A Reflection of Jehu’s Violence in the Insurrection (2 Kings 9–10) in the Jehoram–Joash Set of Stories in Chronicles (2 Chron 21–24): An Intertextual Analysis

Introduction

One doubts it possible to find as a violent a story anywhere in the Bible, in which so much blood is shed, as in the account of Jehu’s power-grab (2 Kings 9–10).[[1]](#footnote-1) Jehu’s goal, as defined for Elijah in the concluding task of the latter’s prophecy, is one and one only: eradicating the rite of Baal and his believers (1 Kings 19:18). The massive quantities of blood that will flow in the streets of Samaria during the purge of the House of Baal in the third act is already reflected in the first act, when Jehu is anointed by one of the sons of the prophets: “And thou shalt smite the house of Ahab thy master, that I may avenge the blood of My servants the prophets, and the blood of all the servants of the Lord, at the hand of Jezebel. For the whole house of Ahab shall perish; and I will cut off from Ahab every man-child, and him that is shut up and him that is left at large in Israel” (2 Kings 9:7–8).

Jehu, for his part, carries out this task immediately and optimally.[[2]](#footnote-2) As expected, the stage of extirpating the House of Ahab and that of Baal abounds with words such as *va-yishh’hatu, va-hish’hatum* (both denoting slaughter), *hishmidu, va-yashmed* (denoting annihilation), *va-yakh* (smote) and others. To explain the extent and the systematic nature of the obliteration, the author uses phrases such as “until there was left him none remaining” (2 Kings 10:11) and “until there was left him none remaining” (v 14). Thus all these expressions, along with other accounts (e.g., the beheading of the King’s seventy sons and laying them “in two heaps at the entrance of the gate”—v 8), create a single semantic field that knits and unifies the story.[[3]](#footnote-3)

What remains of this broad affair in Chronicles? At first glance, not much. The author of Chronicles (hereinafter: the chronicler)[[4]](#footnote-4) almost totally disregards Jehu’s ascent to power and mentions it only in the context of the killing of Ahiezer king of Judea and his nephews (2 Chron 7–9).[[5]](#footnote-5) With this, Jehu’s role in Chronicles is wound up. Ostensibly, this brevity is understandable because the chronicler avoids systematic reference to the Northern kingdom unless he has a real need to mention it, as in his account of cooperation between an Israelite king and a Judahite king.[[6]](#footnote-6) The Jehu affair concerns itself in greater part with an internal affair involving the Northern kingdom; therefore the chronicler, as in other cases, presents only the part of the whole that pertains to a Judahite king—in this case, the death of Ahazyahu or of his nephews.

Below I wish to argue that even though the story of Jehu is almost totally omitted from Chronicles, much of the violent atmosphere that it embodies permeates Chronicles in those chapters that establish a parallel between the Judahite kings and the House of Ahab. I refer mainly to the series of kings from Jehoram to Joash (2 Chron 21–24).[[7]](#footnote-7) Nowhere in the chronicler’s historical rewrite, from the “begats” to Cyrus’ proclamation, it seems, can one find such a set of descriptions of death and killing as in this series.[[8]](#footnote-8) This, I wish to argue, is not by chance. The chronicler appears to have derived this violent style from two sources: the Deuteronomist’s descriptions in the story of Jehu’s accession and the eradication of the House of Baal, and other violent accounts in the Bible. The outcome reported here is an especially violent representation. Below I review the turbulent events that were bracketed by the reigns of Jehoram and Joash. Some of them, as stated, have no parallel in Kings; the chronicler usually reworks the parallel segment in order to align it with his worldview. In these unparalleled events, he shows a specific tendency to express himself in a style borrowed from violent texts in the story of Jehu or from elsewhere in Scripture.[[9]](#footnote-9)

Jehoram (2 Chron 21)

