

## Durham E-Theses

---

*The rechabites in the bible and in Jewish tradition to  
the time of rabbi David Kimhi*

Christopher Hammond Knights

### How to cite:

---

Knights, Christopher Hammond (1988) *The rechabites in the bible and in Jewish tradition to the time of rabbi David Kimhi*. Doctoral thesis, Durham University.

### Use policy

---

The full-text may be used and/or reproduced, and given to third parties in any format or medium, without prior permission or charge, for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes provided that:

- a full bibliographic reference is made to the original source
- a <https://etheses.durham.ac.uk/id/eprint/6707/> is made to the metadata record in Durham E-Theses
- the full-text is not changed in any way

The full-text must not be sold in any format or medium without the formal permission of the copyright holders.

Please consult the [full Durham E-Theses policy](#) for further details.

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

(2 Volumes)

Volume II

by

Christopher Hammond Knights

The copyright of this thesis rests with the author.  
No quotation from it should be published without  
his prior written consent and information derived  
from it should be acknowledged.

Ph.D.

University of Durham

Department of Theology

1988



19 SEP 1988

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

PART TWO: THE RECHABITES IN JEWISH TRADITION TO THE TIME OF RABBI DAVID KIMHI	3
<u>Chapter Five: The Rechabites in Jewish Tradition to the Time of Rabbi David Kimhi</u>	4
5.1 The Rechabites, the Essenes and the Qumran Community	5
5.2 The Rabbinic References to the Rechabites	13
5.3 The <u>History of the Rechabites</u>	117
5.4 Conclusions: The Rechabites in Jewish Tradition to the Time of Kimhi	140
PROSPECTS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH AND SOME CONTEMPORARY APPLICATIONS	143
NOTES	150
Notes to Chapter One	150
Notes to Chapter Two	158
Notes to Chapter Three	163
Notes to Chapter Four	180
Notes to Chapter Five	193
Notes to Prospects and Applications	205
BIBLIOGRAPHY	206
ABBREVIATIONS	227



PART TWO:

THE RECHABITES IN JEWISH TRADITION TO THE TIME OF  
RABBI DAVID KIMHI

CHAPTER FIVE: THE RECHABITES IN JEWISH TRADITION TO THE TIME  
OF RABBI DAVID KIMHI

Part One of this thesis was concerned with discovering the historical Rechabites, by means of a careful reading of the relevant biblical texts, coupled with some insights drawn from the Social Sciences. A full picture of the sect of the Rechabites, which flourished in Israel in the period c.825-c.500 BCE, has now been drawn. The purpose of this second part of the study is to explore the various ways in which the biblical texts that refer, or were thought to refer, to the Rechabites, primarily Jeremiah 35 and 1 Chronicles 2:55, were used in the writings of Early Judaism.

Jacob Neusner has divided the literature of Early Judaism into four categories: the literature from Qumran; the Apocryphal and Pseudepigraphical writings; the pharisaic or rabbinic writings; and the documents of the New Testament and the Early Church.<sup>1</sup> This seems to be the most convenient way of classifying the material, and it is adopted here. In practice, this means that there are three main sections in this chapter, a short one dealing with the Qumran literature, a long one dealing with the various rabbinic texts, and then a third, again relatively short, one, dealing with the single relevant Pseudepigraphon. There is no section dealing with the Christian references, because the New Testament makes no mention whatsoever of the Rechabites, and the few references to them to be found in the patristic writings are best considered in connection with the

other traditions, rather than as a separate corpus of material.

It should be re-emphasised that we are here dealing with tradition, not with history. There is no evidence to support the claim that the historical Rechabites, mentioned in the Hebrew Bible, survived any much longer than the end of the sixth century BCE. That the biblical texts referring to the Rechabites were appropriated by other groups within Early Judaism seems unmistakable, however, and it is the way that those texts were appropriated that is the concern of this chapter and part of the present study.

#### 5.1: THE RECHABITES, THE ESSENES AND THE QUMRAN COMMUNITY

It has occasionally been proposed, most notably by Matthew Black, that the Essenes/Qumran Community<sup>2</sup> were the descendents of the Rechabites. It should be admitted that this proposal has received little attention from scholars, but it does need to be investigated and analysed. The purpose of this section, therefore, is to examine the material concerning the Essenes in Philo and Josephus, in the Qumran literature and in the Damascus Document,<sup>3</sup> in order to ascertain whether there are indeed any links between the two groups and, if so, of what sort.

Matthew Black's theory, first proposed in 1961 and restated in 1965,<sup>4</sup> was that the Essenes developed out of the Hasid movement which emerged in Judaism at the time

of the Seleucid persecutions. The Hasidim, however, did not represent a complete innovation in the history of Israel.

Rather,

the basic elements in Hasidic Judaism which eventually crystallized into the sect or order of Essenes go very far back into Israel's religious past. I refer to their asceticism, which is undoubtedly to be traced to an ultimate origin in the ancient tribal asceticism, in particular that of the Rechabites or Kenites.<sup>5</sup>

For Black, this "ancient tribal asceticism" stems ultimately from the desert origins of Yahwism, the Rechabites and the Kenites representing "reactionary revivals of 'old nomad tribal customs'".<sup>6</sup>

It is immediately apparent that, whatever his beliefs about the Essenes are, Black's opinions about the Rechabites rest on assumptions that have now been shown to be either unwarranted, or else highly questionable: the link between the Kenites and the Rechabites; the 'Nomadic Ideal' in Ancient Israel; the Rechabites being nomads; the Rechabites being ascetics, with customs which were representative of a revival of ancient customs and practices. All these assumptions have been challenged in the course of this study. As it stands, Black's theory is untenable, because its characterisation of the Rechabites is inaccurate.

It may, nevertheless, still be possible to find links between the Rechabites and the Essenes, but a method

different from that proposed by Black is required. What is needed is a recalling of the distinctive Rechabite practices, and then an examination of the literature by and about the Essenes for possible parallels.

At the start of this exercise it should be stated quite clearly that none of the Dead Sea Scrolls so far published makes any reference to the Rechabites. Neither do the references in Philo and Josephus. Admittedly, Josephus makes mention of the ancient origins of the Essenes, as he does of the ancient origins of the Pharisees and Sadducees, but that is by no means equivalent to saying that they developed from the Rechabites. In his analysis of CD, Philip Davies argues that it reflects an origin for the pre-Qumran Essenes in the Babylonian Exile<sup>7</sup> - surely an 'ancient origin' from Josephus' point of view!

This lack of explicit mention of the Rechabites in the Qumran Scrolls and in the Greek authorities should immediately make us wary of asserting that the Rechabites were some sort of proto-Essene group, or that the Essenes used the biblical texts about the Rechabites as part of their own self-understanding. This caution is further borne out by a comparison of the practices of the Rechabites and those of the Essenes.

The Rechabites were clearly married, and produced offspring within their community, as Jer. 35:6,8 demonstrate. The evidence of the Dead Sea Scrolls and of the Greek writers

on the Essenes is not unambiguous on this subject, however. IQSa and IQM certainly imply married sectaries, and the community reflected by CD is also a married one, but IQS is completely silent on the matter, and may reflect a celibate, male community. Josephus is of the opinion that there were two orders of Essenes, one of which was celibate, the other of which practised marriage, but for the sole purpose of procreation.<sup>8</sup> There is no evidence that the Rechabites married solely to maintain their race. Philo also thinks that the Essenes were celibate.<sup>9</sup>

The Rechabites were commanded by Jonadab to live in tents. While it seems that all the buildings at Qumran were intended for communal use, and that the members of the community there lived in caves, tents, huts or other temporary structures, the term **אֹהֶל**, 'tent', appears but rarely in the Scrolls, and when it does, it apparently does not refer to the dwelling places of the Essenes. The term **מַחֲנֶה**, 'camp', is, however, fairly frequent as a designation of the community, so if a **מַחֲנֶה** was made up of tents, then its occurrence could be an indication that a tent-dwelling community was meant. It is, however, by no means certain that **מַחֲנֶה** in the Dead Sea Scrolls implies tents. Helfmeyer argues that **מַחֲנֶה** in the Scrolls denotes "'communities' or 'separate settlements' with their own specific rules", and not 'collections of tents'.<sup>10</sup> Num. 13:19 presents a biblical usage of **מַחֲנֶה** in the sense of 'unfortified towns'. CD speaks of **עִרֵם**, 'cities', and **בֵּית**, 'house', as well as **מַחֲנֶה**, so it seems unlikely that the Essenes had a 'tent ideology'

like the Rechabites. There is nothing in Philo or Josephus to contradict this conclusion.

It is interesting to note that Abbot Nilus of Ancyra does seem to connect the Rechabites with the Essenes, on the basis of a common tent-residency and wine-avoidance, when he writes,

Moreover, a group of Jews honoured this kind of life; they are the descendents of Jonadab. They approve of all who wish to live thus, and they introduce them to this polity, living in tents forever, abstaining from wine and delicate food, leading a frugal life ... They therefore take special care of their moral conduct, remaining constant in contemplation to a very great extent, whence they are called Iessaioi (Ἰεσσαῖοι), this name indicating that they are skilled in words,<sup>11</sup>

but whether this monk, who died c.430 CE, had access to any firm historical data is doubtful. More probably, he had access to much the same material as we do (though not the Dead Sea Scrolls) and concluded that, as the Rechabites and the Essenes both represented Jewish ascetical groups, they had to be connected with each other, and wrote his treatise on the origins of Christian monasticism accordingly.<sup>12</sup>

The Rechabites were also prohibited the sowing of seed and the planting of vineyard, ie. they were non-agricultural. Philo says that some of the Essenes labour on the land (ὧν οἱ μὲν γεωπονοῦσιν),<sup>13</sup> CD XIII 10 mentions threshing-floor and wine-vat (מגורין ומגורין), and IQS

gives no indication that the community at Qumran did not practise agriculture so, once again, the practices of the Rechabites and the practices of the Essenes are different.

The same appears to be the case with wine. The Rechabites were commanded not to drink  $\text{קָיִי}$ , most probably 'all intoxicants'. The term  $\text{קָיִי}$  is very uncommon in the Scrolls. For instance, in CD it is only used in the quotation of Deut. 32:33 and its explanation, VIII 9-10=XIX 22-23, which is related to the 'rebels', and so is not really a reference to literal wine to be drunk at all.<sup>14</sup>  $\text{תַּירוֹשׁ}$ , 'must', is, however, common in the Scrolls other than CD. Whether  $\text{תַּירוֹשׁ}$  represents fermented or unfermented juice of the grape in the Essene writings is still a matter for scholarly debate, but the general consensus seems to be that it denotes an unfermented liquid.<sup>15</sup> If the Qumran community was abstinent, then it can be explained as stemming from their evident self-conception as a priestly community, and need not be related in any way to the Rechabites. Philo's account of the Therapeutae of Egypt, who may have been related to the Essenes, speaks of their avoidance of wine, and explicitly relates it to priesthood.<sup>16</sup> Despite Jerome's statement,<sup>17</sup> it is not entirely clear whether Josephus intends to say that the Essenes abstained from meat and wine.<sup>18</sup>

The Rechabites and the Essenes also seem to stand at variance with each other in their attitudes to the Land,  $\text{הַאֲדָמָה/הָאָרֶץ}$ . The Rechabites lived in it, Jer. 35:7,11, and not in the desert. IQS VIII 13f, IX 20, IQM I 2f,

4QpPs37 II 1, however, all indicate that the Qumran community deliberately chose to live in the desert, and 1QH IV 8 and VIII 4 may also indicate this.  $\text{רַב־דֶּבֶר}$ , 'desert', is, however, virtually absent from CD, being found only in III 7, which refers to the Israelites in the wilderness of Sinai. While Pliny speaks of the Essene encampment by the shores of the Dead Sea,<sup>19</sup> Philo speaks of them being resident in villages, but not in the desert,<sup>20</sup> and Josephus says that they settle in large numbers in every town.<sup>21</sup>

The purpose of the Rechabite practices was, according to Jer. 35:7, to secure long life in the land where the Rechabites were sojourners ( $\text{גֵּרֵי אֶרֶץ}$ ). Words associated with  $\sqrt{\text{גר}}$  are, however, not common in the Scrolls. The stem is used in 'sojourning in the land of Damascus' in CD VI 5, cf. IV 6. There are two uses of the verb in 1QH,<sup>22</sup> but neither are very helpful. The noun  $\text{גֵּר}$  appears once in 4QF1 and three times in CD,<sup>23</sup> where it denotes the 'alien' or the 'convert' - none of which provides much of a parallel with the Rechabites.

It is clear that the material dealing directly with the Qumran community, ie. the Dead Sea Scrolls other than CD, offers little in the way of possible parallels to the Rechabites. It might have been thought that the non-Qumran material, CD and the accounts in Philo and Josephus, would have been more fruitful, especially if Davies is correct in concluding that the original community represented by CD came into existence during the Exile,<sup>24</sup> but this is

not the case. By isolating the distinctive features of Rechabite practice, marriage, tent-residence, non-agriculturalism, wine-avoidance and living in the Land as 'sojourners', and by comparing them in turn with the variegated material we have concerning the Essenes, the initial caution, voiced because of the lack of occurrences of 'Rechabites' in the Qumran literature, is further strengthened. Not one of the Rechabite practices is unambiguously found in the literature concerning the Essenes. In particular, evidence for Essene tent-residency and agriculture-avoidance is non-existent. Rather, there is evidence to the contrary. The Essenes were not influenced by the Rechabites or by the biblical texts dealing with the Rechabites.

Some scholars, such as Schoeps and Kohler, have attempted to find a connection between the Rechabites and the Essenes on the basis of the rabbinic literature.<sup>25</sup> Both these scholars, however, were writing before the impact of the discovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls was fully realised, so their information about the Essenes was severely limited. The rabbinic references to the Rechabites<sup>26</sup> remain, however, and a number of them stand markedly at variance with the biblical data about them, yet at the same time seemingly very close to what we know about the Essenes. Hence, the views of Schoeps and Kohler are understandable, but it has been shown that a direct connection between the Rechabites and the Essenes is unlikely. Another possibility is that some of the rabbinic texts which mention the Rechabites are, in fact, alluding to the Essenes, but the following section of this study, which will be devoted to an examination of those

rabbinic references, will show that this is also unlikely.

## 5.2: THE RABBINIC REFERENCES TO THE RECHABITES

The term 'rabbinic' is usually applied to those works which are thought to have derived from the Rabbinical Schools which flourished in both Palestine and Babylon in the period following the destruction of the Temple in 70 CE. Scholars commonly close this period with the Yalkutim, the mediaeval rabbinic anthologies, which date from the period c.1200-c.1550 CE. Within this period, the following, roughly chronological, divisions of the vast corpus of material are generally identified: Mishnah and Talmud; Tannaitic Midrashim; Midrash Rabbah; Homiletic Midrashim and the Yalkutim. Although Peter Schäfer has recently demonstrated the problems with studying rabbinic literature in general, and dating the various parts of it in particular,<sup>27</sup> this traditional order will be followed in the ensuing investigation of the rabbinic traditions about the Rechabites, and an attempt will be made, not only to analyze, but also to date those traditions. In doing this, it is recognised that, compared with biblical studies, rabbinic/Second Temple studies are still very much in their infancy, as Schäfer, Grabbe and particularly Neusner have shown,<sup>28</sup> and that therefore much of what is argued here must be tentative, and open to revision as the study of rabbinics progresses. Despite its tentativeness, the present study is nevertheless of value, as it represents the first attempt to gather together in one place for study all the references to the Rechabites in the

rabbinic literature, which should present a reasonably clear picture of the various Jewish interpretations of our group in the period from the Mishnah to the Yalkutim, even if the precise dates of those various interpretations remain elusive.

In locating the references to the Rechabites in the rabbinic literature, two works proved invaluable, A. Hyman's המסורה והמסורה<sup>29</sup> and L. Ginzberg's Legends of the Jews.<sup>30</sup> Virtually all the references to the Rechabites or citations of scriptural texts concerning them mentioned in these two works are investigated here.<sup>31</sup> Other than those to the specific chapters in the Hebrew Bible where the Rechabites appear, or were thought to appear, the Targumim have proved to be singularly devoid of references to the Rechabites. In the Tannaitic Midrashim, references to the Rechabites are found in the commentaries on Exodus 18:27, Numbers 10:29-32, 24:21-23, Deuteronomy 12:5, 33:12. The Onkelos, Neofiti, Pseudo-Jonathan and Fragment Targumim to all these verses were consulted, but they were either not extant, or else did not mention the Rechabites, and so form no part of this enquiry.

Within the rabbinic texts, the same, or very similar, traditions often appear more than once. When this occurs, the tradition is analysed only when it first appears in the present study. In the other instances, cross-reference is made back to it, thus avoiding unnecessary repetition.

Although the rabbinic era is generally closed with the Yalkutim, this survey is concluded by a consideration of two Jewish mediaeval commentators, Rashi and David Kimḥi (Radak), who were roughly contemporary with the Yalkut Shim<sup>C</sup>oni, but who in many ways mark the beginning of a new era of scriptural interpretation.

### Mishnah and Talmud

There is but one reference to the Rechabites in the Mishnah. It is found in the list of families that brought the wood-offering to the Second Temple, Ta<sup>C</sup>anith 4:5:

The Wood-offering of the Priests and the people was brought nine times [in the year]: on the 1st of Nisan, by the family of Arah of the tribe of Judah; on the 20th of Tammuz by the family of David of the tribe of Judah; on the 5th of Ab, by the family of Parosh of the tribe of Judah; on the 7th of the self-same month by the family of Jonadab the son of Rechab; on the 10th, by the family of Senaah of the tribe of Benjamin; on the 15th, by the family of Zattu of the tribe of Judah together with the Priests and Levites and all whose tribal descent was in doubt, and the family of the pestle-smugglers and the family of the fig-pressers. On the 20th of the same month [it was brought] by the family of Pahath Moab of the tribe of Judah; on the 20th of Elul, by the family of Adin of the tribe of Judah; on the 1st of Tebet no Maamad assembled at all since on that day there was appointed the Hallel, an additional offering

and a wood offering.<sup>32</sup>

While both the Bavli and the Yerushalmi quote this Mishnah, their Gemara to it do not address themselves to the appearance of the family of Jonadab the son of Rechab among those who supplied the wood-offering for the Temple, instituted by Nehemiah.<sup>33</sup>

In the Mekhiltas, there appears a story about the 'water-drinking sacrificers'. It seems that the analysis of this story affects the understanding of the tradition found in the Mishnah, so analysis of this Mishnah text will be found along with that of the 'water-drinking sacrificers' story on pages 72-73.

There are a number of references to the Rechabites to be found in the Bavli. It will be convenient to start with the citation of 1 Chron. 2:55 in bSotah 11a, for it will become clear, as this study progresses, that the Rabbis regarded this scriptural verse as referring to the Rechabites.

The relevant paragraph of the Talmud passage reads:

R. Hiyya b. Abba said in the name of Rabbi Simai, There were three in that plan, viz. Balaam, Job and Jethro. Balaam who devised it was slain; Job who silently acquiesced was afflicted with sufferings; Jethro, who fled, merited that his descendants should sit in the Chamber of Hewn Stone, as it is said: And the families of the scribes which dwelt at Jabez; the Tirathites, the Shimeathites, the Sucath-

ites. These are the Kenites that came of Hammath, the father of the House of Rechab; and as it is written, And the children of the Kenite, Moses' father-in-law, etc.<sup>34</sup>

The plan in which Balaam, Job and Jethro were supposed to have been involved was Pharaoh's plan to destroy Israel by drowning all the new-born male Israelites, as recounted in Exodus 1:15-16. The story is repeated in bSanhedrin 106a and in Exodus Rabbah 1:9,<sup>35</sup> where R. Hiyya is said to have spoken in the name of R. Simon, rather than in the name of R. Simai. Both Hiyya and Simai are traditionally held to be of the sixth generation of Tannaim, ie. to have flourished in the period 200-220 CE although, of course, the fact that a saying is ascribed to a particular Rabbi is no guarantee that he actually said it, or that it originated with him.

The tradition that, because of Jethro's activities, his descendents, the Kenites, were worthy to sit in the Chamber of Hewn Stone, Hebrew סַבְּבֵי הַבֵּית הַבְּנוּי, is found elsewhere also, but with different reasons. In bSanhedrin 103b-104a, which is cited in Yalkut Shimoni to the Prophets 130,<sup>36</sup> R. Johanan, usually thought to be a first generation Palestinian Amora, is quoted as saying,

As a reward for [Jethro's saying] 'Call him, that he may eat bread', his descendents were privileged to sit in the Hall of Hewn Stone [as scribes], as it is written, And the family of the scribes which dwell at Jabez, the Tirathites, the

Shimeathites and Sucathites. These are the Kenites that came of Hemath, the father of the House of Rechab, whilst elsewhere it is written, And the children of the Kenite, Moses' father-in-law, went up out of the city of palm trees with the children of Judah into the wilderness of Judah, which lieth in the south of Arad, and they went and dwelt among the people.

The idea that Jethro's words to his daughters in Exod. 2:20, 'Call him, that he may eat bread', occasioned his descendants' reward of places in the Chamber of Hewn Stone is also found in Tanhumah Jethro 4:

As a reward for 'Call him, that he may eat bread', and it was said of Moses, 'because I drew him out of the water', the descendents of Jethro were worthy to sit in the Chamber of Hewn Stone.<sup>37</sup>

Yet another reason for this reward is found in one of the supplementary passages in the Pesikta de Rab Kahana, viz. Piska 3d, which reads,

As soon as Jethro heard of all the miracles which the Holy One wrought against Egypt and Amalek, he came at once and was converted. When thou smitest a scorner the simple will become prudent (Prov. 19:25). What was Jethro's reward? His descendents had the privilege of sitting as judges in the Chamber of Hewn Stones and to be reckoned as part of Israel; thus it was said, They who sat before Jabez: the Tireathites, the Shimeathites, the Sucathites. These are the Kenites, etc. (1 Chron. 2:55)<sup>38</sup>

There are, then, three different explanations to be found in the rabbinic sources as to why Jethro's descendants, the Kenites, were privileged to sit in the Chamber of Hewn Stone - because Jethro fled from Pharaoh's plan to destroy Israel; because he showed kindness to Moses in the wilderness; and because he repented at the sight of all the miracles which God wrought on Israel's behalf. The fact that the phraseology of the saying, 'His descendants were privileged to sit in the Chamber of Hewn Stone', ie. לכו בכין שִׁשְׁבוּ בלשנת הגדית, or something very similar indeed, is common to all three of these explanations strongly suggests that the tradition that Jethro's sons sat in the Chamber of Hewn Stone predates all the explanations of why they were worthy to be there.

The Chamber of Hewn Stone, in which Jethro's descendants were worthy to sit, was, according to bSanhedrin 41a, the room in the Temple court which was used by the Sanhedrin up until forty years prior to the destruction of the Temple, ie. until 30 CE, cf. bRosh Hashanah 31a. 'To sit in the Chamber of Hewn Stone' means 'to sit in the Sanhedrin', prior to 30 CE. Thus, the tradition is claiming that the Kenites were members of the Sanhedrin in the decades around the turn of the era.

The Kenites were not the only descendants of Jethro in the rabbinic traditions. It was said earlier that the Rabbis regarded 1 Chronicles 2:55 as referring to the Rech-

abites. As well as using this verse of scripture as a proof-text for the claim that Jethro merited that his descendants should sit in the Chamber of Hewn Stone, the Rabbis also advanced it as a 'proof' that the Rechabites were identical with the Kenites. Thus, the Mekhilta of Rabbi Ishmael to Exodus 18:27,<sup>39</sup> Sifre Numbers 78,<sup>40</sup> and Yalkut Shimoni to the Prophets 38 all have the saying,

And whence do we learn that the sons of Jonadab [ie. the Rechabites] were from the descendents of Jethro? As it is said, These are the Kenites who came from Hammath, the father of the House of Rechab.

The discussion of Exod. 18:27 in the Mekhilta of Rabbi Simeon bar Yohai also has a long passage about the Rechabites. In the course of it, the following question and answer are found:

And who are these people? These are the Kenites who came from Hammath, father of the House of Rechab. And scripture says, And the sons of the Kenite, the father-in-law of Moses, went up from the City of Palm Trees. You should understand that the House of Rechab is from Jethro.<sup>41</sup>

The only piece of 'evidence' to be advanced in the rabbinic literature for the identification of the Kenites and the Rechabites is 1 Chron. 2:55 and, as will be shown below,<sup>42</sup> there are even places where it is presumed before it is explicitly stated. The connection between the Kenites and the Rechabites is never denied in the rabbinic sources. The closest that anyone comes to such a denial is in the commentary on 1 Chron. 2:55 ascribed to Rashi, which reads:

These were the Kenites - and where was their place? Were they not inhabitants of Kain? There was their place, as it is written, 'Kain, Gibeah and Timnah' (Joshua 15:57). Who came from Hammath the father of the House of Rechab - because they went forth from Hammath, for he was of the House of Rechab, and dwelt in Kain.

In his commentary on Jeremiah 35, however, Rashi quite explicitly states that the Rechabites were of the sons of Jethro. Whatever the historical truth of the matter, and it will be recalled that this study has concluded that 1 Chron. 2:55 does not mention the Rechabites at all,<sup>43</sup> the Kenites and the Rechabites are inextricably linked in rabbinic tradition.

And just as there are rabbinic traditions about the Kenites sitting in the Sanhedrin, so there are rabbinic traditions about the Rechabites sitting in the Sanhedrin. Jeremiah 35:7 terms the Rechabites גֵּרִים, 'sojourners'. By the rabbinic period, however, גֵּרִים and גֵּרִים had come to mean rather 'proselytes'. Thus, in Sifre Numbers 78, Rabbi Joshua says of the Rechabites,

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.

Yalkut Shimoni to the Prophets 38 and 323 ascribe this saying to Rabbi Jonathan, rather than to Rabbi Joshua. Joshua is thought to have lived around the time of the Fall of the Temple and just after. Jonathan is held to have been a fourth generation Tanna, and so to have flourished around the middle

of the second century CE, and to have been of the school of Rabbi Ishmael.

The same idea, of the Rechabites sitting in the Sanhedrin, is found also in the Mekhilta of Rabbi Simeon to Exodus 18:27, and Sifre Zutta to Numbers 10:29,<sup>44</sup> although in both cases it is expressed in a way different from that in the passage in Sifre Numbers. The Mekhilta passage reads:

Rabbi Simeon said: Was not the High Priesthood already cut off? What do I then understand by 'There will not be cut off a man to Jonadab' if not that those who sit in the Sanhedrin will not be separated from him forever?

And the one from Sifre Zutta:

So, just as he acted out of love, so God gave back to him out of love, for thus God says to Jeremiah, 'There will not be cut off a man to Jonadab the son of Rechab standing before me forever', so that there should not be separated from him dwellers of the Sanhedrin forever.

These two quotes provide us with an important clue towards understanding the origin of the traditions currently under consideration. They represent attempts to explain the true meaning of the Promise to the Rechabites, found in scripture at Jer. 35:19, 'There will not be cut off a man to Jonadab the son of Rechab standing before me forever'. 'Standing before Yahweh', עמד לפני יהוה, which, as has been shown,<sup>45</sup> is found fairly frequently in the Hebrew Bible,

was understood by the Rabbis to denote primarily Temple Service and, indeed, there are various traditions, both Jewish and Christian, that the Rechabites became priests. Thus, Sifre Numbers 78, again followed by Yalkut Shim<sup>C</sup>oni to the Prophets 38 and 323, recounts an alternative view to the one that the Rechabites became members of the Sanhedrin:

And others say that their daughters married priests and that their sons' sons offered sacrifice upon the altar.

In the Hebrew Bible, only those who were able to trace their ancestry back to Aaron were eligible to become priests, so the only way that the Rabbis could explain their belief that the Rechabites, who were not only non-Aaronic but also, in their view, non-Israelite, became priests was by positing that there was intermarriage between the House of the Rechabites and the line of Aaron.

The Targum to Jer. 35:19 also seems to show an awareness of the tradition that the Rechabites became priests. It renders the Promise to the Rechabites as, 'There will not cease a man to Jonadab son of Rechab ministering before me forever'. The Aramaic verb rendered 'minister' is שמש, which is regularly used of priestly service in the Targumim.

The Church Historian Eusebius also knows of this tradition. In his Ecclesiastical History II.23.16-17, his account of the martyrdom of James the Just, we read:

And while they were stoning him, one of the priests of the sons of Rechab, the son of Rachabim, who had witness borne to them by

Jeremiah the prophet, cried aloud saying,  
'Cease ye; what do ye? The just one is  
praying on your behalf'.<sup>46</sup>

This passage is apparently drawn from Hegesippus' fifth Memoir, but although Hegesippus is to be dated to the mid-second century CE, it is by no means certain that the tradition that a Rechabite priest interceded for James can be dated this early. It may have originated with Eusebius himself, who lived between c.263 and c.339 CE, for in the other witness to the martyrdom of James, ie. Epiphanius' Panarion 78:14, this intercession is made by James' cousin and successor, Simeon son of Clopas. Like Eusebius, Epiphanius also drew on the work of Hegesippus, and H.J. Lawlor has argued that "Epiphanius had access to a better text of Hegesippus than Eusebius".<sup>47</sup> If this is indeed the case, and it is disputed, notably by Hans von Campenhausen,<sup>48</sup> Epiphanius is more likely to have preserved the original text of Hegesippus in the account of James' death. Given that it is thus uncertain whether the tradition that a Rechabite priest was present at James' death was known to Hegesippus or not, for the moment it is safest simply to state that, by the time that Eusebius came to compose his Ecclesiastical History, the Jewish tradition that the Rechabites became priests was already known in some Christian circles, and not to ascribe an earlier date for its appearance in Christian writings.

This Jewish tradition, however, was not universally accepted in rabbinic circles. The passages in which it

is argued that the Rechabites became part of the Sanhedrin have already been quoted. Rabbi Joshua, in the passage in Sifre Numbers 78, argues that, as all Israel - which included proselytes - were allowed into the Temple courts, Jer. 35:19 must denote something different, something special: that they became members of the Sanhedrin. The implication behind Joshua's claim is that the Temple was still standing, and this is borne out by Urbach's observation that Joshua "lived while the Temple was still in existence".<sup>49</sup> The saying of Rabbi Simeon, in the Mekhilta which bears his name, argues for the Rechabites' presence in the Sanhedrin in a rather different manner. The High Priesthood has been destroyed, so Jer. 35:19 could not have meant that the Rechabites became part of the priesthood, for scripture cannot fail. The Sanhedrin was still in existence, so they must have become part of that body. The implication behind this argument is that the Temple has been destroyed, and this is confirmed by the general opinion that Rabbi Simeon flourished in Palestine in the second half of the second century CE - well after the Fall of the Temple in 70.

The last place where the Rechabites are linked with the Sanhedrin is in the Targum to 1 Chronicles 4:12. As this has been dealt with elsewhere in this thesis,<sup>50</sup> no comments on it are required at this juncture.

It is perhaps surprising to discover that there is only one text where the Rechabites are said specifically to have sat in the Chamber of Hewn Stone, despite that being

the place where the Kenites were said to have sat, and despite the Kenites and the Rechabites being identified with each other in the rabbinic literature. The text is Yalkut Shimoni to the Torah 771, which is acknowledged as coming from Yelammedenu (=Tanhumah?).<sup>51</sup> It reads:

And he saw the Kenite (Numbers 24:21). When he [ie. Balaam] saw the sons of Jonadab the son of Rechab sitting in the Chamber of Hewn Stone, he exclaimed in astonishment, Only Priests and Levites and Israelites may sit in the Sanhedrin, but because he said, Call him, that he may eat bread, his sons were worthy to sit in the Chamber of Hewn Stone, in the powerful place.

Can all these various traditions about the Kenites, the Rechabites, the Chamber of Hewn Stone and the Sanhedrin be given a date and setting for their origin? While Neusner's works rightly urge us to be cautious in matters of date and historical accuracy in rabbinic traditions, and while it may eventually transpire that the traditions under consideration may simply be the result of rabbinic Bible exegesis attempting to reconcile what is said in Jer. 35:19 with what is said in 1 Chron. 2:55, it is nevertheless interesting to note that the New Testament<sup>52</sup> and Josephus<sup>53</sup> indicate that the centuries around the turn of the era were a time of massive conversion to Judaism. This scale of conversion decreased dramatically in the second and subsequent centuries CE, largely due to the rising influence of Christianity.<sup>54</sup> Within a context where there were many converts to Judaism, it would have been inevitable that some converts and their descendents would have ended up in the Sanhedrin. These con-

vert members of the Sanhedrin would have needed some sort of justification for their presence in the Supreme Court. Jethro and his offspring, the Kenites and the Rechabites, were, along with Rahab and Ruth, viewed as the archetypal representatives of proselytes in Jewish tradition, so it would have been natural for the proselyte members of the Sanhedrin to have been referred to as Kenites or Rechabites, and for a justification for their membership to have been sought in terms of the deeds of their 'ancestor', Jethro. This suggests that the traditions concerning the Kenites, the Rechabites and the Sanhedrin may stem from the period around the turn of the era, and may reflect disputes about the status of proselytes vis-à-vis membership of the Sanhedrin. In connection with this, it may be wondered whether the passage from the Yalkut to the Torah 771, despite its lateness, in fact reflects an ancient tradition, in which the older view concerning the composition of the Sanhedrin is characterised as coming from Balaam, reflecting polemic against those who opposed the innovations.

'Jethro merited that his descendents should sit in the Chamber of Hewn Stone' because, as a result of the large numbers of converts to Judaism in the last decades of the Second Temple, significant numbers of proselytes entered the Sanhedrin for the first time. These proselyte members of the Sanhedrin needed to be able to justify their position in the face of opposition. They did so by adopting as their ancestor Jethro, who had fled from Pharaoh's plan to destroy Israel, who had fed Moses in the wilderness, who had converted to

Judaism at the sight of God's saving acts, and who had taught Torah to Israel (Exodus 18) - and one of the principal functions of the Sanhedrin was to give instruction in the Torah. Indeed, there are various traditions about Jethro, the Kenites and the Rechabites being Torah scholars and Torah teachers, and these traditions may predate and may have influenced those about Jethro's descendents sitting in the Sanhedrin, as will be shown as this study of the rabbinic references to the Rechabites progresses.<sup>55</sup>

The next place in the Bavli where a reference to the Rechabites is found is in bBaba Bathra 91b. In this passage, which occurs in the middle of a discussion about Ruth and her relatives, we find the following Haggadic interpretation of 1 Chronicles 4:23:

These were the potters and those that dwell among plantations and hedges; there they dwelt occupied in the king's work. These were the potters refers to the sons of Jonadab the son of Rechab who kept the oath of their father. Those that dwelt among the plantations has reference to Solomon who in his kingdom was like a [constantly flourishing] plant. And hedges refers to the Sanhedrin who fenced in the breaches in Israel. There they dwelt occupied in the king's work refers to Ruth the Moabitess who saw the kingdom of Solomon, the grandson of her grandson; for it is said: And [Solomon] caused a throne to be set up for the king's mother; and R. Eleazar said 'to the mother of the dynasty'.

As the Soncino translator correctly notes, the Talmud has taken נִצְרָה, 'they kept', as being from a root similar to that of הַיֹּצְרִים, 'the potters'.<sup>56</sup>

The whole discussion about Ruth and her relatives, in which this tradition is found, also turns up in the passage from Sifre Zutta which has already been referred to.<sup>57</sup> However, in the version in Sifre Zutta, 'These were the potters' receives the interpretation 'This refers to Boaz and Ruth'. This would certainly fit the context of the passage in both Sifre Zutta and bBaba Bathra, but there is no immediately obvious reason why Boaz and Ruth should be called 'the potters', and there is no means of telling which (if either) tradition reflects the original story, and which the variant.

The version of the story in the Bavli does, however, help to explain an otherwise somewhat obscure tradition to be found in the first recension of the Aboth of Rabbi Nathan, chapter 35, which reads,

How did the descendents of Jethro make their living? By pottery work, for it is said, And the families of the scribes that dwelt at Jabez ... these are the Kenites that came of Hammath the father of the House of Rechab (I Chron. 2:55), and it says, These are the potters, and those that dwelt among plantations, etc. (I Chron. 4:23). They had been people of importance, householders, owners of fields and vineyards, but for the sake of the service of the King of kings of kings, the Holy One, blessed be He, they gave up everything and went off.<sup>58</sup>

The Hebrew text in fact finishes the quote from 1 Chron. 2:55 at 'Jabez'.<sup>59</sup>

At first sight, the contention that the sons of Jethro were provided for by pottery seems anything but proved by a simple citing of a part of 1 Chron. 4:23 alongside a part of 1 Chron. 2:55, but the train of thought in the mind of the author of this tradition in ARN can be reconstructed by means of the exegetical tradition in bBaba Bathra 91b. By quoting 'These are the scribes, the dwellers of Jabez' from 1 Chron. 2:55 and 'These are the potters, and those that dwell among plantations', or 'And those who dwelt at Netaim', from 1 Chron. 4:23, the author of the tradition in ARN has presented the following, in a compressed form: the Kenites, the sons of Jethro, were Rechabites (1 Chron. 2:55); because the Rechabites kept (וְרָצוּ) the oath of their father, they were the potters (וְהָיוּ צֹרְפִים), who lived at Netaim; therefore the Kenites were potters.

This suggests that the author of the tradition found in ARN I, 35 was aware of the one in bBaba Bathra 91b. Judah Goldin, on the basis of the Rabbis named, language, idiom and teaching, places the composition of ARN to not "much later than the third or following century".<sup>60</sup> If he is correct in this conclusion, then the tradition found in the Bavli must predate this.

The idea of the Rechabites leaving all that they owned will be explored further below, when the traditions

that they went to study Torah are investigated.<sup>61</sup>

The final place in the Bavli which uses a biblical text thought to be connected with the Rechabites appears in bKiddushin 30a. The sentence in question reads,

The early [scholars] were called Soferim,  
because they used to count all the letters of  
the Torah.

Compare the very similar jShekalim 5:

R. Abbahu said, It is written, 'The families of the scribes, the inhabitants of Jabez'. Scripture says Soferim, because they arranged the law by numbers.

In his commentary on the Bavli text, Rashi quotes the portion of 1 Chron. 2:55 cited in the Yerushalmi text. According to the Soncino translator, Soferim

is generally applied to the band of scholars from the Babylonian exile, who propagated knowledge of the Torah and interpreted it.<sup>62</sup>

The idea that the early scholars were called Soferim arises through a play on words on the term sofer which, although generally meaning 'scribe', also originally meant 'one who counts'.<sup>63</sup> Thus, the early scribes were seen as counting the letters of the Torah, in order to safeguard the correctness of the text.

This use of 1 Chron. 2:55 really has nothing to do with the Kenites or the Rechabites, although traditions concerning their Torah scholarship do exist.<sup>64</sup> Here, only the

the first four words of the verse are cited by jShekalim and Rashi, because the rest of it is not significant for their purposes. Thus, no further analysis of this tradition is needed.

There is one other place in the Yerushalmi where the Rechabites are mentioned. This is in jTa<sup>C</sup>anith 4:2, which is paralleled by Genesis Rabbah 98:8.

These two texts preserve a tradition of a saying ascribed to Rabbi Levi, generally held to be a second generation Palestinian Amora (c.279-c.320 CE), that a genealogical scroll was found in Jerusalem which gave the ancestry of various Rabbis. The order of the names in the two recensions is not the same, and neither is the context of the saying (demonstrating that it is an isolated tradition, predating both jTa<sup>C</sup>an and Genesis Rabbah). For the purposes of this study, the significance of the tradition is that it claims that R. Jose ben R. Halafta was descended from Jonadab ben Rechab. Jose is usually ascribed to the fourth generation of Tannaim (c.140-165 CE).

It is normally claimed that this tradition reveals that Jose ben Halafta traced his lineage from Jonadab ben Rechab.<sup>65</sup> This is not so. It does not state that it was Jose himself who traced his ancestry such, but that the scroll found in Jerusalem traced his ancestry to Jonadab, just as it traced Hillel's to David, R. Jannai's to Eli, R. Hiyya the Elder's to Shephatiah ben Abitel, and so on. This suggests

that the link has been made typologically, rather than genealogically, and that it has been made by someone other than Jose ben Ḥalafta, because they felt that Jose exhibited traits similar to those of Jonadab and the Rechabites.

The Jewish Encyclopaedia suggests that Jose had a tendency towards Essenism,<sup>66</sup> on the basis of the collection of his sayings preserved in bShabbath 118b. These sayings, however, with the possible exception of 'May my portion be with those who pray with the red glow of the sun',<sup>67</sup> do not appear to be markedly Essene in character, so it is unlikely that the ascription of Jonadab to Jose as ancestor is a covert reference to any Essenism on Jose's part. On the other hand, there is no indication that Jose was actually descended from Jonadab, or that he followed Rechabite discipline - there is no evidence that Jose avoided drinking wine, living in houses, sowing seed or planting vineyard, or that he ever felt inclined to live in a tent. In fact, another of his sayings in bShab. 118b suggests that he lived in a permanent dwelling: 'The beams of my house have never seen the seams of my shirt'. The reference to Jose ben Ḥalafta having his descent traced from Jonadab ben Rechab remains mysterious and inexplicable.

