**The Miscellanies in 3 Kingdoms 2: Language, Meaning and Textual History**

I wrote the basis of this lecture many years ago, in the form of an article published in Hebrew in *Tarbiz* in 2006. Ever since then I have hoped to write an updated version in English, in which I planned to address the claims raised below about the miscellanies. I also wanted to respond to the scholars who had responded to that Hebrew article. However, I have been preoccupied with other projects and have not yet had a chance to take up this task. I am grateful to the organizers of this conference for the opportunity to return to this subject, as a first step toward writing an updated and expanded version of the article in English.

In 1 Kings, 2, after the story of the death of David and before the beginning of the story of Solomon’s kingdom (1 Kings, 3–11), the Septuagint adds two lengthy sections, each comprising about ten verses. The first of these sections comes after the story of the removal of Joab (2:35a–k), and the second after the story of the removal of Shimei (2:46a–l). Both sections can be characterized as collections of information about Solomon, most of which is repeated later in the story, in both the Septuagint and MT, in an identical or relatively similar form. In between the two sections the text relates to Solomon’s marriage to Pharaoh’s daughter; the construction of the cities of Hatzor, Megiddo, Gezer, and Tadmor; the report that “Judah and Israel lived in safety, all of them under their vines and fig trees”; and other such information. Due to the character of these verses, they are often referred to in the literature as miscellanies, and I will use this term in this lecture for the sake of convenience. The first additional section in the Septuagint appears after the removal of Joab (1 Kings 2:28–35). (##). The second comes after the story of the removal of Shimei (in the same chapter, verses 36–46).

Scholars have clearly found both these miscellanies rather strange and related to them as a strange phenomenon, raising a wide range of possible explanations for their presence. A broad overview of these explanations shows that they can be divided into two underlying approaches. The first and perhaps the more common approach regards the miscellanies as a secondary and later element. Hänel, for example, adopted this position in the early twentieth century in one of the first studies of the miscellanies. He argued that the additions constitute a collection of variants, duplicate versions or duplicate translations created during the process of copying and translating the book of Kings. Gooding also regarded the miscellanies as a separate part of the ancient text of Kings. In a series of articles, he portrayed the process of creating the Greek translation of the book of Kings as a type of exegesis – a perspective he also applied to the miscellanies. Over the past few decades, Zipora Talshir and Emanuel Tov have adopted a similar position, describing the Septuagint for the Book of Kings – including the miscellanies in chapter 2 – as an adapted version of the MT. However, they argue that this process occurred in the Hebrew substrata rather than in the process of translation to Greek. These studies have correctly highlighted the unusual character of the miscellanies in the context in which they appear. In my opinion, a satisfactory and systemic explanation of this apparent insertion into the text of the Septuagint has not yet been offered.

Another approach, adopted primarily by European scholars, views the Septuagint of Kings as an earlier version from which MT later developed. According to this approach, the miscellanies preserve an older arrangement that was changed in MT. However, in the Septuagint, these two units interrupt in a rather crude way the story of Solomon’s rise to the throne and the removal of his opponents during the early years of his reign. MT presents a coherent story of the removal of Solomon’s opponents (1 Kings, 1:13–2:46), describing the consolidation of his kingdom until “the kingdom was established in the hand of Solomon” (1 Kings, 2:46). In the Septuagint, the two additional units disrupt both the narrative and the chronological order. According to the story as it appears in MT, Solomon’s kingdom is still in the initial stages of consolidation at this point and he has not yet eliminated his domestic opponents while the miscellanies in the Septuagint relate to events that occurred at the peak of his kingdom, when it extended “from Tiphsah to Gaza” (46f), and all the local kings paid him levies (46b; 46f; 46k).

These difficulties have led most scholars to regard the miscellanies as holding little importance for literary and historical questions concerning the book of Kings, and they go virtually unmentioned in the commentaries on the book. In my opinion, the opposite is the case: the miscellanies have an important role to play in clarifying the literary history of 1 Kings chapters 1–11, and I believe that the key to understanding the miscellanies in 1 Kings lies in an analysis of the narratives about Solomon in chapters 3–11 that parallel the verses of the miscellanies, both in MT and in the Septuagint. The analysis I present today will show that in most cases the verses in MT that parallel the miscellanies deviate from the sequence of the story of Solomon.

**A. The Parallel Verses to the Miscellanies in the Heart of the Story of Solomon**

**(1) Solomon’s Rule: 1 Kings, 4:20–5:6**

The most prominent example can be found in the verses in MT in 1 Kings, 4:20–5:6. The unit begins at verse 4:7, with the heading “Solomon had twelve officials.” Verses 4:8–19 then proceed to list the officials and their districts. After the list ends in verse 19, we might have expected to find the closing description that appears in 5:7–8, which mirrors the format of the opening title: “Those officials supplied provisions for King Solomon…” Instead, MT breaks the sequence of this unit, which provides a variety of economic and governmental information about Solomon’s rule. Verses 5:7–8, which follow this information, seem to be disconnected from their context, particularly since the demonstrative pronoun *ha-eleh* (those) which certainly refers to the officials, is so far removed from its referent. Accordingly, it would seem that in an older version of this unit, verses 5:7–8 came immediately after the list of officials, that is – after verses 4:19. It would then be clear that the demonstrative pronoun “those” referred to the officials who had just been listed. We find this hypothesized order in the Septuagint, which appears here to maintain the original contiguity between the two parts of the list of officials (although the Septuagint does not always preserve an older version, as I will show later).

