this view, the arguments put forward by M.C. Lind are being built upon. His basic view is "that Yahweh as God of War fought for his people by miracle, not by sword or spear", miracle being defined as an act of deliverance that was outside Israel's control, beyond the manipulation of any human agency ... faith meant that Israel should rely upon Yahweh's miracle for her defence, rather than upon soldiers and weapons. The human agent in the work of Yahweh was not so much the warrior as the prophet.

Lind establishes his thesis by examining what he terms the 'Primary History' in the Hebrew Bible, ie. Genesis-2 Kings, particularly focussing on the Exodus, which he regards as having been the paradigmatic salvation event for Israel. He takes to task those scholars who have played down the divine element in Israel's experience of warfare, singling out Schwally, who ascribed the accounts of divine help rendering human activity unnecessary to late Judaic historical writing, Pedersen, who saw the accounts of divine aid as poetic representations of Israel increasing "its psychic strength through its god", von Rad, who argued that "the emphasis on miracle in those narratives that exclude or downgrade the value of human fighting is not historical but theological", and that it arose in the post-solomonic era, and P.D. Miller, Jr, who saw ancient Holy War as a 'synergism', or a combin-
ation of divine and human activity, where the downplaying of the human role was the result of reinterpretation. Lind's investigation of the relevant texts, primarily Exodus 15, reveals that, far from being a late re-interpretation, the emphasis on Yahweh's miraculous deliverance of his people is deeply embedded in what are generally recognised as some of the most ancient texts in the whole of the Hebrew Bible.

While Lind mentions the fact that Yahweh's deliverance at the Reed Sea is executed by means of a nature miracle, while Yahweh is termed 'man of war', in the Song of the Sea (Exod. 15), he does not stress the point, and he certainly does not mention the idea that Yahweh's salvation by means of nature miracles or sudden climatic changes and Yahweh as the divine charioteer are two parts of the same image. However, there are enough places in the Old Testament where Yahweh's intervention in battle is described as taking place through changes in the weather to permit the contention that this was Israel's understanding of her God's means of deliverance. In Exodus 15, a very ancient composition, the Egyptian army is said to have been destroyed by Yahweh 'blowing with his wind'. In the Song of Deborah, also very ancient, Judg. 5:20f, it is recounted in successive verses that the stars from heaven fought against Sisera's forces, and that the river Kishon swept those forces away, which again sounds like an account of a sudden change in climatic conditions causing a flash flood. In Josh. 10:11, the
Amorite kings suffer more from hailstones sent by Yahweh than from the army, and in 1 Sam. 7:10, the Philistines are discomfited before Israel, not because of the Israelites, but because Yahweh 'thundered with a mighty voice'. On each of these occasions, Yahweh's deliverance was prayed for, or announced, by a prophetic figure: Moses, Deborah, Joshua or Samuel. That Joshua was a prophetic figure is revealed by Joshua 24, and Lind argues that

in the light of the lack of other prophetic leadership in the Book of Joshua, it might be that he functioned throughout the time of the conquest in more of a prophetic role than the narratives imply, and that the emphasis upon him as a war leader was largely a retrojection made in the days of the monarchy.

The references just cited should be sufficient to show that, in her earliest period, Israel viewed Yahweh's intervention in war in terms of his control of the weather to the advantage of Israel and to the disadvantage of her enemies. Thus, the fused images of the divine warrior and the storm deity riding his cloud-chariot were quite naturally adopted by Yahwism from Canaanite beliefs, but were 'historicised' into the experience of Israel in the process. Hence, Yahweh as a warrior was viewed as a charioteer from Israel's earliest period, despite Israel's own lack of chariotry in the same period, because the clouds were seen as Yahweh's chariot. When he intervened to save his people, Israel experienced Yahweh's actions as sudden, dramatic changes of weather.
Lind, following Glock, further argues that this belief in Yahweh as the chariot-warrior coming to save his people actually influenced the Israelites against adopting the chariot as a weapon of war. The destruction of chariots and the hamstringing of horses in the pre-monarchical and early monarchical periods was due to political and military necessity, but that was not the only reason. There was also a conscious rejection of the weapon in order to demonstrate trust in Yahweh the warrior, who alone possessed chariots — the clouds.

Israel's faith in Yahweh as warrior led her to reject the military expedience of developing sophisticated weaponry such as horses and chariots even to the time of David.

Other than the prose references in 2 Kings 2-13, the only verses that remain to be dealt with in this study of in connection with Yahweh are Is. 19:1, 66:15, Ps. 20:8. Ps. 104:3 has already been dealt with in connection with 2 Sam. 22/Ps. 18 and rkp. Is. 19:1 speaks of Yahweh riding upon a swift cloud to Egypt, in order to stir up civil strife there. That it was thought that Yahweh's 'stirring up' (v.2) of the Egyptians was due to changes in the weather is evident from verses 5-7:

And the waters of the Nile will be dried up,
And the river will be parched and dry:
And its canals will become foul,
And the branches of Egypt's Nile will diminish and dry up,
Reeds and rushes will rot away.
There will be bare places by the Nile,
On the brink of the Nile,
And all that is sown by the Nile will dry up,
Be driven away and be no more. (RSV)

The verses are the account of a drought: Yahweh battles against Egypt by withholding rain, which results in civil war in the land as the people struggle to obtain water.

Is. 66:15 again links Yahweh's chariots to the weather and to war: 'Yahweh will come in fire, and his chariots like the stormwind, to render his anger in fury, and his rebuke with flames of fire' (RSV). Thunder and lightning are depicted as part of Yahweh's weaponry of destruction.

As in Hab. 3:8, the horses and chariots referred to in Ps. 20:8 are the chariots and its span horses. The chariotry in this verse is earthly chariotry, so it reflects the same idea as the other verses that have been considered here. Earthly chariotry is alien to Israel, because Yahweh is Israel's charioteer. Hence, the contrast in Ps. 20:8 is quite explicitly between chariotry and Yahweh, rather than between weaponry in general and Yahweh. As the Psalm is a 'Royal Psalm', it clearly dates from the period of the monarchy, when chariotry was becoming well-established in Israel. The verse thus may, in fact, be something of a counter-reaction to excessive royal reliance on (earthly) chariotry, with a corresponding lack of trust in Yahweh.
The Prophetical Stories and Chariot Imagery

Within the so-called 'Prophetical Stories' found in the first thirteen chapters of the Second Book of Kings, there are four places where the chariot imagery that has been the subject of the present discussion so far is found: 2 Kings 2:11f, 6:17, 7:6 and 13:14. It is important to discuss these texts as part of the background to the meaning of the term 'Rechabite', because Jonadab's appearance in 2 Kings 10:15f is contemporary with that of Elisha, and it has already been argued in Chapters Two and Three that the Rechabites and the movement represented by Elijah, Elisha and the Sons of the Prophets had close connections with each other.

2 Kings 13:14

2 Kings 13:14 is considered first because commentators have usually accepted that it forms part of the original layer of the story within which it is found, whereas the other verses to be examined are often seen as being the product of later expansions of the narratives.

2 Kings 13:14-19 purports to be the last act of the dying Elisha. Certainly, the verse immediately following the conclusion of the story speaks of his death. The king of Israel, Joash, comes to see Elisha, and weeping cries out 'The Chariotry of Israel and its Horses'. Elisha then commands the king to take up bow and arrow, and places his hands on the king's when he has done so. At
Elisha's instruction, the king then opens the window and shoots an arrow eastward, while the prophet cries, 'Yahweh's arrow of victory, the arrow of victory over Syria' (v.17). Elisha then commands the king to hit the ground with the remaining arrows. The king does so three times, but is rebuked by Elisha for not continuing: 'then you would have struck down Syria until you had made an end of it, but now you will smite down Syria only three times' (v.19).

The narrative in 2 Kings 13-14 seems to be in some chronological disarray, and this makes it difficult to judge whether the reference to Joash in 13:14 is genuine, or whether it is an editorial insertion of the Deuteronomists, as Galling suggests, harmonising the story with Joash's three known victories over Aram. Joash is introduced in 13:10f with the usual deuteronomistic formula, but this is immediately followed, in v.12f, by a notice of his death. By v.13, he has been resurrected again, as the king who visits the dying Elisha. He crops up again in v.25, defeating Hazael. Except for the regnal synchronism in 14:1, he now disappears again until 14:8. 14:8-14 recount the war between Joash and Amaziah king of Judah, and 14:15f represents another notice of Joash's death.

Within the overall schema of the narrative, it is 13:12f which are out of place. These verses are not deuteronomistic, whereas 14:15-16 are, so 13:12f could be a later insertion. It seems best to follow Gray's reconstruction of the redactional history of the text. The original order of
the narrative was 13:10-11, 14-25, 14:8-16, 1-7, 17-29. 13:12f are no part of the original narrative. The account of Amaziah's challenge to Joash (14:8-14) was then transferred, along with the deuteronomistic conclusion to Joash's reign, to its present position, because of its date in the reign of Amaziah, which is the subject of chapter 14. After this transference,

a later hand supplemented the deficiency of the epilogue in chap. 13 by inserting 13:12f, rather anomalously, immediately after the Deuteronomistic introduction to the reign of Joash. 129

Nevertheless, 13:14-21 may still have been displaced from its original context at the end of the Elisha cycle by the Deuteronomists, and placed in its present context as a prelude to the account of the Israelite recovery from the oppression of Aram. 130

Perhaps the repositioning was also intended to equate the saviour mentioned in 13:5 with Elisha. 131 Gray thinks that 13:14-21 originally belonged after 8:29. 132

Given all this uncertainty, it is unwise to form any firm conclusions as to whether the story really did concern Joash, or whether it was originally some other king of Israel who went to see Elisha, or to attempt to ascribe a precise date to the events narrated in the piece. That it was an historical event, however, is virtually undisputed.
For the present purposes, the important phrase in 13:14-19 is רכְב יִשְׂרָאֵל וַתָּשֵׁר נְאֵר, 'The Chariotry of Israel and its Horses'. The phrase is usually thought to be connected with Elisha's activities in the wars with Aram, which made him worth a whole army. Galling, however, is more percept-{
ive, when he asks why chariotry was chosen as the term of comparison. If Elisha's influence was thought to be equivalent to that of an army, why is he specifically equated with only one branch of it? Galling is of the opinion that the origin of the epithet must be sought for in the historical situation at the time of Elisha. He rejects any possible links with those texts which speak of Yahweh as a charioteer, on the grounds that Elisha is called 'The Chariotry of Israel', and that Yahweh does not appear in the passage. Galling seeks the answer in the place where Israel had encountered earthly chariotry, namely in Aram, where the deity rkb 'l, who had a heavenly chariot-corps, is attested. He claims that, as so often in the history of religion, an idea belonging to an opponent was appropriated and transformed. In this case, the heavenly chariot-corps was 'earthed' into the Yahwistic prophet Elisha.

