1 Kings and 3 Kingdoms — Origin and Revision
Case Study: The Sins of Solomon (1 Kgs 11)

Zipora Talshir

The wide gap between the canonical book of Kings (Kgs) and its counterpart in the Old Greek layer of the books of Kingdoms (Kgdms) extends far beyond the usual textual discrepancy created in the natural process of text transmission and is probably the result of revisory activity.¹ Within the Old Greek layer of Kgdms, the section that shows the most outstanding differences from Kgs roughly parallels the reign of Solomon. It has two large additions: the first consists of two miscellanies appended at 2:35a–o and 2:46a–l, and the second is the alternative story of the division of the kingdom added at 12:24a–z. These additions contain little new material compared with the canonical version, but are rather alternative presentations of materials found in the MT (and in the running LXX). Besides these large additions, the main difference between the texts lies in the rearrangement of the text. Thus, the building of Solomon’s palace (1 Kgs 7:1–12) is postponed until after the Temple is furnished (3 Kgdms 7:38–50); Solomon’s marriage to Pharaoh’s daughter (1 Kgs 3:1), together with her endowment (1 Kgs 9:16) are placed just before the building activities of the Temple begin (3 Kgdms 5:14a–b); the statement about the forced labor (1 Kgs 9:15–22) is placed in connection with Solomon’s riches (3 Kgdms 10:22a–c). How have these and many other substantial and more subtle differences emerged?

¹ The Old Greek of Kgdms comprises 1 Kgdms (α), 2 Kgdms 1–10 (ββ), 3 Kgdms 2:12–21:43 (γγ), while the rest of Kgdms belongs to the Kaige Recension (KR) and mainly corresponds to the MT. This division of Kgdms was set by Thackeray and accepted, with little objection, ever since. H. St. J. Thackeray, “The Greek Translators of the Four Books of Kings,” JThS 8 (1907) 262–278.

The Greek Translator

In an important study published in 1950, Wevers presented the exegetical principles that guided the translator of 3 Kgdms 2:12–21:43. His working hypothesis was that the differences between 1 Kgs and 3 Kgdms were created by the Greek translator who remodelled his source. Accordingly, he argued, great caution is needed when using γγ for textual criticism (pp. 302, 322). In this article, however, Wevers entirely neglected the Vorlage and did not engage in the question of whether certain changes could have happened during the transmission of the Hebrew text rather than in translation. The translator’s work should be evaluated in constant interaction with the evaluation of his Vorlage, which might have been substantially different from the text preserved in the MT.

Categories such as those set by Wevers—rationalization, a tendency to glorify Solomon, theological modifications—are not necessarily characteristic of translators. Such tendencies probably inspired authors, redactors and copyists during the ages. Only seldom is a difference between Kgs and Kgdms explicable as purely translational, since, mostly, there are no indications that would define a certain omission, addition, transposition, or other changes as created by the translator rather than in his Vorlage.

Wevers evaluated the translator of 3 Kgdms as following: “By and large the Greek translator whose work is being considered is attempting to render somewhat exactly into Greek the text of the Hebrew” (p. 300). Indeed, this translator—although not as literal as the KR translations—usually kept to his Vorlage, rendering all its elements, in the same order, and mostly in the spirit of the original language rather than the target language. It is difficult to envisage a translator who hardly ever paraphrases his text to be responsible for additions, omissions or rearrangement of the text. He may variegate his equivalents in order to

---

avoid repetition (p. 301), but would he also feel free to omit words or clauses, even if they were tautological (pp. 301–302)? He may have chosen to render בְּעֵל by αἰσχύνη, assuming that his Vorlage did not read בְּעֵל (3 Kgdms 18:19, 25), but would he also omit an entire clause such as 1 Kgs 13:26b for theological reasons (p. 319)?

It is impossible to prove that a certain omission was made by the translator rather than existing in his Vorlage. Wevers’ ‘historical’ argumentation is not effective. He claims, for example, that the translator must have omitted יֹהֶר שֶם דַּעַיִן הוָה “and there they remain to this day” (8:8), because the ark was no longer there in his day (p. 303). However, this was true long before the translator’s time and the omission could have occurred at any stage of the transmission of the Hebrew text. Similarly, there is no reason to assume that the translator replaced the archaic וּלְהוֹז with וּבְרָדַי (6:4–6:37) (p. 302), since the actualization is already found in the MT: בִּרְדָּדָד וּבְהַיְמָה עֶשֶׂנִי “in the month of Ziv, that is, the second month” (6:1). Other calculated omissions which Wevers attributed to the translator could have happened just as well in the course of transmission of his Vorlage; e.g., 8:65–66: “So Solomon held the feast... seven days and seven days, fourteen days in all. On the eighth day he sent the people away”; it did not necessarily have to be the translator who first realized that “and seven days, fourteen days in all” interrupts the sequence of ‘seven days’ / ‘the eighth day’ and omitted it (p. 303). If original, these words could have been omitted by any redactor of the Hebrew text, just as

---

3 See J. Barr, The Typology of Literalism in Ancient Biblical Translations (Göttingen, 1979) 283.

4 The translator hardly meant נִסָּנֶו by נִסְו, as argued by Wevers, just as he did not mean a known month-name by בְּרָדַי which he introduces for בְּעֵל in the following verse. נִסְו is rather a corruption which possibly involves also the end of the previous word בּוּרָדַי.

5 These words are not represented in the RSV!
the Chronicler found it necessary to explain them in his own way (2 Chr 7:8-10).\(^6\)

Finally, Wevers deals only with the smaller differences between the texts, ignoring the more substantial ones, such as the large additions, the rearrangement of the material and the more generally motivated changes such as the chronology (see p. 302, note 5). While de facto the distinction is understandable there is no inherent difference between them, and the smaller changes should be evaluated against the background of the general image of the material. For example, Wevers explains the omission of מִשָּׁלֶךְ הַיְהוֹשֵׁפָט עֵם מֶלֶךְ יִשְׂרָאֵל “And further, Jehoshaphat submitted to the king of Israel” (1 Kgs 22:45) in the LXX (3 Kgdms 16:28) as generated by the translator’s negative attitude towards the northern kingdom (p. 311). However, the omission of this clause should be evaluated in connection with the transposition of the entire passage. Would the translator also be responsible for moving the passage from one place to another? There are too many differences between the texts that would hardly come from a translator. Some of the changes attributed by Wevers to the translator may well be such, but most of the changes are part of the literary activity that produced the different revision of the material as preserved in 3 Kgdms.

A Greek Revisor

Gooding, in a series of intriguing studies during the 1960s and 70s,\(^7\) argued that the changed image of the book of Kings in the LXX does not stem from the Greek translator, but rather from a Greek revisor. In his studies on given units he tended not to decide whether a specific change was by a revisor of the Greek translation or whether it already existed in a Hebrew

---


\(^7\) D. W. Gooding, Relics of Ancient Exegesis (Cambridge, 1976), and some of his articles cited ibid., p. 129, nn. 1-5; also below n. 10.
text he was using. He states his attitude, *inter alia*, in his article on the revisor’s keen interest in timetabling, in reference to 1 Kgs 8:1. The MT begins the verse with: ...“Then Solomon assembled,” while the LXX is much more explicit regarding the time of the event: καὶ ἐγένετο ὡς συνετέλεσεν Σαλωμών τοῦ οἴκοδομῆσαι τὸν οἶκον Κυρίου καὶ τὸν οἶκον ἑαυτοῦ μετὰ οἰκοσ ἑτε, τότε ἐξεκκλησάσθαι ὁ βασιλεὺς Σαλωμών. Gooding explains the origin of this expansion as following: “But the Greek (or the Hebrew text it was following) has felt the need to explain the time to which ἵνα and τότε refer.” There is nothing to indicate that this expansion was first made in Greek. The phrasing is somewhat awkward in Greek as well as in a surmised Hebrew Vorlage; the reason lies in the fact that the expansion is not a new creation by the revisor but rather consists of texts borrowed from other contexts such as 9:1

> ρήμα κατ’ ἐναν τὸν Κοινότητα ἡ πρώτη ἡ ἱερὰ τῆς χριστιανικῆς ἡμέρας “When Solomon had finished building the house of the Lord and the king’s house”; 9:10

ὁ ἱερὸς κτίσμα τῆς ἁγίας ἡ οἰκουμένη ἡ πρώτη ἡ ἱερὰ τῆς χριστιανικῆς “At the end of twenty years, in which Solomon had built the two houses, the house of the Lord and the king’s house.” The expansion in 8:1 probably reflects a text such as: ρήμα κατ’ ἐναν τὸν Κοινότητα ἡ πρώτη ἡ ἱερὰ τῆς χριστιανικῆς...