In its general contours, the chronicler’s account of the reign of Jehoram is based on the Deuteronomist’s rendering. Nevertheless, the chronicler adds several elements that do not resonate in a *vorlage,* some of which are presumably of his invention (*Sondergut*).[[10]](#footnote-10) At issue here, however, are more than additions; the chronicler also reworked parallel verses in the two versions, as in, for example, the results of the war with Edom and the formula of Jehoram’s burial.[[11]](#footnote-11) In the final outcome, Jehoram’s image in Kings, negative to begin with, is made even more unsavory in Chronicles. The title of Begg’s article, “Constructing a Monster: The Chronicler’s *Sondergut* in 2 Chronicles 2,” suffices to illustrate the extent of the influence of these additions on shaping Jehoram’s image.[[12]](#footnote-12) Indeed, examination of these additions leaves no room for doubt: the chronicler considers Jehoram one of the vilest kings in the history of the Judahite kingdom. Here, too, as found in Kings, he quotes (*mutatis mutandis*) the formula of the Davidic covenant: “Howbeit the Lord would not destroy the house of David, because of the covenant that He had made with David, and as He promised to give a lamp to him and to his children always” (2 Chron 21:7). This creates a barrier to the chronicler’s doctrine of retribution, by which every sinner faces summary personal punishment for his misdeeds.[[13]](#footnote-13)

Below I focus on two brief stories, both lacking a parallel account, from Jehoram’s biography. The first recounts the murder of Jehoram’s brother; the second takes up the Arabian-Philistine invasion, one of whose outcomes is the killing of all of Jehoram’s sons and wives with the exception of young Ahazyahu.

Jehoram’s accession to the throne and, in the main, his coronation take place during the lifetime of his father, Jehoshaphat. Jehoshaphat prefers Jehoram over his six brothers “because he [is] the first-born” (2 Chron 21:3).[[14]](#footnote-14) The precedent for choosing a successor monarch while his father lives occurs in Chronicles only in regard to Abijah, who is chosen king while his father, Rehoboam, still lives (v 11:22).[[15]](#footnote-15) To appease his other sons and thus, evidently, to prevent future discord among them, Jehoshaphat acts as did his grandfather, Rehoboam (11:26), and awards them “great gifts, of silver, and of gold, and of precious things, with fortified cities in Judah” (v 21:3). Jehoshaphat’s hope is that such a demarche will head off friction among the brothers. It is to no avail; immediately after Jehoshaphat’s death, Jehoram murders all of his brothers: “Now when Jehoram was risen up over the kingdom of his father, and had strengthened himself, he slew all his brethren with the sword, and divers also of the princes of Israel” (v 21:44). Accounts of murders and political assassinations abound in the Bible and in the ancient East,[[16]](#footnote-16) but the story in our case strongly resembles none other than the first murder in Scripture—it, too, an act of fratricide:

Now when Jehoram was risen up over the kingdom of his father, and had strengthened himself, he slew all his brethren with the sword.

… Cain rose up against Abel his brother, and slew him (Gen 4:8).

The similarity of these two verses casts Jehoram in negative light, of course. Just as the murder of Abel, the younger brother, by Cain, the first-born, is by no fault of the former, so one should understand the murder of Jehoram’s younger brothers. The derogatory slant in explaining these murders is stressed even more by their clash with the presentation of the story, in which it is explained that the brothers no longer pose a threat to Jehoram’s reign now that their father has appeased them with many gifts and settled them in fortified cities on the border of the kingdom, far from Jehoram’s sight.[[17]](#footnote-17) Explicit criticism of the murder appears as the story continues in the “writing” from Elijah: “and also hast slain thy brethren of thy father’s house, who were better than thyself” (v 21:13).[[18]](#footnote-18) We do not know what makes Jehoram’s brothers better than him, but the phrase “better than thyself” may echo Samuel’s reprimand of Saul, it, too, relating to a person’s legitimacy to be king: “The Lord hath rent the kingdom of Israel from thee this day, and hath given it to a neighbour of thine, that is better than thou” (1 Sam 15:28). The chronicler may have borrowed the phrasing that relates to David’s right to rule and projected it onto Jehoram’s brothers, thus attesting that they are fit to reign in lieu of Jehoshaphat.

Jehoram does not settle for murdering his brothers. According to the chronicler’s account, he also eliminates “divers also of the princes of Israel” (2 Chron 21:4). The lineage of these “princes” is hard to determine; it may trace to Jehoshaphat’s father, who, according to the biblical text, is “king of Israel” (v 21:2). Aside from scholars who emend this expression to read “king of Judah,” some consider this swapping a deliberate revision meant to liken Jehoshaphat to the kings of Israel because he had joined them.[[19]](#footnote-19) If this is indeed correct, it is no wonder that the chronicler sees the princes of Israel in those of Judah. By murdering his brothers, Jehoram becomes the only Judahite king who behaves in the manner of Israelite kings such as Nadav (1 Kings 15:29), Zimri (1 Kings 16:11–12) and, above all, Jehu (2 Kings 10:11).

