

Josephus' Portrait of Jehoshaphat

Louis H. Feldman

1. Introduction

In the "rewritten Bible" which we find in the first eleven books of Josephus' *Jewish Antiquities*, the greatest interest is in his portrayal of biblical personalities. Though Josephus assures the reader (*AJ* 1.17) that he will throughout his work set forth the precise details of the Scriptures, neither adding nor omitting anything, he modifies the biblical account, largely for apologetic purposes, on almost every page.¹ His portrait of King Jehoshaphat of Judah, one of the rela-

¹ On the apologetic aspects in his treatment of biblical themes see my various essays: "Josephus' Portrait of Noah and Its Parallels in Philo, Pseudo-Philo's *Biblical Antiquities* and Rabbinic Midrashim", *Proceedings of the American Academy for Jewish Research* 55 (1988), 31-57; "Abraham the Greek Philosopher in Josephus", *TAPA* 99 (1968), 143-56; "Abraham the General in Josephus", in *Nourished with Peace: Studies in Hellenistic Judaism in Memory of Samuel Sandmel*, edd. F.E. Greenspahn *et al.* (Chico, CA 1984), 43-49; "Josephus as a Biblical Interpreter; the 'Aqedah'", *JQR* 75 (1984-85), 212-52; "Josephus' Portrait of Jacob", *JQR* 79 (1988-89), 101-51; "Josephus' Portrait of Moses", *JQR* 82 (1991-92), 285-328; "Josephus' Portrait of Joshua", *HTR* 82 (1989), 351-76; "Josephus' Portrait of Deborah", in *Hellenica et Judaica: Hommage à Valentin Nikiprowetzky*, edd. A. Caquot *et al.* (Leuven-Paris 1986), 115-28; "Josephus' Version of Samson", *JSJ* 19 (1988), 171-214; "Josephus' Portrait of Samuel", *Abr-Nahrain* 30 (1992), 103-45; "Josephus' Portrait of Saul", *HUCA* 53 (1982), 45-99; "Josephus' Portrait of David", *HUCA* 60 (1989), 129-74; "Josephus as an Apologist to the Greco-Roman World: His Portrait of Solomon", in *Aspects of Religious Propaganda in Judaism and Early Christianity*, ed. E.S. Fiorenza (Notre Dame 1976), 69-98; "Josephus' Interpretation of Jonah", *Association for Jewish Studies Review* 17 (1992), 1-29; "Josephus' Portrait of Hezekiah", *JBL* 111 (1992), 597-610; "Josephus' Portrait of Daniel", *Henoch* 14 (1992), 37-96; "Josephus' Portrait of Nehemiah", *JJS* 43 (1992), 187-202; "Hellenizations in Josephus' Version of Esther", *TAPA* 101 (1970), 143-70; and, for an overall survey, "Use, Authority, and Exegesis of Mikra in the Writings of Josephus", in *Mikra: Text, Translation, Reading and Interpretation of the Hebrew Bible in Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity. Compendia Rerum Iudaicarum ad Novum Testamentum*, Sect. 2, vol. I, edd. M.J. Mulder and H. Sysling (Assen 1988), 455-518.

tively minor figures in the Bible, will help to answer the question of whether these modifications are chiefly restricted to the major personalities in the Bible.

One indication of the relative importance to Josephus of a given biblical personality is the sheer amount of space that he devotes to him. Thus Josephus has a ratio of 2.7:1 as compared with the Hebrew text² for his account of Saul, 2.21 for Balaam, 2.16 for Jeroboam, 2.01 for Jehu, 2.00 for Joseph (5.45 for the episode of Joseph and Potiphar's wife and 3.28 for the narrative dealing with Joseph's dreams and subsequent enslavement), 1.98 for Ahab, 1.95 for David, 1.93 for Jehoram of Israel, 1.87 for Samuel, 1.83 for Absalom, 1.71 for Josiah, 1.54 for Samson, 1.52 for Elijah, 1.32 for Daniel, 1.20 for Abraham (2.86 for the *Aqedah* episode), 1.20 for Ezra (0.72 as compared with the Greek text of *I Esdras*, which was apparently Josephus' source), 1.15 for Jonah, 1.11 for Elisha, 0.97 for Hezekiah, 0.91 (or discounting the duplicate material in *II Chronicles*, 1.26) for Manasseh, and 0.24 for Nehemiah. By this standard Jehoshaphat is clearly a person of major interest for Josephus, inasmuch as the ratio of Josephus (*AJ* 8.393-9.17, 9.19-44 = 405 lines) to the Hebrew text (*II Ki.* 3.7-27, *II Ch.* 17.1-21.1 = 201 lines) is 2.01, and the ratio of Josephus to the Septuagint text (297 lines)³ is 1.36.⁴

If, as we have noted, Josephus tends in the portraits of his other biblical heroes to gloss over their defects, we shall find interest in what he does with two major flaws of Jehoshaphat as noted in the Bible (*I Kings* 22.43-44), namely the facts that he did not remove the high places of pagan worship and that he made peace with the idol-worshipping king of Israel.

One of the questions which students of Josephus' version of the Bible have long asked is whether Josephus' changes are due to his sources or whether they represent Josephus' own original interpretation.⁵ One indication that Josephus has put his personal imprint upon his version of the Bible is to be found in the

² For Josephus I have used the Loeb Classical Library text. For the Hebrew text I have used the standard edition with the commentary of Meir Loeb Malbim (New York n.d.).

³ One indication that Josephus had a Septuagintal text or a Hebrew text akin to it may be seen in the fact that our Hebrew text (*I Ki.* 22.30) states that when Ahab and Jehoshaphat joined in their war against the Syrian king, Ahab disguised himself but that Jehoshaphat wore his own robe; the Septuagint, however, states that Ahab disguised himself and that Jehoshaphat wore Ahab's clothes. Josephus' version (*AJ* 8.412) is in accordance with the Septuagint in remarking that Ahab and Jehoshaphat agreed that Ahab should remove his royal garment and that Jehoshaphat should wear Ahab's clothes. On the other hand, there is evidence that Josephus used either a Hebrew text or a Lucianic Greek text, rather than the Septuagint (at least as we have it), when he (*AJ* 9.11) reads *στάντας*, "standing" (cf. *II Ch.* 20.17, *imedu*, Lucianic *στῆτε*) whereas the Septuagint reads *σύνετε* ("understand").

