In his lengthy treatment of Jehoshaphat, the Chronicler presents a curiously ambivalent picture of the king. Jehoshaphat's fidelity is rewarded with wealth and honor, building programs, a large army, and peace and

Author's note: An earlier version of this paper was presented to the Chronicles, Ezra, and Nehemiah Group, at the annual meeting of the Society of Biblical Literature in November, 1990. Professor Milgrom had been scheduled to discuss the reform of Jehoshaphat at the same meeting, but heart surgery prevented his participation.

1. 1 Kgs 15:24b — 2 Chr 17:1
2. Kgs 15:25—21:29 (Information about the Northern Kingdom)
3. Kgs 22:1—41) / 2 Chr 17:2—11 Reform, building program, large armies
4. 1 Kgs 15:25 — 21:29 (Information about the Northern Kingdom)
5. Kgs 22:1—41) / 2 Chr 17:2—11 Reform
7. 2 Kgs 22:49—50 / 2 Chr 20:35—37 (Eliezer, son of Iodavahu) Maritime venture
8. Kgs 22:51 / 2 Chr 21:1 Heath, burial, succession of Jehoram

I have listed all the prophets named in Chronicles and placed the prophets added by the Chronicler in parentheses.
victory (2 Chronicles 17), but his infidelity is met with swift rebuke (19:1—3) and punishment (20:37). It is not that Jehoshaphat’s reign starts well and ends poorly, or vice versa. Rather, initial success is followed by the nearly fatal flaw of the alliance with Ahab and the war against Ramoth-gilead (2 Chr 18:1-19:3). The subsequent, commendable judicial reform (2 Chr 19:4—11) and victory in war (2 Chr 20:1—30) are followed by another disastrous alliance with Ahaziah of the North (2 Chr 3(1:35-37). The account concludes with a death and burial formula (2 Chr 21:1). This faithful king is a pistils ct pcccator.2

In his historical account of Jehoshaphat, the Chronicler meets with mixed reviews. While few today would follow Wellhausen and conclude that the judicial reform is “merely the organisation of justice as existing in the Chronicler’s] own day that he here carries back to Jehoshaphat” and “the reason why the latter [Jehoshaphat] is selected by preference for this work lies simply in his name “Jehovah is Judge,” ”3 we all remain puzzled about the historical value of almost all of the Chronicler’s material about Jehoshaphat not found in the book of Kings. Even those events that seem most historically probable cannot be verified, or they are marked by improbable details or clear theological additions. I would like to illustrate these conclusions by reviewing five of the main pericopes in the Chronicler’s account.

CHAPTER 17: THE REWARDS OF OBEDIENCE

Jehoshaphat walked in the early ways of Asa his father and distanced himself from the behavior of his northern contemporaries (17:3—4). Specifically, he removed the high places and the Asherim from Judah (17:6).1

2. Kiln Striind, Tradition als Interpretation in der Chronik (BZAW 201; Berlin: de Gruyter, 1991) 195.
3. Julius Wellhausen, Prolegomena to the History of Ancient Israel (Cleveland: Meridian, 1961) 191. Wellhausen found the reform impossible in Jehoshaphat’s time because it had the book of the Law as its basis, because it coordinated priests and Levites, and because it was inconsistent with notices in Isaiah and Jeremiah in which rulers were considered to be natural judges. W. F. Albright argued for a date in the late fifth century and for an identification of Ezra as the Chronicler (“The Judicial Reform of Jehoshaphat,” Alexander Marx Jubilee Volume ed. D. Frankel; New York: Jewish Publication Society, 10501 64-82). On the basis of a number of items in the Chronicler that he believed had been confirmed by archaeology, Albright urged historians “to accept his material with gratitude, but to sift it with care” In Albright’s judgment, the Chronicler has “scarcely the most elementary conception of critical method” (p. 74).
4. MT: “David his father” LXX lacks “David,” and this shorter and more original reading in this context refers to Asa.
5. In 2 Chr 20:33, a passage dependent on 1 Kgs 22:44, the Chronicler says that “they” did not remove the high places. Similarly, in his account of Asa, the Chronicler himself states
Asa result, riches and honor were his (17:5; 18:1). Divine fear prevented surrounding nations from attacking Judah, and it induced Philistines and Arabs to pay him lavish tribute (17:10—11). Jehoshaphat built a number of unidentified (and therefore unverifiable) fortified places and store cities throughout Judah. Two ambiguous pieces of evidence, however, are worth discussing at more length: Jehoshaphat’s commissioning of teaching Levites (2 Chr 17:7—9) and his stationing of a large army in Jerusalem (2 Chr 17:13—19).

