

LOVING TOO WELL: THE NEGATIVE PORTRAYAL OF SOLOMON AND THE COMPOSITION OF THE KINGS HISTORY*

W. BOYD BARRICK
USA

“O then, O ‘tis then, that I think there’s no hell
Like loving, like loving too well”.

These sentiments of King Charles II of Great Britain could as well have been said by the King Solomon we meet in the Hebrew Bible (cf. NJPSV Song 8:6aβ)¹. The enthralled Solomon apocryphally associated with the sumptuous love poetry of the Song of Songs² is condemned by his love of

* For Prof. Marcia L. Selsor on her retirement from Montana State University-Billings, with admiration (Jer 18:3-4), appreciation (Prov 3:15, 18), and great affection (Prov 17:17): “...the artist appeals to that part of our being which is not dependent on wisdom: to that in us which is a gift and not an acquisition—and, therefore, more permanently enduring. [S]he speaks to our capacity for delight and wonder, to the sense of mystery surrounding our lives, to our sense of pity, and beauty, and pain” (JOSEPH CONRAD, *The Nigger of the ‘Narcissus’*).

¹ SEE A. FRASER, *Royal Charles: Charles II and the Restoration* (New York, Knopf, 1979). Ironically, Charles’ poem (p. 240) was inspired by his attraction to the ultimately unattainable Frances Stuart.

² In addition to the allegorical interpretations which have dominated traditional Jewish and Christian exegesis, the object of “Solomon’s” desire has been variously identified as Pharaoh’s daughter (see §3 below), Abishag the Shunammite (cf. 1 Kgs 1:3-4), and the Queen of Sheba (cf. 1 Kings 10): for a recent survey see L. S. SCHEARING, “A Wealth of Women: Looking Behind, Within, and Beyond Solomon’s Story”, in *The Age of Solomon: Scholarship at the Turn of the Millennium* (ed. by L. K. Handy; SHCANE 11 [Leiden/New York/Köln, Brill, 1997] 428-56, especially 445-7).

women in the Kings History (hereinafter KH). This negative portrayal is customarily seen as the handiwork of the “deuteronomistic” author-compiler(s) of the KH and rooted in fact. This essay examines that scholarly consensus.

I. PRELIMINARIES

The literary Solomon seems an altogether unlikely villain. As crown-prince he is divinely dubbed “the beloved-one of Yah[weh]” (yēdīdēyāh [2 Sam 12:25]). His reign betokens the surety of Yahweh’s promise to David that “your house and your kingdom will be made secure before me forever” (2 Sam 7:11b-16). The inventory of his accomplishments (1 Kings 4-10) glitters like his drinking vessels, depicting a literal golden age (cf. 10:21b, 27a) of peace and prosperity (cf. 4:20; 5:5). Yet, despite all of this, Solomon is given an unequivocally negative theological evaluation in Kings: he “did evil in the eyes of Yahweh” (11:6a), ranking no better than the kings of the schismatic northern kingdom³. Manasseh and Amon, and the undistinguished Davidids after Josiah⁴. To his feet cling three uncomely clays: he is said to have patronized the bamoth (3:3b), abetted his many foreign wives in the worship of their native deities (11:2,7-8a; cf. 2 Kgs 23:13), and even worshipped them himself (11:5, 8b [LXX⁴], 33 [LXX]), having succumbed to his wives’ pernicious influence on his “heart” (11:2, 3b-4, 9-10).

The negative picture of Solomon is found only in the KH (Neh 13:26 is plainly derivative) and almost entirely in 1 Kings 11, a pathetic picture of the aged king seduced into idolatry by his gargantuan foreign harem, in sharp and clumsy contrast to the glittering representation in 9:26-10:29. The contrast is suspicious on purely literary grounds: if 9:26-10:29 is meant to be even slightly critical of Solomon, as many recent commentators contend⁵, that

³ 1 Kgs 15:26, 34; 16:19a, 25; 22:52; 2 Kgs 3:3; 13:2, 11; 14:24; 15:9, 18, 24, 28; 17:2.

⁴ 2 Kgs 23:32, 37; 24:9, 19. Cf. also 2 Kgs 21:2 (Manasseh), 20 (Amon), and note the stylistic contrast with Ahaz who “did not do right” (16:2b).

⁵ Including K. I. PARKER, “Repetition as a Structuring Device in 1 Kings 1-11”: JSOT 42 (1988) 19-27, and *Id.*, “Solomon the Philosopher King? The Nexus of Law and Wisdom in 1 Kings 1-11”: JSOT 53 (1992) 75-91; L. ESLINGER, *Into the Hands of the Living God, Bible and Literature Series* 24, JSOTSup 84 (Almond, Sheffield, 1989) ch. 5; M. BRETTLER, “The Structure of 1 Kings 1-11”: JSOT 49 (1991) 87-97; A. FRISCH, “Structure and its Significance: The Narrative of Solomon’s Reign (1 Kings 1-12.24)”: JSOT 51 (1991) 3-14; J. T. WALSH, “Symmetry and the Sin of Solomon”: *Shofar* 12 (1993) 11-27, and *Id.*, “The Characterization of Solomon in First Kings 1-5”:

criticism is so understated as to be practicably inaudible, unlike the neon-like obtrusiveness of the criticism in chapter 11; it is strange indeed that the same narrator who daubs the tarnish on Solomon's reign so artfully now feels compelled to sketch his downfall in this artless, ham-fisted fashion "to prevent any misunderstanding about the great King Solomon"⁶. The stylistically conspicuous presentation of Solomon's misconduct begs questions of its compositional history.

1 Kgs 11:1-40 has no counterpart in Chronicles. The customary explanation for this lacuna is that this material was in the Chronicler's KH Vorlage but was omitted in his depiction of the unblemished Solomon one meets in his history⁷. This explanation is not entirely satisfactory—e.g., Solomon's 700 wives (11:3a) would have been the parade example of the Chronicler's view that the possession of many wives betokened Yahweh's favor for the king's faithfulness⁸—and it is further challenged by the possibility that the Chronicler's version of the KH did not contain some of the material in our extant versions⁹: it is perfectly possible that some or all of 1 Kgs 11:1-40

CBQ 57 (1995) 471-93; E. G. NEWING, "Rhetorical Art of the Deuteronomist: Lampooning Solomon in First Kings": *Old Testament Essays* 7 (1994) 247-60; M. A. SWEENEY, "The Critique of Solomon in the Josianic Edition of the Deuteronomistic History": *JBL* 114 (1995) 607-22; P. A. VIVIANO, "Glory Lost: The Reign of Solomon in the Deuteronomistic History", in *The Age of Solomon: Scholarship at the Turn of the Millennium*, ed. by L. K. Handy; SHCANE 11 (Leiden/New York/Köln, Brill, 1997) 336-47; D. S. WILLIAMS, "Once Again: The Structure of the Narrative of Solomon's Reign": *JSOT* 86 (1999) 49-66.

⁶ ESLINGER, *Into the Hands of the Living God...* 154.

⁷ In addition to the commentaries see, e.g., R. L. BRAUN, "Solomonic Apologetic in Chronicles", *JBL* 92 (1973) 503-16, and *Id.*, "Solomon, the Chosen Temple Builder: The Significance of 1 Chronicles 22, 28, and 29 for the Theology of Chronicles", *JBL* 95 (1976) 581-90; R. B. DILLARD, "The Chronicler's Solomon", *WTJ* 43 (1980) 289-300, and *Id.*, "The Literary Structure of the Chronicler's Solomon Narrative", *JSOT* 30 (1984) 85-93; S. L. MCKENZIE, *The Chronicler's Use of the Deuteronomistic History*, HSM 33 (Atlanta, Scholars, 1984) 84-5, 88.

⁸ Cf. S. LASINE, "Solomon and the Wizard of Oz: Power and Invisibility in a Verbal Palace", in *The Age of Solomon: Scholarship at the Turn of the Millennium*, ed. by L. K. Handy; SHCANE 11 (Leiden/New York/Köln, Brill, 1997) 388. As it is, the Chronicler's Solomon has fewer wives than David, Rehoboam, and Abijah (see further n. 91 below).

⁹ E. g., MCKENZIE'S suggestion (*Chronicler's Use*, especially chs. 6-7) that the Chronicler's Vorlage may have been the unrevised "Josianic" version of the KH (commonly Dtr¹); cf. the critique by H. G. M. Williamson, in *VT* 37 (1987) 112-4. For Williamson's alternative hypothesis see his "The Death of Josiah and the Continuing Development of the Deuteronomistic History": *VT* 32 (1982) 242-7; *Id.*, *1-2 Chronicles* (NCBC, Grand Rapids/London, Eerdmans/Marshall, Morgan & Scott, 1982) 408. B. HALPERN, "Sacred History and Ideology: Chronicles' Thematic Structure – Indications of an Earlier Source", in *The Creation of Sacred Literature: Composition*

was not in the Chronicler's Vorlage at all. Unfortunately, there is no agreement as to how many earlier "editions" of the KH might have existed for the Chronicler to have used. Scholarly discussion of the literary prehistory of the KH since the appearance of M. Noth's *Überlieferungsgeschichtliche Studien* in 1943 has gravitated around four basic models¹⁰: (1) Noth's concept of a single "Deuteronomistic History" encompassing Deuteronomy and the Former Prophets, produced by a single author-compiler during the Exile, with minor subsequent revisions; (2) an original Exilic composition, augmented by a series of redactors who continued to shape the work into the post-Exilic period; (3) an original historiographical work composed during the reign of Josiah, and revised subsequently at least once after the fall of Jerusalem; (4) an even earlier original work with a "Hezekian" horizon, which underwent a series of revisions from the Josianic era onward. The proposition that the Chronicler used a version of the KH substantially different from today's versions is more easily imagined by scholars who accept a pre-Exilic original than by those who accept a later original and fewer intervening revisions.

Finally, although virtually all commentators assume a historical and literary connection between the "deuteronom(ist)ic" phenomenon and the reign and reform of Josiah, this has yet to be concretely demonstrated. It is not difficult to find "deuteronom(ist)ic" rhetoric and concepts in post-Exilic and post-biblical literature¹¹ and in other ancient Near Eastern literatures spanning the

and Redaction of the Biblical Text, ed. by R. E. Friedman (University of California Publications, Near Eastern Studies 22; Berkeley/Los Angeles/London, 1981) 35-54, and A. G. AULD, "Solomon at Gibeon: History Glimpsed", *EI* 24 (1993) 1*-7*; *Id.*, *Kings without Privilege: David and Moses in the Story of the Bible's Kings* (Edinburgh, Clark, 1994); "Reading Joshua after Kings", in *Words Remembered, Texts Renewed: Essays in Honour of John F. A. Sawyer*, ed. by J. Davies et al., JSOTSup 195 (Sheffield, Sheffield Academic, 1995) 167-81, contend, in different ways, that an independent source concerning at least the reign of Solomon may have been used in different measure by both the Kings Historian and the Chronicler.

¹⁰ For state-of-the-question surveys and bibliographies see, e.g., S. L. MCKENZIE, *The Trouble with Kings: The Composition of the Book of Kings in the Deuteronomistic History*, VTSup 42 (Leiden, Brill, 1991) 1-19; *Id.*, in *ABD* (1992) 2.160-8, and *Id.*, "The Book of Kings in the Deuteronomistic History", in *History of Israel's Tradition: The Heritage of Martin Noth*, ed. by S. L. McKenzie and M. P. Graham, JSOTSup 182 (Sheffield, Sheffield Academic, 1994) 281-307; S. W. HOLLOWAY, in *ABD* (1992) 4.70-3; E. EYNIKEL, *The Reform of King Josiah & the Composition of the Deuteronomistic History*, OTS 33 (Leiden/New York/Köln, Brill, 1996) ch 1; W. SCHNIEDEWIND, "The Problem with Kings: Recent Study of the Deuteronomistic History": *RelStRev* 22 (1996) 22-7.

¹¹ For discussion see R. F. PERSON, JR., "II Kings 24.18-25, 30 and Jeremiah 52: A Text-Critical Case Study in the Redaction History of the Deuteronomistic History": *ZAW* 105 (1993)

entire biblical period¹²; so sweeping a chronological horizon undermines their diagnostic value regarding authorship and date of composition.

II. THE EVALUATIONS OF SOLOMON AND THE STRUCTURES OF THE SOLOMON NARRATIVE IN KINGS

Recent synchronic analyses of the Solomon narrative¹³ present almost as many different, often contradictory keys to its structure as there are commentators seeking to unlock it¹⁴. This state of affairs demonstrates the difficulty of the analytical task and the creativity (and inherent subjectivity) of the reading process¹⁵. A complicating factor is the compositional history of this material, as a result of which, as A. G. Auld neatly puts it, “new

174-205; *Id.*, “Second Zechariah and the Deuteronomistic School”, *JSOTSup* 167 (Sheffield, JSOT, 1993) chs. 1-2, 7, and *Id.*, “The Deuteronomistic History in its Postexilic Context”, in *Second Temple Studies (forthcoming)*, Holloway, in *ABD*, 4.71.