⁴ For the Septuagint I have used the text of A. Rahlfs, vol. 1 (Stuttgart 1935).

⁵ See, e.g., my "Josephus' portrait of Saul" (above, n. 1), 96-9.

emphasis upon the priesthood, which we may most readily explain as arising from the fact that Josephus himself was a priest and, indeed, was so proud of his priestly ancestry that this is the first point that he makes in his autobiography (*V* 1). Likewise, he stresses almost immediately afterwards (*V* 2), again with obvious pride, that his mother sprang from the rulers of the Hasmonean dynasty, who were not only kings but also high priests.⁶ Furthermore, at the very beginning of the *BJ* (1.3), in presenting his credentials as a historian, Josephus mentions the fact that he is a priest.

In the case of Jehoshaphat, we may note that whereas the Bible (*II Ch.* 17.7-8) enumerated princes, Levites, and priests whom Jehoshaphat sent to the cities of Judah to teach them the law, Josephus (*AJ* 8.395), in his version, predictably omits the Levites (though nine of them are actually mentioned by name in the biblical narrative), who were the great rivals of the priests during his lifetime.⁷ He likewise (*AJ* 19.6), in enumerating the officers whom Jehoshaphat appointed, omits mention of the Levites (*II Ch.* 19.11).

This emphasis upon the priesthood may also be seen in Josephus' version of the scene where Jehoshaphat is assured by the prophet Jahaziel that G-d Himself will take the initiative in destroying the Ammonites and Moabites. In the biblical account (*II Ch.* 20.21), Jehoshaphat then takes counsel with the people and appoints those who are to sing songs of praise and gratitude to G-d. We are not told who those singers are, but we may assume that they are the Levites. Josephus' Jehoshaphat (*AJ* 9.12), however, while specifying that the singers are, indeed, the Levites, adds that he also appointed at the head of the people priests with their trumpets.⁸

2. The Power of Jehoshaphat

In view of the loss of sovereignty in the war against the Romans, Josephus was faced with the delicate task of, on the one hand, answering the charge that the

⁶ We may note that Josephus (*CA* 1.31-32) emphasizes that before marrying a woman, a priest must investigate her pedigree, "obtaining the genealogy from the archives and producing a number of witnesses".

⁷ Note, for example, Josephus' description (*AJ* 20.216-8) of the Levites' successful efforts in urging King Agrippa II to convene a *synedrion* so that they might obtain permission to wear linen robes on equal terms with the priests, though this was, according to Josephus, contrary to the ancestral laws. On the background of the dispute see Hermann Vogelstein, *Der Kampf zwischen Priestern und Leviten* (Stettin 1889); and Rudolf Meyer, "Levitishe Emanzipationsbestrebungen in nachexilischer Zeit", *OLZ* 41 (1939), 721-8.

⁸ In portraying Jehoshaphat's concern with the Temple Josephus is in accord with rabbinic tradition (*Yevamoth* 7b), which ascribed to him the ordinance forbidding anyone to ascend the Temple Mount whose term of uncleanness had not expired, even though he had taken the ritual bath.

Jews were a race of weaklings, while, on the other hand, making sure not to give the impression that they were so confident of their power as to seek actual independence from Roman rule. His solution is to emphasize that the Jews are a mighty people but loyal to their rulers. This is shown, for example, in Josephus' pride (*CA* 2.49) in the fact that Ptolemy Philometor and his consort Cleopatra in the second century BCE entrusted their entire realm to Jews and placed their army under the command of two Jewish generals, Onias and Dositheus.⁹

Josephus (*AJ* 9.17) developed the theme of Jehoshaphat's power by noting that he joined with King Ahaziah of Israel in building ships to sail as far away as Pontus and the trading-stations of Thrace, whereas the Bible (*II Ch.* 20.36) gives the destination of the ships as Tarshish, which Josephus elsewhere (*AJ* 1.127)

⁹ Similarly, in his version of the Bible and especially in his concern to build up further the personality of Joseph, Josephus exaggerates Joseph's power. Thus, in the biblical version (*Gen* 37.7) the sheaves of Joseph's brothers bow down to his sheaf, whereas in Josephus (*AJ* 2.11) the language is much stronger and the sheaves bow down like slaves before their masters. That Joseph, the prototype of the Jewish public servant, turns out to be the ideal administrator, both loyal to his sovereign and concerned for the welfare of the Egyptian people, is clear from Josephus' paraphrase of the Bible. In the Hebrew (*Gen.* 41.40) Pharaoh tells Joseph: "Thou shalt be over my house, and according to thy word shall all my people be ruled". Josephus (*AJ* 2.89) adds that Pharaoh gave Joseph the power to act as he thought fit "both for the people of Egypt and for their sovereign". Again, whereas the Bible (*Gen.* 41.43) states simply that Pharaoh set Joseph over all the land of Egypt, Josephus (*AJ* 2.90) elaborates on this picture by noting the symbols of Joseph's authority, namely his seal and robes of purple, as well as the chariot in which he drove throughout the land. (Similarly, Philo [*De Josepho* 21.120] mentions that Pharaoh bestowed upon Joseph the royal seal and a sacred robe.) That Joseph is obedient to his sovereign may be inferred from the fact that whereas the Bible (*Gen.* 43.26) says simply that Joseph, as Pharaoh's vizier, came home and greeted his brothers without indicating from what place he was coming, Josephus (*AJ* 2.121), eager to stress Joseph's loyalty to his sovereign, fills this lacuna by stating that he came from his attendance (θεραπειῶς) upon the king. Indeed, Josephus (*AJ* 2.140) strives eagerly to make clear that Joseph had no design to supplant the Pharaoh and consequently omits the biblical statement (*Gen.* 44.18) of Judah to Joseph: "Thou art even as Pharaoh". (The Rabbinic tradition [*Sifre Deuteronomy* 334.3] actually speaks of Joseph as having been appointed "king in Egypt". The Septuagint resolves this delicate problem by reading μετὰ Φαραῶ, that is, as the Vulgate understands it, "after Pharaoh".) Again, Josephus is careful to avoid repeating the Scriptural statement (*Gen.* 45.26) of Joseph's brothers to Jacob that Joseph was the ruler of all the land of Egypt; instead, in Josephus' version (*AJ* 2.168) we read that Jacob was told that Joseph was sharing (συνδιέπων) with the king the government of Egypt and had almost the whole charge of it in his hands. Thus, when G-d describes Joseph's status in the administration of Egypt (*AJ* 2.147) He says that He had made him lord of Egypt and that he differed only slightly (ὡς ὀλίγω) from the status of the king.

identifies as Tarsus in Asia Minor, which is considerably closer to Palestine than Pontus on the Black Sea and Thrace; hence Jehoshaphat's achievement in Josephus' version is considerably greater than it is in the biblical version.