The interruption of the sequence in MT and the differences between the textual witnesses prove beyond doubt that the collection of details from 4:20 through 5:6 is not an integral part of the history of Solomon. Moreover, in terms of content, it is clear that this unit is unusual in the context of the later details about Solomon, and in some cases contradicts later verses. Verses 5:4–5, for example, speak of the “peace on all sides… during Solomon’s lifetime.” This contrasts with a later remark about enemies who were “an adversary of Israel all the days of Solomon” (11:14–25). The details in 4:20–5:6 are also somewhat inconsistent with those in chapters 5 and 9 concerning the relations between Solomon and Hiram. This is particularly true regarding the descriptions of the food Solomon provided for Hiram over an entire year (5:25); the collection of the levy for the workers sent to Lebanon (5:28); the granting of cities to Hiram by Solomon, and Hiram’s dissatisfaction with the cities in question (9:11–13). By contrast, in 5:1, Solomon is depicted as the ruler of all the kingdoms from the Euphrates to the River to the border of Egypt, all of which paid levies to him. The picture painted by the unit from 4:20–5:6 reflects Solomon’s image in later generations as a powerful king who ruled a mighty, calm, and secure kingdom. This is the section that appears to be unusual and exceptional in the story of Solomon’s kingdom as presented in the book of Kings, while the remainder of the story may offer a different and more realistic evaluation of Solomon’s might and his regime.

The conception of the borders reflected in 4:20–5:6, which states that Solomon’s rule extended “from Tiphsah to Gaza, over all the kings west of the Euphrates” (5:4), is also incompatible with another description of Solomon’s borders in 1 Kings: “from Lebo-hamath to the Wadi of Egypt” (8:65). Tiphsah is, of course, situated on the Euphrates, while Lebo-hamath is located in the Beqaa Valley of Lebanon, to the south of the city of Kadesh and close to the source of the Orontes River. The distance between the two points is considerable. These divergent perceptions of the borders would appear to reflect differing territorial perceptions. The definition “from Lebo-hamath to the Wadi of Egypt” (8:65) may, to an extent, constitute a realistic perception, perhaps not too different from the northern border as described regarding the heyday of Jereboam the Second. The description of the borders of Solomon’s kingdom as extending from the Euphrates to Egypt (5:1,4) follows geographical and linguistic convention, it is entirely idealistic and utopian.

Commentators have noticed the difficulties raised by the unit of verses 4:20–5:6 and have also acknowledged that some or all of these verses constitute a later addition. In most cases, however, they ignored the fact that the entire unit is replicated in the miscellanies in the Septuagint version of Chapter 2 of 1 Kings. Each verse in this unit is mirrored in the second addition in the Septuagint of Chapter Two. Verse 4:20 is replicated as 46a; 5:1 constitutes a combination of 46b and 46k; 5:2–3 are replicated in 46e; 5:4 in 46f and the first half of 46g; 5:5 in the second half of 46g; and 5:6 in 46i. I will be able to try to explain why these verses are replicated in the miscellanies only after examining some other cases.

**(2) The Forced Labor: 1 Kings 9:15–25**

A similar phenomenon appears in verses 9:15–25. This section opens with the words: “This is the account of the forced labor that King Solomon conscripted” (9:15). The flow is then interrupted by a long, convoluted list (9:15ab–19), while the direct continuation of the opening phrase “This is the account of the forced labor,” comes only in verses 20–22: “All the people who were left … who were not of the people of Israel … whom the Israelites were unable to destroy completely—these Solomon conscripted for slave labor.” The remnants of the other peoples obviously constitute the forced labor recruited by Solomon. This reading is supported by other instances in the Bible and elsewhere when the formula “this is the account of” is used. It would therefore seem that at some stage the “account of the forced labor” was expanded through the interpolation of verses 15b–19, which provide various details about the construction work.

Actually, the list of construction projects that interrupts the “account of the forced labor” (9:15ab–19) is itself not monolithic. The list of structures and cities the opens with the words “to build the house of the Lord … Hazor, Megiddo, Gezer” (9:15) is abruptly interrupted by a kind of “flashback” explaining how Solomon took control of Gezer: “Pharaoh king of Egypt had gone up and captured Gezer and burned it down, had killed the Canaanites who lived in the city, and had given it as dowry to his daughter, Solomon’s wife” (9:16). The text then continues to describe the construction projects: “Beth-horon … Baalath, Tamar (the *qeri* has ‘Tadmor’),” and so forth (9:17–19). This list is introduced by a connecting repetition of the statement “Solomon rebuilt Gezer” (9:17). This detail again disrupts the continuity of the text; it is absent from the parallel location in the Septuagint (1 Kings 10:22a) and is probably also a later secondary or even tertiary addition.

Montgomery argued that the unit that interrupts the “account of the forced labor” section in order to detail Solomon’s construction projects (9:15ab –19) was taken from ancient royal inscriptions dating back to Solomon’s time and embedded here. However, he did not mention that the two elements that comprise this unit have biblical parallels. Verse 16, which as noted is a secondary component in the addition, appears in the Septuagint translation of Joshua 16, while the reports of the construction projects are paralleled in the miscellanies to 1 Kings chapter 2 in the Septuagint. The report on the construction of the inland cities – Hatzor, Megiddo, Gezer Beth-horon, and Baalath – appears in the first addition, in verse 35i. The account of the construction projects in the far north – Tadmor and Lebanon – appears in the second addition, in verse 46b. The report on the construction of the walls of Jerusalem also appears here in the miscellanies, in verse 35c, and the construction of the Millo in verse 35f. Here, too, material that interrupts the sequence of the text and appears to be secondary in MT can be found in the miscellanies in Kings in the Septuagint.

These are not the only difficulties with this unit, however. Verses 23–25 in chapter 9, which come after the end of the “account of the forced labor,” are also unconnected to the unit and appear to constitute a collection of details included here by way of association to matters mentioned in the “account of the forced labor” unit. Verse 23 states the number of Solomon’s chief officers responsible for supervising the work and apparently appears here due to the mention of the fact that the Israelites were not taken into forced labor but served as officers. The wording “these were the chief officers” seems to suggest that this verse stands in its own right, as a kind of introduction to a new list that may have been omitted. In any case, it is not related to the preceding or following verses.