While the idea of searching outside Israel for the solution to a particular perplexing feature of Israelite religion is not intrinsically invalid, it should only be resorted to when no satisfactory answer can be obtained from within Ancient Israel itself. It is, in fact, perfectly possible to explain the origin of the term רכְב יִשְׂרָאֵל וַתָּשֵׁר on the basis of a purely Israelite background. Chariotry was well-
established in the Israelite army in the time of Elisha, so the Israelites were not unfamiliar with the weapon. The conception of Yahweh as the divine charioteer was also well-established at the time - the most significant texts in this regard predate the chariot's introduction into Israel. Thus, the title 'The Chariotry of Israel and its Horses', may be explained as follows. The wholesale adoption of chariotry by Israel was indicative of her lack of faith in Yahweh, cf. Is. 31:1. The title דַּצְתָּנוּלֵבָּהוֹפֶרַע was adopted by Elisha for two reasons. Firstly, as a counterblast to that excessive reliance of the Omrides on political and military strength, as typified by the alien weapon, the chariot. Secondly, as a reminder to Israel that her true chariotry was Yahweh's chariotry of the skies, which won battles through weather changes. As the role of the prophet was to proclaim Yahweh's military action, he was, in some sense, seen as the vehicle of that action, and hence he himself came to be called 'The Chariotry of Israel and its Horses'. The title does not contrast the chariotry of Israel with the chariotry of Yahweh, as Galling thinks, but with the chariotry of 'the nations', as Israel's true chariotry is the chariotry of Yahweh. Thus, the title reflects the same attitude as Ps. 20:8, 'Some boast of chariots and some of horses, but we will boast of the name of Yahweh our God'. Israel's true chariotry is the divine chariotry, proclaimed and symbolised by the Yahwistic prophet. Thus, the epithet stems from the traditions of Holy War, not from those of secular warfare. The king's cry is not one of despair at the impending loss of his most valuable weapon, but is rather a request for the aid of the divine
chariotry in his war against Aram. That that request for aid is answered is indicated by the symbolism of preparing and shooting eastward the arrow, for the bow was the primary weapon in chariot warfare, \textsuperscript{139} cf. 2 Kings 9:24, with the prophetic cry, 'Yahweh's arrow of victory, the arrow of victory over Aram'(2 Kings 13:17).

This interpretation of the origin of the title "~j as a rejoinder and reminder that Israel's true chariotry was the divine chariotry of Yahweh, proclaimed and symbolised by his prophet, will be borne out by the other three texts to be considered in this section.

2 Kings 7:6

The second verse to be examined here occurs in the complex 2 Kings 6:24-7:20 which, although likely to have originally been numerous separate anecdotes, now forms a story with an overarching unity, recounting the siege of Samaria by Aram and the resultant famine, Elisha's prophecy of relief and the coming of that relief. The lepers who decide to desert to the camp of the besieging Aramaeans (7:4) discover it completely deserted (7:5).

(v.6) For the Lord had made the army of the Syrians hear the sound of chariots, and of horses, the sound of a great army, so that they said to one another, 'Behold, the king of Israel has hired against us the kings of the Hittites and the kings of Egypt to come upon us'. (v.7) So they fled away in the twilight ... (RSV)
Verse 6 is usually rationalised by commentators, who argue that it is to be explained as meaning, for example, that a rumour was spread abroad in the Aramaean camp, possibly by one of the Sons of the Prophets, that Israel had hired help from the Hittites and from Egypt. However, when it is remembered that the idea of the divine chariotry was very ancient in Israel, and that this chariotry was thought to act through climatic changes, an alternative explanation may be offered. A similar phenomenon to that recounted in 2 Kings 7:6 is found in 2 Sam. 5:24, where Yahweh tells David,

And when you hear the sound of marching in the tops of the balsam trees, then bestir yourself, for then Yahweh has gone out before you to smite the army of the Philistines.

W.R. Smith and H.W. Hertzberg both link this verse to tree oracles, Robertson Smith arguing that the sound "can only be some rustling sound, as of wind in the branches ... and requires a soothsayer to interpret it," Hertzberg relating it to the sight of "distinct, waving movements in the tops of the trees," although how he derives this from the 'sound of marching' is unclear. Robertson Smith is surely right to relate the sound to wind in the branches, but it is unnecessary to argue that it is an oracle-sign requiring interpretation. Wind and thunder can produce curious sounds, even sounds like that of an approaching army, either on foot or in chariots. It is this concept that underlies both 2 Sam. 5:24 and 2 Kings 7:6. Given that Yahweh's heavenly army, particularly his chariot-corps, was thought to make its effect on Israel's enemies through climatic changes, there is every reason to accept that it was some sort of climatic phenomenon
which the Aramaeans in 2 Kings 7 heard: to them it sounded like an earthly chariot force; in reality, it was an unusual climatic phenomenon, i.e., it was Yahweh's heavenly chariot-corps - which routed the Aramaeans.

Yahweh's prophet Elisha plays a leading role in the proclamation of this victory of Yahweh's heavenly chariot-corps. In 7:1, he foretells the end of the siege, cf. 7:16. Although he is not called 'The Chariotry of Israel' in this passage, it is clear that Elisha is once again closely linked with it. As the one who proclaims the intervention of Yahweh's army, he can in some sense be equated with that (chariot-)army.

2 Kings 6:17

2 Kings 6:8-23 is the story of the sending of troops, by the king of Aram, to surround Dothan, in order to capture Elisha. When the servant of the man of God arises in the morning, he discovers 'an army with horses and chariots ... round about the city' (v.15), and appeals to his master in desperation. In response, Elisha prays, 'Yahweh, I pray thee, open his eyes that he may see', whereupon the servant is granted a vision: 'the mountain was full of horses and chariots of fire round about Elisha' (v.17). The Aramaean host are then smitten with blindness at the prayer of Elisha (v.18), who leads them to Samaria, where their sight is restored (v.19f). At Elisha's command, the king of Israel prepares a great feast for the Aramaeans, and then releases
them (v.22f).

It is clear that the story was not originally a unified whole, and that it has undergone expansionary activity, no doubt intended to magnify the person of Elisha. In v.23, the force that was sent to take Elisha is described as one of the ידיה, 'bands', which suggests that they were a semi-nomadic raiding party, rather than part of the Aramaean army proper. This conclusion is supported by the king's action in feeding and releasing the Aramaeans - if they had been regular soldiers of Aram, they should have been killed. The fact that they were spared suggests that they were members of a tribe, which was only in loose alliance with Damascus, whose co-operation Israel felt it valuable to cultivate. The fact that the Aramaean force was easily outnumbered in Samaria suggests that it was not very large. However, in vv.8-14, the impression is given that this is an official large-scale military expedition, dispatched on the orders of the (unnamed) king of Aram. This no doubt represents hagiographical elaboration.

Verses 15-17 also seem to be an intrusion into the story. The incident contained in them plays no role in the development of the narrative, Elisha's servant does not appear outside them, and the vision of the horses and chariots of fire has no connection with the blinding of the Aramaean forces.

Even though they may be a later expansion, vv. 15-
17 nevertheless represent
the traditional belief about Yahweh's war.
As in the Exodus, no Israelite army was
involved, but only a prophetic personality. 144

Viewing the verses as a later theological reflection is better
than following Gray's attempts at rationalisation. 145 The
fragment is thus true to Israel's understanding of Yahweh's
intervention in war, and to her perception of the role of
the prophet, particularly Elisha, in the conduct of that
war. As Miller observes,
the imagery is especially similar to Ps.68:18,
where Yahweh is pictured as coming from
Sinai with chariots and warriors. 146

2 Kings 6:17, with its talk of horses and chariots
of fire thus stands in the tradition of Yahweh as a chariot-
eer intervening with his heavenly hosts to save Israel, usual-
ly through climatic changes, although there is nothing about
changes in the weather mentioned here. 147 It also reaches a
degree of reflection and reassurance which stands at the heart
of all the Israelite theology of Holy War: 'Fear not, for
those who are with us are more than those who are with them'
(v.16).

2 Kings 2:11, 12

The final occurrence of the chariot imagery in the
Prophetic Stories comes in 2 Kings 2, the narrative of
Elijah's assumption into heaven. Although it appears first
in the Hebrew Bible, the examination of it has been left until
last because it is the only occurrence of the chariot imagery in which Elijah appears, and it has often been claimed that the connection between Elijah and chariot imagery is here secondary.

Having crossed the Jordan, Elijah and Elisha are walking along,

(v.11) and as they still went on and talked, behold, a chariot of fire and horses of fire separated the two of them. And Elijah went up by a whirlwind into heaven. (v.12) And Elisha saw it and he cried, 'My father, my father! the chariots of Israel and its horses!' And he saw him no more. Then he took hold of his own clothes and rent them in two pieces.

It is customary to argue that the title הַבָּרוֹן הָבֶן הָעֲוַרָה, used here of Elijah, has been transferred from 2 Kings 13 by a later redactor, in order to strengthen the links between Elisha and his noted predecessor, ie. the title is secondary here.148 This may very well be true, but it cannot be argued, as is frequently done, that it must necessarily be so on the grounds that, as Elijah is never mentioned as participating in Israel's battles, the title 'The Chariotry of Israel and its Horses' is an inappropriate designation for him. Yahweh's war, in which his prophets acted as proclaimers and, hence, as participants, could, on occasion, be directed not against Israel's enemies, but against Israel herself149 or, rather, against the apostate elements within Israel, which at times seemed to make up the whole of Israel,
cf. 1 Kings 19:10, 14. And Elijah most certainly is depicted as participating in Yahweh's war against Israel. He proclaims the drought in 1 Kings 17:1, and drought is a weapon in Yahweh's arsenal, as Is. 19:1 reveals. He fights against the prophets of Baal on Mount Carmel (1 Kings 18). Thus, the epithet רָכַב יִשְׂרָאֵל וְיִשְׁרָאֵל, as an indication of the prophet's role in Yahweh's war, cannot be a priori denied to Elijah. If it has been transferred to him from Elisha, it is nevertheless a correct interpretation of the person and work of Elijah.

Most commentators also wish to separate the reference to the whirlwind and the reference to the horses and chariots of fire in v.11 from each other, although there is little agreement as to which is original and which is expansionary. That more than one source may have been combined cannot be entirely ruled out, but it should be remembered that the foregoing investigation has demonstrated that there was a close link in Israelite thought between the idea of divine chariotry - of which the horses and chariots of fire are certainly an instance - and climatic phenomena - of which the whirlwind is certainly one. This connection was very ancient in Israel; indeed, it seems to have been adopted and transformed from Canaanite beliefs. There is hence nothing intrinsically improbable in the combining of these two ideas in 2 Kings 2:11. Gray mentions, but rejects, the idea that the horses and chariots of fire could represent natural phenomena, such as the dust-devil and the sirocco. Given the rich background to the divine chariotry motif traced in the course
of this section, Gray seems to have been mistaken in his rejection of this idea. It is probable that the horses and chariots of fire are the same as the whirlwind, as the chariotry of fire was the divine chariotry, which was thought to be linked with climatic phenomena. This is certainly the interpretation of the passage offered by Ecclesiasticus 48:9, which is addressed to Elijah and reads, 'You who were taken up by a whirlwind of fire, in a chariot with horses of fire'. It is also possible that the connection between the whirlwind and the horses and chariots of fire was of some influence on the author of 2 Kings 6:15-17, who would then have thought that some sort of climatic changes were involved with Elisha's dealings with the Aramaeans.

The Rechabites

On the basis of the rich background traced at length in the preceding paragraphs, some suggestions concerning the title 'Rechabite' may now be made. It has been shown that מַכְר means 'to mount upon something', and not 'to ride along', and that מַכְר probably means something like 'he who mounts', ie. it has a meaning not very different from that of the substantive participle מַכְר. The distinction between the two arose because מַכְר was originally a name without any precise meaning, and was only invested with such a precise meaning by Jonadab ben Rechab himself. Thus, the Rechabites were 'Those who mount' or, rather, 'The Mounted Ones'. But what did they regard themselves as being mounted on? The most obvious answer would be a chariot (כַּר, מַכְר), although
is used of mounting upon other things also. The fact that there is such a rich store of divine chariotry imagery in the Hebrew Bible, much of it very ancient and deriving ultimately from Canaanite sources, depicting Yahweh as the divine charioteer coming on the storm to save, and occasionally to fight against, his people through weather changes, makes it possible that the Rechabites were connected with the Holy War traditions of Israel, in the specific sense of taking their self-understanding from this conception of Yahweh as the divine charioteer. This conclusion is supported by the occurrence of the divine chariotry imagery in connection with the prophets Elijah and Elisha, who proclaimed Yahweh's intervention in battle, either for or against Israel, and so symbolised, and thus became equated with, the divine chariot-corps. It has already been argued in Chapters Two and Three that there was a close connection between the Rechabites and the movement represented by Elijah, Elisha and the Sons of the Prophets. The further constellation of ideas associated with , common to both the Rechabites and Elijah and Elisha as a title, strengthens this contention.