Josephus goes out of his way on more than one occasion to stress Jehoshaphat's loyalty and reliability as an ally. Thus, whereas in the Bible (*II Ki.* 3.8) Jehoram the king of Israel asks his ally Jehoshaphat by which way they should march against the Moabites, he answers very simply, "By the way of wilderness of Edom". Josephus' Jehoshaphat (*AJ* 9.30) goes much further in not only promising to assist Jehoram but also to compel the Idumaeen king, who was under his authority, to join in the campaign against the Moabites.

Regarding the description of the tremendous power of Jehoshaphat, however, Josephus apparently realized the danger that the king might be compared with powerful autocratic rulers. Indeed, in the Bible (*II Ch.* 17.12) we read that he built in Judah fortresses and store-cities (*`arei misekenoth*, Septuagint πόλεις ὄχυράς). The reader may very well be reminded that when the Israelites were afflicted with burdensome labors in Egypt they built store-cities (*`arei misekenoth*, Septuagint πόλεις ὄχυράς, the very same phrase found in *II Chronicles*), namely Pithom and Raameses, for Pharaoh (*Ex.* 1.11). Hence Josephus (*AJ* 8.396), while citing Jehoshaphat's strongholds, avoids mention of the store-cities.

It is surely significant that in the very brief eulogy (*AJ* 9.44) which Josephus appends to his pericope he makes a point of mentioning that Jehoshaphat had been emulous (μιμητής) of the acts of David. Indeed, it is precisely the most outstanding qualities of David which Josephus proceeds to develop in his paraphrase.

3. The Virtues of Jehoshaphat

The great hero, as we see particularly in Josephus' portraits of Abraham, Jacob, Joshua, Samson, Saul, David and Solomon, must be well-born,¹⁰ must have reverence for his parents and ancestors, and must, like Plato's philosopher-king, possess the four cardinal virtues of wisdom, courage, temperance and justice, plus the virtue of piety, which Plato (*Prot.* 349B) already counts as the fifth of the virtues.¹¹ These are virtues which admirers of the Jews, such as Aristotle, Theophrastus, Megasthenes, Hecataeus of Abdera and Varro noted in them, but which their detractors found wanting.¹² The Jewish hero, in addition to being, in

¹⁰ See my "Josephus' Version of Samson" (above, n. 1), 173-6, and "Josephus Portrait of Saul" (above, n. 1), 59-62.

¹¹ Aristotle, *De Virtutibus et Vitiis* 5.1250B22-23, defines piety as either a part of justice or as an accompaniment to it.

¹² See my "Philo-Semitism among Ancient Intellectuals", *Tradition* 1 (1958-59), 27-39; my "Anti-Semitism in the Ancient World", in *History and Hate: The*

effect, a Platonic-like philosopher, must also be a Periclean-like statesman, a high priest and a prophet, all in one. The recitation of his virtues is a veritable aretology, such as was popular in Hellenistic times.¹³ Not all of Josephus' biblical heroes, however, have all of these qualities. Consequently, we may well ask to what degree Jehoshaphat, in Josephus' portrait, attains these ideals. In the case of Jehoshaphat, as we shall see, the virtues which Josephus stresses are courage, justice and piety.

The virtue of courage (ἀνδρεία) in Israelite heroes is stressed by Josephus in a number of additions to the biblical narrative,¹⁴ especially since the Jews had been reproached with cowardice by such critics of the Jews as Apollonius Molon (*apud CA* 2.148). Josephus himself was especially sensitive on this point because he himself had been subjected to such a charge (*BJ* 3.358).

Josephus' Jehoshaphat (*AJ* 8.399), in an extra-biblical addition (*I Ki.* 22.4, *II Ch.* 18.3), is a military general with a force not smaller than Ahab's. Indeed, Josephus (*AJ* 8.399), in a passage that has no biblical parallel (*I Ki.* 22.5) in either the Hebrew or the Septuagint version, paints a picture of Jehoshaphat, prior to the joint expedition with Ahab to recover Ramoth-Gilead, in which he and Ahab sit upon their thrones and distribute pay to their respective armies. The description is highly reminiscent of the scene described by Livy (2.12.7), in which Gaius Mucius Scaevola enters the Etruscan camp at the time when the soldiers are being paid while the king is seated upon his throne.

Jehoshaphat's bravery is likewise accented by the fact that, whereas in the Bible (*I Ki.* 22.30) it is Ahab who takes the initiative before the battle against the king of Syria and says to Jehoshaphat that he, Ahab, would disguise himself while Jehoshaphat would go into battle wearing his own clothes, in Josephus (*AJ* 8.412) it is a joint decision (συνέθεντο) by Ahab and Jehoshaphat; moreover, Jehoshaphat surely needed courage, in Josephus' version, to take his place in battle wearing Ahab's clothes, knowing full well that the enemy would aim at Ahab in particular as the one who had provoked the war.

The scene in the battle with the Syrians (*I Ki.* 22.32; *II Ch.* 18.31) surely does not reflect Jehoshaphat's reputation for bravery, inasmuch as Jehoshaphat is portrayed as crying out when the Syrian captains mistakenly assume that he is Ahab because he is wearing the latter's clothes. The Bible (*II Ch.* 18.31) then declares that it is G-d who rescued him from this dangerous situation. In Jose-

Dimensions of Anti-Semitism, ed. D. Berger (Philadelphia 1988), 15-42; and my "Pro-Jewish Intimations in Anti-Jewish Remarks Cited in Josephus' *Against Apion*", *JQR* 78 (1987-88), 187-251.

¹³ See M. Hadas, "Aretologies and Martyrdoms", in his *Hellenistic Culture: Fusion and Diffusion* (New York 1959), 170-81.