While Gooding does not make up his mind concerning the details—whether the change originated in Hebrew or in Greek—he is quite decisive on the whole revision of 3 Kgds: it was first created by a Greek revisor. His approach is very clear in his inclusive article on Text and Midrash in the LXX. He postpones his answer to the question of whether specific changes are based on a Hebrew text or not to a later time, when the Samuel texts from Qumran cave 4 will be published, but assertively states his opinion that at least part of the re-interpretation and re-arrangement was


9 The Greek of 8:1 is not identical with that of 9:1 or 10; hence the text of 8:1 was not copied from the Greek version of 9:1 or 10.

not created in the Vorlage, or by the original translator, but rather by a later revisor of the Greek translation (pp. 1-2). Out of four carefully defined possibilities he chooses the following explanation for the creation of 3 Kgdms: “The original translators used a text basically the same as the MT; but later revisors revised and re-ordered the Greek on the basis of a Hebrew text far different from the MT” (p. 17). This Hebrew text was, in his opinion, characteristically midrashic and heavily revised the original text.

Some general comments on Gooding’s concept are in order, even though they do not necessarily contradict his thesis. First, it is not easy to accept his assumption that the revisors of the LXX, that is, at quite a late stage, still had Hebrew texts at their disposal whose variants they saw fit to incorporate into their revision. Second, this revision, which he claims changed the LXX that actually agreed with the accepted Hebrew text, would have a completely different orientation than the known revisions, which rather attempted to bring the LXX closer to the gradually crystallizing Hebrew text. Finally, if 3 Kgdms is a revision of the original LXX we would expect to find traces of this revisory activity; however, 3 Kgdms does not show any traces of the sort of revision envisaged by Gooding.11

A Hebrew Revisor

In my opinion, the gap between the texts was created neither by the Greek translator nor by a Greek revisor, but rather by a Hebrew revisor. The findings of Qumran have taught us that different editions of biblical books existed concurrently. Qumran provided evidence for the harmonistic and non-harmonistic editions of the Pentateuch, juxtaposed beforehand in the Samaritan Pentateuch and the MT, for both the long and short editions of Jeremiah, previously known from the MT and the LXX, as well as for two substantially different texts of Samuel. While no such evidence exists for Kgs, there is no inherent reason to evaluate the difference between Kgs and

---

Kgdms on a different level. Just as the large additions in Chapter 2\textsuperscript{12} and Chapter 12\textsuperscript{13} probably had a Hebrew Vorlage—an assumption to which Gooding would agree—there must have been a different Hebrew edition for the entire book of Kgs which is currently attested only in its Greek translation of Kgdms. The relationship between these concurrent Hebrew texts is a matter of philological judgement. I would agree with Gooding that 3 Kgdms is best characterized as a midrash-oriented revision of a text which did not differ much from the MT. This approach is examined below for the section on the sins of Solomon.

**The Sins of Solomon in 1 Kgs and 3 Kgdms**

The author of Kgs constructed the concluding chapter of Solomon’s reign (1 Kgs 11) as an introduction to the division of the kingdom, basing his theodicy for the rupture on the sins of Solomon. It begins with Solomon’s sins (11:1–8). The reaction of God follows immediately, explicitly linking the sins just described with the future division (11:9–13). The sins of Solomon are again mentioned as the reason for the division in Ahijah’s prophecy to Jeroboam (11:33). The different forms of these texts in 1 Kgs and 3 Kgdms are characteristic of the relationship between the two different editions of the Book of Kings. A study of the material in its MT version reveals a complex text that shows many traces of its creation process. In the LXX version, on the other hand, most of the problems characteristic of the MT have disappeared. The question is whether the text preserved in Kgdms is an earlier version which had not undergone the redactional activity characteristic of Kgs, or the work of a later revisor who rewrote material similar to the MT in order to remedy the disorder characteristic of the latter.

\textsuperscript{12} See E. Tov, “The LXX Additions (Miscellanea) in 1 Kings 2 (3 Reigns 2),” *Textus* 11 (1984) 89–118. Tov offers the Hebrew Vorlage of the miscellanea. Regarding their translation he concludes: “These unique similarities prove that the additions were probably rendered by the same person who translated the main text of 1 Kings” (pp. 112–113).

The Sins of Solomon according to the MT of 1 Kgs 11:1–8

1 Kgs 11:1–8 is a programmatic presentation of Solomon’s sins. It does not, however, advance only an ideological statement but seems to be based on two data-like items: (a) Solomon’s harem: דוד והי לושפת חמש את שבע מזאתי פלנשיס “He had seven hundred royal wives and three hundred concubines” (11:3a); and (b) the construction of cult places for foreign deities: ...ואוהב שרים את שלמה באה לבלמה... “At that time, Solomon built a shrine for Chemosh...” (11:7). These items seem to have been part of a source underlying the Book of Kings, possibly the quoted verse הדביד שלמה “the book of the Annals (?) of Solomon” (1 Kgs 11:43). They are marked by formulae which the author uses when introducing data he found in his sources. Thus, 11:3 follows the pattern of passages such as דוד והי לושפת את שבע מזאתי פלנשיס “Solomon had 40,000 stalls of horses for his chariots and 12,000 horsemen” (5:6); דוד והי לושפת את שבע מזאתי פלנשיס “Solomon also had 70,000 porters and 80,000 quarriers in the hills” (5:29). And 11:7 is structured like לאוהב שרים את שלמה באה לבלמה “As soon as16 Pharaoh’s daughter went up from the City of David to the palace that he had built for her, he built the Millo” (9:24). These examples conform to the rules of cited data: not only do they begin with the code words והי לי, but they are also formulated as brief notices, detached from the context. The alleged data in ch. 11, however, are now part of a larger account, which presents the sins of

14 See, e.g., M. Noth, König (BKAT; Neukirchen-Vluyn, 1968) 244.


16 It is difficult to determine whether 3 Kgdms 2:35f ὅτι οὗτος reflects את instead of MT את (in spite of Mic 3:4; Job 11:15).

17 Other examples, outside the reign of Solomon, are: את חמא תלמה באה את התיהו “Libnah likewise fell away at that time” (2 Kgs 8:22); ואת חמא תלמה את התיהו “At that time, Menahem subdued Tiphssah” (15:16).
Solomon in two phases: (1) the many foreign wives that he took (11:1-3); (2) the foreign cults that he consequently introduced in Jerusalem (11:4-8). The two phases are explicitly connected at the beginning of v. 4: "In his old age, his wives turned away Solomon’s heart after other gods.”