¹² See, e.g., K. A. KITCHEN, “Ancient Orient, ‘Deuteronomism’ and the Old Testament”, *New Perspectives on the Old Testament*, ed. by J. B. Payne; Evangelical Theological Society Supplementary Volume 3 (Waco/London, Word, 1970) 1-24; A. LAATO, “Second Samuel 7 and Ancient Near Eastern Royal Ideology”: *CBQ* 59 (1997) 244-69, and *Id.*, “The Royal Covenant Theology in Judah”, in “*Lasset uns Brücken bauen ...*”: *Collected Communications to the XVth Congress of the International Organization for the Study of the Old Testament, Cambridge 1995*, ed. by K.-D. Schunck and M. Augustin, Beiträge zur Erforschung des Alten Testaments und des Antiken Judentums 42 (Frankfurt am Main/Berlin/New York/Wien, Peter Lang, 1998) 93-100; A. MILLARD, “King Solomon in his Ancient Context”, in *The Age of Solomon: Scholarship at the Turn of the Millennium*, ed. by L. K. Handy, SHCANE 11 (Leiden/New York/Köln, Brill, 1997) 50-1.

¹³ See n. 5 above.

¹⁴ Cf. the critiques by G. N. KNOPPERS, “Two Nations Under God, The Deuteronomistic History of Solomon and the Dual Monarchies 1: The Reign of Solomon and the Rise of Jeroboam”, in *HSM* 52 (Atlanta, Scholars, 1993) 124-34, especially pp. 124-7, and *Id.*, “Solomon’s Fall and Deuteronomy”, in *The Age of Solomon: Scholarship at the Turn of the Millennium*, ed. by L. K. Handy, SHCANE 11 (Leiden/New York/Köln, Brill, 1997) 392-410; AULD, *Kings Without Privilege*...31-4; D. A. GLATT-GILAD, “The Deuteronomistic Critique of Solomon: A Response to Marvin A. Sweeney”: *JBL* 116 (1997) 700-3; D. JOBING, “The Value of Solomon’s Age for the Biblical Reader”, in “The Age of Solomon: Scholarship at the Turn of the Millennium”, ed. by L. K. Handy, SHCANE 11 (Leiden/New York/Köln, Brill, 1997) 470-92 (= a slight revision of “‘Forced Labor’: Solomon’s Golden Age and the Question of Literary Representation”: *Semeia* 54 [1994] 57-76).

¹⁵ For the complexities of “reading” the Solomon narrative see S. LASINE, “The King of Desire: Indeterminacy, Audience, and the Solomon Narrative”: *Semeia* 71 (1996) 85-118, and *Id.*, “Solomon and the Wizard of Oz”, 375-91.

structuring elements and principles jostle somewhat uneasily with the older ones, as in many a reconstructed building”¹⁶. The negative appraisals of Solomon provide a good case in point.

The Solomonic materials in the KH are arranged so as to make the Gibeon episode (1 Kgs 3:4-15) the keystone event, both theologically and chronologically (cf. 2:46b), in Solomon’s reign. The earliest compositional stratum of this material¹⁷ tells of a visionary encounter in which Yahweh grants the king “a wise and understanding heart” (v. 12b α), “both riches and honor” (v. 13a), and longevity (v. 14b), establishing the theological rationale for his successful reign. This is the ideological counterpart of the secular rationale which comes to the fore later in the representation of Solomon’s reign (see §4 below). The corollary to Solomon’s successful reign is his faithfulness toward his divine patron, after the example of the ever-faithful David (cf., e.g., Psalm 2; 20; 21; 89).

The verses introducing this episode, and casting a shadow on it and the glorious reign it portends, are problematic:

1 Kgs 3:2: raq hā<ām mēzabbēlîm babbāmôt, kî lō>-nibēnah bayit lēšēm
yhwh <ad hayyāmîm hāhēn

This verse seems to condone patronage of bamoth because the Temple had not yet been built. While v. 2a deviates stylistically from v. 3b by using ZB□ (in Piel) alone, this verb links the verse to v. 4a (wayyēlek hammelek gibē<ōnâ lizēbōaλ šām kî hî> habbāmâ haggēdôlâ), the juxtaposition perhaps implying that “the people” patronized the lesser bamoth but Solomon patronized only “the greatest bamah,” the de facto Temple, in Gibeon. V. 2a is grammatically difficult, however: with no obvious antecedent for raq, commentators generally consider it a gloss “to correct the negative description of Solomon’s sacrifice in 3:3b” on which it supposedly was

¹⁶ AULD, *Solomon at Gibeon...* 5*.

¹⁷ Approximately 3:4-6a α →7→9a→11a α (wayyō>mer >ēlōhîm >ēlāyw) →12a-b α →13a →13b β → 14b-15a→15b (wayya<al ... <ābādāyw) (essentially following D. L. CARR, *From D to Q: A Study of Early Jewish Interpretation of Solomon’s Dream at Gibeon*, SBLM 44 (Atlanta, Scholars, 1991) chs. 2-3. Despite differences in methodology, Auld’s reconstructed Urtext underlying both the Kings and Chronicles versions is very similar (*Solomon at Gibeon...*2*, and *Kings without Privilege...* 15-21, 55): 3:4-6a α →7a β →8b→9a β -b→11→12b β →13a β -b→15b α →4:1.

modeled¹⁸, but this explanation begs the question why Solomon's sacrifice would have been negatively described in this chapter in the first place.

1 Kgs 3:3: wayyē>ehab šēlōmōh >et-yhwh lāleket bēluqqōt dāwid >ābīw, raq babbāmōt hū> mēzabbēaλ ūmaqīr

V. 3, unlike v. 2, openly criticizes Solomon for patronizing the bamoth. V. 3b differs from v. 2a in its use of ZB□ (in Piel) and QṬR (in Hiphil), and with v. 4 in terms of content. V. 4 represents Solomon's patronage of "the greatest bamah" at Gibeon as praiseworthy and even permits the inference that "Solomon's faithful patronage of the Gibeonite sanctuary led to God's generosity toward him"¹⁹. V. 3b, on the contrary, regards his patronizing bamoth (note the plural) as disreputable and perhaps even apostate.

It is useful to compare these verses to the formulaic criticism of the Judahite kings for permitting the bamoth, an important structuring device later in the KH²⁰. The hallmarks of this criticism are: (1) the desired fate of the bamoth is expressed by the verb SWR; (2) the worship conducted at the bamoth is expressed by the verbal couplet ZB□ + QṬR, both in Piel; (3) the practitioners are "the people" (hā<ām); and (4) the king is judged in terms of having or not having done "the right" (hayyāšār). This criticism, as a literary motif, occurs successively in the regnal accounts of Jehoshaphat (1 Kgs 22:44), Joash (2 Kgs 12:4), Amaziah (14:4), Uzziah (15:4), and Jotham

¹⁸ CARR, *From D to Q...* 26-7, 58-9, 82-4 (quotation from p. 27). Similarly, e.g., C. F. BURNEY, *Notes on the Hebrew Text of the Books of Kings* (Oxford, Clarendon, 1903) 27-8; J. GRAY, *I-II Kings: A Commentary* (2nd edn.; Philadelphia, Westminster, 1970) 120; G. H. JONES, *1-2 Kings* (NCB, Grand Rapids/London, Eerdmans/Marshall, Morgan & Scott, 1984) 122; S. J. DE VRIES, *I Kings*, WBC 12, (Waco, Word, 1985) 48; I. W. PROVAN, *Hezekiah and the Books of Kings: A Contribution to the Debate about the Composition of the Deuteronomistic History*, BZAW 72 (Berlin/New York: de Gruyter, 1988) 68 n. 30; M. GLEIS, *Die Bamah*, BZAW 251 (Berlin/New York, de Gruyter, 1997) 133-5. H. A. Kenick argues that the verse was part of the original, "deuteronom(ist)ic," version (*Design for Kingship: The Deuteronomistic Narrative Technique in 1 Kings 3:4-15*, SBLD 69 [Chico, Scholars, 1983] 186-7 and n. 30).

¹⁹ CARR, *From D to Q...* 54.

²⁰ For what follows see W. B. BARRICK, "On the 'Removal of the "High-Places"' in 1-2 Kings": Bib 55 (1974) 57-9, building upon H. WEIPPERT, "Die 'deuteronomistischen' Beurteilungen der Könige von Israel und Juda und das Problem der Redaktion der Königsbücher": Bib 53 (1972) 301-39, and further developed by PROVAN, *Hezekiah...* chs. 2-3 and pp. 84-5, B. HALPERN AND D. S. VANDERHOOF, "The Editions of Kings in the 7th-6th Centuries BCE": HUCA 62 (1991) especially 199-212, and EYNIKEL, *Reform of King Josiah...* ch. 2.

(15:35), qualifying an otherwise positive assessment of the king²¹. This sequence of passages²² represents a gradually worsening situation which reached its nadir under Ahaz who, unlike his predecessors in the sequence, “did not do the right in the eyes of Yahweh” (16:2b: *lō>-<āsâ hayyāšār bĕ<ênê yhw*) and actually worshipped at the bamoth himself (16:4a). The notice that Hezekiah finally did “remove” the bamoth (18:4a: *hû> hēsîr >et-habbāmôt*) marks the culmination of the motif—a conclusion assured by the notice that Manasseh, who is judged to have done “the evil” (21:2a: *hārā<*), “rebuilt the bamoth which his father Hezekiah had destroyed” (v. 3a, using *>BD* rather than *SWR*), and by the complete absence of any mention of bamoth in the formulaic evaluations of Hezekiah’s successors²³. This clear stylistic discontinuity is one indication of the existence of a pre-“Josianic”—or “Hezekian”—edition of Kings (KH-1) which has undergone subsequent revision²⁴.

1 Kgs 3:3b qualifies a positive evaluation of Solomon (v. 3a) in terms resembling but not identical with the KH-1 formulaic complaint: *Qṭr* is in Hiphil—a characteristically late conjugation more typical of Chronicles than of Kings²⁵—and *babbāmôt* is differently placed, while v. 3a bears no

²¹ 2 Kgs 12:4 is typical: *raq habbāmôt lō>-sārû, <ôd hā<ām mēzābbēlîm ûmēqatîrîm babbāmôt*.

²² The motif also includes the notice that the bamoth were not “removed” during Asa’s reign (1 Kgs 15:14a). Jehoram (2 Kgs 8:18-19) and Ahaziah (8:27) are judged by the standard of Ahab to whom they uniquely were related. The formula is not used of Abijam, perhaps having been lost in the revision(s) of the evaluation of Rehoboam. Athaliah receives no evaluation: denying her any type of formulaic envelope, whether by editorial design or lack of data, effectively denies her any type of authentic regnal status.

²³ McKenzie’s objections on this point (*Trouble with Kings...* 120) fail to distinguish between concern about bamoth as expressed in evaluation formulae and as expressed in the story-telling narratives (e.g., about Josiah’s reform). On the very different character of the formulaic notions applied to the kings after Hezekiah see also, e.g., R. D. NELSON, *The Double Redaction of the Deuteronomistic History*, JSOTSup 18 (Sheffield, JSOT, 1981) 36-42; PROVAN, *Hezekiah...* 134-43; HALPERN-VANDERHOOF, *Editions of Kings...* 194-212.

²⁴ My use of “Hezekian” and “Josianic” is meant to identify compositions which place special emphasis on or culminate with Hezekiah and Josiah, respectively, but were not necessarily created in those reigns.