¹⁴ See my articles cited in n. 1 above: "Abraham the General in Josephus"; "Josephus' Portrait of Jacob", 110-12; "Josephus' Portrait of David", 141-7; and "Use, Authority and Exegesis of Mikra in the Writings of Josephus", 490-1.

phus' version (*AJ* 8.414), however, Jehoshaphat does not cry out and he is not rescued by G-d's intervention; rather, we read only that when the Syrians saw that it was not Ahab they themselves turned back.

And yet Josephus, in order to retain his credibility, omits the exaggeration implicit in the biblical account (*II Ch.* 20.1) that a great multitude was coming to attack Jehoshaphat from Edom, from beyond the sea. If this were true, it would, of course, magnify the achievement of Jehoshaphat in overcoming such a vast enemy, coming as if from afar. But Josephus is content (*AJ* 9.7) to say that the attackers included a large division of Arabs and says nothing of their coming from beyond the sea.

Josephus is concerned not to give the impression that Jehoshaphat had lost confidence in himself, as would seem to be apparent from the biblical statement (*II Ch.* 20.12) that he is powerless against the great multitude arrayed against him and that he did not know what to do. Josephus' Jehoshaphat (*AJ* 9.9) prays to G-d to protect the city but gives no indication that he himself is powerless.

The virtue of justice (δικαιοσύνη), it will be recalled, is the centerpiece of Plato's *Republic*. Josephus' (*AJ* 6.305, 13.294) identification of justice with law must have powerfully appealed to the Romans in his audience, who placed such a premium upon the rule of law and who were so proud of their achievements in this field. Josephus (*AJ* 16.176) boastfully remarks that while customs vary even within a given nation, justice is regarded as most useful by both Greeks and non-Greeks, and that the laws of the Jews have the greatest sense of justice, so that, if they are properly kept, one must be kind and friendly to all men. He (*CA* 1.60) remarks that the Jews strive especially to educate their children to keep the laws and the ancient piety. Indeed, the importance of justice as an attribute of the biblical heroes is constantly stressed by Josephus in extra-biblical additions;¹⁵ in particular, it is an attribute of the three patriarchs — Abraham, Isaac and Jacob — as we see, for example, in Nehemiah's extra-biblical remarks (*AJ* 11.169) in his address to the people. That the quality of justice is particularly prominent in Jehoshaphat is evident from the fact that despite the relative brevity of the pericope about Jehoshaphat the adjective δίκαιος is found no fewer than six times (*AJ* 8.394, 9.4, 9.5 [*bis*], 9.33, 9.35) and the noun δικαιοσύνη is found once (*AJ* 9.16).

This emphasis upon the importance of justice may be seen in the instructions which Jehoshaphat gives to the judges of his realm. The biblical version (*II Ch.* 19.6) places the emphasis upon the fact that it is G-d and not man for whom they judge and that therefore they should have the fear of the L-rd. He continues (*II Ch.* 19.9-10), stressing the guilt that they will feel and the wrath of G-d which

¹⁵ See my articles cited in n. 1 above: "Josephus' portrait of Jacob", 112-3; "Josephus' Portrait of Joshua", 362-4; "Josephus' Version of Samson", 190-2; "Josephus' Portrait of Saul", 82-83; "Josephus' Portrait of David", 150-6; and "Use, Authority and Exegesis of Mikra in the Writings of Josephus", 492-3.

will afflict them if they judge improperly. Josephus (*AJ* 9.3), in his version, omits the elements of fear and guilt and stresses instead that judges should take thought of nothing so much as justice in judging the multitude and that G-d sees everything that is done even in secret. He adds (*AJ* 9.5) an additional reason why judges should exercise the greatest care, namely that Jerusalem, which is the seat of judgement, is the site of the Temple of G-d. We may note that such a remark comes most appropriately from Josephus, as a priest of that Temple.

Coupled with justice is the virtue of humanity (φιλανθρωπία), as we see in Philo.¹⁶ An integral part of φιλανθρωπία is the virtue of showing gratitude.¹⁷ In the case of Jehoshaphat, although there is no indication in the Bible (*II Ch.* 19.4) that he expressed gratitude to G-d after managing to survive the rout of his forces by the Syrians, Josephus (*AJ* 9.2) specifically declares that Jehoshaphat thereupon betook himself to give thanks and offer sacrifices to G-d. Jehoshaphat likewise shows gratitude in Josephus' version when the prophet Jahaziel declares that G-d will fight for Judah. According to the Bible (*II Ch.* 20.18), Jehoshaphat bowed his head with his face to the ground. Josephus adds (*AJ* 9.11) that Jehoshaphat and the multitude gave thanks to G-d, as well as showing obeisance to Him.

Piety (εὐσέβεια), a cardinal virtue, as we see in Plato (*Prot.* 330B, 349B) and in the Stoics (*SVF* 3.64.40 and *D.L.* 7.119), was likewise especially important for the Romans, as may be perceived in the fact that the key quality of Aeneas in Virgil's great national poem is *pietas*. Hence it is not surprising that this virtue is, as Attridge notes,¹⁸ exemplified in almost every major character in Josephus. That it is particularly prominent in Jehoshaphat may be seen in the fact that the

¹⁶ Philo, *De Mutatione Nominum* 40.225; *De Vita Mosis* 2.2.9; *De Decalogo* 30.164. See the discussion by H.A. Wolfson, *Philo: Foundations of Religious Philosophy in Judaism, Christianity, and Islam* II (Cambridge, Mass. 1947), 220 n. 146.

¹⁷ Isaac exhibits this quality in particular in his relations with Abimelech. Indeed, according to Josephus' extra-biblical comment (*AJ* 1.264; cf. *Gen.* 26.30-31), Isaac set more store on ancient favors bestowed upon himself and his father than on recent indignation. Josephus consequently cites this as an example of Isaac's good nature (χρηστότητα). This quality of good nature is particularly characteristic of Abraham (*AJ* 1.200); and it is noteworthy that Eliezer commends Rebecca for her possession of this quality (*AJ* 1.247). Again, Josephus (*AJ* 7.111) elaborates on the concern which David shows for the remnant of the house of Saul (*II Sam.* 9.1), adding, in particular, that beside all the other qualities which he possessed was the virtue of being ever mindful of those who had benefited him at any time. Moreover, Josephus (*AJ* 7.272) spells out the way in which David would show his gratitude to Barzillai for providing him with sustenance, namely that he would cherish him in old age with every honor; he also promises to take care of him and to provide for him.