(1) Solomon’s wives. The first piece of information—the number of Solomon’s wives (11:3a)—disrupts the account of his sins. Vv. 1–4 run as following: “(v. 1) King Solomon loved many foreign women... Moabite, Ammonite...; (v. 2) from the nations of which the Lord had said to the Israelites, None of you shall join them... Such Solomon clung to and loved; (v. 3) He had seven hundred royal wives and three hundred concubines; and his wives turned his heart away; (v. 4) In his old age, his wives turned away Solomon’s heart after other gods...”. V. 3 stands out in the context: vv. 1–2 and 4 clearly speak of Solomon’s foreign wives. Does v. 3 provide the number of these foreign wives? This may be its meaning in its present context but it is hardly its original meaning: v. 3a must have concerned Solomon’s entire harem, not only his imported wives; it was part of a source which was written ad majorem regis gloriam and described, besides his wisdom, riches and horses and chariots, also his many wives, another indication of his glory.18

Surprisingly, the evaluation which follows, ירש נשים את לבו “and his wives turned his heart away” (v. 3b), is also awkward in the context, since it is repeated at the beginning of v. 4: "...his wives turned away Solomon's heart.” In addition, the style of v. 3b is markedly different from its context: v. 3b uses לָבַב, while the entire passage uses לְבָּב v. 2, 4 (three times) and 8;19 v. 3b has the absolute use of לָבַב, while the entire passage

---

18 This does not mean that we are dealing with exact data; rather, it is a typological number which is designed to express the king’s splendor in its round figures: 300 and 700, one thousand in all.

19 Briggs came to the conclusion that לָבַב characterizes the Deuteronomistic redaction in Kgs, while לְבָּב was used in the deuteronomicist's sources; the data is not unequivocal but the general argument is reasonable; see C. A. Briggs, “A Study of
adds a complement: אבות אלמים (v. 2); אחרי אלילים (v. 4); ימים הישר (v. 9).

These considerations suggest that the author found all of v. 3 in his source, where both the data (3a) and its consequence (3b) did not refer to foreign wives but to many wives. This is corroborated by the law of the king in Deuteronomy: "And he shall not have many wives, lest his heart go astray" (Deut 17:17). In Deuteronomy the women are certainly not foreign; the issue is ‘abundance’, in regard to other matters as well: ימים וישר ותעבוד אלים (v. 16-17). It is difficult to ignore the affinity between the law of the king which warns against abundance in silver and gold and horses and women, and king Solomon who was renowned precisely for his gold and horses (I Kgs 10:14–

20 Cf. 2 Sam 19:15 controllers of the heart of all the men of Judah as one man,” and especially Deut 17:17, which is discussed below.

21 The law of the king then reasons why the king should avoid abundance: Therefore, he will not act haughtily toward his fellows (Deut 17:20; vv. 18–19 interrupt the sequence). This is the ‘royal’ version of the general moral “over the abundance of everything” (Deut 28:47) which causes arrogance to the point of ignoring God: ‘and you say to yourselves, My own power and the might of my own hand have won this wealth for me’ (8:17). Paradoxically, this developed into forgetting the national God and worshipping foreign gods instead (8:19). The law of the king, too, specifies the observance of the commandments (17:20) but, unlike Deut 8 and 1 Kgs 11, does not speak of other gods. See M. Weinfeld, Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomic School (Oxford, 1972) 280ff., 367ff.
29) and women (11:3). This connection was made in ancient times by Ben Sira. His praise of Solomon culminates with the statement “You were called by the honorary name called upon Israel” (47:18). He then turns to mention his sins, which include not only women as in Kgs, but also the accumulation of gold and silver, as in Deut: "you gathered gold like tin and amassed silver like lead. You gave your loins to women, and let them rule your body" (47:18ff). The Sages explicitly argue that Solomon transgressed the law of the king in regard to both women and horses:

ואמר י''זandez מפנימיה של אשה גננת גוּלְּהַת הַצְּרֶם סֵפֵר אַל יָרְבֶה וְלֵשַׁם נֵצְרוֹ נַעֲשֶׁה בָּאֲדֻמָּה אֵין יָרֵבָה אל נַעֲשֶׁה אָסֵפֶר י''זandez מַרְכֶּזֶת נֵצְרוֹ נַעֲשֶׁה בָּאֲדֻמָּה אֵין יָרֵבָה אל נַעֲשֶׁה אָסֵפֶר י''זandez מַרְכֶּזֶת נֵצְרוֹ נַעֲשֶׁה בָּאֲדֻמָּה

R. Isaac said: why were not the reasons for the commandments revealed? Because twice were the reasons revealed and the greatest in the world failed them; it is written: he shall not have many wives, said Solomon: I will have many and will not trespass; but it is written: In his old age, his wives turned away Solomon’s heart; and it is written: and he shall not keep many horses, and Solomon said: I will keep many, and will not have (the people) return, and it is written: A chariot was imported from Egypt etc. (b. Sanh. 21b).

22 Driver remarks that the author of the law of the king tacitly refers to Solomon’s policy; S. R. Driver, Deuteronomy (ICC; Edinburgh, 1902) 211. Yeivin asserts that the law of the king is based on the image of Solomon; S. Yeivin, “The Time of the Book of Deuteronomy,” in B. Dinahburg Volume (Jerusalem, 1949) 31-48 (Heb.).

23 Translations and commentators of Ben Sira usually explained this text in accordance with Kgs, understanding the reference to Solomon’s wealth as part of his praise and starting his sins with the women (RSV: “But you laid your loins beside women ...”). This contradicts the dynamics of the text: (1) the reference to Solomon’s honorable name is the climax of the praise; (2) while the style changes on passing to the reference to Solomon’s wealth, there is no difference between the phrasing of the sayings on wealth and women and they obviously belong together. Segal, aware of the rabbinical interpretation (see above), realized that this was the meaning of the text; M. H. Segal, Ben Sira (Jerusalem, 1958) ad loc. (Heb.).
The medieval commentator R. Joseph Qara is even more inclusive in his comments ad 1 Kgs 11:1: "you must conclude that he [i.e., Solomon] trespassed all three of them: he shall not amass silver and gold to excess, and he shall not have many wives nor shall he keep many horses".

The history of 11:3, then, would seem to be as follows: (1) its original form was a note on Solomon's huge harem (v. 3a) which at one time joined notes such as the data on his gold and horses; (2) this note was expanded by the evaluation (v. 3b), in the spirit of Deuteronomy; (3) finally, this text ended up in the description of Solomon's foreign wives who turned away his heart after their gods. In its present position it interrupts the flow of the description in vv. 1–2, 4ff. This is an interesting example of a component, v. 3, that is earlier than the context it is set in, but nevertheless carries the characteristics of a gloss that disrupts the context.24

Our description is of course tentative and partial; the author may have had additional data in his source, e.g., concerning Solomon's intermarriage with foreign wives (v. 1).25 Such information may have been the basis for the author's concept of Solomon's sins. He applied the prohibition inherent in the ban law against the Canaanites (Exod 34:11–16; Deut 7:1–3, also Josh 23:12) to Solomon's intermarriage with women from neighboring countries.

24 Accordingly, Burney argues that 11:3a does not belong to the original material, but is rather a marginal note which was added at a later stage—in different places—in both the MT and the LXX; 11:3b, in his opinion, is an even later addition. Burney actually reconstructs the original text of Rd (the Deuteronomistic redactor) without v. 3; C. F. Burney, Notes on the Hebrew Text of Kings (Oxford, 1903; repr. New York, 1970) 154–155.

25 This seems to be a realistic element in Solomon's foreign policy; see A. Malamat, "Aspects of the Foreign Policies of David and Solomon," JNES 22 (1963) 1–17. Moab, Amon and Edom are part of the 'empire' (2 Sam 8:2, 14; 12:26–31), and indeed, the mother of the next king is an Ammonite (1 Kgs 14:21). Sidon was Solomon's ally (1 Kgs 5:20) and for the Hittites see 10:29. The reference to the daughter of Pharaoh in v. 1 is syntactically awkward (see Rashi to Josh 2:1 and BDB, s.v. כתוב, p. 85b). The marriage itself is historically problematic, but it is an insistent tradition corroborated by several texts (1 Kgs 3:1, 7:8, 9:16, 24).
probably influenced by the law of Deuteronomy 23, which originally was not concerned with marriage at all, but rather with the right to be part of the community that worships the national God.26

In sum, two concepts were combined in the account of Solomon’s sins: many wives and foreign wives, and the general turn of the heart with the turn after foreign gods. The Sages have already questioned the logic of the law of the king: אל ירבה לו נשים... כי תוחרז זאואר: מราרח ואו, ולא ירבה שנים נשים... ויריד הוא אל שצאתו "משרדה את לבו. כי שנים נשים... כי אברוח)... אברוח שאם: אברוח את שמרותיו את לבו, והי הוא אל שצאתו he should not have many wives... R. Judah says: he may take many, as long as they do not turn his heart. R. Simeon says: even one woman that turns his heart, he should not take her” (m. Sanh. 2:4). And Qimhi comments on our passage in Kgs: ישתים רוחת ישנה בנה, אשת שדהמה ובש ממשל ומי מריה אמור... אל ירבה לו נשים, כי ושivité נשים, ושתי נשים, ושתי נשים, ושתי נשים... אלא ירבה לו נשים,"

Two wrongs did he commit, one that he had many wives, and even if they were Israeliites, he should not have taken many... let alone that they were foreign, and turned his heart after foreign..."