The next verse, verse 24, describes Pharaoh’s daughter going up from the city of David to her house and the construction of the Millo. This verse is also completely unrelated to the preceding narrative and appears to have been included due to the reference to the construction of the Millo in the “account of the forced labor” (9:15). This verse appears in a slightly different version in the body of the Septuagint at a different point in the sequence – between God’s words as quoted at the beginning of chapter 9 (3–9) and the new unit detailing the events that occurred “at the end of twenty years, in which Solomon had built the two houses” (beginning at verse 10). Even in the Septuagint, this verse feels out of place. It may have been included in the Septuagint here due to the reference to the construction of the two houses, including the king’s house, where Pharaoh’s daughter lived (9:10). Alternatively, the association may be the mention of Egypt in the previous verse in the Septuagint: “who brought their fathers out of Egypt…” (1 Kings 9:9). In either case, it is clear that this verse is independent and does not form an organic part of the text in any of the versions.

The third verse in this sequence, verse 25, discusses the burnt offerings and sacrifices and the completion of the house. Again this is an independent verse that is unrelated to the information about Pharaoh’s daughter in the previous verse, and certainly to the maritime adventure of Solomon and Hiram that follows in verses 26–28. The verse may have been shifted here due to the references to the construction of the house at the beginning of the “account of the forced labor” (9:15) or the beginning of the unit (9:10), and perhaps a better location might have been before chapter 9, after the completion of the house (compare to verse 8:65). In its current position, it clearly has the character of an independent unit.

The unusual character of verses 23–25 in chapter 9 is clear also from the Septuagint. These three verses do not follow the “account of the forced labor” in the Septuagint (10:22a–c). Verses 23 and 25 do not appear at all in the body of the Septuagint, while, as already noted, verse 24 appears elsewhere (9:9a). This further supports the conclusion that these verses are not an organic part of the “account of the forced labor.” Once again, material that interrupts the flow of the narrative and is mostly absent or found elsewhere in the Septuagint is paralleled in the miscellanies in Chapter 2 of 1 Kings. Verse 23 in chapter 9 is the parallel of verse 35h; verse 24 is the parallel of the second part of verse 35f; verse 25 is the parallel of verse 35g.

**(3) Pharaoh’s Daughter: 1 Kings 3:1**

The verses discussed above that are appended to the “account of the forced labor” (9:23–25) raise additional questions, for example concerning the details about Pharaoh’s daughter. As I showed above, verses 16 and 24 in chapter 9, which discuss Pharaoh’s daughter, are secondary in their context. In addition to the verses in chapter 9 that mention Pharaoh’s daughter, the only other significant mention comes at the beginning of the description of Solomon’s kingdom: “Solomon made a marriage alliance with Pharaoh king of Egypt; 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 the Lord and the wall around Jerusalem” (3:1). This verse certainly seems out of place in its current location. The information about Pharaoh’s daughter is unrelated to the closing verses of chapter 2 and to the next part of chapter 3, which presents Solomon’s dream at Gibeon. The verse also mentions the completion of Solomon’s house and the Temple, although at this point in the narrative the construction of these buildings had not even begun. The positioning of this item as the first event in the description of Solomon’s kingdom is also surprising: did the author of Kings find this event so important as to warrant its presentation as the first event in the history of the kingdom? Moreover, in most instances, the Deuteronomic authors begin the description of each new king with a theological or ritual evaluation, in the style of “he did what was right in God’s eyes” or “he did evil in God’s eyes.” The introductions also relate to the worship of the high places, noting, for example, that “the high places were not removed; the people still sacrificed and made offerings on the high places.” In this instance, too, if we remove the single verse about Solomon’s marriage to Pharaoh’s daughter, the description of Solomon’s kingdom also begins with this type of theological and ritual evaluation: “Solomon loved the Lord, walking in the statutes of his father David; only, he sacrificed and offered incense at the high places” (1 Kings, 3–3). This introduction seems to form a direct continuation of the closing verse of the previous chapter (2:46): “So the kingdom was established in the hand of Solomon.” When there is a struggle for succession, the narrator sometimes describes this struggle before presenting the theological and ritual evaluation; an example of this is the story of the rise to the throne of Jehoash (2 Kings, 11–12:4). Accordingly, the Deuteronomic description of Solomon’s kingdom should have begun with the Deuteronomic evaluation (1 Kings, 3:2–3), immediately after the story of the succession struggles and Solomon’s consolidation of his rule (1 Kings, 1–2). Thus the details about Solomon’s marriage to Pharaoh’s daughter deviates from the usual structure of the descriptions of the reigns in the book of Kings.

Another point worth noting is that, like in the previous example I discussed (4:20 – 5:6), the Septuagint for verse 1 in chapter 3 differs significantly from MT. The story of Solomon’s marriage to Pharaoh’s daughter does not appear in the first verse of chapter Three in the Septuagint, and the translation may preserve the older introduction to the history of Solomon’s kingdom. In the Septuagint, the theological and ritual evaluation begins the chapter, following straight on from the story of the struggles for succession and the consolidation of Solomon’s rule, without the disruptive information about Pharaoh’s daughter. The details about Pharaoh’s daughter are not completely absent from Septuagint – they appear after verse 14 in chapter 5 (14a in the Septuagint), together with the story of Pharaoh’s conquest of Gezer (chapter 5, verse 14b in the Septuagint and verses 16–17a in MT). Thus the Septuagint brings together in one place the details about Pharaoh’s daughter that are divided between verse 1 of chapter 3 and chapter 9, verses 16–17a in MT). This arrangement would seem to be preferable, and the various details concerning Pharaoh’s daughter are certainly interrelated. However, it is hard to assume that the Septuagint here preserves an older order predating MT, since it is inconceivable that such an order would have been changed to the clumsy order found in MT. Moreover, even in the Septuagint these verses still seem detached from their context, interrupting the sequence of chapter 5 in the Septuagint no less than they do chapter 3 in MT. Wherever they appear, these details seem to constitute an artificial interpolation in their current location.