### The Mekhiltas

Although the Mekhilta of Rabbi Ishmael and the Mekhilta of Rabbi Simeon are not completely identical, and the precise nature of the relationship between them is still

a matter for scholarly debate, it is nevertheless clear that the two works are closely linked with each other, so they are treated in parallel in this analysis of their exegesis of Exodus 18:27, where their treatment of the Rechabites is found. We are fortunate in having critical editions of both works, and a translation of one of them.<sup>68</sup> For the purposes of the present study, the Mekhilta of Rabbi Ishmael will be abbreviated as Mek. Ishmael and the Mekhilta of Rabbi Simeon as Mek. Rashbi. In what follows, Lauterbach's translation of Mek. Ishmael, Amalek IV, lines 98-182, is given in parallel with the author's own translation of Mek. Rashbi, Jethro 18:27.

Mek. Ishmael

AND MOSES LET HIS FATHER-IN-LAW DEPART. R. Joshua says: He sent him off with all the honors in the world. R. Eleazar of Modi<sup>C</sup>im says: He gave him along many gifts.

From the answer which he gave Moses you can learn all this. It is said: "And he said, 'Leave us not, I pray thee'" (Num. 10.31). Moses said to him, 'You have given us good advice, fair advice. And God agreed with your words. "Leave us not, I

Mek. Rashbi

AND MOSES LET HIS FATHER-IN-LAW DEPART. R. JOSHUA says: He sent him off with all the honours in the world. R. Eleazar of Modi<sup>C</sup>im says: He gave him many gifts.

He said to him, Behold, I shall go and convert the people of my district. From the answer which he gave them you should know what they said to him,

'Leave us not, we pray' (Num. 10:31). They said to him, 'You have given us good advice, fair advice. And God agreed with your words. "Leave us not, we

pray thee"! But he<sup>69</sup> said to  
 him, "Is a lamp of any  
 use except in a dark place?  
 Of what use could a lamp  
 be with the sun and the  
 moon? You are the sun  
 and Aaron is the moon.  
 What should a lamp be doing  
 where there are the sun and  
 the moon?

No! I shall go  
 to my land and tell everybody  
 and convert all the people  
 of my country,  
 leading them  
 to the study of the Torah  
 and bringing them nigh  
 under the wings of  
 the Shekinah.

One might think that he  
 simply went back and did  
 nothing,  
 but scripture says, And  
 the children of the Kenite,  
 Moses' father-in-law,  
 went up out of the city  
 of Palm Trees, etc.<sup>70</sup>

And he went and dwelt  
 with the people.

pray". But he said to  
 them, "Is a lamp of any  
 use except in a dark place?  
 Of what use could a lamp  
 be with the sun and the  
 moon? You are the sun  
 and Aaron is the moon.

No! I shall go  
 and convert all the people  
 of my country,  
 leading them  
 under the wings of  
 heaven.

One might think that he  
 simply went back and did  
 not return,  
 but scripture says, And  
 the children of the Kenite,  
 Moses' father-in-law,  
 went up out of the city  
 of Palm Trees with the  
 children of Judah to the  
 desert of Judah which is  
 south of Arad,  
 And he went and dwelt  
 with the people.

Up to this point, the two Mekhiltas have, despite  
 one or two slight differences, stuck fairly closely to each  
 other. There is nothing so far that appertains directly to

the Rechabites, or to the Kenites that requires comment.

Mek. Rashbi now has a long passage (eight lines in Epstein and Melamed's edition) which discusses various other reasons why Jethro went back to his own country. Epstein and Melamed bracket this section, indicating that it is an addition. Mek. Ishmael continues,

The term "people" here is but a designation for wisdom, as in the passage "No doubt but ye are the people and with you is the perfection of wisdom" (Job 12.2) - do not read Tamut,

'perfection', but Tumat, 'cessation'. As long as the wise man is alive, his wisdom is kept alive with him. As soon as the wise man dies, his wisdom is lost with him. Thus we find that when R. Nathan died, his wisdom was lost with him -

They went and sat with those sitting before Jabez - for were there inhabitants of Jabez? There were only disciples of Jabez -

as it is said,  
And the families of the scribes who sat before Jabez, the Tirathites, the Shimeathites, the Sucathites. These are the Kenites that came from Hammath, the father of the House of Rechab (1 Chron. 2.55).

They went and sat with those sitting before Jabez,

as it is said,  
And the families of the scribes who sat before Jabez, the Tirathites, the Shimeathites, the Sucathites. These are the Kenites that came from Hammath, the father of the House of Rechab (1 Chron. 2:55).

Lauterbach's footnote indicates that the passages marked off by dashes are regarded by him as parenthetical remarks, and "not part of the original Midrash about the Kenites".<sup>71</sup>

When this section of the two Mekhiltas is set out in parallel, it can be seen that, once the bracketed insertion in Epstein and Melamed is removed, Mek. Rashbi preserves the shorter, simpler and, hence, possibly more original reading, for the section which begins by citing Judges 1:16 and ends by citing 1 Chronicles 2:55. For the compiler of Mek. Ishmael, the connection the two verses of scripture was not quite clear enough, so he resorted to a somewhat arbitrary interpretation of 'the people' at the end of Judg. 1:16. He equates 'people' with 'wisdom', on the basis of Job 12:2, by means of which the compiler understands the last phrase of Judg. 1:16 to mean 'and they went and dwelt with wisdom'. This then enhances the link with 1 Chron. 2:55, because Jabez is regarded as the archetypal wise man in the rabbinic literature<sup>72</sup> - because he had scribes sitting before him (1 Chron. 2:55), and because 1 Chron. 4:10 was interpreted as meaning that Jabez requested study of the Torah.

In connecting Judges 1:16 and 1 Chronicles 2:55, the Mekhiltas do not stand alone in claiming that when the sons of Jethro left the city of Palm Trees, they went and joined Jabez. The tradition is found also in Sifre Numbers 78 (quoted in Yalkut Shim<sup>c</sup>oni to the Prophets 38), Sifre Zutta to Num. 10:29, Aboth of Rabbi Nathan I, 35, Sifre Deuteronomy 12:5 and Tanhumah Jethro 4.

Before examining these texts to show how they make the connection between the Kenites going up from the City of Palm Trees and their going before Jabez to study Torah (a fact not made completely clear in the Mekhiltas), it is important to remind ourselves of the two scriptural verses under discussion:

Judges 1:16:

ובני קניז חזקו משח עלו מעיר התמרים  
את בני יהודה מדבר יהודה אשר בנגב ערד  
וילך וישב את העם

And the sons of Keni, father-in-law of Moses, went up from the City of Palm Trees with the sons of Judah to the Desert of Judah, which is south of Arad. And he went and dwelt with the people.

1 Chronicles 2:55:

ומשפחות ספרים יושבי יעבז תרעתיים  
שמעתיים סוכתיים המה הקיבילים הבאים  
מחמת אבי בית רכב

And the families of the scribes, inhabitants of Jabez, Tirathites, Shimeathites, Sucathites. These are the Kenites who came from Hammath, father of the House of Rechab.

The first connection between these two verses is that they both mention Kenites. This makes it natural that the two should be linked. Secondly, Judg. 1:16 claims that 'he (presumably a collective singular) went and dwelt', and 1 Chron. 2:55 mentions 'dwellers of Jabez', so there is also a verbal link. These Kenites, 'dwellers of Jabez', are also called 'families of scribes', and the scribal func-

tion was to study and teach Torah. Hence, for the Rabbis, when the Kenites went up from the City of Palm Trees, they went and dwelt with Jabez and learnt Torah.

The way this basic piece of exposition is worked out varies from text to text. It has already been said that Mek. Rashbi may preserve the original form, and that Mek. Ishmael has made the connection by way of Job 12:2. In Sifre Numbers 78, in a clause by clause discussion of part of 1 Chron. 2:55, the following appears:

'The dwellers of Jabez', because they left Jericho and went alongside Jabez, to Edar, to learn. They believed the Torah, as it is said, 'And Jabez called on the God of Israel, etc. And God granted that which he asked' (ibid. [1 Chron.] 4:11). They were lacking someone from whom to learn, and he was lacking someone to teach. Those who were lacking came to learn alongside him who lacked someone to teach, as it is said, 'And the sons of Keni, father-in-law of Moses, went up from the City of Palm Trees' (Judg. 1:16).

This is quoted in Yalkut Shim<sup>c</sup>oni to the Prophets 38, albeit in quite a different (and also compressed) form:

'They went up from the City of Palm Trees', for they left the fair portion of Jericho, and came before Jabez - to Arad - to learn Torah, as it is said, 'And Jabez called etc. And God granted that which he asked'. Hasidim came to learn alongside a Hasid.

The opening and closing scriptural citations are different, because of the different use to which the Yalkut is putting the saying, viz. as an exposition of Judg. 1:16, rather than

of 1 Chron. 2:55. The insertion of 'the fair portion of Jericho' (דוֹשְׁנָה שֶׁל יְרִיחוֹ) in the Yalkut has probably arisen because, as will be seen, the phrase appears in several other places in connection with this subject. The section following the citation of 1 Chron. 4:11 in the Sifre is a highly awkward piece of Hebrew, using לָמַד in both its senses of 'to teach' and 'to learn'. The same idea, but in completely different, and easier, language, is to be found in Mek. Ishmael, later in its exposition of Exodus 18:27.<sup>73</sup> There are also textual variants in the manuscript tradition of the Sifre - MS  $\tau$  in Hörowitz' apparatus reading חֲסִיד, 'Hasid', and חֲסִידִים, 'Hasidim', for חָסֵר, 'he who lacks', and חֲסֵרִים, 'those who lack'. It would then seem that the text with which the Yalkut-compiler was familiar was of the  $\tau$ -family, from which he has excerpted בָּאוּ חֲסִידִים לְלִמּוֹד אֶצְל חֲסִיד, with his customary method of abbreviating the texts before him.

This means that, in this case, no decision as to the textual priority between the text of the Sifre as represented in the critical edition, and that represented in the Yalkut, can be attempted without further investigation of the manuscripts. Nevertheless, it is still clear that this tradition in the Sifre to Numbers reinforces the connection between Judg. 1:16 and 1 Chron. 2:55 with the Jabez material in 1 Chron. 4:11f.

The authors of ARN I, 35 and Sifre Deuteronomy 12:5<sup>74</sup> both saw no necessity to provide any additional explanation for the claim that, when they left the City of Palm Trees,

the Kenites went before Jabez to study Torah, other than the citation of 1 Chron. 2:55. Sifre Zutta to Num. 10:29 and Tanhumah Jethro 4, however, reproduce a Midrash different from the base form found in Mek. Rashbi, and also different from the forms in Sifre Numbers and Mek. Ishmael. It is introduced differently in the two texts, in Sifre Zutta by 'And there are those who say that they were dwelling there all the time that Joshua was alive, but they went forth to study Torah after he died', and in Tanhumah Jethro by 'When he came into the land, they gave (him) the fair portion of Jericho'. The Midrash then continues in both texts:

He said, I have not come with all my substance, but I have left all which belongs to me in order to learn Torah, but now I am sowing and reaping, and when shall I learn Torah? They said to him, There is a man teaching Torah in the city, and this is a dry place. It is a wilderness, and there is no wheat there. When he heard this from them, he went, as it is said, And the sons of Keni the father-in-law of Moses went up from the City of Palm Trees (Tanhumah completes the citation of Judg. 1:16). They went and they found Jabez sitting in the school-house, and Priests and Levites and Kings were sitting with him - even all Israel were sitting there! They said, We are proselytes, how can we sit with these people? (Sifre Zutta adds: What did they do?) They sat in the gates of the school-house, and were listening and learning, as it is said, And the families of the scribes, the inhabitants of Jabez (Tanhumah continues the quotation to 'These are the Kenites').

The opening speaker is Jethro.

The immediate concern is not with why the Kenites left the City of Palm Trees, which will be dealt with in due course, but with where they went to. Correspondingly, at this stage in the enquiry, the only material of this Midrash to be analysed is that concerning where the Kenites went to.

As in the other texts considered here, the basic explanation is via 1 Chron. 2:55, but in this case another new element has been introduced. Instead of leaving Jabez' precise geographical location unconsidered, this Midrash specifically places him in 'the city', teaching Torah to Priests, Levites, Kings - and to 'all Israel' besides - in a school-house (בית-המדורש). This has probably been derived from the use of עלה in Judg. 1:16. The 'City of Palm Trees' was, for the Rabbis, Jericho, as will be shown below. Jericho was on the pilgrimage route to Jerusalem, as the journey of Jesus to Jerusalem in the Synoptic Gospels, for instance, demonstrates. עלה was used of pilgrimage to the Holy City, cf. the headings to Psalms 120-134, and Jerusalem is geographically a great deal higher than Jericho. If one was to 'go up' from Jericho, the only place one could 'go up' to was Jerusalem. Hence, when the Kenites 'went up' from Jericho, they could only have gone to Jerusalem, the city. With Jabez now located inside the Holy City, the only place where he could possibly be teaching Torah was in a Beth Hamidrash. In this Midrash, his status is magnified still further: no longer has he a few disciples in an unnamed place; rather, 'all Israel' are sitting in his school-house learning Torah from him - forcing the Kenite proselytes (גרים)

to sit in its gateways.

This Midrash does not seem to have any literary dependence on the 'base text' observed in other rabbinic sources, so it could have developed separately, in a completely different milieu. On the other hand, on the basis of the assumption that the simpler a tradition is, the earlier it is likely to be, it may be tentatively proposed that the earliest material arguing that Judg. 1:16 meant that the Kenites went to study Torah with Jabez is that where this is explained simply by a citation of 1 Chron. 2:55, without any further elaboration, and that the latest is the long Midrash contained in Sifre Zutta and Tanhumah Jethro, even though this Midrash does contain other, more ancient, traditions.

It is to be observed that, in this use of 1 Chron. 2:55 to explain Judg. 1:16, the fact that 'House of Rechab' appears in 1 Chron. 2:55 is completely coincidental, and forms no part of the argument. It might be argued that this reflects circles where the link between the Kenites and the Rechabites was not maintained, but this is unlikely. It has already been shown that the Kenite-Rechabite link is never explicitly denied in the rabbinic texts,<sup>75</sup> and it will be shown below that, on the contrary, the underlying assumption is that the two groups were connected, even when it is not explicitly stated.<sup>76</sup>

The foregoing analysis, starting from a passage in the Mekhiltas, has answered the last of the four questions

that the Rabbis asked of Judg. 1:16: where did the sons of Keni go up from? How did they come to be there in the first place? Why did they leave? Where did they go? In the course of answering this last question, the answer to the first, namely that the Kenites went up from Jericho, has been taken for granted. It is now appropriate to justify the claim that the 'City of Palm Trees' in Judg. 1:16 was indeed understood to be Jericho by the Rabbis.

The 'City of Palm Trees' is found as a designation for Jericho elsewhere in the Hebrew Bible at Deut. 34:3 and 2 Chron. 28:15. The term 'City of Palm Trees' appears also in Judg. 3:13, where it almost certainly also means Jericho. Modern scholarship, however, has tended to see in the 'City of Palm Trees' in Judg. 1:16 a reference to some place other than Jericho, cf. Myers<sup>77</sup> and Soggin,<sup>78</sup> who proposes that it here denotes either So<sup>c</sup>ar, on the southern shore of the Dead Sea, or else Tamar, some 30 km further south. mYebamoth 16:7 already makes the former identification, so it is quite ancient. The other references to Jericho in the Mishnah<sup>79</sup> do not call it 'City of Palm Trees', Judg. 1:16 is not cited in the Mishnah, and Zoar is found nowhere else in it.

Despite this connection between the 'City of Palm Trees' and Zoar in mYebamoth, the other rabbinic authorities consulted in connection with this study unanimously agree that the 'City of Palm Trees' in Judg. 1:16 is Jericho.<sup>80</sup> This is also the opinion of Targum Jonathan, which reads קריתא יריחו, 'city of Jericho', for 'City of Palm Trees' in both Judg.

1:16 and 3:13. This equation is no doubt drawn from the fact that it is made elsewhere in scripture.

It is not yet appropriate to consider the second and third questions that the Rabbis asked of Judg. 1:16, as the Mekhilta passage under examination does not treat them. Rather, it is to the next passage in the Mekhilta to Exodus 18:27 that we must now turn:

Mek. Ishmael

Mek. Rashbi

Just as he [Jethro] loved the Torah, so his sons after him loved the Torah, for God says to Jeremiah, 'Go to the House of the Rechabites and make them drink wine. And I set before the House of the Rechabites bowls full of wine and cups, and I said to them, Drink wine' (Jer. 35:2). Jeremiah said to them, 'God told me that you should drink wine'. They said to him, 'Our father commanded us not to drink wine all the days that this house lies desolate. But it is the case that it was not yet destroyed, but he said to us, You should be mourning for it, for its destiny is that it should be destroyed. And he said

to us, Do not anoint,  
and do not write, and do  
not live in houses, and  
we have done according to  
all which Jonadab our  
father commanded us.'

This passage, not found in Mek. Ishmael, opens with the claim that, just as Jethro loved the Torah, so did his descendants after him, with Jer. 35:2 as the proof-text for this claim. The verb rendered 'loved' is אָהַב, and one of the names of Jethro was חֹבַב, 'Hobab', explained in the rabbinic literature as 'because he loved the Torah', as will be shown below.<sup>81</sup> Jer. 35:2 is advanced as evidence to support the claim that Jethro's sons also loved the Torah not only in Mek. Rashbi, but also in Sifre Numbers 78 (quoted in a compressed form in Yalkut Shim<sup>c</sup>oni to the Torah 169), and in Sifre Zutta to Num. 10:29. It is significant that, while Mek. Rashbi and Sifre Numbers 78 both have passages which 'prove' that the Rechabites and the Kenites were identical by citing 1 Chron. 2:55,<sup>82</sup> in both cases this 'proof' occurs later in the text than this implicit assertion of the identity of the two groups. This suggests that the identification of the two groups with each other was such a commonly held belief in the rabbinic era that a 'proof' of it was not required to be set forth before using material concerning the Rechabites to explain material concerning the Kenites.

It has already been observed that 1 Chron. 2:55 was used by the Rabbis to argue that the Kenites-Rechabites learnt

Torah from Jabez. Here it is claimed that they proved themselves faithful adherents of Torah by keeping their father's commands. This presumably means that the Rabbis regarded Jonadab's prohibitions as being consonant with the commands of Torah - although they do not seem to have therefore concluded that Jeremiah's injunction to the Rechabites to drink wine was thus an injunction to break the Torah. Rather, as a later section in the passage of Mek. Rashbi on Exod. 18:27 reveals, Jeremiah's proclamation of the imminent fall of the Temple was seen as the impetus which caused Jonadab to lay his prohibitions on his sons:

Come and see how great is the righteousness which the sons of Jethro have, for lo, Jonadab son of Rechab heard from the mouth of the prophet that the Temple was destined for destruction, and he stood and commanded his sons three prohibitions: that they should not drink wine, and should not build houses and should not plant vineyards, as it is said, And they said, we do not drink wine because Jonadab our father commanded us saying, Do not drink wine, you or your sons forever, and do not build a house and do not sow seed and do not plant vineyard, but live in tents all your days, that you may live many days upon the face of the land wherein you are sojourners (Jer. 35:6-7).

The same tradition is found in Tanhumah Shemini 5:

Why did he reflect and say, Do not drink wine, you and your sons, except that he heard Jeremiah prophesying the destruction of the Temple, and began commanding his sons from then (Jeremiah 35), Do not drink wine, and do not build houses and do not

sow seed and do not plant vineyard and  
 have nothing, but live in tents all your  
 days? And they mourned from then and  
 kept their father's command,

which is reproduced in a slightly different form in Tanhumah  
Buber Shemini 14.<sup>83</sup> In Sifre Numbers 78 (again quoted in  
Yalkut Shim<sup>C</sup>oni to the Prophets 38), the tradition appears  
 in a shortened form:

Because this house is destined to be  
 destroyed, they (Yalkut: we) see it as  
 if it were destroyed now: And a house  
 you will not build and seed you will not  
 sow, etc. And we have obeyed the voice  
 of Jonadab, etc. And we have dwelt in  
 tents and we have obeyed and we have done  
 according to all which Jonadab our father  
 has commanded us.

There are two important features about the tradition  
 reflected in these extracts from rabbinic sources: that the  
 Rechabites observed their distinctive practices as mourning  
 rites because the Temple was destined to be destroyed; and  
 that they did so because Jonadab had heard Jeremiah the pro-  
 phet proclaiming this fate for the Temple. The first feature  
 is also found in the rabbinic exegesis of the gentilics of  
 1 Chron. 2:55, so a full analysis of it will be postponed  
 until this exegesis is examined.<sup>84</sup> At this stage in the  
 investigation, only the second feature will be examined:  
 Jonadab placing his prohibitions on his sons because of  
 Jeremiah's preaching.

So far in this study of the rabbinic traditions

concerning the Rechabites, there has been little on their actual origin. This thesis has followed all modern commentators in seeing the Jonadab ben Rechab in 2 Kings 10 as the 'father' of the Rechabites named in Jeremiah 35. It has sought to place the origin of the Rechabites in a split in the Northern Prophetic Guild Movement, itself formed as a reaction to the evils of society under the Omrides. The explicit connection between the Jonadab of 2 Kings 10 and the Jonadab of Jeremiah 35 only occurs very late indeed in Jewish tradition. In Yalkut Shim<sup>C</sup>oni to the Prophets 3, a passage of the Mekhilta of Rabbi Ishmael which discusses the importance of adding or subtracting a letter to or from someone's names appears. The last example of the change in spelling of a name reads:

You see it also in the case of Jonadab whom they originally called Jehonadab. But after he had come act as he did, they took off one letter from his name, so that he was called merely Jonadab. In this connection, the sages said: Let a man never associate with a wicked person, not even for the purposes of bringing him near to the Torah.<sup>85</sup>

Differences in the spelling of names were deemed significant by the Rabbis, and explanations were advanced for different spellings, especially if it involved the addition or subtraction of a letter. In Sifre Zutta to Num. 10: 29, therefore, the following discussion concerning Jethro is found:

His name was called Jethro (יֶתְרוֹ), because he added (Hiph. of יָרָה) a command in the Torah. And what was the command that he added

in the Torah? As he said to Moses,  
 Choose from all the people (Exodus 18:21).  
 Behold, just as he added a command in the  
 Torah, so God added a letter to his name,  
 for at first he was called Jether, but  
 later he was called Jethro.

Of particular interest for the purposes of this study is the fact that the passage from the Mekhilta cited in the Yalkut does not specify which J(eh)onadab is meant. The compiler of the Yalkut therefore adds a footnote of his own:

And when he came to act as he did: This refers to when they encouraged Amnon to sleep with Tamar, or else it was alluding to Jehonadab ben Rechab, who conspired with Jehu, and was called Jonadab in Jeremiah (35:10). So this is established even more.

In 2 Samuel 13, the story of Amnon's rape of Tamar, Amnon is encouraged in his deed by one Jonadab ben Shimeah. In 2 Sam. 13:3, 32, 35, he is called Jonadab, but in v.5 his name appears as Jehonadab. The same variety of spelling is found in the biblical material concerning Jonadab ben Rechab. In 2 Kings 10, his name is spelt Jehonadab. In Jeremiah 35 (contrary to the opinion of the Yalkut), it appears as both Jonadab and Jehonadab.

This tradition concerning Jonadab ben Rechab is important for two, no doubt connected, reasons. Firstly, the only other place in the rabbinic literature where Jonadab's 'alliance' with Jehu is even mentioned is in David Kimhi's

(Radak's) commentary on Judg. 1:16, where the following is found:

In the days of Jehu, Jonadab son of Rechab was loved and honoured in Israel, and in the days of Jeremiah the prophet, the House of the Rechabites were in the midst of the sons of Israel.<sup>86</sup>

Kimhi lived c.1160-1235 CE, and the Yalkut was probably compiled at roughly the same time. Thus, the idea that the Jonadab of 2 Kings 10 is to be linked with the Jonadab of Jeremiah 35 is a very late one in rabbinic writings. It appears much earlier in Christian circles. For instance, the connection is found in Questions on 4 Kings by Theodoret of Cyr (c.393-c.466 CE), chapter 33:

Who was Jonadab the son of Rechab? A pious man - both him and his family. They continued living in tents and avoiding wine-drinking. The prophet Jeremiah also recounted their praise. This information also discloses their piety: for upon seeing him, he blessed, that is saluted, him. Then he answered, "Is your heart straight with my heart, as my heart is with your heart?" And he said, "It is. Jehu said to him, If it is, give me your hand." After that he spoke with him to take him with him in his chariot. "Come with me and see my zeal for the Lord. And he sat him in his chariot." And there are so revealed in the world a number of pious people amongst the ten tribes, through whom all the wise ones of the world bore with ruling.<sup>87</sup>

Besides its lateness in Jewish circles, the conn-

action between 2 Kings 10 and Jeremiah 35 in the Yalkut is important also because, unlike any of the other references to the Rechabites in the rabbinic literature, it presents Jonadab, and hence the Rechabites, in an unfavourable light. Just as the addition of a letter to someone's name was seen as the reward for something meritorious, so the subtraction of a letter was seen as the punishment for something reprehensible. 2 Kings recounts the association between Jonadab and Jehu. Even within the Bible itself, Jehu is condemned (Hos. 1:4), so it is clear that the Rabbis, who had a high esteem for the Rechabites, removed any possible hint of a smear on their character by simply omitting any reference to their ancestor's dealings with the murderous king Jehu. Thus, 2 Kings 10:15, 16, 23, are never cited anywhere in the rabbinic writings.

As has been already noted, this tradition in the Yalkut is found in a footnote and not in the main text. Hence, while it is true that the Yalkut is an anthology of earlier Midrashim, this particular comment seems to have come from the compiler himself - who has indicated that it does so by placing outside his main text.

Having shown that 2 Kings 10 was not linked with the Rechabites until the time of Radak and the Yalkut, the alternative, earlier proposal, which regarded Jonadab not as some dim and distant ancestor, but as a contemporary figure, who had heard Jeremiah's proclamation of the destruction of the Temple and reacted accordingly, may now be examined.

Precisely the same idea is found in a document which J.H. Charlesworth has recently classified among the Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament. This document has been variously titled, but Charlesworth prefers to call it The History of the Rechabites.<sup>88</sup> It is extant in Greek, Syriac and Ethiopic, and its present form seems to be sixth-century and Christian. Charlesworth is of the opinion that it has an underlying Jewish core, contained in chapters 7:12-16:1a.<sup>89</sup>

It is only in these chapters, and specifically in 8-10, that mention is made of the Rechabites and their history in Jerusalem during the days of Jeremiah. At this stage in our work it is best to suggest only that sections of this document are Jewish or heavily influenced by Jewish traditions and that they may antedate the second century AD.<sup>90</sup>

In chapter 8, the Rechabites recount their origins in the following words:

v.2: For, when Jeremiah the prophet proclaimed that the city Jerusalem shall be given into the hands of the destroyers, he tore his clothes, and girded himself with sackcloth around his waist, and sprinkled ashes upon his head, and put dirt upon his bed. And he ~~exhort~~ed all the people to turn away from its evil way.

v.3: And our father Rechab, son of Aminadab, heard (Jeremiah's exhortation) and exhorted us, "Hear, O sons of Rechab and daughters of your father, and remove your clothes from your body, and do not drink a carafe of wine, and do not eat bread from the fire, and do not drink liquor and honey, until the Lord hears your petition.

v.4: And we said, "What he has commanded us, let us do and obey.

v.5: And we threw off our clothing from our body, and we did not eat bread from the fire and did not drink a carafe of wine, neither honey nor liquor, and we lamented a great lament, and we petitioned the Lord.

v.6: And he heard our prayer, and turned away his anger from the city Jerusalem. And mercy from the Lord came to the city Jerusalem; and he was merciful to his people, and turned away his death-bearing anger.

Compare also 9:8-10:3.

Obviously, this tradition is by no means identical with the ones from the rabbinic literature that are currently under consideration. However, it does have sufficient points of contact to suggest that it should not be divorced too readily from the rabbinic traditions. It too assigns the origins of the Rechabites' practices to their father's reaction to Jeremiah's prophecies, albeit here of the destruction of Jerusalem, rather than of the Temple. The elements of mourning rites are found also, in that the Rechabites claim that they 'lamented a great lament' (a Semitism). These points of contact are such that a common milieu must be assumed for the origins of the traditions in the document called The History of the Rechabites and in the rabbinic literature. If Charlesworth's contention is correct, then the rabbinic traditions could also be dated as possibly antedating the second century CE. There is, however, good reason to believe that there is something seriously wrong with

Charlesworth's analysis of The History of the Rechabites, as section 5.3 below will show, so it is unwise to use it to date anything at the present, early stage of research into it.

<sup>91</sup> All that can be said at the present is that, sometime prior to the compiling of the Tannaitic Midrashim, the idea arose that the practices of the Rechabites were inspired by the preaching of Jeremiah. The idea, no doubt, stems from the fact that, once 2 Kings 10 is excluded, as it apparently was in Jewish tradition until the 12th century CE, the only 'historical' data to be found about the Rechabites in the Bible is contained in the Book of Jeremiah.<sup>92</sup>

Mek. Ishmael and Mek. Rashbi now each have passages which, although not identical with each other, nevertheless correspond to each other, in that they both offer explanations of the three gentilics contained in 1 Chron. 2:55:

Mek. Ishmael

Mek. Rashbi

Thus they were called Tirathites, Shimeathites, Sucathites. Tirathites, because they were not willing to cut the hair. Sucathites, because they were not willing to anoint themselves. Shimeathites, because they obeyed the voice of their father. Another opinion is, Tirathites, because they heard the Teru<sup>C</sup>ah from Sinai. Another opinion is,

Tirathites<sup>93</sup> because when they sounded the horn in supplication they were answered.

Shimeathites, because they heard the sound of the trumpet-blast at Sinai.

Sucathites because they dwelt in tents,<sup>94</sup> as it is said, 'But we have dwelt in tents<sup>95</sup> and have hearkened, and done according to all which Jonadab our father commanded us' (Jer. 35.10).

Tirathites, because they used to sound the Teru<sup>C</sup>ah in their prayers and were answered.

Shimeathites, because they obeyed the sound of the words of the Torah. Another opinion is, because their prayers were heard.

Sucathites because they used to live in booths.

Another opinion is, because they were covering Israel and protecting them.

Discussion of the meaning of תרנתיים שמעתיים סינתיים,

'Tirathites, Shimeathites, Sucathites', in 1 Chron. 2:55 is widespread in the rabbinic literature, being found not only in the Mekhiltas to Exod. 18:27, but also in Sifre Numbers 78, Sifre Zutta to Num. 10:29, Tanhumah Jethro 4, Tanhumah Wayyaqhel 9 and Yalkut Shim<sup>C</sup>oni to the Prophets 38. Outside rabbinic literature proper, the Targum to 1 Chron. 2:55 preserves an exegesis of the three names also, and outside of Jewish literature altogether, St Jerome preserves exegetical translations of the three names in the Vulgate of

1 Chron. 2:55, which provides an important external guide for helping to date this material.

The texts in question are as follows:

Yalkut to the Prophets 38: Tirathites, because they were shaved. Tirathites, because they sat in the gates of Jerusalem. Tirathites, because they sounded the Teru<sup>C</sup>ah and were answered. Shimeathites, because they heard the sound of the Teru<sup>C</sup>ah on Sinai. Sucathites, because they did not anoint themselves with oil. Sucathites, because they dwelt in booths.

Although the Yalkut is almost certainly the latest of the rabbinic texts to be cited here, it has been given first because it appears that the compiler of the Yalkut has here primarily used Mek. Ishmael, only omitting the scriptural quotation, and adding two other explanations, both of which can be found in Sifre Numbers 78.

Sifre Numbers 78: Tirathites, because they heard the Teru<sup>C</sup>ah from Mount Sinai. Tirathites, because they sounded the Teru<sup>C</sup>ah and were answered. Tirathites, because they did not cut the hair. Tirathites, because they sat in the entrance of the gates of Jerusalem. Shimeathites, because they obeyed the commandments of their father. Sucathites, because they did not anoint themselves with oil. Sucathites, because they dwelt in booths.

It was said above that the explanations in the Yalkut not found in Mek. Ishmael were drawn from this passage in Sifre

Numbers. It should be noted that the Yalkut explains 'Tirathites' as meaning 'because they were shaved' or 'because they used to cut the hair' - the Hebrew מגלחים may be pointed either as an active or as a passive - while in the Sifre the complete opposite is found, 'because they did not cut the hair'. Compare also Mek. Rashbi, which is also in the negative. The compiler of the Yalkut may simply have misread the Sifre text, or else the change may have been deliberate. This will be further investigated when the individual explanations are examined below.

Sifre Zutta: Tirathites, because they sat in the gate. Shimeathites, because they listened and learnt. Sucathites, because Israel was protecting them.

Tanhumah Jethro 4: What does 'Tirathites' mean? That they were sitting in the gate. 'Shimeathites', because they listened and learnt. 'Sucathites', because Israel covered them. Another explanation is, what does 'Tirathites' mean? In the time when Israel entered into distress, they sounded the Teru<sup>c</sup>ah and were answered.

These explanations from Sifre Zutta and Tanhumah Jethro come at the end of the Midrash about Jethro and his sons going up to the city to study Torah in the school-house with Jabez that has already been quoted.<sup>96</sup> Hence, the first three in each are basically the same. The fourth in Tanhumah Jethro takes the already existing tradition that the Rechabites were called Tirathites because they blew the Teru<sup>c</sup>ah and were answered and, as in Mek. Rashbi, expands it - Mek. Rashbi

by adding 'in their prayers', Tanhumah by stating the circumstances in which they carried this out.

Tanhumah Wayyaqhel 9: Tirathites, because they sat in the Chamber of Hewn Stone. Shimeathites, because all Israel heard Halakah from their lips. Sucathites, because they were overshadowed by the Holy Spirit.

These three explanations are unique among the rabbinic explanation of 'Tirathites, Shimeathites, Sucathites'. The passage in which they are found is paralleled by one in the Midrash Psalms,<sup>97</sup> but there 1 Chron. 2:55 is cited without any explanation of these three names. Even if the passage in Midrash Psalms is regarded as the earlier, because it is the shorter, we are no nearer a date for the passage, as Midrash Psalms is a compilation of material dating, according to Braude,<sup>98</sup> from 300-1300 CE!

The Vulgate of 1 Chron. 2:55: And the families of the scribes that dwell in Jabes, singing and making melody and abiding in tents. These are the Kinites who came of Calor, father of the House of Rechab.<sup>99</sup>

Jerome completed his Latin translation of the scriptures at the end of the fourth century CE. It has convincingly been demonstrated, most recently for example by C.T.R. Hayward, that Jerome was familiar with Jewish, and particularly Targumic, traditions, and that he reflected his knowledge of these in his biblical translation and commentaries.<sup>100</sup> This is evident in his rendering of 1 Chron. 2:55, where he has

attempted to explain the three gentilics, rather than transliterate them. In so doing, he appears to be drawing on traditions found both in the Midrashic literature and also in the Targum.

The relevant section of the Targum to the verse reads:

One called them Tirathites, because their voice, when they sang, was like a fanfare; Shimeathites, because they joyfully devoted themselves to the (study of the) traditions. Sucathites, because they were covered with a spirit of prophecy.

If all the above traditions are analysed name by name, the following results are yielded. תרעזרם, 'Tirathites', is explained in four ways: as coming from תער, 'razor';<sup>101</sup> from the Aramaic תרט (=Hebrew שער), 'gate';<sup>102</sup> from רוע, 'to sound the Teru<sup>c</sup>ah';<sup>103</sup> and from תרועה, 'Teru<sup>c</sup>ah'.<sup>104</sup> The Vulgate provides a positive indicator to the date - c.400 CE. Jerome's 'canentes' is derived from the rabbinic tradition that the Rechabites were called תרעזרם because they sounded the Teru<sup>c</sup>ah and were answered. The Teru<sup>c</sup>ah in the Mishnah denotes a quavering blast blown upon the Shofar within the liturgy.<sup>105</sup> Thus, 'to sound the Teru<sup>c</sup>ah' denotes a form of prayer, as the additions in Mek. Rashi and Tanhumah Jethro demonstrate. The Targum has taken this a step further by introducing the notion of singing, which is taken up in the Vulgate. This suggests that this explanation of תרעזרם is considerably older than 400 CE. It may even

stretch back to the first century. It will be recalled that the clans named  $\text{שְׂמַנְתִּים סִכְנָתִים}$  in 1 Chron. 2:55 are called  $\text{סֹפְרִים}$ , 'scribes'. Robert Hayward has shown that the connection between scribes and praise in the Targumic literature is one that dates back at least as far as the first century CE,<sup>106</sup> and that it "reflects faithfully the conditions and institutions of later Second Temple times".<sup>107</sup>

The fact that

the uttering of praise is not an activity  
associated with the scribes in the tractates  
of the Mishnah and Tosefta<sup>108</sup>

also argues in favour of a date in the first century CE for scribes declaring praise. As the same idea has been preserved in the midrashic exegesis of 1 Chron. 2:55, it is likely that these midrashic traditions also stem back to the first century CE, and possibly even earlier.

It is not impossible that the heading of Psalm 70 in the LXX,  $\text{τῷ Δαυιδ· υἱῶν Ἰωνάδαβ καὶ τῶν πρῶτων ἀρχιμαλωτισθεντῶν}$ , also reflects the tradition connecting the Rechabites with praise. If this is so, the date of the tradition's origin should be pushed back at least as far as the second century BCE. Incidentally, it seems rather unlikely that the LXX of Judg. 1:19 contains a deliberate mention of the Rechabites, as Kaminka argued,<sup>109</sup> as it stands at variance with the other Jewish traditions about the Rechabites, which are uniformly positive. It is more likely that in the reading  $\text{ῥῆγαβ}$  for the Hebrew  $\text{רְכָב}$ , we have a case of accidental misvocalisation.

The explanation of תַּרְצִיחַ as deriving from the Aramaic צַרַח, 'gate', shows up very clearly that the Rabbis were equally at home in Aramaic, the vernacular language of Jews in both Palestine and Babylon, and rabbinic Hebrew, the language of the academies. Explanations of words in one language by means of the meaning of a similarly spelled word in the other are relatively common in the rabbinic writings. צַרַח was a common Aramaic word in every age,<sup>110</sup> but the fact that in all four of the places where this etymology occurs, 'the gate(s)' are either of Jerusalem or of a school-house in Jerusalem, suggests that it has a Palestinian provenance.

The derivation from צַרַח, 'razor', may come from a supposed connection between the Rechabites and the Nazirites, although it is unlikely that any such connection ever actually existed.<sup>111</sup> There is no biblical account of the Rechabites leaving their hair unshorn, but it was part of the vow of a Nazirite, Num. 6:5. It is more likely, however, that it derives from mourning rites. The regulations concerning mourners in the Talmud specify that it was obligatory for mourners to let their hair grow,<sup>112</sup> even if there is evidence that, in the biblical period, tonsure was the standard symbol of mourning.<sup>113</sup> As the Talmudic regulations became normative in Judaism, with regard to mourning customs at least, then if this is the correct background on which to see the explanation of תַּרְצִיחַ as coming from צַרַח, then the reading of the Yalkut must be seen as a simple error, omitting the negative, rather than a conscious change, reflecting

a change in practice.

And there is other evidence to support this supposition that part of the rabbinic understanding of the Rechabites and their practices was as mourners. As has already been shown,<sup>114</sup> the tradition that the Rechabites observed their practices because the Temple was destined to be destroyed was quite widespread. In some of these cases,<sup>115</sup> the Rechabites are described as *קַתְּנָבִילִי*, 'mourning'. Indeed, in the passage in the Tanhumahs, their practices, as recounted in Jer. 35, are specifically advanced in support of the claim that they were mourning - mourning for the destroyed Temple. That wine was to be avoided during a period of mourning and lamentation is evidenced by Dan. 10:3, where *קַתְּנָבִיל* is also used, cf. Testament of Reuben 1:9f. The prohibition on the conducting of manual labour by mourners<sup>116</sup> may be seen as the origin of the idea that not building houses, sowing seed or planting vineyard were indicative of the Rechabites' status as mourners. There does not appear, however, to be any evidence of a tradition in Judaism which prescribed tent-residence for those in mourning. Mourners were also required to abstain from anointing themselves with oil, as Dan. 10:3 again demonstrates, and one of the explanations of *סִיכָתִים* in 1 Chron. 2:55 is *כִּי לֹא שָׁחֲטוּ בַּשֶּׁמֶן*, 'because they did not anoint themselves with oil'. Finally, it is interesting to note that the Jewish army at Yeb (Elephantine) in c.408 BCE practised acts of mourning because of the destruction of their Temple. Their rites of mourning included sexual abstinence, the avoidance

of oil and the avoidance of wine.<sup>117</sup>

That certain groups of Jews practised excessive mourning rites because of the destruction of the Second Temple may be shown by bBaba Bathra 60b, where it is recounted that R. Joshua successfully persuaded these people to give up these practices. Given that the Rechabites are not condemned in the Midrashim for observing such mourning customs, it is possible to suggest that, if bBaba Bathra 60b faithfully reflects a problem of the immediate post-70 period, the tradition that their customs were observed as mourning rites for the loss of the Temple derives from a time and milieu where the more lenient view, propounded by R. Joshua in bBaba Bathra 60b, had not become dominant. Given that Joshua is thought to have lived around the time of the Fall of the Temple and just after, this again suggests a first century CE date for the origin of this tradition. More specifically, a date in the years immediately following the destruction of the Temple, ie. 70-c.80 CE.