¹⁸ H.W. Attridge, *The Interpretation of Biblical History in the Antiquitates Judaicae of Flavius Josephus* (Missoula 1976), 116.

noun εὐσέβεια occurs twice (*AJ* 9.2, 9.16) and the adjectives εὐσεβής and ὅσιος once each (*AJ* 8.394, 9.35) in the pericope.

We may see the emphasis which Josephus places on Jehoshaphat's piety¹⁹ in his version of the biblical statement (*II Ch.* 17.7-9) that Jehoshaphat sent princes, Levites and priests to teach in the cities of Judah. Josephus' Jehoshaphat shows more forceful initiative and leadership (*AJ* 8.395) in summoning (συγκαλέσας) the governors and priests; we read, furthermore, that he kept on ordering them (ἐκέλευεν, note the force of the imperfect tense) to go not merely to Judah in general but throughout the land, indeed city by city, and not merely to teach but to teach all the people. Moreover, it is not merely, as in the Bible, that these representatives have the book of the law of G-d with them: they teach the people not merely to know but to practice the laws of Moses — "both to keep them and to be diligent in worshipping G-d". The result as stated in the Bible (*II Ch.* 17.10) is that the fear of the L-rd fell upon the people, whereas in Josephus' pericope (*AJ* 8.395) we are told that there was nothing for which the people were so ambitious and so disposed to love as the observance of the laws.

Another indication of Jehoshaphat's piety may be seen in Josephus' addition (*AJ* 8.402) to Jehoshaphat's question in the Bible (*I Ki.* 22.7, *II Ch.* 18.6), prior to the campaign to recover Ramoth-Gilead and after the false prophets foretell victory, whether there is not another prophet of whom they might inquire. In Josephus' version we are told that Jehoshaphat was able to discern from their words that they were false prophets. At that point, whereas in the Bible (*I Ki.* 22.8-9, *II Ch.* 18.7-8) it is Ahab who then summons an officer with instructions to fetch Micaiah the prophet, in Josephus (*AJ* 8.403) it is Jehoshaphat who takes the initiative in bidding (κελεύσαντος) that Micaiah be produced.

In particular we may note that the juxtaposition of justice and piety is frequent in Josephus' additions to the biblical text.²⁰ Thus, almost at the very beginning of his account of Jehoshaphat (*AJ* 8.394) — in contrast to the biblical narrative (*II Ch.* 17.3) which states that G-d was with Jehoshaphat because he followed the ways of his father — Josephus' Jehoshaphat stands on his own feet, with no mention of his father; and the reason why he wins the favorable (εὐμενές) response of G-d is that he is just (δίκαιος) and pious (εὐσεβής) and that he daily sought to do something pleasing (ἡδύ) and acceptable (προσηνές)

¹⁹ The rabbis similarly (*Berakhoth* 10a, Jerusalem *Berakhoth* 9.13b, *Midrash Psalms* 4.3, cited by L. Ginzberg, *The Legends of the Jews* VI [Philadelphia 1928], 310 n. 30) highlight Jehoshaphat's tremendous faith in G-d, which is the cornerstone of his piety; they note that in the war against the Aramaeans, despite the fact that an enemy held his sword at Jehoshaphat's very throat, the king entreated the help of G-d, and it was granted.

²⁰ See Attridge (above, n. 20), 115-6 n. 3. So also Dionysius of Halicarnassus (2.62.5), who remarks that the great Roman lawgiver, Numa Pompilius, introduced two virtues through which the city would be prosperous — justice and piety.

to G-d. Another instance of the effective juxtaposition of Jehoshaphat's justice and piety may be seen in Josephus' version (*AJ* 9.16) of the aftermath of the miraculous victory over Ammon and Moab. Whereas the Bible (*II Ch.* 20.30) says that thereafter the realm of Jehoshaphat was quiet, Josephus (*AJ* 9.16) shifts the emphasis again to Jehoshaphat himself, remarking that from that time onward he enjoyed splendid fame because of his righteousness (δικαιοσύνη) and his piety (εὐσεβεία) toward G-d. Likewise, in an extra-biblical addition (*AJ* 9.35), when the prophet Elisha is consulted by the allied kings of Israel, Judah and Idumaea at a time of severe drought, Elisha swears that he would not answer them were it not for the sake of Jehoshaphat, who was a holy (ἅγιον) and a righteous (δικαίον) man.

Josephus does much to emphasize the role of Jehoshaphat in bringing his subjects back to the observance of the Torah. Thus, in the Bible (*II Ch.* 19.4) we are told only that Jehoshaphat brought his subjects back to G-d, whereas Josephus (*AJ* 9.2) explicitly declares how he did this, namely by teaching the people thoroughly both the laws given by G-d and the piety (εὐσεβείαν) to be shown Him.

Jehoshaphat's religious sincerity in Josephus may be seen in another contrast: in the biblical version (*II Ch.* 20.5-12), when the Moabites and the Ammonites come to do battle with Jehoshaphat, he prays to G-d stating that he is powerless against the enemy, but Josephus portrays him (*AJ* 9.9) as showing his true sincerity and sympathy for his people by breaking down in tears.²¹

Another contrast with the biblical account brings out the extent of Jehoshaphat's piety in Josephus. In *II Ch.* 20.20, when his people are beset by the Moabites and the Ammonites, Jehoshaphat tells them to believe in G-d and His prophets, whereas in *AJ* 9.12 he spells out that they must show their faith in the prophet Jahaziel by actually refusing to array themselves for battle, although that would naturally have seemed the wise thing to do. Again, whereas in the Bible (*II Ch.* 20.21) Jehoshaphat tells his subjects to give thanks to G-d, since His steadfast love endures forever, in Josephus (*AJ* 9.12) Jehoshaphat goes so far as to tell his subjects to give thanks as if He had already delivered their country from the enemy, even though this is far from the case since the enemy's huge force had not yet attacked.

