NARRATIVE TENSION IN I KINGS 1-11

NARRATIVE TENSION IN I KINGS 1-11:

A STUDY OF THE STRUCTURAL AND

THEMATIC UNITY OF THE SOLOMONIC NARRATIVE

by

KIM IAN PARKER, M.A., B.A.

A Thesis
Submitted to the School of Graduate Studies
in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements
for the Degree
Doctor of Philosophy

McMaster University

February 1988

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY (1988) McMASTER UNIVERSITY
(Religious Studies) Hamilton, Ontario

TITLE: Narrative Tension in I Kings 1-11: A Study of the Structural and Thematic Unity of the Solomonic Narrative

AUTHOR: Kim Ian Parker, B.A. (McMaster University)
M.A. (McMaster University)

SUPERVISORS: Professor A.E. Combs
Professor A.M. Cooper

NUMBER OF PAGES: vii, 177

ABSTRACT

During the past century, historical-critical scholarship on the reign of Solomon (I Kings 1-11) has advanced the argument that the narrative is a heterogeneous mix of material, originating from diverse socio-historical settings. Reasonably enough, critical research on the Solomon narrative has concentrated on a number of compositional or redactional questions. The result of this research, however, is that the narrative itself is no longer read as a unit or as containing a coherent message.

The purpose of this thesis is to try to recover the meaning of the narrative through a holistic reading of I Kings 1-11. In particular, the thesis explores the "narrative tension" or "literary inconsistencies" in the text's portrayal of Solomon. The main problem facing the interpreter is to account for the fact that Solomon is both Israel's ideal and its apostate king. The thesis argues that this narrative tension can be explained through a holistic reading of the text, without recourse to an historical-critical analysis.

The holistic approach reveals the structural unity of the text; the two dream theophanies to Solomon (3:4-15; 9:1-10) act as fulcrums which balance the narrative in two sections, one pro-Solomon, the other anti-Solomon. The unifying

theme of both sections, it is argued, is Solomon's relationship with Torah and Wisdom. The development of that relationship lends a thematic tension to the narrative as well. By explicating these structural and thematic elements, the thesis demonstrates that the narrative tension in the Solomonic material is purposefully contrived. The investigation as a whole reveals that the narrative has a unity and an integrity of its own, from which a coherent message emerges.

Acknowledgements

I wish to express my gratitude to my co-supervisors, Dr. A.E. Combs and Dr. A.M. Cooper, and to my reader, Dr. L. Braswell, for their many constructive criticisms and suggestions for improvement. In particular, I would like to thank both Eugene Combs for the inspiration he has provided and the interest he has shown in this project, and Alan Cooper for his invaluable help on points of methodological and exegetical detail.

I would also like to thank my parents for their much appreciated moral support, and for their encouraging words. Above all, however, I owe a special thanks to my wife Cathy, who has read and commented on the entire manuscript, and who offered help of every kind at every stage. It is she to whom this thesis is affectionately dedicated.

Table of Contents

CHAPTER ONE

HISTORICAL-CRITICAL APPROACHES TO KINGS

The Rise of the Historical-Critical Question

Modern historical-critical approaches to the book of Kings have generally focused upon a number of redactional questions. Questions concerning the date, authorship, and place of writing have been uppermost in the minds of historical critics. The narrative itself was believed to contain a heterogeneous mix of legends, prophecy, archaeological data, lists and sermonic prose. Scholars have interpreted the apparently disparate material to reflect a multitude of sources, each originating from a different socio-historical context. The first chapter of this thesis will describe how such an interpretation came into being and elucidate the problems inherent in just such a reading.

The rise of the historical-critical question will be examined through an investigation of the reading strategy employed by the historical critics. This investigation will not only clarify the context of critical research on the book of Kings, but also, more importantly, help to expose the underlying methodological assumptions of the historical critics. It must be remembered, however, that the following outline is not meant as a comprehensive analysis of all the authors, theologians and historians who have contributed to the rise of modern biblical criticism.[1]

[1] Such a comprehensive study would require an additional thesis and take me well beyond the boundaries of this study. In any event, much has already been written on the subject. For an excellent analysis of the rise of historical criticism and hermeneutical issues in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, see H.F. Frei, *The Eclipse of Biblical Narrative* (1974); a more historical approach can be found in E.G. Kraeling, *The Old Testament Since the Reformation* (1955). Other surveys of the historical-critical movement can also be found in Grant (1952), McNeil (1952), Terrien (1952), Hahn (1954), De Vries (1962), Richardson (1963), Neill (1963), Cazelles (1976), and, for additional bibliographic material, see especially Hayes (1979:84-85).

It is, rather, included to demonstrate the growth of the historical-critical question.

The single most important figure in the rise of historical criticism and "the innovator of the historicity of the Bible" (Cassirer 1951:184), was Benedict de Spinoza (1632-1677). If the Protestant reformers such as Luther and Calvin had freed the Bible from tradition, and, in so doing, opened the way for a rationalistic interpretation of Scripture, it was Spinoza who, in his *Theologico-Political Treatise* (1670), was the first to lay out the rules for the interpretation of Scripture in any systematic way.[2] Spinoza's rationalistic approach to the Bible led him to the conclusion that one should interpret Scripture the same way one would interpret nature. Just as one learns natural laws from nature, so one learns scriptural laws (or gains knowledge of Scripture) from the Bible itself; as one can discover the fundamental laws and principles of nature, so one can discover the fundamental laws of the Bible:

> I may sum up the matter by saying that the method of interpreting Scripture does not widely differ from the method of interpreting Nature — in fact, it is almost the same. For as the interpretation of nature consists in the examination of the history of nature, and therefrom deducing definitions of natural phenomena on certain fixed axioms, so Scriptural interpretation proceeds by the examination of Scripture, and inferring the intention of its authors as a legitimate conclusion from its fundamental principles (Spinoza 1951:99).

Spinoza also called upon the aid of history in his interpretation of the Bible. He argued that "the universal rule, then, in interpreting Scripture is to accept nothing as an authoritative Scriptural statement which we do not perceive very clearly when we examine it in the light of history" (Spinoza 1951:101). From this

---

[2] Certainly this was not Spinoza's only purpose in writing the *Treatise*. He also wanted to construct a political state which was based on reason rather than revelation. See Combs (1983:9-28) for the political implications of Spinoza's biblical criticism.

universal rule, Spinoza deduced that although one must try to understand the history of each book in the Bible, it is impossible to attain any degree of precision in this area (Spinoza 1951:113). Only those statements which are unambiguous could be trusted, and, for Spinoza, these were few in number.

The result of Spinoza's biblical exegesis is that the Bible became the object of an historical inquiry rather than the repository of revealed history. In order to make the Bible understandable, there was a need to determine the place and the time of writing of each individual book as well as for a thorough investigation into the language and history of the Bible (Strauss 1965:142-44). The Bible had lost its timeless quality; instead, it was now conditioned by time: meaning was now derived through the tools of empirical observation and only within an historical context. As Hans Frei writes, "in circular fashion, the Bible's own story became increasingly dependent on its relation to other temporal frames of reference to render it illuminating and even real" (1974:50). With the placing of meaning in an historical frame of reference, the historical-critical method was inaugurated.

The results of Spinoza's biblical exegesis, if not entirely original, were in fact the inevitable result of his rational interpretation and his freedom from the restraints of tradition.[3] From his leading premise (i.e., natural law or the laws of nature were established by God), Spinoza was able to argue that the prophets were not to be trusted and that the miracles that were reported in Scripture did not take place. For if it is granted that God's nature does not change, he cannot

[3] It is probable that Spinoza had read and used the English political philosopher Thomas Hobbes's *Leviathan* (1651) as well as the works by the Jewish exegetes Ibn Ezra and Maimonides, who had arrived at similar conclusions about the authorship and date of various books — albeit from different perspectives (Strauss 1965). But even if Spinoza's results were not original, his methodological and systematic analysis makes him a precursor of the historical-critical method (Grobel 1962:410; Strauss 1965).

contradict himself by contravening his own natural laws. Miracles which violate the law of nature simply could not have happened (Spinoza 1951:13-97). Spinoza also mustered considerable evidence to show that Moses was not the author of the Pentateuch, and that there has been considerable editorializing of the historical books as well (1951:120-132). Many of the remaining books of the Bible are filled with errors and inconsistencies (1951:133-156). In this manner, Spinoza subtly subverted orthodoxy under the guise of rational observation and under the name of reason. It remained for the ensuing centuries to concentrate on the implications of Spinoza's doctrines once the Bible had been freed from its place as the ultimate authority. By the end of the nineteenth century, the way was already well paved for one of the most influential expressions of the documentary hypothesis, as formulated by Julius Wellhausen (see Terrien 1952:138; De Vries 1962:415-16; Hayes 1979:115-20).

Wellhausen did not originate the concept of the documentary hypothesis of the Pentateuch *per se*; nevertheless, he did redate the various narrative strands of the Pentateuch. In so doing, Wellhausen had not only redated the Pentateuch, but, according to his evolutionary scheme, rewritten all of Israelite history and religion. According to Wellhausen, Israelite religion had evolved from a "primitive stage" of Yahwehism (with traces of animism, totemism and polytheism), to a "henotheistic stage" of the prophets, which was later superseded by the "ethical monotheism" of the exile. The Levitical laws, therefore, far from being revealed to Moses at Sinai, were a product of post-exilic Judaism (Terrien 1952:134; De Vries 1962:416).

Although many of Wellhausen's ideas have been superseded or dismissed for their too obvious Hegelianism, Wellhausen remains an influential figure today for establishing the idea of change in biblical history (Kraeling 1955:98). The Bible

was seen to have been, throughout its history, affected by change and flux. As such, it represented an incomplete or inadequate account of history. It was up to the historical critic, therefore, either to supply the missing historical information which would make the narrative comprehensible, or to divorce the narrative from its literary context to avoid repetitions and contradictions. It is only after an inquiry into the historical circumstances surrounding the narrative (i.e., authorial intention, date, place, etc.), that it becomes intelligible. The historical method thus became *the* method of biblical studies. The meaning of a given narrative became intimately linked with the compositional character of the narrative. The Bible was secularized and "was no longer the criterion for the writing of history; rather history had become the criterion for understanding the Bible" (Krentz 1975:30).

It is this historical-critical approach, inaugurated by Spinoza and reaching its heights with Wellhausen, that has, for the most part, gripped biblical studies. And although scholars do not speak of "sources" so much as they speak of "traditions" or "redactions," the interest in the historical circumstances surrounding the individual units is paramount. The historical investigation proceeds on the assumption that the text is incomprehensible as it stands, and its meaning can only be comprehended by an historical investigation into the composition of the various sources, traditions or redactions.

The extent to which the historical-critical analysis has pervaded studies on the book of Kings can be illustrated by an examination of three fields dominating the study of Kings: source criticism, tradition criticism and redaction criticism. This survey, however, will be thematic rather than exhaustive. The three major components of modern historical-critical investigation will be isolated and the typical scholarly opinions within each discipline will be described.

Source Criticism

Source criticism is rooted in two primary concerns of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries: first, that the Bible is conditioned historically (cf. Spinoza); second, that Moses drew upon at least four sources in the writing of the Pentateuch (Wellhausen). It further rests upon five distinct literary features about the text: first, the use of different divine names; second, language and style; third, contradictions and inconsistencies in the text; fourth, repetition of material; fifth, evidence that different accounts have been combined (Hayes 1979:118).

Source criticism is also the combination of an initial literary analysis and a subsequent investigation into the historical setting. And although the source critic is interested in seeking historical information which can ultimately be used to understand the text, the critic starts his analysis by making literary observations about the text. The source critic wants "to determine its literary character, origins, and states of written composition" by an investigation of the "logical and thematic inconsistencies" (Habel 1971:6). It is then that the critic "relates his literary findings to their historical context" (Habel 1971:7).

With the synthesis of the historical-critical approach by Wellhausen, source criticism moved beyond the Pentateuch in order to discern the sources of the Former Prophets (Joshua to II Kings) as well. There are a number of literary characteristics in the Former Prophets which would indicate that the historical books underwent a long and complicated compositional history. In the first place, since the story line of Joshua to II Kings is a chronological continuation of the one in the Pentateuch there is a strong possibility that the four sources detected in the Pentateuch (J,E,D,P) continue as well. Second, there are a number of duplications in the Former Prophets (notably the two stories of the Conquest [Joshua 6-11 and Judges 1] and the two versions of the rise of the

monarchy [I Samuel 8-12]) which would lead scholars to believe that there is a continuation of at least two sources. In the following paragraphs I shall briefly describe the contributions of four source critics (Benzinger, Hölscher, Smend, Eissfeldt) in order to understand their methodological assumptions and assess their impact on determining the meaning of the narrative.

I. Benzinger (1899, 1921) and G. Hölscher (1923, 1952) have both argued that the sources J (the Yahwistic source, after the divine name YHWH) and E (after the divine name Elohim) continue from the Pentateuch on into the Former Prophets. Yet, whereas Benzinger argued that the compiler (or the person responsible for the arrangement of the book of Kings in its final form) not only had access to J and E, but to the Book of the Acts of Solomon (I Kings 11:41), the Book of the Chronicles of the Kings of Israel (I Kings 14:19), and the Book of the Chronicles of the Kings of Judah (I Kings 14:29), Hölscher argued that the compiler made use of only J and E and that it was E who had previously combined and edited the court annals.

Benzinger also argued that he could trace J as far as II Kings 17:3-4, and that J was compiled under the reign of Hezekiah, sometime during the latter part of the eighth century. The E source, on the other hand, was written no later then 610 B.C., during the reign of Josiah, more specifically, during the reforms mentioned in II Kings 22-23. The reign of Josiah thus forms a fitting climax to the narrative (1921:21). And although Benzinger argued that two redactions of the material had taken place, one before the Exile and one after the Exile (1899:xiii), the main criterion for the division of the narrative into sources is stylistic:

> Even though the book of Kings provide a continuous historical narrative, it is not, however, a homogeneous product of one author. It is, rather, a compilation, the work of a "Redactor" (R), whose own

> contribution was limited essentially to create a narrative framework. On the one hand, there is a considerable number of short factual comments which have an entirely annalistic character. Note the loose connection of *'āz* or *hû'*, the very brief depiction of even important events, and the absence of any reflection. On the other hand, there are a whole series of detailed narrative pieces whose style is, at times, folkloric, and, at other times, sermonic in character, and of an entirely different historical value.

In a similar vein, Hölscher argued that stylistic criteria determined the nature and extent of the individual sources (1923: 152ff.), but argued for different divisions in the text. According to Hölscher, the J source extended only as far as the description of the division of the kingdoms in II Kings 12:19 and was written ca. 800 B.C. The rest of the material in the narrative (or that which does not derive from an editor or compiler) belongs to the E source and is dated after 561 B.C., the date of Jehoiachin's release from prison by Evil-Merodach. Thus, although both source critics based their divisions into sources on stylistic grounds, both divided the text differently, and determined the nature and scope of each source differently as well.

Two other source critics, R. Smend (1921) and O. Eissfeldt (1965), argued for the existence of three separate sources in the book of Kings. Smend, whose notes were compiled by H. Holzinger and published posthumously in 1921, argued for the existence of a J^1, J^2, and an E source. According to Smend, the narrative of J^1 extends up to the Elisha narrative in II Kings 3 whereas J^2 extends to the reign of Jehu in II Kings 9-10. E's conjectural route covers much of the remainder of the narrative, as far as the destruction of the Temple in II Kings 22-23. Smend also posited other sources such as the history of Solomon and the history of the kings of Israel and Judah in the total makeup of the book of Kings. Once again the criterion for the division into the respective sources J^1, J^2, and E appears to be literary although, owing to the fragmentary nature of the article, it

is difficult to determine Smend's hermeneutical stance with much precision (Smend 1921:181ff.).

Likewise Eissfeldt (1965) used literary phenomena to isolate the three strands that, for him, comprise the book of Kings. Eissfeldt's description of the narrative sources appears to be similar to Smend's (except that he substituted an L or a "Lay" source for Smend's J^1 and a J source for Smend's J^2). Eissfeldt, however, refused to outline his own literary sources in the book of Kings. He admitted, "it is nevertheless not possible to reconstruct this original [outline of Kings] and divide it up again into its individual strands" (1965:298). The confusion, for Eissfeldt, arises because of the fact that, for the author of Kings, there were other sources available besides L, J and E (1965:290).

All that can be ascertained from Eissfeldt's analysis is that there are three sources: L dating from 950-850 B.C.; J from 900-825 B.C.; and E from 850-750 B.C. Nevertheless, the alleged dates for the sources of the book of Kings do not arise from Kings itself, but from Eissfeldt's prior dating of the sources in the Pentateuch (1965:247). Furthermore, it is on stylistic grounds (i.e., repetitions and contradictions) that Eissfeldt determined what constitutes a narrative unit or source (1965:287).

A distinct pattern emerges thus far from the work of the source critics: stylistic differences determine sources and sources determine the history of the composition of the text (i.e., when and where each source was composed). It is thus through the history of the composition of the text that the historical critic tries to understand the "original" meaning of the text. There are serious weaknesses in this approach. Although all four source critics agreed that the narrative strands of the Pentateuch continue through Joshua to II Kings, there is no unanimity as to just what belongs to J or E, what the extent of the sources is, or

even what the number of sources in the narrative is. Indeed, it was suggested quite early that the theory of the multiple sources in the Former Prophets was unsound. In 1926 R. Weise wrote:

> the assumption that two great presentations [J and E] covered the history of Israel from its beginnings (Genesis) until its final collapse (end of II Kings) is an exaggeration of the literary-critical system which is customarily named briefly after Wellhausen (quoted in Eissfeldt 1965:246).