Cumulatively, this evidence seems very strong indeed. The Rechabites were seen as mourning for the destroyed Temple. Their practices specified in Jer. 35:7f were seen as mourning rites, and לֹא יִגְדְּלוּ and לֹא יִשְׁחַטְּמוּ were also interpreted along similar lines, as denoting the non-shaving of the hair and the avoidance of anointing oneself with oil - both also rites of mourning and lamentation. It is plausible that the origins of this exegesis lie among groups who, after the Fall of the Second Temple, practised extreme mourning rites, and

who felt that they needed a scriptural precedent in order to justify their actions, and found it in the Rechabites.

Tanhumah Wayyaqhel 9 explains תַּרְעַתִּים as שְׁהִיוּ אֲשֶׁר בְּלִשְׁכַּת הַגִּידִיט. It has already been demonstrated that there is a rabbinic tradition that the Kenites and, in one case, the Rechabites, sat in the Chamber of Hewn Stone,<sup>118</sup> and this underlies this explanation. How תַּרְעַתִּים is to be 'etymologically' related to any of אֲשֶׁר, לִשְׁכָּה or גִּידִיט must remain obscure, however. At least with the other explanations of תַּרְעַתִּים, there was at least some resemblance in letters between תַּרְעַתִּים and the interpretation. No such resemblance is to be found here.

All the explanations of שְׁמַעְתִּים, 'Shimeathites', derive from שָׁמַעַתְּ, 'to hear, obey'. In two cases, the explanation is drawn directly from Jer. 35: Mek. Rashbi, 'because they heard the voice of their father', and Sifre Numbers 78, 'because they heard the commands of their father'. These probably represent the earliest explanation. Derived from it is the explanation that they were called Shimeathites 'because they heard the voice of the words of the Torah', also found in Mek. Rashbi. This is so because, as was shown above,<sup>119</sup> in Mek. Rashbi, Sifre Numbers 78 and Sifre Zutta, the saying 'Just as he [Jethro] loved the Torah, so his sons loved the Torah' is justified by reference to the Rechabites' refusal to accede to Jeremiah's command to drink wine in Jer. 35, ie. at this stage in the tradition, Jonadab's commands are seen as having the force of Torah. The explanation, again found in Mek. Rashbi, that their prayers were answered

(שְׁחִיטָה תַּפְּלֵאךְ נְשִׁמְעָה), derives from the same circles as the explanation of Tireathites as being because they sounded the Teru<sup>c</sup>ah and were answered, and is probably contemporary with it, ie. first century CE or earlier. Jerome's use of 'atque resonantes', rendered 'and making melody' by the Douai translation, is slightly odd. 'Resono' does not seem an obvious rendering of שִׁמְעָה. It means 'to resound, re-echo', so it is possible that Jerome was attempting to convey the idea that שִׁמְעָה means not only 'to hear', but 'to hear and respond', ie. 'to obey'. The explanations contained in Sifre Zutta=Tanhumah Jethro, Tanhumah Wayyaqhel and the Targum, all link שִׁמְעָה to the study and teaching of the Torah, albeit in different ways. Sifre Zutta=Tanhumah Jethro, 'because they were hearing and learning' Torah from Jabez. Targum, 'because they joyfully devoted themselves to the (study of the) traditions (שִׁמְעָה)', which would logically, but not necessarily chronologically, precede Tanhumah Wayyaqhel, 'because all Israel heard Halakah from their lips'. This last may be dependent on the traditions that the Kenites sat in the Chamber of Hewn Stone, and that the Rechabites sat in the Sanhedrin, teaching words of Torah.<sup>120</sup> If the Rechabites were held to have sat in the Sanhedrin, and to have taught Torah, then who else but all Israel could have heard them, and what else but Halakah, Oral Torah, could have been heard from them? The final explanation is that contained in Mek. Ishmael and Yalkut Shim<sup>c</sup>oni, 'because they heard the sound of the Teru<sup>c</sup>ah on Sinai'. The same explanation is given to תְּרִיעָה in Mek. Rashbi, so it could derive from the same source.

The explanations of סוכתים, 'Sucathites', can be divided into four. 'Because they did not anoint themselves with oil' (Mek. Rashbi and the Yalkut) has already been dealt with above. 'Because they dwelt in booths' (both Mekhiltas, the Yalkut and the Vulgate) derives from equating סוכתים with סוכות, 'booths', and then equating סוכות with אהלים, 'tents', and hence with Jer. 35:7, where the Rechabites are commanded to live in tents. 'Because they were overshadowed with the Holy Spirit' (Tanhumah Wayyaqhel) or 'with the Spirit of Prophecy' (Targum) reflects the equation between the prophet and scribe found elsewhere in the Targumim,<sup>121</sup> dated to the first century BCE by Hayward<sup>122</sup> - it will be recalled that both the Targum and Tanhumah Wayyaqhel found a meaning related to Torah scholarship for שמעתי. The final tradition concerning סוכתים is preserved in two, mutually contradictory forms. Sifre Zutta=Tanhumah Jethro, 'because Israel was covering them', and Mek. Rashbi, 'because they were covering Israel and protecting them'. Obviously, two different ideologies are represented here, one which accepts that proselytes are able to protect Israel, the other which does not. On balance, it seems more likely that Mek. Rashbi's reading would have been ideologically less acceptable, especially after the decline in the number of converts to Judaism in the second and subsequent centuries CE, and that it was changed, rather than vice versa.

To conclude this investigation of the three clan names in 1 Chron. 2:55, as they are explained by the rabbinic literature, it may be re-emphasised that the Vulgate indi-

cates that attempts to interpret 'Tirathites, Shimeathites, Sucathites' were already well-established by the fourth century CE. It has been demonstrated that there are grounds for thinking that a number of these interpretations are considerably older, some perhaps even predating the Fall of the Temple, some deriving from the period immediately post-70. However, it cannot be ascertained whether all the interpretations found in the rabbinic literature are as old as the first century, or even whether they were all current in the fourth - Jerome may have been familiar with a broad range of interpretations, and have practised selectivity, but it is equally possible that the interpretations found in the Vulgate were the only ones that Jerome knew. The explanations found in the Jewish literature fall broadly into four categories: the Rechabites were mourning the loss of the Temple; they were learning and teaching Torah; they were praying and being answered; and they were being obedient to their father's commands, which were Torah.

Both Rashi or, rather, one of his followers<sup>123</sup> and David Kimḥi eschew these Haggadic interpretations of the three gentilics. Rashi's commentary on 1 Chron. 2:55 says of these three words that 'all of these are names of their father's houses'. Radak is rather more outspoken, when he writes:

Tirathites, Shimeathites, Sucathites - names of families. There are many interpretations of these names, but if we were to try to interpret the meanings of these names, it would be impossible, for we have nothing

beyond what is written.

Radak avowedly rejects all attempts at explaining the meaning of these three names as being mere speculation, without any basis in fact. It is almost as if he is rejecting the whole Haggadic means of scriptural exegesis in favour of a more 'literal' - or even 'critical'! - reading of the text. It was to be this method that won out in biblical exegesis, and in many respects Rashi and Radak stand closer to modern critical exegesis than they do to their Jewish predecessors.

Mek. Ishmael

It happened once that one  
said

[mockingly]

"Today there is a sacrifice  
of the sons of the water  
drinkers!"

And a heavenly voice came  
forth from the Holy of  
Holies and cried out

"He who received their  
offerings in the desert,  
He will also receive  
their offerings now".

Mek. Rashbi

And it happened once that  
one said

"Today there is a sacrifice  
of the house of the water  
drinkers!"

A heavenly voice came  
forth from the Holy of  
Holies and cried out  
to them

"He who received your  
father's offerings in the  
desert, He will also re-  
ceive your offerings now".

This story of the 'water-drinking sacrificers' is found elsewhere in the rabbinic literature only in Yalkut Shim<sup>c</sup>oni to the Prophets 323, where the footnote indicates that the Yalkut is citing the Mekhilta, ie. Mek. Ishmael. The critical editions of Mek. Ishmael indicate that it has a number of textual variants in this particular story, some of

which are reflected in the various readings to be found in the Yalkut. The critical edition of Mek. Rashbi, however, lists no variants for its reading of the text. It seems as if the Yalkut is drawing solely on Mek. Ishmael here for its tradition.

Despite the various readings, it is clear that the main thrust of the story is identical in all its versions, so the analysis of the contents of the story may proceed without the need to attempt to ascertain its 'original form'.

It is to be noted that the saying does not explicitly mention the Rechabites, and that the appellation בני/ביצ/ שוֹטְאֵי מַיִם is not one that is applied to them in the Bible or elsewhere in the rabbinic literature. Indeed, 'drinkers of water' is not a biblical phrase. Its only occurrence is in Ezek. 31:14, 16, where כָּל שֹׁטְאֵי מַיִם appears, but there it applies to trees, so it is of little relevance here. Given that the tale has no actual mention of the Rechabites, and that the Rechabites are not called 'sons of a drinker of water' elsewhere, the possibility must be reckoned with that this tale did not originally refer to the Rechabites at all, and that it was only secondarily connected with them by the compiler(s) of the traditions underlying the Mekhiltas. It should be recalled that the Rechabites were not the only people in Israel to have abstained from all intoxicants. Serving priests and Nazirites were similarly abstinent, and there is no reason not to assume that this applied to other groups also, in the Second Temple period as well as during

the First. For instance, mNazir 1:4 makes mention of a life-long Nazirate, presumably in the late Second Temple period.

The tale presumably derives from the period prior to the destruction of the Second Temple, although there is no other occurrence of it in the rabbinic literature. It ascribes an ancient origin to the water-drinking sacrificers - 'in the desert' surely means 'during the Exodus wanderings' - and it deals with the acceptability or otherwise of sacrifices offered by a group of people whose membership of Israel was being challenged in some quarters - Lauterbach's translation of the saying begins 'It happened once that one said [mockingly]'. The validity of the water-drinking sacrificers' offering is challenged, and is vindicated by the bath qol proclaiming that, like Israel, these people had offered sacrifice to God in days of old.

If the supposition that the tale originally had nothing to do with the Rechabites is correct, what reasons can be adduced for its insertion into the material dealing with them that is now contained in the Mekhiltas? Neither in Mek. Ishmael nor in Mek. Rashbi is there any apparent contextual reason for the appearance of the tale - it has no direct connection with what precedes or what follows. It must therefore be concluded that it was inserted on the grounds that it was thought to refer to the Rechabites/Kenites, and an explanation for that assumption must sought outside the immediate context of the saying in the literature.

The following explanation is put forward as a hypothesis which, if it is substantiated, would demonstrate that the connection was made purely by way of biblical exegesis, rather than by way of any historical facts. Deut. 29:10 reads

טַפְּכֶם נְשִׁיכֶם וְגֵרְךָ אֲשֶׁר בְּקִרְבְּךָ מִחֹטֵב עֵצִים עַד שֹׁאֵב מַיִם,

'your little ones, your wives, and the sojourner who is in your camp, both he who hews your wood and he who draws your water' (RSV), cf. Josh. 9:21, 23, 27. Jer. 35:7 terms the Rechabites גְּרָיִם, although its meaning is probably different from that of גֵּר in Deut. 29:10. Rabbinic tradition does, however, regard the Rechabites as being non-Israelites (but nevertheless proselytes), as has already been shown, on the basis of their being called garim. If Deut. 29:10, with its description of the gerim as 'hewers of wood and drawers of water', was in the mind of certain Rabbis, it may well have led to the supposition that the story concerning the water-drinking sacrificers was about the Rechabites. Gerim gather wood and draw water. Rechabites were gerim. The Rechabites therefore gathered wood and drew water. Water-drawers were also, no doubt, water-drinkers. Hence, an offering made by the sons of a drinker of water was one made by the Rechabites.

This hypothesis has the added advantage that it also goes some way towards explaining the appearance of the family of Jonadab ben Rechab among the list of people responsible for bringing the wood-offering for the Temple in mTa<sup>c</sup>an 4:5.

<sup>124</sup> Most of the rest of the families named in this Mishnah are drawn from the list in Nehemiah 7, so the appearance of the Rechabites is somewhat peculiar. However, if the Rabbis

viewed the Rechabites as the gerim par excellence, with responsibility not only for drawing water, but also for hewing and gathering wood for cultic purposes (cf. Josh. 9:23, 27), then their inclusion in a list of families responsible for bringing the Second Temple wood-offering is explicable.

What remains obscure, however, is the reason for the date on which they were supposed to bring it: 7th Ab. This date may be connected in some way with the 'commemoration' of the destruction of the First Temple, which was believed to have happened on 9th Ab, but certainty in this matter is impossible.

Mek. Ishmael

Mek. Rashbi

And who are these people?  
 "These are the Kenites who came from Hammath, father of the House of Rechab".  
 And scripture says, "And the sons of Keni the father-in-law of Moses went up from the city of Palm Trees" (Judg. 1:16). You should understand that the House of Rechab is from Jethro.

This paragraph from Mek. Rashbi has already been quoted above, when the rabbinic identification of the Kenites and the Rechabites was discussed in connection with the material concerning the Chamber of Hewn Stone and the Sanhedrin. It was there said that there are even places in the literature where the connection between the two groups is presumed before it is explicitly stated.<sup>125</sup> The places where this happens are

Mek. Rashbi and Mek. Ishmael to Exod. 18:27, Sifre Numbers 78 and Sifre Zutta to Num. 10:29. The first three of these do have a consideration of how it is known that the Kenites are equal to the Rechabites, but in each case it appears after the connection has already been implicitly stated - as has been shown, Mek. Rashbi, Sifre Numbers and Sifre Zutta all use Jer. 35:2 to prove that, just as Jethro loved the Torah, so did his sons,<sup>126</sup> and Mek. Ishmael, whose explicit statement of the connection comes later, has used Jer. 35:10 to explain 'Sucathites' as meaning 'dwelling in booths'.<sup>127</sup>

As well as coming in a later place, the explicit statement of the connection to be found in Mek. Ishmael is different from that in Mek. Rashbi. A translation of it has been given above on page 20. It is cited in Yalkut Shim<sup>c</sup>oni to the Prophets, and is found in a virtually identical form in Sifre Numbers 78, which suggests that it had a currency prior to both Mek. Ishmael and Sifre Numbers, as neither looks to be dependent on the other.

The link between the Kenites and the Rechabites in the rabbinic literature is always made by way of 1 Chron. 2:55 - the בֵּית רֶכָב of that verse, in reality a place name,<sup>128</sup> was seen to be identical with the בֵּית הַרְכָבִים, the community of the Rechabites, in Jer. 35. That the text does not mention the Rechabites, or connect them with the Kenites, has already been demonstrated,<sup>129</sup> so it is clear that we are here at the level of tradition and of biblical interpretation, and not at the level of history.

Mek. Rashbi now continues with the passage quoted above on page 47, which claims that Jonadab laid his prohibitions on his sons as a reaction to the preaching of Jeremiah. As this was fully dealt with above, no further comment is needed at this point.

Mek. Rashbi now devotes three lines (in Epstein-Melamed) to proving that abstinence from wine prolongs a man's days, by citing the examples of Cain, Noah, Lot and Uzziah, but strangely not the Rechabites, although their abstinence is clearly the reason for the insertion of this passage here. The use of the Rechabites as an example extolling teetotalism is not common in the rabbinic literature - it is found only Tanhumah Shemini 5, its parallel in Tanhumah B Shemini 14, and in Radak's commentary on Jer. 35, so it is apparently a comparatively late phenomenon.

Mek. Ishmael

R. Nathan says: The covenant with Jonadab the son of Rechab was greater than the one made with David.

For the covenant made with David was only conditional, as it is said, "If thy children keep my covenant etc."

Mek. Rashbi

R. Nathan says: The covenant which the Holy One, blessed be He, made with the sons of Jethro was greater than the covenant which he made with the sons of David.

For the covenant which He made with David was only made conditionally, as it says, "If your sons keep my covenant and my testimonies which I shall teach them, their sons shall also sit upon your

(Ps. 132.12)

and if not, "Then I shall visit their transgression with the rod"(Ps. 89:33).

But the covenant with Jonadab the son of Rechab was made without any condition, for it is said, "Therefore thus saith the Lord of Hosts the God of Israel, there shall not be cut off unto Jonadab the son of Rechab a man to stand before me for ever" (Jer. 35.19).

throne forever"

(Ps. 132:12).

But the covenant which was made with Jonadab the son of Rechab was not made conditionally, as it says, "Therefore, thus says the Lord of Hosts, God of Israel, there shall not be cut off unto Jonadab the son of Rechab a man to stand before me for ever" (Jer. 35:19).

The form of the saying found in Mek. Ishmael is reproduced in Yalkut Shim<sup>c</sup>oni to the Prophets 38 and 323. Mek. Rashbi makes it clear that the two covenants in question were made by God, and prefers to cite the whole of Ps. 132:12, rather than only half of it and Ps. 89:33, thereby emphasising the blessing for obedience, rather than the punishment for disobedience. By reading 'sons of Jethro' for 'Jonadab son of Rechab', Mek. Rashbi also creates a neat pun, by also inserting גדול הברית שכרת הבק"ה לבני יתרו יתן מן, thus: הברית שכרת לבני דוד. Deciding whether one of these traditions represents a 'modification' of the other is, however, impossible.

Although the text of the critical editions of the Mekhiltas prefer the reading 'R. Nathan', there is some text-

ual authority for the reading 'R. Jonathan'. Jonathan's name is found in a mutilated form in the Tosephta,<sup>130</sup> so it is perfectly plausible that he is meant by the name 'Nathan' here. Jonathan is traditionally held to have been a fourth generation Tanna.

The saying is the result of biblical exegesis, rather than of any known historical fact. The statement derives from a comparison of Jer. 35:19 with Ps. 132:12. The similarities between the covenant made with the Rechabites and that made with David have been noted by J.D. Levenson,<sup>131</sup> who does not, however, note this rabbinic tradition. R. Jonathan has failed to consider Ps. 89:30,34, which both imply that the covenant with David and his sons was, in fact, as unconditional as that with Jonadab, and vice versa, that with Jonadab was as conditional as that with David and his sons, in that it was made with the expectation that Jonadab's sons would maintain their father's practices, and that they would be punished by Yahweh if they did not, even though Yahweh would not withdraw his blessing from them.

As the saying itself contains no historical allusions, it is virtually impossible to date it. Even if R. Jonathan did say it, it need not necessarily have originated with him - he could have passed it on from someone else. Alternatively, the saying may have originated later than Jonathan, and have been ascribed to him pseudepigraphically.

Mek. Ishmael now has a longish passage dealing with

the three things that were given to Israel conditionally, and the three that were given unconditionally. It has appeared here on the catchword principle - the catchword being <sup>50</sup> שׁוֹמֵר, 'conditionally', which is found also in the discussion of the covenants with David and Jonadab. This passage has no mention of the Rechabites or the Kenites, so further examination of it is not required here.

Mek. Ishmael follows this discussion with its version of the 'proof' that the Rechabites and the Kenites were identical. As this passage has already been discussed above,<sup>132</sup> no further consideration of it is offered here.

Mek. Ishmael

They sought a teacher. And Jabez was seeking pupils, as it is said: "And Jabez called on the God of Israel, saying, 'Oh that thou wouldst bless me indeed, and enlarge my border, and that thy hand might be with me and that thou wouldst work deliverance from evil, that it may not pain me'. And God granted him that which he requested" (ibid. [1 Chron.] 4:10).

Mek. Rashbi

There has already been cause to mention this passage of Mek. Ishmael.<sup>133</sup> The character of Jabez as the archetypal Torah scholar is examined below.<sup>134</sup> Mek. Ishmael then provides an exposition of 1 Chron. 4:10 in terms of Torah study and

disciples, but without mentioning the Rechabites by name. There is then a discussion of Prov. 29:13 and 22:2, followed by a second exposition of 1 Chron. 4:10, ascribed to R. Judah the Prince, in terms of family and health.

Mek. Ishmael

Mek. Rashbi

R. Simeon said: Was not the High Priesthood already cut off? What do I then understand by 'There will not be cut off a man to Jonadab' if not that those who sit in the Sanhedrin will not be separated from him forever?

This saying has already been discussed in connection with the traditions about the Kenites and the Rechabites sitting in the Sanhedrin,<sup>135</sup> so nothing more need be said here.

Mek. Ishmael

Mek. Rashbi

If such is the case with one who was from the peoples of the lands and the tribes of the earth, because he acted out of love, that God gave back to him out of love, how much more is it so with those who are from Israel!

This forms a sort of homiletic conclusion to the

whole passage, using the rabbinic exegetical technique known as Qal Vahomer, or ad minoriam ad majoriam. The saying is found also in the passage of Sifre Zutta that deals with the Rechabites, where it is used not only to conclude the material about Jethro and his descendents, but also that about Rahab the Harlot, which suggests that it formed something of a refrain, concluding examinations of those Gentiles who had shown outstanding devotion to the God of Israel, such as Jethro, Rahab and Ruth.

Sifre Numbers 78, quoted in Yalkut Shimoni to the Torah 169 and to the Prophets 38, has a different Qal Vahomer conclusion:

And if this is the case with those who brought themselves near, how much more will God bring Israel near when they do the will of God!

A third way of expressing this concept is found in Tanhumah Bammidbar 26 and Numbers Rabbah 5:9, in different recensions.

Tanhumah: Whoever fears me I shall glorify, and I shall not cut off his name forever. From whom do you learn this? From the sons of Jonadab. Because they did my will, what is written about them? "There will not lack a man to Jonadab son of Rechab standing before me forever." Now, if I have done such to proselytes because they did my will, how much more is it the case with Israel, when they do my will, that they should not be cut off, nor their name kept from my presence, but they will live and be established forever, as it is said

(Deut. 4), "but you who held fast to the Lord your God are alive this day".

Numbers Rabbah: ... will I honour all who fear me, and I will not cut off their name from the world. From whom do you learn this? From the children of Jonadab the son of Rechab. As a reward for having performed my will, what is written about them? There shall not be cut off unto Jonadab the son of Rechab a man to stand before me forever (Jer. xxxv, 19).

Now if I have done so much to those that are proselytes, is it not all the more to be expected that Israel, who are my loving children, my dear children, should, provided that they act in accordance with my wish, stand before me forever? As it says: Oh that thou wouldst hearken to my commandments! Then would thy peace be as a river ... His name would not be cut off nor destroyed from before me (Isa. xlviii, 18f), and it also says: But ye that did cleave unto the Lord your God are alive every one of you to this day (Deut. iv, 4).

These three traditions all serve the same purpose. They 'earth' what has been a somewhat academic discussion of a group very much on the fringe of Judaism into the life and experience of contemporary Jewish readers and hearers of the texts. The whole discussion of Jethro, the Kenites and the Rechabites becomes exhortatory, because of these texts. They did God's will and were blessed, even though they were not of Israel. You are of Israel. Do God's will yourselves, and your blessing will be even greater!

Not that the passage of the Mekhiltas finishes with

this exhortatory conclusion. The closing passage of the exposition of Exod. 18:27 is found in both Mek. Ishmael and Mek. Rashbi. The passage does not mention the Kenites or the Rechabites, but rather provides a date for the events that have been narrated, assigning them to the second year of the Exodus. It should not be seen as the end of the Mekhiltas' exegesis of Exod. 18:27. Rather, it forms, in Mek. Ishmael at least, the conclusion to the whole of the tractate Amalek, and serves to present some sort of date for the events described in that tractate. Because of that wider function, the passage has very little, if anything, to do with Exodus 18:27 and its interpretation.

#### Sifre Numbers 78

Most of the material dealing with the Rechabites to be found in Sifre Numbers 78, a commentary on Num. 10:29, has already been considered, as it has parallels in the Mekhiltas to Exodus 18:27. This section, therefore, will deal with the remaining sections of Sifre Numbers 78, and provide cross-references to the earlier discussions of the chapter.

#### Sifre Numbers 78

AND MOSES SAID TO HOBAB THE SON OF REUEL. Hobab was his name. Reuel was his name, because it is said, "And they came to Reuel their father" (Exod. 2:18), like it says, "And Heber the Kenite has separated from Cain, from the sons of Hobab the father-in-law of Moses"(Judg. 4:11). Hobab was his name and Reuel was not his name,

and when scripture says, "And they came to Reuel their father", it means that the girls were calling their grandfather, "Abba". R. Simeon ben Manasseh says, Reuel was his name - 'Friend of God' - as it is said, "And Aaron came, and all the elders of Israel, to eat bread with the father-in-law of Moses before God". R. Dosthai says, Keni was his name. And why was his name called Keni? Because he abstained from the action of jealousy in the incident when they provoked God to anger, as it is said, "They have moved me to jealousy with that which is not God" (Deut. 32:31), and it says, "There is the seat of the image of jealousy, which provokes to jealousy" (Ezek. 8:5). R. Jose says, Keni was his name. And why was his name called Keni? Because he acquired heaven and earth and the Torah. R. Ishmael in the name of R. Jose says, Reuel was his name. And why was his name called Reuel? Because he befriended God, as it is said, "Do not forsake your friend and the friend of your father" (Prov. 27:10). R. Simeon bar Yoḥai says, He had two names, Hobab and Jethro. Jethro because he gave rise to an additional section in the Torah, as it is said, "And you shall provide from all the people" (Exod. 18:21). But were not these things in the hands of Moses from Sinai? As it is said, "If you should do this thing which God has commanded you". And why was it concealed from the eyes of Moses? In order to suspend merit upon a meritorious person. Hence, the matter which is suspended upon Jethro. Hobab because he loved the Torah, for we have not found concerning all the proselytes that they loved the Torah like Jethro.

The many names apparently ascribed to Jethro in the

Bible prompted much speculation amongst the Rabbis. Besides this passage in Sifre Numbers 78, see also, among the texts currently under investigation, Sifre Zutta to Num. 10:29, Tanhumah Jethro 4 and Yalkut Shim<sup>c</sup>oni to the Prophets 38. The passage in the Yalkut seems to be drawn from Mek. Ishmael, Amalek III, 3lf,<sup>136</sup> which is paralleled by Mek. Rashbi, Jethro 18:1.<sup>137</sup>

Examples of the rabbinic etymological explanations of Hebrew names have already be given above, when the 'Tirathites, Shimeathites, Sucathites' of 1 Chron. 2:55 were examined.<sup>138</sup> There is no need to provide such a detailed examination of Jethro's names. It is sufficient to note that these passages well reveal the rabbinic belief that different names belonging to the same person denoted different aspects of his character.<sup>139</sup>

The next paragraph of Sifre Numbers 78 is the one which describes the love of Jethro's sons for the Torah by citing Jer. 35:2. This has been discussed above on pages 46 and 48. Sifre Numbers then continues:

Because they obeyed the commands of Jonadab their father, God established scribes from them, as it is said, "The families of the scribes, the dwellers of Jabez, Tirathites, Shimeathites, Sucathites" (1 Chron. 2:55).

This is the first place where the idea that the scribes mentioned in 1 Chron. 2:55 were raised up by God because of the Rechabites' obedience to Jonadab's commands has been met with. Elsewhere in the rabbinic literature, the survival of the Rechabites is usually debated with reference to Jer. 35:19.

Here, 1 Chron. 2:55 is viewed as reflecting a time period later than that of Jer. 35.

There then follows the discussion of the three clan names quoted above on page 57. This in turn is succeeded by the paragraph dealing with the phrase "The dwellers of Jabez" which was dealt with on page 39. Sifre Numbers then has the 'proof' that the Rechabites were Kenites quoted on page 20.

Sifre Numbers 78 now has a discussion of the various interpretations of the Promise to the Rechabites (Jer. 35:19), consisting of a quotation of the Promise itself, the paragraph quoted above on page 21, and the one quoted on page on page 23. Its discussion of the Rechabites is concluded with the Qal Vahomer saying cited on page 80. The rest of Sifre Numbers 78 deals with matters other than the Kenites and the Rechabites, so falls outside the scope of the present study.

#### Sifre Numbers 81

Sifre Numbers' comment on the last sentence of Num. 10:29 is fairly short, but it introduces an important theme in the rabbinic traditions about the Rechabites. It was earlier suggested that the Rabbis asked four questions of Judg. 1:16: Where did the sons of Keni go up from? How did they come to be there in the first place? Why did they leave? Where did they go? The answers to the first and last of these questions have already been ascertained: from Jericho, to

the dwelling place of Jabez, to study Torah with him. Sifre Numbers 81 provides the answers for the second and third.

AND IT WILL COME TO PASS, THAT IF YOU GO WITH US, THIS GOOD THING SHALL HAPPEN. And what was the good that they promised to him? They spoke when Israel divided the land, and they left the fat portion of Jericho, 500 cubits upon 500 cubits. They said, Whoever should build the Chosen House in his portion, let him receive the fat portion of Jericho. They gave it - a choice portion - to Jonadab the son of Rechab, and they ate of it for 440 years, as it is said, "And it came to pass in the 480th year after the sons of Israel came out of the land of Egypt" (1 Kings 6:1). Subtract from them the forty years which Israel spent in the wilderness, and we find them eating of it 440 years. And when the Shekinah came to dwell in the portion of Benjamin, the sons of Benjamin came to receive their portion, and they arose and turned it away from themselves, as it is said, "And the sons of Keni, the father-in-law of Moses, went up from the City of Palm Trees" (Judg. 1:16).

The second and third questions, 'How did the sons of Keni come to be in Jericho in the first place?', and, 'Why did they leave?', are considered elsewhere in the rabbinic literature in Sifre Zutta to Num. 10:29 (end), Sifre Deuteronomy 12:5, 33:12, Aboth of Rabbi Nathan I, 35, Tanhumah Jethro 4 and Yalkut Shimoni to the Prophets 38 (which seems to have been drawn from Sifre Numbers 81).

The question, 'Why were the Kenites/Rechabites in Jericho in the first place?', receives two answers in these texts: at the division of the land following the conquest, Jericho was left unallocated, to be received as compensation by the tribe which had the Temple built in its territory, and the Kenites/Rechabites were given it in the meantime; and Jethro was given Jericho when he came into the land with Israel, in fulfillment of Moses' words in Num. 10:29, 'Come with us and we will do good to you'.

The latter tradition is found only once, in Tanhumah Jethro, in the introduction to the Midrash also found in Sifre Zutta. All the sources just cited reflect the former tradition, but not in a uniform manner. In Sifre Numbers 81, one of the traditions in Sifre Zutta, and in Sifre Deuteronomy 12:5, Israel divides the land and leaves Jericho. In Sifre Deut. 33:12 and ARN I, 35, this is done by Joshua. Only Sifre Num. 81 and Sifre Deut. mention the size of the portion left unallocated (500x500 cubits). Sifre Num. 81, Sifre Zutta and probably Sifre Deut. 33:12, simply say that the portion of Jericho was left for the tribe that would have the Temple built in its territory, while Sifre Deut. 12:5 and ARN I, 35 specify that it was left for the Benjaminites to receive when the Temple was built in their territory. Sifre Num. 81 and Sifre Deut. 33:12 say that it was given to the Rechabites in the meantime, Sifre Deut. 12:5 and ARN I, 35 that it was given to the Kenites, and Sifre Zutta that it was given to Jethro himself!

Given this almost bewildering variety of details in the witnesses to the one basic tradition, a variety so diverse that no two instances of the tradition are the same, it is not possible, nor perhaps even methodologically correct, to attempt to push behind the witnesses, in an attempt to find the 'original' form of the saying. With some of the other sayings considered in this survey, it has been possible to do this, and secondary accretions have been identifiable, but this is not the case with the 'receiving and leaving of Jericho' tradition.

The ultimate source of the tradition also remains a mystery. There is no biblical evidence for Jericho being left unallocated at the division of the land, to be received as compensation for land lost by the tribe which eventually had the Temple built in its territory. That Jericho might have been left out of the allocation of the land could perhaps have been inferred from Joshua's curse upon it, Josh. 6:26, cf. 1 Kings 16:34, but this can hardly have formed the foundation of the Midrashic tradition. Cursed land would hardly have been called a 'fat portion', דוֹשֶׁן, or a 'choice portion', חֵלֶק בְּרִמָּה, nor would it have been viewed as a very appropriate recompense for land lost as a result of the building of the Temple and, in any case, Josh. 18:21 indicates that the Benjaminites owned Jericho right from the division of the land. K. Kohler was of the opinion that the connection between the Rechabites and Jericho was an allusion to the Essene community at En Gedi,<sup>140</sup> but this suggestion may be discounted, as the Qumran Scrolls make no mention

of Jericho, and the Greek witnesses to the Essenes do not connect it with them either. As noted above,<sup>141</sup> the Qumran community saw themselves as living in the desert, not in the 'fat portion of Jericho'. The Apocryphal, Pseudepigraphical, Targumic and other rabbinic literature all seem to be similarly silent on the matter, so further progress on ascertaining the date and provenance of this tradition is difficult.

The idea that the 'fat portion of Jericho' that was left unallocated was 500 cubits square has nothing to do with the traditions about Jericho. It derives from the Temple traditions. Ezekiel 42:16-20 and 45:2 indicate that the Temple was to cover 500x500 cubits. The portion to be received as compensation was thus the same size.

The second tradition concerning the Rechabites/Kenites being in Jericho, and their reasons for leaving it, is found in Tanhumah Jethro 4 and Sifre Zutta. The passage in question has already been cited.<sup>142</sup> Jethro, having received Jericho, complains that he never has any time to study Torah, because he spends all his time sowing and reaping. He is told that there is a man teaching Torah in the city, so the Kenites leave Jericho and go and sit before Jabez, in order to learn Torah. A not dissimilar tradition is found in ARN I, 35,<sup>143</sup> where it is recounted that the sons of Jethro were potters, great men with houses, fields and vineyards, and in order to do the work of the King of kings of kings, they left it all, and went and studied Torah

with Jabez.

These stories may reflect an ancient, possibly pre-Christian, origin. They depict the Rechabites/Kenites as giving up manual labour in order to go and study Torah, whether that labour be sowing, or reaping, or pottery. The practices of the Rechabites, as recounted by Jer. 35, ie. not living in houses, not sowing seed or planting vineyard, seem to lie behind ARN's description of the former life of Jethro's sons. This abandonment of manual labour, in order to learn Torah, suggests that the tradition here regards the activity of the Torah scholar as being the preserve of the 'honourable idler'. This same picture is depicted in the work of Jesus Sirach (first quarter of the second century BCE), 38:24-39:11. The rabbinic literature, however, contains many injunctions to the effect that Torah scholars should also have a trade, cf. mAboth 1:10, 2:2, bPes. 113a.<sup>144</sup> Bernhard Lang says of the scriptural scholars of the period 150 BCE-70 CE that, as in the case of Paul the Apostle, "the ideal is to combine study of the Torah with the practice of a trade".<sup>145</sup> This is not what our traditions say, nor is it what Jesus Sirach says. The text of Ecclesiasticus mentions those who work in the field (38:25f) and potters (38:29f), as being those who are needed for the life of a city, but who have no time for scholarship (38:22f).

This idea, of the Torah scholar as one who is free from worldly pursuits, seems to be the one underlying the Midrashim in Sifre Zutta, Tanhumah Jethro and ARN I, 35.

Given that this idea becomes replaced by that of the scholar also maintaining himself by a worldly trade, it seems evident that this tradition, presented in what are much later documents, may well have an ancient origin, possibly stemming originally from the second century BCE.

### Sifre Zutta to Numbers 10:29

As with Sifre Numbers 78, much of this portion of Sifre Zutta has already been considered in connection with material found elsewhere in the rabbinic literature. This section will therefore provide the cross-references needed in order to read the chapter of Sifre Zutta as a complete whole.

It opens with what is, in effect, a compressed version of the portion of Sifre Numbers 78 quoted above on pages 82-83. This is followed by the discussion of Jethro's name, which was quoted on pages 49-50. After this comes the claim that Jethro's sons loved the Torah as much as he did, using Jer. 35:2 as a proof-text. This was dealt with on page 46. The next paragraph is the one which argues that Jer. 35:19 meant that the Rechabites became members of the Sanhedrin, quoted on page 22. This in turn is followed by the Qal Va-homer conclusion that was discussed on pages 79-80.

Sifre Zutta now moves to a consideration of the two other leading examples of proselytes in rabbinic thought, Rahab and Ruth. The passage concerning Ruth is partially reproduced in bBaba Bathra 91b.<sup>146</sup> It then returns to a direct consideration of Num. 10:29-32, with the Midrash concerning

the 'fat portion of Jericho' that was mentioned on pages 86-90. This is followed by the story of Jethro living his labours in order to go and study Torah in the city. This was quoted on page 41. The passage concludes with the discussion of the three clan names of 1 Chron. 2:55 that was quoted on page 58.

### Sifre Deuteronomy

There are two places in the Sifre to Deuteronomy where the Rechabites are mentioned, 12:5 and 33:12. Both these texts were considered in connection with Sifre Numbers 81, on pages 86-88. The end of the passage in Sifre Deut. 12:5 was also discussed on pages 37 and 40-41.

### The Midrash Rabbah

There are four places in the Midrash Rabbah, where there is either a mention of the Rechabites, or else a citation of Jeremiah 35 or 1 Chronicles 2:55. Genesis Rabbah 98:8 was dealt with on pages 32-33; Exodus Rabbah 1:9 on page 17; and Numbers Rabbah on pages 80-81. Thus, only Genesis Rabbah 97 (New Version) needs to be considered here.

This chapter of Genesis Rabbah is a Midrash on Jacob's blessings (Gen. 49), which appears in most manuscripts of the work, but not in the Vatican or Temanite MSS. It is printed at the end of the current Wilna edition, was included by Theodor and Albeck in their critical edition,<sup>147</sup> and by

the Soncino translation, which is given here:

THE SCEPTRE [STAFF] SHALL NOT DEPART FROM JUDAH (xlix, 10). This alludes to the Exilarchs in Babylon who chastise the people of Israel with the staff. NOR A LAWGIVER FROM BETWEEN HIS FEET. This alludes to the House of Rabbi, who publicly teach Torah in Eretz Israel. Another interpretation: THE SCEPTRE [STAFF] SHALL NOT DEPART FROM JUDAH alludes to the Messiah, son of David, who will chastise the state with a staff, as it says, Thou shalt break them with a rod [staff] of iron (Ps. ii, 9). NOR A LAWGIVER FROM BETWEEN HIS FEET alludes to the inhabitants of Jabez, the Tirathites, Shimeathites, Sucathites, who gave legal rulings to Israel in the Great Sanhedrin, which sat in the Chamber of Hewn Stones in the territory of Judah, as it says, And the families of scribes that dwelt at Jabez etc. (1 Chron. ii, 55).

This passage is quoted in Yalkut Shim<sup>c</sup>oni to the Torah 160, where 'descendents of Hillel' appears, rather than 'patriarchs of the House of Rabbi'. Jabez is named as Rabbi's grandson in Derek Eretz Zutta 1:18,<sup>148</sup> which might suggest that the text in Genesis Rabbah is the one that has been changed, to bring the two interpretations into parallel with each other. Hillel was also chronologically prior to R. Judah the Prince, and was alive when the Temple was still standing, when the Great Sanhedrin was still meeting in the Chamber of Hewn Stone, in the Court of the Temple. It has already been shown that the tradition that the Kenites/Rechabites sat in the Sanhedrin may plausibly be dated to the first

century CE.<sup>149</sup> Certainty over the correct reading is, however, impossible.

### The Homiletic Midrashim

A number of the relevant texts from the Homiletic Midrashim have already been considered in the course of this study. Thus, the Aboth of Rabbi Nathan I, 35 was discussed on pages 29-30 and 86-91, Derek Eretz Zutta 1:18 on page 93, Pesikta de Rab Kahana 3d on pages 18-19, Tanhumah Jethro 4 on pages 18, 37, 41, 43, 56-61, 66-67, 84, and 86-91, Tanhumah Bammidbar 26 on pages 80-81, Tanhumah Wayyaqhel 9 and Midrash Psalms 1:18 on page 59. There are, however, a number of other texts from the Pesikta de Rab Kahana, Pesikta Rabbati, Midrash Aggadah, 2 Alphabet of Ben Sirach, Tanhumah Shemini and Tanhumah Tezzaveh which have not yet been examined. These texts form the subject of the present section.

Yalkut Makiri, like the better-known Yalkut Shimoni, is a late collection of Midrashim, dated by EJ to 1300-1400 CE.<sup>150</sup> Ginzberg referred to its exposition of 'How beautiful upon the mountains are the feet of the messenger of good tidings', Is. 52:7, as an "unknown Midrash quoted in Makiri on Is. 52".<sup>151</sup> Subsequent scholarship has revealed, however, that the Midrash in question is anything but unknown. It is, in fact, Supplement 5:2 to the Pesikta de Rab Kahana. Only the end of this section is relevant for the purposes of this study. It reads:

And who will be the ones bringing the good

tidings? They will be, said R. Joshua, the descendents of Jonadab the son of Rechab, who will be the first with good tidings to Israel, for it is said, There shall not be cut off unto Jonadab the son of Rechab a man to stand before me forever (Jer. 35:19). Indeed, Jonadab's descendents will go up [to Jerusalem], where they will be the first to bring an offering, since of them it is said, a man to stand before me forever, words which include an allusion, one may infer, to the days of the Messiah.