²⁵ See D. EDELMAN, “The Meaning of *qitṭēr*”: VT 35 (1985) 395-404, and R. E. CLEMENTS, in TWAT (1990) 7.10-8. Three of the five remaining occurrences of *Qṭr* (in Hiphil) in Kings are found in the story of the man-of-god from Judah (1 Kgs 12:33; 13:1, 2) which is certainly post-“Hezekian,” and two are in the story of Ahaz’s altar (2 Kgs 16:13, 15) where its transitive use has no chronological significance. The Hiphil is regular in Chronicles (1 Chron 6:34; 23:13; 2 Chron 2:3, 5; 13:11; 26:16, 18, 19; 28:3; 29:7, 11; 32:12); the Piel is conspicuously rare, and each

resemblance at all to the positive assessments given the other Judahite kings. In view of the stylistic regularity of the formulaic complaint, these dissimilarities are very likely indicative of different authorship²⁶. V. 3b is best understood as a proleptic inverted quotation²⁷ of the KH-1 formula by a later redactor of the Solomon story; it has in mind 2 Kgs 16:4a concerning Ahaz (wayyēzabbēaλ wayyēqatṭēr babbāmôt) and is meant to doubly besmirch Solomon by both the accusation and the comparison²⁸. 3:3a evaluates Solomon in terms of his “love” (>HB) of Yahweh and his adherence to the “customs” (λuqqôt) of David; the first foreshadows his “love” of women which leads to his downfall (11:1, 2b), while the second alludes back to David’s theological fealty to Yahweh alloyed with the “blood-thirsty political expediency” which he recommended to his heir (2:1-10)²⁹ and his sexual misbehavior with Bathsheba (2 Samuel 11)³⁰. “Walking in the customs of David his father” is a unique comparison with David in the KH³¹, but it is the positive counterpart of 2 Kgs 17:19b which accuses Judah of violating Yahweh’s “commandments” (mišwôt) by emulating “the customs” of (North-)

occurrence can be plausibly attributed to an earlier source: 2 Chron 25:14; 28:4 (= 2 Kgs 16:4), 25; 34:25 (Q of yqṭyrw = 2 Kgs 22:17). For discussion see EDELMAN, *Meaning of qitṭēr...* 401-2. For a putative source behind 2 Chron 25:14 cf., e.g., J. M. MYERS, *II Chronicles*, AB 13 (Garden City, Doubleday, 1965) 144; MCKENZIE, *Chronicler’s Use...* ch. 4, especially p. 92; S. JAPHET, *I-II Chronicles: A Commentary*, OTL (Louisville, Westminster/John Knox, 1993) 857-60.

²⁶ Provan acknowledges the dissimilarities, but minimizes their significance (*Hezekiah...* 68-9); Carr ignores the dissimilarities and regards v. 3 as “a typical Deuteronomistic regnal evaluation” (From D to Q...13).

²⁷ On this editorial device see P. C. BEENTJES, “Inverted Quotations in the Bible: A Neglected Stylistic Pattern”: *Bib* 63 (1982) 506-23, and B. PECKHAM, “Writing and Editing”, *Fortunate the Eyes that See: Essays in Honor of David Noel Freedman in Celebration of his Seventieth Birthday*, ed. by A. B. Beck et al. (Grand Rapids/Cambridge, UK, Eerdmans, 1995) especially 366-71.

²⁸ Cf. WEIPPERT, *Beurteilungen...* 314-5.

²⁹ Cf. WALSH, *Characterization of Solomon...* 487-8.

³⁰ ESLINGER finds this allusion in the comparison in 11:4 which he sees as sarcasm (*Into the Hands of the Living God...* 155), and this would be nicely foreshadowed by 3:3a.

³¹ For discussion see PROVAN, *Hezekiah...* ch. 4. In the other Davidic comparisons using HLK, one walks “before” Yahweh (1 Kgs 8:25; 9:4) or in the “way, manner” (derek) of Yahweh (1 Kgs 3:14; 11:33, 38; cf. 2:3) or of David (2 Kgs 22:2); Yahweh’s “way” includes adherence to his “statutes” (3:14; 11:33, 38; cf. 2:3 and 6:12; similarly 9:4), the common deuteronom(ist)ic sense of ḥuqqôt/ḥuqqîm (e.g., Deut 4:1, 5, 8, 14; 6:8; 8:11; etc.; 1 Kgs 8:58, 61; 9:6; 11:11, 33, 34, 38; 14:8; 2 Kgs 17:13, 34; 23:3).

Israel³². *ḥuqqōt* in the sense of “(human) customs” in these passages is idiosyncratic and late (see Ezek. 20:18; cf. Lev. 18:3b; 20:23a)³³. It seems clear enough that both 3:3a and 3:3b belong not to the original “Hezekian” edition of the KH, but to a revised “Josianic” (KH-2 = conventionally Dtr¹) or even later edition, and that they need not have entered the work together.

III. WHITHER PHARAOH'S DAUGHTER

1 Kgs 3:2 leads naturally into v. 4a. Since at least v. 3b breaks this connection, 3:1-2 + 4a must antedate it compositionally. V. 1a reports that Solomon entered into an alliance with Egypt which was sealed by his marriage to an Egyptian princess, whereupon “he took Pharaoh’s daughter and brought her into the City of David until he had finished building his own house and the House of Yahweh and the wall around Jerusalem” (v. 1b). This notice forms a narrative inclusio with 9:24a—“then³⁴ Pharaoh’s daughter went up from the City of David to her own house which Solomon had built for her”—segmenting Solomon’s reign into a “Construction Phase” (during which “whatever Solomon set his heart on building...throughout the land of his

³² Similarly 17:8a. See M. BRETTLER, *The Creation of History in Ancient Israel* (London/New York; Routledge, 1995) 112-34 and accompanying notes. Brettler considers both 2 Kgs 17:8a and v. 19b to be post-586 (= KH-3 or later).

³³ The occurrence in Mic. 6:16a (paralleling “the customs of Omri” with “the works [ma \check{c} šēh] of the house of Ahab”) is generally considered a secondary addition: see, e.g., H. W. WOLFF, *Micah: A Commentary*, trans. by G. Stansell (CBC, Minneapolis, Augsburg Fortress, 1990) 185-99 (especially pp. 197-8); cf. D. R. HILLERS, *Micah* (Hermeneia, Philadelphia, Fortress, 1984) 79. Jer 10:2-3a (“the way [derek] of the nations...the customs of the peoples”) would be the earliest occurrence if the pericope itself is not secondary: J. Bright could say that it “is all but universally conceded to come from another hand than Jeremiah’s” (Jeremiah [AB 21; Garden City: Doubleday, 1965] 79; cf. more recently, e.g., R. P. CARROLL, *Jeremiah: A Commentary*, OTL (Philadelphia, Westminster, 1986) 254-9; its authenticity is advocated by, e.g., W. L. HOLLADAY, *Jeremiah 1* (Hermeneia, Philadelphia: Fortress, 1986) 321-37, especially pp. 324-30, and on vv. 2-3a see pp. 322 n. 3a, 330-1; P. J. KING, “Jeremiah and Idolatry”: *EI* 25 (1996) 31*-6*; J. R. LUNDBOM, *Jeremiah 1-20*, AB 21A (New York, Doubleday, 1999) 577-82. The other occurrences of *ḥōq* in the Jeremiah corpus (5:22, 24; 31:35; 32:11; 33:25; 44:10, 23) suggest that more strictly “religious standards” may be meant.

³⁴ MT’s >ak is awkward and most commentators emend to >az (with LXX): e.g., J. A. MONTGOMERY, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Books of Kings*, ed. by H. S. Gehman, ICC (Edinburgh, Clark, 1951) 210, 214; GRAY, *I-II Kings...* 252 n. a; JONES, *1-2 Kings...* 218. The MT is retained by, e.g., DE VRIES, *I Kings...* 130 n. 24a.

dominion” he built [9:19b; cf. also v. 1b]) and a “Post-Construction Phase”³⁵. The foremost of his construction projects in the narrative is the Temple, but even though it took only seven years to complete (6:37-38) the “Construction Phase” lasted a full 20 years (9:10). While Pharaoh’s daughter resided in the City of David, the worship of Yahweh had to have been conducted elsewhere; it is not inappropriate, therefore, for Solomon to have patronized the bamah at Gibeon in this period (3:4-15), contrary to the impression given by v. 3b but consistent with v. 2. V. 2a is usually thought to justify the expedient taken by “the people” and by Solomon at this time, but the structuring inclusio makes such a rhetorical defense superfluous, at least by the author-compiler responsible for the inclusio. V. 2a, beginning as it does with the exceptive raq (as does v. 3b; cf. also 2 Kgs 12:4; 14:4; 15:4, 35), is better construed as a negative comment on the practice of “the people” and a subtle criticism of Solomon for allowing the circumstances which necessitated the practice to persist too long³⁶. V. 1b is a suitable antecedent for the raq clause thus understood. The clause itself resembles but is not identical with a portion of the KH-1 formulaic complaint (ûmĕqatṭĕrîm is missing), an indication that it too may belong to a later edition of the work.

1 Kgs 3:1b also forms a chronological inclusio with 9:15, a building notice which does not mention Pharaoh’s daughter. The different word-order—“palace-Temple-wall” in the first, “Temple-palace-wall” in the second—and mention of “the Millo” only in the second suggest that one is actually an inverted quotation of the other³⁷: the word-order in 3:1b is tendentious, reflecting poorly on Solomon’s priorities (cf. 6:38-7:1), consistent with the evaluative v. 2; the word-order in 9:15 reflects well on Solomon, and doubtless is the original³⁸. Omission of “the Millo” in 3:1b implies that Pharaoh’s daughter is to change residences before “the Millo” is built, and this is achieved in the narrative by 9:24b (“then he built the Millo”), despite the friction which it creates with v. 15³⁹. In terms of composition, therefore, the list

³⁵ For discussion see B. PORTEN, “The Structure and Theme of the Solomon Narrative (1 Kings 3-11)”: HUCA 38 (1967) especially 98-9, and especially BRETTLE, *Structure of 1 Kings 1-11...* 87-97.

³⁶ For this interpretation see J. G. MCCONVILLE, “Narrative and Meaning in the Books of Kings”, Bib 70 (1989) 35, and I. W. PROVAN, *1-2 Kings*, NIBC (Peabody, MA/Carlisle, Cum.: Hendrickson/ Paternoster, 1995) 45; contrast, e.g., VIVIANO, *Glory Lost...* 343 and n. 15.

³⁷ See n. 27 above.

³⁸ Cf. WALSH, *Characterization of Solomon...* 486-7.

³⁹ >az is not necessarily indicative of an archival extract (as classically postulated by J. A. MONTGOMERY, “Archival Data in the Book of Kings”: JBL 53 [1934] 49); it may be no more than a

of Solomon's building projects (9:15) probably antedates the Pharaoh's daughter inclusio (3:1b and 9:24b): the use of Pharaoh's daughter's whereabouts as a structuring device must have been imposed upon the Solomon narrative in Kings secondarily; it can be no earlier than a revised "Josianic" edition (KH-2), and 3:3b which it antedates must be later still (KH-3 or later).

Of the five references to Pharaoh's daughter in Kings (1 Kgs 3:1; 7:8; 9:16, 24a; 11:1aβ), only 9:24a has a counterpart in Chronicles: "Solomon brought Pharaoh's daughter up from the city of David to the house which he had built for her" (2 Chron 8:11a). The notice occurs at the same place in both narratives (contrast LXX), suggesting that the Chronicler inherited both the text and the placement of 8:11a from his KH Vorlage. This source may have also contained some version of 3:1b (but probably without 3:1a which is not in the LXX) to explain how Pharaoh's daughter got to the City of David in the first place, conceivably suppressed by the Chronicler to distance Solomon as much as possible from a theologically uncomfortable entanglement with Egypt⁴⁰; the plainly parenthetical 9:16 (Gezer as Pharaoh's dowry gift to Solomon), grafted onto v. 15 by means of a Wiederaufnahme with "Gezer," could have been lost in the Chronicler's reworking of vv. 15-19 in which there is no mention of "Gezer" at all (2 Chron 8:4-6)⁴¹. On the other hand, the omission of 7:8 (a notice that "the house which Solomon made for Pharaoh's daughter whom he had taken [in marriage]" was similar to "his own house where he would live"), and the entire report of the construction of the governmental quarter (7:1-12), is less easily explained: it is implausible that an author-compiler seeking to glorify Solomon would not have been interested in his secular building projects, while retaining mention of the comparatively esoteric topic of the Egyptian princess' removal from the City of David⁴². In MT Kings 7:12 awkwardly anticipates 9:10-24 by presenting Solomon's secular construction projects in the royal quarter before recounting

literary device "to join originally independent materials in a non-temporal way" (with B. O. LONG, *1 Kings, with an Introduction to Historical Literature*, FOTL 9 (Grand Rapids, Eerdmans, 1984) 24.

⁴⁰ This seems preferable to McKenzie's suggestion that it was omitted because it places the building of the palace before the building of the Temple (*Chronicler's Use...* 84-5), a problem which could have been resolved by repositioning the reference (cf. LXX).

⁴¹ Cf. 1 Chron 6:67; 7:28: for discussion see JAPHET, *I-II Chronicles...* 619-21, 622-4.