Some of the commentators noted the alien character of verse 3:1 in the various witnesses, and particularly in its current location in MT. They suggested that it shares a common origin with the other details about Pharaoh’s daughter, such as verse 24 in chapter 9. For the most part, though, they ignored the fact that this verse is paralleled in Chapter 2 of 1 Kings in the Septuagint, at verse 35c. This same location also includes the parallel text to verse 9:24, at verse 35f.

This same situation can be found in other verses repeated in the miscellanies, but I cannot present all of these in this lecture.

**B**

To summarize, my examination showed that all the verses that are paralleled in the miscellanies appear out of place in their current position in MT and in the body of chapters 3 through 11 in the Septuagint. Can it be a coincidence that the large group of verses that interrupt the flow of the narrative at various points in MT and in the Septuagint are also replicated in the miscellanies to 1 Kings chapter 2 in the Septuagint?

The hypothesis that the redactor of the book of Kings, as reflected in the Septuagint, uprooted these secondary verses from their location because they disrupted the flow of the narrative, and arranged them in a single block at the beginning of the story of Solomon’s kingdom, raises numerous difficulties, since the resulting sequence in Septuagint is no more elegant. Moreover, this assumption casts the biblical redactor in the role of a modern Bible scholar, concerned about problematic sequences, contradictions, and rough edges and eager to restore the original order. Two centuries of biblical scholarship have shown the reverse: the biblical editor does not share the modern scholar’s concerns regarding repetitions and contradictions. Indeed, in some cases, contradictions, rough edges, and difficulties were created during the work of the biblical redactors through the deliberate amalgamation of different versions concerning the same material, or the combination of stories about different events that the redactors believe occurred at the same time. With this in mind, it is difficult to believe that a biblical redactor would uproot problematic verses from their location and group them together in chapter 2 after analyzing the literary sequence and difficulties.

It is much easier to assume that these verses originally constituted a short, independent document, perhaps similar in content and form to the miscellanies found in Chapter 2 of 1 Kings in the Septuagint. This document reached the authors of Kings at a later stage and was then broken down and integrated into the story of Solomon at various points, based on the context, the time the events occurred, or by way of association. This process occurred in the scrolls that formed the basis for MT and the Septuagint during one of the stages of transmission, apparently independently the versions. Meanwhile, the document embedded in 1 Kings in the Septuagint (and almost certainly in its Hebrew base-text), that is to say at the end of 2 Kingdoms or the beginning of 3 Kingdoms, was received in one of the stages of transmission and integrated in its entirety as a type of appendix. It may have appeared initially in the margins and was later inserted in the body of the text of chapter 2. This process explains why the miscellanies disrupt the story of the struggle for the throne of David and Solomon’s rise to power.

In order to confirm this hypothesis, we must be sure that the miscellanies are not a random collection of facts collected from the story of Solomon because they disrupted the flow of the narrative, or for some other reason. First, although the units were once regarded as a collection of variants, this does not seem to be the case. Some of the verses do not have parallels in the body of the story. For example, verse 35e – “And Salomon made the sea and the supports and the great washbasins and the pillars and the fountain of the court and the bronze sea” – does not have a parallel in MT or in the body of the Septuagint. In fact, this verse contradicts MT (chapter 7, 13–45), which states that the sea, the supports, the copper washbasins, and the pillars were made by Hiram. It is true that the Temple chapters in MT preserve a tradition that Solomon made certain utensils, but these were only items used inside the building, such as the golden altar, the table, and the candlesticks (7:48–50). Verse 35e, which reports that Solomon also made items such as the pillars, the sea, and the copper vessels, reflects a competing tradition to that found in MT. It cannot be argued that verse 35e is based on the Temple chapters in MT, since these mention numerous other items that do not appear in 35e, some of which might be considered more important. The order of the items is also completely different. Conversely, verse 35e mentions one item that is not mentioned in the Temple chapters – the “fountain of the court,” suggesting that the author of the miscellanies was in possession of a separate tradition. The unique content and language of verse 35e, and the difficulties the verse creates concerning the body of the story of Solomon indicate that this verse cannot be regarded as a variant.

Second, the verses of the miscellanies have a distinct style that distinguishes them from the rest of the story of Solomon. All the verses in the miscellanies are forumulated in the style of a chronicle and are not separated by story segments such as Solomon’s dream at Gibeon (1 Kings, chapter 3, verses 4–15) or Solomon’s trial (verses 16–28 in the same chapter). Both sections begin by describing Solomon’s wisdom. Their openings use names derived from the roots *ḥet-kaf-mem* and *bet-yod-nun*, and they both use the simile “like the sand that is by the sea” to describe a large number. The description of Solomon’s kingdom is similar in each of the units – an exaggerated portrait of a folkloristic character comprising of pseudo-administrative details about Solomon. Both units repeatedly quote enormous numbers concerning craftsmen (35d), the officials (35h), Solomon’s food (46e), and the number of stables and horsemen (46i). Both units depict Solomon as a mighty king who controls the surrounding peoples (46b, 46f, 46g). In both units, Solomon builds cities – within the country in the first section (35i), and on the far northern borders in the second, in Tadmor and Lebanon (46c–46d).