This idea, that those bringing the good tidings to Israel are the sons of Jonadab, is also found in PRK Supp. 5:4, where Jer. 35:19 is the prooftext for the claim that the Rechabites would be the heralds,

who upon entering the Temple will bring offerings, procure expiation and bring tidings of redemption to Israel.

There are two ideas contained in this tradition. Firstly, that the Rechabites will announce the good tidings of salvation, and secondly, that in so doing they will exercise a priestly ministry. It has already been shown that the origin of the tradition that the Rechabites became priests lies in the interpretation of נָמַד לְפָנַי in Jer. 35:19.<sup>152</sup> This holds true for this tradition also, even though this phrase of the verse does not actually appear in the Hebrew of either PRK Supp. 5:2 or 5:4. As Lauterbach has pointed out, rabbinic scriptural citations are often not given in full, yet the crucial word or words for the interpretation lies in that part of the verse that has not been cited. This has been

recognised by the English translation of PRK, which has extended the quotation in both Supp. 5:2 and 5:4.

That the Rechabites would be those bringing the good tidings of salvation seems to have been deduced from the fact that Jer. 35:19 promises that the Rechabites will endure in perpetuity (כִּלְיֵי הַיָּמִים), which PRK understands to mean 'until the days of the Messiah'.

The date of the tradition is problematic. It is ascribed to R. Joshua, who lived around the time of the Fall of the Temple, in Supp. 5:2, but whether the ascription is genuine is open to debate. According to Sifre Numbers 78, R. Joshua taught that Jer. 35:19 meant, not that the Rechabites entered the Temple, but that they were members of the Sanhedrin. Whether the two PRK passages presuppose that the Temple has fallen is also debateable. Supp. 5:2 is silent on the matter. Supp. 5:4 speaks of the New Jerusalem coming down from heaven to earth, before it speaks of the Rechabites entering the Temple with the good news - does this passage presuppose that the events of 70 CE have happened or not? Whatever the date of this tradition, it may be safely pointed out that this is the first instance of an 'eschatological' interpretation of the Promise to the Rechabites in Jer. 35:19. The traditions that they became priests and that they became members of the Sanhedrin are more 'this-worldly', and it has been argued that they reflect a concrete historical situation in the first century CE. The traditions in PRK, and those in Pesikta Rabbati, Midrash Aggadah, 2 Alphabet of

Ben Sirach and the History of the Rechabites are more 'other-worldly' - though recognition of this is not in itself an aid towards dating these traditions: 'other-worldly' traditions are not necessarily later than 'this-worldly' ones; the reverse may be true, or else they could have emanated from different sources.

Ginzberg lists Pesikta Rabbati 31,<sup>153</sup> Midrash Aggadah to Num. 24:22 and 2 Alphabet of Ben Sirach 28 together, as all dealing with the future abode of the Rechabites.  
154

The passage from Pesikta Rabbati reads: ואלה מארץ סיני 'And these from the land of Sinim (ibid. [Is. 49:12]). These are the sons of Jonadab the son of Rechab'. The context suggests that the Rechabites are here viewed as exiled Jews who will be brought back to Jerusalem in the messianic age. The connection of the Rechabites with the age of the Messiah has already been encountered in the supplements to PRK, but there the tradition was rather different. Here, the question that is being addressed is: Given that Jer. 35:19 promises that the Rechabites will last forever, and that scripture cannot fail, the Rechabites must be still alive today somewhere. They are nowhere to be found in the 'Known World', so their existence must currently be in some remote place, referred to under the biblical name Sinim, from whence they will eventually return to Jerusalem. Braude places the redaction of Pesikta Rabbati to the seventh century CE.<sup>155</sup>

The 11th century CE<sup>156</sup> Midrash Aggadah to the Pentateuch<sup>157</sup> contains a similar idea in its consideration of Num. 24:22: "In the destruction of the Temple, the sons of Jonadab the son of Rechab were not exiled, because they were of the sons of Keni, for the Holy One, blessed be He, sent them to the dark mountains".

The "dark mountains", as one of the abodes of the Exiles, along with the region beyond the River Sambation, is found also in Numbers Rabbah 16:25, but without any mention of the Rechabites.

2 Alphabet of Ben Sirach, dating from after the rise of Islam,<sup>158</sup> tackles the same problem in a rather different way. In chapter 28 of this work, the following sentence is found: "The descendents of Jonadab live in Paradise where they entered alive".

Ginzberg rightly compares these three traditions with the one found in the History of the Rechabites,<sup>159</sup> where the Rechabites describe how they were brought to the Isles of the Blessed Ones, and how they live there. Before these traditions of the abode of the Rechabites can be further analysed, further study on the History of the Rechabites needs to be carried out.<sup>160</sup>

At this stage, however, it may be said that these traditions about the Rechabites presumably derive from a time and a place where there were no 'ready-made' candidates who

fitted the description of the Rechabites as always existing, and hence the scriptural promise had to be 'dehistoricised', in order for it not to be proved false. The tradition that the Rechabites were members of the Sanhedrin was able to use the increasing number of proselytes being incorporated into first-century CE Israel as examples of contemporary 'Rechabites', still very much 'standing before the Lord'.

The tradition in Tanhumah Shemini 5/Tanhumah Buber Shemini 14 has already been noted in passing.<sup>161</sup> The two versions of the one Midrash are largely, but not completely, identical. It is a discussion of the merits of abstinence from wine, and is found in the middle of a larger discussion of Lev. 10:9, where serving priests are commanded not to drink wine. The Midrash opens with the statement, אֲשֶׁר־אָדָם שְׂאֵינוֹ לְהוֹט אַחֲרֵי הַיַּיִן, 'Blessed is the man who is not anxious for wine', which it then proceeds to illustrate by way of the example of the Rechabites, who were banned from drinking wine by their father, because he had heard Jeremiah prophesying the destruction of the Temple. Unlike Israel, the Rechabites have obeyed what was commanded them, and so they have received the promise of eternal survival.

This the first occasion where the example of the Rechabites has been adduced as an argument in favour of the practice of temperance in the consumption of alcohol. The other Midrashim, as has been seen, have focussed on very different themes. Admittedly, Mek. Rashbi to Exodus 18:27 includes a claim that abstinence from wine prolongs one's

days, but it is argued from the examples of Cain, Noah, Lot and Uzziah, but not from the example of the Rechabites, even though it occurs in the middle of a passage dealing with them!<sup>162</sup> This suggests that this tradition derives from a date and milieu where the ethics of alcohol were deemed to be more important than more abstract speculation about the Kenites and the Rechabites and how their example of fidelity should serve as a paradigm for Israel. This is a significant shift in emphasis, away from the example of fidelity to the example of abstinence, but when and where it happened cannot be determined without further investigation into the history of Judaism. The Tanhumah was probably compiled in the period 775-900 CE, and there is no evidence for the use of the Rechabites in this way before this date - in the material considered here, it is only found elsewhere in Radak's commentary on Jer. 35, where a homily extolling the virtues of abstinence appears, citing Prov. 20:1, Is. 5, 28:1.

The other passage in the Tanhumah which cites 1 Chron. 2:55 is Tanhumah Tezzaveh 9. It has been noted several times in the course of this survey that Jabez was regarded by the Rabbis as the Torah scholar par excellence. This passage of the Tanhumah provides the most succinct summary of this belief:

AND THIS IS THE THING THAT YOU SHALL MAKE FOR THEM. This is what scripture says, 'The wise will inherit honour'(Prov. 3). Glory befits the wise who labour in the Torah. Torah says, 'Strength and honour are with me, substantial property and righteousness'. And

so you find 36 generations from Adam to Jabez. And it is not written of any of them except Jabez that they were honourable (1 Chron. 4). 'And Jabez was more honourable than his brothers'. And why is it written of him that he was honourable? Because he was a Torah scholar, assembling congregations and expounding the arguments of Torah to many, as it is written (1 Chron, 2), 'And the families of scribes, the inhabitants of Jabez, Tirathites, Shimeathites, Sucathites. These are the Kenites who came from Hammath, father of the House of Rechab'.

The understanding of Jabez as the Torah scholar par excellence stems in part from a pun on his name, as bTemurah 16a shows: 'He was called ... Jabez, because he counselled and fostered Torah in Israel'. The word rendered 'counselled' is  $\text{יָצַח}$ , which is similar to  $\text{יָבֵז}$ , 'Jabez'. Compare the proposed etymology of his name in the MT of 1 Chron. 4:9f, as if from  $\text{יָבֵז}$ , 'sorrow', which is just as forced an explanation as the rabbinic one. The idea of Jabez as the Torah scholar is also derived from 1 Chron. 2:55, where the 'inhabitants of Jabez' are the 'families of scribes' - and scribes are teachers of Torah. That the Jabez of 1 Chron. 2:55 was a place and that of 4:9f a person was immaterial to this exegesis. C.T.R. Hayward has shown that the connection of scribes with Torah teaching "is likely to be as old as the first century AD, possible [?] older still".<sup>163</sup> This would imply that at least some of the traditions concerning Jabez may be very ancient.



The '36 generations from Adam to Jabez' is the other interesting feature of this passage from the Tanhumah. It is unlikely that the number 36 derives from an attempt to count the generations from Adam to Jabez, as detailed in 1 Chron. 1-4. 1 Chron. 4:9f is an isolated fragment, unconnected with what precedes or with what follows, and Jabez' parents are unnamed. It is more likely that the '36 generations' is linked in some way to the tradition that there was, in each generation, 36 hidden just men, who preserved the world and daily received the divine countenance. While the idea of the hidden just men is older, Gershom Scholem assigns the number 36 to the fourth century Babylonian teacher Abbaye, but unfortunately he does not name his source.<sup>164</sup> Scholem goes on to argue that, as the scriptural basis for this is patently forced (it is derived via Gematria), Abbaye

took an idea known to him from other sources  
or views and in this way read it into  
Scripture in order to find further support  
for it there.

He is of the opinion that Abbaye derived it from the fact that ancient astrology divided the 360 degrees of a circle into 36 deans, each with its own master, whom he appropriated for Judaism as the 36 hidden just men.

If Scholem is right, and if the '36 generations from Adam to Jabez' is dependent on this tradition, ie. that the thirty-sixth group of thirty-six hidden just men would produce a highly important figure, then this part of the Jabez tradition, which seems to be found only here is, in contrast with his fame as a Torah scholar, late - post-

fourth century CE.

### The Yalkutim

Yalkut Shim<sup>C</sup>oni to the Torah has been dealt with as follows: Indication 160 on pages 93-94; Indication 169 on page 80; and Indication 771 on page 26. To the Prophets 3 was discussed on page 49 and 130 on pages 17-18. To the Prophets 1074 is Yalkut Shim<sup>C</sup>oni's treatment ad. loc. of 1 Chron. 2:55. It cites the passages from bSotah 11a and jShekalim, both already considered, acknowledging them as sources. Yalkut Makiri to Isaiah 52:7 was considered on page 94.

The two remaining passages are both found in Yalkut Shim<sup>C</sup>oni to the Prophets. Indication 38 is part of the Yalkut's discussion of Judges 1, and Indication 323 deals with Jer. 35. The former passage is the longest passage dealing with the Rechabites in the Yalkut. Despite its length, it may be divided up into eleven different sections, as follows:

- (1) The seven names of Jethro. See page 84;
- (2) When they went up from the City of Palm Trees, the sons of Keni left Jericho and went before Jabez to study Torah. Pages 39-40;
- (3) For when the land was divided, the Israelites left the fat portion of Jericho as compensation for the tribe which would have the Temple built in its territory. For 440 years, the Rechabites ate its produce, until the Benjaminites came and took it over. Page 86;
- (4) They went and sat before Jabez, proved by 1 Chron. 2:55. Pages 39-40;

- (5) An exposition of the clan names in 1 Chron. 2:55. Page 57;
- (6) The Rechabites observed their practices because the Temple was destined to be destroyed. Page 48;
- (7) The saying of R. Nathan that the covenant with Jonadab was greater than that with David. Page 76;
- (8) The saying of R. Jonathan that Jer. 35:19 meant that the Rechabites became members of the Sanhedrin. Page 21;
- (9) The anonymous saying that the daughters of the Rechabites married priests. Page 23;
- (10) 1 Chron. 2:55 used to prove that Jonadab's sons were of the sons of Jethro. Page 20;
- (11) The Qal Vahomer conclusion. Page 80.

Indication 323 may also be divided, this time into six parts, other than the opening citation of Jer. 35:7:

- (1) An anonymous saying concerning the acceptance of a sacrifice offered in the Temple by the sons of the drinkers of water. See pages 69-70;
- (2) The saying of R. Jonathan that the covenant with Jonadab with Jonadab was greater than that with David;
- (3) A second saying from R. Jonathan to the effect that Jer. 35:19 meant that the Rechabites became members of the Sanhedrin;
- (4) An alternative opinion, that the daughters of the Rechabites married priests;
- (5) 1 Chron. 2:55 cited to prove that Jonadab's sons were of Jethro's sons;
- (6) The Qal Vahomer conclusion.

When this anthology is compared with that in Indication 38, just listed, it becomes clear that 323 is another

instance of the end of 38, except that the 'water-drinking sacrificers' have been inserted. Other variations between the passages are so slight as to be negligible.

This fundamental similarity between 323 and the end of 38 is capable of three explanations: that 323 formed the basis of 38, and the compiler omitted the 'water-drinking sacrificers' for some reason; that 38 is the Vorlage of 323, and the sacrifice of the water drinkers has been inserted; or that in 38 and 323 we have two recensions of an earlier collection of traditions about the Rechabites.

The first possibility, that the compiler already had 323 before him when he composed 38, founders on the water-drinking sacrificers story. This appears nowhere in 38, yet if the compiler had had it before him, in the collection reflected by 323, when he was creating 38, surely he would have retained it? No good reason can be adduced for its omission.

That 38 is the Vorlage of 323 is also a remote possibility. If the compiler were consciously using material he had already used elsewhere in the same work, would he really have gone to the trouble of writing it all out again? The answer to this question must be in the negative, as there is evidence in the Yalkut Shim<sup>C</sup>oni of the compiler directing his readers to another Indication where a particular subject is discussed, rather than repeating himself. Thus, in 38, immediately after the passage which is identical to 323, the

compiler continues his discussion of Judges 1 with ואת (כתוב ברמז כ"ח) ה'בוסי, "'And the Jebusites' (written about in Indication 28)". By analogy, it must be concluded that if the compiler had had his discussion of Judg. 1:16 before him when he was preparing his discussion of Jer. 35, rather than repeat all his material again, he would have written the citation from Jer. 35:7, the 'water-drinking sacrificers' story, and then have abbreviated the rest to something like כתוב ברמז ל"ח, "written about in Indication 38".

This leaves the third option: that there is evidence here for an earlier collection of traditions about the Rechabites, consisting of a citation of Jer. 35:7, R. Jonathan's saying that the covenant with Jonadab is greater than the one with David, his second saying, that Jer. 35:19 means that the Rechabites became part of the Sanhedrin, the anonymous saying that the daughters of the Rechabites married priests, the 'proof' that the Rechabites were Kenites, and a Qal Vahomer conclusion.

All these elements are found elsewhere in the rabbinic traditions about the Rechabites but, while internal comparison of the Yalkut reveals that the compiler has adopted a pre-existing collection of sayings, there is no evidence for this collection elsewhere in the material under study. The closest parallel is in Sifre Numbers 78, where three of the elements appear together: the saying that the Rechabites sat in the Sanhedrin (there ascribed to R. Joshua!), the one

concerning their daughters marrying priests, and the Qal Vahomer conclusion. The question and answer about the Rechabites being Kenites is found a few lines earlier. Evidently, the Sifre to Numbers represents a stage where some of the traditions that had eventually coalesced by the time of the Yalkut had already come together, but others were still floating independently. It is also evident that the compiler of the Yalkut Shim<sup>c</sup>oni was not completely original in his selection of material for his anthology, but that he was in part guided by earlier, smaller collections of Midrashim.

#### The Mediaeval Commentators: Rashi and Radak

At various points in this discussion about the rabbinic traditions concerning the Rechabites, mention has been made of the commentaries of Rashi (R. Solomon ben Isaac, 1040-1105 CE) and Radak (R. David Kimḥi, c.1160-c.1235 CE) on the Bible. To round off this survey, consideration of the material which these two commentators offer in their commentaries on Judg. 1:16, Jer. 35 and 1 Chron. 2:55 is here provided.

#### Judges 1:16

Rashi reflects the common rabbinic traditions here, that the fat portion of Jericho was given to the sons of Jethro, to eat of it until the Temple should be built, when the tribe who had had it built in its territory would receive Jericho as compensation. The sons of Jethro ate of it for

440 years, then their disciples left it and went alongside Othniel ben Kenaz, ie. Jabez, to study Torah. Rashi explains 'And he went and dwelt with the people' as 'People are the disciples who were sitting before him'.

Radak's exposition of the verse is much longer. Jericho is the City of Palm Trees because it has many palms. We are not told why they went from the City of Palm Trees, or whether they were resident there with the Canaanites. This is possible, because at the time Jethro was not with the Israelites, as it is written, 'And he went to his own land'. Because Jethro did good to Israel, the Holy One did good to Jethro throughout all generations. They lived in Israel in tents, and used to move around from place to place, cf. Saul's words to them in 1 Samuel 15. Radak next mentions the Rechabites explicitly: 'Behold, the righteousness which is kept for them forever: in the days of Jehu, Jonadab son of Rechab was loved and honoured in Israel, and in the days of Jeremiah the prophet the Rechabites were in the midst of the sons of Israel, and scripture says "There will not lack a man to Jonadab son of Rechab standing before me forever". And the House of the Rechabites are of the sons of Jethro, as it is said, "These are the Kenites which came from Hammath, father of the House of Rechab"'. Radak later mentions that, in fulfillment of the promise to Jethro, "Come with us and we will do you good", his sons were given the fat portion of Jericho, 500 by 500 cubits, which was left for the tribe which would have the Temple built in its portion. They owned it for 440 years, until the Temple was built in Benjamin.

'They went up from the City of Palm Trees', for they left their substance and went to study Torah in the wilderness of Judah with Othniel (ie. Jabez), as 1 Chron. 2:55 proves.

All of what Rashi, and much of what Radak, says is found elsewhere in the rabbinic literature. There are one or two features of Radak's exposition that are worthy of note, however, such as the connection between the Jonadab of 2 Kings 10 and the Jonadab of Jer. 35, which has already been remarked upon.<sup>165</sup> The idea of living in a tent, and being able to move around from place to place, is evidently one that appealed to Radak, as will be seen when his exposition of Jeremiah 35 is examined.

#### Jeremiah 35

Again, Radak's commentary is longer than Rashi's. The main features of Rashi's exposition are that the Rechabites were of the sons of Jethro, that they lived in tents because, as sons of Jethro, they had no share in the land, that they kept pasture-animals (מדבריות), and that they came unwillingly to Jerusalem and were now living in houses.

All these are questions that are often addressed by modern commentators. Were the Rechabites Kenites? Were they shepherds? Did they abandon their distinctive lifestyle once they came to Jerusalem? The findings of Part One of this study suggest that the answer to each of these questions is, in fact, 'no', but Rashi's explanation of the Rechabite

tent-dwelling, as being connected with landlessness, reflects the conclusions of this study concerning their designation as garim, even if Rashi's reasons are different.

Radak's exposition of Jer. 35 also has a number of distinctive features about it. He observes that, when the Rechabites call Jonadab their father, they must mean their ancestor, as Jonadab flourished in the days of Jehu, the Rechabites in the days of Jehoiakim.<sup>166</sup> Radak then explains the Rechabite practices as enabling the Rechabites, because they had nothing committing them to one location, to flee from evil and draw near to good, thus ensuring long life, which is denied to someone with houses, fields and vineyards, who must stay in one place, even in time of dearth. Radak draws a parallel between the Rechabites and the Patriarchs, with their itinerant lifestyle. He then presents a homily extolling the virtues of abstaining from wine. Dealing with Jer. 35:19, Radak presents three opinions: that of Targum Jonathan, that which claims that the daughters of the Rechabites married priests, and the one which claims that they sat in the Sanhedrin - all familiar traditions!<sup>167</sup>

Once again, Radak, and here also Rashi, has introduced an exposition markedly different from that found in the Midrashim. Only Radak in the Jewish literature compares the Rechabites with the Patriarchs - something which this study has also done - and only Radak has held up the itinerant lifestyle as being worthy of commendation. Other than Radak, only Tanhumah Shemini has used the example of the Rechabites

to extol the virtues of teetotalism. Radak and Rashi have refrained from the more fanciful speculation about the fate of the Rechabites, as reflected by Pesikta Rabbati, Midrash Aggadah and 2 Alphabet of Ben Sirach, restricting themselves to the (probably) older material found in the Targum and the Tannaitic Midrashim. All this reflects a new soberness and care which mark out Rashi and Radak as a turning point in Jewish scriptural exegesis. We are approaching the realms of 'scientific' exegesis.

#### 1 Chronicles 2:55

Our commentators' expositions of 1 Chron. 2:55 show the same restraint and soberness that was noted in their expositions of Jer. 35. They are worth quoting in full here.

Rashi: AND THE FAMILIES OF SCRIBES, INHABITANTS OF JABEZ. The company of Jabez, for he was managing them, as it is written below, 'Jabez was more honourable than his brothers'. TIRATHITES, SHIMEATHITES, SUCATHITES. All these are names of their father's houses. THESE ARE THE KENITES. And where was their place? Were they not inhabitants of Kain? There was their place, as it is written, 'Kain, Gibeah and Timnah'(Joshua 15:57). WHO CAME FROM HAMMATH FATHER OF THE HOUSE OF RECHAB. Because they went forth from Hammath, for he was of the House of Rechab, and dwelt in Kain. Another opinion is that Jabez is the name of a city in Issachar, as it is written, 'Rabbith, Kishion, Ebez'(Joshua 19:20).

It is almost as if 'Rashi'<sup>168</sup> is deliberately shunn-

ing the old Haggadic exegesis of this verse which, as has been seen in this survey of the rabbinic traditions, have been fairly fanciful at times, especially concerning Jabez and the Tirathites, Shimeathites and Sucathites. Rashi also seems to eschew a genealogical meaning for *קנזים*, in preference for a spatial one - as this study has also done.

This preference for a more sober method of exegesis is found also in Radak's commentary on the verse:

AND THE FAMILIES OF THE SCRIBES, INHABITANTS OF JABEZ. As it says, these families were also of the sons of Salma. SCRIBES, because they were scribes and teachers, and inhabited a city which was called Jabez. Perhaps Jabez built it, and it was called by his name. TIRATHITES, SHIMEATHITES, SUCATHITES. Names of families. There are many interpretations of these names, but if we were to try to interpret the meanings of these names, it would be impossible, for we have nothing except what is written ... THESE ARE THE KENITES ... Our sages, of blessed memory, said that they were from the sons of Keni, the father-in-law of Moses, and that they were mixed with the families of Judah and were counted with them. FROM HAMMATH FATHER OF THE HOUSE OF RECHAB. And they are the families of the House of the Rechabites mentioned in the book of Jeremiah, and the name of the father of that family is Hammath.

Radak's exposition of the three clan names has already been considered, in the examination of the "many interpretations" of those names,<sup>169</sup> and what was said there

bears repeating here. It is almost as if Radak is avowedly rejecting the whole Haggadic means of scriptural exegesis in favour of a more 'literal' reading of the text. It was to be this method that was to become dominant in biblical exegesis and, in many respects, Solomon ben Isaac and David Kimhi stand closer to modern critical scholars than they do to their Jewish predecessors, whose work is reflected in the Mishnah and Talmuds, Tannaitic Midrashim, Midrash Rabbah, Homiletic Midrashim and Yalkutim. As Rashi and Radak form such a marked turning in the Jewish traditions concerning the Rechabites, they form a fitting close to this study of those traditions.

### Conclusion

The foregoing survey of the rabbinic references to the Rechabites has worked through the literature in its 'traditional' order, but it has become clear that the date of a tradition does not necessarily correspond with the date of the work in which it first appears. Many of the traditions identified in this analysis have been seen to be considerably older, and it is important, by way of conclusion, to present the data in what seems to be its chronological order.

The earliest tradition concerning the Rechabites seems to be the one that they practised Torah scholarship as a full-time pursuit, free from worldly interests. Because this is held up as an ideal in Ecclesiasticus, but is not held to be commendable in the first centuries of the Common Era, this tradition has nothing preventing the ascription

of a second century BCE date to it.

A number of traditions were seen to have nothing in them which urged a date later than the first century CE, despite Neusner's cautions about this period in Jewish history.<sup>170</sup> The traditions concerning the Kenites, the Rechabites and the Sanhedrin plausibly reflect disputes over the composition of the Sanhedrin after the mass conversions to Judaism of the late pre-Christian/early Christian period. The ones which understand the Tirathites as Teru<sup>c</sup>ah-blowers, the Sucathites as being overshadowed by the Holy Spirit, the Shimeathites as Torah scholars, Jabez as a Torah scholar and the story of the water-drinking sacrificers all seem to reflect the period prior to the Fall of the Temple.

To the period immediately following the Fall, and among groups which felt that it was right to observe harsh mourning customs, and which required a scriptural precedent for this belief, belong the traditions that the Rechabites observed their practices as mourning rites for the loss of the Temple, instigated by the preaching of Jeremiah.

There are also a number of traditions without a date beyond the possible date of the document in which they appear. In these cases, it is unwise to speculate about earlier dates for their origin.

This applies to the tradition found in ARN that the Rechabites were potters (3rd-4th century CE), and to those

in the Tannaitic Midrashim for which no earlier date can be assigned: the one that the Kenites/Rechabites went up from Jericho and studied Torah with Jabez; the one that the Kenites and the Rechabites were identical; the one that the covenant with Jonadab was greater than the one with David; and the one that the Rechabites received Jericho. There is nothing in these traditions which forces us to assign a pre-400 CE date to them. Much of the material very possibly is older than this date, but there is no way of demonstrating it.

For the same reason, the connection between Jose ben Halaftha and Jonadab ben Rechab cannot be dated any earlier than the probable date of the compilation of the Yerushalmi, ie. once again c.400 CE. The tradition that there were 36 generations from Adam to Jabez seems to be later than this date.

There is no firm evidence that the tradition that the Rechabites were the heralds of the good tidings of the redemption predates the compilation of PRK (5th-6th century CE); nor that the tradition that they were exiled to the land of Sinim predates the compilation of PR (7th century CE).

Similarly, the shift in emphasis, away from the Rechabites' example of fidelity to their example of abstinence, appears first in the Tanhumah, and there is no certain evidence that it predates the compilation of this work (c.775-c.900 CE).

The date of connection between the Jonadab of 2 Kings 10 and the Jonadab of Jeremiah 35 is easier to ascertain - it is found only in Radak and in Yalkut Shim<sup>C</sup>oni, and may be dated to c.1200 CE. At this time also, the first hint of a negative evaluation of the Rechabites appears, again in the Yalkut. Up until this point, the rabbinic evaluation of our group has been uniformly high.

At approximately the same time, Rashi and Radak begin to move away from Haggadah to a more literal reading of the text, marking the close of the period under discussion.

Undoubtedly, many of the traditions for which there is no firm evidence for an earlier date are considerably older than the documents in which they first appear. But without any firm evidence, as has been adduced for the material dated to the period 200 BCE-100 CE, it is impossible to ascertain precisely how much older those traditions may be. Hence, it is methodologically safer not to assign a date earlier than the date of the documents in which they appear to them, until new external evidence should appear. With the external evidence available, however, it is clear that rabbinic exegesis of the material concerning the Rechabites has, in some cases, a very ancient origin. This is consonant with Weingreen's thesis that the roots of rabbinic exegesis are to be found within the Old Testament itself.<sup>171</sup>

The portraits of the Rechabites in the writings of

rabbinic Judaism are anything but uniform. Rather, they represent many and varied applications of a single set of biblical data to changing contemporary situations. They served as a model for scholars of Torah in the time of Jesus Sirach. They served as a model for proselyte members of the Sanhedrin in the decades around the turn of the Era. They served as a model for those Jews who practiced severe rites of mourning and lamentation for the Temple after its destruction. They provided a ready example for those who wished to extol teetotalism. And so on. Throughout the literature, there is no unified conception of who they were or what they represented, and this diversity of outlook is preserved in almost compendious style. 'Rabbinic' exegesis of scripture was evidently not a monolithic entity. Despite having fixed rules,<sup>172</sup> it adapted the biblical traditions it had at its disposal to contemporary persons, situations and events.

### 5.3: THE HISTORY OF THE RECHABITES

As well as the numerous rabbinic references and the few Christian references to them, the Rechabites also appear in a narrative which in recent years has been classified among the Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament. This narrative, in its present form, is found in two principal recensions, the Greek and the Syriac, and in a third, the Ethiopic, which seems to be derivative, as well as in numerous translations and/or redactions into Armenian, Arabic, etc.

The two principal recensions, while varying in points of detail, share the same basic story. The holy monk Zosimus spent forty years dwelling in the desert, praying that God would show him where the Blessed Ones dwelt. His request is finally granted, and he is led out from his cave for forty days, after which he collapses from exhaustion, and spends a further three days praying. Then a wild animal appears, and carries him further on his journey - in the Syriac, it brings him all the way to the Ocean, in the Greek it carries him only to the edge of the desert. After more prayer, Zosimus is brought to the river Eumeles by a storm of wind.

Once beside the water, a voice comes out of it, telling Zosimus that he cannot cross it. He immediately prays again, and two magnificent trees spring up, one on each side of the water. Zosimus is picked up by the tree on his side, and is passed to the tree on the other, which sets him down in a beautiful land.

Travelling through the land, he meets a seated naked man who, as Zosimus learns through conversing with him, is one of the Blessed Ones. The Blessed One takes him to an assembly of his fellows, who think that, because a man from the world has been able to enter into their abode, the end must have arrived. Two angels then appear, and reassure them that Zosimus has been sent by God, and that his stay will not be permanent.

Zosimus is then delivered into the hands of an attendant, but his arrival stirs up great excitement among all the Blessed Ones, who eagerly question their visitor to such an extent that Zosimus, wearied by it all, instructs his attendant to tell the Blessed Ones that he is not there, so that he can rest. The attendant is so shocked by this that he has Zosimus brought before an assembly of the Blessed Ones, who seek to send him away. Zosimus, however, begs forgiveness, and receives it. He then tells them his story, and asks to be told theirs.

The Blessed Ones then tell how their father, Jonadab the son of Rechab (Greek: Rechab the son of Aminadab), when he heard Jeremiah prophesying the destruction of Jerusalem, had commanded them not to eat bread, or drink wine, or wear garments, and to lament a great lament, until the Lord should hear their petition. They did so, and the Lord turned away his anger from the city. But then a new king arose, who commanded the Rechabites to turn away from their practices. When they refused, he imprisoned them. By angelic intervention, the Rechabites were rescued from gaol, and brought to their present abode.

There then follows a long description of the current life of the Blessed Ones. They are nourished by what the natural habitat of their abode produces. They spend their whole life in prayer, and maintain a severe sexual discipline. They have no counting of time, and are not naked as Zosimus thought, but are clothed with the garment of immortal-

ity. They eat but once a day, and the angels dwell with them.

The Syriac now has a passage describing how the angels announce to them the events of the Incarnation. Both recensions then have a description of Lent in the Abode of the Blessed Ones, during which time they are fed with Manna.

The Blessed Ones then recount how they suffer no mental or physical privations, but are nevertheless not immortal. When the time for a Blessed One to die has come, it is announced by an angel: All the Blessed Ones gather together rejoicing, the angels dig the grave, and the one who is to die enters the grave saluting his fellows, before his soul is carried by the angels to heaven, where it is received by the Son of God, and brought to the Father, at which point the Blessed Ones remaining on earth worship God.

At the conclusion of this 'Life of the Blessed Ones', Zosimus is dismissed, and returns to his original dwelling in the same way as he arrived - the trees lift him over the water, and the wind and the animal bring him back to his home.

The Syriac ends at this point, but the Greek continues with various other narratives about the life, death and burial of our hero.

This summary of the narrative in question plainly reveals why it has received numerous titles, both in the headings of the various Greek and Syriac manuscripts of the

work, and in modern editions of the text and secondary literature. James H. Charlesworth has conveniently gathered together all the titles from the MSS.<sup>173</sup> M.R. James, who first edited the Greek version, titled it simply the 'Story of Zosimus' or 'Narratio Zosimi'.<sup>174</sup> This title is drawn from Greek MS A (Cod. Par. Gr. 1217). F. Nau produced the first edition and translation of the Syriac, and entitled it 'La Légende inédite des fils de Jonadab, fils de Rechab, et les Îles Fortunées'.<sup>175</sup> Zanolli called it 'La Leggenda di Zosimo'.<sup>176</sup> Picard and Nikiprowetzky termed it 'La Narration de Zosime', a title also found in English in an article by Brian McNeil.<sup>177</sup> Charlesworth himself originally called it the 'Apocalypse of Zosimus',<sup>178</sup> but later changed his mind and called it the 'History of the Rechabites',<sup>179</sup> the title under which the work appears in the new Old Testament Pseudepigrapha<sup>180</sup> and in the SBL Texts and Translations series.<sup>181</sup> Charlesworth's research student, E.G. Martin, called it simply the 'Account of the Blessed Ones'.<sup>182</sup>

This wide variety of nomenclature has inevitably caused confusion, which has been compounded by the fact that Zosimus was a relatively common Christian name in the first centuries of the Common Era.<sup>183</sup> It does seem, however, best to retain James' title, Story of Zosimus, for the present, for in its current form that is precisely what the document is, even though, as Charlesworth points out, the apocryphon is composite.<sup>184</sup> The document is also, in its present form, a Christian work, probably dating from the fifth or sixth century.<sup>185</sup> Charlesworth's preferred title,

which "draws attention to the Jewish character of the earliest section of the work",<sup>186</sup> is dependent on Charlesworth and Martin's reconstruction of the redactional history of the text, and cannot be accepted until that redactional history has been examined and subjected to critique.

There is also a problem with the chapter divisions in the text. James divided the Greek recension into 22 chapters. Charlesworth, following Martin, divided the Greek into 23 chapters, added the versification, and divided the Syriac similarly. However, this division into 23 chapters was not made until 1979, and Charlesworth's own work on the document prior to this date used James' divisions. This creates some difficulty in using Charlesworth's work, and care is needed if his argument in The Pseudepigrapha and Modern Research is to be followed by using the modern translation and edition. For the purposes of this study, Charlesworth's chapter and verse divisions are followed, as his work is the most readily accessible and as his verse divisions allow for greater precision in citations than James' division into chapters alone.<sup>187</sup>

It is not proposed to offer here a full analysis of the Story of Zosimus (henceforth, StorZos) and its redactional history. For the present purposes, the important section is chapters 8-10. It is only in these chapters (other than in the title in 1:2 in the Syriac) that the Rechabites are named, and it is these chapters that have been identified by Charlesworth and Martin as being the oldest

section of the work, stemming from the Palestinian Judaism of the first century CE.<sup>188</sup> According to Charlesworth and Martin, the rest of the document was built up by various additions at the beginning and at the end of the text, coupled with various interpolations. This process of redaction was carried out by both Jews and Christians.<sup>189</sup> Charlesworth has elsewhere indicated that he regards the Christian activity on the text as postdating the Council of Nicaea.<sup>190</sup>

As well as claiming that StorZos 8-10 is the ancient core of the text, to which everything else was gradually added, Charlesworth and Martin have made numerous other claims, an examination of which will form the bulk of the present study of the document. They regard the passage in StorZos 8-10 as being very heavily dependent on Jer. 35, and regard the text as showing evidence that it was originally composed in a Semitic language, although neither Charlesworth nor Martin come to any firm conclusions about the original language of the document, or about the precise nature of the relationship between the Greek and Syriac recensions. James,<sup>191</sup> Nau<sup>192</sup> and McNeil<sup>193</sup> all follow the lead given by the heading to Syriac MS D (BM Add. 12174) and regard the Story as having been originally written in Hebrew, then translated into Greek, and then from Greek into Syriac.

These claims of Charlesworth and Martin give rise to three questions which will be considered here: can StorZos 8-10 be read as a complete text on its own in either

Greek or Syriac? What is the precise relationship between StorZos 8-10 and Jer. 35? Which Version of Jer. 35 was used by the author of StorZos 8-10? Answering these questions will give rise to some observations on a serious methodological problem in the study of Early Judaism.

Fundamental to the argument of Charlesworth and Martin is the contention that StoZos 8-10 can be isolated as a separate unit, forming the heart of the document, to which everything else was later attached. The logical conclusions of this claim are two-fold: that chapters 8-10 can be read on their own as a self-contained unit, and that the rest of the document makes no sense without them. A closer reading of the text, however, suggests that while chapters 8-10 may plausibly be read as an independent document, the rest of StorZos still makes good, and arguably better, sense without them. If this observation can be proved to be correct, it would deal a serious blow to what may be called the Charlesworth-Martin theory of the text's redactional history.

If the end of chapter 7 and the beginning of chapter 8 are compared in the Greek and Syriac recensions, it will become clear that the Greek represents an awkward join, which has been 'ironed out' in the Syriac:

Greek 7:14: And I said to them, "I wish to apprehend from you your places-of-sojourning".

8:1 And they rejoiced a great joy, taking tablets of stone they inscribed (them) with their fingernails thus: "Hear, hear,

O sons of men, from us who became blessed,  
because we are also from you".<sup>194</sup>

The rest of chapters 8-10 do not, in fact, deal with the 'places-of-sojourning' of the Blessed Ones, about which Zosimus wished to learn, but rather with their history prior to their arrival at those 'places-of-sojourning', in which Zosimus shows no interest whatsoever. The account of the Blessed Ones' abode begins in chapter 11, not chapter 8.

Compare now the Syriac of 7:14, which forms a highly suitable introduction to chapters 8-10:

Then I said to them, "I beg (you) from your blessedness to write for me a history of (how) your entrance here (was possible) so that your history may be a good introduction and a beautiful example for everyone who wishes to be guided by the fear of God."<sup>195</sup>

Turning now to the end of chapter 10 and the beginning of chapter 11, we again find evidence of a sharp break in the Greek that has been eliminated in the Syriac. The end of chapter 10 in the Greek reads, "And he did not scatter us all over the world, but gave us this country", which hardly connects at all with the opening of chapter 11, "Hear, hear, (O) sons of men (about) the place-of-sojourning of the Blessed Ones". The Syriac, however, leaves out the last verse of chapter 10, and for 11:1 reads, "We did not sow (any seed) in the whole land; but God placed us as holy beings in this land". The Syriac flows better, which strongly suggests that the Greek represents the more primitive

form of the text, which has been redacted by the Syriac editor.<sup>196</sup>

This investigation of the 'joins' between chapters 7 and 8 and chapters 10 and 11 thus reveals that there are some very rough transitions from one chapter to the next in the Greek, whereas in the Syriac this abruptness is not found. If chapters 8-10 of the Greek, other than the first half of 8:1, are dropped from the narrative, nothing is lost in terms of the flow of the story, and arguably quite a lot is gained. Zosimus' request to learn about the Blessed Ones' present lifestyle, to which their prior history is strictly superfluous, is answered immediately, instead of three chapters later. Charlesworth has elsewhere argued that one sign of an interpolation into a text is that when the passage in question is removed, "the flow of thought is often clarified or improved".<sup>197</sup> Applying Charlesworth's own methodology to StorZos 8-10 suggests that, far from being the 'ancient core' of the document, it is, in fact, an interpolation. If one was to read StorZos 1-7, 11-end in the Greek recension, a completely coherent narrative would remain - a narrative that is more coherent than one read with chapters 8-10 retained.

But what about the better-flowing Syriac narrative? Surely this must be seen as the creation of a redactor/translator who, aware of the inconsistencies in the text he had before him, which included chapters 8-10, tidied it up into a better-flowing narrative by rewriting the end of chapter 7/

start of chapter 8 and the end of chapter 10/start of chapter 11.

This conclusion, that chapters 8-10 are an insertion into an already existing narrative, is borne out by the fact, noted already by Charlesworth,<sup>198</sup> that the Blessed Ones are only called the Rechabites in these chapters. Elsewhere in StorZos, they are invariably called the Blessed Ones. If chapters 8-10 had formed the basis for the whole of the rest of the narrative, then it would be reasonable to expect that the Blessed Ones would have been called Rechabites elsewhere in it as well, taking the lead from the core of the narrative. But they are not, a situation which is easily explained by the proposal to see chapters 8-10 as a later insertion into an already existing narrative recounting the travels of Zosimus to the Island of the Blessed Ones.

It is not impossible that the Ethiopic version of StorZos reflects a text without chapters 8-10. The Ethiopic version has received even less critical attention than the Greek and Syriac versions, so the comments made here must be regarded as being extremely tentative indeed. The document entitled the History of the Blessed Ones in the Time of Jeremiah<sup>199</sup> seems to be composed of three separate elements: the story of the flight of the Holy Ones to the Blessed Isles in the time of Jeremiah, and the visit of Alexander the Great to them;<sup>200</sup> this appears to be a self-contained text, to which has been added an account of the journey of the monk Gerasimus (=Zosimus?) to the Island of the Blessed Ones,

which seems to be a narrative drawing heavily on StorZos 1-18, seemingly without chapters 8-10, but it is hard to be certain - the Ethiopic document has already included an account of the arrival of the Blessed Ones (who are not called Rechabites) at their island, so it would not have needed to have included it again. Within this second section, a long passage has been inserted into the speech of the Blessed Ones,<sup>201</sup> designed to show that the Blessed Ones are Christians, and thus to justify their ascent to heaven at death.