⁴² In light of the Chronicler's belabored explanation for her change of residence (8:11b), one wonders why the reference would have been retained at all! The LXX version of v. 11b is usually preferred to the MT, but cf. JAPHET, *I-II Chronicles...* 625-6.

the Temple's adornment (7:13-51) and dedication (8:1-66) which, as the narrative stands, would have taken place thirteen years after the building had been completed (cf. 6:37-38), a delay consistent with the interpretation proposed above for 3:2; 7:1-12 follows the first in the LXX (after 3 Reg. 7:51) and follows the second in Josephus (Ant 8.130-154). Sequencing differences between the MT and the LXX (as here and in 11:1-8 [see §4, Notes B, F, and G below]) often are indicative that some of the materials in question are secondary additions to the pericope⁴³. The most satisfactory explanation of this state of affairs is that MT 7:1-12 was not part of the version of the KH used by the Chronicler, but entered the corpus at a later date and wherever it seemed to "fit"⁴⁴. If so, the edition of the KH which served as the Chronicler's Vorlage antedates the editions represented by the MT and the LXX.

IV. SOLOMON AS WOMANIZER

The theological criticism of Solomon introduced in 1 Kgs 3:1-3 resumes in 11:1-13. Mention of Solomon's harem of high-born foreign wives is in keeping with the notices concerning his annual income of gold (10:14-22), the "gifts" received from foreign notables attracted by his wisdom (10:23-25), and his multinational commercial ventures (10:26-29): Solomon's great wealth and international prestige resulted from an astute foreign policy with Egypt and "all the kings of the Hittites and the kings of Syria" (10:29b), sealed with marriage alliances with some of them. All of these betoken Solomon's greatness and would have been understood as such by his contemporaries and by later historiographers (such as the Chronicler) wishing to burnish his image. But, Solomon's harem is viewed completely negatively, as the source of his religious misconduct which resulted in the schism: Solomon's kingdom will be divided after his death because "his heart had turned away from Yahweh the god of Israel who had...commanded him concerning this matter to never walk after other gods" (11:9b-10a). His misconduct is attributed metaphorically to their untoward influence over his "heart" (vv. 2, 3b-4, 9-10) which

⁴³ Cf. E. TOV, "Some Sequence Differences between the MT and the LXX and their Ramifications for the Literary Criticism of the Bible": JNSL 13 (1987) 151-60.

⁴⁴ AULD, *Kings without Privilege...* 22-9 (cf. ID., *Solomon at Gibeon...* 6*); that the insertion was made by the Wiederaufnahme technique is convincingly demonstrated by J. TREBOLLE BARRERA, "Redaction, Recension, and Midrash in the Books of Kings": BIOSCS 15 (1982) 24-8.

consequently was no longer “completely faithful” (šālēm) to Yahweh as David’s “heart” had been (v. 4b; cf. 3:6aβ).

As a piece of literary art, the pericope is an artless jumble of material, much simplified in the LXX, and no doubt reflecting a complicated compositional and textual history. It is impossible to believe that either version is the handiwork of a single author-compiler or redactor, “deuteronomistic” or otherwise⁴⁵:

a) nāšīm in vv. 1, 3b, 4, and 8 could mean either “wives” or “women.” In v. 3a, however, nāšīm must mean “wives,” glossed as šārôt (“princesses”, or somesuch), and differentiated from “concubines” (pilagšīm); nāšīm elsewhere in the pericope must mean “women” for consistency, unless we suppose that his concubines did not seduce him theologically but his wives did. If the seductresses are meant to be specifically his wives, however, mention of other women in v. 3a needlessly confuses the issue.

b) MT v. 1a characterizes Solomon’s “wives/women” with two uncoordinated qualifiers, nākērîyôt and rabôt. The LXX differentiates the two concepts in its ordering of this material: the pericope begins with Kai ho basileus Salômôn en philogunēs, probably representing wēhammelek šēlômōh >aḥab nāšīm rabôt of MT v.1aα⁴⁶, followed by MT v. 3; this is followed by a second equivalent of MT v. 1a which speaks only of the foreign-ness of Solomon’s women (kai elabe gunaikas allotrias, kai tēn thugatera pharaō), followed by v. 2. Both the list of nations (v. 1b) and the quoted scripture (v. 2a) speak to the foreign-ness of the women, while v. 3 speaks to their number.

c) The reference to Pharaoh’s daughter (v. 1aβ: wē>et-bat-par<ōh) is usually seen as a late gloss because it sits ungrammatically at the head of the uncoordinated list of nations in v. 1b to which it is assumed to belong⁴⁷, but it follows quite naturally after the general reference to Solomon’s other amours,

⁴⁵ For recent discussions of the textual evidence, including earlier scholarly literature, see KNOPPERS, *Two Nations Under God 1...* 140-3 (with a restored Urtext, the point of departure for my own), and EYNIKEL, *Reform of King Josiah...* especially 260-8. Cf. also the classic treatments by BURNEY, *Notes...* 152-7; MONTGOMERY, *Kings...* 231-6, and GRAY, *I-II Kings...* 271-80.

⁴⁶ Philogunēs, like Eng. “womanizer,” implies more than a few women.

⁴⁷ E.g., BURNEY, *Notes...* 154; MONTGOMERY, *Kings...* 231, 245 (“syntactically impossible”); GRAY, *I-II Kings...* 272 n. d; JONES, *1-2 Kings...* 233; S. J. D. COHEN, “Solomon and the Daughter of Pharaoh: Intermarriage, Conversion, and the Impurity of Women”: *JANES* 16-17 (1984-1985) 26; AULD, *Solomon at Gibeon...* 6*; KNOPPERS, *Two Nations Under God 1...* 141 n. d.

reminding the reader of her introduction in 3:1b⁴⁸. It is noteworthy that this is the only reference to Pharaoh's daughter that occupies exactly the same place in the MT and LXX versions.

d) The MT and the LXX contain slightly different lists of foreign women whom Solomon "loved," in addition to Pharaoh's daughter⁴⁹. The original list included at least "Moabites" (#1), "Ammonites" (#2), "Edomites" (#3b), and "Hittites" (#5) which appear in the same position in both series; the MT adds "Sidonians" (#4, an intertextual inference from 5:15-27?), the LXX adds "Arameans" (#3a, a dittograph of "Edomites" [#3b]?) and "Amorites" (#6), and it is impossible to determine whether any of these are also original. There is no obvious model for any permutation of these items; the closest is Ezra 9:1-2 (with 4-5 matches), a list of "the peoples of the lands" with whom the people and religious leaders of Yehud had wrongfully intermarried⁵⁰: Canaanites (possibly understood to include Sidonians [cf. Gen 10:15]), Hittites, Perizzites, Jebusites, Ammonites, Moabites, Egyptians, and Amorites⁵¹, including five of the seven indigenous nations of Deut. 7:1-5 (cf. Ex. 34:11-16; 1 Kgs. 9:20) with whom the Israelites are not to intermarry and of which only "Hittites" and "Amorites" also occur in our lists.

⁴⁸ Well put by JOBING (*Value of Solomon's Age... 478* [= 'Forced Labor'... 64]): "Pharaoh's daughter functions in chaps. 3-10 to establish that the cause of Solomon's eventual fall is already there when he is in his glory; simply waiting for the turn to the negative, when she will again be the very first person mentioned (11:1)." Cf. also ESLINGER, *Into the Hands of the Living God...* 129-30; SWEENEY, *Critique of Solomon...* 613-7.

⁴⁹ For Notes D and E cf. in particular G. N. KNOPPERS, "Sex, Religion, and Politics: The Deuteronomist on Intermarriage": HAR 14 (1994) 121-41, and *Id.*, *Solomon's Fall and Deuteronomy...* especially 394-409.

⁵⁰ Deut 23:4 prohibits "Ammonites and Moabites" (cf. 1 Kgs 11:7) from entering the assembly, while v. 8 speaks more positively of "Edomites" and "Egyptians" in the same connection, a typological distinction not recognized in our lists. Neh. 13:23 speaks of "Jews who had married women of Ashdod, Ammon, and Moab." "Moabites and Ammonites," together with men from Edom, figure in 2 Chronicles 20: for these nationalities in the context of post-Exilic concerns see P. R. DAVIES, "Defending the Boundaries of Israel in the Second Temple Period: 2 Chronicles 20 and the 'Salvation Army'," in *Priests, Prophets and Scribes: Essays on the Formation and Heritage of Second Temple Judaism in Honour of Joseph Blenkinsopp*, ed. E. Ulrich et al., JSOTSup 149 (Sheffield, JSOT, 1992) 43-54.

⁵¹ For discussion of this material see the commentaries and T. ISHIDA, "The Structure and Historical Implications of the Lists of Pre-Israelite Nations": Bib 60 (1979) 461-90. M. Fishbane sees the "Ammonites" and "Moabites" as a "tendentious addition" in both Ezra 9:1 and Neh 13:23 (*Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel* [Oxford, Clarendon, 1985] 124 n. 52).

e) The scriptural citation (v. 2a) also has no obvious model. It resembles Deut 7:3, but most closely approximates Josh 23:11-12, a portion of Joshua's exhortation which deals with sexual intercourse (B>, as here) and intermarriage with the "nations left here among you" (cf. v. 11). Particularly striking is the fact that the citation is identified as Yahweh's words, from which it can be inferred that the original source had already achieved an authoritative scriptural status and thus may antedate the citation by some considerable time.

f) V. 3a is the stuff of legend and folklore, not of daybooks or court histories—700 wives and 300 concubines would have constituted two-fifths the estimated population of Jerusalem (the "City of David") at this time! ⁵² *šārôt* in v. 3a and all of v. 3b are not in the LXX version.

g) The LXX version of 11:4aβ-8 orders the material very differently from the MT: 4b→4aβ →7→5a→8→6. MT v. 5 (two deities worshipped by Solomon) and MT v. 7 (two deities for which Solomon built a bamah) are merged to form a single triad of deities as in 11:33 and 2 Kgs 23:13, but in an aberrant word-order (Kemosh-"Milkom"⁵³, -Astoreth, rather than Astoreth-Kemosh-Milkom).

h) The formal evaluation of Solomon (v. 6) more naturally comes at the end of the unit in the LXX, but this is at odds with its typical KH placement as "a preface to particular offenses"⁵⁴. The MT sequence recalls the evaluation of Manasseh (2 Kgs 21:2a→3a) and the pseudo-evaluation of Rehoboam (1 Kgs 14:22a→23) where the specific offense is building bamoth; both of these

⁵² Y. SHILOH, "The Population of Iron Age Palestine in the Light of a Sample Analysis of Urban Plans, Areas, and Population Density": BASOR 239 (1980) 30. Nonetheless, according to N. H. SNAITH, "there is no need to doubt the accuracy of these numbers" ("The First and Second Books of Kings: Introduction and Exegesis": IB [1954] 3.102); cf. GRAY, *I-II Kings*... 274. On the "sixty queens and eighty concubines" mentioned in Song 6:8 see M. H. POPE, *Song of Songs*, AB 7C (Garden City, Doubleday, 1977) 567-9; cf. SCHEARING, *Wealth of Women*... 446-7 and n. 61. See further n. 91 below.

⁵³ Molek was not an Ammonite deity: there is universal agreement that MT's *lmlk* is a scribal error for *lmlkm* (with LXX^L and Pesh.): see J. DAY, *Molech: A God of Human Sacrifice in the Old Testament*, University of Cambridge Oriental Publication 41 (Cambridge: Cambridge University, 1989) 32, 74, and Knoppers, *Two Nations under God* 1...141, 142-3 n. o.

⁵⁴ Cf. KNOPPERS, *Two Nations Under God* 1... 142 n. L (citing Deut 7:4; 9:7ff.; Josh 23:16; Judg 2:19-20; 3:7-8; 10:6-7).

passages are post-“Hezekian,” and the latter is almost certainly post-“Josianic”⁵⁵.

i) V. 8a presupposes v. 7 and supplies the antecedent for *lē>lōhêhen* in v. 8b. MT v. 8b reports, “they [Solomon’s foreign wives] *maqṭîrôt ûmēzabbēḥôt lē>lōhêhen*,” the Hiphil of QṬR pointing to a post-“Josianic” origin (see §2 above)⁵⁶; the LXX^L version, however, has masc. sing. verbs which make Solomon himself the idolatrous worshipper as foreshadowed by 3:3b.

The MT and the LXX versions of this pericope evolved differently from a common ancestor which can be tentatively reconstructed:

¹ And King Solomon loved many foreign wives/women as well as Pharaoh’s daughter: Moabites, Ammonites, Edomites, ~~<omit w/LXX: Sidonians>~~ Hittites, ~~<+w/LXX: Amorites>~~² from the peoples concerning whom Yahweh said to the children of Israel, “May you not penetrate them, nor they penetrate you, for surely they will turn away your heart after their gods”; to these Solomon clung in love.³ He had 700 wives—princesses— and 300 concubines; ~~<omit w/LXX: and his women turned away his heart.>~~⁴ And when Solomon was old his wives/women turned away his heart after other gods; and his heart was not wholly true with his god Yahweh as was the heart of his father David. ~~<omit w/LXX: And Solomon went after the Sidonian deity Ashtoreth and the Ammonite abomination Milcom.>~~⁵ {⁶And Solomon did what was evil in the eyes of Yahweh, and did not wholly follow Yahweh as his father David had done.} ⁷ Then Solomon built a bamah for the Moabite abomination Kemosh, and for the Ammonite abomination “Milcom,” ~~<+w/LXX: and for the Sidonian abomination Ashtoreth>~~ on the mountain east of [or: in the vicinity of]⁵⁷ Jerusalem; ⁸ and he did so for all his foreign wives/women, burning incense and sacrificing to their gods-.