Both of the additional sections in the Septuagint also include various unique linguistic and stylistic features that are common in the miscellanies, but largely alien to the usual language of the story of Solomon’s kingdom and the Book of Kingdoms in general. This phenomenon may suggest that the verses in the miscellanies were written by an author with a distinct style and language compared to the authors of the sources that comprise the story of Solomon’s kingdom (1 Kings, chapters 1–11). I will now present some of these unique linguistic forms, by way of example:

1) The *resh-dalet-he* root probably belongs to the poetic register of biblical Hebrew. It appears only in biblical poems, prophecy, and in the priestly source, whose language is known to be close to the poetic register. The root also appears just three times in clearly prose sections of the book of Kings. All these three instances occur in the miscellanies in the Septuagint and in the parallel verses in MT (35i [5:30; 9:13]; 46f [5:4]). In biblical prose, the root *nun-gimel-sin* usually appears in similar contexts to the root *resh-dalet-he* in the poetic register. In the exodus story, for example, we find *ha-nogesim ba-‘am* (“the taskmasters of the people,”) analogous to *ha-rodim ba-‘am* with the same meaning in Kings (5:30; 9:23).

(2) The phrase “Judah and Israel,” in that order, is relatively uncommon in biblical literature, occurring just seven times in the Bible – five times in the book of Chronicles, and twice in our miscellanies (46a; 46g) and in their parallels in MT (4:20; 5:5). The phrase in its more common order “Israel and Judah” also appears in the miscellanies (l46), but not in chapters 3–11 in 1 Kings. The phrase “all Israel” is common in the book of Kings (for example: 3:28; 4:7), referring to both Israel and Judah.

(3) The phrase “like the sand which is by the sea,” used to denote a large quantity, appears in each of the miscellanies: “And the Lord gave Salomon discernment and very great wisdom and breadth of mind like the sand which is by the sea” (35a [5:9]); “and Ioudas and Israel were very many as the sand which is by the sea in great number” (46a [4:20]). However, with the exception of these parallel verses, the phrase does not appear in the remainder of the history of Solomon, nor anywhere else in the book of Kings. Instead, the common phrase in the story of Solomon’s kingdom is “…so numerous they cannot be numbered or counted” (1 Kings 3:8; 8:5).

(4) The formula “Solomon had x of one thing and y of another” appears in each of the additional sections: “Salomon had seventy thousand bearing a burden and eighty thousand stonecutters in the hill country” (35d [5:29]); “Salomon had forty thousand brood mares for chariots and twelve thousand horsemen” (46i [5:6, and compare 1 Kings, 10:26; 1 Chronicles 1:14, 9:25]). However, with the exception of the parallel verses, this formula does not appear elsewhere in the history of Solomon or in the entire book of Kings.

Although the miscellanies do not form a clear narrative, it is clear that they are ordered in a structured manner. A common theme or dominant idea can be identified in each of the units. The first unit (35a–k) focuses mainly on Solomon’s construction projects, while the second (46a–l) concentrates on the peace and calm enjoyed during his reign. As you can see in the presentation, the second unit has a chiastic and concentric structure. The central verse (d) contains the main idea of the unit, which can also be found in the unit’s opening and closing elements: the peace that prevailed in Solomon’s time, allowing Israel and Judah to live, each man under his vine and under his fig tree.

[[TEXT]]

The chiastic structure created in the opening and closing verses of the second section of the miscellanies – “Ioudas and Israel” in 46a echoed by “Israel and Ioudas” in 46l – emphasizes the affinity between these two framing verses. Together, the two verses point to the central verse of the section: “and he had peace on all his sides round about, and Ioudas and Israel lived in confidence, each under his vine and under his fig tree” (46g). The word *shalom* here clearly echoes the sounds of Solomon’s name, and it is possible that this verse offers an implicit exegesis on his name.

The situation regarding the first section (35a–i) is more complex, and it seems likely that the form that survives in the miscellanies of the Septuagint does not reflect the original version. However, even here it is possible to detect leitmotifs that run through the entire section. I cannot go into too much detail now due to time limitations, but I will just note that the first section may well also include an exegesis on Solomon’s name. Verse 35g reads “Salomon would offer up in the year three whole burnt offerings and peace offerings… and he finished the house.” The words *shelamim* – whole burnt offerings – and *shilam* – finished – both echo the sound of the name *Shelomo*. The phrase *shilam et ha-bayit* – finished the house – is particularly worth noting. The *pi‘el* form of the root *shin-lamed-mem* usually means to repay a loan or debt, financial or otherwise. This is the only instance in the Bible where many commentators agree that the form is to be interpreted as meaning completed or finished, similar to the *hiph‘il* form (for example, in Isaiah chapter 38, verse 13, and elsewhere). The choice of the *pi‘el* form may reflect a deliberate preference for the sound closest to the name Shlomo, in order to interpret his name as referring to “the one who completed the house.” Some commentators rejected the interpretation of *shilam* as completed, both because this form is never used with this meaning in biblical Hebrew and because in the story of the Temple, the root *kaf-lamed-he* is usually chosen to convey completion (1 Kings 6:9, 14, 38; 7:1, 40; 9:1). Instead, they suggested that *ve-shilam et ha-bayit* should be understood as meaning “he established peace and order.” This meaning is similar to that in the Book of Job (8:6): “and make the habitation of thy righteousness prosperous,” 'וְשִׁלַּם נְוַת צִדְקֶךָ'. This reading is closer to the interpretation of Solomon’s name that I mentioned before. In any case, it seems clear to me that the verse presents a play on Solomon’s name.

So while it is true that these sections do not feature a linear plot or narrative, it is clear that they are not random collections of variants recorded by a scribe. In terms of its literary character, this unit is similar to the details about David and his kingdom that appear in the additional sections in Samuel (II Samuel, chapters 21 to 24), or the passage in Judges, 1–2:6, which serves as a kind of introduction to the Book of Judges.