After the missive from Elijah, God strikes Jehoram with a serious illness, as Elijah prophesied: “Behold, the Lord will smite with a great plague thy people, and thy children, and thy wives, and all thy substance” (2 Chron 21:14). The word used for “smite,” *nogef,* is unique; in all of Scripture it recurs only in the plague of the frogs, reported in a style strongly similar to Elijah’s comments: “…Behold, I will smite all thy borders with frogs” (Ex 7:27). Elijah’s prophecy continues to come true. The Arabians and the Philistines overwhelm Jehoram and kill all members of his household apart from his young son Jehoahaz, who survives.[[20]](#footnote-20) The chronicler describes an act of nearly total homicide. The expression “apart from his young son Jehoahaz, who survives” (v 17) echoes the Deuteronimistic wording of the Jehu stories, in which the eradication of the worshipers of Baal and the king’s descendants is described in similar language: “neither left he any of them” (2 Kings 10:14) or “there was not a man left that came not” (v 21).[[21]](#footnote-21) As Amar has shown, the survival of Ahazyahu squares with the chronicler’s tendency to punish sinning kings by the killing of their sons (so with Jehoram, Ahazyahu, and Ahaz) with the exception of one survivor, as the Davidic covenant requires.[[22]](#footnote-22)

Ahazyahu (2 Chron 22:1–9)

Ahazyahu king of Judah, identified by the biblical account as Jehoram’s younger son, rules for only one year. During that time, he maintains the relations that his grandfather, Jehoshaphat, established with the kingdom of Israel and, also like his grandfather, he fights together with Jehoram king of Israel against Hazael king of Aram at Ramot Gil’ad. The outline of the account in Chronicles is based largely on the parallel story in Kings apart from several conspicuous differences. The story centers on the anointment of Jehu, which is meant “to cut off the house of Ahab” (2 Chron 22:7). The phrase “whom the Lord had anointed” (ibid.) corresponds, of course, to the account in Kings, in which anointment with oil is described (2 Kings 9:3, 6).[[23]](#footnote-23)

As stated above, Jehu’s actions are described with severe brevity and pertain only to the story of the killing of the king of Judah and his nephews. At this point, the chronicler parts ways with the parallel account in the underlying text. In Kings, Jehu also kills Jehoram king of Israel and afterwards Ahazyahu, who has fled from him.[[24]](#footnote-24) The chronicler, in contrast, elides the killing of Jehoram and focuses on that of Ahazyahu. Here, the two versions diverge. In Kings, the killing of Ahazyahu is reported first and only afterwards, under totally different circumstances, does Jehu slay Ahazyahu’s brothers. The chronicler describes this differently: Jehu kills the princes of Judah and Ahazyahu’s nephews and only afterwards seeks Ahazyahu, who has fled to Samaria.[[25]](#footnote-25) The versions diverge again in identifying the person responsible for Ahazyahu’s death. According to Kings, Ahazyahu does not die at once. First, he is gravely wounded, evidently by Jehu’s soldiers, and only later, when he fled to Megiddo, does he succumb to his injuries: “…And he fled to Megiddo, and died there” (2 Kings 9:27). The chronicler, in contrast, describes an immediate death; what is more, it takes place in Jehu’s presence: “… and they brought him to Jehu, and slew him” (v. 22:9). It is not out of the question that the chronicler, in this case, adopts the modus operandi that Jehu invokes toward Ahazyahu’s brethren in Kings. There, too, Jehu wishes to capture them alive so that his servants will slay them in his presence. The killing of Azaryahu with Jehu looking on is certainly a more humiliating and cruel death than the parallel account in Kings. Finally, the fact that Ahazyahu is brought before Jehu echoes the fate of Zedekiah king of Judah after the latter has fled from Nebuchadnezzar king of Babylon. In both cases the king flees, is captured, and is taken to the king (2 Kings 25:5–8). It is true that Zedekiah’s fate is the mere loss of his eyesight at the hand of the servants of the Babylonian king; Ahazyahu’s denouement is worse: he is killed by the servants of the Israelite king.