In the earliest version of Solomon’s seduction (in bold) the issue is the number of seductresses, consistent with Deut. 17:17a’s admonition that a king should “not multiply wives for himself, lest his heart turn away”⁵⁸, but

⁵⁵ For traces of an earlier actual evaluation of Rehoboam see 2 Chron 12:13-14 and 3 Reg 14:22-23. See also n. 87 below.

⁵⁶ So, e.g., A. F. CAMPBELL, *Of Prophets and Kings: A Late Ninth-Century Document (1 Samuel 1-2 Kings 10, CBQM 17)* (Washington, DC, Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1986) 87 n. 51 (“post-dtr”).

⁵⁷ Cf. J. F. DRINKARD, “<al pēnê as ‘East of’”:*JBL* 98 (1979) 285-6.

⁵⁸ For discussion of the “Law of the King” see the commentaries and, e.g., F. GARCÍA LÓPEZ, “Le Roi d’Israel: Dt 17:14-20”, in *Das Deuteronomium: Entstehung, Gestalt und Botschaft*, ed.

using NTH rather than SWR to describe their impact on his “heart”⁵⁹. Commentators who detect critical elements in the preceding presentation of Solomon’s reign⁶⁰ find the rationale of that criticism also in the “Law of the King”, and its presentation understated as here with the criticism softened by having Solomon in his dotage at the time (recalling the example of David [1 Kgs 1:1-4]). If the reference to Pharaoh’s daughter is original, 11:1a should belong to the same compositional stratum as 3:1b-2, as 3:3a which inaugurates the >HB motif and which is probably “Josianic” KH-2 or later (see §2 above), and as the inclusio with 9:24a which is no earlier than KH-2 (see §3 above). It is reasonable to suppose that all of these are the handiwork of the KH-2 author-compiler. This Urtext was revised at least once and substantially, shifting the focus to the foreign-ness of Solomon’s wives. Stylistically, the new material (in italics) was added appositionally, as if an alternative version or peshet-like exposition is being appended to the original. The triad of deities preserved in LXX v.7 is an inverted quotation of the normative list in v. 33 and 2 Kgs 23:13⁶¹ and thus KH-3 or later⁶², the verse “correcting” the Urtext by taking note of the creation of the bamoth attacked by Josiah (see further §5 below), and later redistributed in MT to create v. 5 as a doublet of sorts⁶³. V. 8b, if the LXX^L reading is accepted⁶⁴, would close

by N. Lohfink, BETL 68 (Leuven, University, 1985) 277-97; BRETTLER, *Structure of 1 Kings 1-11...* 92-4; G. N. KNOPPERS, “The Deuteronomist and the Deuteronomic Law of the King: A Reexamination of a Relationship”: ZAW 108 (1996) 329-46. The pericope probably has a pre-deuteronomic core, arising perhaps among critics of Hezekiah (cf. Isa 2:6-9).

⁵⁹ NTH used in this metaphorical way cannot be dubbed “deuteronomic phraseology” (so M. WEINFELD, *Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomic School* [Oxford, Clarendon, 1972] 321) without qualification. It occurs nowhere in Deuteronomy (cf. Deut 16:19; 24:17, 19 [all in Hiphil]; 4:34; 5:15; 7:19; 11:2; 26:8 [all in Qal]) and is practically unique in 1 Kgs 11:2, 3, 4 (all in Hiphil), 9 (in Qal); the closest parallels are Josh 24:23 and 1 Kgs 8:58, both arguably “deuteronomistic” passages, and also Ps 119:36, 112, and 141:4 and Prov 2:2, and 21:1 which are not. SWR, used in Deut 17:17 and frequently (e. g., 4:9; 9:12, 16; 11:16, 28; 17:20; 28:14; 31:29; 1 Kgs 15:5; etc.) clearly is the “deuteronom(ist)ic” idiom. This same qualification applies to the “deuteronomic” identification of *bāmā/bāmôt* in the sense of “cult place/s” (*ibíd.*, 323, 326) which is not found in Deuteronomy 12 (the most relevant pericope to find it) or elsewhere in that corpus.

⁶⁰ See the references cited in n. 5 above.

⁶¹ See n. 27 above.

⁶² The relatively rare >āz + Imperfect construction used in 11:7a α , suggests an interpolation only redactionally related to its immediate context: see I. RABINOWITZ, “>āz Followed by Imperfect Verb-Forms in Preterite Contexts: A Redactional Device in Biblical Hebrew”: VT 34 (1984) 53-62.

⁶³ The locational notice in v. 7a β (*bāhār >āšer <al-pēnē yērūšālaīm*) is missing from the LXX and is usually considered a secondary harmonization with 2 Kgs 23:13: so, e.g., BURNEY,

an inclusio with 3:3b—also KH-3 or later (see §§2-3 above)—darkening Solomon’s entire reign with the shadow of idolatry; in terms of narrative continuity, the bamoth built by Solomon in 11:7 (|| 23:13) are those at which he himself worshipped according to 3:3b. V. 3a is a parenthetical interpolation like 9:16; although it is compatible with the proposed original of v. 1a (but cf. Note A above), it probably was added subsequently as an amplification of it⁶⁵. V. 6 may have been added to v. 4aβ by means of a Wiederaufnahme (...kēdāwid >ābīw in both) before or concurrently with the addition of vv. 7-8; use of the evaluative hārā< points to a definitely post-“Hezekian,” probably post-“Josianic” origin (see §2 above). If vv. 3 and/or 6 represent an intermediate stage (post-“Josianic” KH-3), the refocusing of the pericope and the addition of 3:3 would have occurred at a later stage (KH-4), closer in time to the post-Exilic mixed-marriage controversy reported in Ezra 9-10 and Neh 13:23-30a.

V. SOLOMON AS BAMOTH-BUILDER

Independent confirmation of the negative biblical picture of Solomon would seem to exist in the report of Josiah’s purge of various religious phenomena, including certain cultic installations built by Solomon just across the Wadi Kidron from the City of David (2 Kgs 23:13): “and the bamoth east of [or: in the vicinity of] Jerusalem south of the Mount of the Destroyer, which Solomon the king of Israel built for the Sidonian abomination Ashtoreth and for the Moabite abomination Kemosh and for the Ammonite abhorrence Milkom, the

Notes... 154; MONTGOMERY, *Kings...* 232; GRAY, *I-II Kings...* 273 n. b, 279; JONES, *1-2 Kings...* 236; DE VRIES, *I Kings...* 142 n. b, 143; CAMPBELL, *Of Prophets and Kings...* 87 n. 51; KNOPPERS, *Two Nations under God 1...* 142 n. N. In my opinion, the original addition contained both the triad of deities and the locational notice, and was imperfectly preserved in both the MT (by breaking up the triad) and the LXX (by omitting the locational notice).

⁶⁴ See KNOPPERS, *Two Nations under God 1...* 141, 143 n. R. Few modern commentators adopt this reading, but Knoppers points out that the other ancient readings can be best explained as attempts to absolve Solomon from this extremely defaming example of idolatry (cf. the Chronicler’s Solomon); cf. also BURNEY, *Notes...* 154-5. See further n. 82 below. For a revocalization of MT yielding references to cultic equipment see M. COHEN, “maqīrôt ûmēzabbēhôt lē>lōhēhen (1 Rois xi 8b)”: VT 41 (1991) 332-41.

⁶⁵ If not an actual Wiederaufnahme, wayyattû nāšāyw >et-libbô in v. 3b certainly resonates with nāšāyw hiṭṭû >et-lēbābô in v. 4a. V. 3b is not found in the LXX, however, and may be spurious: cf. KNOPPERS, *Two Nations under God 1...* 141 n. a.

king defiled.” This verse is anticipated by 1 Kgs 11:7-8 (quoted above) and these passages, read synchronically, are universally assumed to convey historically reliable information: Josiah did, in fact, “defile” those bamoth which were, in fact, built by Solomon somewhere on the Mount of Olives—hammašhîṭ, “the destroyer,” usually considered a pun or corruption of hammišhâ, “the anointing” (cf. Targ.), but probably authentic for the period⁶⁶ and dedicated to various foreign deities worshipped by his foreign wives.

Granting the biblical tradition the benefit of the doubt, it is reasonable to suppose that Solomon would have taken steps to satisfy the religious needs of at least his principle foreign wives, along with their retainers and the merchants who followed in their wake⁶⁷. Ahab’s “house of Baal,” built for his Sidonian-born queen Jezebel (1 Kgs 16:32; cf. 18:19 and 21:26), would have served such a function as probably did the “house of Baal” in Jerusalem, destroyed at the downfall of her kinswoman Athaliah (2 Kgs.10:18-27)⁶⁸: cultic

⁶⁶ No convincing explanation has been advanced for why a benign and rather obvious designation would have been replaced with a malevolent and comparatively obscure one; “anointing,” not otherwise associated with this mountain, seems a very roundabout way to make a connection with “olives.” Since the purported “pun”/“corruption” is in keeping with the mountain’s close association with death (see 1 Kgs 2:37; cf. also Ex 12:13, 33; 2 Sam 24:16[1 Chron 21:1]), tangibly documented by the numerous tombs cut into its western slope opposite the City of David (especially at Silwan: see D. USSISHKIN, *The Village of Silwan: The Necropolis from the Period of the Judean Kingdom*, trans. by I. Pommerantz [Jerusalem, Israel Exploration Society/Yad Izhak Ben-Zvi, 1993]), there is no reason why it should not be authentic. *har hazzêṭîm*, “Mount of Olives” (Zech 14:4) would be a later horticulturally-based substitute for the original; cf. the informal descriptor used in 2 Sam 15:30, and note the absence of any nomenclature at all in Ezek 11:23. Whether the original nomenclature derived from the tombs, or the practice of burying there during the monarchic period arose from an earlier tradition reflected in the nomenclature, the location implies some connection between the Solomonic installations and the funereal aspects of the site and its pre-Solomonic religious associations (cf. the report in 2 Sam 15:30a, 32a, that it was customary to “bow’ to God/deities [lê>lôhîm]” at its summit, although this could be an anachronistic allusion to later practice); cf. the case for the god Nabu (Nergal) advanced by J. B. CURTIS, “An Investigation of the Mount of Olives in the Judaeo-Christian Tradition”, *HUCA* 28 (1957) 137-77.

⁶⁷ Cf. 1 Kgs 20:14. On ḥûšôt, “foreign bazaars,” and comparable institutions in the ancient Near East see M. ELAT, “The Monarchy and the Development of Trade in Ancient Israel”, in *State and Temple Economy in the Ancient Near East*, ed. by E. Lipiński, *Orientalia Lovaniensia Analecta* 6 (Leuven, Department Orientalistik, 1979) 2.543-5, and S. YEIVIN, “The Divided Kingdom: Rehoboam-Ahaz/Jeroboam-Pekah”, in *The Age of the Monarchies: Political History*, ed. by A. Malamat, *World History of the Jewish People* 4:1 (Jerusalem, Massada, 1979) 138.

⁶⁸ Note Y. Yadin’s suggestion that both “houses of Baal” were not actually built in the capital cities (“The ‘House of Baal’ of Ahab and Jezebel in Samaria and that of Athalia in Judah”, in *Archaeology in the Levant: Essays for Kathleen Kenyon*, ed. by P. R. Moorey and P. J. Parr

“embassies,” so to speak, established by the state to further its diplomatic and commercial interests and patronized primarily (if not exclusively, unless promoted by an evangelical royal sponsor) by aliens residing in or otherwise closely associated with the capital (cf. the Catholic chapels maintained at state expense as part of the official households of the foreign queens of the Stuart kings)⁶⁹. The appeal of this historical reconstruction (now reinforced by “an Egyptian [commercial] enclave with its own sanctuary” at IAI Ashkelon)⁷⁰ is undeniable, and its wide acceptance is understandable: “It is a historical fact,” asserts S. J. De Vries, “that Solomon built, or allowed to be built, pagan shrines near Jerusalem... This was as much a part of his deliberate policy as his multiple marriages”⁷¹.