Again, whereas in the Bible (*II Ch.* 20.26) it is the people of Judah who bless the L-rd for the victory over Ammon and Moab, in Josephus (*AJ* 9.14) the focus is on Jehoshaphat. It is he who looks out over the valley where the enemy had

²¹ The favorable view of this crying here does not contradict Josephus' omission of Jehoshaphat's crying (*AJ* 8.414) in the incident where the Syrians mistakenly assume that he is Ahab. The latter, we may note, is a military situation where crying would indicate cowardice, whereas in *II Ch.* 20.5-12 and *AJ* 9.9 the crying is portrayed as a religious act of praying to G-d.

encamped and sees it full of corpses, whereupon he rejoices at the wonderful way in which G-d had helped his nation, so that with no effort on their part He had by Himself given them victory.

Moreover, once they had heard about the miraculous defeat of the Ammonites and Moabites, all the nations, we are told (*II Ch.* 20.29) developed fear of G-d. In Josephus' version (*AJ* 9.16), however, they are struck with terror not of G-d but of Jehoshaphat, since they felt sure that G-d would henceforth fight on his side.

4. Political Theory

The underlying theme of Josephus' *BJ* is to emphasize (1.10) that the responsibility for the ill-fated revolt was the civil strife (στάσις οικεία) engendered by the Jewish "tyrants" (οἱ Ἰουδαίων τύραννοι). He contrasts (*BJ* 1.27) the brutal treatment by these tyrants of their fellow-countrymen (ὁμοφύλους) with the clemency which the Romans showed toward the Jews, even though they were an alien race (ἄλλοφύλους).

The same theme of the dreadful consequences of civil strife pervades much of his paraphrase of the Bible in the *Antiquities*. In his *prooemium*, Josephus (*AJ* 1.5) sets forth as the goal of his work that it should embrace not only the entire ancient history of the Jews but also an evaluation of their political constitution (διάταξιν τοῦ πολιτεύματος). He appeals to his politically minded audience by stressing the theme of civil strife (στάσις), so familiar to readers of Thucydides' description (3.82-84) of revolution at Corcyra.²²

²² Thus Josephus portrays (*AJ* 1.117) the punishment inflicted by G-d upon the builders of the Tower of Babel as discord (στάσις, a word not found in the Septuagint version, *Gen.* 11.9), created by having them speak various languages. Again, according to Josephus' addition (*AJ* 1.164), G-d thwarted Pharaoh's unjust passion toward Sarah by bringing about an outbreak of disease and of political strife (στάσει τῶν πραγμάτων). Similarly, in his treatment of the rebellion of Korah, Josephus (*AJ* 4.12) remarks that it was a sedition (στάσις) "for which we know of no parallel, whether among Greeks or barbarians", clearly implying that information about seditions was familiar to his readers. Likewise, in discussing the consequences of the seduction of the Hebrew youth by the Midianite women, Josephus (*AJ* 4.140) remarks that the whole army was soon permeated by a sedition far worse than that of Korah. Indeed, a good portion of Book 4 (11-66, 141-155) of the *Antiquities* is devoted to accounts that illustrate the degree to which στάσις is the mortal enemy of political states, a subject particularly stressed by Josephus as a comment on the warring factions among his contemporary Jews during the war against the Romans. In particular, the ruler must himself observe the law and stress the importance of its observance among the people. This is particularly the case in Josephus' depiction of David and Solomon; see *AJ* 7.130, 338, 373-374, and the comments by S. Schwartz, *Josephus and Judaeen Politics* (Leiden 1990), 180-1.

Indeed, when the Kingdom of Israel comes to an end and Josephus (*AJ* 9.282) seeks to analyze the underlying cause of its demise, he insists that the beginning of Israel's troubles was the rebellion which it undertook against the legitimate king, Rehoboam, when it chose Jeroboam as king. It is almost as if Josephus is analyzing the demise of the Jewish state of his own day, which he likewise ascribes to the rebellion against the legitimate authority, in this case, Rome. In a word, Josephus (*AJ* 9.282) points his finger at Jeroboam's lawlessness (παρανομίαν), the very quality which he denounces in the revolutionaries, particularly in his bitter attack on the Sicarii (*BJ* 7.262) as the first to set the example of lawlessness (παρανομίας) and cruelty (ώμότητος) to their kinsmen.²³ Furthermore, David (*AJ* 7.198) complains that, in addition to ingratitude, Absalom has been guilty of the much greater sin of lawlessness (παρανομωτέροις) in having designs upon the kingship. These designs, he says, are doubly sinful in that the kingship had not been given to him by G-d. To the Romans, who had such a deep and long-standing reverence for law and who were so proud of their legal tradition, such attacks on Jeroboam and Absalom for their lawlessness would be most impressive.

It is likewise significant that whereas the Bible (*II Ch.* 17.4), in praising Jehoshaphat, declares that he did not follow in the ways of the kingdom of Israel, Josephus (*AJ* 8.394), in his clear desire to promote the unity of the Jewish people, omits all reference to the ways of Israel and says, rather, that Jehoshaphat sought to do something pleasing and acceptable to G-d.

It is furthermore in the interest of stressing the importance of the unity of the Jewish people that Josephus avoids the awkward implication of the Scriptural passage (*II Ch.* 18.1-2) that after making a marriage alliance with Ahab, the king of Israel, Jehoshaphat waited several years before visiting Ahab. Josephus (*AJ* 8.398) has quietly reduced the years to "some time" (μετὰ χρόνον τινά). Likewise, whereas the Bible (*II Ch.* 18.2) states that it was by guile that Ahab persuaded (*vayesithehu*) Jehoshaphat, Josephus (*AJ* 8.398), seeking to smooth relations between the Jewish kingdoms, says Ahab invited (παρεκάλεσε) Jehoshaphat to become his ally in a war against the king of Syria. Indeed, Josephus (*AJ* 8.398) increases considerably the warmth with which Ahab greeted Je-

²³ It is this lawlessness (παρανομίαν) and iniquity (ἀδικίας) which Josephus (*AJ* 8.314), in an editorial comment not found in his biblical source (*I Ki.* 15.24), stresses brought about the destruction of the kings of Israel, one after the other, in a short space of time. That Jeroboam is, for Josephus, the model of lawlessness may be discerned by comparing the Bible (*I Ki.* 16.30), which speaks of the evil which Ahab did but which does not mention Jeroboam, and Josephus' statement (*AJ* 8.316) that Ahab did not invent anything in his wickedness but merely imitated the misdeeds and outrageous behavior (ὑβρίν) which his predecessors showed toward G-d; of these predecessors and their misdeeds, Josephus here singles out Jeroboam and his lawlessness (παρανομίαν).

hoshaphat. Thus, according to the biblical account (*II Ch.* 18.2), Ahab killed an abundance of sheep and oxen for Jehoshaphat and for the people with him; Josephus expands on this, remarking that Ahab gave him a friendly welcome (φιλοφρόνως) and splendidly (λαμπρῶς) entertained, with an abundance of grain and wine and meat, the army which accompanied him.