In his third year, Jehoshaphat sent out a commission of fifteen people to teach in Judah. The specificity of the names, the prominence of laity, and the listing of Levites before priests convinced Hugh Williamson that this was early material that was available to the Chronicler. What is unclear, however, is how this teaching commission is related to the subsequent judicial reform (19:4—11), if it is related at all. Also unclear is what the members of this commission taught. The Chronicler surely thought of the Pentateuch when he noted that the book of the law of Yahweh was with them (17:9), but the vast majority of modern scholars would insist that the Pentateuch did not exist in the ninth century B.C.E. Jacob Myers proposed that this book of the law was some kind of royal law code, like that of Hammurapi. Since none of the identifiable law codes in the Bible is royal, Myers’ suggestion is interesting but not really enlightening. If vv. 7—9 reflect a historical event from the time of Jehoshaphat, some, non-Pentateuchal law code is meant; if vv. 7—9 are completely the creation of the Chronicler, the book of the law is the Pentateuch.

The second ambiguous notice concerns his army in Jerusalem. A good king is known by his large armies, as Peter Welten has shown.

that the king removed the high places (2 Chr 14:2), but in a passage taken from 1 Kgs 15:14 notes that “they” did not remove the high places during Asa’s reign (2 Chr 15:17).

6. Jehoshaphat apparently acted as soon as he became sole king and not just co-regent. Asa had become diseased in his feet in his thirty-ninth year and died in his forty-first year (2 Chr 16:12—13 I Kgs 15:23—241). The Chronicler probably thought Jehoshaphat was a co-regent with Asa during the latter’s illness.

7. 11. G. M. Williamson, 1 and 2 Chronicles (NCBC; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1982) 282. Wilhelm Rudolph attributed v. 8 to the Chronicler, but thought that vv. 7 and 9 came from older material (Chronikbiidrer IHA’F 21; Tübingen: Mohr, 19551 251. Strübing believes the teaching by laity and priests is a projection back into monarchical times from the postexilic, dyarchical government (Tradition, 138).

8. Since Jehoshaphat sends out the delegation in chap. 17 but personally encourages a return to the Lord in 19:4, the teaching and the reform may refer to different events. Albright concluded that 2 Chr 17:7—9 was a misunderstood doublet of the tradition of judicial reform (“Judicial Reform:” 82).


10. Strübing chooses the second option (“Tradition als Interpretation, 146).

Jehoshaphat stationed troops in all the fortified cities of Judah and placed prefects (nsybym) throughout Judah and the cities of Ephraim that his father Asa had captured. But it is his army in Jerusalem that most confirms his fidelity and that most confounds the modern historian. A curious mixture of elements of a standing and a conscript army, the Jerusalem force had five named leaders, three of whom are called captains of thousands for Judah, and two of whom were responsible for Benjamin. An epithet for Amasiah son of Zichri, the third leader for Judah ("the one who volunteered for Yahweh") gives an air of verisimilitude to the whole list. But the numbers for the army are incredibly high, especially if they are only for the part of his army that was stationed in Jerusalem: 780,000 for Judah and 380,000 for Benjamin, or 1,160,000 in all. As I argued a few years back, these numbers are not to be reduced by transforming them into 1,160 battalions or the like. Instead the Chronicler, in my opinion, ascribed an army of more than 1,000,000 soldiers to Jehoshaphat. But the size of this army serves only to indicate Jehoshaphat's high standing before God; it offers no realistic picture of the army deployed by Jehoshaphat. When Jehoshaphat and Ahab attack Ramoth-gilead in chap. 18, the only part of the battle we see is the Syrian encirclement of Jehoshaphat and his divine protection. The role of Jehoshaphat's army is virtually nonexistent.

In the campaign against a three-nation coalition reported in 2 Chronicles 20, the battle is "fought" with Jehoshaphat's prayer, Jahaziel's prophetic speech, and the singers' praises.

Was the army commanded by Jehoshaphat standing or conscript? How large was it? All we seem to know for sure from 2 Chr 17:14-18 is a list of names of five of the king's captains.