This “historical fact” must be seriously doubted. There is, first of all, the very practical question of how these installations managed to survive intact the c. 300 years between their construction by Solomon and their desecration by Josiah. Continuity of cultic loci is a truism in the ancient Near East, and not least of all in ancient Palestine, but so too is the constant need to rebuild,

[Warminster, Aris & Phillips, 1978] 127-35); cf. now J. A. EMERTON, “The House of Baal in 1 Kgs xvi 32”: VT 47 (1997) 293-300.

⁶⁹ See, e.g., T. H. ROBINSON, *A History of Israel* (Oxford, Clarendon, 1932) 258; J. BRIGHT, *A History of Israel*, 3rd edn. (Philadelphia, Westminster, 1981) 245, 252; G. W. AHLSTRÖM, *Royal Administration and National Religion in Ancient Palestine*, SHANE 1 (Leiden, Brill, 1982) 18, 62; R. H. LOWERY, *The Reforming Kings: Cults and Society in First Temple Judah*, JSOTSup 120 (Sheffield, JSOT, 1991) 106-8. The foreign “embassy” analogy (used by LOWERY, *Reforming Kings*... 107 et passim; cf., e.g., Robinson, *History of Israel*... 258) is helpful, but the religious dimension, central for the biblical phenomena, is normally a very minor factor in the modern embassy. A more precise analogy would be the French and Spanish embassies in Stuart London and their extensions in the form of the private Catholic chapels maintained at state expense as part of the official households of the foreign queens of Charles I (the French Henrietta Maria), Charles II (the Portuguese Catherine of Braganza), and James II (the Italian Maria of Modena). The influence of these ladies on the religious policies and personal beliefs of their husbands varied in fact but loomed large in the rhetoric of Protestant extremists. The same can be said of two of Charles II’s chief mistresses (cf. Solomon’s concubines): the English Barbara Duchess of Cleveland and the French Louise Duchess of Portsmouth, both Catholics. Charles II was unabashedly a ladies man, and the comparison with Solomon was not lost on the Protestant propagandists of the time. See A. FRASER, *Royal Charles: Charles II and the Restoration* (New York: Knopf, 1979). The fact that Catholicism was officially illegal in Stuart England makes the analogy with ancient Judah (especially as refracted through the Bible’s theological prism) particularly useful.

⁷⁰ See L. E. STAGER, “Ashkelon and the Archaeology of Destruction; Kislev 604 BCE”: IE 25 (1996) 68*-9*.

⁷¹ DE VRIES, *I Kings*... 143-4.

renovate, and restore cultic and other installations to which years of use, the impermanence of materials and workmanship, the effects of nature, and socio-political circumstances have not been kind⁷². Solomon's Temple, a contemporary structure of comparable function, is an apt example (cf., e.g., 2 Kgs 12:1-17[2 Chron 24:4-14])⁷³; if built of comparable material (but cf. §6 below), Solomon's bamoth, unprotected by the city wall, would have been more vulnerable to the ministrations of besiegers and despoilers, beginning already in Rehoboam's reign (1 Kgs 14:25-28). It is especially difficult to imagine how they escaped the attention of Sennacherib's troops who, he claims, surrounded Jerusalem with earthworks, penning Hezekiah inside "like a bird in a cage"⁷⁴. That Josiah's reform-minded predecessors, most notably Hezekiah, also left them alone is another puzzlement⁷⁵. Also to be considered is the severe earthquake of c. 750 (cf. Isa 2:6-22; 5:14-17; Amos 1:1; Zech. 14:4-5), the effects of which may have been as devastating in and around Jerusalem as at nearby Gezer⁷⁶. Another question concerns the patrons of

⁷² See the germane discussions in *The Architecture of Ancient Israel: From the Prehistoric to the Persian Periods*, ed. by A. Kempinski and R. Reich (Jerusalem, Israel Exploration Society, 1992); especially R. REICH, "Building Materials and Architectural Elements in Ancient Israel", 1-16, and E. NETZER, "Massive Structures: Processes in Construction and Deterioration", 17-27; cf. also REICH, *Palaces and Residences in the Iron Age...* 202-22, and HERZOG, *Administrative Structures in the Iron Age...* 223-30. For a maximalist inventory of archaeologically-known Solomonic structures see W. G. DEVER, "Monumental Art and Architecture in Ancient Israel in the Period of the United Monarchy", in *Recent Archaeological Discoveries and Biblical Research*, Samuel and Althea Stroum Lectures in Jewish Studies 6 (Seattle/London, University of Washington, 1990) 85-117 (= a revised version of "Monumental Architecture in Ancient Israel in the Period of the United Monarchy", in *Studies in the Period of David and Solomon and Other Essays*, ed. by T. Ishida [Winona Lake, Eisenbrauns, 1982] 269-306).

⁷³ See the brief discussion by C. L. MEYERS, "The Elusive Temple": BA 45 (1982) 33-41.

⁷⁴ ANET, 287-8, possibly supported by Mic 4:14; but cf. 2 Kgs 19:32 (Isa 37:33). Although the Assyrian army probably encamped on the Northwest Hill overlooking the city (see D. USSISHKIN, "The 'Camp of the Assyrians' in Jerusalem": IEJ 29 [1979] 127-42), in the quadrant of the city's circuit opposite the Mount of Olives, troops reconnoitering the neighborhood or foraging for foodstuffs and water surely would have reached this location.

⁷⁵ Lowery supposes from this silence that "Hezekiah's centralization reform did not include an attack on embassy row" (*Reforming Kings...* 207).

⁷⁶ For archaeological evidence of the earthquake at Gezer see W. G. DEVER, "A Case-Study of Biblical Archaeology: The Earthquake of ca. 760 BCE": EI 23 (1992) 27*-35*. According to Yeivin ("Divided Monarchy," 168-9): "Because of [this earthquake] the southern part of the Mount of Olives collapsed into the valley of Kidron, covering the spring of En-rogel.... There is little doubt that not only were the surroundings of Jerusalem damaged but that the houses in Jerusalem itself collapsed and probably part of the Temple." Similarly, e.g., B. MAZAR, *The Mountain of the*

these installations in the intervening centuries: it might be imagined that some of the offspring of Solomon's foreign wives (e.g., Rehoboam [1 Kgs 14:21b]) continued to adhere to the deities of their mothers, that other diplomatic marriages with devotees of these deities ensued, that alien merchants continued to patronize these installations, and/or that a stable Judahite foreign policy would have required their retention and upkeep⁷⁷ any excuse to enhance the believability of the received tradition. In short, the proposition that cultic installations, built by Solomon on or about the Mount of Olives as religious expressions of his foreign policy, would have continued in use down to the reign of Josiah is impossible to accept without fabricating a set of hypothetical circumstances to be even remotely plausible.

Neither 1 Kgs 11:1-11 nor 2 Kgs 23:13 actually speaks of diplomatic marriages, and 23:13 does not mention any women at all: that is a synchronic, readerly hypothesis supplying a plausible historical circumstance to make the pericope more believable⁷⁸. In this instance, however, a synchronic reading misleads rather than enlightens. 23:13 reverberates intertextually with both the building notice in 11:7-8a and Ahijah's recapitulation in 11:33. The list of deities in 23:13 (which does not identify the worshippers) is congruent with the one in 11:33⁷⁹, suggesting that this couplet

Lord (Garden City, Doubleday, 1975) 157-8. This sounds like an exposition of Josephus's account of the earthquake which occasioned Uzziah's leprosy (Ant 9.222-27), and this account itself may be a midrashic conflation of Amos 1:1, Zech 14:5, and 2 Chron 26:16-21, instead of independent testimony; D. N. Freedman and A. Welch claim that the account is "unsupported archaeologically" ("Amos's Earthquake and Israelite Prophecy", in *Scripture and Other Artifacts: Essays on the Bible and Archaeology in Honor of Philip J. King*, ed. by M. D. Coogan et al. (Louisville, Westminster John Knox, 1994) 189).

⁷⁷ Of Manasseh's international diplomacy A. F. Rainey speculates ("Manasseh, King of Judah, in the Whirlpool of the Seventh Century BCE", in *"kinathūtu ša dārāti": Raphael Kutscher Memorial Volume*, ed. by A. F. Rainey, Tel Aviv Occasional Publications 1 (Tel Aviv, Tel Aviv University, 1993) 151): "These new political/economic ties were expressed in terms of the foreign cults established in Jerusalem. Many of the shrines to the various deities were doubtless associated with the embassies/consulates established by the diplomatic missions that came to Jerusalem (cf. during Solomon's reign 1 Ki 11:4-8; and for the location of the many shrines in Manasseh's day, cf. 2 Ki 23:13-14)." There is no actual evidence for any of this, and Rainey's inference from 23:13-14 (which surely would have mentioned any such structures for which Manasseh was responsible had they been there) seems especially specious. For other examples cf., e.g., LOWERY, *Reforming Kings...* 107-8.

⁷⁸ Cf. LASINE, *King of Desire...* 103-5.

⁷⁹ 1 Kgs 11:33: <aštoret šiqquš šīdōnīm // kēmōš >ēlohē mō>āb // milkôm >ēlohē bēnē-
<ammôn. 1 Kgs 23:13: <aštoret šiqquš šīdōnīm // kēmōš šiqquš mō>āb // milkôm tō<ābat bēnē-
<ammôn.

is primary, both verses belonging to the same compositional stratum—presumably the “Josianic” KH-2—and thus, by the preceding analyses, compositionally earlier than 11:7-8⁸⁰. In v. 33 Ahijah predicts the schism and names its cause: “[Yahweh will tear the kingdom asunder] because he [i.e., Solomon, with the Versions; or: they, with MT] has/have forsaken me and “bowed” to the Sidonian deity Ashtoreth, to the Moabite deity Kemosh, and to the Ammonite deity Milkom, and has/have not walked in my ways doing right in my eyes like David his father did.” Both the singular and the plural readings are defensible, but in the KH-2 context proposed here the singular is preferable⁸¹ (as commentators generally agree)⁸²: Solomon worshipped these “other gods” himself and he had built the bamoth on or about the Mount of Olives dedicated to them for his own worship, a perverse complement to the Temple of Yahweh which he built on the mountain on the other side of the Kidron⁸³.

⁸⁰ That 1 Kgs 11:31-38 is a composite text is evident from its redundancies and overloaded verbiage, but there is little agreement as to its compositional history: in addition to the commentaries see, recently, MCKENZIE, *Trouble with Kings...* 41-7, and KNOPPERS, *Two Nations under God 1...* 186-99 (both with earlier literature). The close resemblance of v. 31b and v. 35 suggests the expansion of an Urtext by means of the Wiederaufnahme technique: the Urtext may have consisted of only vv. 31b + 36-37a + 38, and was subsequently expanded, first by the addition of vv. 33-35 (note the use of LQH in v. 7aβ and v. 35a) and later by the insertion of v. 32. If this scenario approximates reality, the KH-1 Urtext did not specify why the kingdom will be divided, only that Yahweh is the ultimate cause. 11:11-13 eviscerates the dramatic force of Ahijah’s message to Jeroboam in 11:31-38 and probably is no older than KH-2.

⁸¹ In 9:6-9 a plural referent also occurs unexpectedly: this is a demonstrably secondary passage which reinterprets Solomon’s portended failure to “walk before me as David your father walked bētām lēbāb and with uprightness, doing all that I have commanded you” (vv. 4-5) in terms of the people having “gone and served other gods and ‘bowed’ to them”; as a result of their apostasy “Israel” will go into exile and the Temple will be destroyed, clear allusions to the historical realities of 587/6 (cf. Jer 19:7-9) and thus indicative of a post-“Josianic” date of composition: see in particular KNOPPERS, *Two Nations under God 1...* especially 109-10 (finding three stages of composition for 9:1-9: vv. 1-2 [“Josianic” (his Dtr¹)], vv. 4-5, and vv. 6-9 [both “from the exile or later”]).

⁸² See the commentaries and recently KNOPPERS, *Two Nations Under God 1...* 186-8 and nn. B-C, H. The three instances of original singular verbs becoming plurals in MT Kings considered here (1 Kgs 9:6-9; 11:8b, 33) are consistent with the general tendency of that recension to pluralize verbs with collective subjects, demonstrated by R. F. PERSON, JR., *The Kings-Isaiah and Kings-Jeremiah Recensions*, BZAW 252 (Berlin/New York, de Gruyter, 1997) 113 et passim.