Likewise, when Ahab approaches Jehoshaphat to induce him to join in the military action to recover Ramoth-Gilead, the Bible (*I Ki.* 22.4, *II Ch.* 18.3) quotes Jehoshaphat as saying, "I am as you are, my people as your people". Josephus (*AJ* 8.399) amplifies this, remarking that Jehoshaphat willingly offered his aid, and adds, in order that the reader may not think that Jehoshaphat was inferior in military might to Ahab, that he had a force not smaller than Ahab's.

Josephus could not avoid the fact that Jehu the prophet in the biblical account (*II Ch.* 19.2) reproaches Jehoshaphat, telling him that because he had helped Ahab G-d was angry with him. Josephus (*AJ* 9.1), however, softens the reproach by having Jehu remark that G-d was displeased (ἀρδῶς) with this act.

Again, the Bible (*II Ch.* 20.37) contains the castigation of Jehoshaphat by Eliezer the son of Dodavahu for joining Ahaziah, the king of Israel, in an alliance, and records his prophecy that as a result of this alliance G-d would destroy what they had made, namely the fleet of ships which they built in Etzion-Geber. Josephus (*AJ* 9.17), eager to promote the unity of the Jewish people, sidesteps this condemnation and instead ascribes the loss of the ships to their great size.²⁴

This same theme of Jewish unity may be seen in another Josephan addition. The Bible (*II Ki.* 3.9) states that the kings of Israel, Judah and Edom joined in their expedition against the Moabites. Josephus (*AJ* 9.31), clearly seeking to show that the alliance was more than one of convenience, adds that Jehoram, the king of Israel, came first to Jerusalem with his army and received a splendid reception by Jehoshaphat. We then see that Jehoram and Jehoshaphat are true partners in forming their military strategy. In the Bible (*II Ki.* 3.8) it is Jehoram who makes the decision as to military strategy after asking Jehoshaphat for advice as to which way they should march; in Josephus the decision is a joint decision to advance through the wilderness of Idumaea, since the enemy would not expect them to attack by this road. Again, when their army lacks water Jehoshaphat, in an extra-biblical addition (*AJ* 9.33), shows warm, brotherly feeling for Jehoram by comforting him; and this feeling is described as characteristic of his righteousness.

²⁴ In contrast, the rabbinic tradition (*Avoth de-Rabbi Nathan* 9.42, *Alphabet of Ben Sira* 14a, cited by Ginzberg [above, n. 19], 310 n. 27), emphasizes that Jehoshaphat was punished for his friendship with the kings of Israel by having his fleet destroyed. Indeed, we hear (*Seder Olam* 17), that G-d had actually condemned Jehoshaphat to death for having joined Ahab in war and that he was saved only by his prayer.

5. Apologetics

One of Josephus' aims in his rewriting of Scripture is to make the account more credible. Thus he diminishes the role of G-d and often employs the time-honored formula of allowing the reader to make up his mind about miracles.²⁵ Similarly, he avoids grotesque elements, such as the exaggerated portrayal of Samson's strength, which we find in rabbinic literature and in Pseudo-Philo's *Biblical Antiquities*.²⁶ Likewise, while wishing to emphasize the size and power of Jehoshaphat's military forces, he apparently felt that it would be hard to believe the Bible's statement (*II Ch.* 17.15) that the tiny state of Judah could have produced an army of 280,000 under Jehoshaphat's general Jehohanan and another army of 200,000 under his general Amasiah (*II Ch.* 17.16). Hence, Josephus (*AJ* 8.397) has reduced the size of Jehohanan's army to 200,000 and has omitted Amasiah's army altogether. Likewise, while it is certainly flattering to Jehoshaphat's power to read (*II Ch.* 17.11) that the Arabs brought him as tribute 7700 rams and 7000 he-goats, Josephus (*AJ* 8.396) avoids the apparent exaggeration by dividing it up into an annual tribute of 360 lambs and 360 kids.²⁷

One of the recurrent charges against the Jews is hatred of mankind. Even Hecataeus (*apud* Diod. Sic. 40.3.4), who is otherwise well-disposed toward the Jews, describes the Jewish way of life as "somewhat unsocial" (ἀπάνθρωπὸν τινὰ) and hostile to foreigners (μισόξενον). Throughout his *Antiquities* Josephus is concerned with refuting these charges.²⁸ It is in line with this tolerant attitude toward the religions of others that we find Josephus (*AJ* 8.394) omitting the biblical statement (*II Ch.* 17.3) that Jehoshaphat did not seek the Baalim. Likewise, he omits (*AJ* 8.394) the Bible's statement (*II Ch.* 17.6) that Jehoshaphat removed the pagan high places and the Asherim from the land of Judah.²⁹ In-

²⁵ See my "Use, Authority and Exegesis of Mikra in the Writings of Josephus" (above, n. 1), 503-7.

²⁶ See my "Josephus' Version of Samson" (above, n. 1), 183-9.

²⁷ The rabbis, on the contrary, exaggerate Jehoshaphat's power tremendously. Thus we hear (*Midrash Psalms* 15.118) that each division in Jehoshaphat's army consisted of not less than 160,000 warriors.

²⁸ Thus Josephus notes that Abraham is moved by compassion for his friends and neighbors the Sodomites (*AJ* 1.176), that Joseph sells grain to all people and not merely to native Egyptians (*AJ* 2.94 and 2.101), that David, far from being a misanthrope, is a φιλόανθρωπος, and that Solomon asks that G-d grant the prayers not only of Jews but also of foreigners (*AJ* 8.116-7). Jews, says Josephus (*AJ* 4.207 and *CA* 2.237), following the Septuagint (*Ex.* 22.28), are forbidden by the Torah to blaspheme the gods of others out of respect for the very word "god". See my "Use, Authority and Exegesis of Mikra in the Writings of Josephus" (above, n. 1), 494-6.