Thus, not only do source critics disagree among themselves over the nature and scope of the material, but there is also a surprising lack of detail about how the sources were put together or compiled. There is little systematic explanation of how the individual strands were unified. To a certain extent, my next historical-critical theme, tradition criticism, will attempt to answer these very questions. Tradition historians seek the overriding theological motivation of the compiler (or redactor) who gathered together the disparate traditions. I will now see how successful they have been in trying to understand the narrative.

Tradition Criticism

The source-critical method, refined by Wellhausen and applied to the book of Kings by Benzinger, Hölscher, Smend and Eissfeldt, was soon superseded by a scholarly method which took into consideration both the "pre-literary" stage of the narrative, and, to a certain degree, the text in its final form. Most scholars were quick to realize the inadequacies of the source-critical approach: to what extent were the sources themselves a compilation of an early pre-literary tradition, and, further, is there any overarching literary schema which sought to unite the disparate sources? In part, "form criticism", inaugurated by H. Gunkel (1862-1932), sought to answer the first question. Form criticism assumed that the literature of the Old Testament had a long and complicated prehistory and it

attempted to isolate the "form" (*Gattung* or genre) in which the earliest material was conceived. It also assumed that, underlying the written tradition, there was an earlier oral tradition which originally comprised legends, sagas, blessings, oaths, laments, hymns, etc. Finally, form criticism further assumed that each genre arose in a particular setting (*Sitz im Leben*), and that the original setting of the narrative unit could be recovered from the determination of its genre.

Form criticism would thus seek, through its attempt to understand the oral and preliterary stage of the narrative, to uncover the literary history of the text (Tucker 1971:6-9). It thus shares the historical concerns of source criticism, but with a new emphasis on the pre-literary phase of the composition as opposed to its written sources. Through an examination of such literary forms one could gain a better understanding of the original setting in which certain texts were first orally composed and transmitted.

Form criticism, as a method of investigation of the literary history of the narrative, gave birth to another method, tradition criticism. Tradition criticism uses the results of both form criticism and source criticism in its attempt to give a history of the Old Testament literature in both its pre-literary and literary stages. Although tradition criticism does refer to either the pre-literary or the literary development of the material, when applied to the book of Kings it is more concerned with the growth of the literary traditions of the narrative (Tucker 1971:19). Tradition criticism, therefore, describes the way in which the traditions (either pre-literary or literary) were assimilated in the composition of the Old Testament, whereas form criticism describes the individual units that compose the narrative. In the succeeding pages we shall examine the impact of three tradition critics on the book of Kings: M. Noth, G. von Rad and H.W. Wolff.

With the 1943 publication of M. Noth's *Überlieferungsgeschichtliche Studien* (ET: *The Deuteronomistic History*, 1981), critical research on the book of Kings was radically altered. Noth argued that a single exilic author, the Deuteronomist (Dtr.), gathered together diverse traditions to compose a unified "theological history" which extended from Deuteronomy to II Kings. The Dtr., however, was not only a collector of traditions but an individual author who exercised his creativity in composing a unified account, and whose theology was based on Deuteronomy. Thus, the Dtr. was an author whose historical composition was based upon those sources which were available to him. Nevertheless, the author created and compiled his material in such a way as to leave his own enduring stamp on the tradition. Noth's simple theory seemed to resolve the earlier problems of authorial intention and date of composition in an entirely fresh and provocative manner. No longer were scholars bound to an unending division and fragmentation of the narrative in order to determine the original literary sources.

Although Noth recognized that a variety of sources was embedded in the tradition (1981:77), there was a remarkable unity and coherence in the tradition that could only be accredited to the hand of the Dtr. himself:

> Dtr. was not merely an editor but the author of a history which brought together material from highly varied traditions and arranged it according to a carefully conceived plan. In general Dtr. simply reproduced the literary sources available to him and merely provided a connecting narrative for isolated passages. We can prove, however, that in places he made a deliberate selection from the material at his disposal (1981:10).

The material achieved unification in a variety of ways. Noth perceived a similarity in the simplistic style and language of the Hebrew used (i.e., without particular artistry or refinement, 1981:5), but this in itself, Noth admits, is not conclusive evidence in favour of a single author/redactor. Stronger evidence is provided by the fact that at key places in the Deuteronomistic history,[4] the Dtr. has

[4] Throughout this thesis, I will use the abbreviation "Dtr. history" to refer to the "Deutero-

a pivotal figure come forth with a speech which looks forwards and backwards in order to interpret history and derive some lesson as to what the people should do (i.e., Moses in Deuteronomy 31 [1981:34-35]; Joshua in Joshua 1 and 23; Samuel in I Samuel 12; Solomon in I Kings 8:14-61 [1981:5-6]). Sometimes the Dtr. himself presents a series of historical reflections in order to summarize the narrative (Joshua 12; Judges 2:11f; I Kings 17:7f. [1981:6]).

According to Noth, another mark of unification in the Dtr. history is the unified chronology which extends throughout the narrative. The Dtr., in I Kings 6:1, mentions the 480 years which have elapsed since the Israelites went forth from Egypt. By a careful calculation, Noth reckoned that the 480th year, which coincides with the building of the Temple for Yahweh, is also the sum of the total number of years mentioned from Moses to Solomon. No one but an editor, Noth argued, could construct such a schematic chronology (1981:18-25). Similarly, unity is achieved by the introductory speeches related in Deuteronomy 1:1-4:43, which function as a preamble not to the Deuteronomic Law, but to the Dtr. history as a whole (1981:14). It was in this manner that the entire Dtr. history was introduced by the exilic Dtr., and it gave some justification for the succeeding loss of the land in the exilic period.

Noth also argued that the single authorship of the Dtr. history can be ascertained on the basis of the theology of Deuteronomy. In Joshua, Israel receives blessings, as outlined in Deuteronomy 28:1-14, for its obedience to Yahweh. Yet for its disobedience, as in Judges to II Kings, Israel receives the curses outlined in Deuteronomy 28:15-68. Israel is thus viewed in the light of its obedience to the

---

nomistic history"; the abbreviation "Dtr." will refer to the "Deuteronomist", that is, the author/compiler of that history; and the word "Deuteronomic" will refer to material pertaining solely to the book of Deuteronomy.

Torah (1981:79-83). The fact that Israel no longer possessed the land and was in exile meant that Israel had seriously turned aside from following Yahweh and was being punished (1981:90-91). The Dtr.'s "theological history" shows the inevitable consequences of Israel's apostasy, as well as God's moral order and intervention in history:

> Dtr. did not write history to provide entertainment in hours of leisure or to satisfy a curiosity about national history, but intended it to teach the true meaning of the history of Israel from the occupation to the destruction of the old order. The meaning which he discovered was that God was recognisably at work in this history, continuously meeting the accelerating moral decline with warnings and punishments and, finally, when these proved fruitless, with total annihilation (Noth 1981:89).

It is in this manner that Noth argued for the essential unity of the Dtr. composition. The Dtr. carefully selected and edited his sources to produce a single unified theological history which extended from Deuteronomy to II Kings. Although other tradition critics (notably von Rad, Wolff) were in agreement with Noth's hypothesis of a single exilic author, they were in basic disagreement with Noth's "theology of doom". I shall now show how each in turn tackled the thesis set forth by Noth.

In an article entitled "*Deuteronomium-Studien*" in 1947 (ET: "Deuteronomic Theology of History in I and II Kings", 1966), von Rad focused on the power of Yahweh's creative word in history and so hoped to modify Noth's theological claim (1966:208). Von Rad argued that the Dtr. conceives of Yahweh's word operating in two ways: first, Yahweh's word is a law which judges and destroys, and, second, it is a "gospel" which saves and forgives (i.e., the continual fulfillment of the prophecy to David, 1966:219). Thus, Yahweh's word functions both as a "curse" upon law breakers (as in Deuteronomy) and as a "prophetic promise" (as in the Davidic covenant).

Noth's bleak outlook for Israel is mitigated by the fact that Yahweh, throughout the course of Israelite history, continually offers a prophecy-fulfillment schema whereby Yahweh's promises are worked out in history. Von Rad offered eleven such prophecy-fulfillment episodes in Israelite history to blunt the notion of severe punishment for the whole people; if some were suitably repentant, Yahweh would mitigate the punishment (1966:208-214). Even though the northern kingdom of Israel brought about its own destruction through the sin of Jeroboam I (I Kings 14:16), Yahweh had, at least, postponed punishment for two hundred years (von Rad 1966:213).

Insofar as the southern kingdom was concerned, Yahweh had established the eternal promise of the everlasting dynasty of David (II Samuel 7) to bring salvation and forgiveness to the people (1966:214-221). The hope was for some future king (possibly Messianic [1966:216]) who would restore peace and justice. Seen in this light, the release of Jehoiachin from prison at the end of the Dtr.'s work is emblematic of the continuance of the Davidic line (1966:220). This incident is of tremendous theological significance; Yahweh can and still does act in history when and if he so desires.

Thus, even though von Rad and Noth were in basic agreement as to the creative role of the Dtr., they differed insofar as his theology is concerned. For Noth, the Dtr. paints a picture of irrevocable doom; for von Rad, the inevitable destruction is modified, if not overcome, by the power of the creative word of Yahweh in history. Through Yahweh's word, history has a purpose and a meaning. The self-fulfilling promise to David, which Yahweh establishes, offers salvation and the promise of continuance of the line.

Like von Rad, H.W. Wolff also found a theme of hope in the theology of the Dtr. In an article appearing in 1966 called "*Das Kerygma des*

deuteronomistischen Geschichtswerks" (ET: "The Kerygma of the Deuteronomistic Historical Work", 1975), Wolff argued that the theme of forgiveness pervades the work from beginning to end. Wolff questioned why an exilic author would want to record Israel's catastrophic history as one of "righteous judgement" (1975:85). In contrast to von Rad, however, Wolff argued that Nathan's oracle (regarding the continuance of the eternal dynasty of David) is too little upon which to base a theology of hope. Wolff approached the problem from a fresh direction. He argued that Yahweh's wrath and judgement on the people caused them to repent and to "return" (*šûb*) to God, thereby gaining divine forgiveness. A grand pattern emerged whereby the people's apostasy was followed by Yahweh's punishment, which was followed by repentance. Yahweh then sent a deliverer to save Israel.

Not only did this pattern clearly emerge in the period of the judges, Wolff argued, but it also appeared in the period of the kings as well. Although the people rejected the covenant, Yahweh established a king for Israel because of the people's prayers of repentance. Thus, judgement and wrath were averted by the people's prayers and willingness to return (*šûb*) to Yahweh. Even when Israel was close to destruction (II Kings 17), Yahweh gave the people one last chance to return. But, having failed to repent, the people were doomed. On the other hand, Josiah was faithful precisely because he decided to return (*šûb*) to Yahweh (Wolff 1975:86-91).

Although the repeated infidelity of Judah climaxed in the exile, according to Wolff, there was still a hope offered to the people if they would only return to Yahweh. Wolff turned to Solomon's dedicatory prayer (I Kings 8) for evidence. The fact that Solomon offered hope to the "exiles" if they returned to Yahweh (I Kings 8:33,35,46-53) was taken by Wolff to imply that the plight of the exiles in

Babylon was not as hopeless as it may first have appeared (1975:91-93). If the people were suitably repentant, a new hope lay in the future. The Dtr. history as a whole was nothing less than "an urgent invitation to return to the God of salvation history" and "the only possibility of salvation" (1975:99).

Thus both Wolff and von Rad disagreed with Noth's theology of doom, arguing for a more positive outlook of the Dtr. Nevertheless, Wolff and von Rad disagreed between themselves as to how the Dtr. accomplished this optimistic theology. Von Rad emphasized the prophecy-fulfillment schema as well as the promise of the eternal covenant to David, whereas Wolff emphasized the "theology of return" (*šûb*). Other tradition critics, notably Brueggemann and Timm, have also taken issue with Noth's theology and have, instead, argued in favour of the more positive aspects of the Dtr. (see Kenik 1983:8-10). Although it is not necessary to document these scholars' findings in detail, they all argued for a unified authorship and overarching theology; they all disagreed, however, on what that theology might be.

In light of the accomplishments of Noth and of the tradition critics in general, scholarship on the book of Kings had taken a decisive turn. Scholars now viewed the narrative as a deliberate and carefully conceived work of a single author with an overarching theological plan. No longer was the narrative viewed merely as a composite of sources which had been sewn together, somewhat haphazardly, by a redactor.

Nevertheless, in spite of the attempt to see the unity in the narrative, the basic premise of the tradition critics was that the narrative material was an historical account. The compiler arranged the material in such a way as to shed light on the outcome of Israelite history; the theology was always seen in light of whatever conclusion the tradition critic had drawn about the history of Israel.

Thus, the assumption was that the compiler attempted to rationalize his own particular historical situation by composing an historical etiology — be it optimistic or pessimistic.

Although the narrative had now been viewed as a unified, albeit redacted work, scholars still continued to see the book of Kings as a composite of various sources, each with its own distinctive literary flavour. What unity was perceived in the narrative was only an editorial unity. The text was a patchwork of carefully edited traditions with supplements from the hand of the compiler. In any event, the difference between a compiler, redactor or author was not always clear. Noth himself sometimes suggests that the Dtr. resembles a compiler more than a creative author:

> The Dtr. clearly did not intend to create something original and of a piece but was at pains to select, compile, arrange and interpret existing traditional material, which was already in written form on the history of his people in Palestine, that is, he consciously committed himself to using the material available to him (1981:77).

At other times, Noth (and the subsequent tradition critics) still spoke of the Dtr. as an author. In this respect, there has been an additional charge levied against Noth and his followers that the author/redactor was not as private and idiosyncratic as Noth had imagined but was, on the contrary, affiliated with a group or tradition. In other words, the Dtr. history was the creation of a "D" group (rather than a creation of a single personage) who were instrumental in saving the oral tradition and allowing for the dynamics of the oral tradition (Kenik 1983:24-26).

Yet, perhaps the most effective criticism against the tradition critics is that they themselves do not agree as to the message, meaning or theme of the text. Some critics have decided to concentrate on the theme of wrath and destruction

whereas others have decided to concentrate upon the theme of hope and grace. One has a theology of doom and judgement whereas the other has one of forgiveness and salvation. Indeed, the utter simplicity of the theory of a single exilic compiler has its drawbacks as scholars themselves seem incapable of handling the complexity of the issues while still maintaining the integrity of the text. In part, the problem of the complexity of the issues presented vs. the theory of the single authorship will be dealt with in much greater detail by the next and last historical-critical theme, redaction criticism.

Redaction Criticism

The problem which had plagued the tradition critics, that is, how to account for both the optimistic and pessimistic themes in the narrative if it is to be understood as a unified and coherent composition, was taken up by the redaction critics. The thematic conflict was resolved by arguing for the existence of two or possibly more redactions to the text, each with its own overarching theological motivations. Thus, the answer to the problem of multiple themes was solved by the apparent existence of multiple redactions. Indeed, redaction criticism, or criticism which viewed the text as an amalgamation of editorial revisions, was the most formidable argument against the theory of a unified composition. There was now no necessity of seeing a single theme or theology in the narrative as the text was a compilation of many different themes. Because of the appeal of the easy collapse of contradictions into a theory of multiple redactions, redaction criticism has been the theory most consistently applied to the book of Kings in order to discover the meaning of the text.[5]

[5] At first glance, redaction criticism appears to be the same as source criticism, and, indeed, there are similarities between the two of them. Both argue for the existence of redactors who assembled the narrative at some stage in Israelite history. But whereas source critics argue for the

An embryonic form of the argument against Noth's idea of a single author emerged as early as the nineteenth century in Abraham Kuenen's *Historisch-Kritische Einleitung in die Bücher des Alten Testaments* (translated from the Dutch, three vols., 1887-94). Kuenen argued that the book of Kings was originally a pre-exilic composition which was later supplemented by a second redactor during the exile. Kuenen had come to that conclusion because of the apparent contradictions in the narrative. Some passages presupposed the exile (I Kings 5:4, 9:1-19, 11:9-13; II Kings 17:19-20, 20:17-18, 21:11-15, 23:26-27, 24:2-4), whereas other passages presupposed the fall of Israel but not of Judah (I, 1887-94:88-100; see Nelson 1981:14-16; Mayes 1983:3). The logical explanation, according to Kuenen, was that there were two redactions of the material, one pre-exilic and the other exilic.

It is interesting to note the literary criteria chosen by Kuenen which enabled him to divide his sources. He seized upon the repeated phrase "unto this day," and argued that an exilic author would never have used such a phrase as the situation no longer applied to him. Therefore those places where the phrase "unto this day" occurs must be pre-exilic. Similarly, those passages that dealt with the Temple must also have been pre-exilic as the Temple was no longer extant in the exilic period. On the other hand, those passages that predicted the destruction of Judah could only be exilic. And although Kuenen noted that there are enormous literary problems in uncovering the two editions of Kings with any great accuracy (I, 1887-94:93; see Nelson 1981:17), one can arrive at an approximate division by separating those sections which deal with the pre-exilic situation from those that deal with the exilic one.

---

continuation of the Pentateuchal strands, redaction critics are much more thematic in their treatment of the material.