Athaliah (2 Chron 22:10–23:21)

Athaliah accompanies her accession to the monarchy is accompanied by eradicating the entire royal line apart from Joash, who survives.[[26]](#footnote-26) The chronicler’s description of the event resembles that in Kings with two differences: “… She arose and destroyed [*va-te’abed*] all the seed royal of the house of Judah (2 Chron 22:10), as against “… she arose and destroyed [*va-tedaber*] all the seed royal” (2 Kings 11:1). It is not clear what the chronicler wishes to attain by replacing *va-te’abed* with *va-tedaber.* Some believe that *va-tedaber* stems from the root *dalet-bet-resh* in binyan pi’el and denotes domination or defeat, as found in Psalms in binyan hif’il: “Even the God that executeth vengeance for me, and subdueth [*yadber*] peoples under me” (Ps 18:48) or “He subdueth peoples under us” (Ps 47:4).[[27]](#footnote-27) The context, however, shows, at least in Psalms 18, that at issue is not a subduing but rather a hope for the utter annihilation of these peoples. The hope flows from the beginning of the verse: “Even the God that executeth vengeance for me,” that is: the vengeance hoped for is the annihilation of the enemy. If this is indeed the meaning, it would seem that the chronicler wishes to stress by the switch to *va-tedaber* that the sole interpretation of Athaliah’s actions is the utter extirpation of the “seed royal” and not the mere discontinuation of rule, as the parallel *va-te’abed* might imply.[[28]](#footnote-28)

The extirpation of the entire royal line of the House of Judah, as the chronicler adds, parallels the Jehu’s smiting of the entire House of Ahab:

… She arose and destroyed all the seed royal of the house of Judah.

So Jehu smote all that remained of the house of Ahab ….

Both cases resonate with the annihilation of those defeated. Furthermore, the chronicler’s addition of “of the house of Judah” parallels Jehu’s total eradication “of the House of Ahab.”[[29]](#footnote-29)

Six years into Athaliah’s reign, Jehoiada the priest gathers strength and wishes to restore Joash to the throne. This account, too, abounds with violence and is reminiscent of the story of Jehu’s insurrection, at least where it comes to the motif of the uprising against the king and the extirpation of the House of Ahab.[[30]](#footnote-30) Generally speaking, the chronicler’s revisions are not numerous. Insofar as they exist, they pertain to two additions relating to the continuation of the Davidic dynasty (2 Chron 23:3) and the reinstatement of the Temple rites that David, the patriarch of the dynasty, had originally instituted (vv 18–19). In the account of the uprising against Athaliah, the changes are rather minor and the killing of Athaliah and Matan, priest of Baal, is described nearly identically in both renderings. Nevertheless, two revisions are noteworthy. The first pertains to the order to kill Athaliah. In Kings, it is expressed in passive voice: “Let her not be slain in the house of the Lord” (2 Kings 11:15). The chronicler, in contrast, switches the mode to active: “Slay her not in the house of the Lord” (2 Chron 23:14).[[31]](#footnote-31) Another difference is the number of people who take part in destroying the House of Baal. According to the Deuteronomist, they were “all the people of the land” (*‘am ha-arets*) whereas the chronicler elides the word “the land” (*ha-arets*), thus attributing the destruction of the House of Baal to the nation at large (*‘am*) and not to a distinct group within it.[[32]](#footnote-32)

Joash (2 Chron 24)

Of all the kings mentioned thus far, only Joash is reported as having started his reign well.[[33]](#footnote-33) Even here, a painstaking reading of the text shows that this auspicious period should be credited to Jehoiada the priest. At the outset of the account, the chronicler notes that “Joash did that which was right in the eyes of the Lord all the days of Jehoiada the priest” (2 Chron 24:2); after his death, he links the two again: “Now after the death of Jehoiada came the princes of Judah … and they forsook the house of the Lord, the God of their fathers (v 17).”[[34]](#footnote-34)