The foregoing suggests the following redactional history for StorZos. The earliest recoverable form is the Greek of chapters 1-7, 11-18. The Ethiopic translation used in the History of the Blessed Ones in the Time of Jeremiah was taken from this Greek text. After the Ethiopic translation had been made, chapters 8-10 were inserted into the Greek text. The Syriac translation of chapters 1-18 was then made, after which chapters 19-23 were added to the Greek. Each translation was not simply a literal rendering of the text from one language to another, but was rather a full-scale redaction. Whether, as Syriac MS D would have it, there was ever a Hebrew text underlying the Greek is something which it is now impossible to ascertain. There is also no sure way in which this original Greek story can be dated.

Chapters 8-10 must now themselves be briefly examined, to see whether they present a self-contained unity. While they do contain one or two oddities in their narrative,

it is probable that the chapters do represent a complete whole, which existed independently of the rest of StorZos, and which was inserted en bloc into the Story at some unknown date. Being in the first person plural, and being placed in the mouth of the Rechabites, chapters 8-10 are truly pseudepigraphical and may be, as Martin suggests, "an attempt to give a psychological means of resistance to oppression".<sup>202</sup>

There are almost certainly some Christian interpolations in chapters 8-10, which is not surprising if the chapters represent a Jewish text that has been incorporated into a Christian document, which seems to be the best way of explaining chapters 8-10 and 1-7, 11-18 respectively. Martin argues that 9:3, 7, 9, 10:6 and parts of 8:1, 2, 3, 6, 9:10, 10:5, 9 represent Christian insertions.<sup>203</sup> More work needs to be done on this aspect of chapters 8-10, but it may be wondered whether the Rechabites' command to cast away their clothing in 8:3, 5, 9:9 does not stem from a Christian hand. Martin, following a lead given by McNeil, thinks that the nudity of the Rechabites represents a desire to return to the pre-lapsarian state. A positive evaluation of nudity is very uncommon in Judaism, however. Indeed, Jubilees 3:31 says,

It is commanded in the heavenly tablets, to all who will know the judgment of the law, that they should cover their shame and they should not be uncovered as the gentiles are uncovered.<sup>204</sup>

In some circles in the Early Church, however, nudity was

highly esteemed as an ascetical practice. For instance, at his trial, Priscillian, the fourth century bishop of Avila, was said to have claimed that he was "accustomed ... to pray in a state of nudity".<sup>205</sup> If it is supposed that StorZos originally emanated from Christian ascetic circles, then both the insertion of chapters 8-10 and the Rechabites' nudity commandment are explicable. The Rechabites were seen as Jewish precursors of Christian monks,<sup>206</sup> and the nudity commandment represents a Christian addition to the Jewish text, made in order to bring that Jewish text more into line with the Christian document, which exalted nudity, cf. 4:1, 5:2-4, 12:3.

If chapters 8-10 did circulate independently of the rest of StorZos, then we have no means of ascribing an early or late date to it by way of a redactional-critical theory, as Charlesworth and Martin have sought to do. The caution that was expressed earlier about following Charlesworth in entitling the whole document the History of the Rechabites has proved well-founded. Those chapters which mention the Rechabites form no part of the original text. They are intrusive into the story, the narrative flow of which is improved by their removal. They may be earlier in date than the rest of the Story, but on the other hand they may not - once the Charlesworth-Martin redactional-critical theory of the document's origins is rejected, there is no way of determining the relative dates of the two parts. The formation of StorZos was not by successive authors/redactors/translators adding sections before and after the 'Rechabite

Text' of chapters 8-10. On the contrary, this 'Rechabite Text' was only inserted into StorZos once the story of Zosimus' travels to the Island of the Blessed Ones was in a more or less coherent form.

Charlesworth and Martin have seen a very close relationship between StorZos 8-10 and Jeremiah 35, describing the former as a "midrashic expansion of Jeremiah 35",<sup>207</sup> as following "the biblical account closely",<sup>208</sup> and as being "based directly on the account of the Rechabites in Jeremiah 35",<sup>209</sup> the only differences being the addition of the nudity commandment and the introduction of the confrontation with the king.<sup>210</sup> However, it is debateable whether StorZos 8-10 is as closely dependent on Jer. 35 as Charlesworth and Martin like to think.

There are two places in the major recensions of StorZos where the origin and nature of the practices of the Rechabites are recounted, viz. 8:3-5 and 9:8f.

Greek 8:3-5: And our father Rechab, son of Aminadab, also heard (Jeremiah's exhortation) and exhorted us, "Hear, O sons of Rechab and daughters of your father, and remove your clothes from your body, and do not drink a carafe of wine, and do not eat bread from the fire, and do not drink liquor and honey until the Lord hears your petition. And we threw off our clothing from our body, and we did not eat bread from the fire, and did not drink a carafe of wine, neither honey nor liquor, and we lamented a great lament and petitioned the Lord.

The Syriac of these verses is much the same, except that it has 'Jonadab, the son of Rechab' for 'Rechab, son of Amin-adab'.

Greek 9:8f: "And when our father, your servant, heard (the decree), he commanded us, saying, "Do not drink a carafe of wine, and do not eat bread from the fire until the Lord hears your petition". And we listened to the command of our father, and made our bodies naked, and did not drink wine, and did not eat bread from the fire, and we prayed to (the) Lord for the city Jerusalem.

The Syriac only represents 9:8, and includes a command to the Rechabites not to dwell in houses.

In StorZos, the Rechabites' practices are inspired by the preaching of Jeremiah. This is not the case in Jer. 35 but, as has been shown, there is a fairly strong motif in the rabbinic traditions about the Rechabites of Jonadab laying his prohibitions on his followers because of what Jeremiah proclaimed.<sup>211</sup> In Jer. 35, the Rechabites' practices are designed to ensure that the Rechabites enjoy long life in the land where they are 'sojourners', but in StorZos 8-10, their practices form part of their prayer and lament to God to avert his wrath from the city of Jerusalem. This feature of StorZos again has a parallel in the rabbinic traditions, where the lamentation is over the Fall of the Temple.<sup>212</sup> StorZos 10:3 (Greek: But we said, "We do not disobey God"; Syriac: But we answered the king, "We shall neither break our promise to God; and we shall not cease from (obeying) the covenant with him forever".) is also reminiscent of the rabbinic esteem

for Jonadab's commands as Torah,<sup>213</sup> something which again is not explicitly found in Jer. 35.

Charlesworth and Martin are correct to note that there is nothing in Jer. 35 about the Rechabites removing their clothing, or about the new king, or about the Rechabites meeting him. But they do not note that there is nothing in Jer. 35 about not eating bread from the fire, found in StorZos 8-10. This is not found in the rabbinic traditions about the Rechabites either, but it should be noted that in Dan. 10:2f, the avoidance of bread is part of the rites of mourning and lamentation, and that Dan. 10:12 indicates that it was a way of imploring the Lord. Thus, the command not to eat bread can be seen as a logical extension of the view, common to both the rabbinic literature and StorZos 8-10, that the Rechabites carried out their practices because they were mourning and lamenting, either for the Temple or for Jerusalem as a whole. It is interesting to note that, in StorZos 1:1, Zosimus also does not eat bread or drink wine, as a means of imploring the Lord.

There are also a numbers of features in Jer. 35 which are not found in StorZos 8-10. The biblical narrative commands the sons of Jonadab not to sow seed or plant vineyard or have anything, but to live in tents. These are not found in StorZos 8-10: only 9:8 Syriac mentions anything about not living in houses, but not living in houses is not the same as living in tents. StorZos 11:5, outside of the section dealing with the Rechabites, comprises a list of

those things not found among the Blessed Ones. Admittedly, it includes vineyards, cultivated fields and houses, but as it also contains wood, iron, fire, swords, silver and gold, it is likely that any similarity with Jer. 35 is completely coincidental.

The rabbinic references to the Rechabites demonstrate a concern with showing how Jer. 35:19, which promises that Jonadab son of Rechab will never lack a man 'standing before' Yahweh, was being fulfilled in the present. As scripture cannot fail, the Rechabites must be still existing in some way. As Charlesworth and Martin note,<sup>214</sup> there are some rabbinic texts which take a similar line to that taken by StorZos 8-10, but there are also numerous other rabbinic traditions which argue that the Rechabites became incorporated into the Sanhedrin or into the Priesthood.<sup>215</sup>

These observations about StorZos 8-10 and its dependence on Jer. 35 give rise to some comments about a serious methodological problem in the study of Early Judaism, particularly in the study of the rabbinic literature and of the Pseudepigrapha. It has been shown that there are numerous points where StorZos 8-10 has much in common with various rabbinic traditions, not only in the idea of the Rechabites being taken to some Blessed Abode, but also in several details of the practices of the Rechabites and the reasons for those practices. Yet, beyond the similarity between StorZos 8-10 and the three rabbinic passages which speak of the Rechabites being translated to a Blessed Abode,<sup>216</sup> these parallels have

not been noted by Charlesworth or Martin. Both Charlesworth and Martin make use of Ginzberg's Legends of the Jews,<sup>217</sup> but between them have only come up with one reference to this work,<sup>218</sup> which not only gives a distorted picture of what the rabbinic literature says about the Rechabites, but is also unfair to Ginzberg who does, in fact, include references to most of these rabbinic traditions. A fuller use of Ginzberg's index, coupled with a consultation of Hyman's list of scriptural references in the rabbinic literature,<sup>219</sup> would have revealed this rich rabbinic tradition in its fullness.

This neglect of the rabbinic parallels is not uncommon in Pseudepigrapha studies. The reverse is also true. Paul Trebilco, in his recent review of Jacob Neusner's Judaism in the Beginning of Christianity, a work dealing with the rabbinic material, has commented,

Unfortunately, the book does not deal with the literature of the Pseudepigrapha, and thus focusses on only one of the strands of Judaism at this time.<sup>220</sup>

There has been a tendency to regard the Judaism represented by the rabbinic literature and that represented by the Pseudepigrapha as being almost separate entities with, at best, only minor points of contact between them. The insufficient use of the reference works to one of the bodies of material by those working on the other body has heightened this tendency. Yet, this examination of StorZos 8-10 has revealed many points of sometimes quite detailed

contact between the two, strongly suggesting that the Judaism of the Pseudepigrapha and the Judaism of the Talmud and Midrash were, in fact, a lot less remote from each other than modern scholarship sometimes seems to think.

Once the study of StorZos 8-10 is informed by the rabbinic traditions about the Rechabites, it becomes impossible to describe these chapters as being directly based on Jer. 35. They reflect rather those rabbinic traditions, and must therefore be placed within the Sitz im Leben of those traditions. That the rabbinic traditions contain ancient material is undisputed, but that in itself is no guide to the date of a particular text. StorZos 8-10 is a unity, with a small number of interpolations, but it may not have been compiled, using ancient material, until a relatively late date. Indeed, the fact that it deals with Jer. 35:19 by placing the Rechabites in some remote abode may even argue for a late date - it must reflect a time when there were no actual groups known to the author who called themselves, or could be called, Rechabites. As has been shown, it seems that there were within the first century CE several groups for whom the title 'Rechabite' would have been .. appropriate.

Charlesworth and Martin's redactional-critical theory of StorZos has been turned on its head. Far from being the ancient core of the document, dating from before the Fall of the Temple in 70 CE, chapters 8-10 have been shown to be a later insertion into an already existing narrative, an insertion which, while drawing on early traditions, may

in fact have only been composed at a late date, at a time when there were no actual groups in Palestinian Judaism called the Rechabites.

If these conclusions are correct, then a serious question mark must be raised against the inclusion of StorZos - even under the title History of the Rechabites - amongst the Pseudepigrapha. A case could be made for the inclusion of chapters 8-10, which certainly are Jewish, pseudepigraphical and related in form or content to the Old Testament, thus meeting three of Charlesworth's five criteria for the inclusion of a work amongst the Pseudepigrapha.<sup>221</sup> It does not claim to be inspired, but this is not such a serious problem as the fact that chapters 8-10 of StorZos cannot be dated prior to 200 CE with any certainty. Given this uncertainty about dating this Jewish material, it seems best to reclassify the History of the Rechabites: Charlesworth included the whole of the Story of Zosimus under this title in his second category of Pseudepigrapha.<sup>222</sup> This should be revised. Only chapters 8-10 should be called the History of the Rechabites, and only these chapters have any claim for inclusion, as the rest of the document is not dependent on them in any way, and they should be included in Charlesworth's third category - those works which might be included, but are really beyond the chronological limits, or are included because of the default of other categories.

One implicit assumption in Charlesworth and Martin's work on StorZos 8-10 is that its author worked directly with

the Massoretic Text. Given its close connections with the rabbinic traditions about the Rechabites, as noted above, it is of course possible that there was no written biblical Vorlage of StorZos 8-10 at all, that it was created without any direct reference to the Bible. But it is interesting to note that StorZos 8:3, 5, 9:8, 9 Greek use the phrase  $\kappa\epsilon\rho\alpha\mu\iota\omicron\nu\ \omicron\acute{\iota}\nu\omicron\upsilon$ , translated by Charlesworth as 'a carafe of wine'. The Syriac in these verses reads simply  $\} \text{ܘܝܢ}$ , 'wine'. Neither Charlesworth, nor anyone else, notes that the phrase  $\kappa\epsilon\rho\alpha\mu\iota\omicron\nu\ \omicron\acute{\iota}\nu\omicron\upsilon$  is in fact drawn from LXX Jer. 42:5, not from MT Jer. 35:5, which reads  $\text{גַּבְעוֹתַי מִלֵּאמֹתַי}$ . Charlesworth has also argued that phrases such as 'lamented a great lament' betray the fact that StorZos was originally written in a Semitic language,<sup>223</sup> but in his edition and translation of the Greek recension he notes that 'rejoiced a great joy' is used in Matt. 2:10 - a Greek document!<sup>224</sup> Thus, like most of the documents of the New Testament, the original language of StorZos 8-10 need not have been Hebrew or Aramaic, but Greek, written by a Hellenised Jew, familiar with both the LXX and the rabbinic traditions.

The fact that the author of StorZos 8-10 was familiar with the LXX and the rabbinic traditions about the Rechabites does not necessarily mean that he had written copies of these documents in front of him. This is suggested in particular by the fact that the Greek text of StorZos 8-10 is very confused about the titles of the Rechabites. In 8:3, their founder is referred to as  $\rho\eta\chi\alpha\beta\ \upsilon\acute{\iota}\omicron\varsigma\ \alpha\mu\iota\nu\alpha\delta\alpha\beta$ , and he addresses his offspring as  $\upsilon\acute{\iota}\omicron\upsilon\ \rho\eta\chi\alpha\beta$ . In 9:5, he is called

ῥηχαβ υἱου ἰωναδαβ. Neither of these titles for the founder of the Rechabites, nor this title for the Rechabites themselves, are found anywhere in the Text and Versions of the Old Testament. The Syriac also manages to come up with a unique title in the part of 8:1 not found in the Greek:  .

This investigation of the Story of Zosimus has not taken the form of a full-scale investigation of the whole of the document. In particular, beyond isolating chapters 8-10 as a late insertion into the text, the question of the growth of the document has not really been examined. Further work needs to be carried out on the portion of the document, excluding chapters 8-10, which is common to both the Greek and the Syriac recensions, ie. chapters 1-7, 11-18, taking the Ethiopic version into account. These chapters form a coherent narrative, which was probably originally composed by a Christian, but it is possible that there have been additions and interpolations into this narrative. Chapters 8-10, apart from the few Christian insertions, are thoroughly Jewish, but do not form the basis of the rest of the document. An examination of 7:14-8:1 and 10:9-11:1 reveals that both these sections contain awkward joins in the Greek, which have been tidied up in the Syriac, and that the narrative flows better if 8:1b-10:9 is omitted altogether. The fact that the Rechabites only appear in chapters 8-10 and that the Ethiopic seems to have no knowledge of these chapters support the contention that Story of Zosimus once existed without chapters 8-10.

These chapters, however, do seem to form a coherent unity. They show familiarity with both the LXX translation of Jeremiah and the rabbinic traditions about the Rechabites. They were thus probably composed, in Greek, by a Hellenised Jew. As they seem to reflect conditions when no group called the Rechabites was known to their author, the chapters should probably be given a late date, even though some of the rabbinic traditions which they seem aware of are undoubtedly ancient. A more precise date or provenance cannot be given but, as there is no firm evidence for dating these chapters prior to 200 CE, and as they do not form the basis of the rest of the document, Story of Zosimus should be called Story of Zosimus, and not History of the Rechabites, which should be used to denote chapters 8-10 alone. It is only these chapters which should be included in the Pseudepigrapha, and in the third, not the second, category.

#### 5.4: CONCLUSION: THE RECHABITES IN JEWISH TRADITION TO THE TIME OF RABBI DAVID KIMHI

The material gathered in the foregoing pages has shown that the biblical texts about the Rechabites were used in many different ways in Jewish tradition. Investigation of the texts dealing with, and stemming from, the Essenes has yielded a conclusion that is perhaps surprising: the Rechabites did not serve as a model for the Essenes or, if they did, no trace of that model can be found in the literature. It seems rather unlikely that the Qumran documents yet to be published will alter this conclusion. The New Testament con-

tains no references to the Rechabites at all, and the Patristic citations are few and far between: for Eusebius, the Rechabites were Second Temple priests; for Nilus of Ancyra, and for the compiler of Story of Zosimus, they were forerunners of Christian monks; but otherwise the Church Fathers seem to have had little interest in them. The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament yielded a single, short document, the History of the Rechabites, truly pseudepigraphical, yet closely related to the rabbinic traditions about the Rechabites, probably quite late, and now embodied in a Christian apocryphon. By contrast, the rabbinic literature contains many references to them, a fact which is not simply to be attributed to the larger size of the rabbinic corpus. Their supposed descent from Jethro, the prototypical convert in Jewish tradition, no doubt did much to enhance their position, but is not the sole reason for their importance. They were seen as biblical precursors for various groups who who eventually became part of rabbinic Judaism. The early Torah scholars used the model of the Rechabites, to justify their full-time study of the Torah. Those proselytes who became members of the Sanhedrin called themselves Rechabites, to justify their position. Those people who responded to the Fall of the Temple in 70 CE by practising extreme rites of mourning called themselves Rechabites, to justify their practices. Those who wished to commend abstinence found a ready-made example in the biblical Rechabites. Later, when all those groups calling themselves Rechabites had disappeared, the Promise to the Rechabites was reinterpreted. Our group were now living in some remote, blessed, and yet still

earthly, place. The sheer variety of all these traditions bears witness to a fundamental Jewish belief - that scripture is not out-of-date or irrelevant, but speaks anew, through Haggadah and Halakah, to each generation, with as much life and as much freshness as it did to its first hearers. It is the Word of God, ever vibrant, ever new, ever applicable to new situations. That so many groups in the Judaism of the period c.200 BCE-c.1200 CE were able to identify with, and draw inspiration from, the Rechabites of Jeremiah 35 (and of 1 Chronicles 2:55, in Jewish belief), bears eloquent testimony to the way in which that belief was realised in practice.

PROSPECTS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH  
SOME CONTEMPORARY APPLICATIONS

PROSPECTS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH AND SOME CONTEMPORARY  
APPLICATIONS

No research project can ever cover a subject completely. This is particularly true when the subject in question is, like the Rechabites in the Bible and in Jewish tradition, one that has received little scholarly attention in the past. This study has attempted to be full-scale and systematic, but there are nevertheless areas which have been left unexplored. In addition, the study has raised several new questions, which are worthy of further research. It is important, then, at the end of this thesis, to offer some suggestions as to how it may serve as a springboard for further investigation in both biblical and Jewish studies.

To deal with the areas left unexamined first. The topics selected for study in Chapter Four were, to a certain extent, a personal choice. Another researcher, with different interests, may have come up with a completely different set of subjects. In particular, possible pre-Islamic Arabic parallels to the Rechabites is an area which deserves to be explored.<sup>1</sup> In addition, the use of other Social Science models may produce some interesting results. For instance, Mary Douglas' work on consecration<sup>2</sup> may shed some further light on precisely how Jonadab's commands were thought to have ensured the Rechabites' long life in the land, and the common anthropological interest in leaders as creative ideal models may provide insights into the person of Jonadab from another direction.

The material in Chapter Five was deliberately rather circumscribed in two respects. Firstly, by not treating the Patristic material as a separate entity, and secondly by finishing the survey with David Kimḥi. It would be an interesting exercise to see whether the Biblia Patristica lists any citation of the relevant texts other than those cited here,<sup>3</sup> and whether they are capable of being analysed as a collection in their own right. An examination of the mediaeval and modern Jewish uses of the traditions about the Rechabites would also be desired. For instance, Benjamin of Tudela claimed that he had found Rechabites in Arabia in 1160 CE, the English missionary Wolff claimed the same in 1828 CE, and Judah Löw b. Bezaleel, in 1599 CE, argued that the Jews in China were descended from the Rechabites.<sup>4</sup>

Furthermore, the section on the Story of Zosimus and the History of the Rechabites was nothing more than an introduction to these two texts. Much more work needs to be done on both, especially on the formation of StorZos and on Christian interpolations in HistRech. There are also a number of interesting affinities between HistRech and the biblical narrative of the Exodus from Egypt, which are worthy of exploration.

The new questions which this study has raised are many and varied. The form-critical study of Jeremiah 35 has suggested that the Hebrew prophets were not simply speakers of poetic oracles, but were also capable of publicising their views by means of prose tracts. This calls for further

investigation into the forms of the prophetic message and its means of dissemination.

It has been shown that the best way of understanding the Rechabites is as a prophetic group which originated in a schism in the Northern Prophetic Guild Movement. This raises questions about the nature of the prophetic protest in Ancient Israel, about the social setting of prophecy, about prophetic groups and about conflict within these groups. The connection between the Rechabites, Elijah and Elisha and the ancient Yahwistic chariot imagery suggests that this imagery may be one of the sources of later Jewish Merkabah mysticism. All these subjects are worthy of further attention.

The conclusions reached concerning 1 Chronicles 2:55, 4:12 call for a renewed investigation into the biblical genealogies and their function, with particular attention to the language used.

Above all, at the level of method, this study has demonstrated the importance of attempting to carefully consider and evaluate all the evidence available about a particular feature of Old Testament religion, before coming to any conclusions about that feature. Time and again in these pages, it has been shown how the various theories that have been advanced about the biblical Rechabites have either failed to utilise all the data, or else have failed to critically evaluate that data, and so have produced distorted pictures. It is hoped that the results of this study

will commend themselves simply because they have attempted to critically take account of all the data.

The study of the rabbinic references to the Rechabites has revealed various ways in which the biblical material about them was applied in the period 200 BCE-1200 CE. Suggesting some contemporary applications of the material must, of necessity, be a brief, inevitably culture-conditioned, affair.

In some modern Christian circles, the title 'Rechabite' has been adopted by a society of total abstainers. This is one, rather limited, way of applying the material to contemporary society. The biblical Rechabites were much more than just total abstainers, and were not teetotal because they were opposed to alcohol in principle. Perhaps it is better to look to what the Rechabites stood for, rather than to what they actually did, for hints at an example for today. Their lifestyle was a prophetic, sectarian one, teetotal because alcohol would have impaired their prophetic ability, itinerant because they were protesting at the evils of urban society. Perhaps the example of the biblical Rechabites is calling those of us who are in the Western Church to rethink our lifestyle and our outlook, to be aware of the social evils in our society, as the Rechabites were aware of the social evils in theirs, and to protest against those evils, as much by the way we live as by what we say; to be aware of the importance of the family grouping in the religious life,<sup>5</sup> and to be tolerant and supportive of those who seek to live in this way, even if

such groups appear to have little to do with 'mainstream' Christianity, just as the Rechabites seemed to have little to do with 'mainstream' Yahwism. In this way, we will be being more true to the spirit of the commands of Jonadab ben Rechab than if we were to shun wine, houses, fields and vineyards and were to live in tents. The Rechabites do have a message for today, but it lies more in their ideals than in their practices.

NOTES

BIBLIOGRAPHY

ABBREVIATIONS

## NOTES

## CHAPTER ONE

1. R. de Vaux, Ancient Israel: Its Life and Institutions, London, 1961, p.520.
2. P.A. Riemann, Desert and Return to Desert in the Pre-Exilic Prophets, unpublished Harvard Ph.D. thesis, 1964, p.57 n.22.
3. For example, he does not mention S. Klein, 'Die Schreiberfamilien: 1 Chronik 2:55', MGWJ 70 (1926), pp.410-416 (while Klein discounts any mention of the Rechabites in this verse, his article should have been cited, as the verse is usually taken as referring to them. See further, pages 27-28 below) or P. Seidensticker, 'Prophetensöhne - Rechabiter - Nasiräer', Studii Biblicii Franciscani Liber Annuus 10 (1959-60), pp.65-119.
4. The bibliography for which de Vaux cites separately from that for the Rechabites. See de Vaux, ibid.
5. K. Budde, 'The Nomadic Ideal in the Old Testament', New World 4 (1895), pp.726-745.
6. P.A. Riemann, op. cit., passim; S. Talmon, 'The Desert Motif in the Bible and Qumran Literature', in ed. A. Altmann, Biblical Motifs: Origins and Transformations, Harvard University Press, 1961, pp.31-63.
7. See, for example, D.R. Jones, Isaiah 56-66 and Joel, London, 1964, p.10f.
8. J. Calvin, Commentaries on the Book of the Prophet Jeremiah and the Lamentations, ET, Edinburgh, Calvin Translation Society, Vol. 4, pp.302-324.
9. See, for example, G.C. Workman, The Text of Jeremiah, Edinburgh, 1889; J.G. Janzen, Studies in the Text of Jeremiah, Harvard, 1973; E. Tov, The LXX Translation of Jeremiah and Baruch, Missoula, 1976; S. Soderlund, The Greek Text of Jeremiah: A Revised Hypothesis, JSOTS 47, Sheffield, 1985.
10. Calvin, op. cit., p.311.
11. ibid., p.302f.
12. For instance, he does not deal with the fact that in the Book of Jeremiah some passages are in the First

Person and some in the Third, nor with the fact that the Book of Jeremiah contains both prose and poetry. In addition, it is far from clear what particular archive Calvin had in mind.

13. This is worked out in detail on pages 149-151 below.
14. M. Weber, Das Antike Judentum, Tübingen, 1920, p.283; B. Lang, Monotheism and the Prophetic Minority, Sheffield, 1983, p.81.
15. Calvin, op. cit., p.303.
16. ibid.
17. ibid.
18. ibid., p.308
19. ibid., p.314.
20. See further, section 2.3 below.
21. Calvin, op. cit., p.307f.
22. ibid., p.314.
23. ibid., p.308f.
24. ibid., p.323.
25. ibid., p.324.
26. See further, pages 207-211 below.
27. H. Ewald, The History of Israel, ET, London, 1878, Vol. IV, p.79f.
28. ibid., Vol. V, p.371.
29. E.H. Plumptre, article 'Rechabites' in ed. W. Smith, Dictionary of the Bible, London, 1863, Vol. 2, pp.1006-1008.
30. ibid., p.1006.
31. ibid.
32. ibid.
33. ibid., p.1007.
34. ibid.
35. ibid.

36. Plumptre, 'Rechabites', p.1008.
37. ibid., p.1006.
38. ibid.
39. Plumptre seems to be drawing on the commentary of Cornelius à Lapide on 2 Kings 10:15, which dates from 1642. What de instit. monach. is is completely unclear, and John of Jerusalem is not known as a publicist, except as possibly being the author of the mystagogical lectures traditionally ascribed to St Cyril, John's predecessor. I am grateful to Mr Gerald Bonner and Dr David Hunt, respectively of the Theology and Classics Departments of the University of Durham, for their assistance in this matter.
40. H. Wace and P. Schaff (eds.), A Select Library of Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers, Second Series, Vol. 6, New York and London, 1893, p.121.
41. K. Budde, art. cit. (n.5); idem., 'Das Nomadische Ideal im Alten Testament', Preussische Jahrbuch 1896, pp.57-79.
42. Budde, 'Nomadic Ideal', p.727.
43. ibid., p.728.
44. ibid.
45. See the works of Talmon and Riemann cited in nn.2 and 6.
46. Kh. Keukens, 'Die Rekabitischen Haussklaven in Jeremia 35', BZ (NF) 27 (1982), p.228.
47. Budde, art. cit., p.727.
48. L. Gautier, 'A propos des Récabites', La Liberté Chrétienne 1901, pp.241ff. Republished in his Études sur la Religion d'Israël, Lausanne, 1927, pp.104-129, from which the references are taken.
49. J.W. Flight, 'The Nomadic Idea and Ideal in the Old Testament', JBL 42 (1923), pp.158-226.
50. R. Kittel, Die Bücher der Könige, Göttingen, 1900; idem., Die Bücher der Chronik, Göttingen, 1902.
51. A.W. Streane, Jeremiah, together with the Lamentations, Cambridge, 1903.
52. C.H. Cornill, Das Buch Jeremia, Leipzig, 1905.
53. S.R. Driver, The Book of the Prophet Jeremiah, London, 1908 (second edition).

54. F. Giesebrecht, Das Buch Jeremia, Göttingen, 1907.
55. A.S. Peake, Jeremiah and Lamentations, Edinburgh, 1910-1912.
56. E.L. Curtis and A.A. Madsen, The Books of Chronicles, Edinburgh, 1910.
57. L.E. Binns, The Book of the Prophet Jeremiah, London, 1919.
58. G.A. Smith, Jeremiah, London, 1922.
59. K. Marti, Die Religion des Alten Testaments, Tübingen, 1906.
60. E. Meyer, Die Israeliten und ihre Nachbarstämme, Halle, 1906.
61. C.F. Burney, 'A Theory of the Development of Israelite Religion in Early Times', JTS (OS) 9 (1907-1908), pp.321-352.
62. A. Causse, 'La Legislation Sociale d'Israël et l'Idéal Patriarcal', RTP 7 (1919), pp.189-212, 237-256.
63. W.H. Bennett, article 'Rechab, Rechabites' in ed. J. Hastings, Dictionary of the Bible, Edinburgh, 1903, Vol. 4, pp.203-204.
64. T.K. Cheyne, article 'Rechabites' in eds. Cheyne and J.B. Black, Encyclopaedia Biblica, London, 1903, Vol. 4, cols.4019-4021.
65. G.A. Barton and J.D. Eisenstein, article 'Rechabites' in eds. I. Singer et al, The Jewish Encyclopaedia, New York, 1905, Vol. 10, p.341f.
66. H. Winckler, Religionsgeschichtler und Geschichtlicher Orient, Leipzig, 1906.
67. J.W. Rogerson, Anthropology and the Old Testament, Oxford, 1978 (reprinted Sheffield, 1984), p.31.
68. J.W. Flight, 'Nomadic Idea and Ideal', p.214.
69. ibid., p.211.
70. ibid., p.167 n.56.
71. S. Klein, 'Die Schreiberfamilien: 1 Chronik 2:55', MGWJ 70 (1926), pp.410-416. Klein maintained his views in an article which appeared in Hebrew a year later, 'Studies in the Genealogical Chapters of the Book of Chronicles', Ziyyon Me'assef 2 (1927), p.9.

72. Klein, 'Die Schreiberfamilien', p.415.
73. ibid., p.412f.
74. ibid., p.413. Emphasis added.
75. ibid.
76. ibid., p.414.
77. ibid., p.414f.
78. See especially below, page 57.
79. J.W Rothstein and J. Hänel, Das Erste Buch der Chronik, Leipzig, 1927, Vol. 1, p.35.
80. P. Volz, Der Prophet Jeremia, Leipzig, 1928 (second edition), pp.323-327; F. Nötscher, Das Buch Jeremia, Bonn, 1934, pp.255-258.
81. S. Talmon, '1 Chron. 2:55', Eretz-Yisrael 5 (1958), pp.111-113 (a slightly abbreviated, English version of this article appeared in IEJ 10 (1960), pp.174-180); P. Ph. Seidensticker, 'Prophetensöhne - Rechabiter - Nasiräer', Studii Biblicii Franciscani Liber Annuus 10 (1959-1960), pp.65-119.
82. See, for example, J.A. Montgomery and H.S. Gehman, Kings, Edinburgh, 1951, p.409; N.H. Snaith and R. Calkins, '2 Kings', IB 3, New York, 1954, p.240; A.C. Welch, Jeremiah: His Time and his Work, Oxford, 1955, p.240; M.H. Pope, article 'Rechab' in ed. G. Buttrick et al, The Interpreters' Dictionary of the Bible, New York, 1962, Vol. 4, pp.14-16; J. Paterson, 'Jeremiah', in eds. M. Black and H.H. Rowley, Peake's Commentary on the Bible, rev. ed. London, 1963, p.557f; J. Bright, Jeremiah, New York, 1965, pp.189-191.
83. See, for example, W. Rudolph, Jeremia, Tübingen, 1968 (third edition), pp.225-229 (first edition: 1947); idem., Chronikbücher, Tübingen, 1955, pp.22,25,32-33f; J.P. Hyatt, 'Jeremiah: Introduction and Exegesis', IB 5, New York, 1956, p.1059; A. Weiser, Der Prophet Jeremia, Göttingen, 1955, p.325; R. de Vaux, Ancient Israel: Its Life and Institutions, London, 1961, p.14f; S. Moscati, The Semites in Ancient History, Cardiff, 1959, p.95.
84. Seidensticker, art. cit., p.100.
85. ibid.
86. ibid., p.104.

87. See above, page 23.
88. P.A. Riemann, op. cit. (n.2).
89. ibid., p.7.
90. ibid., p.8.
91. ibid., p.51.
92. ibid.
93. ibid., p.52.
94. ibid., p.53.
95. ibid.
96. ibid., p.183.
97. S. Talmon, 'The Desert Motif in the Bible and in Qumran Literature' in ed. A. Altmann, Biblical Motifs: Origins and Transformations, Harvard University Press, 1966, pp.31-63.
98. ibid., p.34.
99. ibid., p.35.
100. ibid., p.36.
101. ibid., p.37.
102. S. Abramsky, 'House of the Rechabites - Genealogy and Social Character', Eretz-Yisrael 8 (1967), pp.255-264 (Hebrew), 76\* (English summary).
103. ibid., p.255
104. ibid., p.256.
105. ibid., p.257.
106. ibid., p.258 (Author's Translation).
107. ibid.
108. ibid., p.259f.
109. ibid., p.260.
110. ibid., p.261.
111. ibid., p.262.

112. Abramsky, 'House of the Rechabites', p.263.
113. ibid., p.264.
114. N.K. Gottwald, The Tribes of Yahweh, London, 1980, p.444f.
115. EJ 13, cols. 1609-1612.
116. F. Frick, The City in Ancient Israel, Missoula, 1977; idem., 'The Rechabites Reconsidered', JBL 90 (1971), pp.279-287; idem., article 'Rechabites', IDB Supplementary Volume, New York, 1976, p.726ff.
117. Gottwald, op. cit., p.890.
118. Frick, 'Rechabites Reconsidered', p.282.
119. ibid., p.283.
120. ibid., p.283f.
121. ibid., p.285.
122. J. Gray, 1 and 2 Kings, London, 1977 (third edition), p.559 (first edition:1964).
123. Frick, 'Rechabites Reconsidered', p.284.
124. ibid.
125. See G.H. Jones, 1 and 2 Kings, London, 1984, p.468; T.R. Hobbs, 2 Kings, Waco, Texas, 1985, p.128f.
126. See, for example, J.A. Thompson, The Book of Jeremiah, Michigan, 1980, p.616f; C.L. Feinberg, Jeremiah: A Commentary, Michigan, 1982, p.243ff.
127. See, for example, R.P. Carroll, Jeremiah, London, 1986, pp.652-656.
128. J.D. Levenson, 'On the Promise to the Rechabites', CBQ 38 (1976), pp.508-514.
129. ibid., p.510.
130. ibid., p.511.
131. ibid., n.14.
132. ibid., p.514.
133. ibid., p.508 n.1f.
134. J.T. Cummings, 'The House of the Sons of the Prophets

and the Tents of the Rechabites', in ed. E.A. Livingstone, Studia Biblica 1978, vol. 1 (Old Testament), JSOTS 11, Sheffield, 1979, pp.119-126.

135. ibid., p.121f.
136. ibid., p.122.
137. ibid., p.123.
138. ibid., p.122f.
139. ibid., p.124.
140. Kh. H. Keukens, 'Die Rekabitischen Haussklaven in Jeremia 35', BZ (NF) 27 (1982), pp.228-235.
141. ibid., p.230.
142. ibid., p.231.
143. ibid., p.231f.
144. ibid., p.233.
145. ibid.
146. ibid., p.234.
147. ibid., p.235.
148. ibid., p.234.

## CHAPTER TWO

1. K. Budde, 'The Nomadic Ideal in the Old Testament', New World 4 (1895), p.728.
2. S. Abramsky, 'House of the Rechabites - Genealogy and Social Character', Eretz-Yisrael 8 (1967), p.255.
3. F. Frick, 'The Rechabites Reconsidered', JBL 90 (1971), p.287; J. Gray, 1 and 2 Kings, London, 1977 (third edition), p.559; N.K. Gottwald, The Tribes of Yahweh, London, 1980, p.321 et al.
4. W. Rudolph, Chronikbücher, Tübingen, 1955, p.25; J.M. Myers, 1 Chronicles, New York, 1965, p.16; H.G.M. Williamson, 1 and 2 Chronicles, London, 1982, p.55f.
5. S. Klein, 'Die Schreiberfamilien: 1 Chronik 2:55', MGWJ 70 (1926), pp.410-416.
6. S. Talmon, '1 Chron. 2:55', IEJ 10 (1960), p.174ff.
7. Note, also, that the LXX renders כֹּכַב by ῥήχᾱβ, rather than by the expected ῥήκαβ.
8. These traditions are examined in detail in Chapter Five below.
9. Klein, art. cit., p.415; R. Kittel, Die Bücher der Chronik, Göttingen, 1902, p.20.
10. G. Richter, 'Untersuchungen zu den Geschlechtsregister der Chronik', ZAW 34 (1914), p.165f. He maintained his position in his 'Zu den Geschlechtsregister, 1 Chronik 2-9', ZAW 49 (1931), pp.260-270.
11. Rudolph, op. cit., pp.22, 25.
12. ibid., p.25.
13. See Chapter Five.
14. Klein, art. cit., p.412f.
15. Kittel, op. cit., p.20.
16. Investigated in detail in Chapter Five of the present study.
17. Rudolph, ibid.
18. Abramsky, art. cit., p.255 (Author's Translation).

19. Abramsky, 'House of the Rechabites', p.256.
20. Talmon, '1 Chron. 2:55', p.178.
21. Abramsky, art. cit., p.255
22. Talmon, art. cit., p.176f.
23. Budde, 'Nomadic Ideal', p.727.
24. Talmon, art. cit., p.178.
25. So most commentators, although Rudolph, Chronik-bücher, p.78, who follows this view, admits that it is difficult to explain the omission on these grounds.
26. Klein, 'Die Schreiberfamilien', p.414; Rudolph, op. cit., p.25.
27. Rudolph, ibid.
28. See section 2.2 for details.
29. Klein, art. cit., p.415.
30. See below, 2.4, for the evidence that he was a Benjaminite.
31. That geography can be an important function of genealogies has been shown by, for example, R.R. Wilson, Genealogy and History in the Biblical World, New Haven, 1977, p.40.
32. Rudolph, op. cit., p.33f.
33. A number of the opinions expressed in the following examination of 1 Chronicles 4:12 have also appeared in C.H. Knights, 'The Text of 1 Chronicles IV 12: A Reappraisal', VT 37 (1987), pp.375-377.
34. R. le Déaut and J. Robert, Targum des Chroniques, Rome, 1971, vol. 1, p.48.
35. J. Levy, Chaldäisches Wörterbuch über die Targumim, Leipzig, vol. 2, p.175 (under the entry סנהדרין).
36. וּמִנֵּלָם דְּהֵאֵי רַכָּא לִישָׁנָא דְּמַלְכוּתָא הוּא, 'And whence do we prove that Rekha has the meaning of royalty (aristocracy)?' Translation from M. Jastrow, A Dictionary of the Targumim, the Talmud Babli and Yerushalmi, and the Midrashic Literature, London and New York, 1903, p.1474.
37. Sifre Numbers, ed. H.S. Horowitz, Jerusalem, 1966, p.73. The use of 'proselytes' (גרֵּי) in the rabbinic

literature to denote the Rechabites arises from the fact that the Rechabites are described as רַחֲבִיטִים in the MT of Jer. 35:7.