Thus, the Rechabites were a group of prophets (and prophetesses!), and were associated with the Holy War traditions of Israel, not as soldiers, but as the proclaimers of Yahweh's intervention in the Holy War, a war that could as well be against Israel as for her. Thus, if the compilation of 2 Kings 10 reflects the correct chronological order of events, and Jonadab really did accompany Jehu to Samaria, then he would have done so in order to proclaim Yahweh's
intervention in the battle against Baalism. If the compila-
tion is incorrect, as this study has concluded, and 2 Kings
10:15f have nothing to do with Jehu's journey to Samaria, then
it still indicates that Jehu received prophetic support for
his reign, although not necessarily for the massacre of the
worshippers of Baal.

It is appropriate to raise here the question of
why Jonadab ben Rechab appears in 2 Kings 10, rather than
Elisha or one of the Sons of the Prophets. It has already
been noted that Cummings has pointed out that the 'Three
Swords' prophecy of 1 Kings 19:17 leads to the expectation
that Elisha will accompany Jehu in the narrative. Instead,
the previously unknown Jonadab appears. Cummings' argument
is highly suggestive: he is of the opinion that we here have
a trace of a split in the prophetic circles in the Northern
Kingdom following the death of Elijah, a split between Eli-
sha and the Sons of the Prophets on one hand and the Rechab-
ites on the other, occasioned by the issue of house-building.
Cummings argues that 2 Kings 6:1-7 is a story legitimising the
building of houses by the prophets, and that something only
needs to be legitimised if it is challenged. As has been
shown in this study, there were very great similarities be-
tween the Rechabites and Elisha/the Sons of the Prophets,
except that the former lived in tents, and would thus repre-
sent the necessary challenge to prophetic house-dwelling.

Given the meagre evidence available, this thesis
is perhaps incapable of definitive proof, but conflict within
prophetic circles within the Northern Kingdom was known at this
time, as 1 Kings 22 demonstrates. It is also possible that 2 Kings 2:9 supports this theory. In the verse, Elisha asks Elijah that he may inherit a 'double portion' of his spirit. Deut. 21:17 reveals that the 'double portion' was the regular inheritance of the first-born son, so Elisha is evidently requesting that he should become Elijah's successor. What is curious, and generally not dealt with by commentators, is why Elisha felt it necessary to be so appointed.

The answer is surely that either Elisha was Elijah's natural successor, cf. 1 Kings 19:19-21, but his position was under threat of usurpation - by Jonadab? - and so Elisha requests a confirmation of his own status from the master, or else it is Elisha who is the usurper, displacing Jonadab, Elijah's natural successor, but with Elijah's connivance. If this suggestion is correct, it is a further indication that the Rechabites and Elisha/the Sons of the Prophets represent nothing less than prophetic rivals for the inheritance of Elijah. Elisha and his followers have the dominant role in the narratives in 2 Kings, but this may simply be the result of editorial activity, rather than a reflection of the actual situation. It is worth recalling that Jeremiah 35 demonstrates that the Rechabites were still in existence in c.600 BCE - long after the demise of the Sons of the Prophets.

The suggestion that the Rechabites originated in a split in the prophetic circle around Elijah will be examined further in the next section of this chapter, when the Rechabites are examined using the sociological concepts of 'sect' and 'schism'. The reason why house-building should have been
the cause of the split will also there be explored. Whether or not the suggestion is finally proved to be correct, the fact still remains that the best setting upon which to understand the title 'Rechabite' is that of the divine chariots, of Yahweh as the divine charioteer coming to save, or to fight against, his people, using climatic phenomena. This intervention was announced by Yahweh's prophets, who thus symbolised what they proclaimed, and so came to be called, in the case of Elijah and Elisha, 'The Chariotry of Israel and its Horses'. The Rechabites were a prophetic group, closely linked with Elijah, Elisha and the Sons of the Prophets, and also proclaimed Yahweh's military intervention through climatic changes, and so adopted the title 'The Mounted Ones' - the Rechabites. 154

4.3: THE RECHABITES AS A SECT - THE USE OF A SOCIOLOGICAL MODEL TO EXPLAIN AN OLD TESTAMENT PHENOMENON

It has become popular in contemporary biblical scholarship, particularly in North America, to seek to apply insights from the Social Sciences to the Old Testament. This development is to be welcomed. The use of such insights serves to alert biblical scholars to the Nomothetic elements of Israelite religion, as well as to its Idiographic features - and, of course, the particular can only be properly understood once the general has been properly recognised and understood. 155 The application of Social Science models to the Old Testament also has a heuristic value, in that it can present a new means of approaching the data and, hence, it
can pose new questions of the Old Testament - and scholarship is as much about asking the 'right' questions as finding the 'right' answers. As J.G. Gager has put it,

new answers arise not so much from new data as from new questions; and new questions arise from new theories, new hypotheses and new assumptions. 156

The application of such models to the Old Testament is, however, by no means a completely straightforward task. The Old Testament does not provide anything like a full picture of life in Ancient Israelite Society, yet, despite the advances made in biblical archaeology, it remains the primary source of material concerning that Society - and the information that it provides is nothing like adequate enough for many Social Scientists. There is also often a communications blockage between Social Scientists and Old Testament Scholars, proficiency in both disciplines being rare. 157

In addition, models are often adopted from the Social Sciences uncritically, with the Old Testament data sometimes being moulded to 'fit' the model in question, or even being ignored altogether. 158 It is perhaps, then, not surprising that the use of models drawn from Sociology, Anthropology, Psychology, and so on, has not, with a few noted exceptions such as John Rogerson, Robert Carroll and Keith Whitelam, 159 commanded much popularity in the U.K., and that one British scholar, Cyril Rodd, has dismissed the whole exercise as futile. 160

The fact, however, that the exercise is a diffi-
cult one should not mean that it should not be attempted, for the potential gains are great. The exercise is one that needs to be undertaken with caution, and it is fortunate that Malina, Herion and Rogerson have all recently offered suggestions as to how to go about applying Social Science models to biblical studies.\footnote{161} As the sociological approach to the Old Testament is still relatively unfamiliar in Britain, their views are here summarised, even if the result is that the introduction to this section of the present chapter is rather longer than might be expected.

First of all, it is important to be aware of the purpose and limitations of the Social Sciences. By their very nature, the Social Sciences are generalising sciences. They look to how meanings are imposed on men and seek to explain human behavior in terms of typicalities. They underscore generalities, the common elements of meaning typical of a given social group.\footnote{162} In so doing, the Social Sciences construct models, abstractions of similarities, in order to attempt to explain as much of the complex as possible in terms of the simple. Herion terms this 'Reductionism',\footnote{163} and, as Malina points out, this is merely a reflection of what all human beings subconsciously do: the human mind can only cope with a very limited number of concepts at any one time, so it 'chunks' data, in order to understand it.

Human beings, it seems, cannot make sense of their experiences and their world without making models of it, without thinking
in terms of abstract representations of it.\textsuperscript{165}

It is clear that no one model can ever explain 100\% of the observed variance, so every model must be used with a clear regard for its limitations. Herion summarises this position neatly, when he writes,

> the reduction of complexity always entails a certain methodological risk since the line separating the enlightening epitome from the vulgarizing distortion can sometimes be very fine.\textsuperscript{166}

This limitation on the use of models is recognised by Social Scientists, as the following two quotes from Bryan Wilson, a leading Sociologist of Sects, clearly demonstrate:

> The types that sociologists construct are reifications. Their inherent danger is that, instead of being useful short-hand summaries of crucial elements in the empirical cases they are meant to epitomize, they become caricatures remote from empirical phenomena.\textsuperscript{167}

Ideal-types are not empty boxes into which the sociologist drops appropriate cases; they are, rather, to be used to make us aware of the specific historical, organizational, compositional or other features of a sect that depart from our hypothetical system of logical relationships. The type should always turn us back to historical or empirical data so that we can explain those features of a case which
contradict our hypothesized common-sense assumptions. 168

Unfortunately, many Old Testament scholars who use sociological or other Social Science models do not recognise the limitations of these models, and seek to use them almost as a substitute for the data provided by the Hebrew Bible itself. This seems to be due to what Herion terms 'Positivism'. Many scholars coming from the Humanities tend to regard the more 'scientific', or 'objective', approaches to knowledge used by the Social Sciences as being somehow 'better' than the more 'subjective' approaches used by History, Theology and Philosophy, and so as being above criticism. 169 If a Social Science model is going to be used in biblical studies, it must not be used uncritically. It must be remembered that basic to all models is their falsifiability.

This is part of the problem with P.D. Hanson's use of Troeltsch's Church-Sect typology in his analysis of the situation in post-exilic Judah. 170 Not only does he not criticize Troeltsch's typology, but he also shows himself unaware of the developments made in the Sociology of Sects since Troeltsch's pioneering work appeared in 1911. The present study seeks to examine the Rechabites as a religious sect, using 'sect' in its strictly sociological sense, meaning 'a religiously separated group', without any of the pejorative overtones so often associated with the word. But unlike Hanson's use of the typology, an effort will be made to present a fairly comprehensive survey of the sociological
study of sects, before applying the typology. It is hoped that the use of sect typology will illuminate the study of the Rechabites from a new direction, that some new hypotheses will lead to some new questions, and thus to some new answers, about this phenomenon in Ancient Israel.

With these preliminary cautionary remarks made, we may now go on to offer a history of the Sociology of Sects, to outline the features of sects in general, to explain the adopted typology more fully, and then to seek to apply it to the Rechabites. It is proposed to then go on to examine the Sociology of Schism, to see if this can shed any light on the origin, rather than the character, of the Rechabites.

A History of the Sociology of Sects

Put at its simplest, a sect may be defined as 'a religiously separated group', but to say that almost raises more questions than it answers. Separated from what? How? What features do sects have in common with each other? Sociologists have been addressing these questions throughout the twentieth century, and it is important to detail the views of the leading scholars in the field.

The original sectarian typology was formulated by Ernst Troeltsch, a pupil of Max Weber, in 1911. His typology was based almost entirely on a study of mediaeval Catholicism. At its heart was the dichotomy between the 'Church' and the 'Sect'. Put briefly, he characterised the
Church as "overwhelmingly conservative", desiring "to cover the whole life of humanity", utilising "the state and the ruling classes" to further that desire. This, in practice, meant that the Church was "dependent upon the upper classes and upon their development". At the opposite end of the pole stood the sects, small groups in comparison with the Church, aspring after personal inward perfection, and seeking direct personal fellowship between the members of each group. Thus, there was renunciation of any idea of dominating the world. Having no desire to incorporate the forms of social life, the sects' attitude to the world, state and society varied from tolerance to indifference to outright hostility. Sects were connected with the lower classes and, according to Troeltsch, had the following characteristic features:

- lay Christianity, personal achievement in ethics and in religion, the radical fellowship of love, religious equality
- ... indifference towards the authority of the state ... directness of the personal religious relationship, criticism of official spiritual guides and theologians, the appeal to the New Testament and the Primitive Church.

This Church-Sect dichotomy, as a sociological formulation, is the basis of all subsequent sociological research into sects and sectarianism. The model has been considerably developed, as it fails to adequately describe the complexities of the various forms of religious organisation, and does not provide a comprehensive, and hence useful, classification of the nature of sects. Hence, Troeltsch's
typology is really rather simplistic, and not very useful in sociological analyses of sectarianism.