THE BATTLE FOR Ramoth—GILEAD (2 CHR 18:1—19:3)

The last generation of historians has subjected the account of the battle in 1 Kings 22 to rigorous scrutiny that needs not be repeated here. Simon DeVries detects two narratives in 1 Kings 22 and identifies the northern and southern kings of his Narrative A as Joram the son of Ahab.
and Ahaziah the son of Jehoshaphat respectively. These identifications, I believe, were neither known nor suspected by the Chronicler. Instead, he took the kings named in 1 Kings 22 at face value and copied here, for the only time in his work, a lengthy text from the Deuteronomic History dealing with a northern king. The Chronicler’s only significant omissions are the bloody details of Ahab’s death (1 Kgs 22:35—38) and Ahab’s final regnal formula (1 Kgs 22:39—40), which interprets Ahab’s death as the fulfillment of the word of Yahweh.

Although the Chronicler can hardly be criticized for failing to engage in modern historical criticism, biblical scholars have often called attention to three additions that the Chronicler makes to this account that involve historical or textual questions in their own right.

The Chronicler begins by repeating a note from 2 Chr 17:5 about the king’s prosperity, but he gives it quite a different interpretation: “Although Jehoshaphat was rich and honored in abundance, he entered into a marriage alliance with Ahab” (2 Chr 18:1).” The Chronicler refers, of course, to the marriage of Athaliah, the daughter of Ahab, who married Jehoshaphat’s son Jehoram. While Jehoshaphat traveled to Samaria for no apparent reason according to 1 Kings 22, the Chronicler makes this trip part of the marriage agreement and reports Ahab as serving Jehoshaphat a banquet of sheep and cattle. So it was that Ahab ‘seduced’ Jehoshaphat to take part in the campaign against Ramothgilead (2 Chr 18:2).

The second supplement to the Kings’ Vorlage appears in 2 Chr 18:31, although this time the Chronicler’s contribution may be less than often alleged.

1 Kings 22:32a(3b) 2 Chronicles 18:31 a(3b

| They turned against him to fight. | They surrounded him to fight. |
| When Jehoshaphat cried out, Yahweh helped him. | When Jehoshaphat cried out, Yahweh helped him, and Cod seduced them away from hint. |

15. S. DeVries, 1 Kings (WBC 12; Waco, Tex.: Word, 1985) 269. J. Maxwell Miller also believes that the kings in 1 Kings 22 were not originally Ahab and Jehoshaphat. He, like DeVries, finds two narratives in this chapter. One deals with a battle involving Jehoram of Israel and Ahaziah of Judah; the other involves Jehoahaz son of Jehu and, perhaps, Joash of Judah (“The Elisha Cycle and the Accounts of the Omride Wars.” JBL 85 1986 445-48).


17. 2 Kgs 8:18. In 2 Kgs 8:26, Athaliah is called the “daughter” of Omri. The NRSV translates bar in the latter case as ‘granddaughter’.
The italicized words in Chronicles are usually identified as an addition made by the Chronicler. "The theme of God's help, especially in a military context, as a response to prayer is a favourite with [the Chronicler].... Even in the middle of a battle which he should never have been fighting, Jehoshaphat could find the kind of deliverance which the Chronicler always delights to relate." As noted by Werner Lemke and Raymond Dillard, however, the bracketed words in Kings are attested in the Lucanian recension of the Septuagint. Hence already in one recension of Kings, Jehoshaphat's cry may have been more than an appeal for his own soldiers to help or a notice to the enemy that he was not Ahab; it was, instead, a prayer soon to be answered. Thus God's ready response to Jehoshaphat's prayer, while fitting nicely into the Chronicler's concept of retribution, may have been inherited by the Chronicler from a text of Kings.  

The Chronicler in any case did specify what this help meant: "God seduced the enemy away" The verb 'seduce' echoes the verb used by the Chronicler to describe Ahab's endeavors to get Jehoshaphat to join his military campaign (v. 2). The Chronicler makes it explicit that the Syrians did not just turn away from Jehoshaphat to go after Ahab, their primary prey (1 Kgs 22:33 // 2 Chr 18:32). Rather, they were drawn away by a higher power.