**C**

The redactors of the book of Kings received this additional section at a relatively late stage, probably after the Deuteronomic editing of the book. As a result, the textual witnesses show signs of different attempts to integrate the text. The authors or scribes who received the text had two main methods at their disposal for embedding it, both of which can be seen in the main witnesses: the dismantling of the section and the embedding of its constituent parts inside the body of the story, according to context, or its inclusion as a single block.

In the editions reflected in MT and in the Septuagint for chapters 3–11, the text was dismembered and its parts integrated at relevant points in the ongoing narrative of the history of Solomon, based on chronological or thematic affinity or by way of association. Thus, for example, verses 46a, 46b, 46f, 46g, and 46k from the text (or similar verses in the original document), which relate to Solomon’s rule, were embedded in the list of Solomon’s officials (1 Kings, 4:7 to 5:8). It is reasonable to assume that the redactor regarded the unit describing the officials in the country bringing payments to the king’s table – “every man in his month; they let nothing be lacking” (5:7) – as the best place to integrate verses from the document discussing the rulers of the kingdoms – “and they were bringing gifts, and they were subject to Salomon all the days of his life” (46b, 46f, 46k [5:1,4]). The redactor regarded the rulers of the kingdoms as Solomon’s officers in distant lands who collect taxes on his behalf. Together with these verses (4:20–5:5), they included several other verses from the second half of the document that also discuss Solomon’s economic and governmental actions. The remaining verses on other issues were embedded elsewhere according to their context. However, since as I have noted these details were added at a later stage, they stand out from the surrounding text no matter where they were placed.

In chapter 2 in the Septuagint, by contrast, the document was embedded as a single block of text. The reason for this is probably that the document only existed in its complete form at a late stage, and may have been in the possession of the last authors or scribes. It was inserted at this particular point because the end of chapter 2, after the story of the succession to the throne (1 Kings, chapters 1–2), and before the main story of Solomon’s kingdom, marked the end of the scroll of Samuel and the beginning of the scroll of Kings in the tradition that formed the basis of the Greek translation. The scribe who wished to preserve the document might have written it on a separate piece of parchment and sewed it onto the scroll or copied it at the beginning or end of the scroll. This approach pays little attention to literary considerations, focusing instead on ensuring that the document is not lost, as well as on technical considerations – that is, the choice of the most convenient place to sew in or copy the material.

The embedding of the document at this point at a late stage may well also explain why the document was later divided into two and its two columns were separated by the story of the removal of Shimei (1 Kings, 2:36–46). We can assume that the document was first embedded as a single block immediately after verse 46 in chapter 2 – following the words “So the kingdom was established in the hand of Solomon.” However, a scribal error caused the first section of the document (35a–k) to be placed after verse 35. The words “so the kingdom was established in the hand of Solomon” (2:46 in MT) appear in the Septuagint at the end of verse 35 in chapter Two, rather than after verse 46 as in MT, despite the fact that the story of the succession and the story of the removal of Solomon’s opponents have not yet been completed. MT would seem here to preserve the original position of these words (“So the kingdom was established in the hand of Solomon”) as a closing phrase for these two stories, while in the Septuagint they were relocated to verse 35. A possible reason for this is that the scribe’s eyes may have jumped from similar words in verses 35 and 46: Verse 35 begins with the words “The king put Benaiah son of Jehoiada…,” while verse 46 includes the words “the king commanded Benaiah son of Jehoiada.” Thus the scribe may have mistakenly placed the words “So the kingdom was established in the hand of Solomon” in verse 35, instead of after the words “the king commanded Benaiah son of Jehoiada” in verse 46. The first part of the document was transferred along with these words, while the second remained in place after verse 46 and before the Deuteronomic introduction to the story of Solomon beginning “The people were sacrificing at the high places, however…”

Thus, the inclusion of the document in the Septuagint took place in two stages, probably in different periods and perhaps even in different scrolls. Fragments of the document were embedded here and there in chapters 3-11 of 1 Kings, while the entire document was embedded in Chapter 2 as a kind of appendix to the book of Samuel and the story of Solomon’s rise to power, after the scribe received this document. This process in the Septuagint, where a section was embedded in its entirety as an appendix, and elsewhere (in the same textual witness) it was broken down into its constituent parts, has occurred elsewhere. The same process can be seen in Judges, 1–2:5. This unit consists mainly of various details about the tribes’ failures to dispossess the inhabitants of the land, and it was embedded in Judges as a single unit. In Joshua, however, the unit was divided into a series of appendices interpolated into the descriptions of the inheritances of the tribes. Judges 1:10–15, 20 was duplicated in Joshua 15:13–19. Judges 1:21 was duplicated in Joshua 15:63; 1:27–28 in Joshua 17:11–13; 1:29 in Joshua 16:10; and Judges 1:34–35 in the Septuagint of Joshua, 19:47a, 48a. As in our case in Kings, in this case in Joshua–Judges the original appears as a separate unit wherever it is positioned. In Judges, where the unit is embedded as a single chunk of text, the material serves as a kind of introduction to the story of the conquest of the Land and it is apparent that it was introduced separately from the other material at the end of Joshua (24:31) and the programmatic introduction to Judges (beginning at 2:6), marked by a connecting repetition (Judges 2:6–9). In Joshua the original verses are scattered throughout the book, but wherever they appear they stand out from their surroundings. Take the example of verse 63 in chapter Fifteen: “But the people of Judah could not drive out the Jebusites, the inhabitants of Jerusalem; so the Jebusites live with the people of Judah in Jerusalem to this day.” This verse concludes the orderly priestly list of the cities of Judah (Joshua 15), but it does not belong to this list in either style or content; moreover, it contradicts the later priestly list (Joshua 18:28), where Jerusalem is included under the inheritance of Benjamin, rather than Judah. As in the case of the book of Kings, there are no grounds for claiming that these verses were moved from one place to another; rather, they both developed separately from a common source.