Richard Niebuhr, followed by Liston Pope, provided the next stage in the development of the typology.\(^\text{174}\)

For them, a sect arises as a schism from a parent ecclesiastical body, either a church or a previous sect. It then becomes a distinct and independent type of religious organization, but moves, if it survives, increasingly towards the Church type.\(^\text{175}\)

It was axiomatic of the Niebuhr-Pope formulation that sects inevitably became denominations. Niebuhr regarded this process as being caused by the birth of children to first-generation sect members, forcing the sect to take on the character of an educational and disciplinary institution, \textit{ie.} a denomination.\(^\text{176}\) Pope placed the origin of this process even earlier, pointing out that from the beginning there are relations - careless husbands, aged mothers - who are not signatories to the contract, but for whose religious welfare ... the new sect has a derived, but inescapable, responsibility. The conventicle becomes a parish almost immediately.\(^\text{177}\)

Also, as members of the sect, originally at the margins of society, approach the centre of that society, so the sect becomes more churchly.

The sect ... represents a reaction, cloaked at first in purely religious guise, against both religious and economic
institutions. Overtly, it is a protest against the failure of religious institutions to come to grips with the needs of marginal groups, existing unnoticed on the fringes of cultural and social organization. But as the sect begins to force its way into the cultural pattern and to become entrenched as an institution within the cultural fabric, it passes from sect type to church type. Then new sects arise, in protest against the failure of old sects and of society to distribute their benefits more impartially. 178

Thus, for Pope and Niebuhr, there was an inevitable evolution from sect to denomination. Pope even provided a list of some 21 indices of that transition, ranging from position in the cultural scene (cultural periphery denoting sectness, cultural centre churchness) to the type of hymns used in worship (folk music indicating sectness, stately and liturgical hymns churchness). 179

The problem with this list of indications of the 'sectness' or 'churchness' of a given movement is that, seemingly, each of the 21 is to be assigned equal weight in the evaluation - but can the type of hymns used in worship be assigned an equal value to the attitude toward the prevailing culture, for instance? In addition, the Niebuhr-Pope formulation fails to explain adequately those sects which successfully maintain their isolation, either vicinal or cultural, from society at large, cf. the Amish Mennonites and the Exclusive Brethren respectively. Niebuhr does, in fact, mention the Mennonites,
and implies that he regards them as a continuing sect, which stands somewhat at variance with his earlier assertion that all sects become denominations.  

It is clear that the sectarian typology formulated by Niebuhr and Pope is not one that is applicable to all sects in every age. Rather, it is highly culture-specific. As Benton Johnson put it,

those radical 'anti-worldly groups', which Troeltsch would unhesitatingly have called sects, cannot be understood so clearly in terms of [Niebuhr's] sect-to-church hypothesis. The major historical trend of the Amish, the Shakers, or to a lesser extent the Quakers, can scarcely be understood as a simple process of 'accomodation' to the values of outer society. It seems safe to say that despite some astute and valuable observations that Niebuhr makes in presenting his sect-to-church hypothesis, the actual developmental sequence he poses is pretty much confined to voluntarist Calvinist sects in a mobile society.

Johnson himself proposed a somewhat different typology for understanding 'church' and 'sect'. Rather than basing the typology on attitudes to secular culture, as Niebuhr and Pope had done, which led to the conclusion "that once sects had relaxed their opposition to worldly ways, they are churches", he based it on the 'process of justification', arguing that a body which dispenses justification, or sal-
vation, through liturgical and ritual ceremonies performed by religious functionaries could be called a 'church', while one in which the strict adherence to a set of ethical norms guarantees salvation could be called a 'sect'. Johnson is absolutely right to point up the importance of 'interior' factors for the correct understanding of the 'church' and the 'sect', and his conclusions are utilised below. Where he goes astray, however, is in downplaying the importance of 'attitudes to the world' in sect-typology, for if someone is to be 'saved', the question is not only 'How?', but also 'From what?'

The four scholars so far considered, Troeltsch, Niebuhr, Pope and Johnson, all worked with a simple Church-Sect dichotomy. A major breakthrough in the Sociology of Sects came when J.M. Yinger observed that this simple ideal type was by no means adequate to cover the full range of the observable data. By using two criteria, the degree of inclusiveness of the members of a society, and the degree of attention to the function of social integration as contrasted with the function of personal need, he proposed a six-stage 'spectrum', without asserting that any one stage would necessarily evolve into any other. Firstly, there is the Universal Church, which supports the integration of a society, while simultaneously satisfying the personal needs of individuals at all levels of society, thus containing sectarian impulses within itself. The Universal Church is a very rare phenomenon. Secondly, there is the Ecclesia, which also reaches the bounds of society, but is less successful than the
Universal Church at incorporating sectarian tendencies. Established National Churches fall into this category. The third stage along the spectrum is occupied by the Class Church or Denomination, which is still in substantial harmony with the secular power structure, but is limited by class, racial or even regional boundaries. The fourth position is taken by the Established Sect, which is a development from one of the two remaining categories. A sect will, after a short period of time, either disintegrate, or else become moulded into a formal structure with techniques for admitting new members and for preserving their common interests. Some sects develop into denominations, generally those which emphasize the problems of anxiety and sin, while sects that are primarily concerned with the evils of society become Established Sects. The fifth position in the spectrum is occupied by the Sect itself. Following Troeltsch, Yinger divides sects into three types, according to their response to an undesired situation - acceptance, opposition or avoidance, the last being the most common response. Finally, there is the Cult, which is a small, short-lived and often local group, gathered around a dominant leader. Its beliefs and rites are often very much at variance with those of the rest of society. It rarely outlives the death of its leader, and is almost entirely concerned with the individual, with little regard for questions of social order.

Yinger's work is important, but it does not represent the only approach in the Sociology of Sects. Bryan Wilson, who has dominated the field for the last 25 years,
approaches the subject from a slightly different angle. He has always maintained his basic typological formulation, but has at the same time has modified it in several respects. The important feature of his work, from the point of view of the application of sect-typology to the Old Testament, is that while, like all the other typologies detailed here, Wilson's typology was originally formulated in order to classify sectarianism in a Christian, Western context, he has also successfully applied it to primitive, non-Christian societies. This suggests that his classification is a more appropriate one to apply to Ancient Israel than the others. It will be recalled that Hanson uncritically adopted Troeltsch's typology without asking whether it was possible, or even ever intended, to apply that typology to a non-Christian and non-Western setting.

Starting from the question, 'What shall we do to be saved?', Wilson develops his typology of sects on the basis of the Weberian notion of 'Responses to the World' and on conceptions of the supernatural. He details seven possible responses. Firstly, the Conversionist, which says that men must change in order to be saved. Secondly, the Revolutionist, which says that the world is evil, and salvation will come by divine intervention, which men must await. Thirdly, the Introversionist, which says that, instead of men or the world being changed, the world must be abandoned, so that the sectarians can cultivate their own holiness. The fourth response is the Manipulationist, which seeks the manipulation of the world, often by esoteric or occult means, for
the benefit of the individual, benefit being seen in terms of those things which are generally well-regarded in the world. The fifth is the Thaumaturgical, where 'salvation' is seen in terms of immediate release from tensions and difficulties, gained by special, almost magical, dispensations by supernatural agencies from the normal laws of causality. This response differs from the Manipulationist in the highly particular nature of salvation, and in the absence of any clear idea of the benefits likely to accrue. The sixth response is the Reformist response, in which the world is seen as evil, but that evil, in some of its manifestations, may be overcome by reform in accordance with the dictates of conscience. The final response is the Utopian one, where an attempt is made to find a basis for a radical reconstruction of the world. The world is evil because men have created an evil system. Salvation is attained by returning to the basic principles by which the creator intended men to live. It is, of course, possible that some groups may embrace more than one of these responses, either simultaneously or successively.

Excluding only the conformist response - the acceptance of existing agencies of salvation - these appear to be the seven possible types of solution to the central religious quest. All of them assert that salvation is to be attained, and that at least some men should attain it. The supernatural agencies are said to have acted, to be acting or be intending to act to this end. Men must acknowledge this, and do as they are enjoined in
order to be saved. 188

This typology of sects is the most comprehensive one available and, as Magic and the Millenium demonstrates, it can be applied to sectarian responses in non-Christian, 'primitive' settings, as well as to those in the more 'traditional' Christian milieux. For this reason, Bryan Wilson's typology is adopted for the present purposes (without rejecting other typologies where they do not contradict Wilson's), and the Rechabites will be examined as an instance of a sect of his third type of response: the Introversionist.

Features of Sects

While all sects have different practices and outlooks, it is nevertheless true that all sects that fall into one of the seven categories proposed by Bryan Wilson will have features in common with each other - otherwise the concept of categories would not exist! It is also true, however, that any group which may be called a sect must have at least some features in common with all other sects, for the concept of a 'sect' to have any value at all. The purpose of this section is therefore two-fold. Firstly, the features of sects in general will be outlined, and secondly, those of Introversionist sects in particular will be detailed. With this data, drawn largely from B.R. Wilson's observations of actual sects in numerous different settings, it will be possible to examine the Rechabites as an instance of an Introversionist sect.
In 1982, B.R. Wilson proposed the following ideal type for all sects. They tend to be exclusive movements, refusing to allow dual allegiances. They tend to claim that they have a monopoly of complete religious truth, which others do not enjoy—this truth provides the framework for all aspects of faith and practice. They are usually lay organisations, generally rejecting the religious division of labour and denying any special religious virtuosity to anyone except, in some cases, their own founders and leaders. Religious obligations are thus equal for all 'who accept the truth'. Sects are implicitly marked by voluntarism—an individual chooses to be a sectarian, and he is normally required to show some mark of merit in order to be accepted as a sect member. Sects exercise concern for sustained standards among their members, exercising sanctions against the wayward. They are protest movements.

Some of these points can be elaborated somewhat. Proof of personal merit for membership can be demonstrated by knowledge of the sect's doctrine, by an affirmation, or even by the recommendation of existing members of the sect who are in good standing. The sanctions exercised against the wayward can include, ultimately, the expulsion of the persistent recalcitrant. The sect regards itself as an elect, a gathered remnant, possessing some sort of special enlightenment, and hence it expects personal perfection of its members. All sects seek to keep their members separate from the world, either by isolation—minimising contact with outsiders—or by insulation—the imposition of
behavioral rules calculated to protect sect values by reducing the influence of the external world when contact necessarily occurs.

As a sect is a protest movement, it asserts a teaching and commandment different from those of the 'orthodox', but that alternative is never a complete and total rejection of all elements in the orthodox tradition, otherwise the sect could not be recognised as a protest movement. Rather, the sect espouses and maintains a set of different emphases, with some elements omitted from, and some added to, the 'orthodox' set of beliefs with, more importantly, an alternative principle and source of authority. Although the sect is a religious protest group, it does not invariably mean that the group against which it is protesting is also religious - it could represent a religious protest against secular society.

It was said above that the Introversionist response to the world was to abandon it, and to direct the attention of sect members away from the world solely onto the sect community. This may be achieved by vicinal isolation, where the group sets up its own community away from all others, as in the case of the Amish Mennonites or the Hutterites, or else by cultural isolation, where the members are permitted no friends and few, if any, close acquaintances outside the sect community, as in the case of the Exclusive Brethren. The member of an Introversionist sect is a member of the sect before he is anything else, and he finds his friends within the sect group. There is a strong in-group morality, and usually
strict endogamy as well — spouses are found from within the sect community. This serves to retain a very high proportion of second-generation sect members. Thus, the sect fellowship serves as the members' whole society. Expulsion from it (for moral laxity) will inevitably mean the loss of everything and everyone near and dear to the member. Thus, while originally the intent of the abandonment of the world was the preservation of the members until the moment of salvation, be it death or the Advent, in practice, in Introversionist sects, the community itself becomes nothing less than the locus of salvation for the sectarian — a concept that is, in fact, very close to the Durkheimian belief that the deity was a representation of the society in question. As Bryan Wilson puts it,

purity in the community becomes the basis for salvation, and for purity to prevail, exclusion of the impure, as a type of religious hygiene, becomes essential.