After Jehoiada’s death, Joash changes his ways radically. The account from here to the end of his life in Chronicles is an expansion, written on the basis of a chronicalistic doctrine, of two verses in the underlying text that appear in Joash’s concluding formula and deal with his servants’ conspiracy against him and his death (2 Kings 11:21–22).This expansion is typified by violent precedents. Zechariah son of Jehoiada the priest reproaches the nation for having forsaken God and is pelted with stones “at the commandment of the king in the court of the house of the Lord” The use of the root *resh-gimel-mem* (and not *samekh-quf-lamed*) to denote this lapidation ostensibly suggests that Zechariah’s death took place in accordance with Torah law.[[35]](#footnote-35) However, by comparing this with the account of the stoning of the gatherer of wood on the Sabbath (Num 15:36), we immediately see why this act had no solid legal grounds:

“And all the congregation brought him without the camp, and stoned him with stones, and he died, as the Lord commanded Moses.”

“… at the commandment of the king in the court of the house of the Lord.”

The stoning of the gatherer takes place at the Lord’s behest; Zechariah’s lapidation occurs by order of the king. Another salient contrast between the sources concerns the location of the event. The gatherer of wood is sent to a place outside the camp for this purpose: “And all the congregation brought him without the camp …” (Num 15:36).[[36]](#footnote-36) In Zechariah, contrastingly, the stoning takes place in the court of the house of the Lord. The beginning of the verse, “And they conspired against him,” implies that it is a well-planned murder and not a random act. In this context, the murder of Zechariah resembles Athaliah’s death in at least one sense: both are preceded by a conspiracy. Athaliah screams “*qesher qasher”* (a conspiracy did he make) and of Zechariah, it is written “and they conspired against him.” Still, a meaningful difference between the cases exists. Jehoiada the priest refrains from killing Athaliah in the house of the Lord: “…for the priest said: ‘Slay her not in the house of the Lord’” (2 Chron 23:14).[[37]](#footnote-37) The house of the Lord and its court are used as litmus tests for the loyalty of the nation and the king to God. This is why the chronicler notes that Joash and the nation have left “the house of the Lord.” The change of wording, of course, deviates from the accepted phraseology that usually relates to forsaking the Lord and not to forsaking his house.[[38]](#footnote-38) Therefore, forsaking the house of the Lord is the weapon that appears in the first act and is ultimately fired in the third act, in the form of the murder of the prophet specifically in the court of the house of the Lord.

Furthermore, the murder of Zechariah on the grounds of the Temple and the events before and after following this event parallel the scene of the destruction of the Temple (2 Chron 36:17–21). According to the account, Nebuchadnezzar king of Babylon comes upon Jerusalem, slays the young men of Israel within the Temple confines (v 18), loots the Temple implements, and then destroys Jerusalem. In both accounts, this is preceded by the dispatch of prophets in order to steer the king and the nation back to the straight path:

“He sent prophets to them, to bring them back unto the Lord” (2 Chron 24:19).

“And the Lord, the God of their fathers, sent to them by His messengers, sending betimes and often…” (2 Chron 36:15).

In both accounts, the demarche fails: the nation either does not heed the prophets or disdains the word of the Lord. Immediately afterward, Zechariah is stoned to death in the court of the Temple at Joash’s behest and the young men of Israel are killed in the Temple at the command of Nebuchadnezzar king of Babylon. The next stage in both accounts is the looting of the Temple (vv 24:23; 36:18). This parallel further overshadows the persona of Joash because in its aftermath he becomes Nebuchadnezzar’s parallel: both are directly responsible for the looting of the Temple and the death within its confines.[[39]](#footnote-39)

Joash turns his back on Zechariah and does not remember the latter’s kindness toward his father, Jehoiada. The verse is phrased similarly to that in Genesis about the chief butler who forgets Joseph:

“Thus Joash the king remembered not the kindness which Jehoiada his father had done to him” (2 Chron 24:22).

“Yet did not the chief butler remember Joseph, but forgot him” (Gen 40:23).

Ingratitude stands out in both cases but is more egregious in our case, of course. Transcending a forgetfulness that would amount to another two years in prison in the worst case, it involves conspiring to put a prophet to death. There are grounds for the claim that Zechariah does not die immediately, since he yet manages to utter a final sentence against the dastardly act: “And when he died, he said: ‘The Lord look upon it, and require it’” (2 Chron 24:22). Most likely, therefore, Zechariah is gravely injured by the lapidation and then dies of his wounds or is even given the *coup de grâce* by Joash himself (“but slew his son”).