The final addition by the Chronicler to this battle report comes in the first three verses of chap. 19. Jehoshaphat returned home in peace despite the ominous threat uttered by Micaiah against Ahab: "If you indeed return home in peace, Yahweh has not spoken through me" (2 Chr 18:27). Having ignored the prophet Micaiah, who was still in jail (2 Chr 18:26), Jehoshaphat was met by Jehu, the son of Hanani, a prophet, or seer, of his own kingdom (2 Chr 19:2). A prophet by this name had appeared to 13aasha, a northern king, according to 1 Kgs 16:1, 7. The Chronicler infers that both Hanani the father and Jehu the son were prophetic figures, and he has Hanani prophesy to Asa and Jehu to Jehoshaphat. This Jehu raises the Chronicler's accusing question for him: "Will you help the..."
wicked (in battle), and will you love (in a marriage alliance) those who hate Yahweh?" (2 Chr 19:2). Whereas 1 Kings 22 comes to a climax with the brutal death of Ahab (1 Kgs 22:35–38), Ahab's death is toned down and moved off center stage in the Chronicler's account (2 Chr 18:34). For the Chronicler the campaign of Jehoshaphat against Ramothgilead represents the kind of unholy alliance with the North that he bitterly opposes. Here is the divine sentence: "Because of this, wrath from Yahweh is upon you (19:2).

Jehoshaphat's good deeds, however, mitigated the damage24. "But good words were found with you for you exterminated the Asherot (cf. 2 Chr 17:6) from the land and established your heart to seek Yahweh" (2 Chr 19:3). Yahweh let grace prevail over justice. Verses 1–3 of chap. 19 are followed by additional good deeds of Jehoshaphat: his judicial reform (19:4–11) and the king's acting (without an alliance with Israel and in perfect dependence on God) against national enemies in 2 Chronicles 20.25

The Chronicler's additions to the text of 1 Kings 22 at the beginning and end gave this historical account an entirely new orientation. Elsewhere in this essay I discuss important theological arguments expressed through accounts whose historicity is doubtful, or at least hard to attest. The Chronicler may have created such "historical" accounts to express his theological opinion. In 2 Chr 18:1–19:3, however, the Chronicler modified an account about the death of Ahab that he had inherited from the Deuteronomistic History, and he transformed it by his additions into an indictment against Jehoshaphat.

THE JUDICIAL REFORM OF JEHOSHAPHAT (2 CHR 19:4–11)

Keith Whitelam and others have shown the plausibility of Jehoshaphat's ninth-century reform26 because the judicial system presupposed in

23. According to 2 Chr 18:7, Ahab hated Micaiah. Jehu's speech concludes, therefore, that Ahab also hated the one who sent Micaiah.

24. When Rehoboam had humbled himself, the anger of Yahweh also turned away from him (2 Chr 12:12).

25. Approval for Jehoshaphat is reported in Elijah's letter to Joram: "You did not walk in the ways of Jehoshaphat and Asa" (2 Chr 21:12). Cf. 2 Chr 22:9, "[Jehoshaphat] sought Yahweh with his whole heart," and 2 Chr 20:32 (ill Kgs 22:43). "He walked in the way of his father Asa, and he did not turn from it. by doing that which was right in the eyes of Yahweh." Jehoshaphat's approval is qualified in 2 Chr 21:33 (ill Kgs 22:44).


27. The battle in 2 Chronicles 21 displaces the battle of 2 Kings 3. In the latter account, great wrath came upon Israel when the king of Moab offered his firstborn on the wall.

28. When 1 Kgs 22:46 mentions that there were deeds of Jehoshaphat that went unreported in the Deuteronomistic History, we may conclude that the judicial reform was one of those deeds. The reform may have been omitted in Kings because it did not serve
the eighth-century prophets (run by professional judges, royal princes, and leaders of the people)"—"displays a change from the judicial system known during the United Monarchy of the tenth century. It was David's failure to delegate authority that partially led to his problems with Absalom, and Solomon himself took the judicial initiative in his famous judgment scene with two prostitutes (1 Kings 3). Since Jehoram the son of Ahab, a contemporary of Jehoshaphat, delegated a judicial decision raised by the Shunamite woman to an official (saris, 2 Kgs 8:6), it is not implausible that Jehoshaphat undertook similar delegation of responsibility. By delegating judicial authority to officials throughout the kingdom, Jehoshaphat was extending his own jurisdiction and so restricting the influence of the local courts.

The Chronicler's account of the reform seems to antedate the present form of the laws in the book of Deuteronomy (1:9-18, 16:18-20, 17:8-13). Thus the Chronicler reports that Jehoshaphat appointed judges in all the fortified cities of Judah (19:3), whereas Deuteronomy prescribes such judges for all the gates/towns of Israel. The "judge" (at the place your God will choose) in Deut 17:9 seems to be a later official than the more primitive "governor of the house of Judah" of 2 Chr 19:1.