38. As K. Kohler argued in 'The Essenes and the Apocalyptic Literature', JQR 11 (1920-21), p.161.
39. J. Gray, 1 and 2 Kings, p.559; F. Frick, 'Rechabites Reconsidered', p.286; N.K. Gottwald, Tribes of Yahweh, p.321.
40. Chronikbücher, p.33f.
41. The Books of Chronicles, Edinburgh, 1910, p.106ff.
42. A. Kaminka, 'Studien zur LXX an der Hand der Zwölf Kleinen Prophetenbücher', MGWJ (1928), p.262f.
43. L.W. Batten, Ezra and Nehemiah, Edinburgh, 1913, p.222.
44. On the whole question of harmonisation in OT manuscripts, see E. Tov, 'The Nature and Background of Harmonisation in Hebrew Manuscripts', JSOT 31 (1985), pp.3-29.
45. Batten, ibid.
46. Kh. Keukens, 'Die Rekabitischen Haussklaven in Jeremia 35', BZ (NF) 27 (1982), p.233.
47. Except for Codex B of LXX reading ρζκχδ for ρμααβ throughout the passage, other than in v.2. See further, p.53 above.
48. P. Ackroyd, The Second Book of Samuel, Cambridge, 1977, p.50.
49. eg., A.F. Kirkpatrick, The Second Book of Samuel, Cambridge, 1899, p.76; W. McKane, 1 and 2 Samuel, London, 1963, p.196; J. Mauchline, 1 and 2 Samuel, London, 1971, p.212.
50. H.W. Hertzberg, 1 and 2 Samuel, ET, London, 1964, p.263.
51. McKane, ibid.; Mauchline, ibid.; J.A. Soggin, Joshua, ET, London, 1972, p.113.
52. P.K. McCarter, 2 Samuel, New York, 1984, p.127f.
53. Page 72.
54. J. Gray, op. cit., p.134.
55. Translation from W. Whiston, The Antiquities of the Jews by Flavius Josephus, London, nd, p.263f.

56. For the accusative particle  $\text{כִּי}$  before a noun in the nominative, cf. G-K 117 k-m; G.I. Emerson, 'Widening Horizons: Some Complexities of Hebrew Grammar', in ed. J. Eaton, Horizons in Semitic Studies: Articles for the Student, Birmingham, 1980, p.83f.
57. Frick, 'Rechabites Reconsidered', p.283f.
58. W.B. Barrick, 'The Meaning and Usage of R-K-B in Biblical Hebrew', JBL 101 (1982), pp.481-503.
59. The Lucianic recension of LXX and Old Latin have an addition in the latter part of the verse, but it is not relevant for the present purposes.
60. See J. Robinson, The Second Book of Kings, Cambridge, 1976, p.99f; J. Gray, 1 and 2 Kings, p.559; R. de Vaux in La Sainte Bible, Paris, 1958, p.162.
61. H.-Chr. Schmitt, Elisa, Gütersloh, 1972, p.25.
62. E. Würthwein, Die Bücher der Könige, 1 Kön. 17-2 Kön 25, Göttingen, 1984, p.340; G.H. Jones, 1 and 2 Kings, London, 1984, pp.451, 464.
63. S. Timm, Die Dynastie Omri: Quellen und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte Israels in 9. Jahrhundert vor Christus, FRLANT 124, Göttingen, 1982, p.139.
64. T.R. Hobbs, 2 Kings, Waco, Texas, 1985, p.125.
65. The view of Keukens 'Rekabitischen Haussklaven', p.234, that Jonadab was a Judaeen military officer acting as a rearguard for the Judaeen princes is unlikely in the extreme.
66. G.H. Jones, op. cit., p.464.
67. See G. Ahlström, 'King Jehu - A Prophet's Mistake', in eds. A.L. Merrill and T.W. Overholt, Scripture in History and Theology, Pittsburgh, 1977, pp.47-69.
68. F. Frick, 'Rechabites Reconsidered', p.283.
69. ibid.
70. J.T. Cummings, 'The House of the Sons of the Prophets and the Tents of the Rechabites', in ed. E.A. Livingstone, Studia Biblica 1978, vol. 1 (Old Testament), JSOTS 11, Sheffield 1979, p.123f.
71. ibid., p.122f.
72. S. Norin, 'Jo-Namen und Jeho-Namen', VT 29 (1979), pp.87-97.

73. ibid., p.91.
74. A.R. Millard, 'YW and YHW Names', VT 30 (1980), pp. 208-212.
75. ibid., p.210. See also N. Avigad, 'New Names on Hebrew Seals', Eretz-Yisrael 12 (1975), p.69 (Hebrew).
76. F. Frick, 'Rechabites Reconsidered', p.282f.
77. ibid.
78. Cummings, 'House of the Sons of the Prophets', p.123f.
79. Most commentators think it means 'Rider'. See BDB, p.939; EJ vol. 13, col. 1609; F. Frick, 'Rechabites Reconsidered', p.283; Cummings, 'House of the Sons of the Prophets', p.123; and below, pages 236-238.
80. Abramsky, 'House of the Rechabites', p.262.
81. Unfortunately, two recent studies relevant to 2 Kings 10:15f, 23 were unavailable when this thesis was being prepared. They are: A. Rofé, The Prophetical Stories: The Narratives about the Prophets in the Hebrew Bible, their Literary Types and History, Jerusalem, 1982, (Hebrew); J.C. Treballe-Barrera, Jehu y Joas: Texto y Composicion Literaria de 2 Reyes 9-11, Valencia, 1984.

## CHAPTER THREE

1. For a survey of current issues in Jeremianic studies, see P.R. Ackroyd, 'The Book of Jeremiah - Some Recent Studies', JSOT 28 (1984), pp.47-59.
2. See, for example, J.G. Janzen, Studies in the Text of Jeremiah, Harvard, 1973; E. Tov, The LXX Translation of Jeremiah and Baruch, Missoula, 1976; idem., 'Some Aspects of the Textual and Literary History of the Book of Jeremiah', in ed. P.-M. Bogaert, Le Livre de Jérémie: Le Prophète et son Milieu, les Oracles et leur Transmission, Leuven, 1981, pp.145-167; P.-M. Bogaert, 'De Baruch à Jérémie: Les Deux Redactions Conservées du Livre de Jérémie', in ed. Bogaert, Le Livre de Jérémie, pp.168-173; idem., 'Les Mécanismes Rédactionnels en Jér. 10,1-16 (LXX et TM) et la Signification des Suppléments', in ed. Bogaert, Le Livre de Jérémie, pp.222-238; S. Soderlund, The Greek Text of Jeremiah: A Revised Hypothesis, JSOTS 47, Sheffield, 1985.
3. The principal difference of arrangement is the fact that the 'Oracles against the Nations' section is found almost at the end of the MT of Jeremiah (chaps. 46-51), but in the middle of the LXX (25:14-31:44), with a different internal order - the MT order being Egypt, Philistines, Moab, Ammonites, Edom, Damascus, Kedar, Elam, Babylon, and the LXX order Elam, Egypt, Babylon, Philistines, Edom, Ammonites, Kedar, Damascus, Moab.
4. Soderlund reports that 3097 words of the MT of Jeremiah are not represented in LXX; Greek Text of Jeremiah, p.11.
5. Soderlund, ibid.
6. ibid.
7. ibid.
8. ibid., p.12.
9. Janzen, op. cit.; Tov, op. cit.; Bogaert, artt.cit.
10. Soderlund, loc. cit.
11. ibid.
12. ibid., pp.193-248.
13. To this extent, the sub-title, A Revised Hypothesis, seems a somewhat inaccurate description of Soderlund's

book. Rather, as the back cover states, the work "seeks to take stock and review current research", rather than to present a "Revised Hypothesis". This slight blemish apart, Soderlund's work is an excellent contribution to Jeremianic studies.

14. Soderlund, op. cit., p.248.
15. Janzen, Studies in the Text of Jeremiah.
16. By using the terms 'omission' and 'addition', no pre-judgement of the priority of a longer or shorter reading is intended. Janzen prefers the terms 'zero variant' and 'plus variant'.
17. See below, pages 135-136.
18. Janzen, op. cit., p.67.
19. See C.T.R. Hayward, 'Some Notes on Scribes and Priests in the Targum to the Prophets', JJS 36 (1985), p.210.
20. See below, pages 173-175.
21. Janzen, op. cit., p.74. See pages 69-71 of Janzen's book for his justification for following the shorter textual tradition of LXX over the proper names in Jeremiah.
22. Below, pages 135-136.
23. Janzen, op. cit., p.51.
24. See below, pages 137-138.
25. Janzen, op. cit., pages 69-71.
26. ibid., p.51.
27. Verse 6: כִּי יִהְיוּנָדָב בֶּן-רֹכַב מֵבִינֵי צוּהַ עַל־כְּנוֹ  
Verse 8: יִהְיוּנָדָב בֶּן-רֹכַב מֵבִינֵי לִכְלֵי מִשְׁרַת צוּנָן
28. G.A. Smith, Jeremiah, London, 1922, p.293.
29. See below, page 111.
30. Janzen, op. cit., pages 75-86.
31. The argument over translators and revisers in the LXX of the Book of Jeremiah still rages. See Tov, LXX Translation of Jeremiah and Baruch, and the critique of this work in Soderlund, Greek Text of Jeremiah, pp.153-192.

32. See Janzen, Studies in the Text of Jeremiah, p.75f, for details.
33. P.610, col. A.
34. On the use of  $\text{סל}$  before the subject in passive formations, see G-K 121 a-b; G.I. Emmerson, 'Widening Horizons: Some Complexities of Hebrew Grammar', in ed. J. Eaton, Horizons in Semitic Studies: Articles for the Student, Birmingham, 1980, p.83f.
35. Janzen, op. cit., p.51f.
36. See above, page 99.
37. In the BHS apparatus, ad. loc.
38. Die Prosareden des Jeremiabuches, BZAW 132, Berlin, 1973, p.126.
39. See C.T.R. Hayward, Divine Name and Presence: The Memra, New Jersey, 1981; B.D. Chilton, The Glory of Israel: The Theology and Provenience of the Isaiah Targum, JSOTS 23, Sheffield, 1983, pp.56-69.
40. See above, pages 105-106.
41. For this phrase, Targum reads, חלף דשליחיהן לותהוק, ואל קבילו ומתנבאו להוק ולא סבו, 'For I sent unto them my servants the prophets, but they did not hearken, and they prophesied unto them, but they turned not'.
42. op. cit., p.52.
43. LXX does not render השכים ודבר.
44. The asterisked passages in Theodotion v.17 continues into v.18 with και τω αλς η ρμαβ ελπεν ζερεμιας.
45. See above, pages 105-106.
46. See above, pages 104-105.
47. op. cit., p.105f.
48. See further Chapter Five.
49. op. cit., p.65.
50. In the BHS apparatus, ad. loc.
51. See pages 135-136.
52. B. Duhm, Jeremia, Tübingen, 1901.

53. S. Mowinckel, Zur Komposition des Buches Jeremia, Kristiana, 1914.
54. S. Mowinckel, Prophecy and Tradition, Oslo, 1946, p.61f.
55. J. Skinner, Prophecy and Religion: Studies in the Life of Jeremiah, Cambridge, 1922, p.231f.
56. ibid., p.102f.
57. W.O.E. Oesterley and T.H. Robinson, An Introduction to the Books of the Old Testament, London, 1934, pp.288-313.
58. ibid., p.299.
59. ibid., p.301f.
60. ibid., pp.302, 304f.
61. ibid., p.305f.
62. ibid., p.306.
63. J. Bright, 'The Date of the Prose Sermons of Jeremiah', JBL 70 (1951), pp.15-35; idem., Jeremiah, New York, 1965.
64. Jeremiah, p.lxiii.
65. 'Prose Sermons', p.27.
66. ibid., pp.30-35.
67. Cf. W.L. Holladay, 'Prototype and Copies: A New Approach to the Poetry-Prose Problem in the Book of Jeremiah', JBL 79 (1960), pp.351-367; idem., 'Style, Irony and Authenticity in Jeremiah', JBL 81 (1962), pp.44-54; idem., 'Jeremiah's Lawsuit with God', Interpretation 17 (1963), pp.280-287; 'The Background of Jeremiah's Self-Understanding', JBL 83 (1964), pp. 153-164; idem., 'Jeremiah and Moses', JBL 85 (1966), pp.17-27; idem., 'The Recovery of Poetic Passages of Jeremiah', JBL 85 (1966), pp.401-435; idem., 'A Fresh Look at "Source B" and "Source C" in Jeremiah', VT 25 (1975), pp.394-412.
68. W.L. Holladay, Jeremiah, vol. 1, Philadelphia, 1986.
69. 'Prototype and Copies', p.354.
70. 'Prototype and Copies', passim.

71. Weippert, Prosareden.
72. Holladay, 'Fresh Look', passim.
73. J.P. Hyatt, 'Jeremiah: Introduction and Exegesis', IB 5, pp.779, 798.
74. Holladay, 'Fresh Look', p.411.
75. E.W. Nicholson, Preaching to the Exiles: A Study of the Prose Tradition in the Book of Jeremiah, Oxford, 1970.
76. ibid., p.26.
77. ibid., p.36.
78. ibid., p.134f.
79. R.P. Carroll, From Chaos to Covenant: Uses of Prophecy in the Book of Jeremiah, London, 1981; idem., Jeremiah, London, 1986.
80. cf. From Chaos to Covenant, p.13.
81. The title of the first chapter of From Chaos to Covenant, consciously modelled on the title of Albert Schweitzer's famous The Quest of the Historical Jesus (London, second edition, 1911). See Carroll, From Chaos to Covenant, p.25.
82. From Chaos to Covenant, p.60; cf. ibid., pp.11-13; R.P. Carroll, 'Poets not Prophets: A Response to "Prophets through the Looking-Glass"', JSOT 27 (1983), pp.25-31.
83. From Chaos to Covenant, p.142; Jeremiah, pp.422-425.
84. Bright, Jeremiah, p.lxxii.
85. J.M. Berridge, Review of From Chaos to Covenant, JSOT 24 (1982), p.115.
86. Carroll, Jeremiah, pp.82-86.
87. See, for example, J. Calvin, Commentaries on the Book of the Prophet Jeremiah and the Lamentations, ET, Edinburgh, 1854, vol. 4, p.302f; M. Weber, Das Antike Judentum, Tübingen, 1920, p.283; B. Lang, Monotheism and the Prophetic Minority, Sheffield, 1983, p.81; G. Widengren, Literary and Psychological Aspects of the Hebrew Prophets, Uppsala, 1948, pp.55f, 71-73, 77, 82, 114, 121; J.R. Lundbom, 'Baruch, Seraiah and Expanded Colophons in the Book of Jeremiah', JSOT 36 (1986), p.107f.

88. For a consideration of where the second section should be delimited, see below, page 129.
89. So Bright, Jeremiah, p.lxxvii, and J.A. Thompson, The Book of Jeremiah, Grand Rapids, Michigan, 1980, p.37. Mowinckel, Komposition, p.31, assigns the the whole chapter to Type C.
90. Thompson, op. cit., pp.71-76. See also the more nuanced description of prophetic actions in Lang, Monothetism, pp.81f, 88f.
91. "Of all the dramatic acts presented in the [Jeremiah] tradition, this one is the most symbolical and the least performative" (Carroll, Jeremiah, p.654).
92. As Carroll is inclined to do, Jeremiah, p.656.
93. See below, pages 139-149.
94. Hyatt, 'Jeremiah', p.1060; W. Thiel, Die Deuteronomistische Redaktion von Jeremia 26-45, WMANT 52, Neukirchen-Vluyn, 1981, p.44f.
95. See below, pages 135-139.
96. For this reading, see above, pages 104-105.
97. Bright, Jeremiah, p.190. Thiel, op. cit., p.45f, regards the whole of vv.13-18 as redactional, and only vv.12, 19 as being the original conclusion to the chapter.
98. See above, page 111.
99. Note especially the common use of the unusual phrase  
בָּשׂוּבָה לַיהוָה, 39:18, 45:5.
100. Pace Carroll, From Chaos to Covenant, p.215.
101. Preaching to the Exiles, p.33f.
102. ibid., p.34.
103. In number of verses.
104. op. cit., p.34.
105. See below, pages 141-149.
106. Although it will be shown that there are grounds for thinking that some of the editorial expansions in Jer. 35 do stem from the Deuteronomists. See below, pages 143-146.

107. Jeremiah, pp.183-194.
108. Thiel, Deuteronomistische Redaktion, p.44f.
109. Apart from Jer. 35:7, they are Lev. 25:6, 45; Is. 5:17; Ezek. 47:22; Ps. 105:12=1 Chron. 16:19; 2 Chron. 15:9; Job 19:15.
110. It is possible that the idea contained in Ps. 105:12=1 Chron. 16:19 is the same as that found here in Jer. 35:7. See below, pages 198-199.
111. In the BHS apparatus, ad. loc.
112. Thiel, op. cit., p.44.
113. Above, pages 98-99.
114. On this, see, for example, C. Begg, 'Unifying Factors in 2 Kings 1.2-17a', JSOT 32 (1985), p.82f.
115. See above, page 100.
116. On the priority of MT in v.7b, see above, page 101.
117. Above, pages 103-104.
118. See above, page 134.
119. This seems to be the mistake of Thiel, op. cit., pp. 45-47, who regards the whole of vv.13-18 as redactional, thereby leaving no contrast between the Rechabites and the people. Thiel then goes on to claim that the Deuteronomists, in the speech that they have inserted, have correctly perceived the intention of Jeremiah's act!
120. In addition to Thiel, whose opinion has just been cited, Erbt (cited in A.S. Peake, Jeremiah and Lamentations, vol. 2, Edinburgh, 1912, p.149) and Hyatt ('Jeremiah', p.1060) hold such extreme views.
121. 11:2, 9; 17:25; 18:11; 32:32; 36:31.
122. Bright, 'Prose Sermons', p.33.
123. Holladay, 'Prototype and Copies', p.365.
124. Jer. 7:28; 17:23; 32:33.
125. Jer. 2:30; 5:3.
126. Holladay, ibid.
127. Weippert, Prosareden, pp.121-147.

128. cf. Deut. 8:6, 19:6, 26:17, 28:9.
129. Holladay, 'Prototype and Copies', p.355.
130. C. Brekelmans, 'Jeremiah 18,1-12 and its Redaction', in ed. P.-M. Bogaert, Le Livre de Jeremie, p.349.
131. Prosareden, pp.215-222.
132. Holladay (art. cit.) does not suggest it as a prototype of the occurrences in the prose.
133. M. Weinfeld, Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomistic School, Oxford, 1972, p.350.
134. See, for example, Carroll, Jeremiah, p.655.
135. 1 Kings 2:4, 8:25=2 Chron. 6:16, 1 Kings 9:5=2 Chron. 7:18, Jer. 33:17.
136. Jer. 33:18.
137. Below, pages 205-213.
138. Carroll, From Chaos to Covenant; idem., Jeremiah; Nicholson, Preaching to the Exiles.
139. Bright, Jeremiah, p.lxvii.
140. Jer. 30:2, 36:2, 51:60, cf. Widengren, Literary and Psychological Aspects, and Lundbom, 'Expanded Colophons'.
141. See the literature cited in n.87.
142. Carroll, From Chaos to Covenant, p.11, et al.
143. Holladay, 'Fresh Look', p.408.
144. Below, pages 205-213.
145. Preaching to the Exiles, chap.4, passim.
146. Below, pages 196-197.
147. op. cit., p.29.
148. This is done by, for example, E.A. Leslie, Jeremiah, Chronologically Arranged, Translated and Interpreted, New York, 1954; and Bright, Jeremiah.
149. Carroll, Jeremiah, p.38.
150. J.R. Lundbom, Jeremiah: A Study in Ancient Hebrew Rhetoric, Missoula, 1975, pp.107-109.

151. Lundbom, Jeremiah, p.109.
152. ibid., p.107f.
153. ibid., p.108 (Emphasis Lundbom's).
154. "This arrangement cannot be understood as the one that was originally intended.", ibid., p.107.
155. Carroll, Jeremiah, p.509.
156. ibid., p.653.
157. Above, pages 127-129.
158. Verses 1-7 and 1-6 respectively.
159. Verses 8-11 and 7-11(12) respectively. This study (page 128) has regarded v.11 as the end of the unit in chapter 18. Most commentators take the unit on into v.12. Brekelmans' analysis, detailed below (page 165f), vindicates treating v.11, rather than v.12, as the end of the unit.
160. Above, pages 126-127.
161. Carroll, From Chaos to Covenant, p.131.
162. Nicholson, Jeremiah 1-25, Cambridge, 1973, p.121.
163. Leslie, Jeremiah, p.87; Peake, Jeremiah, vol.1, p.192ff.
164. Hyatt, 'Jeremiah', p.922.
165. C.H. Cornill, Das Buch Jeremia, Leipzig, 1905, p.171f.
166. W. McKane, Jeremiah, vol. 1, Edinburgh, 1986, p.lxxii.
167. Weippert, Prosareden, pp.215-222.
168. In the BHS apparatus, ad. loc.
169. Hyatt, ibid.
170. D. Kellermann, article 'יְרֵמְיָהוּ', in eds. G.J. Botterweck and H. Ringgren, Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament, vol. 2, ET, Grand Rapids, Michigan, 1977, p.348.
171. But see, for example, McKane, op. cit., p.lxxiv.
172. Brekelmans, 'Jeremiah 18,1-12', p.345f.

173. Carroll, From Chaos to Covenant, pp.77f, 170.
174. Skinner, Prophecy and Religion, p.163.
175. Nicholson, Preaching to the Exiles, p.80f.
176. Leslie, Jeremiah, p.193f.
177. Bright, Jeremiah, p.125f.
178. Weippert, Prosareden, pp.191-209.
179. Peake, Jeremiah, vol. 1, p.231.
180. Hyatt, 'Jeremiah', p.960.
181. Brekelmans, 'Jeremiah 18,1-12'.
182. See the criticisms of Weippert's work in Carroll, Jeremiah, p.42f, and W. McKane, 'Relations between Poetry and Prose in the Book of Jeremiah with Special Reference to Jeremiah III 6-11 and XII 14-17', in ed. J.A. Emerton, Congress Volume: Vienna 1980, SVT 32, Leiden, 1981, p.228.
183. As this study has done in relation to chap. 35, and as Douglas Jones' forthcoming commentary on Jeremiah in the New Century Bible Commentary series will do.
184. Weippert, op. cit., pp.48-67, 191-209.
185. Brekelmans, art. cit., p.347.
186. W. Thiel, Die Deuteronomistische Redaktion von Jeremia 1-25, WMANT, Neukirchen-Vluyn, 1973, p.214.
187. Brekelmans, ibid.
188. ibid.
189. ibid., p.348f.
190. ibid., p.348.
191. ibid., p.350.
192. cf. Jer. 13:1, 30:1, 32:1, 34:1.
193. Above, pages 134-135.
194. Above, pages 149-151.
195. Page 98.
196. J. Gray, 1 and 2 Kings, London, third edition, 1977, p.748.

197. Gray, Kings, p.755.
198. Above, pages 151-152.
199. cf. Jer. 13:1, 17:19, 19:1, 28:13, 34:2.
200. N. Glueck, Rivers in the Desert, London, 1959, p.143.
201. Carroll, Jeremiah, p.651.
202. For the priority of LXX in v.5, see above, page 100.
203. Carroll, ibid.
204. M. Noth, Die Israelitischen Personennamen im Rahmen der Gemeinsemitischen Namengebung, BWANT 46, Stuttgart, 1928, p.200f.
205. P.941.
206. In 2 Samuel 4.
207. There is no textual uncertainty over this instance of the word 'all' - it is found in both MT and LXX.
208. ie. Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and the Book of the Twelve Prophets.
209. It is not clear whether the father or the son is being designated by the title.
210. Above, page 99.
211. See the BHS apparatus, ad. loc., for details.
212. J.R. Porter, ' אֲנִי הָיִיתִי אֶלֶּם ', JTS (NS) 32 (1981), p.429.
213. ibid., p.428f.
214. B.O. Long, 'Social Dimensions of Prophetic Conflict', Semeia 21 (1982), p.46.
215. Duhm, Jeremia, p.286.
216. Page 100.
217. Kh. Keukens, 'Die Rekabitischen Haussklaven in Jeremia 35', BZ (NF) 27 (1983), pp.228-235.
218. See the quote from p.234 of Keukens' article on page 48 above.
219. Above, section 2.5.

220. See Gray, Kings, p.329f, quoting J. Fichtner, Das Erste Buch von den Königen, Stuttgart, 1964, p.207.
221. Below, pages 298-299.
222. cf. B.R. Wilson, Religion in Sociological Perspective, Oxford, 1982, p.89.
223. Below, section 4.3.
224. Keukens, 'Rekabitischen Haussklaven', p.231.
225. ibid.
226. ibid.
227. K. Budde, 'The Nomadic Ideal in the Old Testament', New World 4 (1895), p.729.
228. Pages 193-194.
229. R.J. Forbes, Studies in Ancient Technology, vol. 3, Leiden, 1955, p.60.
230. P.K. Hitti, History of the Arabs, London, seventh edition, 1960, pp.19, 337.
231. The Hebrew of the verse reads, אֶהְנִיךָ מֵאֵת מִלְּבִיטָא מֵאֵת מִלְּבִיטָא, RSV mg., 'I would lead you and bring you into the house of my mother; she will teach me. I would give you spiced wine to drink; the juice of my pomegranates'. Does the parallelism of the third and fourth stichs suggest that מֵאֵת מִלְּבִיטָא is grape-wine spiced with pomegranates, or fermented pomegranate juice?
232. Lev. 10:9; Num. 6:3 (twice); Deut. 14:26, 28:7, 29:5, 9; Judg. 13:4, 7, 14; 1 Sam. 1:15; Is. 5:11, 22, 24:9, 56:12; Mic. 2:1; Prov. 20:1, 31:4, 6.
233. Gen. 9:21, 49:11f; Deut. 28:39, 32:33; Is. 6:10; Jer. 48:33; Hos. 14:8; Am. 5:11, 9:14; Mic. 6:15; Zeph. 1:13; Neh. 13:15; 1 Chron. 27:27. cf. Deut. 29:5; Jer. 40:10, 12; Job 32:19; Song of Songs 2:4, 7:10.
234. Both חֲרֻצְנִיָּם and גַּל are hapax legomena, and their precise meaning is uncertain.
235. See below, page 196.
236. See also below, pages 191-192.
237. See further, Chapter Five.
238. Hitti, op. cit., p.19.

239. The statement in Deut. 29:5, that Israel drank no  $\text{לֶחֶם}$  or  $\text{כֶּסֶף}$  in the wilderness, should not be seen as contradicting this statement. Deut. 29:5 is a statement affirming that Yahweh's care for Israel in the wilderness was so great that Israel was sustained with food and clothing entirely by their God, without any endeavour on their part:  $\text{לֶחֶם}$  and  $\text{כֶּסֶף}$  - and bread, also mentioned in the verse - are as much the 'work of human hands' as the 'fruit of the earth'. Thus, the verse cannot really be used to argue that the desert life was a total one.
240. Frick, 'Rechabites Reconsidered', p.285; Gray, Kings, p.559.
241. See the discussion of the Rechabites and the Cult in 4.5, below.
242. See the discussion of the Rechabites and the Nazirites in 4.6, below.
243. F. Frick, The City in Ancient Israel, Missoula, 1977, pp.213, 216.
244. cf. 1 Sam. 21:5; 2 Sam. 11:11.
245. This will be explored further in section 4.2.
246. J. Calvin, Commentaries on Jeremiah and the Lamentations, vol. 4, p.314.
247. Abramsky, 'House of the Rechabites', p.260.
248. Frick, 'Rechabites Reconsidered', p.284; P.A. Riemann, Desert and Return to Desert in the Pre-Exilic Prophets, unpublished Harvard Ph.D. thesis, 1964, p.51f.
249. "A figure of speech using a verb or adjective with two nouns, to one of which it is strictly applicable, while the word appropriate to the other is not used". (The Concise Oxford Dictionary, Oxford, sixth edition, 1976, p.1357).
250. J. Skinner, Genesis, Edinburgh, 1910, p.118; C.A. Simpson, 'Genesis: Introduction and Exegesis', IB 1, New York, 1952, p.522f; S.R. Driver, The Book of Genesis, London, sixth edition, 1907, p.69.
251. Skinner, ibid.
252. N.K. Gottwald, The Tribes of Yahweh, London, 1980, p.452.
253. Abramsky, ibid. The observations of J.T. Luke, Pastoralism and Politics in the Mari Period (Michigan Ph.D.,

- 1965), Ann Arbor, Michigan, 1978, p.29f, support the present conclusions.
254. Gottwald, Tribes of Yahweh, p.440f.
255. J.T. Cummings, 'The House of the Sons of the Prophets and the Tents of the Rechabites', in ed. E.A. Livingstone, Studia Biblica 1978, vol. 1 (Old Testament), JSOTS 11, Sheffield, 1979, pp.119-126.
256. ibid., p.122.
257. cf. BDB, p.444; N.H. Snaith, '1 Kings: Exegesis', IB 3, New York, 1954, p.145.
258. Vol. 6, col. 632.
259. ibid., col. 633.
260. cf. 2 Kings 4:2, 6:1-7, 32.
261. The word מִת, 'tent', never appears in the Elijah-Elisha cycles.
262. Frick, City in Ancient Israel, pp.220-231.
263. cf. Is. 27:10; Jer. 5:17, 8:14; Hos. 8:14.
264. cf. Is. 5:8-17 and B. Lang, 'The Social Organization of Peasant Poverty in Biblical Israel', Monotheism and the Prophetic Minority, pp.114-127.
265. J. Blenkinsopp, A History of Prophecy in Israel, London, 1984, p.74.
266. Abramsky, 'House of the Rechabites', p.258.
267. Frick, 'Rechabites Reconsidered', p.284.
268. cf. Lev. 19:10, et al.
269. cf. Deut. 12:12, 14;29, 26:12; R. de Vaux, Ancient Israel, p.74. Some commentators, such as J.A. Soggin (Judges, London, 1981, p.266) and C.F. Burney (The Book of Judges: Introduction and Notes, London, second edition, 1920, p.422) wish to see in גֵּר שָׂם (Judges 17:17) an error of vocalisation for גֵּר שָׂם (Gershom), cf. 18:30, Exod. 2:22. They may be right, but this does not affect the argument that the Levites were called גֵּרִים because they were landless Israelites, as this idea is found in Judg. 17:7, וְאֵנִי הֹלֵךְ לְגֹיִר בְּאֶרֶץ אֲמֹנָה, 'I am going to sojourn where I can find a place', and 19:1, וַיְהִי אִישׁ לְוִי גֵר בְּרִמְכֵזַיִם הַר-אֶפְרַיִם, 'A certain Levite was sojourning in the remote parts of the hill country of Ephraim', both of which are accepted

- by Soggin (op. cit., pp.266, 269, 284) and Burney (op. cit., pp.423, 459).
270. D. Kellermann, article 'גור' in TDOT 2, ET, 1977, p.445.
271. F.A. Spina, 'The Israelites as Gērīm, "Sojourners", in Social and Historical Context', in eds. C.L. Meyers and M. O'Connor, The Word of the Lord shall go forth: Essays in Honor of David Noel Freedman in Celebration of his 60th Birthday, Winona Lake, Indiana, 1981, pp.321-335.
272. Spina's preferred translation of גרים.
273. 'Rekabitischen Haussklaven', p.230.
274. Compare the reading of the RSV, 'The guests in my house', and H.H. Rowley, Job, London, 1970, p.169.
275. See Chapter Five of the present work.
276. Below, section 4.3.
277. Abramsky, 'House of the Rechabites', p.259.
278. Carroll, Jeremiah, pp.652-656.
279. L.E. Binns, The Book of the Prophet Jeremiah, London, 1919, p.264.
280. Pages 195-196.
281. Above, page 142.
282. So BDB, p.416.
283. See above, pages 125-127.
284. Above, pages 142-143.
285. It is derived from the same stem as שָׁמַר, 'shoulder'. In verbal use, its ultimate meaning is 'to load beasts at the break of day'. See BDB, p.1014.
286. Carroll, From Chaos to Covenant, p.88.
287. Above, pages 143-146.
288. See above, page 111.
289. See above, pages 111-112.
290. J.D. Levenson, 'On the Promise to the Rechabites', CBQ 38 (1976), p.511, quoting M. Weinfeld, 'The Covenant of Grant in the Old Testament and in the Ancient

- Near East', JAOS 90 (1970), p.185.
291. Levenson evidently thinks of the Rechabites as a family grouping of some sort.
292. Levenson, art. cit., p.511n.14.
293. ibid., p.508.
294. ibid., p.514 n.25.
295. For the phrase לֹא יִכְרֹת אִישׁ, see above, pages 147-149.
296. As will be shown in Chapter Five.
297. J. Calvin, Commentaries on Jeremiah and the Lamentations, vol. 4, p.324.
298. A. Gelin, 'Le Livre de Jérémie', La Sainte Bible, Paris, 1958, ad. loc.
299. P. Volz, Der Prophet Jeremia, Leipzig, second edition, 1928, p.327.
300. Binns, Jeremiah, p.268; Peake, Jeremiah, vol. 2, p.150; C.L. Feinberg, Jeremiah: A Commentary, Grand Rapids, Michigan, 1982, p.246f.
301. Carroll, From Chaos to Covenant, p.215; idem., Jeremiah, p.655.
302. So, for instance, E. Würthwein, The Text of the Old Testament, ET, London, 1980, p.18f. On the Tiqqune Sopherim, see C. McCarthy, The Tiqqune Sopherim and Theological Corrections in the Massoretic Text of the Old Testament, Göttingen, 1981.
303. Skinner, Genesis, p.304f.
304. cf. Jer. 14:11 and J.T. Willis, 'Dialogue between Prophet and Audience as a Rhetorical Device in the Book of Jeremiah', JSOT 33 (1985), pp.71-75.
305. cf. Gen. 20:7, where it is said of Abraham that, 'he is a prophet, and he will pray for you'.
306. On the nature of the worship at the Temple following the Fall of Jerusalem, see D.R. Jones, 'The Cessation of Sacrifice after the Destruction of the Temple in 586 BC', JTS (NS) 14 (1963), pp.12-31.
307. See the discussion of the Rechabites and the Cult in section 4.5, below.

308. cf. for Moses, Deut. 18:15, and for Samuel, 1 Sam. 3:20.
309. Cummings, 'House of the Sons of the Prophets', passim.

## CHAPTER FOUR

1. E.H. Plumptre, article 'Rechabites', in ed. W. Smith, Dictionary of the Bible, London, 1863, vol. 2, p.1007.
2. So, for example, R.M. Geer, Diodorus of Sicily, with an English Translation (LCL), vol. 10, London, 1954, p.87 n.3; J. Starcky, 'Petra et la Nabatène', Dictionnaire de la Bible Supplément 7, Paris, 1966, col. 939; A. Negev, 'The Nabateans and the Provincia Arabia', ANRW II.8, Berlin, 1977, p.528.
3. P.A. Riemann, Desert and Return to Desert in the Pre-Exilic Prophets, unpublished Harvard Ph.D. thesis, 1964, p.52, and F. Frick, The City in Ancient Israel, Missoula, 1977, p.215f, are both sceptical about the link, but neither investigate it critically.
4. Text and translation from the LCL edition.
5. S. Cohen article 'Nabataeans', IDB 3, New York, 1961, p.491.
6. Geer, op. cit., vol. 9, p.viif; Negev, art. cit., p.526.
7. Jane Hornblower, Hieronymus of Cardia, Oxford, 1981, passim.
8. The use of the LXX in this comparison does not imply that, if he had been drawing on the biblical account, Diodorus/Hieronymus would have been dependent on the Greek translation of the Hebrew Bible. Rather, it is intended to demonstrate the probable vocabulary that would have been found in Diod. Sic. XIX.94 if he had been dependent on Jer. 35 at all.
9. Negev, art. cit., p.528.
10. See above, pages 186-191.
11. Above, pages 196-197.
12. See below, page 298.
13. Hornblower, op. cit., pp.153, 177f, 219.
14. The Assyrian sources, with their various spellings, are conveniently listed in I. Eph'al, The Ancient Arabs, Jerusalem, 1982, p.221.
15. So E.C. Broome, 'Nebaiati, Nebaioth and the Nabataeans: The Linguistic Problem', JSS 18 (1973), pp.

- 1-16; J.R. Bartlett, 'From Edomites to Nabataeans', PEQ 111 (1979), pp.62-66.
16. Negev, 'Nabataeans', p.527; Eph'al, Ancient Arabs, p.222f.
  17. Riemann, Desert and Return to Desert, p.52.
  18. G.W. Bowersock, Roman Arabia, Cambridge, Mass., 1983, p.14.
  19. Translations from the LCL edition.
  20. For further details of the history of Nabataea in this period, see, for instance, E. Schlirer, The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ, rev. ed. by G. Vermes, F. Millar and M. Black, vol. 1, Edinburgh, 1973, pp.574-586.
  21. M.S. Seale, The Desert Bible, London, 1974, p.17f.
  22. G. Buccellati, The Amorites of the Ur III Period, Naples, 1966, pp.330-332.
  23. ibid., pp.282-287.
  24. Seale, op. cit., p.18.
  25. M. Liverani, 'The Amorites', in ed. D.J. Wiseman, Peoples of Old Testament Times, Oxford, 1973, p.106.
  26. A. Haldar, Who were the Amorites?, Leiden, 1971, p.53.
  27. K. Prag, 'The Intermediate Early Bronze-Middle Bronze Age: An Interpretation of the Evidence from Trans-jordan, Syria and Lebanon', Levant 6 (1974), p.105.
  28. ibid.
  29. N.K. Gottwald, 'Were the Early Israelites Pastoral Nomads?', in eds. J. Jackson and M. Kessler, Rhetorical Criticism: Essays in Honor of James Muilenberg, Pittsburgh, 1974, pp.223-255. Gottwald republished this essay in his The Tribes of Yahweh, London, 1980, pp.435-463. The page references here are to The Tribes of Yahweh.
  30. S. Moscati, The Semites in Ancient History, Cardiff, 1959.
  31. By J.T. Luke, Pastoralism and Politics in the Mari Period, (Michigan Ph.D., 1965), Ann Arbor, Michigan, 1978.

32. See the criticisms of The Desert Bible by Gottwald in The Tribes of Yahweh (p.764 n.366).
33. Liverani, 'Amorites', p.107ff.
34. Prag, 'Intermediate Early Bronze-Middle Bronze Age', p.102.
35. J.T. Luke, 'Observations on ARMT XIII 39', JCS 24 (1971), pp.20-23.
36. Translation and notes by J.A. Wilson in ed. J.B. Pritchard, Ancient Near Eastern Texts relating to the Old Testament, Princeton, second edition, 1955, pp.18-22.
37. ibid., p.19.
38. Above, pages 189-191; cf. Gottwald, op. cit., p.440f; Haldar, Who were the Amorites?, p.50f.
39. See above, pages 186-189.
40. F. Frick, 'The Rechabites Reconsidered', JBL 90 (1971), pp.279-287.
41. See above, pages, 183-184.
42. P.938.
43. S. Mowinckel, 'Drive and/or Ride in OT', VT 12 (1962), p.278.
44. W.B. Barrick, 'The Meaning and Usage of R-K-B in Biblical Hebrew', JBL 101 (1982), pp.481-503.
45. ibid., p.481.
46. ibid., p.482. כָּבַח is followed by הָלַךְ, 'to go', in 1 Kings 1:38, 13:13f, 2 Kings 9:16; by כָּוַח, 'to flee', in 2 Sam. 13:29; by כָּוַח, 'to fly', in 2 Sam. 22/Ps. 18:11 and by כָּשַׁח, 'to bring up', in 2 Sam. 6:3.
47. Barrick, art. cit., p.482f.
48. ibid., p.485.
49. ibid., p.485 n.26.
50. ibid., p.485.
51. ibid., p.486.
52. ibid., pp.487-500.

53. Barrick, 'R-K-B in Biblical Hebrew', p.500.
54. ibid., p.501.
55. P.938, col. B.
56. Ed. and trans. S.P. Tregelles, Gesenius' Hebrew and Chaldee Lexicon, Grand Rapids, Michigan, 1949, p.768.
57. M. Noth, Die Israelitischen Personennamen im Rahmen der Gemeinsemitischen Namengebung, BWANT 46, Stuttgart, 1928, n.1258.
58. BDB, p.938; Gesenius' Hebrew Lexicon, p.769.
59. Above, page 92.
60. יָשׁוּ derives from יָשָׁה, and יָמָךְ from יָמַךְ.
61. Is. 21:16, 17, 42:11, 60:7; Jer. 2:10, 49:28; Ezek. 27:21.
62. Gen. 25:13=1 Chron. 1:29.
63. Mowinckel has shown that the phrases רֶכֶב וּפָרָשִׁים and רֶכֶב וּסוּסֵי מִלְחָמָה denote 'chariotry and its span-horses', not 'chariots and cavalry' ('Drive and/or Ride in OT', pp.284-295). Thus, in Jer. 17:25, 22:4, the picture is not of some of the kings and princes driving chariots, and some of them riding on horses, but of all the kings and princes driving horse-drawn chariots (ibid., p.285).
64. The chariots of the king of Israel are mentioned in 1 Sam. 8:11f, but the speech in 8:11-18 does not date from the time of Samuel. It has been plausibly assigned to the Solomonic period (R.E. Clements, 'The Deuteronomistic Interpretation of the Founding of the Monarchy in 1 Sam.VIII', VT 24 (1974), pp.398-410).
65. As in Josh. 11:6.
66. 2 Sam. 8:4.
67. 1 Kings 9:19.
68. Or perhaps from Musri. See the commentaries, most recently G.H. Jones, 1 and 2 Kings, London, 1984, ad. loc.
69. Mowinckel, art. cit., p.281 n.15, p.286.
70. R. de Vaux, Ancient Israel: Its Life and Institutions, ET, London, 1961, p.224.