Zechariah’s last words carry dual meaning. The first meaning echoes Genesis 9:5: “And surely your blood of your lives will I require; at the hand of every beast will I require it; and at the hand of man, even at the hand of every man’s brother, will I require the life of man.”[[40]](#footnote-40) The triple repetition of the root *daled-resh-shin* (require) signifies vengeance here, and Zechariah’s last request of God should also be construed as such.[[41]](#footnote-41) The second meaning squares with the chronicler’s frequent use of this root to express the proper relationship of man with God. Man’s seeking of God is a guarantee of success and reward throughout Chronicles; doing the opposite may trigger retribution.[[42]](#footnote-42) It is true that the roles are reversed here: it is not man who should be seeking God but the Deity who demands an accounting from man. Just as man is perpetually duty-bound to require God and is punished for failing to do so (see, for sample, concerning Saul, 1 Chron 10:4–13), so does Zechariah insist that the Deity must be continually required to avenge his blood.[[43]](#footnote-43)

Another noteworthy point concerns the phrase “his father Jehoiada.” Obviously, the reference here is not to biological paternity but to guardianship. The use of the expression “his father,” followed immediately by “but slew his son,” creates the misapprehension of a murder within the family, as we found at the beginning of this series of passages with Jehoram.

The accounts of violence do not end here. The fate of Joash and the nation is immediately sealed when they dare to deviate from the path and afterward, when they murder the prophet Zechariah. An Aramean force reaches Jerusalem and before it leaves it carries out a series of killings (“and destroyed all the princes of the people”—2 Chron 24:23) that ends with *shefatim* (judgment) against Joash. The chronicler’s doctrine of retribution is fully realized by identical verbs that create a sense of measure-for-measure:

“… because they had forsaken the lord, the God of their fathers” (2 Chron 24:23).

“And when they were departed from him—for they left him in great diseases…” (v 24:25).

Joash forsakes the Lord, for which reason the Aramean force forsakes him in his bed, where he lies deathly ill, after having executed judgment against him.[[44]](#footnote-44) The two servants who conspire against him need only finish the job and slay him in a humiliating way as he lies bedridden and helpless.[[45]](#footnote-45)

Ultimately, Joash’s death parallels the stoning and judgment of Zechariah: both men are left gravely ill and receive the *coup de grâce*.[[46]](#footnote-46) The use of the relatively uncommon lexeme *shefatim* for “judgment” echoes an expression used in the account of the plagues in Egypt: “… and against all the gods of Egypt I will execute judgments [*shefatim*]” (Ex 12:12).[[47]](#footnote-47) Just as the *shefatim* are devices with which to punish the Egyptians and their gods, so are they used to punish Joash. In a certain sense, an *inclusio* of sorts exists here: the heavy punishment meted to Jehoram in his last days is also linguistically linked to the plague of the frogs in Egypt, as noted above. The severe penalties foisted on Jehoram and Joash echo those invoked against the Egyptians. If the intensity of the punishment reflects that of the misdeed, then both monarchs met the criteria and paid for it in a way that accurately represents their just desserts. Consequently, Jehoram, the sole survivor after he has murdered all his brothers, and Joash, the sole survivor after Athaliah has murdered all his brothers, sets the end-mark of the set of accounts of four Judahite kings who represent a very deep nadir in the history of the Davidic dynasty.[[48]](#footnote-48) For this reason, not only is their fate associated with similar motifs (as in the root *het-lamed-yod*, for example) but so are their death and burial, as the burial formula extracted from that appearing in the platform text is written about both[[49]](#footnote-49):

Jehoram: “And they buried him in the city of David, but not in the sepulchres of the kings” (2 Chron 21:20).

Joash: “And they buried him in the city of David, but they buried him not in the sepulchres of the kings” (2 Chron 24:25).