⁸³ The common assumption from 2 Kgs. 23:13 is that three “bamoth” (bāmôt), one for each deity listed, were “defiled,” even though 1 Kgs. 11:7aα claims only one “bamah” (bāmā). Whatever the compositional origin of 11:7aα, it is hard to account for this discrepancy: if 11:7aα is secondary and dependent on 23:13, it must be the handiwork of an incredibly inattentive and

By this analysis, then, there were no building notices preparatory to 2 Kgs 23:13 in either KH-1 or KH-2. Indeed, there is no reason to expect it to have been otherwise: “the horses which the kings of Judah had dedicated to the sun” at the entrance to the Temple (23:11), the altars “which the kings of Judah had made” on its roof (v. 12a), and the komer-priests “whom the kings of Judah had ordained to burn offerings in the bamoth in the cities of Judah and around Jerusalem” (v. 5a) are introduced to the reader with no informational forewarning of any kind (so also Ahaz’s “dial” [20:9-11]). These notices, like v. 13⁸⁴, presumably also refer to phenomena which actually existed in the Josianic era and were affected by his religious pogrom even though the author-compilers of the KH did not see fit to mention them earlier. In the case of Solomon’s bamoth, this oversight was “corrected” secondarily and imperfectly by the insertion of 11:7-8⁸⁵.

CONCLUSIONS

This study has little consolation for those who are inclined to trust the historicity of the tarnished Solomon of the KH. If the preceding analyses are

careless redactor; if it antedates 23:13, the pl. there must be questioned. The LXX of 23:13 presupposes hbyt (“the house”) rather than MT’s hbmwt (“the bamoth”), a unique reading customarily ignored or dismissed as a scribal mistake (hupsēlon in 1 Kgs 11:7 rules out a deliberate harmonization). It is not impossible that the translator’s Vorlage actually read hbmh of which hbyt might be considered a somewhat easier corruption. The evidence, such as it is, raises the possibility that Solomon was credited with having built a single bamah-installation for the worship of several foreign deities, and that Josiah “defiled” that installation. As a “house” for multiple deities, Solomon’s bamah would have mirrored his Temple in Josiah’s day functionally (cf. 23:4) and perhaps to some extent even architecturally: standing opposite each other on supernaturally-charged mountains, separated by the Wadi Kidron with its tombs and other necromantic associations, they would certainly have been seen as rival cultic “houses” by Josiah and other adherents of a “reformed” state-sponsored Yahwism.

⁸⁴ Pace Gleis who considers 23:13 to be “historisch völlig unglaubwürdig” (Bamah, 111 and n. 595).

⁸⁵ The same impulse prompted the secondary insertion in 2 Kgs. 23:12a specifying that “the roof” (haggāg) in question was that of “Ahaz’s upper-chamber”: in addition to the commentaries (note Montgomery’s opinion that, if secondary, it is “a worthy historical gloss” [*Kings...* 533]), see, e.g., G. N. KNOPPERS, *Two Nations Under God, The Deuteronomistic History of Solomon and the Dual Monarchies 2: The Reign of Jeroboam, the Fall of Israel, and the Reign of Josiah*, HSM 53 (Atlanta, Scholars, 1994) 178 n. 9, and EYNIKEL, *Reform of King Josiah...* 254-5, 347.

accepted, this patina was painted into the literary picture of Solomon relatively late and for ideological, not antiquarian, purposes:

KH-1 ("Hezekian" horizon): Ø

KH-2 ("Josianic" horizon = Dtr¹): 3:1-2, 3a; 11:1a (without *nākēryôt*), 4a

KH-3 (post-"Josianic" horizon): 11:3, [5-6?]

KH-4 (post-Exilic horizon): 3:3b; 11:1a (*nākēryôt*), 1b-2, [5-6?], 7-8

Solomon's wives/women were introduced in KH-2 in order to blame the schism on his misdeeds (replacing a different KH-1 explanation in which Jeroboam⁸⁶ or possibly Rehoboam⁸⁷ was the culpable party). That author-compiler utilized a contemporary tradition attributing the origin of certain cultic installations on the Mount of Olives to Solomon (23:13), from which he inferred that it was his wives who had led him astray. The KH-3 redactor made modest augmentations in the nature of fine-tuning; if 11:3 is his, the fact that the Chronicler's account contains no echo of this verse would support the contention that his Vorlage was the "Josianic" KH-2 edition. The KH-4 author-compiler went much further, recasting the theme from one of too many wives/women (consistent with Deut. 17:17a) to one of alien wives, reflecting the same extreme xenophobia which finally carried the day in post-Exilic Yehud (cf. Ezra 9-10; Neh 13:23-30a)⁸⁸. Indeed, this is precisely the context in which we find the only other biblical reference to Solomon's sin: Neh 13:26, where it is an object lesson to persuade the people to give up their foreign wives and everything else foreign⁸⁹.

Little in the material examined here can be claimed to have been part of the original KH-1 story of Solomon, much less derive from the historical

⁸⁶ See n. 80 above. Note also that 2 Kgs. 17:21 uses the same "tearing" (QR<) image as 1 Kgs 11:9-13, 29-39, but in such a way as to deprive the northerners' secession of its divine sanction, making them rebels with no just cause against the House of David and its divine patron, and denying the polity they created any genuine Yahwistic legitimacy: see BRETTLE, *Creation of History...* 124-6. This view is expressed even more clearly in 1 Kgs 12:19 and is even echoed by the Chronicler (2 Chron 13:4-7). If not vestiges of the original KH-1 explanation of the schism, these would represent yet another (perhaps reflecting the secular reality of the event).

⁸⁷ Perhaps reflected in the LXX "supplement": see C. S. SHAW, "The Sins of Rehoboam: The Purpose of 3 Kingdoms 12:4A-Z": JSOT 73 (1997) 55-64.

⁸⁸ For post-biblical Jewish tradition and speculation along this line see S. J. D. COHEN, "From the Bible to the Talmud: The Prohibition of Inter-marriage": HAR 7 (1983) 23-39, and especially *Id.*, *Solomon and the Daughter of Pharaoh...* 23-37, and the literature cited there.

⁸⁹ Cf. FISHBANE, *Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel...* 123-9.

personage of the same name. The entire topic of Solomon's seductive wives/women could well be the product of creative intertextual exposition spun out of the "happy wives/women" envied by the Queen of Sheba (1 Kgs 10:8a [LXX^L]), the "conventional wisdom" that kings in particular should be wary of domination by women (cf. Prov 31:3)⁹⁰, and the commonsensical assumption that a king of Judah would have had several wives (cf. 4:11, 15; 14:21b)⁹¹. Pharaoh's daughter is another matter.

1 Kgs 3:1b, 9:16, and 9:24 are closely interrelated, and the content of at least 3:1b and 9:16 could not have been imaginatively inferred from other passages⁹². The parenthetical placement of 1 Kgs 9:16 probably is not original. In the LXX this note about Pharaoh's daughter's dowry more naturally follows her introduction in 3:1b (the remainder of MT 9:15-22 follows 10:22) which follows 5:14⁹³. This ordering of the material (lacking the geopolitical causation supplied by MT 3:1a) makes Solomon's "taking"⁹⁴ Pharaoh's daughter a consequence of the international reputation of his wisdom which also attracted the Queen of Sheba (10:1, 4, 6-7), and makes Pharaoh's actions on Solomon's behalf analogous to Hiram's seminal

⁹⁰ Cf. a letter from Shamshi-Adad I (c. 1813-1781) criticizing his son Yasmah-Addu as king of Mari for sleeping with women and neglecting his military duties (ARM 1:69, rev. l. 13, cited by J. H. TIGAY, *Deuteronomy*, JPSTC [Jerusalem/Philadelphia, Jewish Publication Society, 1996] 167-8).

⁹¹ Rehoboam is credited with eighteen wives and sixty concubines (2 Chron 1:21), Abijah with fourteen wives (2 Chron 13:21), and David with only seven wives (1 Chron 3:1-9) and a similarly modest number of concubines (2 Sam. 15:16). If the numbers for Rehoboam and Abijah are artificial, reflecting the Chronicler's ideological understanding of royal family-size, the gargantuan size of Solomon's harem in Kings is all the more suspicious. On Rehoboam's Ammonite mother see now A. MALAMAT, "Naamah, the Ammonite Princess, King Solomon's Wife": RB 106 (1999) 35-40, pointing out that Solomon's regnal years indicate that the marriage was arranged by David and thus was not a Solomonic initiative.

⁹² Contrast 3:1a which elaborates on her "taking" in 3:1b, and 7:8 which elaborates on her "house" in 3:1b and 9:24a.

⁹³ So also in "Miscellany A" which follows LXX 2:35: for discussion see, in addition to the commentaries, D. W. GOODING, "The Septuagint's Version of Solomon's Misconduct": VT 15 (1965) especially 326-31, and *Id.*, *Relics of Ancient Exegesis: A Study of the Miscellanies in 3 Reigns 2*, SOTSM 4 (Cambridge, Cambridge University, 1976) 18-23, 66-73 and accompanying notes; E. TOV, "The LXX Additions (Miscellanies) in 1 Kings 2 (3 Reigns 2)": Textus 11 (1984) 89-118; COHEN, *Solomon and the Daughter of Pharaoh... 27*; AULD, *Solomon at Gibeon... 5*-6**.

⁹⁴ Only 3:1a requires the "taking" to mean marriage, and there are other possibilities without it: cf. GOODING, *Septuagint's Version of Solomon's Misconduct... 329-31*, and *Id.*, *Relics of Ancient Exegesis... 70-73*.

contributions to the building of the Temple which follows immediately—both examples of how his wisdom caused him to be honored by “all the kings of the earth” (5:14). In this arrangement the mention of Pharaoh’s daughter makes a very positive ideological statement about Solomon. Such an arrangement of these notices could well have been part of a “Hezekian” historiographical work which almost certainly would have been favorably disposed toward Solomon (cf. Prov 25:1)⁹⁵. That a “Hezekian” work would capitalize on a tradition associating Solomon with Egypt to his benefit can be inferred from Egypt’s likely role in Hezekiah’s maneuverings on the international scene (cf., e.g., Isa 20; 31:1-7; 31:1-3)⁹⁶, as well as the strong cultural interest in things Egyptian among some Judahite elites during this period⁹⁷—not least four unique cube-shaped tombs at Silwan (#3, 28, 34, 35), on the slopes of the Mount of Olives opposite the City of David, cut out from the bedrock on three or four sides, each with an Egyptian-style cornice along the upper edge of the facade, a gabled ceiling, and in some cases (unquestionably #3, the so-called “Tomb of Pharaoh’s Daughter”) a pyramid-shaped roof. These tombs are dated to the late 8th century on palaeographic grounds (the “Royal Steward” inscription from tomb #35), and the earliest of the simpler and more numerous Silwan tombs with flat ceilings probably are contemporary⁹⁸. The unknown individual buried in Tomb #3 certainly was a

⁹⁵ Few would disagree with J. L. CRENSHAW’s assessment (*Old Testament Wisdom: An Introduction* [Atlanta, John Knox, 1981] 94; cf. pp. 45, 48): “There is no reason for the tradition to arise associating Hezekiah with wisdom unless a historical basis for such thinking existed, although legends do seem to cling to this king (Isaiah 36-39) just as they do to Solomon, whom Hezekiah sought to resemble.” It can be safely assumed that this regime’s interest in Solomon extended beyond his wisdom.

⁹⁶ For Egypt’s international machinations during this period see, e.g., BRIGHT, *History...* 280-1, 284-6; J. M. MILLER and J. H. HAYES, *A History of Ancient Judah and Israel* (Philadelphia, Westminster, 1986) 352-3, 358-63; G. W. AHLSTRÖM, *The History of Ancient Palestine from the Paleolithic Period to Alexander’s Conquest*, JSOTSup 146 (Sheffield, JSOT, 1993) 692-6.

⁹⁷ E.g., Hezekiah’s seal which bears a 2-winged beetle pushing a ball of dung symbolizing the rising sun, familiar from Egypt and Phoenicia and consistent with the iconography of the contemporary Imlk sealings: F. M. CROSS, “King Hezekiah’s Seal Bears Phoenician Imagery”: *BAR* 25/2 (1999) 42-5, 60, and *IDEM*, “A Bulla of Hezekiah, King of Judah”: *Realia Dei: Essays in Archaeology and Biblical Interpretation in Honor of Edward F. Campbell, Jr., at his Retirement*, ed. by P. H. Williams, Jr. and T. Hiebert, Scholars Press Homage Series 23 (Atlanta, Scholars, 1999) 62ff. Cf. B. SASS, “The Pre-Exilic Hebrew Seals: Iconism vs. Aniconism”: *Studies in the Iconography of Northwest Semitic Inscribed Seals*, ed. by B. Sass and C. Uehlinger (Fribourg/Göttingen, University/Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1992) 214-9.

⁹⁸ Ussishkin, *Village of Silwan...* 43-63, 281-2, 320-32.

person of consequence in Hezekiah's court, a colleague of the majordomo Shebna, the likely occupant of Tomb #35 (Isa 22:15-25), another of Hezekiah's "new men"⁹⁹ perhaps even of Egyptian ancestry.