26 See S. Mowinckel, "Zu Deuteronomium 23:2-9," AvO 1 (1922) 90; K. Galling, "Das Gemeindegesetz in Deuteronomium 23," in Festschrift A. Bertholet (Tübingen, 1950) 178. These two laws are merged in Ezr 9:1-2, 12: "The people of Israel... have not separated themselves from the peoples of the land... the Canaanites, the Hittites, the Perizzites, the Jebusites, the Ammonites, the Moabites, the Egyptians, and the Amorites. They have taken their daughters as wives... so that the holy seed has become intermingled with the peoples of the land... Now then, do not give your daughters in marriage to their sons... do nothing for their well-being or advantage forever.” Deut 23 is interpreted in reference to marriage in m. Yebam. 8:3, and see Rashi to Deut ad loc. As Kaufmann puts it: “Clearly, 1 Kgs and Ezr-Neh offer expansions and interpretations of the ancient laws of the Torah. The prohibition of intermarriage with the seven peoples of Canaan is explained as carrying a general meaning, and applied to all foreign peoples”; Y. Kaufmann, The History of Israelite Faith (4 vols.; Jerusalem and Tel Aviv, 1956) 2:366 (Heb.). Kaufmann sees the concept expressed in 1 Kgs 11:1-2 as a product of Solomon’s own time; see ibid., p. 193. It would seem, however, that such concepts were appropriate for the time of conquest and settlement, on the one hand, and for the time of the Return, on the other, but hardly for the time of the Kingdom. See Kaufmann’s interesting presentation of the problem in his Golah ve-Nehar (Tel Aviv, 1939) 1:235-237 (Heb.).
god, and he was confident in his wisdom and said: I will take many and will not stray.”

(2) The Cult. We assume that data regarding the construction of cult places for foreign deities came into the hands of the author from his sources and he constructed his own words on Solomon’s sins around them. The data he copied read something similar to v. 7, סקפן אינת bịמה לזכרה שקד. מואב המר אש על פי ירושלם עלמוד שקד בני נמע.

“At that time, Solomon built a shrine for Chemosh the abomination of Moab on the hill near Jerusalem, and one for Molech the abomination of the Ammonites.” 27 It is difficult to determine whether this referred also to the deity of Sidon (see v. 5) or other deities (see v. 8). 28 The author did not simply quote the data regarding the building of high places, but began with a more general reference to the king’s decline influenced by his foreign wives (vv. 4–6). This combination resulted in quite an awkward text: v. 5 speaks of Solomon as having followed Ashtoreth and Milcom, while v. 7 refers to high places built for Chemosh and Molech. The repetition and the discrepancy are the result of the merger between the source and the author’s own contribution. 1 Kgs 11:33 combines the data into one sequence: יהוה...לעコミュニケ...לכללם...לכללם... “For they have forsaken Me; they have worshiped Ashtoreth..., Chemosh, and Milcom....” Similarly, 2 Kgs 23:13, ואית הנה אח נב מהעל נפי ירושלם...לעคิ...לכלם...לכלם...לכלם... “The king also defiled the shrines facing Jerusalem... which Solomon... had built for Ashtoreth..., for Chemosh..., and for Milcom....”

27 If such an original note actually existed, it probably did not read בקפן ‘abomination’, but rather אלוהי ‘god’. The word for the Ammonite god may not have been ‘Molech’, since this designation occurs in contexts which deal with consigning one’s son or daughter to the fire of Molech (in Leviticus and in 2 Kgs 23:10; Jer 32:35) and is never associated with the Ammonites. In v. 5 the form is לכלם, a form also repeated in the related passages of 1 Kgs 11:33 and 2 Kgs 23:33.

28 According to Nielsen the original note referred only to one high place built for Chemosh/Molech, who were one and the same deity, as suggested by Judg 11:24; E. Nielsen, *Shechem: A Traditio-Historical Investigation* (Copenhagen, 1959) 43.
In sum, 1 Kgs 11:1–8 is a cluttered text in which the traces of the process of composition are conspicuous. It is based on data from ancient sources used by probably more than one Deuteronomistic writer of Solomon’s story.

**The Sins of Solomon according to LXX 3 Kgds 11:1–8**

The problems characteristic of the MT version of this passage completely disappear in 3 Kgds. How do we envisage the relationship between these two texts?

Following is a collation of the two versions of Solomon’s sins, the MT and the LXX, accompanied by a retroverted text presumably used by the translator, presupposing that the changes were made in the Hebrew Vorlage and not by the translator or by a later Greek revisor. Retroverted texts are questionable; however, in this case the difference lies mainly in the arrangement of the text while the text itself is quite similar to the MT.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3 Kgds 11:1–8 LXX</th>
<th>3 Kgds – Vorlage</th>
<th>MT 1 Kgs 11:1–8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>οι βασιλεῖς Σαλομών</td>
<td>ο βασιλεῖς Σαλομών</td>
<td>ο βασιλεῖς Σαλομών</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ἰν πιλογύνης</td>
<td>Ἰν πιλογύνης</td>
<td>Ἰν πιλογύνης</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>καὶ ἐραν αὐτῶ</td>
<td>καὶ ἐραν αὐτῶ</td>
<td>καὶ ἐραν αὐτῶ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀρχουσι ἑπτακοσία</td>
<td>ἀρχουσι ἑπτακοσία</td>
<td>ἀρχουσι ἑπτακοσία</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>καὶ παλλακαὶ τριακοσία</td>
<td>καὶ παλλακαὶ τριακοσία</td>
<td>καὶ παλλακαὶ τριακοσία</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>αὕτη ἡ γυναῖκα ἀλλοτρία</td>
<td>αὕτη ἡ γυναῖκα ἀλλοτρία</td>
<td>αὕτη ἡ γυναῖκα ἀλλοτρία</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>καὶ τὴν θυγατέρα Φαραώ</td>
<td>καὶ τὴν θυγατέρα Φαραὼ</td>
<td>καὶ τὴν θυγατέρα Φαραὼ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Μωαβίτιδας Ἄμμανίτιδας</td>
<td>Μωαβίτιδας Ἄμμανίτιδας</td>
<td>Μωαβίτιδας Ἄμμανίτιδας</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Σύρας καὶ Ἰδουμαίας</td>
<td>Σύρας καὶ Ἰδουμαίας</td>
<td>Σύρας καὶ Ἰδουμαίας</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Χετταίας καὶ Ἄμμανίτιδας</td>
<td>Χετταίας καὶ Ἄμμανίτιδας</td>
<td>Χετταίας καὶ Ἄμμανίτιδας</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


30. The verses of the LXX are numbered according to Brooke-McLean. The underlined words are missing in the parallel text. Omissions are marked by - - - , and transpositions by ~.


2 ἐκ τῶν ἐθνῶν ἐν Ἰσραήλ
ἀλλὰ ἄγαπήσαι 
οἱ ἐκ μιᾶς ἀνθρώπου, καὶ οἱ ἐκ μιᾶς υἱῶν τῶν πολυγυνῶν ἐν Ἰσραήλ ἡμᾶς ἀφήσατε τὸ καθεῖτέον αὐτῶν.