Mentioning the subject of Jehoram’s and Joash’s burial prompts me to discuss the relation between the burial motif in the Jehu account and that in the case at hand. One of the recurrent motifs in the Jehu story is the way the dead are buried. This matter already appears in Jehu’s anointment in reference to Jezebel: “And the dogs shall eat Jezebel in the portion of Jezreel, and there shall be none to bury her” (2 Kings 9:10). This motif continues to accompany the story farther on. Jehoram king of Israel is said to have been killed and his corpse tossed into “the portion of the field of Naboth,” without burial (v 25). Of Ahazyahu, in contrast, it is stated explicitly that he was taken to burial in the city of David (v 28). After Jezebel’s death, Jehu wishes to have her buried, “for she is a king’s daughter.” When his servants set out to inter her, however, they find “no more of her than the skull, and the feet, and the palms of her hands” (v 35).

The burial motif recurs in the series of stories bounded by Jehoram and Joash. Of these two kings it is written, as stated, that they were buried in the City of David but not in the sepulchers of the Davidic monarchs (2 Chron 21:20, 24:25). Ahazyahu, in turn, is said to have been buried only because he was Jehoshafat’s grandson, but the place of his burial appears to have been in Samaria.[[50]](#footnote-50) In all three cases, the chronicler revises the underlying text, according to which these kings were buried in the sepulchers of the Davidic line.[[51]](#footnote-51) This revision, it seems to me, may be imputed to the application of the tendency in the Jehu stories. In the Jehu account, a person’s burial is seen a last and deserving respect, certainly when the deceased is a king or a king’s daughter. The chronicler adopts this approach. Thus, he makes sure to bury all the kings—but not before doing a posthumous reckoning with them and noting that their burial clashes with the accepted norm of interment, in the royal sepulchres.[[52]](#footnote-52)

Discussion of the findings

To continue the discussion, I present below a table that juxtaposes all manifestations of violence that appear in Chronicles with their parallels in Kings. Wherever a parallel exists, I note whether the chronicler revises the terminology.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Chronicles** | **Kings** | **Differences** |
| Jehoram murders his brothers | – |  |
| Jehoram murders the princes of Judah | – |  |
| All of Jehoram’s family other than his son, Ahazyahu, are killed by the Arabians | – |  |
| Jehu kills (the sons) of Ahazyahu’s brothers | + | In Kings, *va-yish’hatum* (slaughtered them) is written; in Chronicles, the term used is *va-yahargem* (killed them)*.* |
| Jehu kills the princes of Judah | – |  |
| Jehu kills Ahazyahu | + | In Chronicles, the killing is described as taking place in Jehu’s presence. [כן?] |
| Athaliah murders the royal line  | +  | In Kings, the verb *va-te’abed* is used; in Chronicles, the verb *va-tedaber* appears. |
| Athaliah is killed. | + | In Chronicles, the active voice is used: *va-yemituha*; in Kings, the voice is passive: *va-tumat.* |
| Matan the priest is killed | + | No difference. |
| The prophet Zechariah is stoned to death. | – |  |
| The Aramean army overwhelms Jerusalem and slays the princes of the nation.  | – |  |
| The Aramean army brings *shefatim* (judgment) upon Joash. | – |  |
| Joash is killed in his bed by his servants. | + | In Kings, Joash is killed but not in his bed but instead “at Beth-millo, on the way that goeth down to Silla” (2 Kings 12:21).\_\_. |

The table above shows that the historical account of the Judahite kings from Jehoram to Joash abounds with violence, death, and murder. Some of these accounts have no parallel in the underlying text. Those that have parallels underwent the chronicler’s adaptation in accordance with his doctrine and found more acute expression.[[53]](#footnote-53) The following were added or adapted in this manner: the murder of Jehoram’s brothers, the murder of the princes of Judah, the killing of Jehoram’s sons and wives by the Arabians; the murder of Ahazyahu by Jehu, the murder of Ahazyahu’s nephews by Jehu, the murder of the “seed royal” by Athaliah, the killing of Athaliah, the murder of Zechariah by Joash, the Arameans’ slaughter of the princes of the nation and, finally, the killing of Joash. In most of these cases, the chronicler’s language takes a step up from that of the Deuteronomist (with the exception, as seated, of the case of Ahazyahu’s brothers).

All these data converge to one conclusion: Just as one cannot find anywhere else in the Book of Kings a concentration of violence and death as appears in the Jehu chapters, so one cannot find anywhere else in Chronicles a concentration of violence and death as appears in the series of accounts of these four kings, from Jehoram to Joash. Above I reasoned that the chronicler, while eliding nearly all of the story about Jehu’s ascent to the throne, did not forgo the Deuteronomist’s exceptional and violent descriptions that accompanied this coup.