Thus, evangelism is generally not practised by Introversionists, and new members from the world are often not readily admitted, as the sect community exists to save its members from the world, not to go out to save the world.

Introversionist sects, as part of their isolating mechanism (which is often only a defence mechanism, preserving the community's distinctive piety), frequently make sacred the distinctive practices of their daily life, particularly dress, customs and language, even though these practices may have originally had no religious import whatsoever. This tendency is not simply a result of innate human conser-
vatism. It is also a clear indication of the all-pervasiveness of the sacred. Introversionists are sometimes seen as conservatives ... but they seek only to conserve a range of elements of the received tradition, and often embrace entirely new revelations and new forms within which to accomplish the preservation of this separate way of life.193

Introversionist groups which adopt vicinal isolation can only really do so if they take up a communistic way of life. This way of life is often agricultural, as in the case of the Amish Mennonites and the Hutterites. Among less-developed peoples, it has been found that the autonomous Introversionist movement appears to rely on the Quietistic Prophet for its inspiration. Of course, not all Introversionist sects are autonomous, ie. start out life as an Introversionist sect. Many are mutations of other responses, such as the Revolutionist or the Reformist. The non-arrival of the Advent, or the failure to change society, induces the group to abandon the world altogether, and to withdraw.

The Rechabites as an Introversionist Sect

Having outlined the features of sects in general, and of Introversionist sects in particular, it should now be possible to depict the Rechabites in terms of this typology. It is clear that they were indeed a sect, a religiously separated group, who separated from 'the world', as a protest against the social and religious evils of society in Israel
under Ahab. They had a concept of 'salvation', in that they believed that adherence to their rules would ensure 'long life in the land'. The standard promise of blessing, ie. salvation, in the Old Testament is of long life in the land, even if the regular formula is different from that found in Jeremiah 35. The Rechabites seem to have been a 'lay' organisation - everyone in the community, men, women and children, had the same obligations and so, presumably, the same privileges. They apparently had no religious virtuosos, except their own founder, Jonadab, and possibly their current leader, but this is far from certain. Jaazaniah appears as the Rechabites' leader in Jer. 35:3, but he plays no distinct role in the story - in v.6, it seems as if all the Rechabite men reply to Jeremiah's invitation to drink wine. They seem to have had no priests, and no liturgical means for the dispensation of justification. That justification, or salvation, seems to have been achieved by keeping Jonadab's (ethical) commands - another sectarian feature. Thus, the Rechabites must have felt that they were able to dispense with the sacrificial system of justification offered by the Samaria and Jerusalem Temples, and by other shrines, yet at the same time remaining fervent Yahwists.

There is also sufficient evidence available to describe the Rechabites as an instance of the Introversionist response, rather than as an instance of any of the other responses identified by B.R. Wilson. They were certainly not Conversionist, Manipulationist or Thaumaturgical. They do not appear, in Jeremiah 35 at any rate, to have had the
the attitudes typical of the Reformist response, and they do not seem to have had a concept of salvation by divine intervention, so they were hardly Revolutionists. Winckler thought that Rechabite discipline represented "a deliberate attempt to create an imagined ideal state of human life", which sounds very like a description of a Utopian sect. It is true that, in their practical effects, a vicinally isolated Introversionist sect and a Utopian sect may appear to be very much the same and, indeed, as movements may embrace more than one response simultaneously, presumably some sects may be both Introversionist and Utopian. Nevertheless, Bryan Wilson has always been very careful to draw a distinction between Introversionists and Utopians - the former see "the world as irredeemably evil and salvation to be attained only by the fullest possible withdrawal from it", while the latter seek "to reconstruct the world according to some divinely given principles, to establish a new social organization in which evil will be eliminated". Thus, the identification of the Rechabites as Introversionists whose community developed like those described by Wilson in Magic and the Millenium, rather than as Utopians, hinges on the contention that they sought to abandon the world, rather than to reconstruct it. That their programme was one of abandonment is clear from the observation that they apparently did not seek to attract others to their lifestyle, which they would have done if they had regarded that lifestyle as an "ideal state of human life". Thus, the Rechabites are best seen as an instance of the Introversionist response.
The Rechabites practiced vicinal isolation, up until the time that they fled to Jerusalem. This isolation would help to account for the scarcity of references to the Rechabites in the Old Testament. Their lifestyle would have meant keeping themselves away from others as much as possible. That way of life was evidently communistic, and it seems not unreasonable to propose that they were endogamous. Jonadab is revered as לֹאֵל, 'father', in Jer. 35. While this term is capable of a broad range of meanings beyond parenthood or ancestry, it is not impossible that, over time, with intensive inter-marrying of all members of the sect, each member really was, in some sense, descended from, or at least related to, Jonadab. According to Jer. 35:7, the purpose of keeping Jonadab's commands was that 'you may live many days in the land wherein you are sojourners'. Thus, failure to keep these commands would entail loss of long life in the land. It was pointed out above that, for an Introversionist sect, the sect community becomes the member's sole socio-religious matrix, expulsion from which would entail the loss of everything and everyone near and dear. This is tantamount to social, religious and cultural death. This strongly suggests that the Rechabites did practice expulsion for failure to keep Jonadab's rules - the wayward Rechabite would be cast out from his society, ie, the Rechabite community. To be cut off from his society, and from his God - for the Introversionist sectarian, the two virtually coinhere - spells nothing less than death. Observation of Jonadab's commands resulted in 'long life in the land', because not only were they injunctions to maintain a prophetic lifestyle, but also
they marked off the Rechabites as a separated community, a community into which virtually all its members were born and raised hardly knowing anything or anyone other than the sect and fellow sect-members. Jonadab's rules probably functioned also as a means of excluding impurity ('the world') from the community, but precisely how the specific commands functioned to do this, in Rechabite mentality, lies beyond the scope of an analysis drawn from sect-typology.

It was observed that vicinally isolated Introversionist sects are frequently agricultural. However, it is clear that the Rechabites were non-agricultural, and probably non-pastoral as well. It will be proposed later in this chapter that the Rechabites were dependent on alms for their existence. If this is the case, then the Rechabites must have had some degree of contact with the outside world: being dependent on it for food, they could not have abandoned it completely. Complete isolation is, however, very uncommon among Introversionist movements, even among those which practice vicinal isolation. Minimal contact is practiced if necessary. As Bryan Wilson puts it,

sects of this type insulate themselves, avoiding other men in all but the most essential concerns of everyday life

- and food certainly is an essential concern of everyday life! In connection with this point, it is interesting to ask whether the laws in Lev. 19:9f, Deut. 24:19-22, concerning the leaving of the gleanings in the fields, to be collected by the orphan, the widow and the sojourner, were
at least partly designed to allow the Israelites to leave food for groups such as the Rechabites, *i.e.* to give them alms, while at the same time allowing the Rechabites to largely maintain their isolation from society at large when receiving those alms.

Introversionist sects often make sacred the distinctive practices of their daily life, particularly customs, dress and language. There is no direct evidence for archaic dress and language among the Rechabites, although it is possible that Elijah and the Sons of the Prophets may have had distinctive marks and dress, *cf.* 1 Kings 20:35-41, 2 Kings 1:8. It is possible, however, that Jonadab's commands, which in Jer. 35 seem to have the force of sacred law for the Rechabites, could originally have been pragmatic, commanding the Rechabites to live as prophets, and only in time took on a distinctively sacred character. E. Isichei has observed that a sectarian will often value the barriers around his sect so highly that he will identify them with the sect's continued existence, even if he is unable to provide a rational explanation of his attitude. Is it possible that this is what happened with the Rechabites? The commands were originally pragmatic, being injunctions to maintain the prophetic lifestyle, but in time that pragmatism was largely lost, the commands became sacralised, and the members of the sect clung to them more as the badge marking them out as Rechabites than as essentials of the life of prophets, without properly knowing what actual practical function those commands originally had. This proposal would
help to explain why the Rechabites felt that they were able to claim that they had kept all Jonadab's commands, while at the same time being false to the spirit of those commands. Part of Jonadab's commands stemmed from prophetic anti-urbanism, yet the Rechabites appear in Jerusalem in Jer. 35. As they were still living in tents, they had kept the letter of the commands. If they had been fully aware of the meaning of those commands, they would not have fled to the city. Within this context, the Promise to the Rechabites in Jer. 35:18f could be functioning as much as an exhortation as an oracle of salvation. The divine word is urging the Rechabites to return to the spirit, as well as to the letter, of their commands, to live as prophets again.

By coming to Jerusalem, the Rechabites evidently abandoned their vicinal isolation. Nevertheless, their distinctive practices, which were maintained, would have resulted in cultural isolation (or, at least, severe insulation) in the new, urban setting. Other Introversionist sects, such as the Exclusive Brethren, have successfully maintained such isolation in urban settings. Thus, the Rechabites probably felt that they were able to maintain their all-important isolation from 'the world', even in the city.

It has been argued in this thesis that the Rechabites are best understood as a prophetic community. Is it possible to reconcile this with the evidence that also suggests that they were an Introversionist sect? R.P. Carroll has observed that one of the ways of avoiding dissonance is by separation.
He seems also to suggest that the Rechabites represent an exclusivist movement among the prophets,²⁰⁵ even if he does not develop this idea in his later writings.²⁰⁶ He further notes that "it could be argued that the communities of prophets tended to keep themselves away from the cities".²⁰⁷ Even though they kept themselves away from the cities, these communities of prophets nevertheless had direct involvement in socio-political activity, cf. 1 Kings 20:35ff, 2 Kings 9:1ff. It also appears that it was normal for members of the wider Israelite society to go to consult a prophet on the Sabbath or New Moon, cf. 2 Kings 4:23. Such involvement in society on the part of Introversionist sects is not excluded by the model.

The sect withdraws from the world, or allows its members to be active in the world only for human betterment at the behest of conscience and at the periphery of human concern.²⁰⁸

Given these observations, would it be possible to suggest that the Rechabites functioned as a vicinally isolated Introversionist group of prophets who, like other prophetic groups, were normally only available, for the dispensation of oracles in return for some sort of gift, at set times, namely the New Moon and the Sabbath? Thus, contact with outsiders, for human betterment, was practiced by the Rechabites, but was nevertheless rigidly proscribed.

Thus, the data at our disposal permits us to say, with some degree of certainty, that the Rechabites are an instance of an Introversionist sect in Ancient Israel. They have features in common with Introversionist sects from other
ages and cultures. They do not, however, fit the ideal type perfectly. Like any sect, they have unique features. In particular, their actual practices for maintaining their isolation, not drinking wine, not building houses, not sowing seed or planting vineyard, but living in tents, are quite unparalleled, and this uniqueness is underscored by the Rechabites' general character as a sect demonstrating the Introversionist response. Looking at the Rechabites as an Introversionist sect has also raised new ideas and new questions for discussion, over the exercise of sanctions against wayward members of the community, over the community's means of sustenance, over whether Jonadab's commands were originally pragmatic and whether that pragmatic function was properly understood after those commands had become sacralised, and over whether the Rechabites were able to serve as a community of prophets and as a vicinally isolated sect. Obviously, none of these questions can be settled with any certainty, but it is hoped that none of them conflict with any of the biblical data that we have about the Rechabites, and that none of that biblical data has been neglected in the exercise. If these two hopes have been fulfilled, then the conclusions reached here are at least as probable as any others which use all the available data about the Rechabites, and it is hoped that they commend themselves as the most reasonable account of this Old Testament group.