3 καὶ ἐγενήθη ἐν καιρῷ γῆς ἡ Ἁβραάμ ἐν Ἰσραήλ ἐν Νάμαθ ἐν Ἰσραήλ.
The comparison between the texts has four aspects: (1) the translation (translation technique)—changes which originate with the translator; (2) the text (textual criticism)—textual variants created in the process of transmission; (3) the revision (literary criticism)—changes introduced by the revisor who deliberately reshaped the text; (4) the transmission of the Greek text. A clear-cut distinction between the different stages is not always possible. While the importance of the different aspects may change with the texts concerned, in our case, the most important stage is obviously the revision.

(1) The Translation

Understanding the translator’s technique is the first step towards evaluating the nature of his Vorlage. Regardless of the general layout of the text, the parallel texts show the work of a fairly literal translator. The quite elaborate text of 11:2, for example, was translated strictly, item by item:
The translator may not always be as literal as this, but he is generally keen on preserving his Vorlage as closely as possible, with random ad hoc interpretations and reformulations.

11:1 — The most interesting feature contributed by the translator is found at the very beginning:

καὶ ὁ βασιλεὺς Σαλωμῶν ἦν φιλογύνης

The layout of the Greek passage makes it clear that רבח should be set aside, since the foreign women are first introduced later on. Hence, ἦν φιλογύνης is most likely the equivalent of רבח נשית. If so, the translator chose to forgo the exact representation of the elements of his

31 Hatch & Redpath have φιλογύνης (or rather φιλογύνας, as most of the MSS read) as the equivalent ofishi נִשָּׁה (rather than רְבִּחַ נִשָּׁה). Similar equivalents would be : בְּעֶשֶׁב־בַּכֶּר = פִּילוֹמַרְטִים (Prov 17:19); דִּבְרֵי אֲדֹנָי = פִּילוֹגִיאֲרִים (MS A in 2 Chr 26:10). The use of φιλο-compounds, common in 2–4 Macc, is otherwise quite rare in the LXX; see further פִּילוֹנֵים = פִּילוֹנֵיקָא (Ezek 3:7); פִּילוֹסְדֶּה = פִּילוֹסְדוֹפָס (Dan 1:20).
**Vorlage** and condensed the words **אזכ נפש דמות** into the compound Greek term that well expresses their meaning but does not keep their form.\(^{32}\)

11:2 — In v. 2, adduced above as an example of sheer literalism, the translator's creativity nevertheless emerges: (a) he chooses for **אזכ נפש דמות** the verb **ἀπειπέω**; which is quite rare in the LXX, in order to emphasize God's prohibition; (b) he may have chosen to render **אזכ נפש דמות** with **μυ**, which again emphasizes the prohibition, but he may have had **κρ** in his **Vorlage**;\(^{33}\) (c) he probably rendered **אזכ נפש דמות** as **εἰδόλων**, although the Hebrew text features variegated divine names.\(^{34}\)

11:3 (I) — We tend to attribute to the translator a slight syntactical reformulation such as **ductory (κρ εἴδολοι)**.

He also may have rendered **שודד** by **ἀρχον**. However, the word **שודד** may not have been in his **Vorlage**, since the structure of the passage changes: unlike the MT it reads ... **םויהך נֶפֶשׁ רְצָה** and in its following and **םויהך נֶפֶשׁ רְצָה**; the initial **שודד** being the anchor for the second is the anchor for the

---

\(^{32}\) Cf. the translation of **הילולית אשה דגל ילֶי** (1 Kgs 12:8, 10) by **οἱ συντροφοὶ αὐτοῦ** *(3 Kgdms 12:24r)*.

\(^{33}\) Thus, J. Gray, **Kings** (OTL; London, 1964) ad loc. The Peshitta and the Targum have **אזרך נפש דמות,** which, like the LXX, is not an unequivocal proof of a different reading.

\(^{34}\) The foreign deities are designated as following: v. 2 **אזרך נפש דמות** = **εἰδόλων**; v. 4 **אזרך נפש דמות** = **θεοί**; v. 5 **ἐπανέβλεψε** = **βαλεלύματι**; **טב** = **εἰδόλων**; v. 7 **מֶלכָּחִים שְׁנֵיתָן טַעְמָהֶנָּם** = **εἰδόλων**; v. 8 **מלכִּים שלחת** = **εἰδόλων**; v. 33 **מתְּלֶבֶץ מַלְכֶּהָ יִבְּרָנִים** = **προσοξεδισματι**. In spite of v. 4 (**אזרך נפש דמות** = **θεοί**), it would seem that **εἰδόλων** is the regular equivalent for foreign gods (three times). Nevertheless, in vv. 5, 7 the same word stands for **טב** suggesting that his text read **אזרך נפש דמות** not **טב**, since we would expect him to render **טב** by **προσοξεδισμα** whereas **βαλεלύμα** would stand for **טב** (as in the KR, 2 Kgs 23:13 **טבּי נפש דמות** = **προσοξεδισμα... βαλεלύμα...**). In v. 33 the translator may have variegated his equivalents or may have had a different Hebrew text.
subsequently mentioned nationalities. This change, although stylistic by definition, may therefore come from the revisor, since it is connected with the rewriting of the passage.

11:6 (8) – τὴν πόλιν Ἰσραήλ ἡ δευτέρα οὖσα. It would seem natural for a translator to abandon the Hebrew phrase and introduce a simpler verb, but his Vorlage may as well have read הַלֵּךְ אָמֵרָי.36

(2) The Text

Besides the possible variants mentioned above, the list of foreign wives shows an item or two that must be characterized as variants.

Μωαβείτιδας Ἀμαμαίτιδας
Σύρας καὶ Ἰδιομαίας
Χετταίας καὶ Ἀμορραίας

The designation Σύρας which has no parallel in the MT probably stands for Αύρας, a plausible variant in view of the immediately following Αρμαίων.37 The LXX thus presents three pairs: Moabites and Ammonites, Arameans and Edomites, Hittites and Amorites. However, the omission of the Phoenicians does not speak for the originality of the LXX in view of the relationship with Hiram and the place Ashtoreth assumes in the list of foreign deities. If the Arameans are original, a quite plausible set of peoples emerges: Moabites and Ammonites, Arameans and Edomites, Phoenicians and Hittites. The Amorites do not seem to be an original item in the list of women Solomon married. It may be a by-form of the Arameans since the

35 Cf. v. 17 ἀσῆμεν ἀρμῖσθαι. Here too, however, the formulation of the entire verse is different, making it difficult to determine whether the translator is responsible for the change or had a different text.

36 In Num 14:24; 32:11-12; Josh 14:8-9, 14 the translators use forms of ἐπορευθήκατο for לָלַךְ אָמֵרָי; the same Greek verb is used also for לָלַךְ אָמֵרָי.

37 The interchange of the similar letters ר/ר is all the more expected in the framework of two similar words. See also the interchange רָשָׁם/אָמָה in v. 25; see further 2 Sam 8:13-14 (and cf. 2 Kgs 14:7).
words differ only in metathesis.

The pair Hittites and Amorites may draw on Ezek 16:3, "By origin and birth you are from the land of the Canaanites—your father was an Amorite and your mother a Hittite" (repeated in v. 45). In addition, since the Amorites designate the Canaanites in general (e.g., 1 Kgs 21:26; 2 Kgs 21:11), they may have been meant as an antecedent for the subsequent "the nations of which the Lord had said...." The list that expanded the prohibition to include nations outside its original meaning is reconnected, in the text reflected in the LXX, to the peoples of Canaan.