The question now is: What motivated the chronicler to produce these violent accounts precisely then?

As stated above, in the entire account of the Judahite kings (1 Chron 10–2 Chron 36), the interval between Jehoram and Joash is one of the lowest of nadirs.[[54]](#footnote-54) Two of these four kings—Jehoram and Ahazyahu—are thoroughly vile, lacking any redeeming virtue. Athaliah wipes out the entire royal line and her power-grab is taboo.[[55]](#footnote-55) Joash is the only king whose initial reign seems to be described favorably; further reading, however, reveals that all his actions are contingent on the close guidance of Jehoiada the priest. The moment Jehoiada dies, Joash’s righteousness expires as well. This period is so grim that Steven Schweitzer defines it as “the worse alternative reality.”[[56]](#footnote-56)

To express his disgust for this period, the chronicler imports a style and content from the dramatic account of the eradication of the Northern kingdom’s rite of Baal and from other violent descriptions in Scripture. Just as Jehu employs extreme violence against the House of Ahab and the Baal rite, so is unprecedented violence brought against and by the kings of Judah. In reference to each of the four kings who reigned during this time, the chronicler inserts extreme acts of violence that in part, as stated, are unparalleled by the Deuteronomist or, alternatively, are paralleled but not in language as trenchant as this.

Referring to the House of Ahab in Chronicles, Ehud Ben-Zvi notes the strong relations between that house and the coeval Judahite kings:

The House of Ahab bears a paradigmatic, ideological status in Chronicles.… this House is construed as exerting some irrational attraction for Davides, even among the best of them.… Since, within the discourse of the book, the Davidic kings were never supposed to become allies or partners of the Northern Kingdom, the very existence of the House of Ahab brought incommensurable danger to the House of David.[[57]](#footnote-57)

The “irrational attraction” of the Davidic dynasty for the House of Ahab, according to Ben-Zvi, makes the latter an imitation of the former. Indeed, walking in the path of Ahab or Baal is described in reference to each of the four monarchs (vv 21:6; 22:5, 7; 23:17). Such a reality is utterly anathema to the chronicler, prompting him to borrow the violent style used in the account of Jehu’s seizure of the throne and in other stories in the Bible, and to apply it, sometimes inserting new events and sometimes with a tangential redaction of parallel events, to the series of stories about these four kings. Thus, in fact, these chapters become the most violent in all of Chronicles.

The chronicler’s attempt to struggle against the House of Ahab due to its foreign characteristics appears to overlap his attempt to struggle, or at least to warn against, the possibility that the inhabitants of Judah [במקור: יהוד] will adopt the customs and culture of the Persian Empire.[[58]](#footnote-58) In his struggle against outside influences, the chronicler marshals all tools available to him, including, as stated, the adoption of terminology and behavior patterns from violent biblical stories generally and the account of Jehu’s accession particularly, all of which deal with the eradication of foreign influences.[[59]](#footnote-59) This tendency is not new; it stands out throughout Chronicles.[[60]](#footnote-60) Here, however, it appears to find broader expression specifically in this set of stories bounded by Jehoram and Joash.

Conclusion

Given his disregard of the Northern dynasty, the chronicler’s reference to the story of Jehu’s accession to the throne is presented with extreme brevity: only three verses as against seventy-three in Kings. This dramatic abridgment, however, does not keep him from adopting the violent terminology used in these accounts, and in other violent stories in Scripture, and from applying them to our case, the set of stories bracketed by Jehoram and Joash, which parallel the chronology of the House of Omri. The four kings who reigned during this time—Jehoram, Ahazyahu, Athaliah, and Joash—represent a nadir in the history of the Judahite kingdom. The chronicler, true to his doctrine, finds it correct to criticize this era by intensifying his description of the violent acts that these kings carried out and were subjected to. He does so in two ways: expanding the accounts of these kings with stories peppered by acts of violence; and reworking stories from the Book of Kings by taking the tenor and terminology of violence that Kings offers to a higher level. Thus Jehu’s uncompromising war on the House of Ahab and the culture of Baal recurs in Chronicles in the chronicler’s war against the Judahite kings who adopted the culture of the House of Ahab.
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