²⁹ Perhaps Josephus was troubled by the fact that the Bible seems to contradict itself on this point, inasmuch as *I Kings* 22.34 says specifically that during Jehoshaphat's

deed, whereas, according to the Bible (*II Ch.* 19.3), the prophet Jehu, after reproaching Jehoshaphat for joining Ahab in a military alliance, remarks that he did well by destroying the Asherim, Josephus (*AJ* 9.1) very diplomatically omits mention of Jehoshaphat's destruction of the Asherim since this would imply disrespect for the religion of others, and instead declares in the vaguest terms that he would be delivered from his enemies, despite having sinned, because of his good character (φύσιν).

This emphasis upon Jehoshaphat's liberal attitude toward pagans may be seen in Josephus' version of the biblical remark (*II Ch.* 17.10) that the reason why the neighboring kingdoms did not make war against Jehoshaphat was that the fear of the L-rd fell upon them. In Josephus' version (*AJ* 8.396) this fear is replaced by a positive feeling of love, since we read that the neighboring peoples continued to cherish (στέργοντες) him.

Moreover, Josephus, from his own experience with the Romans in the Jewish revolt of 66-74, was well aware of the concept of a "just war", which must be waged only when there is clear evidence of an unjust assault and when all attempts at a peaceful solution have failed.³⁰ Hence, it is significant that whereas the biblical context (*I Ki.* 22.3) states merely that Ahab told the servants of Jehoshaphat that Ramoth-Gilead, which was in the hands of the king of Syria, really belonged to him (Ahab), Josephus (*AJ* 8.399) expands this by giving the history of Ahab's claim, namely that the city had first belonged to his father and that it had been taken away by the father of the Syrian king; he justifies to Jehoshaphat the military action which they are jointly about to undertake. Furthermore, as Begg³¹ has correctly noted, Ahab is a respecter of peace who refuses to be party to its disruption without prior prophetic authorization (*AJ* 8.401).

Josephus was keenly aware that his paraphrase of the Bible had considerable contemporary implications. Thus, writing from Rome under the patronage of the Roman Emperor and in the wake of the disaster of the Jewish revolt of 66-74, he placed less emphasis on G-d's promise of Palestine to Abraham;³² we may

reign the high places were not taken away and that the people continued to sacrifice and burn incense on the high places. Josephus resolved the problem by omitting the statements of both *Kings* and *Chronicles* on this point.

³⁰ See *Cic. Off.* 1.11.34-6; *Rep.* 3.23.34-5.

³¹ C. Begg, "The Death of King Ahab according to Josephus", *Antonianum* 64 (1989), 230-1.

³² Indeed, as J.L. Bailey remarks ("Josephus' Portrayal of the Matriarchs", in *Josephus, Judaism, and Christianity*, edd. L.H. Feldman and G. Hata [Detroit 1987], 162), Josephus is more interested in portraying the marriage alliance arranged by Abraham than he is in the biblical theme of the fulfillment of G-d's promise that Abraham's descendants will inherit the Land of Israel. Surely such a theme would have appeared treasonous to Romans in his audience. In fact, this

likewise see Josephus' care in omitting land theology in the pericope of Jehoshaphat. Thus, while in the Bible (*II Ch.* 20.11) the land has been given to the Israelites by G-d as an inheritance, in Josephus' version (*AJ* 9.9) the central focus is not on the land but on the Temple; in other words, Josephus has converted a political gift of G-d to a religious one. To be sure, he does mention the land, but it is not as an inheritance to be an independent state but rather as a dwelling place (κατοίκησιν).

6. Summary

If the sheer amount of space devoted to a biblical figure is a criterion of Josephus' interest, Jehoshaphat is of considerable importance to him. Josephus places his personal imprint upon this portrait by downgrading the importance of the Levites and emphasizing that of the priests, in whose number he himself was counted. In particular, he develops the theme of Jehoshaphat's military and commercial power and his loyalty and reliability as an ally. He is careful, nevertheless, to avoid language that might lead the reader to compare him with autocrats such as the biblical Pharaoh.

As to Jehoshaphat's virtues, Josephus stresses his courage particularly in the battle against the Syrians. He omits the embarrassing scene in the Bible in which Jehoshaphat cries out when he is surrounded by the enemy. Josephus emphasizes Jehoshaphat's justice especially in the instructions which he gives to his judges. He exhibits the quality of gratitude, which is closely connected with justice, in the thanks and sacrifices which he offers to G-d. He shows his piety in the forceful initiative and leadership which he displays in ordering his representatives to teach all the people throughout all the land, and not merely to know but to practice the law of Moses. He likewise shows initiative in bidding King Ahab of Israel to summon the prophet Micaiah. He shows his extreme faith in the prophet Jahaziel by instructing his people not to draw themselves for battle, so sure is he of G-d's aid. In the interest of stressing the unity of the Jewish people Josephus, unlike several references in the biblical narrative, displays a positive attitude towards the alliance of the Jehoshaphat's Kingdom of Judah with the Kingdom of Israel.

promise is omitted in the passage (*AJ* 1.157) which parallels *Genesis* 12.7, as well as in the passage (*AJ* 1.170) which parallels *Genesis* 13.14-17, in that (*AJ* 1.184) which parallels *Genesis* 15.18, and in that (*AJ* 1.193) parallel to *Genesis* 17.19-21. Again, after Isaac proves his unquestioning faith at the '*Aqedah*, G-d promises him (*AJ* 1.234) that after a life of felicity he will bequeath to a virtuous and lawfully begotten offspring a great dominion (ἡγεμονίαν), where it seems obvious that the nature and extent of this dominion has been kept deliberately vague. See further, B.H. Amaru, "Land Theology in Josephus' *Jewish Antiquities*", *JQR* 71 (1980-81), 201-29.

To make his account more credible Josephus has avoided undue exaggerations in giving the number of troops in Jehoshaphat's army. In order to emphasize a liberal attitude toward other religions he omits the biblical references to Jehoshaphat's removal of the Baalim and the Asherim from the high places. He is careful to make clear that the war which he waged against Syria was a just war. He omits land theology which would be offensive to the Romans; his central focus is rather on the Temple.

Yeshiva University