The overall purpose of the Deuteronomistic historian. Other Deuteronomists included it in their work, although they projected back into the Mosaic age in Dent 16:18-21 and 17:8-13. The Mosaic period is out of the question, however. Contrast the settled towns (Deut 16:18) with the pre-settlement period. Also contrast the exclusiveness of the Jerusalem sanctuary in Deut 17:8, 10 with the realities of the pre-settlement period. Strubing finds in 2 Chr 19:4—11 a legal arrangement from late exilic times (Tradition als Interpretation, 173).


32. J. Salmon suggests that the extension of the reform beyond the fortified cities was a second phase of the initial reform (Judicial Authority in Early Israel: An Historical Investigation of Old Testament Institutions [Ph.D], diss., Princeton Theological Seminary, 1969) 381—82). Rolf Knierim notes that the transition from the older to the new legal systems would take place first in the fortified cities, where the king's authority was most recognized (Exodus 18 and die Neuordnung der mosaischen Gerichtsbarkeit, Zug' 1967 119611 146—71).

"heads of families," assigned to locally based institutions of justice (2 Chr 19:8), are not mentioned in Deuteronomy. This shows the diminished importance of tribal officers and family heads by the time of Deuteronomy. All this suggests that in some respects the source used by the Chronicler was typologically older than the present form of the laws in Deuteronomy.

Jehoshaphat's establishment of a central court in Jerusalem to deal with disputed cases referred to it from local courts also seems historically likely. These cases could be resolved by the establishment of precedents or the formulation of new law. It was at Jerusalem alone that priests served on the judiciary.

Still, the account of the judicial reform in Chronicles is not without its historical problems. The distinction between "matters of the king" and "matters for Yahweh" (2 Chr 19:11) does not seem to be part of Jehoshaphat's reform, but was a later development. Civil law and sacral law were differentiated only when there was no longer a king in Israel. This conclusion casts considerable doubt on the historical character of Amariah, the chief priest, who was in charge of matters dealing with Yahweh, and on Zebadiah, son of Ishmael, leader of the tribe of Judah, who was in charge of matters concerning the king. If this differentiation of duties arose only in the Persian Period, we cannot be sure where the Chronicler got the names of Amariah and Zebadiah.

In sum, the Chronicler's source seems to antedate the final form of Deuteronomy and reflect the period of Jehoshaphat in some matters but seems later than the time of Jehoshaphat and the end of the Southern Kingdom in its distinction between the matters of the king and the matters for Yahweh.

34. Cf. the discussion of homicide in 2 Chr 19:10 and Deut 17:8.
35. The text of 2 Chr 19:8 presents a problem that cannot be conclusively resolved at this time. Did the appointees return to Jerusalem (so MT)? But there is no evidence that the court ever went "on the road"? Or did the court sit, or preside there (so RSV and NRSV, with no notification of the vowel change)? Or did this court decide cases for the inhabitants (cf. LXX, NAB of Jerusalem? The REB reads: "to arbitrate in lawsuits among the inhabitants of the towns" (sic). Whitelam argues against the court in Jerusalem serving as a court of first instance for the inhabitants of Jerusalem (The Just King, 201). It might be suggested, however, that this court resolved disputed cases from the provincial courts and from a lower Jerusalem court.
36. Whitelam, The Just King, 212. Albright did not think there were different courts set up in Jerusalem for religious and civil cases, but the chief priest served as "foreman" in religious cases and the "head of the tribe of Judah" took his place in civil cases ("Judicial Reform," 76).
37. Is Amariah the same as Amariah the son of Azariah and father of Ahitub mentioned in 1 Chr 5:37 16:1117? According to this passage, the temple was built under Azariah's high priesthood.
38. In some respects, therefore, it is later even than the final form of Deuteronomy.
THE INVASION FROM THE EAST (2 CH 20:1—30)

The defensive war against the Moabites, Ammonites, and the sons of Seir," replaces in Chronicles a war against Moab in 2 Kings 3. Martin Noth called attention to the specific place-names in 2 Chr 20:2, 16, 24, and 26, some of which occur nowhere else in the Bible, and suggested that the Chronicler was referring to an actual war in the third century against early Nabateans, who came from Meun, a city near Petra. Rudolph supported Noth on the importance of the specificity of the place-names but argued that the Chronicler used a written source that recorded a much earlier war between an Edomite coalition and Jehoshaphat himself. The Chronicler gloss on Hazazon Tamar, that is Engedi (2 Chr 20:2), was taken by Rudolph as evidence for his using an earlier account. Rudolph's position has been adopted with some variations by Williamson, who proposes that the etymological etiology of v. 26' was added secondarily to an earlier account that lacked it. Williamson believes that the Chronicler took an originally fairly insignificant incident and magnified it for didactic reasons.