**D**

Our next task is to clarify how a document crafted as a type of chronicle describing Solomon’s era ended up later in the process of transmission in the hands of post-Deuteronomic scribes – and why it was preserved in a fuller form in a marginal location in the Septuagint. I believe that the answer lies in the late date at which this document was composed. Numerous signs point to such a late date, some of which I alluded to earlier, such as the exegetical characteristics of the text (the wordplay around Solomon’s name) and the stylistic similarities to Chronicles or its sources (such as the phrase “Judah and Israel”).

The late date of this material is also supported by linguistic evidence. The following are some examples of this.

The expression “beyond the River” appears twice in the document with the meaning “the area west of the Euphrates” (46f). This expression – the Hebrew *me-‘ever la-nahar* and the Aramaic equivalent *‘avar nahara* – appear in the Bible only in the Books of Ezra and Nehemiah, which were composed toward the end of the Persian era (for example, Ezra 4:10–11; 5:3; 6:6; 8:36, and Nehemiah 2:7,9 and 3:7). In earlier sources, the same expression – “beyond the River” – refers to the area east of the Euphrates, reflecting the perspective of the biblical authors. An example of this is in the well-known statement in Joshua, chapter 24, verses 2–3: “Long ago your ancestors […]lived beyond the Euphrates.” Although the same expression (*eber nāri*) appears in Neo-Assyrian sources from as early as the seventh century, it only appears in the Bible with this meaning in the books that describe the Return to Zion and thereafter. It is universally agreed that this term only entered the language in the west of the region from the Persian period onwards, later becoming a standard administrative and political term, despite the fact that the expression only makes sense from the Mesopotamian perspective.

The related expression “from Tiphsah to Gaza,” describing the borders of Solomon’s kingdom, also alludes solely to the reality of the Persian period. “Tiphsah” as the name of a city is not found in any of the Mesopotamian sources, although the Assyrian and Babylonian royal documents mention the names of numerous settlements around the Euphrates. The first mention of Tiphsah outside the Bible can be found in the writings of Greek historians who described the city as an important crossing point between the two banks of the Euphrates. Tiphsah, or Thapsacus, as they called it, served as an important center for Persian rule over the west. The palace of the satrap of Syria was situated nearby, as Xenophon mentions (Anabasis 1:4, 11). It was here that the young Cyrus (Xenophon, Anabasis 1:4, 11, 17–18) and Alexander of Macedonia (Arianus, Anabasis, 3:4, 6) crossed the Euphrates on the way to Babylonia. Accordingly, the author of the relatively short text under discussion must surely have made a deliberate effort to adopt an archaic style reminiscent of the ancient chronicles. However, he was unable to avoid the use of terms such as “beyond the River” or “from Tiphsah to Gaza,” which reveal the document’s later date.

Despite its brevity, several other phrases that are typical of only later biblical Hebrew can be found in it. I will give a few examples. The expression *roḥav lev* – “largeness of heart” – appears in verse 35a (5:9 in MT). This is similar to the phrase in the late Psalm 119, verse 32, *ki tarḥiv libi* – “for Thou dost enlarge my heart.” The phrase alludes to wisdom (NRSV translates “for You enlarge my understanding,”) suggesting “open our heart to understand, increase our knowledge.” A similar expression – *reḥav lev* or *reḥav levav* – appears elsewhere in the Bible, (Psalm 101:5; Proverbs 21:4, and see also Proverbs 28:25). However, this refers to a completely different negative state of being arrogant.

The word *sabal* – “laborer” – appears in 1 Kings, 5:29, the parallel verse in MT to verse 35d in the Septuagint. Apart from the appearance in our section (and the parallel occurrence in 2 Chronicles, 2:17), the word appears just twice in the Bible. All the instances are in later sections, such as 2 Chronicles 2:1 and 34:13. It also appears in post-biblical Hebrew, for example in the Mishna – *Kelim* 28:9. BDB identifies the word as late and regards the occurrence in Kings as a corruption. However, if we accept the hypothesis that the document and its parallel in the Septuagint are later writings, there is no longer any need to suggest a textual corruption.

The triple combination of the verbs eat, drink, and be happy that appears in 46a – “Ioudas and Israel were very many … eating and drinking and being happy” (verse 4:20 in MT) occurs elsewhere in the Bible only in later writings, such as Ecclesiastes (8:15) and Trito-Isaiah (65:13).

The combination of the preposition *‘ad* and the root *kaf-lamed-he* appears in our text in verse 35c (chapter 3, verse 1 in MT): “And he took the daughter of Pharaoh … until he first finished his house and the house of the Lord…” The meaning is “until something is completed” or “until someone finishes doing something.” This form appears many times, but solely in later biblical literature, for example 1 Chronicles 28:20 and 2 Chronicles 8:16. In classical biblical Hebrew, the combination of *‘ad* and the root *kaf-lamed-he* has a meaning of “until he destroys” and always has a negative connotation, suggesting “until it has consumed you off the land” (Deuteronomy 28:21). For the sense of “until someone finishes something” or “until something is finished,” classical biblical Hebrew used the phrase *‘ad tom*. It is particularly interesting to compare the common form in classical biblical Hebrew, as it appears in our story – *’ad tom kol ha-bayit* – “until all the house was finished” (1 Kings, chapter 6, verse 22) – with the language of the document: *‘ad kalato livnot et ha-bayit* – “until he had finished building his own house” (Septuagint: 1 Kingdoms, chapter 2, verse 35c [MT: 3:1]). The latter form is closer to later biblical Hebrew. The use of the combination *‘ad* and the root *kaf-lamed-he* in later biblical literature with the sense of “until something is completed” or “until someone completes something” can also be found in the Qumran Scrolls: “until they have completed hurling seven” (1QM 8,1); “until the priest finishes speaking” (4Q408 11,3; 4Q376 1,2,2; 1Q29 1,4), and in Ben Sira: “finishing the service at the altars” (50:14, 19, according to Manuscript B).