Julius Wellhausen (1878, 1899) was the next major exponent of the double-redaction hypothesis, and, as such, he followed Kuenen's lead.[6] Wellhausen had persuasively argued that the historical books were mostly completed in the pre-exilic period but were later revised in light of the exile (1973:272-94; 1899:208-20). The second exilic editor modified the first editor's frame story by adding the synchronistic data. Like Kuenen, Wellhausen also relied on the "unto this day" formula to determine the pre-exilic material from the exilic. Similarly, mention of the exile was another determining factor in isolating the two alleged redactions (1899:298-99).[7]

After the fervour surrounding Noth's thesis had subsided, the double-redaction hypothesis was taken up with renewed energy. Although source-critical theories had, for all intents and purposes, been superseded by both form and tradition criticism, redaction criticism had, in some sense, sprung up to fill the void left by source criticism. In my discussion of the post-Noth redaction critics, it will be apparent that two sub-groups emerge: the double redactionists such as Cross, Nelson and Friedman, and the multiple redactionists such as Jepsen and Dietrich. I shall begin my study with the double redactionists and conclude with

---

[6] An impressive list of scholars also followed Kuenen in arguing in favour of a pre-exilic and exilic redaction, albeit with slight modifications. In the area of introductions to the Bible, Driver (1919), Pfeiffer (1948), Fohrer (1965), and Eissfeldt (1965) are among the notables who accepted the double-redaction hypothesis, and, among the commentaries, Kittel (1900), Burney (1902), Skinner (1904), Gray (1970), Robinson (1972), and Jones (1984) stand out (see Kenik 1983:18 n.64).

[7] R.D. Nelson (1981:14-21) has conveniently summarized the list of criteria upon which the scholars who advocated the double redaction drew. According to Nelson, those arguments which have little value are: (a) mention of the exile [the author could have been referring to other exiles]; (b) "unto this day" formula [the author was probably using an historian's source]; (c) the author's historical situation which would preclude access to certain types of information [but there is evidence that other sources have survived]; (d) literary style [poor evidence and not conclusive]. Arguments which are of value, according to Nelson, are: (i) structure; (ii) literary criticism; (iii) two views of the dynastic promise; (iv) the existence of two distinct theologies. I shall be dealing with Nelson's "valuable" arguments in more detail below.

the multiple redactionists.

The simplicity of F.M. Cross's theory (1973) of a double redaction (one during the reign of Josiah, the other during the exile), perhaps accounts for its popularity among scholars. Unlike the redaction critics prior to him, Cross demonstrated that the determination of the two sources in Kings did not so much depend upon vague and inconsistent literary evidence (the use of formulaic language, terms and style), but was more thematic in character. As such, it was more akin to the themes perceived by the tradition critics. Nevertheless, the Dtr. history was not necessarily the same unified account that the tradition critics had seen, but was, rather, a double redaction whereby the "theology of judgement and doom" could be placed beside the "theology of forgiveness and salvation" as both were now to be perceived as mutually exclusive pieces of work.

The first redaction (R^1) was, according to Cross, Josianic propaganda and, in this respect, R^1 evidences two themes and two theologies. The first theme deals with the grave sin of Jeroboam I which seals the fate of the northern kingdom of Israel (1973:279-81). This theme is contrasted with the faithfulness of David who "walks in the ways of Yahweh" and establishes a cultic centre for Yahweh in Jerusalem (1973:281-83). The climax of the first theme is the destruction of Israel, whereas the climax to the second theme is Josiah's reforms. Not only does R^1 contrast David and Jeroboam, Cross argued, but two theologies are contrasted: (a) the covenant ideology in which the apostasy of Israel seals their doom; (b) the royal ideology in which a glimmer of hope is established because of the faithfulness of David. In this connection, the logical successor to the throne of David is Josiah, whose reform is modelled on both covenant theology (to stop apostasy) and royal ideology (hope for the future); "in Josiah is centred the new Israel" (1973:284).

Nevertheless, with the advent of the exile, the work of R^1 necessarily had to be rewritten. It was the job of the second redactor (R^2) to update the history and account for the fact that the people were now living in exile. To account for the destruction, R^2 likened the sins of the southern Judean king, Manasseh, to those of his northern counterpart, Jeroboam I. The fall of the Judean state would thus parallel the fall of the Israelite one. Cross argued further that the language used to describe the destruction of the southern kingdom is stilted and "weak" (1973:286), which showed a second hand at work. The theme of hope had been suppressed, but not completely eradicated (1973:288).

Cross's ingenious answer to the problem of the two themes in the Dtr. history was able to reconcile the theological conflicts discernible among the tradition critics: Noth was correct in recognizing the note of doom in the Dtr. history as that is what the second redactor had intended; nevertheless, von Rad was also correct in pointing out the theme of grace and hope as that is the thrust of the first redactor's message. Wolff was also correct in perceiving the theme of repentance at work as the second redactor did very little to change the first redactor's work in this regard (1973:288). Yet it remains to be determined whether Cross succeeded in interpreting the text, or whether he was merely able to harmonize the disparate views of the tradition critics.

Cross's theme was adopted by R.D. Nelson (1981). Nelson attempted to flesh out Cross's thesis by arguing in detail that the problem of the two conflicting themes is overcome by the double-redaction hypothesis. The problem vanishes when the narrative is considered to be the product of two Dtr. theologians working in two different historical periods. The main redaction of the work was during the Josianic period, and later, during the exile, a supplement was added by another redactor. The first redactor, according to Nelson, acted as a

propagandist for Josiah's policies, and could thus be assigned to a specific historical context, meeting a specific historical situation (1981:121-23).

Thus the optimistic tone of the narrative stems from the renewed hope that was taking place under Josiah, whereas the pessimistic tone of the narrative is attributed to the exile. In this respect, Nelson followed Cross very closely. According to Nelson, the exilic author was responsible for having reinterpreted the historical events in order to make the people realize that Yahweh's judgement was just (1981:123). Salvation, accordingly, does not come through the Davidic line (as in the first redaction), but through the realization and acceptance of Yahweh's punishment.

Nelson also isolated four pre-exilic theological themes which were either transformed or abandoned by an exilic redactor. Nelson pointed out that the ark and the cult surrounding it were of great interest to the first redactor (DtrH.), but after the destruction of the Temple, the ark ceased to have any real significance. An exilic author, therefore, would not be concerned with the loss of the ark when the Temple was destroyed. Second, the ambiguous attitude toward the land is also explained by the theory of a double redaction. Each redactor had a different intention: the first showed the land to be one of promise; the second, to be one of destruction. Third, the first redactor judges Israel's kings by the standard of Josiah, whereas for the exilic author, there are no heroes, only villains, in the narrative. Fourth, the destruction of Israel had a positive effect on Judah as it functioned to teach the southern kingdom about the folly of apostasy. Nevertheless, the loss of Judah had a negative effect on those living in exile and did not function in such a pedagogic capacity (1981:123-28).

By thus placing the theory of a double redaction firmly in an historical setting, Nelson hoped to combat Noth's theory of a single exilic author who had a

unified purpose. Nelson boldly asserted that his analysis would show that "the concept of a double redaction of the work will eventually be accepted by most scholars because it is the best explanation for all the data" (1981:128).

R. Friedman (1983) attempted to lend a literary credence to the theory of the double redaction as he concentrated on the perceived differences between the two redactors. Friedman noticed that the patterns which the tradition critics had isolated (von Rad's prophecy-fulfillment schema, the interest in the high places, the Davidic promise) all cease after Josiah. In other words, the unified themes that the earlier critics perceived in the narrative do indeed occur but they occur only up to the time of Josiah. The first redactor (Dtr.^{1}) also had a definite interest in the Torah, but this too ceased after Josiah (1981:10-12). Friedman concluded that the emphasis of the first redactor concerned: (a) the Torah of Moses (1981:26); (b) central worship at Jerusalem (1981:29); (c) the exclusive worship of Yahweh (1981:30); (d) Egypt (1981:32). Thus, the first redactor's interest was to model Josiah on the paradigm of Moses.

Friedman also defined the role of the second redactor (Dtr.^{2}) on the basis of stylistic evidence. He isolated eighteen passages (1981:25-26) which he attributed to the second redactor. The exilic redactor was interested in the people as a whole rather than individuals (1981:33), in the fact of the exile itself (1981:35), and in the lack of divine intervention (1981:39).

It was in this manner that Friedman was able to argue that any perceived unity between the two redactions was only the result of the second redactor's clever imitation of the themes and style of work which was before him. Contradictions in the Dtr. history, however, were the result of the same redactor's inability to meld the work into a coherent whole. Friedman, like Cross before him and his contemporary Nelson, argued that the purpose of the exilic author was to

transform the Dtr. history into a coherent literary account.

All three aforementioned double redactionists sought to construct the hypothesis that best explains the literary facts of the Dtr. history. They attempted to escape the dilemma of the multiplicity of themes of a single author as discerned by the tradition critics. Their answer was simple: the contradictory themes are best explained by the existence of two redactors, each with different and distinct views to express.

Despite the simplicity of that answer, it raises a number of problems. In the first place, it assumes that an exilic author has different concerns than a pre-exilic one. And although it may be true that the outlook of a people living in exile may be different than that of a people living in Judah, it is a theory that is based on historical rather than literary evidence. Nowhere does the text itself admit the existence of two authors; those authors are surmised from a hypothetical historical reconstruction of the literary events. Based solely on the literary features in the text, the existence of two editors is impossible to disprove or prove, precisely because it is not a question with which the text itself is *explicitly* concerned, although it may be an *implicit* concern of the reader.

The weakness of the double-redaction argument is apparent insofar as the redaction critics themselves cannot agree in all cases as to what portion stems from the exilic redactor and what stems from the pre-exilic one (cf. Long 1984:16). Furthermore, there is an imprecision as to what constitutes a unified theme and who is responsible for a given section of the narrative. Some scholars argue that the existence of a unified theme after the exile is attributable to the clever imitation of the exilic author. On the other hand, the contradictions within the narrative are attributable to the carelessness of an exilic author who could not cover his tracks.

The textual divisions and attributions to the respective redactors do not depend on the evidence of the text itself, but on the *a priori* assumptions that each scholar brings to the text. The theory is convincing only if one first agrees that the writing is the product of a particular historical situation. The exilic redactor is thus perceived not only as being inconsistent in his editing of certain material, but as having an ambiguous attitude towards his material. He lacks fixed principles for the inclusion, exclusion, or insertion of material, at least in the current scholarly accounts of the exilic redactor's activity.

If the redaction critics approached the text with a prior notion of the history of the narrative, they also did so with a prior conception of how to read the material. In determining the existence of a pre-exilic redaction, scholars anticipated that the original narrative would end with a flourish: hence the argument that Josiah brings the story to a natural and fitting conclusion. This theory, however, may misrepresent the way in which ancient literature functions. The expectations that scholars take to the narrative are based on "modern cultural preferences and literary tastes" (Long 1984:18). Scholars would be better led by the way in which ancient literature operates: it proceeds analogically (i.e, by a paratactic style in which a narrative is composed of individual items placed in a series [Long 1984:19]) rather than consecutively. It may be the purpose of the document to force the reader to try to reconcile the apparently contradictory statements in order to discern the meaning of the narrative.

The above discussion pertains directly to the work of the multiple redactionists with which we shall conclude my discussion. Two scholars in particular epitomize the views of the multiple redactionists while making the same assumptions as the double redactionists. A. Jepsen was a contemporary of M. Noth but his *Die Quellen des Königsbuches* was not published until 1956. Jepsen is

important for he, like Noth, saw Kings as an exilic book that had identifiable themes which could be attributed to the author.

Unlike Noth, however, Jepsen posited the existence of three authors rather than just one. The first author was a Jerusalem priest who composed a synchronistic chronicle of the kingdoms of Judah and Israel up to the time of Hezekiah (sometime after 587 B.C. [1956:30-40]). To this chronicle was added the annals of the court archives (1956:54-60) as well as his own impression of the cultic history (1956:60-76). Jepsen agreed with Noth that the purpose of this history was to explain the judgement of Yahweh (1956:76). Jepsen's second redactor was from the prophetic circles. This redactor took over where the first one left off, adding the material about the prophets and the wisdom material (1956:98-99), and, as well, adding his ideas about God's dealing with Israel (1956:89-98). The narrative also underwent a third redaction at the hand of a priest, sometime near the end of the sixth century (1956:102). This so called "Levitical circle" was responsible for the addition of sacrificial and priestly concerns.

According to Jepsen, Kings was a product of the exile, and was written sometime between the destruction and the rebuilding of the Temple. The reason that there are so many diverse opinions is due to the fact that the material had suffered from three successive redactions by three different people with distinctive interests. In this manner, Jepsen would collapse the literary tensions of Kings through three redactions. In the manner of the double redactionists, he argued that one author could not be responsible for such contradictions. The possibility that one author could produce such complex viewpoints is not an issue for Jepsen.

W. Dietrich (1972) also distinguished three different sources in the Dtr. material. The original document consisted of historical material on the kings of

Israel and Judah which was written just after the fall of Judah (1972:107-09). Dietrich called this the DtrG. ("G" standing for "*geschichte*" or history). To this were added prophetic speeches, stories, and annals which were later altered, expanded and added to the historical narrative by a prophetic circle, called DtrP. (1972:110-34). The final deuteronomistic redactor added further material after the release of Jehoiachin in 561 B.C. This material was exclusively legal or nomistic in character and Dietrich called this supplementor DtrN ("N" standing for "*nomos*" or law). This redaction was responsible for the legal sayings, law code and the material concerning Jerusalem and the Temple (1972:44,147).

Thus, Dietrich's material was divided, like Jepsen's, on the basis of content; the first was the historical material (DtrG), the next the prophetic (DtrP), and the last the legal (DtrN). Although all three redactions were completed in about 560 B.C., there is a definite evolutionary pattern in the stages of redaction as discerned by Dietrich. There are, to be sure, definite reminiscences of Wellhausen here insofar as law is to be considered later than prophecy and prophecy is considered to be later than an original unwritten law (see Kenik 1983:17). Dietrich would also resolve tensions within the narrative by attributing them to the work of the different authors or redactors. The main tension according to Dietrich is that among the legal, prophetic and historical traditions.

Thus the study of the historical-critical approaches to Kings has come full circle. The source-critical approach sought to describe the narrative in terms of the continuation of the Pentateuchal sources "J" and "E" into the Former Prophets. The criterion for the division of the sources was loosely based upon alleged stylistic differences,[8] but, in actual fact, developed from the critic's prior

[8] R. Polzin points out the weaknesses inherent in arguing that stylistic differences can determine the relative age of a narrative unit (1980:14f.).

understanding of the narrative strands in the Pentateuch (see especially Eissfeldt 1965:247). Noth and the tradition critics came as a welcome relief to the endless fragmentations of the source critics. Even though Kings was still viewed as a composite of sources, the tradition critics argued that the narrative of Kings, in its final form, was an integral and unified work which reflected a unified theology. Unfortunately, the tradition critics could not agree among themselves what that unified theology was and some were at the opposite ends of the spectrum (Noth and von Rad). This proved to be their undoing in the minds of the redaction critics who argued that the diverse theological concerns of the tradition critics were merely reflective of a multiple or double redaction. The contradictory themes could be understood, they argued, by conceiving of a pre-exilic and an exilic redactor. Although the theory of the double redaction had its origin in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, the post-Noth redactionists had been able to combine arguments for thematic unity with historical control over their material. Each redactor was responding to a different historical situation and constructed his theology accordingly. The redactionists were thus able to combine the findings of the two earlier groups of historical critics.

Nevertheless, there were weaknesses and inconsistencies in the arguments of the redaction critics. There was still no unanimity among them as to where to divide the text, although most generally followed the theory of Cross. Yet there was a fundamental misunderstanding as to how ancient literature operated which led to their problematic conclusions (cf. Long 1984:18). Furthermore, there were confusions over the exilic redactor's attitude toward his material which had not effectively been answered. And, finally, the basis of the textual divisions depended on idiosyncratic *a priori* assumptions. Once the redactors' motivations were granted (be they historical or theological), it was always possible to support

them from the text. It now becomes my task to suggest a new method, unfettered by the reins of historical criticism, with which to approach the text. I shall also expose some of the inconsistencies, from a methodological perspective, of the three methods just described.

From Historical to Literary Criticism

It should be stated at the outset that although the historical-critical approach is responsible for the fragmentation and separation of the narrative of Kings into smaller "sources" or "traditions", the discipline has made many important contributions to the study of the Bible. Historical criticism does offer some type of exegetical control over the random proof-texting and eisegesis of antiquity. As A. Richardson argues, "historical information provided the best antidote against uncontrolled subjectivism" (1963:302). It is also true that by uncovering the history of the text, historical criticism has freed the Bible from the confines of ecclesiastical dogma.[9] Yet, what is most important for the scholarly interest in the Bible is that historical criticism provides a wealth of information on philology, textual criticism, historical knowledge and exegetical precision (Childs 1979:39-40).

Nevertheless, the rise of historical criticism also entailed severe losses for both the scholarly community and the lay community well. As a result of the increasingly specialized skills required to unravel the tangled web of the history of the transmission of the text, there was a breakdown of communication between scholarly and "ordinary" readers. Lay readers lost confidence in their ability to understand simple biblical stories; the Bible became a book solely for

[9] This was Spinoza's explicit purpose. See, especially, the preface to his *Theologico-Political Treatise* (1951:1-6).

the professionals to decipher. Yet even the experts were wary of just how much of the biblical account could be trusted.[10] Furthermore, the narrative components were no longer seen within their own literary context and a vast gulf separated the historically reconstructed material and the canonical literature (Childs 1979:39-40).

The avowed purpose of the historical-critical method is to obtain objective results about "What actually happened?" and "Why?" (Krentz 1975:37). The overriding concern of the historical critics is to uncover the historical dimension behind the text. Biblical literature is investigated in order to write a history of the transmission and compilation of the text, or in order to discern its socio-historical context. History, insofar as the historical critic is concerned, supersedes canonical or literary considerations. As Frei argues:

> The real history of the biblical narrative in which the historian is interested is not what is narrated or the fruit of its narrative shape; rather, it is that to which the story refers or the conditions that substitute for such a reference. In short, he is interested not in the text as such but in some reconstructive context to which the text "really" refers and which renders it intelligible (1974:134-35).