71. 2 Chron. 35:24.
72. ANET, p.279.
73. ibid., p.284f.
74. cf. Gen. 24:61; 1 Sam. 30:17.
75. cf. Num. 22:22; Judg. 5:10; 2 Sam. 18:9.
76. cf. 2 Kings 9:18, 19, 18:23.
77. 2 Sam. 6:3 (the mounting of the Ark for its journey to Jerusalem).
78. Mowinckel, 'Drive and/or Ride in OT', p.279.
79. 1 Macc. 16:4, 7.
80. art. cit., pp.283f, 284 n.1.
81. For Deut. 33, cf. F.M. Cross and D.N. Freedman, 'The Blessing of Moses', JBL 67 (1948), pp.191-210; W.F. Albright, Yahweh and the Gods of Canaan, London, 1968, p.14f. For Ps. 68, cf. S. Mowinckel, Der Achtund-sechzigte Psalm, Oslo, 1953, pp.1-73. For 2 Sam. 22/Ps. 18, cf. F.M. Cross and D.N. Freedman, 'A Royal Song of Thanksgiving: 2 Sam. 22=Ps. 18', JBL 72 (1953), pp.15-34.
82. P.D. Miller, Jr., The Divine Warrior in Early Israel, Cambridge, Mass., 1973, pp.74-128.
83. ibid., p.74f.
84. eg. by F.M. Cross and D.N. Freedman, 'A Note on Deuteronomy 33:26', BASOR 108 (1947), pp.6-7; A.D.H. Mayes, Deuteronomy, London, 1979, p.409f; Barrick, 'R-K-B in Biblical Hebrew', p.497f.
85. Barrick, art. cit., p.497.
86. ibid.
87. For a consideration of the whole hymn, see Miller, op. cit., pp.75-87.
88. ibid., p.75.
89. For a brief survey of the literature on this much debated psalm, see Miller, op. cit., pp.102-104.
90. See the RSV text. Miller (op. cit., p.105) inclines towards emendation. F.M. Cross (Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic, Cambridge, Mass., 1973, p.165 n.82)

and Barrick ('R-K-B in Biblical Hebrew', p.496 and n.91) both favour equating רכב בגרבו with rkb <sup>C</sup>rpt.

91. J. Day, God's Conflict with the Dragon and the Sea, Cambridge, 1985, p.31f.
92. ibid., p.32.
93. art. cit., p.497.
94. See BDB, p.877.
95. Divine Warrior, p.108f.
96. ibid., p.108.
97. ibid., p.120f.
98. ibid., p.118.
99. Mowinckel, 'Drive and/or Ride in OT', p.285.
100. Barrick, art. cit., p.482.
101. Mowinckel, art. cit., p.298f.
102. The two ideas were already joined in Canaanite beliefs.
103. M. Weinfeld, '"Rider of the Clouds" and "Gatherer of the Clouds"', JANES 5 (1973), p.422f.
104. ibid., p.424.
105. ibid.
106. E. Ullendorff, 'Ugaritic Marginalia', Orientalia 20 (1951), p.272 n.2; idem., 'The Contribution of South Semitic to Hebrew Lexicography', VT 6 (1956), pp.194-198; idem., 'Ugaritic Studies within their Semitic and Eastern Mediterranean Setting', BJRL 46 (1963-64), pp.243-244; S.P. Brock, 'Νεφεληγερετα = rkb <sup>C</sup>rpt', VT 18 (1968), pp.395-397.
107. Ugaritic texts are here cited according to the numeration of A. Herdner, Corpus des Tablettes en Cuneiformes Alphabétiques (CTA), vols. 1-3, Paris, 1963. Transliterations and translations are taken from J.C.L. Gibson, Canaanite Myths and Legends, Edinburgh, second edition, 1978.
108. Above, page 235.
109. cf. P.C. Craigie, 'The Comparison of Hebrew Poetry: Psalm 104 in the Light of Egyptian and Ugaritic Poetry', Semitics 4 (1974), p.16.

110. A.S. Kapelrud, Baal in the Ras Shamra Texts, Copenhagen, 1952, p.61.
111. ibid., p.50.
112. M.C. Lind, Yahweh is a Warrior: The Theology of Warfare in Ancient Israel, Scottdale, Penn., 1980.
113. ibid., p.23.
114. ibid.
115. ibid., pp.47-65.
116. ibid., p.24, dealing with F. Schwally, Der Heilige Kreig im Alten Israel, Leipzig, 1901.
117. Lind, Yahweh is a Warrior, p.24f, dealing with J. Pedersen, Israel: Its Life and Culture, III-IV, London, 1947, pp.1-32 (quoting from page 18).
118. Lind, op. cit., p.25, dealing with G. von Rad, Der Heilige Krieg im Alten Israel, Göttingen, 1952.
119. Lind, op. cit., p.26, dealing with Miller, Divine Warrior.
120. Lind, op. cit., p.49.
121. ibid., p.87.
122. ibid., p.81.
123. ibid., p.27f; A.E. Glock, Warfare in Mari and Early Israel (Michigan Ph.D.), Ann Arbor, Michigan, 1968, p.213.
124. Lind, op. cit., p.171.
125. Mowinckel, 'Drive and/or Ride in OT', p.281 n.15, p.286.
126. For פרשים as 'horses' and not 'horsemen', see Mowinckel, art. cit., pp.289-295; K. Galling, 'Der Ehrenname Elis as und die Entrückung Elias', ZThK 53 (1956), pp.131-135.
127. art. cit., p.130.
128. J. Gray, 1 and 2 Kings, London, third edition, 1977, p.593.
129. ibid.
130. ibid., p.597.

131. Gray, Kings, p.592.
132. ibid., p.465.
133. So Gray, op. cit., p.598; J. Bright, A History of Israel, London, second edition, 1972, p.245; G.H. Jones, 1 and 2 Kings, London, 1984, p.502.
134. Galling, 'Ehrenname Elisas', p.135.
135. ibid., p.145.
136. ibid., p.146f.
137. It will be recalled that it was claimed that Ahab fielded 2,000 of them at Qarqar.
138. Galling, art. cit., p.145.
139. "Chariot tactics cut out hand to hand fighting and demanded the use of long-range weapons' (de Vaux, Ancient Israel, p.243).
140. So Gray, op. cit., p.524f; Jones, op. cit., p.436.
141. W.R. Smith, Lectures on the Religion of the Semites, London, second edition, 1907, p.195f.
142. H.W. Hertzberg, 1 and 2 Samuel, ET, London, 1964, p.274.
143. Galling, art. cit., p.138.
144. Lind, Yahweh is a Warrior, p.138.
145. Gray, op. cit., pp.512f, 516.
146. Miller, Divine Warrior, p.134.
147. Or perhaps there is - see the examination of 2 Kings 2:11f below.
148. Galling, art. cit., p.142; Gray, op. cit., p.476; Jones, op. cit., p.386.
149. Lind, op. cit., pp.33, 145-168.
150. cf. Galling, art. cit., p.141f; Jones, op. cit., p.386.
151. Gray, op. cit., p.475.
152. See above, pages 45-46 and 90-91.
153. J.T. Cummings, 'The House of the Sons of the Prophets and the Tents of the Rechabites', in ed. E.A. Living-

- stone, Studia Biblica 1978, vol. 1 (Old Testament), JSOTS 11, Sheffield, 1979, p.123.
154. An investigation into the links between the prophets-chariot imagery connection and later Jewish Merkabah mysticism would be a profitable area of research. Unfortunately, such an investigation lies beyond the scope of the present study.
155. 'Nomothetics' is defined as "an interest in observed regularities and explanatory generalizations", and 'Idiographics' as "a concern for specific or unique traits", in G.A. Herion, 'The Impact of Modern and Social Science Assumptions on the Reconstruction of Israelite History', JSOT 34 (1986), p.26 n.1.
156. J.G. Gager, 'Shall we marry our Enemies? Sociology and the New Testament', Interpretation 36 (1982), p.260.
157. See J.W. Rogerson, Anthropology and the Old Testament, Oxford, 1978 (reprinted Sheffield, 1984), p.2.
158. Herion, art. cit., p.12, criticises R.R. Wilson's work on these grounds.
159. J.W. Rogerson, op. cit., passim; idem., 'The Use of Sociology in Old Testament Studies', in ed. J.A. Emerton, Congress Volume: Salamanca 1983, SVT 36, Leiden, 1985, pp.245-256; R.P. Carroll, When Prophecy Failed: Reactions and Responses to Failure in the Old Testament Prophetic Traditions, London, 1979; K.W. Whitelam, 'Recreating the History of Israel', JSOT 35 (1986), pp.45-70; R.B. Coote and K.W. Whitelam, The Emergence of Israel in Historical Perspective, Decatur, 1987.
160. C.S. Rodd, 'On Applying a Sociological Theory to Biblical Studies', JSOT 19 (1981), pp.95-106.
161. B.J. Malina, 'The Social Sciences and Biblical Interpretation', Interpretation 36 (1982), pp.229-242; Rogerson, 'Sociology in OT Studies', passim.; Herion, art. cit., passim. The whole of Interpretation 36/3 is devoted to the Social Sciences and biblical studies. In addition to the article by Malina, it includes the one by Gager mentioned above (n.156) and a contribution from B.O. Long. M.G. Brett has recently published a critique of Herion's work ('Literacy and Domination: G.A. Herion's Sociology of History Writing', JSOT 37 (1987), pp.15-40). While he makes many cogent points, he does not negate Herion's cautions about applying Social Science models to the Old Testament.
162. Malina, art. cit., p.232.

163. Herion, 'Reconstruction of Israelite History', p.7.
164. Malina, 'Social Sciences and Biblical Interpretation', p.231f.
165. ibid., p.232.
166. Herion, ibid.
167. B.R. Wilson, 'Introduction' in ed. idem., Patterns of Sectarianism, London, 1967, p.2.
168. B.R. Wilson, Religion in Sociological Perspective, Oxford, 1982, p.105.
169. Herion, art. cit., pp.6, 12.
170. P.D. Hanson, The Dawn of Apocalyptic, Philadelphia, 1975, pp.215-220.
171. E. Troeltsch, The Social Teaching of the Christian Churches, ET, London, 1931, vol. 1, pp.331-343.
172. ibid., p.331.
173. ibid., p.336.
174. H.R. Niebuhr, The Social Sources of Denominationalism, New York, 1929; L. Pope, Millhands and Preachers: A Study of Gastonia, New Haven, 1942, pp.117-140.
175. Pope, op. cit., p.118.
176. Niebuhr, op. cit., p.20.
177. Pope, op. cit., p.121.
178. ibid., p.140.
179. ibid., pp.122-124.
180. Niebuhr, op. cit., p.38f.
181. ibid., p.19f.
182. B. Johnson, 'A Critical Appraisal of the Church-Sect Typology', American Sociological Review 22 (1957), p.91.
183. ibid., p.89.
184. J.M. Yinger, Religion, Society and the Individual, New York, 1957, p.147f.
185. B.R. Wilson's works include, Sects and Society, London, 1961; 'Introduction' in ed. idem., Patterns of Sectarianism, London, 1967, pp.1-21; 'An Analysis of Sect Development', Patterns, pp.22-45; 'The Pentecostalist Minister: Role Conflicts and Contradictions of Status',

- Patterns of Sectarianism, pp.138-157; G. Willis and idem., 'The Churches of God: Pattern and Practice', Patterns of Sectarianism, pp.244-286; idem., 'The Exclusive Brethren: A Case Study in the Evolution of a Sectarian Ideology', Patterns of Sectarianism, pp. 287-342; idem., Religious Sects, London, 1972; idem., Magic and the Millenium, St Alban's, 1975; idem., Religion in Sociological Perspective, Oxford, 1982.
186. In Magic and the Millenium.
187. To this extent, Herion's strictures about the use of sociology in Old Testament studies ('The Reconstuction of Israelite History', p.24) do not apply to Wilson's work.
188. B.R. Wilson, Religious Sects, p.40.
189. B.R. Wilson, Religion in Sociological Perspective, pp.91-93.
190. B.R. Wilson, 'An Analysis of Sect Development', p.37.
191. E. Durkheim, Les Formes Elémentaires de la Vie Religieuse, Paris, 1912.
192. B.R. Wilson, Religious Sects, p.130.
193. B.R. Wilson, Magic and the Millenium, p.412.
194. See above, page 133.
195. See B. Johnson, 'A Critical Appraisal of the Church-Sect Typology'.
196. J.W. Rogerson, Anthropology and the Old Testament, p.31.
197. B.R. Wilson, Magic and the Millenium, p.23.
198. ibid., p.25.
199. P.26 n.18.
200. See above, pages 186-191.
201. Below, section 4.4.
202. B.R. Wilson, Religious Sects, p.44.
203. E. Isichei, 'From Sect to Denomination among English Quakers', in ed. B.R. Wilson, Patterns of Sectarianism, p.172.

204. See B.R. Wilson, 'The Exclusive Brethren'.
205. R.P. Carroll, When Prophecy Failed, p.118.
206. Carroll, From Chaos to Covenant, London, 1981; idem., Jeremiah, London, 1986.
207. When Prophecy Failed, p.118.
208. B.R. Wilson, 'An Analysis of Sect Development', p.28.
209. B.R. Wilson, 'Introduction', p.17f.
210. J. Wilson, 'The Sociology of Schism' in ed. M. Hill, A Sociological Yearbook of Religion in Britain 4, London, 1971, pp.1-20.
211. R. Wallis, Salvation and Protest, London, 1979, pp.174-192.
212. J. Wilson, art. cit., p.16.
213. J.T. Cummings, 'The House of the Sons of the Prophets and the Tents of the Rechabites'.
214. Above, pages 192-194.
215. See J.W. Rogerson, Anthropology and the Old Testament, chapter 2.
216. See above, section 2.1.
217. See, for example, J.L. Crenshaw, Prophetic Conflict, BZAW 124, Berlin, 1971 and S.J. de Vries, Prophet against Prophet, Grand Rapids, Michigan, 1978.
218. J. Gray, 1 and 2 Kings, pp.378 n.d., 379f.
219. K. Budde, The Religion of Israel to the Exile, New York, 1899, p.43f.
220. Carroll, Jeremiah, p.654.
221. W.R. Smith, Lectures on the Religion of the Semites, p.484.
222. See above, page 196.
223. P.A. Riemann, Desert and Return to Desert in the Pre-Exilic Prophets, p.52.
224. See Chapter Five below.
225. A.R. Johnson, The Cultic Prophet in Ancient Israel, Cardiff, second edition, 1962, pp.25-29.

226. H.H. Rowley, The Servant of the Lord, London, 1952, p.105f; idem., From Moses to Qumran, London, 1963, p.127ff; R.R. Wilson, Prophecy and Society in Ancient Israel, Philadelphia, 1980, pp.192-212.
227. R.R. Wilson, op. cit., p.196.
228. ibid., pp.205f, 212.
229. W.O.E. Oesterley and T.H. Robinson, Hebrew Religion: Its Origin and Development, London, 1934, pp.184-186.
230. J.A. Soggin, Judges, London, 1981, p.229f.
231. N.K. Gottwald, The Tribes of Yahweh, London, 1980, p.774 n.458.
232. J.D. Douglas, article 'Nazirite' in ed. J.D. Douglas et al., Illustrated Bible Dictionary, Leicester, 1980, vol. 2, p.1063.
233. Soggin, op. cit., p.236.
234. ibid.
235. G.B. Gray, 'The Nazirite', JTS (OS) 1 (1899-1900), p.205f.
236. Above, pages 181-182.
237. N.H. Snaith, 'Numbers' in eds. M. Black and H.H. Rowley, Peake's Commentary on the Bible, London, 1962, section 219g.

## CHAPTER FIVE

1. See, for example, J. Neusner, The Rabbinic Traditions about the Pharisees before 70, Leiden, 1971, vol. 3, pp.68-89.
2. That the Essenes of Philo and Josephus and the Community of the Qumran Scrolls had a large degree of equivalence with each other is here, following the majority of scholars, accepted without further analysis.
3. Philip Davies (The Damascus Covenant: An Interpretation of the 'Damascus Document', JSOTS 25, Sheffield, 1983) has made a strong case for the non-Qumranic origin of CD, so it is treated here as an independent witness to the life and beliefs of the Essenes.
4. M. Black, The Scrolls and Christian Origins, Edinburgh, 1961; idem., 'The Tradition of Hasidaean-Essene Asceticism: Its Origins and Influence', in Aspects du Judéo-Christianisme (Colloque de Strasbourg, 23-25 Avril 1964), Paris, 1965, pp.19-33.
5. Scrolls and Christian Origins, p.15.
6. 'Hasidaean-Essene Asceticism', p.20.
7. op. cit.
8. BJ II.8.2, II.8.13.
9. Hypothetica, 11, 14.
10. Article הנה, TDOT 5, p.6.
11. De Monastica Exercitatione, chap. 3 (Greek text and Latin translation in J.P. Migne, Patrologia Graecae, vol. 79, col. 721f).
12. H.-J. Schoeps (Theologie und Geschichte des Judentums, Tübingen, 1949, p.250f) is similarly sceptical about the historical reliability of Nilus' statements.
13. Quod Omnis Probus Liber Sit, 76.
14. I am grateful to Andrew Collins Jones, of University College, Durham, for this observation.
15. See, for example, E.F. Sutcliffe, 'Sacred Meals at Qumran?', Heythrop Journal 1 (1960), p.50; G. Vermes,

- The Dead Sea Scrolls: Qumran in Perspective, London, 1977, p.94.
16. De Vita Contemplativa, 73f.
  17. Adv. Iovinianum, II 14.
  18. See E. Schürer, The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ, revised English edition by G. Vermes, F. Millar, M. Black and P. Vermes, vol. 2, Edinburgh, 1979, p.571 n.60.
  19. Naturalis Historia V 15/73.
  20. Quod Omnis Probus Liber Sit, 76.
  21. BJ II.8.4.
  22. III 25, V 5.
  23. 4QF1 I 4, CD VI 21, XIV 4, 6.
  24. op. cit.
  25. Schoeps, op. cit., pp.247-255; K. Kohler, 'The Essenes and Apocalyptic Literature', JQR 11 (1920-21), pp.160-163.
  26. There are no explicit references to the Essenes in the rabbinic literature.
  27. P. Schäfer, 'Research into Rabbinic Literature: An Attempt to Define the Status Quaestiones', JJS 37 (1986), pp.139-152.
  28. Schäfer, art. cit.; L.L. Grabbe, 'The Jewish Theocracy from Cyrus to Titus: A Programmatic Essay', JSOT 37 (1987), pp.117-124; J. Neusner, The Rabbinic Traditions about the Pharisees, passim, and especially vol. 3, pp.320-368; idem., 'The Bavli in Particular: Defining a Document in the Canon of Judaism in Relationship to the Old Testament', JSOT 33 (1985), pp.109-126; idem., 'When Tales Travel. The Interpretation of Multiple Appearances of a Single Saying or Story in Talmudic Literature', JSNT 27 (1986), pp.69-88.
  29. Second edition, revised by A.B. Hyman, Tel-Aviv, 1979, 3 volumes.
  30. ET, Philadelphia, 1946-1955, six volumes.
  31. Unfortunately, I have been unable to gain access to the Sheeltoth to Exodus, so the reference in Hyman to a

citation of 1 Chron. 2:55 in chapter 39 of this work has not been investigated. A copy of 2 Alphabet of Ben Sirach has also proved unobtainable, so for the material in this I have been reliant on Ginzberg.

32. All quotes from the Mishnah in this study are taken from H. Danby, The Mishnah, Translated from the Hebrew with Introduction and Brief Explanatory Notes, Oxford, 1933.
33. Neh. 10:34, 13:31.
34. All quotations from the Bavli in this study are taken from I. Epstein (ed.), The Babylonian Talmud, Translated into English with Notes, Glossary and Indices, 35 volumes, London, Soncino, 1935-1952.
35. All quotations from the Midrash Rabbah in this study are taken from H. Freedman and M. Simon, Midrash Rabbah, 11 volumes, London, Soncino, second edition, 1951.
36. No critical edition, and no English translation, exists of the Yalkut Shimoni. For the purposes of this study, the 1909 Wilna edition by Z. Kapalowitz has been used.
37. Midrash Tanhumah, Lublin, 1893, vol. 1, p.154.
38. All quotations from the Pesikta de-Rab Kahana in this study are taken from W.G. Braude and I.J. Kapstein, Pesikta de-Rab Kahana, London, 1975.
39. ed. J.Z. Lauterbach, Mekhilta de Rabbi Ishmael, Philadelphia, 1933, vol. 2, p.189.
40. ed. H.S. Horowitz, Sifre d'be Rab (contains both Sifre Numbers and Sifre Zutta), Jerusalem, 1966, p.73.
41. ed. J.H. Epstein and E.Z. Melamed, Mekhilta de Rabbi Simeon bar Yohai, Jerusalem, 1955, p.135.
42. Pages 73-74.
43. Above, section 2.1.
44. Horowitz, Sifre d'be Rab, p.263.
45. Above, pages 207-210.
46. Translation from H.J. Lawlor and J.E.L. Oulton, Eusebius, Bishop of Caesarea: The Ecclesiastical History and the Martyrs of Palestine, London, 1927, vol. 1, p.58.
47. Eusebiana, Oxford, 1912, p.7.

48. 'Die Nachfolge des Jakobus', ZKG 63 (1950), p.137 n.27.
49. The Sages: Their Concepts and Beliefs, ET Jerusalem, 1975, 2 vols. (consectutive pagination), p.592.
50. Above, section 2.2, and C.H. Knights, 'The Text of 1 Chronicles IV 12 - A Reappraisal', VT 37 (1987), pp.375-377.
51. On the problems with the citations of Yelammedenu in the Yalkut, see E. Schlürer, The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ, revised English version, vol. 1, p.98.
52. cf. Matt. 23:15, Acts 2:11, 6:5.
53. Contra Apionem II.39.
54. cf. JE vol. 10, p.222.
55. Below, pages 89-91.
56. Soncino Talmud, Baba Bathra, p.379.
57. To Numbers 10:29.
58. All quotations from the Aboth of Rabbi Nathan in this study are taken from J. Goldin, The Fathers according to Rabbi Nathan, New Haven, 1955.
59. ed. S. Schechter, Aboth de Rabbi Nathan, New York, 1945, p.104.
60. op. cit., p.xxi.
61. Pages 89-91.
62. Soncino Talmud, Kiddushin, p.144.
63. So M. Schwab, Le Talmud de Jérusalem, Paris, 1871-89, vol. 5, p.292.
64. See below, pages 38-43, 89-91.
65. cf., JE, vol. 7, p.241 (article 'Jose ben Halafta'); Schoeps, Theologie und Geschichte des Judenchristentums, p.249.
66. JE, ibid.
67. Compare Josephus' description of the Essenes as praying towards the east before the dawn, as though imploring the sun to rise (BJ II.128).
68. ed. Lauterbach, Mekhilta de Rabbi Ishmael (critical edition with facing English translation); ed. H.S. Horowitz and I.A. Rabin, Mekhilta de Rabbi Ishmael, Jerusalem, 1960 (critical edition); ed. Epstein and Melamed, Mekhilta de Rabbi Simeon bar Yohai (critical edition).

69. Lauterbach here inserts an explanatory 'Jethro' into his translation.
70. Unlike the Hebrew, Lauterbach completes the quotation of Judg. 1:16 in his translation.
71. Vol. 2, p.186 n.7.
72. Tanhumah Tezzaveh 9 provides the classic expression of this. See below, pages 100-103.
73. See below, page 78.
74. ed. H.S Horowitz and L. Finkelstein, Berlin, 1939, p.127ff.
75. Above, pages 19-21.
76. Pages 73-74.
77. J.M. Myers, 'Judges: Introduction and Exegesis', IB 2, New York, 1953, p.694.
78. J.A. Soggin, Judges, London, 1981, p.28.
79. Pes. 4:8, Men. 10:8, Tam. 3:8.
80. See Sifre Numbers 78, 81, Sifre Zutta to Numbers 10:29, Sifre Deuteronomy 33:12 and Yalkut Shim<sup>c</sup>oni to the Prophets 38.
81. Page 83.
82. See above, pages 19-21.
83. ed. S. Buber, Midrash Tanhumah, Wilna, 1885, p.14.
84. Below, pages 56-69.
85. So Lauterbach, Mekhilta de Rabbi Ishmael, Amalek III, 11.54-57. Yalkut adds a scriptural citation.
86. The Hebrew text of Rashi's and Radak's biblical commentaries can be found in the 1866 Warsaw Bible.
87. H.F. Marcos and J.P.B. Saiz, Theodoreti Cyrensis. Quaestiones in Reges et Paralipomena. Editio Critica, Madrid, 1984, p.217f.
88. J.H. Charlesworth, The History of the Rechabites, vol. 1, the Greek recension, Chico, Ca., 1982; idem., 'The History of the Rechabites' in ed. J.H. Charlesworth, The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha, vol. 2, London, 1985, pp.443-461.

89. OTP 2, p.444f.
90. ibid., p.445.
91. cf., OTP 2, p.444 n.9.
92. There is a growing interest in the influence of the Book of Jeremiah on Early Judaism. See, for example, C. Wolff, Jeremiah in Frühjudentum und Urchristentum, Berlin, 1976, which, strangely, fails to mention either the rabbinic texts currently under consideration or the History of the Rechabites.
93. Lauterbach inserts an explanatory 'They were called' before 'Tirathites' in his translation.
94. Hebrew, טוכוס, 'booths'.
95. Hebrew, מהלם.
96. Above, page 41.
97. ed. S. Buber, Schocher Tob, Wilna, 1891, p.18. English translation by W.G. Braude, The Midrash on Psalms, New Haven, 1959, vol. 1, p.26.
98. op. cit., vol. 1, p.xxxi.
99. English translation taken from the 1609 Douai translation of the Vulgate.
100. C.T.R. Hayward, 'Jewish Traditions in Jerome's Commentary on Jeremiah and the Targum of Jeremiah', Proceedings of the Irish Biblical Association 9 (1985), pp.100-120; idem., 'St Jerome and the Aramaic Targumim', JSS (forthcoming).
101. Mek. Rashbi, Sifre Numbers, Yalkut.
102. Sifre Numbers, Sifre Zutta, Tanhumah Jethro, Yalkut.
103. Both Mekhiltas, Sifre Numbers, Tanhumah Jethro, Yalkut, Targum and Vulgate.
104. Mek. Rashbi and Sifre Numbers.
105. mRosh Hashanah 4:9, mTa<sup>c</sup>anith 2:5.
106. C.T.R. Hayward, 'Some Notes on Scribes and Priests in the Targum of the Prophets', JJS 36 (1985), pp.210-221, especially pp.217-221.
107. ibid., p.219f.
108. ibid., p.220.
109. 'Studien zur LXX an der Hand der Zwölf Kleinen Prophetenbücher', MGWJ (1928), p.262f.

110. See K. Beyer, Die Aramäischen Texte vom Toten Meer, Göttingen, 1984, p.728.
111. See above, pages 318-323.
112. bMoed Katan 14b-15b, 27b.
113. cf. Is. 22:12, Jer. 16:6, Ezek. 7:18, Am. 8:10, Job 1:20.
114. Above, pages 45-48, 52-55.
115. Mek. Rashbi, Tanhumah.
116. bMoed Katan 15a-b.
117. See A. Cowley, Aramaic Papyri of the Fifth Century BC, Oxford, 1923, pp.108-119 (Papyrus no. 30).
118. Above, pages 16-28.
119. Pages 45-46.
120. See above, pages 16-28.
121. Hayward, 'Some Notes on Scribes and Priests', pp.210-217.
122. ibid., p.221.
123. Rashi's commentaries on the end of Job and on Ezra, Nehemiah and Chronicles are not from Rashi himself, but may nevertheless reflect his own views. See EJ, vol. 13, col. 1559.
124. See above, pages 15-16.
125. Above, page 20.
126. Above, pages 45-46.
127. See above, pages 55-56.
128. See above, section 2.1.
129. Above, section 2.1.
130. tTerumoth 8:8, tKelim II 3.8.
131. 'On the Promise to the Rechabites', CBQ 38 (1976), pp.508-514. See also above, section 3.3.
132. Pages 20, 74.

133. See above, page 40.
134. See below, pages 100-103.
135. Above, page 22.
136. Lauterbach, vol. 2, p.164.
137. Epstein-Melamed, p.128.
138. Above, pages 55-69.
139. This even extended to the names of God. See, for example, N.A. Dahl and A.F. Segal, 'Philo and the Rabbis on the Names of God', JSJ 9 (1978), pp.1-28.
140. 'The Essenes and Apocalyptic Literature', pp.160-163.
141. Pages 10-11.
142. Page 41.
143. cf., above, page 29.
144. R.T. Herford, The Ethics of the Talmud: Sayings of the Fathers, New York, 1945, pp.30, 41f.
145. Monotheism and the Prophetic Minority, Sheffield, 1983, p.155.
146. See above, page 28.
147. Bereshith Rabbah, Berlin, 1927, p.1219.
148. Translation in ed. A. Cohen, The Minor Tractates of the Talmud, London, Soncino, 1965, vol. 2, p.570.
149. Above, pages 16-28.
150. Vol. 11, col. 1511f.
151. Legends of the Jews, III.380, VI.134.
152. Above, pages 22-23.
153. ed. M. Friedmann, Vienna, 1880, folio 147a.
154. Ginzberg, Legends of the Jews, VI.409.
155. W.G. Braude, Pesikta Rabbati, New Haven, 1968, 2 vols. (consecutive pagination), p.28.
156. So EJ, vol. 16, col. 1518.

157. ed. S. Buber, Vienna, 1894.
158. So EJ, vol. 4, cols. 548-550.
159. Legends of the Jews, VI.409.
160. See below, section 5.3. It also seems probable that the various mediaeval traditions about the Rechabites being found in Arabia are related to this theme, as are the traditions of the "Ten Lost Tribes". See I. Friedlaender, 'The Jews of Arabia and the Rechabites', JQR 1 (1910), pp.252-257.
161. Above, pages 47-48, 75.
162. See above, page 75.
163. 'Some Notes on Scribes and Priests', p.221.
164. The Messianic Idea in Judaism and Other Essays on Jewish Spirituality, London, 1971, p.252.
165. Above, pages 50-51.
166. In their expositions of 2 Kings 10:15f, both Rashi and Radak are preoccupied with ascertaining who says what in the verses, and do not address the issue of whether or not Jonadab has anything to do with the Rechabites.
167. See above, pages 16-28.
168. See above, n.123.
169. Above, pages 68-69.
170. The Rabbinic Traditions about the Pharisees, passim.
171. J. Weingreen, From Bible to Mishna, Manchester, 1976, passim.
172. For details of these rules, see G. Vermes, 'Bible and Midrash: Early Old Testament Exegesis' in eds. P.R. Ackroyd and C.F. Evans, The Cambridge History of the Bible, vol. 1, Cambridge, 1970, pp.199-231.
173. The History of the Rechabites, vol. 1, the Greek recension, p.1f.
174. Apocrypha Anecdota, Texts and Studies 2.3, Cambridge, 1893, pp.86-108.
175. Revue Sémitique 6 (1899), pp.263-266 (introduction), 7 (1899), pp.54-75 (Syriac text), 136-146 (French translation).

176. A. Zanolli, 'La Leggenda di Zosimo Secondo la Redazione Armena', Giornale della Societa Asiatica Italiana, (NS) 1 (1924), pp.146-162.
177. J.-C. Picard, 'L'Histoire des Bienheureux du Temps de Jérémie et la Narration de Zosime: Arrière-plan Historique et Mythique', in ed. M. Philonenko et al, Pseudépigraphe de l'Ancien Testament et les Manuscrits de la Mer Morte, Cahiers de RHPR, Paris, 1967, pp.27-43; V. Nikiprowetzky, 'Pseudépigraphe de l'Ancien Testament et les Manuscrits de la Mer Morte', REJ 128 (1969), pp.5-40, especially pp.22-38; B. McNeil, 'The Narration of Zosimus', JSJ 9 (1978), pp.68-82.
178. J.H. Charlesworth, The Pseudepigrapha and Modern Research, Missoula, Montana, 1976, pp.223-228.
179. In the introduction to the supplement added to the 1981 reprint of The Pseudepigrapha and Modern Research.
180. ed. J.H. Charlesworth, 'The History of the Rechabites', in ed. J.H. Charlesworth, The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha, vol. 2, London, 1985, pp.443-461.
181. See n.173. Volume 2, containing the Syriac and Ethiopic recensions, with facing English translations, has yet to appear.
182. The Account of the Blessed Ones: A Study of the Development of an Apocryphon on the Rechabites and Zosimus (The Abode of the Rechabites), unpublished Ph.D. thesis, Duke University, 1979.
183. See Martin, op. cit., pp.20-25, for details.
184. The History of the Rechabites, vol. 1, the Greek recension, p.1.
185. M.R. James, op. cit., p.95.
186. The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha, vol. 2, p.450 n.1a.
187. One of the criticisms that has been levelled at The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha as a whole is that the works it contains are occasionally given chapter and verse divisions different from those used in other editions of those works. See, for example, R. Bauckham, 'The Apocalypses in the New Pseudepigrapha', JSNT 26 (1986), pp.106, 110.
188. Charlesworth, The Pseudepigrapha and Modern Research, p.225; idem., The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha, vol. 2, p.445; Martin, op. cit., p.237f.

189. Details in Charlesworth, The Pseudepigrapha and Modern Research, pp.224-226. cf. Martin, The Account of the Blessed Ones, passim.
190. 'Christian and Jewish Self-Definition in Light of Christian Additions to the Apocryphal Writings', in ed. E.P. Sanders et al, Jewish and Christian Self-Definition, vol. 2, London, 1981, p.29.
191. op. cit., p.87.
192. Revue Sémitique 6, p.263.
193. art. cit., p.70.
194. All quotations of the Greek, and of its English translations, are taken from Charlesworth, The History of the Rechabites, vol. 1, the Greek recension.
195. All quotations of the Syriac text are from Nau; translations are from Charlesworth, The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha, vol. 2, corrected where necessary in accordance with S.P. Brock's comments in his review of volume two of The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha, JJS 38 (1987), p.109f.
196. This does not, at this stage of the enquiry, necessarily suppose that the Syriac editor was working with the Greek text. It could equally well suggest that the Syriac and the Greek editors were working with a common Urschrift, which was translated literally into Greek, and redacted into Syriac.
197. 'Christian and Jewish Self-Definition', p.30.
198. The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha, vol. 2, p.445.
199. Ethiopic text in E.A.W. Budge, The Life and Exploits of Alexander the Great, London, 1896, vol. 1, pp. 355-376. English translation in vol. 2, pp.555-584.
200. Budge, op. cit., vol. 2, pp.555-561.
201. ibid., pp.569-582.
202. op. cit., p.238.
203. ibid., p.170.
204. Translation from The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha, vol. 2, p.60.
205. J. Stevenson, Creeds, Councils and Controversies: Documents Illustrative of the History of the Church, AD 337-461, London, 1972, p.154.

206. See, for example, Nilus of Ancyra, De Monastica Exercitatione, chap. 3.
207. Charlesworth, The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha, vol. 2,
208. Martin, The Account of the Blessed Ones, p.87.
209. ibid., p.184.
210. ibid.
211. See above, pages 45-55.
212. See above, pages 45-55 and 62-65.
213. See above, pages 45-48.
214. Charlesworth, The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha, vol. 2, p.447; Martin, op. cit., p.228.
215. See above, pages 16-28.
216. Pesikta Rabbati 31; Midrash Aggadah to Num. 24:22 and 2 Alphabet of Ben Sirach 28.
217. Charlesworth, ibid.; Martin, ibid.
218. viz. VI.409.
219. תורה הכתובה והמסורה.
220. Anvil 3 (1986), p.285.
221. The Pseudepigrapha and Modern Research, p.21.
222. ibid., p.21f.
223. ibid., p.225.
224. P.43 n.a to 8:1.

PROSPECTS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH AND SOME CONTEMPORARY APPLI-  
CATIONS

1. cf. W.R. Smith, Lectures on the Religion of the Semites, London, second edition, 1907, p.484f.
2. Purity and Danger: An Analysis of the Concepts of Pollution and Taboo, London, 1966.
3. Index des Citations et Allusions Biblique dans la Littérature Patristique, Paris, 1975-1977.
4. See JE, vol. 10, p.341f.
5. Nicholas Ferrar's 17th century community at Little Gidding comes to mind.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

## 1. EDITIONS AND TRANSLATIONS OF ANCIENT TEXTS

a. Bible

Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia (eds. K. Elliger and W. Rudolph, Stuttgart, 1968ff).

Septuaginta (ed. A. Rahlfs, Stuttgart, 1935, 2 volumes).

Origenis Hexaplorum Quae Supersunt (ed. A. Field, Oxford, 1867-1875, 2 volumes).

Bibliorum Sacrorum Latinae Versiones Antiquae, seu Vetus Italica (ed. P. Sabatier, Reims, 1743, 3 volumes).

Biblia Sacra Polyglotta (ed. B. Walton, London, 1653-1657, 6 volumes).

Holy Bible: Revised Standard Version (New York and London, 1973).

The New English Bible with the Apocrypha (Oxford and Cambridge, 1970).

b. Ancient Near East

Corpus des Tablettes en Cunéiformes Alphabétiques (ed. A. Herdner, Paris, 1963, 3 volumes).

Ancient Near Eastern Texts Relating to the Old Testament (ed. J.B. Pritchard, Princeton, second edition, 1955),

Diodorus of Sicily, with an English Translation (eds. and trans. C.H. Oldfather et al, London, 1933-1967, 12 volumes).

c. Rabbinic

The Bible in Aramaic (ed. A. Sperber, Leiden, 1959-1973, 4 volumes).

- The Targum of Jeremiah (trans. C.T.R. Hayward, Wilmington, Delaware, 1987).
- Targum des Chroniques (eds. and trans. R. le Déaut and J. Robert, Rome, 1971, 2 volumes).
- The Mishnah (trans. H. Danby, Oxford, 1933).
- The Babylonian Talmud (ed. Wilna, 1880-1886, 20 volumes).
- The Babylonian Talmud (trans. I. Epstein, *et al*, London, Soncino, 1935-1952, 35 volumes).
- The Minor Tractates of the Talmud (trans. A. Cohen, London, Soncino, 1965, 2 volumes).
- The Jerusalem Talmud (ed. Wilna, 1922, 8 volumes).
- Le Talmud de Jérusalem (trans. M. Schwab, Paris, 1871-1889, 9 volumes).
- Mekhilta de Rabbi Ishmael (ed. and trans. J.Z.Lauterbach, Philadelphia, 1933, 3 volumes).
- Mekhilta de Rabbi Ishmael (eds. H.S. Horowitz and I.A. Rabin, Jerusalem, 1960).
- Mekhilta de Rabbi Simeon bar Yohai (eds. J.H. Epstein and E.Z. Melamed, Jerusalem, 1955).
- Sifre d'be Rab (ed. H.S. Horowitz, Jerusalem, 1966).
- Sifre Deuteronomy (eds. H.S. Horowitz and L. Finkelstein, Berlin, 1939).
- Bereshith Rabbah (eds. J. Theodor and C. Albeck, Berlin, 1927).
- Midrash Rabbah (trans. H. Freedman and M. Simon, London, Soncino, second edition, 1951, 11 volumes).
- Aboth de Rabbi Nathan (ed. S. Schechter, New York, 1945).
- The Fathers according to Rabbi Nathan (trans. J. Goldin, New Haven, 1955).
- Pesikta de Rab Kahana (ed. B. Mandelbaum, New York, 1962, 2 volumes).
- Pesikta de Rab Kahana (trans. W.G. Braude and I.J. Kapstein, London, 1975).
- Pesikta Rabbati (ed. M. Friedmann, Vienna, 1880).

Pesikta Rabbati (trans. W.G. Braude, New Haven, 1968, 2 volumes).

Midrash Tanhumah (ed. Lublin, 1893, 2 volumes).

Midrash Tanhumah B (ed. S. Buber, Wilna, 1885).

Midrash Aggadah (ed. S. Buber, Vienna, 1894).

Schocher Tob (ed. S. Buber, Wilna, 1891).

The Midrash on Psalms (trans. W.G. Braude, New Haven, 1959, 2 volumes).

Yalkut Shim<sup>c</sup>oni (ed. Z. Kapalowitz, Wilna, 1909, 2 volumes).

Yalkut Makiri to Isaiah (ed. J. Spira, 1894).

The Warsaw Bible (1866) (includes Rashi's and Radak's commentaries).

The Legends of the Jews (ed. and trans. L. Ginzberg, ET Philadelphia, 1946-1955, 7 volumes).

#### d. Patristic

A Select Library of Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church (trans. H. Wace and P. Schaff et al, Oxford, 1890-1900, 14 volumes).

Creeds, Councils and Controversies: Documents Illustrative of the History of the Church (trans. J. Stevenson, London, 1972)

Eusebius, Bishop of Caesarea: The Ecclesiastical History and the Martyrs of Palestine (trans. H.J. Lawlor and J.E.L. Oulton, London, 1927, 2 volumes).