(3) The Revision

The variants mentioned above are just the tip of the iceberg. The discrepancy between 1 Kgs and 3 Kgdms is much more elaborate and is an inherent part of the revision. It does not emerge from variants. In fact, it is amazing how little the texts differ from one another in details. The divergence is mainly due to a different arrangement of the text. The following analysis of the relationship between the texts will show that in spite of the complexity and problematic nature of the MT, it is this version—a proto-MT version—that underlies the revision preserved in the LXX. It would seem that this revision was first made in Hebrew and then translated—broadly speaking, word by word—into Greek.

---

38 Burney, Notes, ad loc., argues that אמרית אמות is a third variant for אמריית.

39 See also the beginning of the list of peoples in 1 Kgs 9:20.

40 Burney, Notes, 18, argues that the arrangement in 3 Kgdms is the right order—on which level is it ‘right’? Gray, Kings, 252, argues that the LXX partly relies on a source which is more objective than the MT—‘objective’ according to which standards? Gray’s assessment that the source used by the LXX referred only to Solomon’s many wives, and did not criticize him right at the beginning of taking foreign wives makes a poor argument, in view of the immediately following reference to the foreign wives in the LXX itself.
(a) The Women
The main problem the revisor took pains to solve was the relationship between ‘many wives’ and ‘foreign wives’, a problem which presents itself, as we have seen, on both critical (the place of v. 3 in the context) and hermeneutical (‘two evils had Solomon done’) levels. This inherent problem of the MT completely disappears in the LXX version of the text:
1 Kgs:
1 King Solomon loved many foreign women...
2 from the nations...
3 He had seven hundred royal wives and three hundred concubines...
4 In his old age, his wives turned away Solomon’s heart after other gods...

3 Kgdms has instead two separate phases:
A
1 King Solomon loved many women...
3 He had seven hundred royal wives and three hundred concubines
B
2 He took foreign women... from the nations...
4 In his old age... his foreign wives turned away Solomon’s heart after other gods...

The rearrangement and slight rewriting of the text created a crystal-clear distinction between two levels: the first constitutes the beginning of v. 1 (without the word ‘foreign’) and v. 3a, and describes Solomon’s many wives. The second has its own opening: “And he took foreign wives,” and continues with the rest of v. 1 and vv. 2 and 4, and refers only to foreign wives, not ‘many’. The revisor left no room for doubt by adding the adjective ‘foreign’ to the women said to turn the king’s heart.\(^\text{41}\) The revision is further substantiated by the disappearance of v. 3b, which refers to the outcome of marrying many wives: “and his wives turned his heart away.” The omission of v. 3b takes the blame off those wives who were not foreign.

\(^{41}\) As articulated by Nehemiah: נ_gl א_lהו הוייא זושיננו, “yet foreign wives caused even him to sin” (Neh 13:26).
It also discards the repetition of MT vv. 3b and 4a. In fact, v. 3b is not simply omitted but merges with v. 4a: MT v. 3b יָשִׂים עַל כָּלָ֣מָו נִשְׁתָּה כַּאֲהָ֔רֵי אֲלֹהִ֗ים and v. 4 נִשְׁתָּה עַל כָּלָ֣מָו נִשְׁתָּה כַּאֲהָ֔רֵי אֲלֹהִ֗ים became: נִשְׁתָּה עַל כָּלָ֣מָו נִשְׁתָּה כַּאֲהָ֔רֵי אֲלֹהִ֗ים. This conflation supports the supposition that the LXX version was created on the basis of a proto-MT version. Other details also point in the same direction. Such is the structure of vv. 1-2: the MT offers an inclusio: והמלך שָלָמָּה אָחָ֥ה נִשְׁתָּה בֵּיהֵמָ֖ה “King Solomon loved many foreign women... Such Solomon clung to and loved”. The rearrangement in Kgdsms made this structure disappear. The omission of ‘many’ is also not coherent with the dynamics of this passage, which stresses that the king had plenty of foreign women (referred to in the long list of foreign nationalities). Kgdsms contains the long list of nationalities but does not characterize them as ‘many’.

Generally speaking, the comparison of the texts poses the following question: why would a smoothly running text such as reflected in Kgdsms be changed into a cluttered text such as preserved in Kgs? The complex form of the MT is the result of its process of composition: an ideologically nurtured account on Solomon’s sins, created on the basis of existent material and not very successfully incorporated into its new context. Kgdsms does not preserve an earlier text that was free of the problematic literary design and of the ideological setting created by the author of the canonical book. It does not offer additional, characteristically original material that is not extant in the MT. Moreover, Kgdsms contains all the

---

42 The awkward syntactical structure of v. 4 thus disappears: it no longer begins with the subject, asyndetically linked to the preceding temporal clause (...ﬂesh מוה נִשְׁתָּה ...); see E. König, Syntax der Hebräischen Sprache (Leipzig, 1897) §370b.

43 The pronoun כֵּן probably refers back to the women, although formally this is difficult to prove; see Noth, Könige, ad loc. The form expected would be כֵּן, but other inconsistencies of the sort exist, especially in second and third person plural; see, e.g., P. Jouïon, Grammaire de l'hebreu biblique (Rome, 1923) §149b. It may have been created through assimilation to the preceding נִשְׁתָּה. The long infinitive form is hardly proof that the reference is to cult; contra A. Cohen, “The Infinitive with a he,” Leb 33 (1969) 238 (Heb.).
redactional – Deuteronomistic or post-Deuteronomistic – material which overlays the earlier elements in Kgs. Even a manifestly late feature such as the application of the ban law to the neighboring peoples is there, word for word. Finally, both texts feature the same line of argument, leading from the sins of Solomon to the division of the kingdom. Therefore, the only reasonable philological explanation of the differences between the texts is that a revisor rearranged and rewrote a proto-MT text into a more coherent account.

(b) The Cult
The dynamics of the narrative concerns the revisor in the following passage as well. The problems raised by the MT are again answered in the LXX.

1 Kgs (v. 4):
when Solomon was old
his wives turned away his heart after other gods
and he was not as wholeheartedly devoted to the Lord...

3 Kgدم (vv. 3–4):
when Solomon was old
and he was not as wholeheartedly devoted to the Lord...
his foreign wives turned away his heart after their gods
The revisor had a different notion of what comes first and what comes last: Solomon was not whole-heartedly devoted to the Lord (as proven by the fact that he took foreign wives), and therefore his foreign wives managed to turn his heart after their gods.

The result of the turning of the heart is also reworked. In Kgs it is divided into two stages, vv. 5–6 and vv. 7–8:

A
5 Solomon followed Ashtoreth... and Milcom...
6 Solomon did what was displeasing to the Lord...

B
7 At that time, Solomon built a shrine for Chemosh... and one for Molech...
8 And he did the same for all his foreign wives...
In Kgdm's the first stage disappears, as do all the repetitions and inconsistencies characteristic of Kgs, especially the mention of Ashtoreth and Milcom in v. 5 compared with Chemosh and Molech in v. 7. Kgdm's offers a smooth and consistent description.

(7+5) At that time, Solomon built a shrine for Chemosh... and one for Milcom...
and for Ashtoreth...

(8) And he did the same for all his foreign wives...

(6) Solomon did what was displeasing to the Lord...

Again, all the elements are preserved in Kgdm's. Ashtoreth, and possibly also the form Milcom, mentioned in Kgs v. 5, are now part of the description of the actual building of the high places. The three deities are plausibly mentioned together, as in 1 Kgs 11:33 and 2 Kgs 23:13. V. 6 is relocated and now forms the conclusion to Solomon's sins.

This passage, like the former, is well organized in Kgdm's; it is difficult to imagine why someone would change it to create the uneven text of Kgs. Rather, the MT shows the problems which resulted from the combination of data regarding the building of high places with the author's own contribution describing Solomon's spiritual deterioration. Kgdm's clears away the inconsistencies. This, precisely, is the difference between the two versions: Kgs shows the traces of the composition process, Kgdm's—the results of the revision.