The historical critic is also keenly interested in trying to understand the author's intention and the meaning the text had for its original audience (Krentz 1975:39). Yet, one may well ask if these questions are necessary or even possible to answer. The theory that "objectivity" can be attained by reconstructing the original historical situation and intention of the author may very well be a contemporary, or even a subjective, prejudice (Polzin 1980:8). In other words, the historical critic's desire to obtain objectivity through an historical reconstruction

---

[10] Spinoza's remark, in this regard, is prophetic: "the history of the Bible is not so much imperfect as 'untrustworthy': the foundations are not only too scanty for building upon, but are also unsound" (1951:120).

of the socio-cultural setting in which the text was allegedly written or compiled may only be a prejudice inherited from the nineteenth century.

The claim to "historical objectivity" is seriously eroded in Hayden White's *Tropics of Discourse* (1978). White demonstrates that every historical text, whether it is so perceived by an interpreter, or whether it is self-consciously historical (i.e., *The Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*), is, in essence, a literary text. It consists of metaphors or tropes which, while they may very well intend to render history accurately, succeed in alerting one to the prejudices of the author, and may be considered "fiction":

> Properly understood, histories ought never to be read as unambiguous signs of the events they report, but rather as symbolic structures, extended metaphors, that "liken" the events reported in them to some form with which we have already become familiar in our literary culture (White 1978:91).

The problem of getting through to the historical dimension behind the text stems from the use of language. Language can only, at best, represent reality; it can never give a true unbiased picture of the events. White argues:

> There can be no such thing as a non-relativistic representation of historical reality, inasmuch as every account of the past is mediated by the language-mode in which the historian casts his original description of the historical field prior to his analysis, explanation, or interpretation he may offer of it (1978:117).

Even though the road to "historical objectivity" through "literary artifact" is problematic, one would do well to remember that the historical critic must necessarily begin his analysis with the literary text (Krentz 1975:37).[11] Nevertheless, once historical critics discover tensions, repetitions and inconsistencies in the narrative, they then rely upon historical information to help solve the problem.

[11] See especially the remark by B.W. Anderson: "it is noteworthy that both Noth and von Rad, despite differences in emphasis, argue procedurally that literary criticism is the provisional starting point for form-critical and traditio-historical investigation" (quoted in Noth 1972:xxi).

The historical solution is then reapplied to the text, forcing historical critics to reappraise (and, in most cases, redivide or fragment) the original text. As Frei writes:

> The clue to meaning now is no longer the text itself but its reconstruction from its context, intentional or cultural, or else its aid in reconstructing that context, which in circular fashion then serves to explain the text itself (1974:160; cf Polzin 1980:6).

When the narrative itself, however, does not conform to the externally reconstructed historical hypothesis, the fault is said to lie in the text rather than the historical reconstruction. Often the Bible undergoes fragmentations in order to conform to the historical picture; narrative logic is replaced by historical logic which seeks to explain the text solely as a product of its socio-cultural environment (Eslinger 1985:35-40; Frei 1974:135). Yet, it is entirely possible that the incoherence detected in the narrative by historical-critical scholarship is not the failure of the text to explain the historical realities adequately, but, rather, the failure of the interpreter to explain the subtleties and nuances of the text.

This is especially true in regard to the history of scholarship on the book of Kings. The biggest problem facing the historical critic is to determine the precise time, place and author of the myriad of sources, traditions and redactions which allegedly are in the narrative or discernible from the narrative. The net result is that the narrative is no longer read as a unit. And although Noth's theory of the Dtr. (i.e., a single person responsible for the compilation and editing of the original traditions into a coherent whole) does move beyond the fragmentation theory, there is still a determined effort to place the author/redactor in an historical context in order to understand his intention and theology. Nor does Noth's theory eliminate his urge to find traditions in the narrative, and, in this respect, he finds himself in the same company as the source and redaction critics.

Because of the historical paradigm by which the literary text is understood, severe distortions of the narrative are necessary in order for the text to make sense. This contextual distortion necessarily implies that the narrative itself has now been taken out of its literary context. Thus, the primary text is often replaced by another text which suppresses the inconsistencies, repetitions and contradictions. This secondary (and often tertiary) text is labelled a "source", "tradition" or "redaction" and a whole theology or author is constructed from this secondary text (Miscall 1983:140). Since the primary text is replaced by a necessarily incomplete or insufficient one, the meaning of the secondary text is also incomplete or insufficient. The obvious problem of dividing the narrative into separate sections and interpreting the resultant sections is that damage has been done to the original context in which the narrative unit was set.[12] It is entirely possible and even likely that the components owe their particular meaning to their context within the text. What will be proposed in this thesis is a way in which the integrity of the narrative can be preserved and understanding can be attained without recourse to an historical-critical solution.[13]

In order to accomplish this task, the book of Kings or, more particularly, the narrative of I Kings 1-11, will be approached from a literary as opposed to a historical perspective. The contradictions and inconsistencies will be viewed as part of a deliberate narrative strategy rather than as "inelegance" (Eissfeldt 1965:289) on the part of the author(s). And although the theory of multiple traditions or

[12] For a more thorough treatment of the problem of extracting texts out of context, see the discussion in Chapter Two, under "Hermeneutical Objections".

[13] It must be emphasized that this thesis is not offered as a thorough refutation of the historical-critical method. On the contrary, many of the insights of the historical critics regarding the places of "tension" in the narrative will be referred to in the thesis. But although the insights of historical-critical scholars on philological or text-critical matters will help to clarify my own work, this thesis will not go so far as to adopt their conclusions.

redactions is based upon textual repetitions, contradictions and stylistic differences, it is not self-evident that these literary tensions automatically imply different authors or traditions. In fact, the theory of a single author could just as easily be advanced based on textual evidence (Alter 1981:88-113). Indeed, it is possible that the author wants the reader to hold two contradictory views simultaneously in a state of tension (Long 1984:18-21). A genuine problem facing the interpreter of I Kings 1-11 may be to understand the narrative strategy in the ambiguous portrait of Solomon or of the Israelite state, not which source belongs to which historical epoch.

Given the current state of critical research on the book of Kings, there is a real need for such an alternative approach to the narrative. What is proposed is a literary approach to the Bible which, in its most basic form, is nothing other than a close and careful reading of the biblical text.[14] The literary approach starts by assuming that the text is a coherent and unified whole in its present form, whatever the history of its development may have been. And although the method does not preclude the existence of textual history or transmission over successive generations, it is the final canonical shape of the narrative which is

---

[14] Although a relative newcomer to the field of biblical studies, the "literary approach" has had many adherents, especially within the last decade. Earlier efforts by R.G. Moulton, *The Literary Study of the Bible* (1895) and D.B. MacDonald, *The Hebrew Literary Genius* (1935), went a long way towards showing the literary features of the Bible. Biblical narrative style is also effectively represented in the first chapter of E. Auerbach's *Mimesis* (1953); similarly, E.M. Good's *Irony in the Old Testament* (1965), has also contributed enormously to the development of the literary study of the Bible. More recently, however, the publication of journals such as *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament, Semeia, Proof-texts* and *Linguistica Biblica* as well as the books by K.R.R. Gros Louis *et. al., The Literary Interpretations of Biblical Narratives* (v.I 1974; v.II 1980), D. Robertson, *The Old Testament and the Literary Critic* (1977), D. Gunn, *The Story of King David* (1978), C. Conroy, *Absalom Absalom!* (1978), R. Polzin, *Moses and the Deuteronomist* (1980), R. Alter, *The Art of Biblical Narrative* (1981), J.P. Fokkelman, *Narrative Art and Poetry in the Books of Samuel* (v.I 1981; v.II 1986), L. Eslinger, *The Kingship of God in Crisis* (1985), D. Jobling, *The Sense of Biblical Narrative I* (Repr. 1986; v.II 1986), have lent considerable credibility to the relatively new discipline of the literary study of the Bible.

most important (Childs 1979:77). The text will thus be examined in its own literary context rather than one demanded by the alleged historical situation. Individual features of the narrative such as language, imagery, structure, ordering of events, plot progression, character development, point of view and narrative voice will be the primary areas of concentration in this thesis. These terms will be clarified during the course of this thesis with reference to modern literary theory.

It would be best, in this regard, to be led by the text itself, rather than to superimpose methodological restrictions upon it. As J.P. Fokkelman writes, "it is the work itself [which] indicates and determines which data and instruments are useful for disclosing its purport" (1981:3). By allowing the text and its own literary conventions to lead and guide the reader to an interpretation rather than have the reader evaluate the material in terms of its historical context or relevance, one approaches a reading strategy known as "new criticism". I shall explain this method of reading and its relevance for biblical studies in chapter two.

CHAPTER TWO

METHODOLOGY

Introduction

In the preceding chapter I argued that, for the historical critic, the meaning of a text was inextricably bound to the historical situation in which it had allegedly originated. By determining the historical situation in which a text arose, the historical critic would "determine the sense the text had for its writer and first audience (the '*sensus literalis sive historicus*')" (Krentz 1975:39). To ignore what the text might have meant to the original audience is to interpret the text anachronistically. As Otto Kaiser writes in his introduction:

> To hear and understand the witness of the biblical books correctly, it is necessary to know at what times and in what circumstances they came into existence. This involves a knowledge of the history, religion, and theology of Israel and Judaism, as well as of the world from which they grew (Kaiser 1975:2).

Thus, it is to avoid reading subjective prejudices of the twentieth century into a text that the historical critic concentrates on matters such as "authorial intention" and "historical context" (see especially Krentz 1975:63-67). By an emphasis on authorial intention and historical context, the historical critic tries to be as "objective" as possible. Nevertheless, as I intend to show in this chapter, the presuppositions of "authorial intention" and "historical context" are more problematic than they might at first appear. Furthermore, it is entirely possible that one need not determine the historical context of the biblical text in order to determine a whole range of equally "objective" semantic possibilities (cf. Polzin 1980:3).

If the historical critic is concerned with "objectivity" in the historical sense, the literary critic attempts to define "objectivity" in its literary sense. The literary critic tries to pay attention to the literary dimension in the text. As one literary critic writes:

> By serious literary analysis I mean the manifold varieties of minutely discriminating attention to the artful use of language, to the shifting play of ideas, conventions, tone, sound, imagery, syntax, narrative viewpoint, compositional units, and much else; the kind of disciplined attention, in other words, which through a whole spectrum of critical approaches has illuminated, for example, the poetry of Dante, the plays of Shakespeare, the novels of Tolstoy (Alter 1981:12-13).

The literary critic thus tries to explain and not deny the literary features of the text. Rather than attributing the disjointed nature of the biblical passages to some type of editorial activity, the literary critic hopes to make sense out of the text as it stands. Of course, this does not preclude the possibility that there may have been complicated editorial activity involved in the composition of the text. Nevertheless, the literary critic's primary responsibility is to the text as it stands (Frye 1983:xvii). The literary context in which a given narrative is situated will thus be given greater emphasis than the historical context in which the narrative was allegedly written. The literary approach will not "invalidate" other approaches so much as it will shift emphasis from historical to literary matters.[15]

The literary study of the Bible in which I am about to engage will thus concentrate on the text apart from the historical situation in which it arose. It will

---

[15] It must be emphasized, however, that operational priority should be given to a literary approach rather than to an historical one. If one tries to understand the historical context before adequately appreciating the message of the biblical text, there is a danger of applying ready-made historical theories to the text in question (see Polzin 1980:8). In fact, most historical critics would concede that one must first start with the text before trying to uncover the historical dimension behind it (Krentz 1975:39; Noth 1972:xxi n.16). It is only after a thorough analysis has been performed that the interpretation may be deepened or enriched by historical considerations (Polzin 1980:8).

assume that the text has a unity and integrity of its own from which a coherent message will emerge. It will furthermore assume that any contradictions and inconsistencies in the text are there by design. Thus, multiplicity of viewpoints will not necessarily imply conflicting editors or redactors with different theological motivations; they will, on the contrary, be held as the deliberate and conscious artistry of the author.[16] This attempt to resolve ambiguities, tensions, contradictions, and ambivalences into one organic unit or whole has many similarities to a methodological approach in literary theory known as "new criticism".[17] I shall now elucidate this theory in order to determine its appropriateness and relevancy for the study of biblical texts.

New Criticism

Because of the concentration and emphasis placed on the text *per se*, new criticism is especially useful as a methodological strategy in examining texts divorced from their historical context. New criticism as a literary movement began in the 1920's in England and is generally associated with F.R. Leavis and I.A. Richards. It later spread to America to become *the* method of critical analysis from the 1930's to the 1950's. It is represented chiefly in the works of J.C. Ransom, W.K. Wimsatt, C. Brooks, M. Beardsley and a number of others (Eagleton 1983:46). Although poetry was the primary focus of the new-critical techniques, new criticism does have important theoretical implications for biblical studies. Because of its polemic against an undue concern with the lives and

[16] See here an interesting discussion by Todorov (1977:53-65) who criticizes the assumptions that modern scholars make when analysing "primitive narratives" in order to discover "insertions" and "interpolations" in the text.

[17] The name *new criticism* was coined after the publication of J.C. Ransom's book *The New Criticism* in 1941. This book lays out many of the critical theories and positions of the new critics in its analysis of literary texts.

psychologies of the authors and its minimization of the role of the historical influences on the literary work, it is ideally suited for the type of analysis that will be proposed here (Eslinger 1985:40).

New criticism has many similarities to an earlier critical movement known as "formalism" (Doubrovsky 1973:12,25; Thompson 1971:11-53) which dealt with the formal features of literary texts. It is also similar to formalism insofar as it treats literary works as having a special language of their own differing from ordinary speech. Literature, as such, has a special status and its meaning can only be ascertained by looking long and hard at the context in which the text is situated (Tompkins 1980:222-23). The literary text would therefore be given a special ontological status and requires a special method to unlock its possible meanings (Wellek and Warren 1971:156).

The procedure for interpreting literary texts is similar to that of the French "*explication de texte*" or a "close reading" of the text. The phrase "close reading" implies a detailed analytical interpretation which concentrates on the words themselves rather than the historical context producing and surrounding them (Eagleton 1983:44). It seeks, through a subtle analysis of the textual ambiguities, to show how these "tensions" are resolved and integrated into a solid structure. As the new critic Cleanth Brooks writes:

> The characteristic unity of a poem ... lies in the unification of attitudes into a hierarchy subordinated to a total and governing attitude. In a unified poem, the poet has "come to terms" with his experience. The poem does not merely eventuate in a logical conclusion. The conclusion of the poem is the working out of various tensions — set up by whatever means — by propositions, metaphors, symbols. The unity is achieved by a dramatic process, not a logical [one]; it represents an equilibrium of forces, not a formula (1975:206-07).

The text itself is seen as a kind of organic unity or autonomous whole; it is something that exists on its own, free from the author, audience and surrounding

world. As such, it is evaluated and judged on its own merit or "intrinsic criteria", involving complexity, coherence, equilibrium, integrity, and the interrelations of its component elements (Abrams 1981:37). By reducing literature to environmental factors such as biography and setting, the historical critic destroys what was essentially *literary.* For the new critic, the text must be disassociated or divorced from its historical context as well as from the plethora of ideas upon which it drew. The text is to be viewed in a kind of isolation or as an independent and self-sufficient object. According to the new critics, there was a danger of extrapolating ideas and phrases out of context as we "demand logical coherences where they are sometimes irrelevant, and we fail frequently to see imaginative coherences on levels where they are highly relevant" (Brooks 1975:202). All that was needed to effect a careful reading was to know what the words themselves meant to the original audience, or a kind of technical knowledge (Eagleton 1983:48).

Although new-critical theories dominated the critical scene for two decades, they did not always meet with unqualified approval. The necessity of seeing the validity of the author's influence upon his work as well as the necessity of taking into consideration the historical factors which contributed to the composition of the literary work seemed to be the main objections to the autonomy of a literary work. I will now turn to a consideration of these objections.

Hermeneutical Objections

By arguing that the text was an autonomous entity that existed quite apart from the author's intention or historical situation, the new critics left themselves open to the charge that meaning was not fixed or absolute, but depended largely on the ingenuity and creativity of the reader in explicating meaning of the text.

If meaning was to be divorced from historical context and authorial intention, the way was wide open for complete relativism. Although this discussion had largely taken place in the field of literary criticism, the issues raised do have a special significance for the interpretation of biblical literature. If we do not take into consideration the historical context or the author's/redactor's intention, do we not also run the risk of relativism?[18]

The problem of the relevancy of authorial intention was addressed by E.D. Hirsch in his *Validity in Interpretation* (1967). Hirsch argued that if one did not take the author's intention into consideration, meaning became "indeterminate" (1967:249) and relative. Hirsch here was taking issue with the hermeneutical stance of Gadamer, who argued that meaning was always historically conditioned and changed in different historical periods. According to Gadamer, the reader brings to the text his own "pre-understanding" which is conditioned by the times in which he lives, or conditioned by his "horizon". Meaning is, therefore, a fusion of the horizon of the author and that of the reader. Meaning is always historically conditioned and can only be relative to the reader's horizon (Hirsch 1967:245-264). Hirsch countered Gadamer's claim that meaning is always historically conditioned by making a distinction between meaning and significance. Meaning is what the author intends or wills and is always stable and fixed. Significance, however, is what the reader assigns to the text which, in fact,

---

[18] These questions, which have enormous relevance for biblical studies, were first posed in their most trenchant form by a pupil of Heidegger, H.G. Gadamer, in his *Wahrheit und Methode* (1960; ET = *Truth and Method*, 1975). Gadamer shifted the focus of attention away from the study of what a text means (through an analysis of its language) to the procedures involved in getting at the meaning of all texts, or from an interpretative problem to a general theory of interpretation. Indeed, hermeneutical problems such as: what is the meaning of a literary text; how relevant is this meaning to the author's intention; can we understand texts of a different "horizon"; is objective interpretation possible; is meaning confined to our own historical situation; are all troubling questions that affect the interpretation of biblical as well as non-biblical texts.

changes from reader to reader (Hirsch 1967:8). What Gadamer calls the plurality of meanings is, according to Hirsch, none other than a plurality of significances (Hirsch 1967:245-64). Hirsch's theory attempted to stabilize meaning as that which the author intends.