Theodoret of Cyrensis: Quaestiones in Reges et Paralipomena (eds. H.F. Marcos and J.P.B. Saiz, Madrid, 1984).

#### e. Pseudepigrapha

The Story of Zosimus (ed. M.R. James, Apocrypha Anecdota, Texts and Studies 2.3, Cambridge, 1893, pp.86-108).

La Légende Inédite des Fils de Jonadab, Fils de Rechab, et les Tles Fortunées (ed. and trans. F. Nau, Revue Sémitique, 6 (1899), pp.263-266, 7 (1899), pp.54-75, 136-146).

La Leggenda di Zosimo Secondo la Redazione Armena (trans. A. Zanolli, Giornale della Societa Asiatica Italiana, (NS) 1 (1924), pp.146-162).

The Life and Exploits of Alexander the Great (ed. and trans. E.A.W. Budge, London, 1896, 2 volumes).

The History of the Rechabites (ed. and trans. J.H. Charlesworth, Chico, Ca., 1982, vol. 1, the Greek recension).

The History of the Rechabites (trans. J.H. Charlesworth, in ed. J.H. Charlesworth, The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha, vol. 2, London, 1985, pp.443-461).

## 2. DICTIONARIES, CONCORDANCES AND GRAMMARS

A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament (eds. F. Brown, S.R. Driver and C.A. Briggs, Oxford, 1907).

Gesenius' Hebrew and Chaldee Lexicon (ed. and trans. S.P. Tregelles, Grand Rapids, Michigan, 1949).

A Dictionary of the Targumim, the Talmud Babli and Yerushalmi, and the Midrashic Literature (ed. M. Jastrow, London and New York, 1903).

Chaldäisches Wörterbuch über die Targumim (ed. J. Levy, Leipzig, 1868, 2 volumes).

Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament (eds. G.J. Botterweck and H. Ringgren, ET, Grand Rapids, Michigan, 1977ff).

Konkordanz zum Hebräischen Alten Testament (ed. G. Lisowsky, Stuttgart, second edition, 1981).

A Concordance to the Septuagint and the Other Greek Versions of the Old Testament (eds. E. Hatch and H.A. Redpath, Oxford, 1897).

המסורה הכתובה והמסורה (ed. A. Hyman, rev. A.B. Hyman, Tel-Aviv, 1979, 3 volumes).

A Complete Concordance to Flavius Josephus (ed. K. Rengstorff et al, Leiden, 1968).

Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar (ed. E. Kautzsch, trans. A.E. Cowley, Oxford, second edition, 1910).

The Concise Oxford Dictionary (Oxford, sixth edition, 1976).

### 3. BOOKS AND ARTICLES

Abramsky, Shmuel. 'The House of the Rechabites - Genealogy and Social Character', Eretz-Yisrael 8 (1967), pp.255-264 (Hebrew), 76\* (English summary).

\_\_\_\_\_. Article, 'Rechabites', EJ, vol. 13, cols. 1609-1612.

Ackroyd, Peter. The Second Book of Samuel, Cambridge, 1977.

\_\_\_\_\_. 'The Book of Jeremiah - Some Recent Studies', JSOT 28 (1984), pp.47-59.

Ahlström, Gosta. 'King Jehu - A Prophet's Mistake', Scripture in History and Theology, eds. A.L. Merrill and T.W. Overholt, Pittsburgh, 1977, pp.47-69.

Albright, William Foxwell. Yahweh and the Gods of Canaan, London, 1968.

Avigad, N. 'New Names on Hebrew Seals', Eretz-Yisrael 12 (1975), pp.66-71 (Hebrew).

Barrick, W. Boyd. 'The Meaning and Usage of R-K-B in Biblical Hebrew', JBL 101 (1982), pp.481-503.

Bartlett, J.R. 'From Edomites to Nabataeans', PEQ 111 (1979), pp.53-66.

Barton, G.A. and Eisenstein, J.D. Article, 'Rechabites', JE vol. 10, p.341f.

Batten, L.W. Ezra and Nehemiah, Edinburgh, 1913.

Bauckham, Richard. 'The Apocalypses in the New Pseudepigrapha', JSNT 26 (1986), pp.97-117.

Begg, Christopher. 'Unifying Factors in 2 Kings 1.2-17a', JSOT 32 (1985), pp.75-86.

Bennett, W.H. Article, 'Rechab, Rechabites', Dictionary of the Bible, ed. J. Hastings, Edinburgh, 1903, vol. 4, p.203f.

- Berridge, J.M. Review of R.P. Carroll's book, From Chaos to Covenant, in JSOT 24 (1982), pp.112-118.
- Beyer, K. Die Aramäischen Texte vom Toten Meer, Göttingen, 1984.
- Binns, L. Elliott. The Book of the Prophet Jeremiah, London, 1919.
- Black, Matthew. The Scrolls and Christian Origins, London, 1961.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 'The Tradition of Hasidaean-Essene Asceticism: Its Origins and Influence', Aspects du Judéo-Christianisme, Colloques de Strasbourg, 23-25 Avril, 1964, Paris, 1965, pp.19-33.
- Blenkinsopp, Joseph. A History of Prophecy in Israel, London, 1984.
- Bogaert, P.-M. (ed.). Le Livre de Jérémie: Le Prophète et son Milieu, les Oracles et leur Transmission, Leuven, 1981.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 'De Baruch à Jérémie: Les Deux Redactions Conservées du Livre de Jérémie', Le Livre de Jérémie, ed. P.-M. Bogaert, pp.168-173.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 'Les Mécanismes Rédactionnels en Jér.10,1-16 (LXX et TM) et la Signification des Suppléments', Le Livre de Jérémie, ed. P.-M. Bogaert, pp.222-238.
- Bowersock, G.W. Roman Arabia, Cambridge, Mass., 1983.
- Bowker, John. The Targums and Rabbinic Literature, Cambridge, 1969.
- Brekelmans, Christophe. 'Jeremiah 18,1-12 and its Redaction', Le Livre de Jérémie, ed. P.-M. Bogaert, pp.343-350.
- Brett, Mark G. 'Literacy and Domination: G.A. Herion's Sociology of History Writing', JSOT 37 (1987), pp.15-40.
- Bright, John. 'The Date of the Prose Sermons of Jeremiah', JBL 70 (1951), pp.15-35.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Jeremiah, New York, 1965.
- \_\_\_\_\_. A History of Israel, London, second edition, 1972.
- Brock, Sebastian P. 'Νεβελμηγερτα = rkb <sup>c</sup>rpt, VT 18 (1968), pp.395-397.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Review of J.H. Charlesworth's The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha, vol.2, in JJS 38 (1987), pp.107-114.

- Broome, E.C. 'Nebaiati, Nebaioth and the Nabataeans: The Linguistic Problems', JSS 18 (1973), pp.1-16.
- Buccellati, G. The Amorites of the Ur III Period, Naples, 1966.
- Budde, Karl. 'The Nomadic Ideal in the Old Testament', New World 4 (1895), pp.726-745.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 'Das Nomadische Ideal im Alten Testament', Preussische Jahrbuch (1896), pp.57-79.
- \_\_\_\_\_. The Religion of Israel to the Exile, New York, 1899.
- Burney, C.F. Notes on the Hebrew Text of the Books of Kings, Oxford, 1903.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 'A Theory of the Development of Israelite Religion in Early Times', JTS (OS) 9 (1907-1908), pp. 321-352.
- \_\_\_\_\_. The Book of Judges: Introduction and Notes, London, second edition, 1920.
- Calkins, Raymond. '2 Kings: Exposition', IB 3, New York, 1954, pp.187-338.
- Calvin, John. Commentaries on the Book of the Prophet Jeremiah and the Lamentations, ET Edinburgh, 1854.
- von Campenhausen, Hans. 'Die Nachfolge des Jakobus', ZKG 63 (1950), pp.133-144.
- Carr, G. Lloyd. The Song of Solomon, Leicester, 1984.
- Carroll, Robert P. When Prophecy Failed: Reactions and Responses to Failure in the Old Testament Prophetic Traditions, London, 1979.
- \_\_\_\_\_. From Chaos to Covenant: Uses of Prophecy in the Book of Jeremiah, London, 1981.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 'Poets not Prophets: A Response to 'Prophets through the Looking Glass'', JSOT 27 (1983), pp.25-31.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Jeremiah, London, 1986.
- Causse, Antonin. 'La Legislation Sociale d'Israël et l'Idéal Patriarcal', RTP 7 (1919), pp.189-212, 237-256.
- Charlesworth, James H. The Pseudepigrapha and Modern Research, Missoula, Montana, 1976 (reprinted with a supplement, 1981).

- Charlesworth, James H. 'Christian and Jewish Self-Definition in Light of Christian Additions to the Apocryphal Writings', Jewish and Christian Self-Definition, vol. 2, ed. E.P. Sanders et al, London, 1981, pp.27-55.
- \_\_\_\_\_. The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha and the New Testament, SNTSMS 54, Cambridge, 1985.
- Cheyne, T.K. Article 'Rechabites', in Encyclopaedia Biblica, eds. T.K. Cheyne and J.B. Black, London, 1903, vol. 4, cols. 4019-4021.
- Chilton, Bruce D. The Glory of Israel: The Theology and Provenience of the Isaiah Targum, JSOTS 23, Sheffield, 1983.
- Clements, Ronald, E. 'The Deuteronomistic Interpretation of the Founding of the Monarchy in 1 Sam. VIII', VT 24 (1974), pp.398-410.
- Cohen, S. Article 'Nabataeans', IDB 3, New York, 1961, pp.491-493.
- Coote, Robert B. and Whitelam, Keith W. The Emergence of Israel in Historical Perspective, Decatur, 1987.
- Cornill, C.H. Das Buch Jeremia, Leipzig, 1905.
- Cowley, A.E. Aramaic Papyri of the Fifth Century BC, Oxford, 1923.
- Craigie, Peter C. 'The Comparison of Hebrew Poetry: Psalm 104 in the Light of Egyptian and Ugaritic Poetry', Semitics 4 (1974), pp.10-21.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Ugarit and the Old Testament, Grand Rapids, Michigan, 1983.
- Crenshaw, James L. Prophetic Conflict, BZAW 124, Berlin, 1971.
- Cross, Frank M. Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic, Cambridge, Mass., 1973.
- Cross, Frank M. and Freedman, David N. 'A Note on Deuteronomy 33:26', BASOR 108 (1947), p.6f.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 'The Blessing of Moses', JBL 67 (1948), pp.191-210.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 'A Royal Song of Thanksgiving: 2 Sam.22=Ps. 18', JBL 72 (1953), pp.15-34.

- Cummings, J.T. 'The House of the Sons of the Prophets and the Tents of the Rechabites', Studia Biblica 1978, vol. 1 (Old Testament), ed. E.A. Livingstone, JSOTS 11, Sheffield, 1979, pp.119-126.
- Curtis, E.L and Madsen, A.A. The Books of Chronicles, Edinburgh, 1910.
- Dahl, N.A. and Segal, A.F. 'Philo and the Rabbis on the Names of God', JSJ 9 (1978), pp.1-28.
- Davies, Philip R. The Damascus Covenant: An Interpretation of the 'Damascus Document', JSOTS 25, Sheffield, 1983.
- Day, John. God's Conflict with the Dragon and the Sea, Cambridge, 1985.
- Döllner, J. 'Der Wein in Bibel und Talmud', Biblica 4 (1923), pp.143-167, 267-299.
- Douglas, J.D. Article 'Nazirite', in The Illustrated Bible Dictionary, ed. J.D. Douglas et al, Leicester, 1980, vol. 2, p.1063f.
- Driver, Samuel R. The Book of Genesis, London, sixth edition, 1907.
- \_\_\_\_\_. The Book of the Prophet Jeremiah, London, second edition, 1908.
- Duhm, Bernard. Jeremia, Tübingen, 1901.
- Durkheim, Emile. Les Formes Élémentaires de la Vie Religieuse, Paris, 1912.
- Emmerson, Grace I. 'Widening Horizons: Some Complexities of Hebrew Grammar', Horizons in Semitic Studies: Articles for the Student, ed. J. Eaton, Birmingham, 1980, pp. 83-90.
- Eph'al, Israel. The Ancient Arabs, Jerusalem, 1982.
- Ewald, Heinrich. The History of Israel, ET London, 1878.
- Feinberg, Charles L. Jeremiah: A Commentary, Grand Rapids, Michigan, 1982.
- Fichtner, J. Das Erste Buch von den Königen, Stuttgart, 1964.
- Flight, John W. 'The Nomadic Idea and Ideal in the Old Testament', JBL 42 (1923), pp.158-226.
- Forbes, R.J. Studies in Ancient Technology, Leiden, 1955ff.

- Friedlaender, Israel. 'The Jews of Arabia and the Rechabites', JQR 1 (1910), pp.252-257.
- Frick, Frank. 'The Rechabites Reconsidered', JBL 90 (1971), pp.279-287.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Article 'Rechabites', IDB Supp, New York, 1976, pp.726-728.
- \_\_\_\_\_. The City in Ancient Israel, SBLDS 36, Missoula, Montana, 1977.
- Gager, John G. 'Shall we Marry our Enemies? Sociology and the New Testament', Interpretation 36 (1982), pp.256-265.
- Galling, Kurt. 'Der Ehrenname Elisás und die Entrückung Elias', ZThK 53 (1956), pp.129-148.
- Gautier, Lucien. 'A propos des Récabites', La Liberté Chrétienne (1901), p.241ff. (=L. Gautier, Etudes sur la Religion d'Israel, Lausanne, 1927, pp.104-129)
- Gelin, A. 'Le Livre de Jérémie', La Sainte Bible (Jérusalem), Paris, 1958.
- Gibson, J.C.L. Canaanite Myths and Legends, Edinburgh, second edition, 1978.
- Giesebrecht, F. Das Buch Jeremia, Göttingen, 1907.
- Glock, Albert E. Warfare in Mari and Early Israel, (Michigan University Ph.D.), Ann Arbor, Michigan, University Microfilms, 1968.
- Glueck, Nelson. Rivers in the Desert, London, 1959.
- Gottwald, Norman K. 'Were the Early Israelites Pastoral Nomads?', Rhetorical Criticism: Essays in Honor of James Muilenberg, eds. J. Jackson and M. Kessler, Pittsburgh, 1974, pp.223-255.
- \_\_\_\_\_. The Tribes of Yahweh: A Sociology of the Religion of Liberated Israel, 1250-1050 BCE, London, 1980.
- Grabbe, Lester L. 'The Jewish Theocracy from Cyrus to Titus: A Programmatic Essay', JSOT 37 (1987), pp.117-124.
- Gray, George B. 'The Nazirite', JTS (OS) 1 (1899-1900), pp.201-211.
- Gray, John. 1 and 2 Kings, London, third edition, 1977 (first edition, 1964).
- Halдар, A. Who were the Amorites?, Leiden, 1971.

- Hanson, P.D. The Dawn of Apocalyptic, Philadelphia, 1975.
- Hayward, C.T. Robert. 'Phinehas - the same is Elijah: The Origins of a Rabbinic Tradition', JJS 29 (1978), pp. 22-34.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Divine Name and Presence: The Memra, New Jersey, 1981.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 'Some Notes on Scribes and Priests in the Targum of the Prophets', JJS 36 (1985), pp.210-221.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 'Jewish Traditions in Jerome's Commentary on Jeremiah and the Targum of Jeremiah', Proceedings of the Irish Biblical Association 9 (1985), pp.100-120.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 'St Jerome and the Aramaic Targumim', JSS (forthcoming).
- Helfmeyer, F.J. Article 'חנה', in TDOT 5, pp.4-19.
- Herford, R.T. The Ethics of the Talmud: Sayings of the Fathers, New York, 1945.
- Herion, Gary A. 'The Impact of Modern and Social Science Assumptions on the Reconstruction of Israelite History', JSOT 34 (1986), pp.3-33.
- Hertzberg, H.W. 1 and 2 Samuel, ET London, 1964.
- Hilgenfeld, A. Die Ketzergeschichte des Urchristenthums, Leipzig, 1884.
- Hitti, Philip K. History of the Arabs, London, seventh edition, 1960.
- Hobbs, T.R. 2 Kings, Waco, Texas, 1985.
- Holladay, William L. 'Prototype and Copies: A New Approach to the Poetry-Prose Problem in the Book of Jeremiah', JBL 79 (1960), pp.351-367.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 'Style, Irony and Authenticity in Jeremiah', JBL 81 (1962), pp.44-54.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 'Jeremiah's Lawsuit with God', Interpretation 17 (1963), pp.280-287.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 'The Background of Jeremiah's Self-Understanding', JBL 83 (1964), pp.153-164.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 'Jeremiah and Moses', JBL 85 (1966), pp.17-27.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 'The Recovery of Poetic Passages of Jeremiah', JBL 85 (1966), pp.401-425.

- Holladay, William L. 'A Fresh Look at "Source B" and "Source C" in Jeremiah', VT 25 (1975), pp.394-412.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Jeremiah, volume 1, Philadelphia, 1986.
- Hornblower, Jane. Hieronymus of Cardia, Oxford, 1981.
- Hyatt, J. Philip. 'Jeremiah: Introduction and Exegesis', IB 5, New York, 1956, pp.776-1142.
- Isichei, Elizabeth. 'From Sect to Denomination among English Quakers', Patterns of Sectarianism, ed. B.R. Wilson, London, 1967, pp.161-181.
- Janzen, J. Gerald. Studies in the Text of Jeremiah, HSM 6, Harvard, 1973.
- Johnson, Aubrey R. The Cultic Prophet in Ancient Israel, Cardiff, second edition, 1962.
- Johnson, Benton. 'A Critical Appraisal of the Church-Sect Typology', American Sociological Review 22 (1957), pp.89-92.
- Jones, Douglas R. 'The Cessation of Sacrifice after the Destruction of the Temple in 586 BC', JTS (NS) 14 (1963), pp.12-31.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Isaiah 56-66 and Joel, London, 1964.
- Jones, G.H. 1 and 2 Kings, London, 1984.
- Kaminka, A. 'Studien zur LXX an der Hand der Zwölf Kleinen Prophetenbücher', MGWJ (1928), pp.242-263.
- Kapelrud, A.S. Baal in the Ras Shamra Texts, Copenhagen, 1952.
- Kellermann, D. Article 'הגל', in TDOT 2, pp.344-350.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Article 'גלג', in TDOT 2, pp.439-450.
- Keukens, Karlheinz. 'Die Rekabitischen Haussklaven in Jeremia 35', BZ (NF) 27 (1982), pp.228-235.
- Kirkpatrick, A.F. The Second Book of Samuel, Cambridge, 1899.
- Kittel, Rudolph. Die Bücher der Könige, Göttingen, 1900.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Die Bücher der Chronik, Göttingen, 1902.
- Klein, Samuel. 'Die Schreiberfamilien: 1 Chronik 2:55', MGWJ 70 (1926), pp.410-416.

- Klein, Samuel. 'Studies in the Genealogical Chapters of the Book of Chronicles', Ziyyon Me'assef 2 (1927), pp.1-15 (Hebrew).
- Knights, Chris H. 'The Text of 1 Chronicles IV 12: A Re-appraisal', VT 37 (1987), pp.375-377.
- Kohler, Kaufman. 'The Essenes and Apocalyptic Literature', JQR 11 (1920-1921), pp.145-168.
- Kraus, S. Greicische und Lateinische Lehnwörter im Talmud, Midrasch und Targum, Berlin, 1898-1899, 2 volumes.
- Kupper, J.-R. Les Nomades en Mésopotamie au Temps des Rois de Mari, Paris, 1957.
- de Lagarde, P. Uebersicht über die im Aramäischen, Arabischen und Hebraischen übliche Bildung der Nomina, Göttingen, 1889.
- Lang, Bernhard. Monotheism and the Prophetic Minority, Sheffield, 1983.
- \_\_\_\_\_. (ed.) Anthropological Approaches to the Old Testament, London, 1985.
- Lawlor, H.J. Eusebiana, Oxford, 1912.
- Leslie, Elmer A. Jeremiah, Chronologically Arranged, Translated and Interpreted, New York, 1954.
- Levenson, Jon D. 'On the Promise to the Rechabites', CBQ 38 (1976), pp.508-514.
- Lind, Millard C. Yahweh is a Warrior: The Theology of Warfare in Ancient Israel, Scottdale, Penn., 1980.
- Liverani, M. 'The Amorites', Peoples of Old Testament Times, ed. D.J. Wiseman, Oxford, 1973, pp.100-133.
- Long, Burke O. 'Social Dimensions of Prophetic Conflict', Semeia 21 (1982), pp.31-53.
- Lüdemann, Gerd. 'The Successors of Pre-70 Jerusalem Christianity: A Critical Evaluation of the Pella-Tradition', Jewish and Christian Self-Definition, vol. 1, ed. E.P. Sanders, London, 1980, pp.161-173.
- Luke, John T. 'Observations on ARMT XIII 39', JCS 24 (1971), pp.20-23.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Pastoralism and Politics in the Mari Period, (1965 Michigan University Ph.D.), Ann Arbor, Michigan, University Microfilms, 1978.

- Lundbom, Jack R. Jeremiah: A Study in Ancient Hebrew Rhetoric, SBLDS 18, Missoula, Montana, 1975.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 'Baruch, Seraiah and Expanded Colophons in the Book of Jeremiah', JSOT 36 (1986), pp.89-114.
- McCarthy, Carmel. The Tiqqune Sopherim and Theological Corrections in the Massoretic Text of the Old Testament, Göttingen, 1981.
- McCarter, Peter K. 2 Samuel, New York, 1984.
- McKane, William. 1 and 2 Samuel, London, 1963.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 'Relations between Poetry and Prose in the Book of Jeremiah with Special Reference to Jeremiah III 6-11 and XII 14-17', Congress Volume: Vienna 1980, ed. J.A. Emerton, SVT 32, Leiden, 1981, pp.220-237.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Jeremiah, volume 1, Edinburgh, 1986.
- McNeil, Brian. 'The Narration of Zosimus', JSJ 9 (1978), pp.68-82.
- Malina, Bruce J. 'The Social Sciences and Biblical Interpretation', Interpretation 36 (1982), pp.229-242.
- Marti, Karl. Die Religion des Alten Testaments, Tübingen, 1906.
- Martin, E. Gary. The Account of the Blessed Ones: A Study of the Development of an Apocryphon on the Rechabites and Zosimus (The Abode of the Rechabites), unpublished Ph.D. thesis, Duke University, 1979.
- Mauchline, John. 1 and 2 Samuel, London, 1971.
- Mayes, Andrew D.H. Deuteronomy, London, 1979.
- Meyer, Eduard. Die Israeliten und ihre Nachbarstämme, Halle, 1906.
- Millard, Alan R. 'YW and YHW Names', VT 30 (1980), pp.208-212.
- Montgomery, James A. and Gehman, H.S. Kings, Edinburgh, 1951.
- Moscatti, Sabatino. The Semites in Ancient History, Cardiff, 1959.
- Mowinckel, Sigmund. Zur Komposition des Buches Jeremia, Kristiana, 1914.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Prophecy and Tradition, Oslo, 1946.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Der Achtundsechzigte Psalm, Oslo, 1953.

- Mowinckel, Sigmund. 'Drive and/or Ride in OT', VT 12 (1962), pp.278-299.
- Myers, Jacob M. 'Judges: Introduction and Exegesis', IB 2, New York, 1953, pp.677-826.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1 Chronicles, New York, 1965.
- Negev, Abraham. 'The Early Beginnings of the Nabataean Realm', PEQ 108 (1976), pp.125-133.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 'The Nabataeans and The Provincia Arabia', Aufstieg und Niedergang der Römischen Welt II.8, eds. H. Temporini and W. Haase, Berlin, 1977, pp.520-686.
- Neusner, Jacob. The Rabbinic Traditions about the Pharisees before 70, Leiden, 1971, 3 volumes.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 'The Bavli in Particular: Defining a Document in the Canon of Judaism in Relationship to the Old Testament', JSOT 33 (1985), pp.109-126.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 'When Tales Travel. The Interpretation of Multiple Appearances of a Single Saying or Story in Talmudic Literature', JSNT 27 (1986), pp.69-88.
- Nicholson, Ernest W. Preaching to the Exiles: A Study of the Prose Tradition in the Book of Jeremiah, Oxford, 1970.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Jeremiah 1-25, Cambridge, 1973.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Jeremiah 26-52, Cambridge, 1975.
- Niebuhr, H. Richard. The Social Sources of Denominationalism, New York, 1929.
- Nikiprowetzky, Valentin. 'Pseudépigraphes de l'Ancien Testament et les Manuscrits de la Mer Morte', REJ 128 (1969), pp.5-40.
- Norin, Stig. 'Jo-Namen und Jeho-Namen', VT 29 (1979), pp. 87-97.
- Noth, Martin. Die Israelitischen Personennamen im Rahmen der Gemeinsemitischen Namengebung, BWANT 46, Stuttgart, 1928.
- Nötscher, F. Das Buch Jeremias, Bonn, 1934.
- Oesterley, W.O.E. and Robinson, T.H. Hebrew Religion: Its Origin and Development, London, 1930.
- \_\_\_\_\_. An Introduction to the Books of the Old Testament, London, 1934.

- Paterson, John. 'Jeremiah', Peake's Commentary on the Bible, rev. ed., eds. M. Black and H.H. Rowley, London, 1963, pp.537-562.
- Peake, A.S. Jeremiah and Lamentations, Edinburgh, 1910-1912, 2 volumes.
- Pedersen, J. Israel: Its Life and Culture, London, 1947.
- Picard, Jean-Claude. 'L'Histoire des Bienheureux au Temps de Jérémie et la Narration de Zosime: Arrière-Plan Historique et Mythique', Pseudépigraphes de l'Ancien Testament et les Manuscrits de la Mer Morte, ed. M. Philonenko et al, Cahiers de RHPR, Paris, 1967, pp.27-43.
- Plumptre, E.H. Article 'Rechabites', in Dictionary of the Bible, ed. W. Smith, London, 1863, vol. 2, pp.1006-8.
- Pope, Liston. Millhands and Preachers, New Haven, 1942.
- Pope, Marvin. Article 'Rechab', in IDB 4, New York, 1962, pp.14-16.
- Porter, J.R. 'בְּנֵי חֶבְרֹן הַיְהוּדִים', JTS (NS) 32 (1981), pp.423-429.
- Prag, Kay. 'The Intermediate Early Bronze-Middle Bronze Age: An Interpretation of the Evidence from Transjordan, Syria and Lebanon', Levant 6 (1974), pp.69-116.
- von Rad, Gerhard. Der Heilige Kreis im Alten Israel, Göttingen, 1952.
- Richter, G. 'Untersuchungen zu den Geschlechtsregister der Chronik', ZAW 34 (1914), pp.107-141.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 'Zu den Geschlechtsregister, 1 Chronik 2-9', ZAW 49 (1931), pp.260-270.
- Riemann, Paul A. Desert and Return to Desert in the Pre-Exilic Prophets, unpublished Ph.D. thesis, Harvard University, 1964.
- Robinson, J. The Second Book of Kings, Cambridge, 1976.
- Rodd, Cyril S. 'On Applying a Sociological Theory to Biblical Studies', JSOT 19 (1981), pp.95-106.
- Rogerson, John W. Anthropology and the Old Testament, Oxford, 1978 (reprinted Sheffield, 1984).
- \_\_\_\_\_. 'The Use of Sociology in Old Testament Studies', Congress Volume: Salamanca 1983, ed. J.A. Emerton, SVT 36, Leiden, 1985, pp.244-256.

- Rothstein, J.W and Hänel, J. Das Erste Buch der Chronik, Leipzig, 1927.
- Rowley, H.H. The Servant of the Lord, London, 1952.
- \_\_\_\_\_. From Moses to Qumran, London, 1963.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Job, London, 1970.
- Rudolph, W. Jeremia, Tübingen, first edition, 1947; third edition, 1968.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Chronikbücher, Tübingen, 1955.
- Schäfer, Peter. 'Research into Rabbinic Literature: An Attempt to Define the Status Quaestiones', JJS 37 (1986), pp.139-152.
- Schmitt, H.-Chr. Elisa: Traditionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen zur Vorklassischen Nordisraelitischen Prophetie, Gütersloh, 1972.
- Schoeps, Hans-Joachim. Theologie und Geschichte des Judentums, Tübingen, 1949.
- Scholem, Gershom. The Messianic Idea in Judaism and Other Essays on Jewish Spirituality, London, 1971.
- Schlürer, Emil. The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ, revised English edition by G. Vermes et al, Edinburgh, 1973-1987, 3 volumes.
- Schwally, F. Der Heilige Kreig im Alten Israel, Leipzig, 1901.
- Schweitzer, Albert. The Quest of the Historical Jesus, ET London, second edition, 1911.
- Seale, M.S. The Desert Bible, London, 1974.
- Seidensticker, P. 'Prophetensöhne - Rechabiter - Nasiräer', Studii Biblici Franciscani Liber Annuus 10 (1959-1960), pp.65-119.
- Simpson, C.A. 'Genesis: Introduction and Exegesis', IB 1, New York, 1952, pp.439-829.
- Skinner, John. Genesis, Edinburgh, 1910.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Prophecy and Religion: Studies in the Life of Jeremiah, Cambridge, 1922.
- Smith, George Adam. Jeremiah, London, 1922.

- Smith, William Robertson. Lectures on the Religion of the Semites, London, second edition, 1907.
- Snaith, Norman H. '1 Kings: Exegesis', IB 3, New York, 1954, pp.18-186.
- \_\_\_\_\_. '2 Kings: Exegesis', IB 3, New York, 1954, pp. 187-338.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 'Numbers', Peake's Commentary on the Bible, rev. ed., eds. M. Black and H.H. Rowley, London, 1963, pp.254-268.
- Soderlund, Sven. The Greek Text of Jeremiah: A Revised Hypothesis, JSOTS 47, Sheffield, 1985.
- Soggin, J. Alberto. Joshua, ET London, 1972.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Judges, London, 1981.
- Spina, F.A. 'The Israelites as Gērīm, 'Sojourners', in Social and Historical Context', The Word of the Lord Shall Go Forth, eds. C.L. Meyers and M. O'Connor, Winona Lake, Indiana, 1981, pp.321-335.
- Starcky, Jean. 'Petra et la Nabatène', Dictionnaire de la Bible Supplément 7, Paris, 1966, cols. 886-1017.
- Strack, Hermann L. Introduction to the Talmud and Midrash, New York, 1983 (reprint of the 1931 JPSA ET of the fifth German edition, 1920).
- Streane, A.W. Jeremiah, Together with the Lamentations, Cambridge, 1903.
- Sutcliffe, E.F. 'Sacred Meals at Qumran?', Heythrop Journal 1 (1960), pp.48-65.
- Talmon, Shemaryahu. '1 Chron. 2:55', Eretz-Yisrael 5 (1958), pp.111-113 (Hebrew).
- \_\_\_\_\_. '1 Chron. 2:55', IEJ 10 (1960), pp.174-180.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 'The Desert Motif in the Bible and Qumran Literature', Biblical Motifs: Origins and Transformations, ed. A. Altmann, Harvard, 1966, pp.31-63.
- Thiel, Winfried. Die Deuteronomistische Redaktion von Jeremia 1-25, WMANT 24, Neukirchen-Vluyn, 1973.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Die Deuteronomistische Redaktion von Jeremia 26-45, WMANT 52, Neukirchen-Vluyn, 1981.
- Thompson, J.A. The Book of Jeremiah, Michigan, 1980.

- Timm, Stefan. Die Dynastie Omri: Quellen und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte Israels in 9. Jahrhundert vor Christus, FRLANT 124, Göttingen, 1982.
- Tov, Emmanuel. The LXX Translation of Jeremiah and Baruch, HSM 8, Missoula, Montana, 1976.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 'Some Aspects of the Textual and Literary History of the Book of Jeremiah', Le Livre de Jérémie, ed. P.-M. Bogaert, Leuven, 1981, pp.145-167.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 'The Nature and Background of Harmonisation in Biblical Manuscripts', JSOT 31 (1985), pp.3-29.
- Trebilco, Paul. Review of Jacob Neusner's book, Judaism in the Beginning of Christianity, in Anvil 3 (1986), p.284f.
- Troeltsch, Ernst. The Social Teaching of the Christian Churches, ET London, 1931, 2 volumes.
- Ullendorff, Edward. 'Ugaritic Marginalia', Orientalia 20 (1951), pp.270-274.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 'The Contribution of South Semitic to Hebrew Lexicography', VT 6 (1956), pp.190-198.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 'Ugaritic Studies within their Semitic and Eastern Mediterranean Setting', BJRL 46 (1963-1964), pp.236-249.
- Urbach, Ephraim E. The Sages: Their Concepts and Beliefs, ET Jerusalem, 1975, 2 volumes.
- de Vaux, Roland. 'Les Livres des Rois', La Sainte Bible (Jérusalem), Paris, 1958.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Ancient Israel: Its Life and Institutions, ET London, 1961.
- Vermes, Geza. 'Bible and Midrash: Early Old Testament Exegesis', The Cambridge History of the Bible, eds. P.R. Ackroyd and C.F. Evans, vol. 1, Cambridge, 1970, pp.199-231.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Scripture and Tradition in Judaism, Leiden, second edition, 1973.
- \_\_\_\_\_. The Dead Sea Scrolls in English, Harmondsworth, Middx., second edition, 1975.
- \_\_\_\_\_. The Dead Sea Scrolls: Qumran in Perspective, London, 1977.

- Volz, Paul. Der Prophet Jeremia, Leipzig, second edition, 1928.
- de Vries, Simon, J. Prophet against Prophet, Grand Rapids, Michigan, 1978.
- Wallis, Roy. Salvation and Protest, London, 1979.
- Weber, Max. Das Antike Judentum, Tübingen, 1920.
- Weinfeld, Moshe. Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomic School, Oxford, 1972.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "'Rider of the Clouds" and "Gatherer of the Clouds"', JANES 5 (1973), pp.421-426.
- Weingreen, Julius. From Bible to Mishna, Manchester, 1976.
- Weippert, Helga. Die Prosareden des Jeremiabuches, BZAW 132, Berlin, 1973.
- Weiser, Artur. Der Prophet Jeremia, Göttingen, 1952-1955, 2 volumes.
- Welch, A.C. Jeremiah: His Time and his Work, Oxford, 1955.
- Whitelam, Keith W. 'Recreating the History of Israel', JSOT 35 (1986), pp.45-70.
- Widengren, G. Literary and Psychological Aspects of the Hebrew Prophets, Uppasala, 1948.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 'Oral Tradition and Written Literature among the Hebrews in the Light of Arabic Evidence, with Special Regard to Prose Narratives', Acta Orientalia 23 (1959), pp.201-262.
- Williamson, H.G.M. 1 and 2 Chronicles, London, 1982.
- Willis, G. and Wilson, Bryan R. 'The Churches of God: Pattern and Practice', Patterns of Sectarianism, ed. B.R. Wilson, London, 1967, pp.244-286.
- Willis, John T. 'Dialogue between Prophet and Audience as a Rhetorical Device in the Book of Jeremiah', JSOT 33 (1985), pp.63-82.
- Wilson, Bryan R. (ed.) Patterns of Sectarianism, London, 1967.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 'Introduction', Patterns of Sectarianism, pp.1-21.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 'An Analysis of Sect Development', Patterns of Sectarianism, pp.22-45.

- Wilson, Bryan R. 'The Pentecostalist Minister: Role Conflicts and Contradictions of Status', Patterns of Sectarianism, pp.138-157.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 'The Exclusive Brethren: A Case Study in the Evolution of a Sectarian Ideology', Patterns of Sectarianism, pp.287-342.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Religious Sects, London, 1972.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Magic and the Millenium, St Alban's, 1975.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Religion in Sociological Perspective, Oxford, 1982.
- Wilson, John. 'The Sociology of Schism', A Sociological Year-book of Religion in Britain 4, ed. M. Hill, London, 1971, pp.1-20.
- Wilson, Robert R. Genealogy and History in the Biblical World, New Haven, 1977.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Prophecy and Society in Ancient Israel, Philadelphia, 1980.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Sociological Approaches to the Old Testament, Philadelphia, 1984.
- Winckler, Hugo. Religionsgeschichtler und Geschichtlicher Orient, Leipzig, 1906.
- Wolff, Christian. Jeremiah in Frühjudentum und Urchristentum, Berlin, 1976.
- Workman, G.C. The Text of Jeremiah, Edinburgh, 1889.
- Würthwein, Ernst. The Text of the Old Testament, ET London, 1980.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Die Bücher der Könige, 1 Kön.17-2 Kön.25, Göttingen, 1984.
- Yinger, J.M. Religion, Society and the Individual, New York, 1957.

## ABBREVIATIONS

<u>ANET</u>	<u>Ancient Near Eastern Texts relating to the Old Testament</u> , ed. J.B. Pritchard.
ARMT	Archives Royales de Mari, Textes.
<u>b</u>	(preceding a tractate name) Babylonian Talmud.
<u>BASOR</u>	<u>Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research</u> .
BCE	Before the Common Era.
BDB	Brown, Driver and Briggs, <u>Hebrew and English Lexicon</u> .
<u>BHS</u>	<u>Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia</u> .
<u>BJRL</u>	<u>Bulletin of the John Rylands' University Library of Manchester</u> .
BWANT	Beiträge zur Wissenschaft vom Alten und Neuen Testament, Stuttgart.
<u>BZ</u>	<u>Biblisches Zeitschrift</u> .
<u>BZAW</u>	Beihefte zur <u>ZAW</u> .
<u>CBQ</u>	<u>Catholic Biblical Quarterly</u> .
CE	Common Era.
<u>CTA</u>	<u>Corpus des Tablettes en Cunéiformes Alphabétiques</u> , ed. A, Herdner.
<u>EJ</u>	<u>Encyclopaedia Judaica</u> , ed. C. Roth <u>et al</u> , New York, 1971.
ET	English Translation.
FRLANT	Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments, Göttingen.
<u>G-K</u>	<u>Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar</u> .
H	Holiness Code
<u>HSM</u>	Harvard Semitic Monographs
<u>IB</u>	<u>The Interpreters' Bible</u> .

<u>IDB</u>	<u>The Interpreters' Dictionary of the Bible.</u>
<u>IDB Supp</u>	<u>The Interpreters' Dictionary of the Bible, Supplementary Volume.</u>
<u>IEJ</u>	<u>Israel Exploration Journal.</u>
<u>JANES</u>	<u>Journal of the Ancient Near Eastern Society of Columbia University.</u>
<u>JAOS</u>	<u>Journal of the American Oriental Society.</u>
<u>JBL</u>	<u>Journal of Biblical Literature.</u>
<u>JCS</u>	<u>Journal of Cuneiform Studies.</u>
<u>JE</u>	<u>The Jewish Encyclopaedia, ed. I. Singer et al, New York, 1905.</u>
<u>JJS</u>	<u>Journal of Jewish Studies.</u>
<u>JQR</u>	<u>Jewish Quarterly Review.</u>
<u>JSJ</u>	<u>Journal for the Study of Judaism.</u>
<u>JSNT</u>	<u>Journal for the Study of the New Testament.</u>
<u>JSOT</u>	<u>Journal for the Study of the Old Testament.</u>
<u>JSOTS</u>	<u>JSOT Supplement Series.</u>
<u>JSS</u>	<u>Journal of Semitic Studies.</u>
<u>JTS</u>	<u>Journal of Theological Studies.</u>
<u>LCL</u>	<u>Loeb Classical Library.</u>
<u>LXX</u>	<u>Septuagint.</u>
<u>LXX<sup>A</sup>/A</u>	<u>Codex Alexandrinus of LXX.</u>
<u>LXX<sup>B</sup>/B</u>	<u>Codex Vaticanus of LXX.</u>
<u>LXX<sup>N</sup>/N</u>	<u>Codex Sinaiticus of LXX.</u>
<u>LXX<sup>L</sup>/L</u>	<u>Lucianic Recension of LXX.</u>
<u>m</u>	<u>(preceding a tractate name) Mishnah.</u>
<u>MGWJ</u>	<u>Monatsschrift für Geschichte und Wissenschaft des Judentums.</u>
<u>MT</u>	<u>Massoretic Text</u>
<u>NEB</u>	<u>New English Bible.</u>

NS (NF)	New Series (Neue Folge).
NT	New Testament.
OT	Old Testament.
OS	Old Series.
P	The Priestly Writing.
<u>PEQ</u>	<u>Palestine Exploration Quarterly.</u>
<u>REJ</u>	<u>Revue des Etudes Juives.</u>
<u>RHPR</u>	<u>Revue d'Histoire et de Philosophie Religieuse.</u>
RSV	<u>Revised Standard Version.</u>
<u>RTP</u>	<u>Revue de Théologie et de Philosophie.</u>
SBLDS	Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series.
SNTSMS	Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series.
<u>SVT</u>	Supplements to <u>VT</u> .
<u>TDOT</u>	<u>Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament.</u>
<u>Tg.</u>	Targum.
<u>VT</u>	<u>Vetus Testamentum.</u>
WMANT	Wissenschaftliche Monographien zum Alten und Neuen Testament.
<u>y</u>	(preceding a tractate name) JerusalemTalmud.
<u>ZAW</u>	<u>Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft.</u>
<u>ZKG</u>	<u>Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte.</u>
<u>ZThK</u>	<u>Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche.</u>