The Sociology of Schism and the Rechabites

The foregoing analysis has dealt with the Rechabites
after they came into being, after they became an Introvers-ionist sect. There is, however, also scope for the appli-
cation of sociological analysis to the origin of our group, to the schism that led to the formation of the Rechabites. The following paragraphs will attempt to do this, firstly out-
lining the theory, and then seeking to apply it to the Rechabites.

While Bryan Wilson's analyses of sect development have been extensively used above, it has to be admitted that he has not provided anything like a full theory of sect origins. He confines himself to listing five ways in which sects can originate: a charismatic figure presents new teachings; internal schism within existing sects; from a more-or-less spontaneous association of like-minded 'seekers'; from attempts to revitalize beliefs and practices within a major religious movement; or from non-denominational re-

What Bryan Wilson says may very well be true, but it hardly constitutes a theory of the Sociology of Schism. For such a theory, we have to turn to the work of J. Wilson and R. Wallis. John Wilson's Sociology of Schism is derived from Smelser's theory of collective behaviour, and works with the concepts of structural strain, structural conduciveness, the mobilising agent, the precipitating factor and social control.

Central to his model is the concept of structural
strain, which is a disjuncture between norms and values, or between roles and norms - accepted norms are no longer fully appropriate to the system's values. A schismatic group is a movement which has its origins in a dispute over norms and allegations that the main group has departed from those implicated in the values of the original movement.

While this concept of strain lies at the heart of any schism, the existence of strain within a movement does not automatically mean that schism will occur. The factor of structural conduciveness suggests other elements that need to be present in some form and combination before schism can occur. J. Wilson proposes the following: easy clique formation increases the likelihood of schism; so does a situation where the group is organisationally highly centralised or, conversely, highly decentralised; the type of authority legitimation is important; if the movement's organisation itself has a sacred aspect, schism is less likely; and the attitude towards the group's ideology is also important, schism being more likely near the ends of the continuum, ie. where there is extreme dogmatism, such that all innovation is heresy, and where there is completely open truth, so that anyone can claim to have revealed it.

While structural strain and structural conduciveness increase the likelihood of a schism occurring in a given group, that schism will not take place without a precipitating factor, such as a speech or an event, to trigger it, or without an agent, usually a charismatic leader, to
mobilise it.

The factor of social control in this model refers to those authorities which play a part in defining the social position of the group and which have the power of discipline over the group. It is, in fact, more influential on groups once they have been formed, rather than during their formation, so is not relevant to the present study.

Roy Wallis' 'Theory of Propensity to Schism' may be summarised as follows: A schism involves the breaking away from a group of an individual who is able to secure the support of some part of that movement's following. To do so, he must be able to secure a legitimate claim to their allegiance. Thus, schismatic propensity is directly proportional to the perceived availability of sources of legitimation within a movement. Schism involves the mobilisation of alternative means of legitimation to those employed by the movement's power-holders, or the mobilisation of the same means of legitimation, where access to those means is widely dispersed throughout the movement.

Wallis goes on to say that Weber observed that the greatest force for a break with an existing institutional order is that wielded by a charismatic leader. Hence, charisma is the principal form of authority which legitimates a schism. Wallis also observes that schism is often characteristic of
the early stages of a movement's life-cycle, and that it also occurs disproportionately often upon the death of a charismatic leader - the leader's death has a destabilising influence on the movement, especially if a number of heirs can claim to have been designated.

J. Wilson's theory of schism is fuller than Wallis', but Wallis has pointed up an important factor not made explicit in Wilson's typology, namely, the importance of perceived availability of sources of legitimation being influential on the propensity to schism. The two typologies are thus complementary, and not contradictory, and they are both employed in the present examination of the origins of the Rechabites.

The present study has argued that, while the commands of Jonadab in Jer. 35:6f represent opposition to the social and religious policies of the Omrides, the Rechabites originated in a schism within the movement represented by Elijah, Elisha and the Sons of the Prophets. If this contention is accepted, then what John Wilson and Roy Wallis have to say is pertinent. The fact that propensity to schism is greater upon the death of a charismatic leader, when there are several heirs-apparent, finds its counterpart in the claim that the split between Elisha and the Sons of the Prophets on the one hand, and Jonadab and the Rechabites on the other, occurred soon after the death of Elijah. Jonadab had sources of legitimation for his schism: he had his own charismatic authority (the Rechabites regarded his commands as law); and
the following of his own family (the Rechabites called him 'father').

What Wallis says about schism being characteristic of the early stages of a movement's life-cycle is also important for the present purposes, as it seems that the Prophetic Guild Movement under Elijah/Elisha/Jonadab was inspired as a response to the Omrides.

J. Wilson's emphasis on the importance of a precipitating factor in the origin of schism is also of note. It will be recalled that Cummings argued that the Rechabites and the Sons of the Prophets represent two halves of the prophetic movement, who split over the issue of building and living in houses. At first sight, it may appear surprising that an issue that seems to be as comparatively minor as house-building would have been the cause of a major split in the prophetic movement. However, the issue of houses is not a minor one, for anti-urbanism, symbolised by the rejection of houses and sedentary occupations, was one of the lynchpins of the movement. It has been shown above that Jonadab's commands were only two-fold: do not drink wine, and do not live a sedentary life. It is also clear that house-building was not the only issue at stake. It was as much a dispute over who was Elijah's real successor as anything else. The house-building served as the precipitating factor of the schism. It was, so to speak, 'the last straw which broke the camel's back', the camel, in this case, being Jonadab.
A hypothesis of the origins of the Rechabites may now be proposed. A hypothesis it may be, but if it is found to be correct, then certain important consequences follow. The Northern Prophetic Guild Movement was founded by Elijah, as a protest against the social, political and religious evils that had arisen in Israel under the Omrides. The movement did not drink wine, as alcohol would have affected the prophets' ability to give oracles, and it shunned urbanism and its related pursuits, notably agriculture, as the city was seen as the principal cause and symbol of those evils it was protesting against. On the death of Elijah, Elisha assumed control of the movement, exercising a highly centralised authority. At least some members of the movement, particularly Jonadab himself, felt that Jonadab had a claim, at least as good as Elisha's, to that leadership, because of his own charismatic authority, because of his family's prestige in the movement and because of his own connection with Elijah. Thus, a situation of structural strain was created. The highly centralised authority of Elisha and the extreme dogmatism of the movement's ideology form the structural conduciveness for schism. The mobilising agent is the person of Jonadab, and the precipitating factor is the issue of house-building. When Elisha sanctioned the building of permanent dwellings, the 'opposition' within the Prophetic Guild Movement seized on this as being heretical and false, not only to the legacy of the itinerant Elijah, but also to the movement's anti-urban ideology, and used it as an excuse to advance the claims of Jonadab for the leadership of the movement. The result was schism, part of the group following
Elisha, and part Jonadab, who made formal laws out of the practices previously followed by the whole of the movement, laws now found in Jer. 35:6f.

This hypothesis has been formulated as one way of explaining the origin of the Rechabites, by the use of a model drawn from Sociology. Admittedly, the hypothesis does go beyond the information given in the biblical sources. But it does not contradict that information. Rather, it views it in a fresh light. The hypothesis points up very clearly how the use of different models, with different presuppositions, can yield very different results. Older Old Testament scholarship, working with the concepts of Evolutionism and Survivals, which were the sociological perspectives of that time, saw the Rechabites as a survival from Israel's nomadic past. Now that the concepts of Evolutionism, Survivals and Nomadism have been severely criticised - 'disproved' even - and now that the ancient origin of the Rechabites, formulated on the basis of 1 Chron. 2:55, has been seriously called into question, the way is clear for the use of another model, and for the formulation of a new hypothesis, one which seeks to take account of all the data. As the data available from the Old Testament is at best patchy, and that from outside the Bible completely non-existent, this hypothesis is incapable of definitive proof. But that does not negate its value. If it commends itself as the most probable explanation of the origin of the Rechabites, then it has served its purpose. It also has a heuristic value, in that it presents a challenge to further research into prophetic
groups, into the personal following of 'charismatic' leaders and into prophetic conflict — already a thriving area of research in biblical studies.  

4.4: THE RECHABITES' MEANS OF SUSTENANCE

If the proposed connection between Elijah, Elisha and the Sons of the Prophets on the one hand, and Jonadab and the Rechabites on the other, is a valid one, then it is legitimate to look to the Elijah-Elisha stories for evidence of the economic means of support of the Rechabites, given that the texts that deal directly with our group are silent on the matter. The overwhelming picture presented by 1 Kings 17-2 Kings 13 in this respect is of individuals and groups without any economic specification, dependent on alms, on gifts made in return for prophetic services rendered, or on what grew of itself (2 Kings 4:38-41). In 1 Kings 17:6, Elijah is dependent on what the ravens, or the Arabs, if Gray is to be believed, bring him. In v.10f, he asks the widow of Zarephath for alms. In 2 Kings 4:8-13, Elisha is cared for by the woman of Shunem simply because he is a 'holy man of God', and not because the woman is desirous of a reward — Elisha's gift of a son is not only unlooked for, but also undesired! In vv.42-44, the man from Baal-Shalishah brings his gift completely voluntarily, seemingly without asking for an oracle. Other texts indicate that it was normal to offer a prophet some sort of gift when going to consult him, cf. 2 Kings 8:8f, where Ben-hadad sends rich gifts to Elisha along with his request to be told whether he would recover
from his sickness, and 2 Kings 5, where Elisha refuses to accept Naaman's gift, and Gehazi attempts to change this. Outside of the Elijah-Elisha complex, 1 Sam. 9:7ff also indicates that it was normal to take a gift when going to consult a prophet, as does Mic. 3:5-8, which shows that one of the abuses of prophecy was to 'prophesy' good things to those who provided food for the prophets and evil to those who did not, i.e. that the temptation for a prophet to change his message in accordance with his client's ability to pay was always great.

Given that the Rechabites were also prophets like Elijah, Elisha and the Sons of the Prophets, it may be legitimately concluded that they also depended for sustenance on what they were given, either as alms, or as gifts in return for their oracles, and on what they could collect by scavenging. Such a conclusion is more warranted than one which claims that they were shepherds, metalworkers or house-slaves.

4.5: THE RECHABITES AND THE CULT

Ascertaining the attitude of our group toward the Temple Cultus at Jerusalem and elsewhere is not easy. When the Rechabites were seen as representatives of the 'Nomadic Ideal', it was relatively easy to ask, with Budde, can it be supposed that the Rechabites observed the feasts of the first-fruits (offering of sheaves), Pentecost (celebration of the completion of the grain harvest) and Ingathering (the feast of the
vintage)? It is inconceivable. Wine they abhorred, they could never have lent themselves to the celebration of feasts for the successful issue of labours which in the name of their God were strictly forbidden. They must have asserted that these festivals did not belong to Yahweh—that they were a foreign worship. Jonadab forbade his descendants to follow agriculture and vine-growing for the very reason that these, according to his convictions, inevitably led to idolatry.219

However, when the Rechabites' lifestyle is seen as having nothing to do with a harking back to some imagined ideal desert life, and nothing to do with a protest against culture per se, but to do with living the prophetic lifestyle, such an assertion of the Rechabites' hostility to the Cult cannot be maintained.