For Hirsch, a text can have only one meaning and that is the author's intended one.[19] In order to see what a text must have meant, an investigation into the author's historical background becomes important as a method of uncovering his intention. In a strange way, despite Hirsch's attack on the historicism of Gadamer, Hirsch would confine meaning to the past (Lentricchia 1980:266-67). History, or at least the time of the composition of the literary text, is an important factor in determining authorial intention and therefore meaning. Meaning is therefore imprisoned in the past; the author is prevented from speaking to anyone but his contemporaries without the aid of historical scholarship (Ruthven 1979:155). Hirsch's theory could thus be invoked by biblical scholars, who wanted to argue that a work cannot be understood apart from the environment in which it was conceived. The author is not immune from the historical factors which shape both him and his literary text; rather, by determining the historical factors at the time of writing, one could better understand the author's intention.

Nevertheless, many of Hirsch's assumptions are problematic, and the attempt to uncover what an author actually intends meets with certain difficulties. In the first place, Hirsch's theory assumes that the author would already know exactly what he was going to write before he commits his words to

---

[19] Hirsch here is responding directly to an influential article by Wimsatt and Beardsley called "The Intentional Fallacy" (1946; reprinted in Wimsatt 1954:3-20). This article argued that the author's intention is ultimately irrelevant to the interpretation of his poem. The meaning of the literary work resides in the work itself, not in the author's psychological condition or the historical factors believed to influence his work.

paper. Yet meanings sometimes arise from the actual writing process itself. Indeed, the process of writing sometimes renders new meanings and modifies the intended ones. Problems have to be dealt with as the writing process takes place, and often the best laid plans "gang aft agley" (Ruthven 1979:143). In any event, the writer may be so immersed in the details of his work that he fails to see its overall larger significance (Ruthven 1979:146). The point is that there is no definitive correspondence between what the writer intends and what the finished product turns out to be. Meaning is best determined by the words themselves, rather than through authorial intention.

To support his position on intentionality, Hirsch must make an equation between the author's "will" and what he ends up writing (Peckham 1976:151). Meaning would therefore be pure and unadulterated in this pre-linguistic state; it is an affair of the consciousness. Now even though Hirsch does admit that it is impossible to know these "intended meanings" with any certainty (Hirsch 1967:17), he does argue that the critic can determine what the author might have meant by reconstructing the author's meaning "types", that is, by determining the conventions and literary assumptions that were operative at the author's time of writing (1967:78-89). This process is, in itself, a very arbitrary one, as Eagleton points out:

> To secure the meaning of a work for all time, rescuing it from the ravages of history, criticism has to pinion its potentially anarchic details, hemming them back with the compound of "typical" meaning. Its stance towards the text is authoritarian and judicial: anything which cannot be herded inside the enclosure of "probable authorial meaning" is brusquely expelled, and everything remaining within the text enclosure is strictly subordinated to this single governing intention (1983:68).

In other words, Hirsch's hermeneutical position is essentially an historical one. Meaning can only be ascertained by understanding the historical situation

at the time the text was composed. As Lentricchia argues, Hirsch does not advance from the position of the nineteenth-century German historicist thinkers:

> In the antagonism to the historicism of post-Heideggerian thought, Hirsch's hermeneutics retreats to the methodology of the *Zeitgeist*-seeking deterministic historicism of the nineteenth century. The "cultural subject" is nothing but its "cultural givens", and both are by Hirsch's admission deliberate reconstructions from a matrix of contingency and process which, or so it is claimed, lie on the other side of human knowledge. Though with the aid of the pre-Heideggerian German hermeneutical tradition (Schleiermacher, August Doeckh, and Dilthey) he has made old-line historicism considerably more sophisticated in its epistemological instruments, it is difficult to see how Hirsch's basic theoretical principles represent a serious and significant advance over those of Hippolyte Taine, or how they avoid falling into similar philosophical pits (1980:266-67).

There is an additional flaw in Hirsch's theory rooted in the problematic nature of language. Even if the author is able to "intend" exactly what he "wills", and write that intention down in a way that will capture his exact meaning, he must face the problem that other readers will not have access to his intention because of the slipperiness of language itself. Language, as the "deconstructionists" are eager to remind us, is essentially inaccurate or inexact insofar as it cannot render meaning precisely (see P. de Man 1979). Language by necessity works by tropes and figures of speech, none of which are factual or literal. Language constantly undermines its own meaning, it is always metaphorical and can never be "literally literal" (Eagleton 1983:145). Every text is, in essence, fictional. Thus, owing to the problematic nature of language, it is doubtful whether the critic accurately captures the intended meanings of the author.

Hirsch's analysis is also questionable insofar as he believes that one can get at the real author's intended meaning through the literary text or from an examination of his work. Yet the only "author" that the critic has access to is the "implied author" who controls the narrative for the reader, not the real flesh and blood author who sits down to write the work (see Booth 1961:76-77; Chatman

1978:146-51). It is a mistake to equate this implied author with the real one, and owing to the rhetorical form in which all literature is cast, it is impossible to have access to the real author, let alone his or her intentions.

Thus, in spite of the attraction that Hirsch's hermeneutics holds out for the historical critic of the Bible, the equation between author's intention and meaning is fraught with difficulty. The assumption that the author's intention is accessible through a reconstruction of the historical situation in which the author wrote does not seriously challenge the new-critical insistence upon the autonomy of the literary text. Nevertheless, other historical critics have added a different nuance to the assumptions of the intentionalists and have argued that, although the author may not be conscious of the incorporation of the historical influences which affect his work, the historical circumstances of the genesis of the text help to shape its composition. By understanding the historical time and place in which the text was conceived, the historical critic could better understand the text itself.

Like the theory of authorial intention, the "influence theory" is also disputable. In the first place, it is extremely difficult to prove the precise historical influence of one text on another. The best that can be ascertained is a similarity of detail, yet to say that text "A" had an influence on text "B" is to give undue attention and prominence to the similarity of detail (Ruthven 1979:127). Furthermore, the theory assumes that any inherent resemblance between texts necessarily implies dependence. It also assumes that because one text was written after another it must have been written on account of it (Ruthven 1979:123). In any case, tracking down the alleged sources is, in itself, an endless procedure as one can always ask, "what influenced the source which influenced the literary text with which we are dealing?" In spite of the fact that a certain number of

influences have taken place, it is a matter of judgement, not demonstratively provable, which source has the most influence on a particular work.

Even if it is possible to determine the precise historical influences on the particular literary text, however, the work takes on a unity and a coherence in its own right. The problem with the influence theory is that the alleged sources in a literary text are often allowed to dictate the meaning of the whole. But something happens to the overall narrative unit when the contradictions and inconsistencies of the text are removed to conform to the historical situation in which the text is believed to have been written. The unity of the text has been shattered and it becomes impossible to see the way in which the text coheres as a narrative.

The theory that there was an "unconscious influence" on the author or the theory that the author has been influenced by "the spirit of the age" or the "*Zeitgeist* theory" is one that historical critics often use in support of their claims. According to this theory, a literary text is a product of and determined by its age. It would place meaning in a kind of culture-bound area whereby a text would only speak to the age in which it was conceived. Nevertheless, the *Zeitgeist* theory can be only sustained if one ignores the text's own distinctiveness and attributes it to the collective spirit of history. And, in order to determine the "spirit of the times", historians have often had to simplify the "chaos of history" into an orderly arrangement to make history comprehensible or intelligible or coincide with a particular theory. This theory or hypothesis is then reapplied to the text in order to understand the work at hand. Again, one would be reading into the text preconceptions about the time of the text's composition (Ruthven 1979:132).

Interpretive Strategy

The preceding discussion is designed to show that the road to "objectivity" through historical analysis is far more problematic than most historical critics might be prepared to admit. If it is true that "objectivity" is a problem to the historical critic even when dealing with modern literary works, how much more so is it to the biblical scholar who is dealing with texts in which historical control over the material is far more difficult, especially in regard to matters such as authorial intention and sifting out historical influences. It would seem, therefore, that the historical-critical assumptions of biblical scholars are far less axiomatic than had previously been thought. Nevertheless, if the claim of objectivity is problematic, the onus still falls upon the interpreter to articulate his interpretative strategy and to follow through with an exegesis that is predicated upon that strategy.[20] Therefore, since my aim is to describe the text (rather than evaluate it), I should consider an interpretative strategy that focuses its attention on the text *per se*. Such an interpretative strategy would consist in describing the text in terms of its literary features rather than evaluating it in terms of the historical influences upon it.

In describing the literary text, the interpreter must pay close attention to its form. Often literary works are characterized as having a "sense" or "form", and where form seems to be lacking the interpreter generally confers one upon the work, thereby "creating order out of chaos". This need to perceive order in an apparently chaotic work has led some ingenious interpreters to discover cryptic

[20] According to S. Fish, "interpretative strategies" (e.g., "new criticism", "structuralism", "psychoanalytical criticism", "deconstruction", etc.) can vary from reader to reader, thus giving rise to different interpretations, or readers can share similar interpretative strategies. The basis for agreement among readers who share similar interpretative strategies is the notion of an *interpretative community*. These communities dictate the norms by which the text is interpreted (1976:482-85).

messages behind the random ordering of the literary features of the text (see especially Strauss 1952). Nevertheless, the problem of whether order is inherent in a text or whether it is imposed upon a text does not, in any way, invalidate the importance of order itself.[21] Thus, both the literary critic and the historical critic attempt to impose order upon a biblical text that appears to be disorderly. Nevertheless, they each do so according to different interpretative strategies: one tries to reconcile the ambiguities, ambivalences, and redundancies in the text through the logic of the narrative itself; the other tries to rearrange the material in the text so that it corresponds to a hypothetical historical reconstruction. (See the discussion in Ruthven 1979:3-8.)

This need to create order out of chaos results in a type of form called "organic". The use of the term "organic" derives from biology and describes the conditions in which parts of an organism cooperate fully with the whole, and all the parts are mutually interdependent. An organic work, therefore, would be like a growing plant which integrates its disparate elements into an organic unity (Abrams 1953:184-225). Although there are a number of problems with the analogy (Ruthven 1979:23; Wellek and Warren 1975:27), it does serve a useful purpose insofar as it describes the literary work as an autonomous whole, existing in and of itself. Furthermore, the analogy also implies that no part of the whole may be analysed without reference to the entire whole of which it is a part.

Such an organic view of the literary work implies that there is a co-operation among the text's various component parts which form a whole or unity. An

---

[21] This need to impose "order" on "chaos" has its parallel in the scientific community in the *Gestalt* movement of the early twentieth century. Gestalt psychologists believe that we try to perceive wholes as opposed to the individual parts which comprise the wholes and that the perception of the individual parts are governed by the whole to which we see them belonging (see Miles 1967:318-23).

organic approach would seek to make the individual features of a literary work intelligible in terms of the entire context, and the context intelligible in terms of its individual features. Thus, the parts help to inform the whole and the whole clarifies and lends coherence to the parts in a kind of symbiosis. This flexible and open relationship between the parts and the whole leads to the classic problem in interpretation known as the "hermeneutical circle". The hermeneutical circle (as formulated by Dilthey, who coined the phrase) is an attempt to describe the self-conscious act of determining the relationship between the whole and the parts. In interpreting a text, one approaches it with a prior sense of its "whole" in order to determine the parts which constitute it. Nevertheless, the meaning of the whole is achieved by an examination of its parts. This circularity of procedure, however, does not imply that a critical examination of a literary text will necessarily be inconclusive or diffuse. The circle is not a vicious one. A valid reading will be achieved by the interaction between our sense of the whole (continually being modified by our appropriation of the parts) and our sense of the parts (being modified by our sense of the whole). (Eagleton 1983:74-77; Abrams 1981:84).

The organic approach, therefore, which attempts to integrate the parts into a coherent whole, attempts to achieve a "truth-of-coherence" (Ruthven 1979:171). The truth-of-coherence, as an interpretative strategy, is to be carefully distinguished from its counterpart, the "truth-of-correspondence". If coherential theorists define truth as how well the parts fit in with the whole, correspondential theorists define truth as how well the text corresponds to the "real" world (Ruthven 1979:172-73). Nevertheless, as I have tried to show, the attempt to demonstrate how well a text corresponds to "reality" is fraught with difficulties. My interpretative strategy will, accordingly, be more concerned with

demonstrating a coherential truth rather than a correspondential one. Meaning, according to this interpretative strategy, will be studied in terms of the relation of the parts and the whole rather than in the relation to the external real world.

The distinction between the two types of truth should be maintained lest I confuse what is "historical" with what is "literary", and look for historical information to the detriment of my literary analysis. The fact that a particular text does not correspond to the alleged historical situation should not preclude an analysis of the text on a purely literary level or on the level of coherential truths. It is probably not so much the case that literature falsifies history as that its aims may be different.[22] We might, therefore, adopt Coleridge's principle of a "willing suspension of disbelief for the moment" (*Biographia Literaria*, quoted in Ruthven 1979:179) in approaching texts of dubious historical accuracy.

If, therefore, my interpretative strategy consists in describing a text in terms of the relation between its parts and the whole rather than evaluating the material in terms of its relation to the historical situation, I should be well advised to adopt an interpretative strategy which seeks to explicate a "truth-of-coherence". Indeed, as previously outlined, new criticism, which deals with what is immanent in the text rather than with the ideas that produce it or surround it, or to which it might be referring, is ideally suited for my task. Through an "*explication de texte*" or a "close reading" of the text, involving a detailed analytical interpretation of the literary data, new criticism also offers critical standards by which an objective interpretation may be attained (Wellek

[22] The most famous treatment of this fundamental problem about the nature and purpose of a literary text is perhaps in Plato's *Republic* (X, 605ff.). Plato sees the poets as a destructive influence because they do not tell the truth or, more probably, because they are more interested in coherential truths than in correspondential ones. In a well-ordered state, therefore, the poets are to banished because they distort the "truth-of-correspondence" and tempt man to abandon "righteousness and excellence" (X, 607).

1978:620). An analysis is to be deemed "good" or "bad" depending on how well it accounts for the details of the text, or how well it unifies "tensions", "ambiguities", "paradoxes", and "ambivalences" into a coherent whole (Brooks 1945:190-93).[23] Before proceeding to my analysis, however, I must define the narrative unit with which I am dealing. In so doing, I will modify my interpretative strategy somewhat to account for the role the reader plays in the interpretative process.

Defining the Unit

Since my interpretative strategy is based upon a close reading of the text in order to determine the relation between the parts and the whole, there is an additional problem of having to define the narrative unit. In the study of the Bible, the determination of the narrative unit is not always self-evident. A number of smaller, self-contained units can be linked so as to form part of the larger whole (Bar-Efrat 1980:156). For example, Solomon's dream theophany at Gibeon is a self-contained unit (Kenik 1983:41-56) which forms part of the larger Solomonic material in I Kings 1-11. Moreover, the narrative of I Kings 1-11 is a part of the books of Kings which, in turn, forms part of the Dtr. history (Noth 1981). And, the Dtr. history along with the Pentateuch, the remaining Prophets and the Writings, comprise the Hebrew Bible.

Thus, the Bible is a series of interconnecting parts, which are all integrally linked to form a much larger whole. In one sense, the only way to avoid what Brooks calls the "heresy of paraphrase" would be to analyse the entire Bible "holistically". Obviously, in a study such as this, there are limitations on how much biblical material one can carefully analyse at a particular time and the

[23] Other "close readings" of biblical texts (e.g. Eslinger 1985) have been notably successful in unifying tensions and illuminating their meanings.

interpreter must impose realistic limitations on himself in order to effect a careful reading (Eslinger 1985:46). Nevertheless, the biblical interpreter is still faced with the awkward question of having to define the unit. As Bar-Efrat writes:

> the limits of the literary unit cannot be fixed a priori, but they are dynamic and vary according to the kinds of questions the literary critic desires to pose, provided of course that the delimiting of the unit has its justification in the text (1980:155).

Taking my cue from Bar-Efrat, I will first discuss the necessity of the "kinds of questions the literary critic desires to pose" and then discuss the "delimiting of the unit" with respect to "its justification in the text".

The delimiting of the narrative according to a particular question will form an important part of the interpretative strategy. It would seem, therefore, that the responsibility for defining and circumscribing the narrative unit falls upon the interpreter, who delimits the narrative in responding to the text. By taking into consideration this limited role of the interpreter in defining the narrative unit, my interpretative strategy will necessarily draw upon a literary-critical theory known as "reader-response criticism" or "audience-oriented criticism".[24]

Reader-response criticism focuses on the interaction between the text and the reader. Readers make the text intelligible by drawing inferences and con-

---

[24] Insofar as my interpretative strategy intends to incorporate various aspects of new criticism and reader-response criticism, it is ironic that reader-response criticism grew up in opposition to the new-critical elevation of the text to an "objective" status, to the exclusion of the reader (Doubrovsky 1973:6; Tompkins 1981:x; Eagleton 1983:47-53; Cooper 1983:62-63). More specifically, reader-response criticism attacked the theory that a poem could be understood apart from the effects it has on its reader, convincingly presented in Wimsatt's and Beardsley's "Affective Fallacy" (1949; reprinted in Wimsatt 1954:21-39). Yet, in spite of the active role of the reader in reader-response criticism, many reader-response critics share similar assumptions with the new critics about what constitutes a literary text. Similarly, biographical concerns and historical influences are down-played by critics in both literary-critical camps, and both agree that meaning resides in the literary language. (See articles by Gibson, Prince, Riffaterre and Iser in Tompkins 1981). Other reader-response critics, however, accordingly place more emphasis on the reader than they do on the text. (See articles by Fish and Michaels in Tompkins 1981).

structing hypotheses. They are not, however, unbiased observers or a purely "objective" critics. They bring to the text certain assumptions and expectations about the nature of the material itself. As the reading process continues, these expectations will be modified by what they learn. This circular process, whereby readers' beliefs and expectations are modified by the text itself and whereby the new expectation about the text modifies their appropriation of the text, is but another instance of the hermeneutical circle. In the attempt to integrate the parts and the whole into a coherent unity, readers are continually trying out hypotheses which best account for the details of the text. The reading process is not, therefore, linear but reflexive and anticipatory as readers are constantly readjusting and reappraising what they have just read in order to anticipate what is to follow (Iser 1974:274-294).