Whether the historical Solomon did have an Egyptian princess as a wife lies beyond the reach of the available evidence. That Gezer first became Judahite under unusual circumstances involving Egypt may be the remembered fact behind 1 Kgs 9:16 because it seems to dovetail nicely with the Palestinian campaigns of either Siamun (more a conjecture than a documented fact) and Sheshonq and with the archaeological record at Gezer¹⁰⁰; the diplomatic marriage of a "daughter" (but not necessarily a natural offspring)¹⁰¹ of either pharaoh to Solomon cannot be ruled out of consideration completely¹⁰², but her peripatetic residency in Solomonic Jerusalem is easier imagined to derive from a later (Hezekian?) etiological

⁹⁹ Shebna's father is not identified in either the inscription or Isa 22:15-25 (unlike his rival Eliakim b. Hilkiyah), suggesting that he was perhaps "an upstart, a parvenu, an individual of ignoble birth" (J. T. WILLIS, "Historical Issues in Isaiah 22,15-25": Bib 74 [1993] 60-70 [quotation from p. 63] with earlier literature).

¹⁰⁰ For Siamun cf. recently, e.g., N. NAAMAN, "Israel, Edom and Egypt in the 10th Century BCE": TA 19 (1992) especially 78-9 (with earlier literature); AHLSTRÖM, *History...* 519-20 (but cf. *Id.*, "Pharaoh Shoshenq's Campaign to Palestine", in *History and Traditions of Early Israel: Studies Presented to Eduard Nielsen*, ed. by A. Lemaire and B. Otzen, VTSup 50 (Leiden/New York/Köln, Brill, 1994) 8); K. A. KITCHEN, "Egypt and East Africa", in *The Age of Solomon: Scholarship at the Turn of the Millennium*, ed. by L. K. Handy, SHCANE 11 (Leiden/New York/Köln, Brill, 1997) 106-23. For Sheshonq cf., e.g., E. A. KNAUF, "King Solomon's Copper Supply", in *Phoenicia and the Bible*, ed. by E. Lipiński, Studia Phoenicia 11 (Leuven, Peeters, 1991) 181-3 (see especially p. 182 n. 59), and H. M. NIEMANN, "The Socio-Political Shadow Cast by the Biblical Solomon", in *The Age of Solomon: Scholarship at the Turn of the Millennium*, ed. by L. K. Handy, SHCANE 11 (Leiden/New York/Köln, Brill, 1997) especially 296-9. See, however, the reassessment of Sheshonq's "invasion" by F. CLANCY, "Shishak/Sheshonq' Travels": JSOT 86 (1999) 2-23.

¹⁰¹ For the semantic elasticity of the words *bēn/bat* in Biblical Hebrew see W. B. BARRICK, "Another Shaking of Jehoshaphat's Family Tree: Jehoram and Ahaziah Once Again": VT 51 (2001) 11-2.

¹⁰² Both hypotheses, and the historical context which they presuppose, are thoroughly evaluated and found wanting by P. S. ASH, DAVID, *Solomon and Egypt: A Reassessment*, JSOTSup 297 (Sheffield, Sheffield Academic, 1999) especially 37-46 ("most likely Siamun's Battle Relief depicts a fictitious victory" [p. 46]), 50-6 ("the surviving texts for Shoshenq's invasion do not suggest that friendly relationships or ties of any sort existed with Palestine at the time" [p. 56]), 112-9 ("it is best at this time to avoid placing any weight on the reports of Solomon's marriage to an Egyptian princess in any reconstruction of relations between Egypt and Palestine during Solomon's time" [p. 119]).

legend than a contemporary archival note¹⁰³. Even less can be said with any confidence about the Solomonic bamoth. The association with Solomon probably is legendary (see §5 above) and may have been current in Hezekiah's Jerusalem (cf. the attribution of Nehushtan to Moses [2 Kgs 18:4b]). That the locational notice in 2 Kgs 23:13 could equally describe the location of the Silwan cemetery which Josiah also attacked (cf. 23:16-18)¹⁰⁴ suggests that the cultic installations may have been related to the tombs in some way. It is possible, for example, that they too were carved out of the mountain rather than erected on top of it¹⁰⁵. The earliest extant rock-cut structures in the Silwan necropolis are several Phoenician-like tombs with gabled ceilings, many unfinished, plausibly dating from the mid-9th century before the anti-Phoenician purge engineered by Jehoiada stopped construction¹⁰⁶. Some euhemeristic explanation(s) of these tombs (more "politically correct" than their historical connection to Athaliah) surely had arisen by Hezekiah's era for Shebna and his colleagues to construct their tombs nearby: perhaps they were imagined to have been part of the "house" Solomon allegedly built for Pharaoh's daughter, and/or the bamoth he allegedly built for three foreign deities¹⁰⁷; perhaps several of these and/or the

¹⁰³ N. Naaman posits the existence of a "chronicle of early Israelite kings" which contained an entry about Pharaoh's daughter which he tentatively reconstructs as 9:16a-b α →3:1aba→9:24a ("Sources and Composition in the History of Solomon", in *The Age of Solomon: Scholarship at the Turn of the Millennium*, ed. by L. K. Handy, SHCANE 11 [Leiden/New York/Köln, Brill, 1997] especially 63-4). It is hard to believe why such a seemingly trivial detail of no lasting consequence or pedagogical utility as the location of the princess vis-à-vis the City of David (unlike the acquisition of Gezer) would have been recorded in such a source.

¹⁰⁴ Asserted by W. G. DEVER, "The Silence of the Text: An Archaeological Commentary on 2 Kings 23", in *Scripture and Other Artifacts: Essays on the Bible and Archaeology in Honor of Philip J. King*, ed. by M. D. Coogan et al. (Louisville, Westminster John Knox, 1994) 157-8, and argued by me in *The King and the Cemeteries: Toward a New Understanding of Josiah's Reform*, VTSup, forthcoming.

¹⁰⁵ 2 Kgs 23:13, so precise in identifying the mountain, is silent on the relationship of Solomon's installations to the mountain, but bāhār in 1 Kgs 11:7a (literally "in the mountain"; so too the location of the cemetery in 23:16) points in this direction; so does Isaiah's reference to Shebna's tomb bassela< (literally "in the rock" [Isa 22:16b]) which well describes the monolithic "Tomb of the Royal Steward" (#35): see USSISHKIN, *Village of Silwan...* 188-202.

¹⁰⁶ See n. 98 above.

¹⁰⁷ It was once supposed (e.g., by F. de Saulcy in 1854) that the "Tomb of Pharaoh's Daughter" (#3) was a small temple in Egyptian style erected by Solomon for his Egyptian wife, and G. Perrot and C. Chipiez (in 1890) supposed it was actually "one of the cult places established by Solomon [which later] was demolished and it was decided to hew out a tomb" (apud USSISHKIN, *Village of Silwan...* 4, 45, also noting Vincent's report [1912] that some

foreign-looking monolithic tombs had by Josiah's day become associated with cultic practices to which the reformers objected¹⁰⁸; finally, although the earliest extant Silwan structures may be no earlier than the mid-9th century, there is no reason that a few structures now obliterated by later quarrying could not have been cut out of the slope further north as early as Solomon's reign when foreign (notably Phoenician) architectural style was in vogue in the new governmental citadel on the other side of the Wadi Kidron.

Resumen.- La evaluación teológica decisivamente negativa de Salomón en la Historia de los Reyes ("hizo mal en los ojos de Yahweh" [1 R 11:6a]) se basa en tres acusaciones: se le atribuye haber patrocinado el bamoth (3:3b), haber ayudado a sus muchas esposas extranjeras en el culto de sus deidades (11:2,7-8a; cf. 2 R 23:13) y hasta de haber venerado algunos de ellos él mismo (11:5, 8b [LXX^L], 33 [LXX]). Este retrato negativo se ve como la obra de el/los "historiador(es) deuteronomista(s)", pero también arraigado en hechos verdaderos. Este ensayo examina este consenso erudito, encontrando: que las esposas/concubinas de Salomón fueron introducidas en la edición "josianica" (de costumbre Dt¹) de los Reyes como concepto teológico para culpar a sus delitos el cismo; que el compilador-autor utilizó una tradición contemporánea que le atribuía a Salomón ciertas instalaciones de culto ("bamoth") en el Monte de Olivas (2 R 23:13) de lo que infirió que eran las esposas de Salomón quines lo habían desviado; que la tradición es euhemerista, no histórica, probablemente teniendo su fuente en la época de Hezekias junto con la reapertura del cementerio de Silwan en la cuesta del Monte de Olivas; la

Jerusalem Christians in his day called the tomb "Madhbah Bint Far<un", in *Altar of Pharaoh's Daughter...* 43 n. 3).

¹⁰⁸ Analogous to Kenyon's "Cave 1," halfway down the slope of the south-eastern hill in Jerusalem, above the Gihon spring: see now H. J. FRANKEN and M. L. STEINER, *Excavations by K. M. Kenyon in Jerusalem 1961-1967, 2: The Iron Age Extra-Mural Quarter on the South-East Hill*, British Academy Monographs in Archaeology 2 (Oxford, Oxford University, 1990), and cf. S. BOURKE, "Excavations in the Iron Age Extra-Mural Quarter on the South-East Hill of Jerusalem: Review Article": PEQ 124 (1992) 59-62; I. ESHEL and K. PRAG, eds., *Excavations by K. M. Kenyon in Jerusalem 1961-1967, 4: The Iron Age Cave Deposits on the South-east Hill and Isolated Burials and Cemeteries Elsewhere*, British Academy Monographs in Archaeology 6 (Oxford, Oxford University, 1995), and cf. H. J. FRANKEN, "Cave I at Jerusalem—An Interpretation", in *Trade, Contact, and the Movement of Peoples in the Eastern Mediterranean: Studies in Honour of J. Basil Hennessy*, ed. by S. Bourke and J.-P. Descœudres, Mediterranean Archaeology Supplement 3 (Sydney, Mediarch, 1995) 233-40, and M. STEINE, "Two Popular Cult Sites of Ancient Palestine: Cave 1 in Jerusalem and E 207 in Samaria": SJOT 11/1 (1997) 16-28. It appears to have been a tomb "recycled" for some other function which came to an end with the erection of the new inner city-wall and adjacent street c. 700. Although its new function is disputed, it possibly served as the "shop" for an intermediary of some sort, "where [poorer] people came to make offerings to enhance fertility, or to have their fortunes told" (Steine, "Two Popular Cult Sites," 25; cf. K. PRAG, "Summary of the Reports on Caves I, II and III and Deposit IV", in Eshel-Prag, *Excavations by K. M. Kenyon in Jerusalem 1961-1967, 4*, 209-16).

tradicón de la hija de Farahón es también "hezekiana" y puede haber estado presente en un trabajo historiográfico pre-deuteronomista de esa era (cf. LXX); un compilador-autor post-exílico de Reyes cambia el tema de uno de demasiadas esposas/concubinas (cf. Dt 17:17a) a uno de esposas extranjeras, reflejando la misma xenofobia extrema que llevó finalmente el día en el Yehud post-exílico (cf. Esd 9-10; Ne 13:23-30a) cuando se sabe que Salomón proveía un modelo negativo (Ne 13:26); ninguna de esta materia provee luz alguna en el "Salomón histórico".

Summary.- *The unequivocally negative theological evaluation of Solomon in the Kings History (he "did evil in the eyes of Yahweh" [1 Kgs 11:6a]) is based on three accusations: he is said to have patronized the bamoth (3:3b), to have abetted his many foreign wives in the worship of their native deities (11:2,7-8a; cf. 2 Kgs 23:13), and to have even worshipped some of them himself (11:5, 8b [LXX¹], 33 [LXX]). This negative portrayal is customarily seen as the handiwork of the "deuteronomistic historian(s)", but also rooted in fact. This essay examines that scholarly consensus, finding: Solomon's wives/women were introduced in the "Josianic" (customarily Dtr¹) edition of Kings as a theological construct to blame the schism on his misdeeds; that author-compiler drew upon a contemporary tradition attributing certain cultic installations ("bamoth") on the Mount of Olives to Solomon (2 Kgs 23:13), from which he inferred that it was Solomon's wives who had led him astray; that tradition is euhemeristic, not historical, probably arising in Hezekiah's era in conjunction with the reopening of the Silwan cemetery in the slopes of the Mount of Olives; the Pharaoh's daughter tradition is also "Hezekian" and may have been present in a pre-deuteronomistic historiographic work from that era (cf. LXX); a post-Exilic author-compiler of Kings recast the theme from one of too many wives/women (consistent with Deut 17:17a) to one of alien wives, reflecting the same extreme xenophobia which finally carried the day in post-Exilic Yehud (cf. Ezra 9-10; Neh 13:23-30a) when Solomon is known to have been a negative role-model in this regard (Neh 13:26); none of this material sheds any light on the "historical Solomon".*