Welten finds no evidence for an earlier source for this battle. He conjectures that tension with enemies contemporary to the Chronicler, the Moabites, Ammonites, and Idumeans, are dramatized in an invented conflict assigned to a narrow geographical region. He finds such a programmatic style of history writing also in 2 Chr 13:3—20 and 14:8—14.

In my judgment the Noth argument, as refined by Rudolph and others, is the best interpretation of the historical background of this invasion from the cast. But two cautions suggest themselves:

39. Cf. the LXX; the MT repeats Ammonites. The Meunites are named after a town. Maon, 10 km. south of Hebron (cf. 1 Chr 4:41, 2 Chr 26:7). The Chronicler identified the Meunim with Seir.
40. 2 Chr 20:1(1, 22-23. Verse 2 associates the coalition with Ararat, presumably a mistake for the graphically similar Edom.
41. Noah believed that Moab and Ammon had been added by the Chronicler ("Eine palastinische Lokalüberlieferung in 2 Chr. 20" ZDPV 67 (1945) 45-71). The two nations, however, seem to be necessary to the plot's development. Verse 23, for example, has Moab and Ammon fight against the inhabitants of Seir before they turn and kill each other.
42. Rudolph, Chronikbücher, 259.
43. "They gathered together in the valley of Zeracah; for there they blessed Yahweh. Therefore, they call the name of that place the Valley of Blessing until this day"
44. Mk-heel argues that the etiology comes from oral tradition and that it was associated with this battle because of its similarity to the Valley of Jehoshaphat in Joel 413:2, 12 (Seher und Propheten Überlieferungen, 51).
45. Welten, Geschichte, 140-33. Cf. Strübing, Tradition als Interpretation, 176-188.
(1) The data from this supposed source are quite fragmentary and the actual war reported of such minor significance that we learn very little about the historical Jehoshaphat by retrieving this nugget of history. The conduct of the war is purely liturgical and is recorded in a way meant to support the theological agenda of the Chronicler.

(2) Arguments based on specific geographical notices or on names of individuals are precarious. We were inclined to accept the authenticity of the names of the commanders of Judah and Benjamin who were stationed in Jerusalem, but we found little to support the authenticity of the names Amariah and Zebadiah, who supposedly dealt with religious and secular matters under Jehoshaphat, but who may in fact have only served as models for the dyarchy of the Persian Period. Abijah's campaign against the North has also been seen to preserve several place-names that undergirded the historical character of the war account, though I believe that these names were drawn from an interpretation of the tribal lists in the book of Joshua.

David L. Petersen has presented a strong case that the purpose of 2 Chronicles 20 was to show that the Levitical singers in postexilic times ought to take the place of the preexilic prophets. Jahaziel's prophetic speech assures Israel that the war is not theirs, but Yahweh's, and that victory will come solely by divine intervention (2 Chr 20:15-17). Jehoshaphat confirms the significance of the prophets when he says, "Believe in Yahweh and you will be made firm; believe in his prophets and succeed" (v. 20). By "prophets" Jehoshaphat would seem to be referring to Isaiah, whose famous wordplay in Isa 7:9 is alluded to in Jahaziel himself, and to Jahaziel's fellow Levites who are Kohathites, or more especially Korahites (v. 19)." The main burden of the chapter is to authenticate the role such Levitic singer-prophets were playing in the cult at the Chronicler's time.

Whatever meager historical information from the time of Jehoshaphat can he recovered from 2 Chronicles 20 the Chronicler supplements with other words that are to be ascribed to his own literary palette and to his own particular theological emphases: the speech of Jehoshaphat in