44 The Peshitta, too, harmonizes between vv. 5 and 7 by adding Chemosh to v. 5.

45 It would seem that the procedure of condensation and simplification caused the omission of the geographical designation, "on the hill near Jerusalem," although it may as well be a later addition in Kgs. Such a later geographical precision is found in 2 Kgs 23:13, אֶשְׁרָה לְפִי עֵרֶשׁ אָשֶׁר מִנוֹקֶל לָהֶר, "facing Jerusalem, to the south of the Mount of the Destroyer" (משירת, probably hides an original form משיהת 'oil'; see h. Sabbath 56b).

46 It is difficult to accept Olmstead's assumption that the final editing of the book of Kings is later than the LXX; A. T. Olmstead, "Source Study and the Biblical Text," AJSL 30 (1913) 1–35; idem, "The Earliest Book of Kings," AJSL 31 (1915) 169–214.
The revisor may have opted for more than a reasonable sequence of events. According to the text preserved in Kgdms, the foreign wives turned Solomon’s heart after their gods and he then built high places for his wives—for them, not for himself. Unlike Kgs v. 5, Kgdms never says that Solomon actually followed the foreign deities himself.

Finally, the question of the language of the revision: is there proof that it was first created in Greek? The most conspicuous translational element relating to the revision is the use of φιλογύνης. Was the term chosen along with the decision to revise the text or is it just a fine equivalent for אָדָם נָשִׁית in the Vorlage? Φιλογύνης by itself can hardly serve as proof that the revision did not take place in the original language. More generally, it is difficult to accept the scenario depicted by Wevers for the Greek translator, and by Gooding for the Greek revisor. A Greek translator would have to be very creative: he would have to reread, rewrite, rearrange, add and omit elements to his liking, and at the same time translate the remodelled text he created. Gooding’s Greek revisor would have to work not only with a given Greek translation but also with additional textual traditions, Greek and Hebrew, and create something new on the basis of all this. Had the revision first been created in Greek, we would have expected to find more of the Greek language pattern; as it is, we must assume that the Greek translator or revisor felt free to remodel the text in many ways, but faithfully kept the pattern of the original language. In spite of the reorganization of the material, its components retain the image of Kgs. The few new components are also structured according to the Hebrew

---

47 Some manuscripts choose the opposite direction and use the singular: it was Solomon who offered and sacrificed to the gods of his foreign wives.


49 As in the alternative story of the division of the kingdom in Chapter 12 and in the miscellaneous additions in Chapter 2; see Talshir, The Alternative Story and Tov, “The LXX Additions,” 113–114, respectively.
language pattern; thus, the additional verbal construction καὶ ἔλαβεν in v. 1, and v. 3 which is relocated but begins with καὶ ἔσαν αὐτῷ, a completely non-Greek formulation. The gap between the alleged freedom of rewriting and the slavish preservation of the style makes it difficult to imagine that the revision was first made in Greek.

(4) The Transmission of the Greek Text and the Question of the Greek Revisor

The Greek text is divided into two distinct traditions: The B-text (Vaticanus and its followers), and the A-text (Alexandrinus and its followers). The B-text is undoubtedly much closer to the original Greek text. The A-text is based on the B-text and attempts to harmonize it with the current Hebrew text. The harmonization, however, is partial; this does not indicate that the Hebrew text current in the time of the Alexandrine revision was much different from the MT, but is rather due to the nature of revisions: the more conspicuous different features are corrected, others remain untouched. Thus, while the data on Solomon’s number of wives (1 Kgs 11:3a) is relocated in the A-text so as to suit its place in an MT-matching Hebrew version, the additional καὶ ἔλαβεν which is characteristic of the revision preserved in the B-text remains untouched in the A-text. The latter also reintroduces דִּבְרֵי in v. 1. The A-text similarly takes care of vv. 4–8, reestablishing the order and reintroducing the absent elements.50 It would seem that changes in order are noticed and taken care of, and missing elements are reintroduced, but minor additions and changes in the B-text are not readjusted,51 resulting in a conflated text.

50 Some of the MSS which belong with the A-text have a conflated version, adding after νετίς νεκρόν αὐτὰ ἄλλα τὰ κύρια τὰ πλείστα, νετίς νεκρόν αὐτὰ ἄλλα τὰ κύρια τὰ πλείστα, although the verse begins with νετίς νεκρόν αὐτὰ ἄλλα τὰ κύρια τὰ πλείστα, a variant which is part of the revision attested in the B-text and aimed to separate ‘many’ from ‘foreign.’

51 In the B-text Σύρος precedes ‘Edomites’, while the A-text has the reverse order, as if in accordance with the order in Kgs, although the latter has νετίς νεκρόν, the word order was restored in the A-text but the equivalent was not changed to meet the proto-MT. It is possible, however, that, the Hebrew read אֲרָמִים.
The state of the Greek material shows the existence of nothing but the Old Greek represented in the B-text and revised by the A-text towards a text-form that runs parallel to the MT. There are no traces of any stages of previous revisions.

In sum, Kgdms is a faithful translation of a later Hebrew revision based on a text such as Kgs. The revisor remodelled the text and retouched its meaning. He distinguished between ‘foreign’ and ‘many’ women in the first part, and made sure, in the second part, that Solomon is not directly accused of actual worship of foreign gods. It would seem, however, that the main reason that triggered the revision was the need to remodel the cluttered text into a more reasonably running account.

God’s Reaction: 1 Kgs / 3 Kgdms 11:9-13

The MT version of 1 Kgs 11:9-13 does not exhibit problems of the sort discussed for 11:1-8. Its structure is clear, consisting of two parts: (1) God’s anger and its reason (vv. 9-10); and (2) Solomon’s punishment (vv. 11-13). The latter first states the punishment Solomon actually deserves—that the kingdom be taken away from him (v. 11)—but two concessions follow for the sake of David: it will not happen in the time of Solomon (v. 12), and even then the dynasty will not be deprived of the entire kingdom (v. 13). It has been argued that the concessions are later additions but this can hardly be the case, since, assuming that the passage does not actually go back to the time of Solomon, it had to take into consideration the facts of the kingdom’s division. The difference between vv. 1-8 and 9-13 lies in the provenance of the material. The complexity of 11:1-8 is mainly due to the awkward use the author made of older materials found in the sources. 11:9-13, on the other hand, is not based on material from an earlier source but is entirely the statement of the Deuteronomistic or post-Deuteronomistic author who introduced this episode of divine intervention in history. Accordingly, the differences between the MT and the LXX—viz. the interference of the revisor—are much more moderate.
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3 Kgds – Vorlage

1 Kgs 11:9-13

(1) The Translation

In this passage, too, the translator faithfully keeps to his Vorlage. Characteristically, he translates Hebrew phrases and formulations literally, such as יִשָּׁנֶה יִגְרוּ מִדֶּנָּה וּלְבָנָה — ἐνδύσετο τοῦτα μετὰ σου and — διαρρήσσων διαρρῆξο (v. 11).

At times, he slightly reformulates the text into a better Greek style. Thus, he replaces τοῦτο with a participle—καὶ ἐντελεμένου—creating a fine continuity between vv. 9 and 10. As in v. 2 (ἄναμεν/ἀπειτεῖν), he emphasizes the negation in v. 10 by introducing an appropriate Greek idiom: τὸ παράπταν μὴ πορεύθηναι for (ἄναμεν ἀλλὸς Αρχίμαθ).

(2) The Text

If taken separately, the differences between the texts may be explained on the level of text transmission. The variants in vv. 11-13 are mainly influenced by or assimilated with Ahijah’s prophecy: (καὶ ἀκούειν ἃ ἐνεστήκει) see 11:31; see 11:34-35; ἐνεργεῖν... ἀκούειν, see 11:34-35; see 11:32, 36; ἐνεργεῖον... ἀκούειν, see 11:31; see 11:34, 38.52 The differences in v. 10 could also have been created randomly in the process of transmission: οἷον ἐνσχήματο ἀπὸ... the additional אֶלֶי (influenced by the preceding אֶלֶי) — are all

52 Wevers, “Exegetical Principles,” 320, asserts that this is an intentional change by the translator who believed that one can transgress God’s commandments (11:11) or leave God himself (19:10 ὡς οἱ Λέοντες ἐκ Δαυὶδ), but cannot abandon his covenant (?). The Peshitta has a conflated text: (ὡς ἐν τῷ Ποταμῷ)

53 Burney, Notes, and Gray, Kings, ad loc., suggest a variant זוזו.
simple enough variants. The additional clause at the end of the verse—יהי להבון שלש עהו אלבכ ור זאלו (LXX v. 3), especially in view of the instability of the text there. However, the accumulation of variants in such a short text would suggest that they were created through a different process.