Very recently, Robert Carroll has suggested that the Rechabites would have rejected a religion which "thought of a deity who dwelled in a magnificently built house",220 they themselves being semi-nomadic tent-dwellers. This is in a similar vein to Robertson Smith's claim that the Rechabites had a taboo on entering houses.221 Where these views flounder, however, is on the fact that the Rechabites do not refuse Jeremiah's invitation to come to the 'House of Yahweh', Jer. 35:2, but only his invitation to drink wine. Given that they had maintained their distinctive practices, and that the commands in Jer. 35 represent the sum of those practices,222 it may be concluded that if they had had a fundamental opposition to the Temple, and a taboo on entering houses, they
would have refused to have entered the Temple, and Jeremiah's invitation to them to have done so would have occasioned the test of their loyalty to their ancestral commands. Just as Jonadab's prohibition on sowing seed and planting vineyard did not mean that the Rechabites were prohibited the consumption of the fruits of agriculture (the prohibition on wine being covered separately), so the prohibition on house-building and dwelling did not mean that the Rechabites were forbidden to enter a house. Thus, the conclusion that the Rechabites had a completely negative attitude to the Temple and to the Cult is unwarranted.

Paul Riemann almost goes to the opposite extreme, when he claims that

the usual interpretation leaves unexplained the obvious similarities between the Rechabites and the Nazirites, whose association with divine service is clear; the appearance of the Rechabites, the only two times that they are mentioned in the O.T., in the vicinity of the capital cities and the major temples; Jeremiah's prophecy that the Rechabites would not lack a man to 'stand before Yahweh', a phrase which usually indicates service in worship ...; the notion of sojourning (Jer. 35.7), which is prominent in the so-called Holiness Code (cf. Lev. 25.23), from priestly circles, and which is connected with the Levites (cf. Dt. 18.6), and the later tradition that the Rechabites were cultic personnel ... The Rechabites may have been an order, or even a family ... devoted to Temple Service; Jehu may have
chosen Jehonadab to help him in his Temple massacre because he was a Temple insider, rather than because he was a "nomad" violently opposed to cult; teetotalism may have been a reaction against the orgiastic rites of Canaan; life in tents may reflect an interest in Holy War, or in the role of the tent shrine in the tribal league, and so on. 223

All these points are disputable. As the next section of this chapter will show, there is little evidence of a connection between the Rechabites and the Nazirites, beyond the fact that both were abstinent, so the fact that the latter were connected with the Cult is no evidence that the former were. It is by no means certain that Jonadab really did accompany Jehu in his Temple massacre, as the mention of Jonadab in 2 Kings 10:23 looks like a gloss, so it is equally uncertain that 2 Kings 10 places Jonadab in the vicinity of a major Temple or that he was a Temple 'insider'. The phrase, 'to stand before Yahweh', does often, but not invariably, denote service in worship, and it has been argued in this study that, in the case of the Rechabites, it does not. The notion of 'sojourning' is found throughout the Hebrew Bible, not simply in H, and the Patriarchs as well as the Levites are said to have 'sojourned' in the land of Israel. The later Jewish debates about whether the Rechabites became priests or members of the Sanhedrin arose from reflections on Jer. 35:19, and not from any historical reminiscences of the Rechabites serving as priests. 224 The teetotalism practiced by the Rechabites was because of their
function as prophets, as was their tent-residency, which was part of a protest against the evils of urbanisation in Ancient Israel.

In fairness to Riemann, it should be said that he is not attempting to provide a firm hypothesis that the Rechabites were cultic personnel, but rather to demonstrate that the data available concerning them need not be interpreted as reflecting the 'Nomadic Ideal'.

Thus it seems that both the view that the Rechabites rejected the Temple Cult completely, and that that they embraced it wholeheartedly, have little to commend them. Rather, they seem to have had a somewhat ambivalent attitude towards it. When the Rechabites were examined using the sociological category of 'sect' above, it was observed that they seem to have had no priests, and no liturgical means for the dispensation of justification. That justification, or salvation, living long in the land where the Rechabites were sojourners, seems to have been achieved by keeping Jonadab's (ethical) commands. Thus, the Rechabites must have felt that they were able to dispense with the sacrificial system of justification offered by the Samaria and Jerusalem Temples, and by the other shrines, yet at the same time remaining fervent Yahwists.

The attitude of Elijah, Elisha and the Sons of the Prophets towards the Yahwistic Cultus is also hard to determine. Aubrey Johnson wished to see them as being closely connected
with the old Israelite cultic sites, but H.H. Rowley and, more recently, R.R. Wilson have disputed this, Rowley observing that the mere fact that a group of prophets appear at or near a sanctuary is no evidence that they had anything to do with the official cultus of that sanctuary, Wilson likening the Sons of the Prophets to a peripheral possession cult, which by definition stands on the edge of society, away from the central cultus. Admittedly, Elijah offers sacrifice at the old Yahwistic shrine on Mount Carmel (1 Kings 18), and hence rabbinic tradition made him, like the Rechabites, into a priest, but the rituals are unusual, and there is no indication that they were part of the normal worship of Yahweh or that Elijah regularly had cultic functions.

In addition, Elisha instigates the destruction of the Temple of Baal in Samaria (2 Kings 9), and it is possible that after the Jehu Revolt Elisha and the Sons of the Prophets relaxed their opposition to the central Cult, and joined with it. However, the overall picture presented by 1 Kings 17-2 Kings 13 is not one of prophetic groups having particularly close contact with the regular shrines. This suggests that the Northern Prophetic Guild Movement, from which the Rechabites sprang, prior to the success of Jehu's revolt, shared that fundamental ambivalence towards the Yahwistic Cult held by the Rechabites. It was not rejected outright, it was not embraced wholeheartedly; it was seen as unnecessary to the life of the movement. After the revolt of Jehu, the Sons of the Prophets seem to have become Conformists. At any rate,
they disappear completely from the pages of the Bible. The Rechabites were evidently more suspicious. At any rate, they maintained their Introversionist identity right down to the time of the Exile.

4.6: THE RECHABITES AND THE NAZIRITES

As well as being identified with the Kenites and held to be paralleled by the early Nabataeans, the Rechabites have also been connected with the Nazirites, both by older scholars, such as Oesterley and Robinson, working with the 'Nomadic Ideal' hypothesis, and by more modern scholars, such as Soggin, who have sought to salvage something of the hypothesis by using the concept of 'semi-nomadism' (generally without saying what is meant by 'semi-nomadism'):

If we want to compare the Nazirite with anyone else, we should think of the sect of the Rechabites described in Jer. 34: these were a group which tried to maintain the ideals of semi-nomadic life in Palestine, viewing them as a privileged condition for a relationship with God. They therefore rejected agricultural produce which came from sedentary farming, especially wine, and permanent buildings, except when the latter provided refuge in case of danger, usually in fortified places.

Now that this study has seriously called into question the contention that the Rechabites had anything to do with a supposed 'Nomadic' or 'Semi-nomadic Ideal', the question of possible links between the Rechabites and the Nazirites needs to be reopened and re-examined in the light of the fresh understanding of the Rechabites offered by this thesis.
Answering the question of possible links is made more difficult by the fact that the biblical data concerning the Nazirites is anything but uniform. The 'Law of the Nazirite' in Numbers 6 envisages a temporary Nazirate, entered into voluntarily, with vows not to cut the hair, to avoid wine and to avoid pollution through contact with a dead body. At the end of the period of consecration, the hair is shaved and cast into the altar fire, the Nazirite makes certain offerings, and rejoins normal society. However, the picture of the Nazirites presented elsewhere in the Hebrew Bible stands at variance with this. Despite the prohibition placed upon his mother in Judg. 13:4, there is no indication that Samson avoided wine, cf. Judg. 14:10. He did not avoid corpses, either (14:8, 19). Only his hair remained unshorn, 16:17, but his Nazirate was for life, not for a limited period, 13:5, 16:17. Samuel also appears to have Nazirite elements in his birth narrative, especially if the LXX is followed in 1 Sam. 1:11, but again there is evidence elsewhere in 1 Samuel which suggests that he did not avoid wine, cf. 9:11ff, 11:14ff, 16:2ff. Neither did he avoid corpse defilement, as his slaughter of Agag (15:32f) reveals. His Nazirate was also permanent. Amos 2:11f suggests that the Nazirites were, like the prophets, a class of 'Holy Ones' raised up by Yahweh, presumably to a lifelong ministry. Am. 2:12 also suggests that the Nazirites avoided wine, but says nothing about their hair or about avoiding corpse defilement. Gen. 49:26 and Deut. 33:16, both pieces of ancient poetry, call Joseph 'אָמַרְתָּנְךָ, 'separated from his brothers' or 'consecrated by his brothers'. In these verses,
Joseph's consecration is marked by "agricultural bounty and military prowess."
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From the examples of Samson, Samuel and Joseph, it would seem that the Nazirite in Israel's early period had something to do with warfare, whereas in the post-exilic period, as revealed by Numbers 6 (P), it had become a means of personal holiness. It has been suggested that, in the pre-exilic period, the term 'Nazirite' was a loose term applicable to anyone devoted to Yahweh, but two factors argue against this supposition. Firstly, Am. 2:11f places prophets and Nazirites in parallel with each other. If the prophets were a readily identifiable collection of people in Israelite society in the time of Amos, then it is reasonable to assume that the Nazirites were one also. Secondly, Judg. 16:17 explicitly connects the Nazirite with long hair, and this is borne out by the other uses of יִּנְבָּה in the pre-exilic period, which connect it with the hair. Thus, Jer. 7:29 uses נבּ of a woman's long, unshorn hair; 2 Sam. 1:10, 2 Kings 11:12, Pss. 89:40, 132:18 use it of the crown of the king, i.e. the fillet which ties back the hair. In Exod. 29:6, 39:30, Lev. 8:9, it denotes the High Priest's diadem, and in Lev. 25:5, 11, יִנְבָּה is used metaphorically of an unpruned vine.

All this suggests that the Nazirate was an ancient, distinct office in Israel, connected in some sense with Holy War, originally marked solely by long hair. Judges 13 was probably composed later than chapters 14-16,233 and so the idea that Samson was supposed to be abstinent is a late creation,
serving to transform the Samson narratives into the story of "the violation of the Nazirite's vow". 234 Am. 2:11f would then be the earliest evidence (8th century BCE) for abstinence among the Nazirites. The avoidance of corpse pollution, in reality impossible for a lifelong Nazirite, 235 would only have been introduced when the vow became a temporary one - in the exilic or post-exilic period, according to the evidence of Number 6.

With this sketched outline of the probable development of the Nazirate, it is now possible to examine the connections and parallels, if any, between the Rechabites and the Nazirites. Discounting the avoidance of corpse pollution as a late development, the first point of difference between the two, in the pre-exilic period, is that there is no evidence that tent-residence was ever part of the Nazirate, nor that it involved avoiding the sowing of seed or the planting of vineyard. There is also no evidence that the Rechabites left their hair unshorn - a feature of the Nazirate from its earliest period. The Rechabites lived as community of men, woman and children, practising a common discipline. This does not appear to have been a feature of the Nazirate. Samson appears as a singular individual. Certainly, his wives were not Nazirites - or even Israelites. 1 Sam. 8:1-3 shows that Samuel had sons, so he presumably also had at least one wife, but there is no indication that they followed the same customs as Samuel himself. It might be argued from Am. 2:11f that, just as there were groups of prophets, so there were also groups of Nazirites, but this is very tenuous indeed: not
all prophets were part of groups (e.g. Amos himself, Am. 7: 14), so Am. 2:11-12 does not necessarily argue for the existence of groups of Nazirites.

This leaves the avoidance of wine, which is common to both Rechabites and Nazirites, from the eighth century onwards. It has already been argued that the Rechabites' refusal to drink wine was indicative of a ban on all intoxicants, rather than on fermented grape juice in particular. Numbers 6 forbids the Nazirites to consume any intoxicants either, and there is no reason to doubt that this was the case in the pre-exilic period also. It has already been argued, on the basis of Is. 28:7, that the Rechabites were ordered to avoid all intoxicants because alcohol would have impaired their ability to function as Yahweh's prophets, and it is not impossible that a similar idea led to the introduction of the ban on intoxicants in the Nazirate. On Numbers 6, Snaith has commented,

It is known that among some peoples, the drinking of alcohol was regarded as a means of securing divine revelation, on the theory that what a man said when he was not in control of his tongue was the word of some other personal agency in control of him. If such practices were connected by the Hebrews with heathen divination, then this would secure their prohibition with the strictest care on specially sacred occasions and for specially sacred people.