46. Ralph W. Klein, "Abijah's Campaign against the North (II Chr 13): What Were the Chronicler's Sources?" ZAII' 95 (1983) 210-17.
47. The NRSV seems to have a defective translation: "Believe in the Lord your God and you will be established; believe his prophets."
48. "If you do not stand firm in faith, you shall not stand firm at all:"
49. Simon J. DeVries suggests that Korah's presence alongside Kohath reflects a stage of tradition development that may be contemporary with the Chronicler himself (1 and 2 Chronicles, FOTL 11; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1989 328). Williamson, however, proposes that the idea of the Korahites as singers stems from the Chronicler's sources (1 and 2 Chronicles, 299).
vv. 6-12, the role of the Levitical singer-prophets, the words of Jahaziel that attribute victory in this war to divine intervention, the resultant panic in which the enemies kill one another, the passive role of the people in the battle, and their subsequent three-day gathering of booty. None of these expansions of the "original" battle account is ascribed to the era of Jehoshaphat by modern historians. A final reference to "The fear of God coming on all the kingdoms of the lands" recalls 2 Chr 17:10: "The fear of Yahweh fell on all the kingdoms of the lands." As a result of Jehoshaphat's piety in the judicial reform and his exemplary role in the battle of 2 Chronicles 20, the Chronicler notes that Jehoshaphat and his kingdom had divinely given rest all around (2 Chr 20:30)."

**FINAL REPORTS ON JEHOSHAPHAT**

*2 Chr 20:31—34 // 1 Kgs 22:41—48*

The Chronicler, as usual, omits the synchronism with the Northern Kingdom (1 Kgs 22:41 b) but otherwise retains the essence of 1 Kgs 22:41—44."

The Chronicler omits 1 Kgs 22:45, which reported Jehoshaphat's making peace with the king of Israel, although he has his own version of such alliances in 2 Chronicles 18 (the war with Ahab against Ramothgilead), as well as the subsequent pact with Ahaziah (see below). He changes the generic source reference of 1 Kgs 22:46 ("the book of the Chronicles of the kings of Judah") to a more specific form ("the words of Jehu son of Hanani which are recorded in the book of the kings of Israel" 12 Chr 20:34). This follows a frequent pattern of ascribing prophetic designations to source documents. Since the source references usually appear at the same point in Kings and Chronicles, it is unlikely that the Chronicler had a differently named source document, and it is

---

50. Jehoshaphat also invoked the tear of God on the judges in 2 Chr 19:7.
51. Cf. 2 Chr 13:23; 14:4, 5 (Asa); 23:21 (after the overthrow of Athaliah).
52. The difference between the Chronicler's interpretation of the people's failure to remove the high places (2 Chr 21:33) and the interpretation found in the Deuteronomistic History (1 Kgs 22:44) shows that for the Chronicler such apostasy was more an inner failure of the heart rather than the outward performance of sacrifices. In 2 Chr 17:6 the Chronicler noted that Jehoshaphat had removed the high places. Because of this discrepancy with v. 33 and the contrast between the people's faithlessness in v. 33 and their faithfulness throughout the rest of 2 Chronicles 20, Rudolph (*Chronikbicher*, 263) identifies v. 33 as secondary. For other reasons he also dismisses vv. 31—32.
53. Contra McKenzie, who concludes: "Source notices like the one in 2 Chron 20:34 were clearly derived from a source other than K.... 2 Chr 20:35—37 may also come from
also unlikely that he had access to the source document alluded to in Kings.

Two additional notes from 1 Kings are omitted: v. 47, which refers to Jehoshaphat's abolition of the rest of the haqqadesh ('male temple prostitutes': NRSV), who were left from the time of Asa, and the reference in v. 48 to the fact that there was no king of Edom in Jehoshaphat's day, only a deputy (nissāb). In Kings this note about the governance of Edom prepares the reader for the change in 2 Kings 3, where Edom is led in battle by its king. Since the latter account is omitted by the Chronicler, the note in 1 Kgs 22:48 may not have seemed necessary to the Chronicler.

2 Chr 20:35—37 // 9 Kgs 22:49—50: The Maritime Adventure with Ahaziah

The two reports about the maritime adventure with Ahaziah differ strikingly from one another. According to Kings, Jehoshaphat made ships to go to Ophir, but they never sailed since they were destroyed at Eziongeber. When Ahaziah subsequently requested Jehoshaphat to let the servants of the northern king sail with him, the king of Judah refused.

According to Chronicles, Jehoshaphat's pact with Ahaziah to build ships came first and was judged by the Chronicler as evil. Hence Eliezer the son of Dodavahu prophesied against Jehoshaphat because he had made a treaty with his northern counterpart. Eliezer announced that Yahweh would punish the king by destroying what he had made. Hence the ships were broken up and unable to sail to Tarshish. By putting the pact with Ahaziah before the destruction of the ships, the Chronicler continues his ambivalent picture of Jehoshaphat and provides another example of immediate retribution. Jehoshaphat thus experienced wrath.” Michelson concludes that the Chronicler had no other source than Kings (contra Rudolph) for this maritime adventure and that the changes in the

---

a source outside of K.... Thus the omission of 1 K 22:47—48 may be due to Chr’s use of another source” (The Chronicler’s Use, 87).