Thus, through the reading process the competent reader[25] considers hypothesis after hypothesis until the most suitable one is arrived at which takes into consideration the details of the parts. A valid interpretation is a result of the interpreter's ability to construct a hypothesis that takes into consideration the greatest amount of detail in the narrative unit (Eslinger 1985:48). Conversely, an invalid reading would not sufficiently account for the data in the text. Theoretically, then, a wild hypothesis will always be invalidated by the recalcitrant data in the text.

Nevertheless, given the circularity of the interpretative strategy proposed, every literary analysis is, as one biblical scholar complains, "doomed to incompleteness" (Conroy 1978:9). The reader can always modify the hypothesis, which

[25] "Literary competence" is, of course, problematic. It involves the notion of an "ideal reader", and the differing reading strategies that each reader employs. For a useful discussion of the topic, see Culler 1975:113-130, and 1981:47-79.

then results in a reappraisal of the parts, which necessarily modifies the working hypothesis. Meaning, therefore, is not precise but approximate; it renders sufficient knowledge but not exact knowledge, rather like determining the square root of *pi*, as one scholar observed (Wimsatt 1954:82). The construction of a good hypothesis can, however, limit the range of probable readings if it cannot determine one cut-and-dried one for a given text (Ruthven 1979:160). The clue to meaning would thus reside in the "hierarchy of possibilities" (Wellek and Warren 1976:141) that a given number of hypotheses provide.

Just as meaning depends, in large measure, upon the types of questions that the interpreter brings to the text, so the definition of the literary unit will also depend on the type of question the interpreter brings to the text. The coherence of the parts and the whole as well as the definition of the unit ultimately reside with the interpreter. The question defines the unit which the interpreter tries to render into a truth-of-coherence. If the question determines the unit, therefore, we must also be sure that the "delimitation of the unit has justification in the text" (Bar-Efrat 1980:155). The third chapter of this thesis will attempt to justify the definition of my narrative unit by giving a coherent rendering of the text, but, for the moment, I shall be content to provide the leading question that will necessarily restrict my analytical survey.

My definition of the narrative unit will begin by taking very seriously Noth's claim that the books from Joshua to II Kings comprise a unified (albeit redacted) work (Noth 1981). (It will be recalled, from the first chapter, that Noth's thesis has been the centre of controversy among biblical scholars since its publication.) For the sake of simplicity, then, I will adopt Noth's terminology and call this material the Dtr. history, although it will not be the purpose of the thesis to determine the historical factors involved in the composition of the material.

Having thus delineated the material from Joshua to II Kings as a feasible narrative unit, I will be able to limit my discussion further by the question I ask of the text. For the purpose of this thesis the question to be asked is: "how is Solomon presented in the Dtr. history?" This question has the effect of further limiting my material to the first eleven chapters of I Kings.

A superficial reading of I Kings 1-11 reveals that Solomon is, on the one hand, the wise king *par excellence*, builder of the Temple, and uniter of the kingdom while, on the other hand, he is notorious for his harsh and uncompromising exploitation of labour, his "unrivaled tyranny" (Crenshaw 1981:83), and his apostasy. Although a number of historical-critical scholars have attempted to solve this problem through recourse to sources or traditions or redactions, a literary approach will assume that the contradictions are deliberate and part of a sophisticated narrative strategy. It will be the purpose of the third chapter of the thesis to unfold what that strategy may be through a close and careful inquiry into the Solomonic material.

CHAPTER THREE

STRUCTURAL ANALYSIS

Describing the Narrative Unit

Since I am concerned with a literary, as opposed to an historical, investigation of I Kings 1-11, it is appropriate that I now describe the narrative unit in greater detail. Such a description will reveal that the material contained in I Kings 1-11 is the product of a sophisticated literary structure, and that the underlying tension in the narrative is designed to expose to the careful reader the two aspects of Solomon's reign. It will thus be the purpose of the third chapter to describe the form or literary structure of I Kings 1-11, whereas the fourth chapter will deal with a number of thematic issues arising from this structural analysis.

The narrative of I Kings 1-11 is but one very important episode in the theological-political affairs of Israel. Central power and authority are consolidated under Solomon only to be irrevocably shattered after his death. The rebellions and struggles for succession which characterize the reigns of Israel's two previous kings, Saul and David,[26] do not happen during the reign of Solomon.[27]

[26] See especially the divided allegiances of the Israelites during these times. Saul had to contend with the young upstart, David, whose charismatic appeal with the people of Israel caused the king to go mad with jealousy (I Samuel 18:6-10), and eventually lose the respect of his people. Similarly, although David was instrumental in laying the groundwork for the united kingdom under Solomon (i.e., he was able to reconcile the northern and the southern tribes after only seven years, see II Samuel 1-5:5), his reign was also plagued by factionalism within his own house. His son Absalom succeeded in subverting the allegiances of a number of Israelites to engineer a *coup d'état* (II Samuel 15-18) and, as well, Sheba succeeded in dividing the monarchy into two camps, the Israelites and the Judeans, for a short period of time (II Samuel 20).

[27] The exception is the struggle for succession (I Kings 1-2), which presents two opposing factions, Adonijah and Solomon. Nevertheless, after the transition of power is completed, "the kingdom was established in the hand of Solomon" (I Kings 2:46b). Another interesting exception may be said to occur later on the narrative. The biblical author first relates that the people of Judah

After the death of Solomon, however, his successor Rehoboam loses control over the united monarchy, and within a very short period of time, the kingdom becomes divided, never again to be united during the course of Israelite and Judean history.[28]

Just as the political strength and unity in Solomon's reign are unprecedented in the Dtr. history, so economic prosperity during Solomon's reign is unprecedented as well. There is an abundance of labour and materials to build an immense Temple and government building complex (I Kings 6-8), and enough gold, silver and bronze to equip the Temple with elaborate furnishings. Rarely is the reader presented with such grandiose economic accomplishments.[29] These circumstances alone are enough to indicate that the Solomonic narrative in I Kings 1-11 is unique and important enough to be worthy of careful and critical analysis.

If the narrative of I Kings 1-11 is distinct from other narratives within the Dtr. history and is, therefore, material for serious critical analysis, it is also evident that an internal logic and coherence within the narrative itself justifies its closer examination. A remarkable symmetry in I Kings 1-11 is to be observed, which is indicative of careful artistry and deliberate planning on the part of the author. Those events described in chapters 1-8 are parallelled (albeit with

---

and Israel "ate and drank and were happy" (I Kings 4:20), and that they "dwelt in safety, from Dan even to Beersheba, every man under his vine and under his fig tree, all the days of Solomon" (5:5, RSV 4:25). Nevertheless, that view is undermined later on the narrative. After Solomon's apostasy, the author relates how Yahweh raised Hadad and Rezon who harassed the monarch "all the days of Solomon" (11:26).

[28] There are a few instances when Israel and Judah join forces to fight a common foe (see I Kings 22, II Kings 3), as there are instances of Israel and Judah at war with each other (see II Kings 14:1-22, 16:5-9). Both kingdoms, however, continue to act autonomously until the destruction of Israel in 722 B.C. and Judah in 586 B.C.

[29] According to historical critics (Noth 1960:250; Donner 1971:414), the only kings who come close to matching the prosperity of Solomon's reign are Jeroboam II of Israel (c. 786-746, II Kings 14:23-29) and Azariah (Uzziah) of Judah (c. 783-742, II Kings 15:1-7). Nevertheless, the biblical author glosses over the prosperity of these reigns and it is only Solomon who merits the glowing economic report of the author (Bright 1971:212-13).

important differences) in chapters 9-11 of the narrative. The narrative itself is framed by an introduction (chs 1-2) and a conclusion (11:14-43), whose three component parts (the problem of succession [1:1-10 and 11:41-43]; prophetic intervention in matters of succession [1:11-52 and 11:28-40]; establishing/relinquishing the throne [2:1-46 and 11:14-27]) are chiastically balanced against each other. Within the confines of the frame stories, the narrative falls into two divisions with the first dream theophany (3:1-15) serving as an introduction to the first section, and the second dream theophany (9:1-10) forming an introduction to the second section.[30] Furthermore, the conclusion to each section of the Solomonic narrative is formed by a description of Solomon's attitude towards God. In the conclusion of the first section, there is a description of Solomon's building projects, his love of God, and an oracle from God (chs. 6-8). In the conclusion of the second section, there is also a description of Solomon's building projects, his love of gods, and an oracle from God (11:1-13). There would thus be two distinct sections of the narrative within the frame stories (chs. 3-8 and 9-11:13), each with its own introduction and conclusion.

This parallel structure is further enhanced by two distinct units within each section of the narrative which are chiastically balanced against each other. The first section of the narrative is divided into two units dealing with (A) domestic

---

[30] This twofold structure to the Solomonic material was also discerned by M. Noth in his thematic study of the Dtr. history (1981:58). Noth points out that the first phase (chs 3-8) showed that "Solomon's ways were pleasing to God" whereas the second phase (chs 9-11) described "the moral deterioration [of Solomon] as a manifestation of old age". Unfortunately, Noth failed to work out systematically the implications of his insight. His overriding concern to isolate the traditions in the narrative perhaps blinded him to the structural cohesiveness of the narrative itself. His comment on the literary unity of the Solomonic narrative is very telling: "apparently no one was stimulated to compile a connected historical account of [Solomon's] reign" (1958:204). A number of other scholars have also seen the parallels between Solomon's two dreams (Montgomery 1951:203-04; Gray 1970:235; Rehm 1979:101; Long 1984:108) but they have neglected to show how the dream sequences function within the Solomonic narrative.

policy (3:16-5:14 [RSV 3:16-4:34]) and (B) labour relations (5:15-32 [RSV 5:1-18]). Similarly, the second section is divided into two units describing (B') labour relations (9:10-28) and (A') foreign policy (10:1-29). Furthermore, the units themselves are divided into two episodes which are also parallelled in each section. Thus, unit "A" in the first section is divided into two episodes, each of which deals with wisdom. The first episode contains a story about two women and Solomon's wisdom (3:16-28), and the second episode contains a story about Solomon's administrative abilities and his wisdom (4:1-5:14 [RSV 4:1-34]). Unit "A'" in the second section of the narrative is also subdivided into two episodes dealing with wisdom. The first episode in "A'" contains a story about the Queen of Sheba and Solomon's wisdom (10:1-13), and the second episode contains a story about Solomon's mercantile abilities and his wisdom (10:14-29).

Similarly, unit "B" in the first section can also be subdivided into two episodes, both of which deal with Solomon's labour relations. There is an episode concerning the contracting of Hiram for the building of the Temple (5:15-27 [RSV 5:1-12]), and an episode concerning the labour used in the building of the Temple (i.e., the corvée, 5:28-33 [RSV 5:13-18]). On the other hand, "B'" can also be divided into two episodes dealing with Solomon's labour relations. One episode concerns a contract with Hiram (9:10-14), and the other concerns the labour used in the building of various projects (9:15-28). Thus, not only are the two units within each section of the narrative chiastically balanced against each other, but the two episodes within each unit are also parallel, thus confirming the thesis that the Solomonic narrative displays a remarkable unity and coherence in its own right. (See chart on the following page.)

SCHEMA OF I KINGS 1-11

Frame Story (3 parts) chs. 1-2

Dream #1 (5 parts) 3:1-15

A. Domestic Policy

1 Women and Wisdom (3 parts) 3:16-28

2 Administration and Wisdom (4 parts) 4:1-5:14 [RSV 4:1-34]

B. Labour Relations.

1 The Contract with Hiram (3 parts) 5:15-27 [RSV 5:1-12]

2 The Corvée (4 parts) 5:28-33 [RSV 5:13-18]

Solomon's Attitude Towards God (3 parts) chs. 6-8

Dream #2 (5 parts) 9:1-10

B'. Labour Relations

1 The Contract with Hiram (3 parts) 9:10-14

2 The Corvée (4 parts) 9:15-28

A'. Foreign Policy

1 Woman and Wisdom (3 parts) 10:1-13

2 Wealth and Wisdom (3 parts) 10:14-29

Solomon's Attitude Towards God (3 parts) 11:1-13

Frame Story (3 parts) 11:14-43

Nevertheless, much more is involved than a simple repetition of events in one section and the other. The main contrast between the two sections is that chapters 3-8 of the narrative are favourable to Solomon whereas chapters 9-11:13 are hostile to him. I intend to show that this ambiguous portrait of Solomon is part of a careful and deliberate plan. Chapter four will discuss the purpose of this plan, whereas chapter three will describe the structural parallels occurring within the Solomonic narrative.

The frame stories surrounding the narrative (chs. 1-2 and 11:14-43) define the narrative's limits. The theme of both frame stories is quite simple: Chs. 1-2 describe how Solomon achieves political power and 11:14-43 describes how Solomon loses political power. And although it is true that Solomon does not lose his power during his own lifetime,[31] the text does indicate that his power over all the tribes of Israel will be lost in the next generation. In any event, there is a structural similarity between the two frame stories that should not go unnoticed. Each frame story consists of three parts that are chiastically balanced against each other, as the following table shows:

Frame Stories

A. Problem of Succession (1:1-10)	C'. Relinquishing the Throne (11:14-28)
B. Prophetic Intervention (1:11-53)	i)
C. Establishing the Throne (2:1-46)	ii) raising of Hadad (11:14-22)
i) David's Farewell Speech (2:1-12)	iii) raising of Rezon (11:23-25)
ii) killing of Adonijah (2:13-25)	iv) raising of Jeroboam (11:26-28)

[31] It should be noted here that Solomon is allowed to retain his own political power not because of what he himself has done, but "for the sake of David his father" (11:12).

iii) killing of Joab (2:26-35)	B'. Prophetic Intervention (11:29-40)
iv) killing of Shimei (2:36-46)	A'. Problem of Succession (11:41-43)

The first frame story begins with an emphasis on the problem of succession. David is old and about to die, and two factions within David's house, Solomon and Adonijah (1:1-10), vie for the throne. The second frame story concludes with the problem of succession very much to the forefront. Solomon is dead and two factions are about to vie for the throne once again, Jeroboam I and Solomon's son, Rehoboam (11:41-43).[32]

There is a second important parallel between the two frame stories that involves prophetic intervention. Aside from the frame stories, there is no other mention of any prophet or prophetic activity during the reign of Solomon (i.e., 3:1-11:14). In the introductory frame story, Nathan the prophet and Solomon's mother Bathsheba engineer a plot to persuade David to proclaim Solomon king (1:10-53). There is thus an instance of a prophet intervening in political matters in order to help choose a king. Similarly, in the concluding frame story, the prophet Ahijah intervenes to designate the heir apparent to the throne, Jeroboam I (11:28-40). While Nathan was instrumental in consolidating the kingdom under the reign of Solomon, Ahijah sows the seeds of revolt that lead to its division after the death of Solomon (see especially I Kings 12).

---

[32] It is perhaps an oversimplification to limit the "succession narrative" to II Samuel 9-20, I Kings 1-2 (so Rost 1982). The problem of succession pervades I and II Kings and the formulaic language used to indicate the beginning and end of the reign of a particular king is but one way in which the individual units can be defined (on the use of "formulaic language" to define the literary units see Burney 1970:x; Driver 1919:175-76; Montgomery 1951:43-44; Eissfeldt 1965:282-89; Long 1984 *passim*). Nevertheless, although the individual units are subservient to the overriding structure of the Dtr. history, a close and careful examination of any unit within the history itself can reveal much about the themes contained therein. For a discussion on the methodological assumptions underlying the "succession narrative", see chapter four, p. 80ff.

The third parallel between the frame stories involves the elimination of the three royal enemies in the first frame story (2:1-46) and the raising of three royal enemies in the latter one (11:14-28). Solomon, in the first frame story, must eliminate three powerful opponents in order to establish the throne: Adonijah, Solomon's older half brother and heir apparent; Joab, David's right hand man and a powerful figure in the government;[33] and Shimei, an old enemy of David (cf. II Samuel 16:5-8). Joab and Shimei were killed in accordance with David's wishes (cf. I Kings 2:5-8), whereas Adonijah was killed because he desired the king's concubine, Abishag (2:13-27). In a quick and expedient manner, Solomon eliminates the three royal enemies and firmly establishes his claim to the throne.

Solomon's loss of political power is likewise described in terms of the appearance of three royal enemies. Yahweh raises up Hadad the Edomite (11:14-22) and Rezon (11:23-25), who are adversaries of the monarchy "all the days of Solomon".[34] The third enemy, of course, is Jeroboam. Thus the disappearance of the three royal enemies of Solomon in the first frame story is parallelled by the appearance of three royal enemies in the second.

Within the narrative proper, six distinct episodes give unity and coherence to the Solomonic narrative. The first of these is the dream theophany (3:1-15),

---

[33] See a provocative article by T. Ishida (1982), who argues that the real power behind the throne during the later part of David's reign (i.e., the "succession narrative", II Samuel 9-20, I Kings 1-2) was Joab and that Solomon's *coup d'état* was engineered in such a way as to discredit and eliminate Joab's influence at the court.