To say that the prohibition on intoxicants in the
case of the Rechabites and in the case of the Nazirites arose from similar motives, *ie.* from an understanding of the proper function of Yahweh's servants, in contradistinction to the practices of the servants of other deities, is not necessarily to say that one drew its inspiration from the other. Serving priests were required to be abstinent also (Lev. 10:9, Ezek. 44:21), and the Nazirate may have adopted its abstinence from the example of the priests, rather than from the example of the prophets, as represented by the Rechabites. However, the possibility that the Nazirate adopted its practices from the example of the Rechabites cannot be ruled out: in Am. 2:11f, prophets and Nazirites appear in parallel with each other, and Amos prophesied in the reigns of Jeroboam II of Israel and Uzziah of Judah, *ie.* in the first half of the eighth century BCE, Jonadab ben Rechab lived in the reign of Jehu, *ie.* in the second half of the preceding century.

Thus, it is impossible to argue in favour of a close connection between the Rechabites and the Nazirites in the pre-exilic period: the former did not leave their hair unshorn, the latter did live in tents or in communities, and did not avoid the sowing of seed or the planting of vineyard. It is possible, however, to see the avoidance of intoxicants, practised by both (by the Nazirites from the time of Amos at the latest), as originating in a common understanding of the functions of the servants of Yahweh as requiring abstinence, so as to be able to function as prophets or as 'specially sacred people', in contrast to the custom of using alcohol in non-Yahwistic divinatory processes.
The foregoing study of the biblical Rechabites, based on a careful reading of the relevant biblical and extrabiblical texts, coupled with some sociological analyses, and informed by the views of previous commentators, has yielded a picture that is perhaps a surprising one. The traditional view of the Rechabites, originally advanced in a cogent form by Budde, which held that they were a group of nomadic pastoralists, a Kenite clan clinging to the ancient desert lifestyle in the belief that that was what the desert deity Yahweh had commanded them, has been shown to be untenable, even in those versions that have preferred to call the Rechabites 'semi-nomadic', rather than 'nomadic'. It has also been shown that the more modern views concerning the Rechabites are equally untenable. The view of Gray and Frick, that the Rechabites were a group of itinerant metalworkers, falls through lack of positive evidence, and through failing to consider all the meagre data available. The view of Keukens, that they were the house-slaves of Jonadab, falls through being based on a series of questionable exegetical claims.

The present attempt to provide a systematic and full-scale study of all the available data has led to an endorsement of the view held by Cummings, and certain other scholars before him, perhaps even including St Jerome, that the Rechabites were a group of prophets closely related to Elijah, Elisha and the Sons of the Prophets. What Cummings proposed briefly has been here worked out fully, and what he proposed simply has here been more finely nuanced. It is thus now possible
to paint as full a picture as one is able of the Rechabites in the Bible, before moving, in Part Two of this study, to an examination of the various ways in which the biblical traditions about the Rechabites were used in later Jewish writings.

The Rechabites originated in the Northern Kingdom, in the days of the Omrides, in the ninth century BCE. They were not Kenites, as has often been claimed, so it is impossible to argue that the Rechabites' origins in Israel were very ancient. Rather, 1 Chron. 2:55, 4:12 do not mention the Rechabites, but refer to the geographical movement of a group of Kenites who originally came from a place called Beth-Rechab, which had nothing to do with the Rechabites. The origins of the Rechabites lie in a schism in the Northern Prophetic Guild Movement after the death of Elijah. Elijah had founded this movement in protest at the perceived social, political and religious evils of the policies of the Omrides. Being prophetic, the movement was teetotal for, like the Nazirites, they believed that it was wrong for the sacred servants of Yahweh to have their judgement clouded by alcohol. In the case of the prophets, drunkeness would have impaired their ability to give oracles. The movement was also itinerant, shunning permanent dwellings and occupations associated with the sedentary, urban life, notably agriculture and pastoralism, although the fruits of these occupations, vegetables, meat and milk, were permitted to the movement's members. The reason for this discipline was because urbanism was regarded as symbolic of the nation's lack of faith in its God,
and because the city was viewed as the cause of most of the evils against which the movement was protesting. The movement's protest was as much by its lifestyle as by its words. Its members lived on alms, on what they were given in return for their oracles, and on what they were able to obtain by scavenging.

One of the members of this movement was Jonadab, or Jehonadab, ben Rechab, who had been part of the Samarian nobility, perhaps even of the Omride court. He joined the movement together with a number of the members of his family, and enjoyed some considerable prestige in the movement, and had an almost charismatic authority. At any rate, Elijah's designated successor, Elisha, regarded Jonadab as a threat to his own position, and sought a reaffirmation of his own status from Elijah, before the latter's assumption into heaven.

Following the departure of Elijah, Elisha assumed control of the Prophetic Guild Movement. Jonadab and his family and supporters, however, were unwilling to accept this, and the movement found itself in a situation of strain and tension. When Elisha sanctioned the building of permanent dwellings by that part of the movement known as the Sons of the Prophets, this proved too much for the opposing faction. Not only was Elisha being false to the legacy of Elijah, he was also abolishing one of the central tenets of the movement, namely, its opposition to urbanism. This 'heresy', along with Jonadab's prestige and support, led to a schism in the
movement, the Sons of the Prophets siding with Elisha, Jonadab's family and supporters siding with him.

Jonadab set about organising his followers. He coined a title for them, 'The House of the Rechabites', based on his own patronymic, 'Rechab', which he invested with the meaning, 'The Mounted One'. In so doing, he was consciously imitating the title, 'The Chariotry of Israel and its Horses', used of Elijah and Elisha. Both titles alluded to the ancient belief that Israel's true chariotry was not the imported, earthly chariotry used by the army, which once again indicated a lack of faith in Yahweh on Israel's part, but was the chariotry of the skies, the chariotry of Yahweh, which fought to save, and occasionally to fight against, Israel, through climatic changes.

Jonadab also regularised the practices of his followers, and promulgated them as a formal law, which was to be observed by the whole community of his followers, men, women and children, with a promise of long life in the land where they were sojourners, i.e. were landless Israelites, living in the Promised Land, as the reward for obedience. These practices were essentially the practices of the Prophetical Guild Movement, but they also functioned as an insulating mechanism, separating the group from outside life almost completely. Thus, the impurity of 'the world' was excluded from the group, and 'long life' assured. The group was also isolated vicinally, practised communism, and was largely endogamous: the children who were born to the comm-
unity, which may legitimately be called a 'sect', were brought up within, and found their spouses from, the community. Any backsliding from Jonadab's rules was punishable by expulsion which, as the sect member was thereby cut off from his world and from his God, was tantamount to death. The group's members had a rather ambivalent attitude towards the the sacrificial cultus of Samaria and Jerusalem, and of other shrines, yet were nevertheless fervent Yahwists, and gave their children Yahwistic names. They revered Jonadab as their 'father'. Through their endogamy, most members of the sect were related to him in some way, but the title also referred to his actions in founding the group, and in providing it with its laws.

Although Jonadab supported Jehu's revolt, but probably not the wholesale massacre of the worshippers of Baal, his group nevertheless maintained its independence and distinctive lifestyle after the revolt's success, whereas the Sons of the Prophets seem to have relaxed their opposition and conformed. Either the Rechabites regarded the revolt as insufficiently drastic, or else the reforms failed to last. In any event, their maintained their isolation for almost 250 years after the time of Jehu. At some point, they also moved south from Israel to Judah, perhaps following the Fall of Samaria in 722 BCE.

While they continued to act as prophets, in time the precise reason why they observed some of their practices became somewhat obscured. The function of those practices in
separating the Rechabites from the rest of society became more important than their function of maintaining a prophetic lifestyle. In particular, the reason why they lived in tents was lost, so when Nebuchadrezzar's bands starting ravaging Judah in c.599 BCE, the Rechabites were able to flee to the 'safety' of Jerusalem, while still living in their tents, without apparently being aware that the reason why they were supposed to be living in tents was because they were opposed to life in the city!

It was in Jerusalem that Jeremiah, in response to a divine command, as his own elegantly-written prose tract tells us, found them. Following Yahweh's commands, he brought the whole of the Rechabite sect into a chamber of the Temple, and invited them to drink wine. From their refusal to disobey their father's commands, Jeremiah drew a lesson for his hearers and observers: the Judaeans have persistently disobeyed Yahweh, so they shall be condemned, as Yahweh promised; the Rechabites have consistently obeyed Jonadab's commands, and so will be saved, as Jonadab promised. Yahweh's Promise to the Rechabites, given through Jeremiah his prophet, was that they would never cease 'standing before' him. It was a promise that they would remain as Yahweh's prophets (with an implicit exhortation to return to that function properly), that they would maintain their distinctive practices and remain living in the Promised Land, despite the imminent disaster.

And they did survive the Fall of Judah in 597-587.
BCE, and did remain living in the Land, practicing their distinctive lifestyle. The exilic redactors of the material that became the Book of Jeremiah knew this. When they came to the tract concerning the Rechabites, they added various words and phrases, in order to reapply its message to the situation of the Exiles, but they did not remove or change any of the material that they had inherited - if the Rechabites had no longer been in existence, then the redactors would have altered the text so that it no longer said that they were, or else they would have left the tract out of their compilation of the 'words of Jeremiah' altogether.

The subsequent history of the Rechabites must be a matter for speculation. The Malchijah ben Rechab who appears in Neh. 3:14 has nothing to do with the Rechabites - Rechab is attested as a personal name in Ancient Israel independent of the Rechabites, and there is no other indication in the verse that Malchijah is connected with them. There is no other mention of the Rechabites elsewhere in the biblical literature of any period, and by the time we reach the Qumran, rabbinic and Pseudepigraphical literature, to be examined in Part Two of the present study, we are in the realms of tradition, not of history. The Rechabites may have become incorporated into the cultic hierarchy in the post-exilic theocracy of Nehemiah, but given their ambivalence to the Cult detected in the course of this study, this is unlikely. It is more likely that they died out in the late exilic or early post-exilic periods, but precisely when and
why they died out must remain a mystery—perhaps they had insufficient offspring to continue the sect, or were killed off by plague, or perhaps even by attack. At any rate, the references in the Jewish literature are sufficiently unlike the biblical references to make it certain that they do not refer to the historical Rechabites, so we are unjustified in claiming that the Rechabites survived beyond the end of the sixth century BCE.

Even if the Rechabites were extinct by the end of the sixth century, they nevertheless represent no mean achievement in the history of Israel. As a group, they survived for around 300 years, maintaining their distinctive practices and outlook. Even if their influence on Israelite and Judaean society was marginal, they nevertheless stood as a symbol and reminder of true Yahwistic faith, as a symbol and reminder of the prophetic critique of the social system of Israel, a critique expressed as much by their lifestyle as by their words. If their quiet message was not heard by society at large, that was not their fault. They had fulfilled their vocation, they had received their promised salvation of 'long life in the land'. They survived the Fall of Jerusalem, and not only escaped the destruction and the chaos, but did so still maintaining their lifestyle and practices, within the land of Israel. Depicted like this, and this picture accords better with the available data than any of the other theories advanced about them, the Rechabites represent a concrete Old Testament example of 'watchmen for the house of Israel' (Ezek. 3:16-21, 33:1-9). The biblical
Rechabites were not shepherds, metalworkers or house-slaves, but prophets, and acted as such in the land of Israel from the second half of the ninth to the end of the sixth centuries BCE.