54. Willi believes that the Chronicler changed the sequence of events because he considered it irrational (‘Insinn) that Ahaziah would offer servants and Jehoshaphat would refuse this offer after the ships were already wrecked (Die Chronik als Auslegung (FRLANT 106; Gottingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1972: 221). The Chronicler may have understood 1 Kgs 22:51 as follows: ‘At that time Ahaziah had said...’ Ahaziah’s speech referred to the building of the ships, as well as to a joint sailing expedition. For the Chronicler the bad alliance guaranteed that the ships would be destroyed before sailing.

55. The LORD will destroy what you have made” (2 Chr 20:37). The verb is used in 1 Chr 13:11 to indicate the way in which God’s anger broke forth against Uzziah.
place-names in this section also come from the Chronicler.” Eliezer is a common name in post-exilic materials, but we have no way of knowing whether the Chronicler selected this name or whether the name of this prophet was known to him from tradition. Eliezer’s speech in any case should be attributed to the Chronicler.

2 Chr 21:1 /1 Kgs 22:51

The Chronicler placed the maritime adventure explicitly at the end of Jehoshaphat’s career (“after this,” 2 Chr 20:35). He therefore implies a connection between this failure of the king and his immediate death.”

SUMMARY

I have argued that the Chronicler’s unique account of the judicial re-form of Jehoshaphat was an important event in Israel’s history, though I have questioned whether Jehoshaphat himself would have distinguished so clearly between “matters of Yahweh” and “matters of the king” In certain respects the account of this reform is typologically older than the deuteronomic laws dealing with some of the same issues. The names of the commanders of Judah and Benjamin in 2 Chronicles 17 and the place-names of 2 Chronicles 20 may also indicate access to additional historical information. Even the etiological glosses in 2 Chronicles 20 may help us distinguish between underlying source and present record.

Other items in Chronicles, such as the book of the law in chap. 17 or the war in chap. 20, may have come from sources not now available to us, although in most cases we lack clear means of proving this. The information contained in these hypothetical sources is so minimal or broken that we cannot always be sure what the original story was trying to say or whether tradition has preserved the correct chronological ascription. Such items add very little to our knowledge of Israel’s history. We have no way of proving or disproving the teaching mission of the Levites.

Some items in the Chronicler’s account of Jehoshaphat seem to be nonhistorical: the figures of Amariah and Zebadiah; the huge numbers of

56. Michael, Seher- und Propheten Überlieferungen, 53–54 (cf Willi, Die Chronik, 219 and Michael Fishbane, Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel, Oxford: Clarendon, 19851 402–3). Kings: “ships of Tarshish to go to Ophir Chronicles: “ships to go to Tarshish.” Rudolph ascribes the difference to the Chronicler’s source (Chronikbucher, 265). Strübend points out that “ships of Tarshish” had become a generic designation for large transport ships and that one would never sail to Tartessus in Spain from Ezion-geber (Tradition als Interpretation, 196).

57. Strübend, Tradition als Interpretation, 198.
Jehoshaphat’s troops in Jerusalem, the prophets Jehu ben Hanani and Eliezer ben Dodavahu and their speeches.

Finally, the Chronicler has arranged his materials in a particular order and made theological additions to them so that the account as a whole reflects the Chronicler’s own theological agenda. Note especially:

• His placement of the judicial reform (2 Chr 19:4—11) and of the war against Edom (2 Chronicles 20) so that these accounts might demonstrate the good that was found in Jehoshaphat by Jehu (2 Chr 19:3)
• His changes in the Ahaziah maritime adventure (2 Chr 20:35—37)
• His additions at the beginning and end of the joint war with Ahab
• His creation of the prayer (2 Chr 20:6—12) and speech of Jehoshaphat (2 Chr 20:20), as well as the prophetic speech of Jehaziel (2 Chr 20:15—17)

Although Albright sometimes gave the impression of lending too much support to the alternate historical information in the Chronicler, his admonition to every would-be historian of Israel in this case is still very much worth hearing: "It is incumbent on the historian to accept his material with gratitude, but to sift it with care"