(3) The Revision

If the variants mentioned above for vv. 11–13 were indeed created in assimilation with Ahijah’s prophecy which repeats the same subject of God’s words to Solomon, all these changes may be from one and the same hand rather than random variants; this would suggest that they are part of a deliberate revision. One of these variants is especially noteworthy, in view of the spirit of this revision as demonstrated above. It would seem that the replacement of הָלָא שְׁמָה with תַּם יֵשְׁתֶלֶם כָּלֶלֶת בְּרֵית הַחֲקָקָה and the reviser must have deliberately changed it to מְצַכֶּיה הַחֲקָקָה. According to KgS, Solomon’s sins went beyond abandoning the Lord’s commandments: he actually broke the covenant, something that the revisor would not dare to say explicitly.

The changes in v. 10, too, seem to be best explained as the work of the revisor. In KgS, vv. 9–10 concentrate on the worship of foreign gods. The author first quotes God’s command to Solomon not to follow other gods: לֶבֶלֶת לֶבֶת... לֵשָׁמֶר. He then goes on to say that Solomon did not heed this particular command: לֶבֶלֶת לֶבֶת... לֵשָׁמֶר... “not to follow other gods and to be careful to do what the Lord had commanded”. 54 Second, having changed the function of להבון, the revisor

54 This may be understood either as two separate commands, one specifically referring to foreign deities, the other more generally to God’s ordinances. It is possible, however, that the second functions as an apposition.
had to find another way to express Solomon’s disobedience and did so by adding a clause at the end:ski venues in what have been, however, only adopted by the revisor, and not by the editor of the L text. The revisor may have been influenced by vv. 11 and 33ff, which refer in general to the Lord’s laws and commandments, or may have constructed his text in accordance with the revelation referred to, i.e., 1 Kgs 9:1-9, specifically vv. 4, 6. In any case, the meaning of the passage changes. The only accusation made against Solomon according to Kgdsms is that he was not wholeheartedly devoted to the Lord. The revision thus tones down the explicit accusation in 1 Kgs that has Solomon disobey the command not to worship foreign gods. If this evaluation is right, the variants in v. 10 were not created separately in the process of transmission but are part of the revisor’s deliberate changes introduced in the passage. This line of revision complies with the text he produced in vv. 4-8 which, unlike Kgs, never openly says that Solomon himself followed foreign deities.

As in the first part, here too there is nothing in Kgdsms which would characterize its text as an older than 1 Kgs. Most telling is the fact that Kgdsms does not fail to represent the clause ונראה אליהם that affiliates our passage with 1 Kgs 9:1-9—a complex text which is probably post-exilic and clearly features two Deuteronomistic layers.55

The changes and additions are all formed in Hebrew patterns; there is no characteristically Greek feature in the text that would suggest the work of a Greek revisor.

(4) The Transmission of the Greek Text and the Question of the Greek Revisor

The last clause of v. 10, attested in both the B-text and the L-text, is missing in the A-text. Rahlfs adopts the A-text, labelling the B-text a repetition

55 The author of 1 Kgs 11 or of 3 Kgdsms 11 is familiar with 1 Kgs 9:1-9 in its composite form. Burney, Notes, 129-131, is right in criticizing those who attribute the entire passage to the same post-exilic writer. Indeed, if it actually contains post-exilic material, it is found only in vv. 6-9. Verses 1-5 and 6-9 are clearly of different provenance. The passage is one of the best proofs that there were two Deuteronomistic editions of the book of Kings (viz. pre-exilic and post-exilic); alternatively, Deuteronomistic and post-Deuteronomistic.
borrowed from v. 4. This may be the case. However, it would be only natural for the A-text to omit this clause, since it adapts the Greek translation to the current Hebrew text. In addition, the A-text keeps the formulation καὶ φυλαξάσθαι ποιήσαι of the B-text, which leaves the A-text without a conclusion specifying that Solomon did not heed the Lord’s command (Kgs ... ולא שמך; B-text: ... לא היה לבך שלם...). The A-text does not testify to an intermediate stage, in which the opening was formulated as in Kgdm, that is ולא היה לבך שלם, but ... ולא היה לבך שלם was not yet added. Rather, the A-text, remodelling the B-text in accordance with the contemporaneous Hebrew text, noticed and corrected the obvious differences but not the more subtle ones.

In conclusion, the reaction of God to Solomon’s sins was retouched by the revisor whose work is translated in Kgdm, so as to avoid explicitly accusing the king of having transgressed the prohibition to worship foreign gods.

The Sins of Solomon in 11:33

A straightforward definition of Solomon’s sins appears in Ahijah’s prophecy, 11:33. Literally, the text reads: “For they have forsaken Me; they have worshiped Ashtoreth the goddess of the Phoenicians, Chemosh the god of Moab, and Milcom the god of the Ammonites; they have not walked in My ways, or done what is pleasing to Me, or kept My laws and rules, as his father David did” (JPS). However, the original text undoubtedly read the singular (RSV: “because he has forsaken me...” etc.): the entire chapter speaks of Solomon’s misconduct, not the people’s, as does Ahijah’s prophecy: vv. 31, 32, 34, 35, 36 all either mention Solomon or refer to him in the singular. The main proof for the assumption that v. 33 also read the singular is offered at the end of this verse itself: בְּדֵד אֲבֵי “as his father David did” makes no sense with the rest of the verse reading the plural.
The plural may be a lapse of the pen or may be intentional, easing the burden off Solomon. What does Kgdms make of this?

3 Kgdms 11:33

3 Kgdms — Vorlage

1 Kgs 11:33

The problem is that neither ποιεῖν, nor its automatic Hebrew equivalent.
make much sense in the context. The choice of this general verb seems like an easy way out of the difficulty presented by this text; at any rate, the change must have been made by the same revisor who managed to avoid throughout the account unequivocally accusing Solomon of having worshipped foreign gods.

In sum, the meaning of the sins of Solomon in 1 Kgs 11:1-8, 10, 11 and 33 changes under the treatment of the revisor whose work is preserved in Kgdms. It is certainly not a mere coincidence that in each mention of Solomon's sins, the revisor makes sure not to say directly that Solomon breached the covenant of the Lord by worshipping other gods. However, it would seem that the ideological considerations were not the only incentive for this revisor's work. The most outstanding facet of his work is the changes he introduced in the sequence of events, as shown in his rearrangement of 11:1-8, as well as in many other parts of the account of the kingdom of Solomon.

58 The L-text reads ἴσοιματι instead. It probably is Lucian's attempt to restore some meaning to the text, rather than a reflection of a Hebrew variant (ἔσώλυσεν being the equivalent for עבד in 3 Kgdms). It is not likely that a Hebrew reading such as עבד would be rendered in 3 Kgdms by ποιεῖν since this is not an attested equivalent in the work of our translator or in γγ, and very rare in the LXX throughout in spite of the high frequency of both verbs. Ποιεῖν could, of course, represent one of many other Hebrew verbs, but it is difficult to guess which. Especially difficult is the absolute use of ἴσοιματι, without any complement. The revisor may have been thinking of an implicit object or of making idols; e.g., ἴσοιματι ἀλλήλος ἴσοιματι "Of the rest of it he makes a god" (Isa 44:17).

59 Solomon's misconduct presented a major problem to the Chronicler who simply omitted the entire chapter.