[34] Note the art of the biblical author who withholds this information until after the description of the events which took place in Solomon's old age (i.e., Solomon's love of foreign women and his apostasy, 11:1-8) even though, chronologically, these events happened during Solomon's reign ("all the days of Solomon", 11:25). This narrative technique not only enhances the symmetry of the narrative, but it also leaves the reader with the impression that the first part of Solomon's reign was characterized by peace and prosperity. The raising of Hadad and Rezon, therefore, can be described as fitting retribution for an apostate king (see Gray 1970:286). The withholding of information for literary effect is forcefully demonstrated in both Auerbach (1953:3-23) and Alter (1981:114-30).

which introduces the first section of the narrative, whereas the second dream theophany (9:1-10) introduces the second section of the narrative. Since the two sections of the narrative express different attitudes towards Solomon, it is important that I pay close attention to the way in which the dream theophanies are related. A closer examination of both dreams reveal a number of interesting similarities:

Dream Theophanies

A. Setting [spatial] 3:1-4	A'. Setting [temporal] 9:1-2
B. Recalling Past [David] 3:5-8	B'. Recalling Past [David] 9:3-4
C. Petition 3:9	C'. Promise 9:5
D. Anticipates Future 3:10-14	D'. Anticipates Future 9:6-9
E. Conclusion [spatial] 3:15	E'. Conclusion [temporal] 9:10

Although most scholars have seen a relation between the two dream occurrences (Montgomery 1951:203-04; Noth 1968:195, 1981:58; Gray 1970:235; Long 1984:108), few have seen their importance to the Solomon narrative itself. Both dreams are enclosed by an introduction (3:1-4 and 9:1-2) and conclusion (3:15 and 9:10) that set the dreams off from the rest of the narrative. The introduction and conclusion to the first dream concern spatial matters (i.e., Gibeon and Jerusalem), whereas the introduction and conclusion to the second dream concern temporal matters (i.e., "after Solomon had finished the house of the LORD and the house of the king" [9:1] and, "twenty years after Solomon finished the two houses" [9:10]). The frame stories of both dreams also concern sacrifice. The movement from Gibeon (3:4, a "high place" where people used to sacrifice before the Temple was built [3:1-3]), to Jerusalem (3:15), in the first dream is

important insofar as it represents the transition from the place of improper sacrifice to the place where sacrifice should be performed (see Kenik 1983:182-197). The temporal references in the introduction and conclusion of the second dream also deal with the completion of the Temple which is to become the proper place to perform sacrifice to Yahweh.

A number of similarities can also be seen within the various parts of the dream theophanies. Both dreams begin with characters recalling the past, Solomon in the first dream (3:5-8), and Yahweh in the second (9:3-4). In both cases, the recollections concern David. David is shown to be the man who walks (*hālak*, 3:6, 9:4) before Yahweh in uprightness (*yāšār*, 3:6, 9:4), and is held out to be the paradigm for Solomon to follow. Furthermore, just as the basis for Solomon's petition to Yahweh (to discern between good and evil, 3:9) lies in his wanting to emulate his father and predecessor David (3:5-8), the promise to Solomon by Yahweh in the second dream is based on his ability to act in accordance with the ways of David (9:5). Thus, the justification of Solomon's political power rests on the fact that he is David's heir (3:6, 9:5) and not in his own ability as a ruler. Of course the possibility exists that Solomon may, on his own initiative, act in accordance with the actions of his father, but the text only presents that as a possibility to be realized, not as a command to be acted out.

A final parallel exists between the two dream sequences insofar as the future is anticipated or predicted in both theophanies. In the first dream, God predicts that Solomon will be a wise and wealthy king who will also live a long time if he follows his father's example (3:10-14). In the second dream, however, the depiction of the future is much bleaker. If Solomon does not follow Yahweh's commands, the kingdom and the Temple will be destroyed (9:6-9). The first dream, therefore, anticipates the relative peace and prosperity that will characterize the

first part of Solomon's reign (chs. 3-8), while the second dream anticipates the demise of the kingdom during the second part of Solomon's reign (9-11:14). Within the structure of the Solomonic narrative, therefore, the two dream sequences are both parallel to one another and introductory to their respective sections of the narrative.

To complement the parallel dream theophanies that introduce the two sections of the Solomonic narrative, the respective conclusions of those sections are also symmetrically arranged. Solomon's relationship with God is notably contrasted in the two parts of the narrative. In the first section, he is acclaimed as the magnificent builder of a vast Temple and administrative complex and, in the second, he is the notorious apostate king. The implications of these two sides of Solomon's character are the subject of chapter four. For now, however, I shall point out the structural similarities between the two corresponding sections of the narrative:

Solomon's Attitude Towards God

Obedience (chs. 6-8)	Disobedience (11:1-13)
A. Building Projects (6:1-10, 14-7:50)	C'. Attitude Towards Tradition
B. Oracle to Solomon (6:11-13)	i) violator (11:1-2)
C. Attitude Towards Tradition (ch.8)	ii) apostate (11:3-6)
i) preserver (8:1-11)	iii) sacrifice to gods (11:8)
ii) prayer to God (8:12-61)	B'. Oracle to Solomon (11:9-13)
iii) sacrifice to God (8:62-66)	A'. Building Projects (11:7)

If Solomon's attitude towards Yahweh is characterized by obedience in chapters 6-8, it is characterized by disobedience in 11:1-13. Solomon's obedience

is described in a variety of ways: (a) his extensive building projects (6:1-10, 14-38; 7:1-50); (b) his attitude towards the tradition (especially insofar as he is the preserver of the tradition [8:1-11], the continuer of the tradition [8:12-61] and the propitiator of the God of the tradition [8:62-66]); (c) the word of Yahweh concerning the consequences of his obedience (6:11-13). Solomon's disobedience, on the other hand, is described in a similar fashion. The text includes a description of (a) his building projects (11:7); (b) his attitude towards the tradition (insofar as he is its violator [11:1-2], its terminator [11:3-6] and its false propitiator [11:8]); (c) the word of Yahweh concerning the consequences of his disobedience (11:9-13).

The symmetry of the contrasting concluding narrative units can now be seen with greater clarity. The building projects which are described in chapters 6-7 detail the construction of the Temple, its furnishings, and the administrative buildings. These projects and their elaborate description occupy a significant portion of the narrative; it is evident that the author's favourable stance towards Solomon culminates in this description (see Wellhausen 1973:281; Radday 1974:55; Gray 1970:157; Noth 1981:60). On the other hand, the almost passing mention of the building of the "high places" for the abominable foreign gods (11:7) is in marked contrast to the earlier elaborate description of the Temple. There would thus be an obvious difference between Solomon's building a place for the name of Yahweh to dwell and his allowing syncretistic religious practices by building a sanctuary for the foreign gods.

Another contrast between the two concluding sections concerns Solomon's attitude towards the tradition. In the first section, Solomon is portrayed as the preserver of the tradition when he installs the ancient ark of the covenant in Temple (8:1-11). Yet, in the second section of the narrative, Solomon allows foreign gods to inhabit the land, in direct violation of the Dtr. tradition (11:1-2;

cf. Deut. 7:3-5; Joshua 22:5, 23:7-8). Furthermore, Solomon's prayer to Yahweh, in which he thanks Yahweh for His glorious deeds in the past (8:12-30) and initiates new laws which are based upon mercy and forgiveness (8:31-61), is in marked contrast to the text's description of Solomon's failure to follow Yahweh and his violation of Dtr. law (11:3-6). Finally, the attitude of Solomon to the tradition in the first section is appropriately shown by the magnificent sacrifice that Solomon initiates on behalf of Yahweh: here the text describes a king whose heart seems totally devoted to Yahweh (8:62-66). The sacrifice which is described in the concluding section of the Solomonic narrative is performed not by Solomon, but by his wives in order to supplicate their gods. Again, a marked contrast exists between the two sections in their descriptions of sacrifice.

Finally, the only two occasions in which Yahweh speaks directly to Solomon (i.e., not in a dream) also occur in these concluding sections of the narrative. In the first section, Yahweh tells Solomon what the consequences of his obedience to him will be: Yahweh will dwell among the people and He will not forsake them (6:11-13). Here, Yahweh promises to support Solomon and his people and, once more, the Davidic ideal is that which Solomon should follow. By contrast, the divine oracle which comes to Solomon after his apostasy is far from optimistic. Solomon has turned his heart away from Yahweh with the consequence that the kingdom will turn away from Solomon's son (11:9-13). Far from promising support, Yahweh will withdraw His support and, far from acting like David, Solomon falls away from Davidic practice with disastrous consequences. Thus, the only two occasions of Yahweh's direct speech to Solomon (cf. 11:9) also point out the marked contrast in Solomon's attitude toward Yahweh.

Having discussed the Solomonic frame stories as well as the introductions and conclusions to the two sections within the narrative, it now becomes my task

to examine four episodes within each section. These episodes lend an additional symmetry and balance to the narrative unit, and their respective treatments of Solomon enhance the narrative tension. It should be observed further that the first two episodes of the first section, which deal with Solomon's domestic policy (wherein his wisdom is used to create an efficient administration, 3:16-5:14 [RSV 3:16-4:34]), are chiastically balanced against the last two episodes of the last section, which deal with Solomon's foreign policy (wherein wisdom is used to accumulate wealth, 10:1-29). In the same way, the last two episodes of the first section, which deal with Solomon's labour relations (5:15-32 [RSV 5:1-18]) are chiastically balanced against the first two episodes of the last section, which also deal with Solomon's labour relations (9:10-28). The four episodes have numerous other parallels that indicate a high degree of literary design.

Comparing Solomon's domestic policy with his foreign policy, two distinct episodes are parallelled: Solomon's domestic policy contains episodes concerning women and wisdom (3:16-28) and administration and wisdom (4:1-5:14 [RSV 4:1-34]), whereas Solomon's foreign policy contains episodes concerning woman and wisdom (10:1-13) as well as wealth and wisdom (10:14-29). Within the parallel episodes, a number of additional structural similarities can be perceived, as the following table shows:

Woman and Wisdom

Harlots (3:16-28)	Queen of Sheba (10:1-13)
A. Audience with King (3:16)	A'. Audience with King (10:1a)
B. Problem Solving (3:17-27)	B'. Riddle Solving (10:1b-3)
C. Consequences (3:28)	C'. Consequences (10:4-13)

In these episodes, the two harlots (in the first section) and the Queen of Sheba (in the second section) seem to have a private audience with the king. The purpose of this communication, moreover, is for the king to be able to solve a problem (3:17-27) or "riddles" (10:1b-3). These are the only two cases in the narrative where Solomon uses his wisdom to solve problems in a type of contest.[35] Furthermore, the consequence of Solomon's problem solving ability in the episode is that "all Israel was in awe of Yahweh" and that the "wisdom of God was in [Solomon] to render justice" (3:28). The consequence of Solomon's being able to solve the Queen of Sheba's riddles, however, is that an enormous amount of wealth pours into the king's treasury (10:4-13).[36] Thus, in the first instance, the purpose of wisdom seems to have been to render "justice", whereas the purpose of wisdom in the second instance seems to be to accumulate wealth.

It is also interesting to examine the second episode concerning Solomon's domestic policy and compare it with the second episode concerning Solomon's foreign policy. Both episodes concern Solomon's wisdom, but, whereas in the first instance (4:1-5:14 [RSV 4:1-4:34]) Solomon's wisdom results in an efficient and well-organized administrative system, in the second instance (10:14-29) Solomon's wisdom appears to result in an even greater accumulation of wealth. Although the parallel segments in these episodes are perhaps not as precise as in other

---

[35] "Problem" and "riddle" solving, or a contest whereby one displays skill in solving problems is well attested in the Ancient Near East (see Montgomery 1951:108-09; Gray 1970:127, 257; Long 1984:68, 120). Nevertheless, it is not my purpose to authenticate these stories in I Kings or even to speculate on the possible influences from other sources. My task is merely to highlight some of the similarities between the two sections in order to expose the underlying narrative tension in the Solomonic material.

[36] It is noteworthy that the proliferation of legends and stories surrounding Solomon and the Queen of Sheba generally portray them in an unsympathetic manner (see stories in Pritchard 1974:65-145). And although there is little justification in the text itself for a number of these interpretations, it is interesting to observe how the negative side of Solomon's character dominates these discussions.

episodes, both episodes do revolve around wisdom's effect on both domestic and foreign policy:

The Function of Wisdom

To Administer Properly (4:1-5:14)	To Accumulate Wealth (10:14-29)
A. List of Officials (4:1-19)	A'.
B. Consequences (4:20, 5:1,4-5)	B'. Consequences (10:14-22)
C. List of Provisions (5:2-3,6-8)	C'. List of Provisions (10:26-29)
D. Solomon's Wisdom (5:9-14)	D'. Solomon's Wisdom (10:23-25)

In domestic affairs, Solomon has organized his kingdom into twelve separate districts (coinciding with the twelve old tribal boundaries [4:1-19]; see Alt [1953:76-89]) with the consequence that "Israel and Judah were happy", and that there was peace and prosperity in the land (4:20, 5:1,4-5 [RSV 4:20-21,24-25]). And, although Solomon's administrative system is not described in the second section of the narrative, the text does describe his annual income of gold (666 talents) and his wealth from his trading ventures (10:14-22). Solomon's initial domestic policy benefits the people, whereas his subsequent foreign policy serves his own self-aggrandizement. The shift of emphasis from actions which benefit the people to actions which benefit the king and his treasury is also evident in the list of provisions in the two complementary sections. In the first section (5:2-3,6-8 [RSV 4:22-23,26-28]), great emphasis is placed on the fact that there is ample food for the people and horses under Solomon's care but, in the second section, there is no mention of food (10:26-29). A description of food is replaced by a reference to silver and cedar (10:27), and the reference to Solomon's horses is that they are imported from Egypt (in flagrant violation of Dtr. law [see Deut.

17:16]).

A final contrast between the two sections concerns wisdom itself. In the first section, Solomon uses his wisdom to render wise judgements and make the people happy. In this section, Solomon also uses his wisdom for practical and aesthetic purposes, that is, to compose proverbs and songs and to classify plants and animals (5:9-14 [RSV 4:29-34]).[37] Although the biblical author, in section two, maintains that Solomon's wisdom "excelled all the kings of the earth" (10:23), that wisdom is now directed towards the multiplication of horses, gold and silver for the king. Again, we should not be surprised to discover that Solomon uses his wisdom in flagrant violation of Dtr. law (see Deut. 17:16-17).

The last two episodes of the first section (5:15-32 [RSV 5:1-18]), which concern Solomon's labour relations, are also to be contrasted with the first two episodes of the second section of the narrative (9:10-28). The first episode in each part of each section of the narrative concerns King Hiram of Tyre (5:15-27 [RSV 5:1-12] and 9:10-14), and the second episode in each part of each section of the narrative concerns the forced labour or the corvée (5:27-32 [RSV 5:13-18] and 9:15-28). As may well be expected, there are a number of features in both episodes in each section of the narrative that are similar, as the following chart concerning the Hiram episodes shows:

---

[37] This encomium to Solomon's wisdom found in 5:9-14 (RSV 4:29-34) has had two important developments insofar as Israelite wisdom is concerned. The attribution of much biblical literature to Solomon (i.e., Proverbs 1-29, Ecclesiastes, Song of Solomon, Wisdom of Solomon) is based on Solomon's reputation for wisdom and on passages such as 5:9-14 (see Scott 1953:262-79). Moreover, the classification of plants and animals (noun lists or onomastica) which is also found in this passage, is also important insofar as the wisdom movement in the Ancient Near East is concerned. Numerous parallels exist in Egypt and Mesopotamia which show that these lists helped students order nature according to certain classifications and topics (see Alt 1976:102-112).

Agreement with Hiram of Tyre

A. Setting (5:15 [RSV 5:1])	A'. Setting (9:10)
B. Agreement (5:16-25 [RSV 5:2-11])	B'. Agreement (9:11-13)
C. Consequences (5:26 [RSV 5:12])	C'. Consequences (9:14)

In both of the Hiram episodes, there seems to be some sort of agreement between Hiram and Solomon. In the first section, Hiram and Solomon reach a mutually satisfactory agreement, whereby Hiram promises to supply Solomon with the material and labour for the building of the Temple and, in return, Solomon gives Hiram wheat and oil. The result of this contract is that Solomon and Hiram make a treaty and there is peace between the Israelites and the Phoenecians. The episode concerning Hiram and Solomon in the second section of the narrative shows that the agreement is far from satisfactory. Although Hiram seems to have fulfilled his part of the contract, he is distressed that the cities Solomon had given him in exchange for 120 talents of gold were in such poor condition (9:11-13). Either Solomon did not fulfill his part of the contract, or he executed his legal responsibility in a way that displeases Hiram. There would thus seem to be a difference between the two contracts between Hiram and Solomon which, again, supports the contention that episodes in the first section of the narrative are favourable to Solomon whereas those in the second section are hostile to him.