Among the other parallels between our document and late biblical books, it is particularly worth mentioning “Solomon’s bread list.” The description in 1 Kings, 5:2–3 reads: “Solomon’s **provision for one day** [literally – “bread for one day”] was thirty cors of choice flour, and sixty cors of meal, ten fat oxen, and twenty pasture-fed cattle, one hundred sheep, besides deer, gazelles, roebucks, and fatted **fowl**.” This can be compared to the “bread of hope” mentioned by Nehemiah (5:18): “Now that which was prepared for one day was one ox and six choice sheep; also fowls were prepared for me, and every ten days skins of wine in abundance; yet with all this I did not demand the food allowance of the governor, because of the heavy burden of labor on the people.” In most cases, scholars have confined themselves to comparing the quantities of food mentioned in the story of Solomon and to those in Nehemiah. If Nehemiah, who speaks in the first person, is not quoting or referencing the figures quoted for Solomon, the connection between the two texts may reflect fixed conventions concerning the description of the meals of the king and his officials in the Persian administration.

Turning to syntax, certain phenomena in our document also suggest a late date of composition. An example is the use of the *ve-qatal* form (*vav* followed by the perfect) to denote the past tense, as found at the end of verse 35g: *ve-shilam et ha-bayit* (“he finished the house”; 9:25 in MT). Several scholars have explained this as the addition of a single later phrase, but there is no reason to separate the final words from the rest of the verse. According to our approach here, this is just another of the signs that reveal the period in which the unit was written. Moreover, as I mentioned earlier, the *pi‘el* form of the root *shin-lamed-mem* is never used to mean “completed” or “finished” in biblical Hebrew – this meaning is always conveyed by the *hif‘il* form *hishlim*. If the verbal form here indeed means “completed,” the *pi‘el* here must be influenced by Aramaic, as Montgomery suggested. This, too, would then be evidence of the late date of the verse.

The linguistic and stylistic features I have discussed, together with the textual witnesses, reflect the lack of a clear textual tradition concerning the verses in the document in Kings. They all add up to the conclusion that not only was the document was embedded in Kings after the main redaction of the book, it also was composed at a later stage, even if it includes certain older traditions. Its author may have collated various details about Solomon from diverse sources and attempted to give them a more ancient feel by mimicking the style of the chronicles and somewhat archaic language. However, he was unable to conceal his true period, which is apparent in linguistic usages confined to the later era and in stylistic and conceptual features that appear only from the Persian period onward. The idyllic and utopian depiction of Solomon’s kingdom may have ancient roots, but in the miscellanies he is regarded as a supreme ruler of all the land west of the Euphrates – a type of Persian pasha or emperor to whom all the kings of the region paid tribute. Even the king of Egypt was his inferior, as shown by the fact that he gave Solomon his daughter as a wife (1 Kings, 3:12 [Septuagint: Chapter 2:35c]). It is probable that this idyllic portrait of Solomon only emerged during the Persian period. It was compatible with the conceptual world and beliefs of this time, particularly given the reality of their political existence alongside other groups in the territories west of the Euphrates.

\*\*\*

Let me try to summarize some of the findings I have presented today.

The key to understanding the miscellanies, in my opinion, lies in the verses in the body of the text that parallel the additional sections. Whenever we examine one of these parallel verses, it seems to be out of place in its context and has the character of a secondary addition. Moreover, the verses in the miscellanies have a distinct linguistic and stylistic character, including ‘midrashic’ wordplay, that sets them apart from the rest of the story of Solomon. I believe that both the miscellanies in Chapter 2 of 1 Kings are a copy of a short independent document that was received by the scribes of the book of Kings at a late stage. These verses form part of a short independent cluster of details about Solomon that was probably consolidated during the Persian period. By various means, this cluster became embedded in the manuscripts of the book of Kings prevalent during the Second Temple period. In Chapter 2 of the Septuagint, the cluster was embedded as a single, continuous unit (which later split into two parts), similarly to the clusters of information placed in the appendices to the early prophets (Judges1–2:5; 2 Samuel 21–24). In the editions reflected in MT (and in the Septuagint of Chapters 3–11), the document was dismantled and dispersed in the body of the story.

The implication of this conclusion is that the relationship between the Septuagint and MT is not similar to cases involving a short edition that was later expanded, or a long edition that was abridged. What we have here are two witnesses to two editions that developed from a single ancient version, and were expanded in a parallel process through the addition of several sections after the main Deuteronomic redaction of the book had been completed. The textual witnesses, and particularly the Septuagint for the Book of Kings, are crucial to any understanding of the development of this book, and this witness provides important support for the supposition that the book of Kings continued to develop and undergo processes of reworking and expansion during the Persian period and even thereafter. This supposition has important ramifications concerning the literary and historical questions the book raises. It emerges that elements of the book such as Solomon’s marriage to Pharaoh’s daughter and the claim that Solomon ruled over all the kings west of the Euphrates are not ancient historical traditions, but rather an idyllic depiction of ancient days added at a later stage. Indeed, most of the extremely positive depictions of Solomon belong to the verses from the miscellanies added at a relatively late stage. This short and independent document may also offer a glimpse into the historiographic sources concerning the monarchic period; these sources may have formed part of the writings that served as sources for the book of Chronicles. At some point, sources of this sort reached the chronicler, who integrated them into his text. It emerges that a small number of these sources reached the scribes responsible for the book of Kings, and were subsequently embedded in some of the versions of this book.