The last similarity between Solomon's labour relations deals with the episodes concerning the corvée or forced labour camps (5:27-32 [RSV 5:13-18] and 9:15-28). In the corvée episode in the first section of the narrative, the labour is described in four stages: (a) the labourers (5:27-29 [RSV 5:13-15]), (b) the super-

visors (5:30 [RSV 5:16]), (c) the labour project (5:31 [RSV 5:17]), (d) a mention of Hiram and Solomon working together harmoniously (5:32 [RSV 5:18]). Within this episode in the first section, the labour seems to be carried on without incident. In the second section narrative where the corvée is again described (9:15-28), a different situation ensues altogether. Although the episode itself may be divided into the same four stages (i.e., [a] labourers [9:20-22]; [b] supervisors [9:23]; [c] the labour projects [9:15-19,24-26]; [d] Hiram and Solomon arrangement [9:27-28]), there is an entirely different tone to the episode. Graphically, the two episodes may be shown thus:

The Corvée

A. The Labourers (5:27-29)	A'. The Labourers (9:20-22)
B. The Supervisors (5:30)	B'. The Supervisors (9:23)
C. The Labour Project (5:31)	C'. The Labour Projects (9:15-19,24-26)
D. Hiram and Solomon (5:32)	D'. Hiram and Solomon (9:27-8)

In the first section of the narrative, the labourers work for a month and then rest for two months (5:27-29). The second section of the narrative, however, describes a situation where slavery exists (9:20-22). And although the text is careful to point out that the slavery does not extend over the Israelites,[38] the situation of harmonious cooperation between the nations (i.e., Hiram and Solomon, 5:32 [RSV 5:18]) has deteriorated to one of ruler and ruled. The duties of

[38] A system of slavery *does* seem to exist over the people of Israel under the auspices of Rehoboam, Solomon's son (cf. I Kings 12:1-11). There also seems to have been some subjugation of the people of Israel in Solomon's time as well, but the biblical author carefully withholds this information from the reader until his description of the reign of Rehoboam. The withholding of information may be in order to justify the rebellion of the northern tribes after the death of Solomon, thus fulfilling the words of Ahijah (12:12-20).

the supervisors or "chief officers" (*śārê hannissābîm*) in the first section have expanded to include that of slave-drivers in the second section. And, if a strong bureaucracy and administration was the basis for power in the first section, the power basis in the second section seems to be based on nationality. The disparity between the numbers of high officials involved in the administration of the labour (insofar as there are 3,300 "chief officers" [*śārê hannissābîm*] in 5:30 [RSV 5:16] and only 550 "chief officers" [*śārê hannissābîm*] in 9:23) is clearly indicative of the weakening of Solomon's bureaucracy, and perhaps the strengthening of his own particular power. In any event, a close reading of the text reveals that Solomon's power structure has changed drastically between the two sections of the narrative.

Solomon's building enterprises, which were in the service of Yahweh in the first section (i.e, the building of the Temple), are primarily concerned with the Solomon's self-aggrandizement in the second section. Solomon directs his attention to the building of his house, the Millo, the wall of Jerusalem, the cities of Hazor, Megiddo, Gezer, Lower Bethhoron, Baalath, Tamar, numerous store cities, the house for Pharaoh's daughter, and a fleet of ships, in the second section of the narrative. Thus, just as the number of the projects for which the labour was exploited changes, so does the motive for the construction of the projects.

A final similarity exists between the corvée episodes insofar as Hiram is mentioned on both occasions. But whereas the first episode indicates a harmonious working relationship that exists between the Israelites and the Phoenecians, the second episode is in relation to mercantile activity that profits Solomon to the tune of 420 talents of gold. This is a sizeable amount of gold in relation to Solomon's annual gold revenue of 666 talents (10:14). In any event, the parallel, although slight, indicates that the relationship between Hiram and Solomon,

which originally was one of mutual admiration and trust, has changed to one of mistrust and one primarily concerned with wealth.

This close analysis of the text has revealed that a remarkable symmetry exists within the entire Solomon narrative. Parallels exist between the introductory (chs. 1-2) and concluding (11:14-43) frame stories which enclose two contrasting sections of the narrative. The first part of each section of the narrative begins with a dream (3:1-15 and 9:1-10) and ends with an episode concerning Solomon's attitude towards God (chs. 6-8 and 11:1-13). Within each section of the narrative, there are four distinct episodes, the first two of which in the first section (women and wisdom [3:16-28] and administrative abilities and wisdom [4:1-5:14]) are parallelled with the last two episodes of the second section (woman and wisdom [10:1-13] and wealth and wisdom [10:14-29]). The parallels are strengthened when it is observed that the first two episodes in the first section concern Solomon's domestic policy and the last two episodes in the second section concern his foreign policy. Furthermore, the last two episodes in the first section (the contract with Hiram [5:15-26 {RSV 5:1-11}] and the corvée [5:27-32 {RSV 13-18}]) are to be compared with the first two episodes of the second section (the contract with Hiram [9:10-14] and the corvée [9:15-28]). Both of these episodes in the narrative concern Solomon's labour relations. The overall parallel structure is further marked by the deliberate contrast between the favourable description of Solomon in the first section and the hostile description of Solomon in the second.

Having exposed the structure of the Solomonic narrative, it becomes my task to determine why the material is arranged in such a fashion. In other words, what is the purpose of the ambiguous portrait of Solomon? In order to answer this question, I must try to discover what thematic concerns are present in the narrative that make the ambiguous portrait necessary. The fourth chapter is

concerned with the elucidation of these thematic issues in my continuing explanation of the Dtr. history's presentation of Solomon. My question can now be made more specific: "what is the purpose of the ambiguous portrait of Solomon in I Kings 1-11?" Answering this question will go a long way towards exposing a number of crucial thematic issues in the narrative itself.

CHAPTER FOUR

THEMATIC ANALYSIS

Introduction: "For or Against Solomon?"

In the preceding chapter I argued that a careful literary plan characterized the narrative of I Kings 1-11. The material was symmetrically arranged so that the first eight chapters of the narrative were favourable to Solomon and the last three chapters were hostile to him. I also argued that the frame stories were both concerned with the problem of succession, in that chapters 1-2 describe how Solomon consolidates his power and 11:14-43 describes the weakening of Solomon's power. Furthermore, six distinct episodes within the first section of the narrative were parallelled in the second section of the narrative, thus lending further support to the claim that I Kings 1-11 has a unity and integrity of its own. I will now try to account for this structural tension in the narrative by investigating a number of its key themes.

Before investigating these themes, however, I should point out that a number of historical-critical scholars have also discerned structural tension in the narrative. This tension is not one that is peculiar to I Kings 1-11, but arises in connection with the so-called "Succession Narrative" (SN) in II Samuel 9-20, I Kings 1-2.[39] According to the argument of these historical critics, the SN is a

[39] The theory that the material in II Samuel 9-20 and I Kings 1-2 is connected in a thematic way was first put forward by L. Rost in his *Die Überlieferung von der Thronnachfolge Davids* (1926; ET = *The Succession Narrative*, 1981). Rost argued that the narrative was a unified and coherent work which was thematically connected by the lietmotif, expressed in the question "who will sit upon the throne of David?" (I Kings 1:20, 27; cf. Rost 1981:89). And although this motif or question is most explicit in I Kings 1-2, Rost argued that the question can be seen to arise throughout II Samuel 9-20 as well. In these passages we learn that David's older sons, Amnon and Absalom, had at certain points proved themselves unworthy of inheriting the kingdom, and that no real leader emerged until Solomon. Each son, in turn, committed the sin of his father and

conflation of two sources, one "pro-Solomonic" the other "anti-Solomonic". Nevertheless, there is still a considerable amount of debate among biblical scholars as to whether the narrative as a whole is essentially in support of Solomon (*in majorem gloriam Salomis*, so Rost 1981:105) or hostile to him. Those who agree with Rost argue that the purpose of the narrative was to justify Solomon's accession to the throne.[40] Those who disagree with Rost argue that the narrative was originally hostile to Solomon and only later did a redactor, who wanted to legitimize Solomon's accession to the throne, embellish the narrative with evidence that was favourable to Solomon.[41] According to this argument, a close

---

disaster ensued. Thus, just as David takes Bathsheba (II Samuel 11), so Amnon rapes Tamar (II Samuel 13), Absalom appropriates his father's concubines (II Samuel 16) and Adonijah, a third older son, similarly tried to claim one of the king's concubines (I Kings 2:13-25). The result of this recurrent pattern of sin is that the kingdom was almost lost and disaster was soon to follow. Nevertheless, it was Solomon who emerged as the son most fit to rule and who quickly restored stability by the elimination of his rivals (Rost 1981:98-100). Thus, according to Rost, the succession narrative was composed by a supporter of Solomon who wanted to legitimize the king's position on the throne, and to relate how it came to pass that David was succeeded by Solomon (Rost 1981:65-115).

[40] Scholars who are in agreement with Rost include Weiser 1961:165; Hertzberg 1964:377; Fohrer 1968:222; von Rad 1966:176ff.; Thorton 1968:159-166. See also additional references in Langlamet 1976:330 n.3. One of the more influential scholars who agrees with Rost is Whybray (1968). Whybray argues that the SN is "political propaganda" which was intended to justify Solomon's position on the throne. He writes: "The fact that the author thus wrote, as Rost put it, *'ad majorem gloriam Salomonis'*, but in a dynastic rather than a personal sense, suggests the existence of some particular political circumstances which inspired or necessitated the writing of the book. Nothing else could adequately account for the tremendous insistence, especially in the closing chapters, on the legitimacy of Solomon's accession. Although the author, no sycophant, had no interest in writing a fulsome eulogy of Solomon, he was deeply concerned about the stability of the dynasty and regime. The insistence on the unworthiness of the other candidates and on the correctness of Solomon's appointment, anointing and enthronement strongly suggests that the book was written at a time when the stability and legitimacy of the régime were being threatened" (1968:53). Nevertheless, much of the textual support for this argument rests on the favourable remarks in regard to Solomon's accession to the throne made by Benaiah in I Kings 1:37. One may well ask (as does Gunn [1978:123 n.4]) whether Benaiah's remarks are meant to reflect the point of view of the author.

[41] The idea that the author of I Kings 1-2 was hostile to Solomon is not new. It was first proposed by Kittel (1900:177-82) and taken up by Hölscher (1952), who argued that the negative assessment of Solomon in I Kings 1-2 was written immediately prior to the collapse of the kingdom. Nevertheless, it was L. Delekat who, in an influential article entitled "*Tendenz und Theologie der David-Salomo-Erzählung*" (1967), argued most persuasively that the succession narrative did have an anti-Solomonic flavour. He based much of his argument on the anti-Davidic passage in II Samuel 10-12, which describes David's affair with Bathsheba. See also Noth 1968:39; Crenshaw

reading of I Kings 1-2 indicates that the final redactor tried to exonerate Solomon by presenting the circumstances surrounding the minor bloodbath that had preceded his succession (which was certainly "public knowledge" [McCarter 1981:360]) in a way that would vindicate Solomon.

There is, therefore, no clear scholarly consensus on the author's intention in the presentation of the role of Solomon in I Kings 1-2. In fact, a number of scholars have said as much, declaring that the narrative is "neutral" in its attitude toward Solomon and seeks to give as objective a presentation of Solomon as is possible (cf. Montgomery 1950:70; McKane 1963:275; Gray 1970:105). Another approach, however, which seeks to use the methods of source and redaction criticism, has arisen and has been the focal point of much discussion in recent times. Scholars such as Würthwein (1974), Veijola (1975) and Langlamet (1976) have argued that there is no tension between the "pro-Solomonic" and "anti-Solomonic" intention of the author. What we have in the text are different literary stages of composition and development that reflect different attitudes towards Solomon. Since this last position is diametrically opposed to my argument, it is appropriate for me to discuss it at this point.

Indeed, the question of the legitimacy of Solomon's accession to the throne would be crucial if one were looking for a simplistic solution to the problem of dynastic succession.[42] In I Kings 1, the reader is informed that king David is old and in poor health. Nevertheless, his successor has not yet been determined and the reader soon finds out that there are two contenders. One is Adonijah

---

1969:138; Brueggemann 1972:103; and Langlamet 1976:330 n.3, for a list of scholars who also discern an anti-Solomonic tendency in the succession narrative.

[42] What follows is a synopsis of the way in which the redaction critics Würthwein, Veijola and Langlamet have read I Kings 1-2 and which necessarily lead to the types of conclusions they drew from the text (see McCarter 1981:358-361).

(David's older son and heir apparent), who is supported by Joab (David's right hand man) and Abiathar (one of David's two high priests). The other is Solomon, who is supported by Zadok (the other high priest), and Benaiah (a high-ranking military official). By the end of I Kings 2, however, Solomon has clearly emerged as the victor (2:46b). Benaiah and Zadok are in positions of power (2:35), Joab and Adonijah are dead (2:25,34) and Abiathar is banished (2:36). The problem for the author (or redactor) is to try to vindicate Solomon's succession in the midst of such mysterious and suspicious circumstances, for, according to the law of primogeniture, Adonijah should have been next in line for the throne. The author would get around this problem by having two characters, Nathan and Bathsheba, claim that David had already designated Solomon to be king, thereby justifying (albeit indirectly) Solomon's legitimacy. In a similar manner, the redactor justifies the elimination of Solomon's enemies: it was not Solomon who initiated the purge but David who, on his deathbed, admonished Solomon to comply with his wishes. Thus, Joab and Shimei are murdered not because they were Solomon's enemies but because David wanted them killed for some earlier crimes they had committed (2:6-10): Joab for killing Abner (II Samuel 2:5,31) and Amasa (II Samuel 20:10), and Shimei for insulting David (II Samuel 16:5-14). And although the murder of Adonijah is not called for by David, it is justified by the redactor's insertion of the story of Adonijah's request for one of the king's concubines. This was seen as a blatant attempt to appropriate royal prerogatives (cf. von Rad 1968:189), and it also aligns Adonijah with the rebellious sons of David, notably Absalom. In this manner, a redactor who is sympathetic towards Solomon and the Davidic dynasty manages to whitewash a narrative that originally had been hostile to Solomon.

At the risk of oversimplifying the detailed redaction-critical analyses presented by Würthwein, Veijola and Langlamet, a few general remarks on their arguments are necessary. All three scholars have followed the lead of L. Delekat and have argued that the viewpoint of the original author/redactor was anti-Solomonic. Nevertheless, although the original text was hostile to Solomon, the text underwent pro-Solomonic augmentation at a later stage in its literary history. Although Würthwein, Veijola and Langlamet disagree to some extent as to who added this material and when this final redactional activity took place, they are all united in their perception of the text: the tension in the narrative is to be explained as the product of redactional activity.[43]

Würthwein, in his *Die Erzählung von der Thronfolge Davids - theologische oder politische Geschichtsschreibung?* (1974), argues that the SN (for him II Samuel 10-20 and I Kings 1-2, see p.58 n.97) has been elevated by a later editor from a "profane" story, which was originally critical of kingship, to a narrative in which David is the ideal king and Solomon's accession to power is theologically justified (cf. Ball in Rost 1981:xl n.93). In trying to determine whether the work was mainly theological or political in intent (see the title of his book), Würthwein argues that the original narrative was not a theological account but a political writing which was hostile to the Davidic monarchy (1974:49-59). Material that is favourable to Solomon is to be regarded as secondary (1974:11-18). And, even though the original writing was not theology but political propaganda (cf. Whybray 1968), it was not exclusively secular either, although that was its tone. The

[43] See the lists of material in I Kings 1-2 that has been considered to be redactional by Würthwein, Veijola and Langlamet in Gunn (1978:123 n.8). To analyze and comment on the alleged redactional activity discerned by the three scholars would take me well beyond the scope and purpose of this thesis and would entail a major study in itself. Nevertheless, the reader should be aware of the attempts by biblical scholars to explain the narrative tension through redactional methods.

work did, however, undergo a "sapiential-theologizing" (a term used by Langlamet in his review of Würthwein's book, 1976:117) at a later date, giving the narrative its pious overtones.

T. Veijola, however, is much more interested than Würthwein in trying to determine when and where the later redactions took place. His views are presented in his detailed analysis of the SN entitled *Die Ewige Dynastie. David und die Entstehung seiner Dynastie nach der deuteronomistischen Darstellung* (1975). Basing much of his argument upon the Deuteronomistic redactions proposed by Dietrich (1972) of a Dtr.G (historian), Dtr.P (a later prophetic editor) and Dtr.N (a final, nomistic editor),[44] Veijola isolates the various strands in the SN according to Dietrich's tripartite structure. According to Veijola, in the first Deuteronomistic redaction (Dtr.G), David is the pious man whom God elevates to the throne in order that the divine plan for "the eternal dynasty of David" (cf. II Samuel 7) might be accomplished. In the second redaction (Dtr.P), David is the penitent king, rather than the pious one, and a note of judgement hangs over his actions. There is, consequently, a lack of interest in the legitimation and eternality of the Davidic kingdom in this redaction. Lastly, the final redaction (Dtr.N) portrays David as the law-abiding king who is the paradigm for all subsequent kings (see Brayley 1976:428). With regard to Solomon, then, Veijola would argue that the narrative in I Kings 1-2 was originally anti-Solomonic (Dtr.G) but was subsequently revised by a pro-Solomonic redactor (Dtr.N) who added sections which tended to legitimate Solomon's succession to the throne (i.e., I Kings 1:30, 35-37, 46-48) and exonerate him from any wrong doing (i.e., I Kings 2:1-9, 31b-33, 44-45; cf. Veijola 1975:16ff). Veijola, like Würthwein, would thus seek to

[44] See a fuller discussion of Dietrich's argument in Chapter 1, pp. 28-29.

eliminate the narrative tension in the description of Solomon's rise to power by attributing the work to different redactors. He writes:

> In its oldest version, chapter [two] offers an unflattering portrayal of how Solomon, after his succession, deals with his closest political rivals. One after another is liquidated irrespective of political asylum (Joab) or of any clear motive (Shimei). With the exception of v.15 (whose setting in the original narrative is dubious), Solomon's brutal actions are nowhere interpreted theologically, or justified morally. This [editorializing] only takes place in the redaction, which is especially influenced by two central themes: the proof of Solomon's innocence, and the divine favour bestowed upon the Davidic dynasty. Solomon's innocence is emphasized insofar as his murderous deeds are explained by the last will of his father David (2:1-9). Other emphases are placed again on the nomistic additions of v.3-4a. ... [These additions] no longer have any connection with the actual events underlying the oldest redactional layer, but speak very generally about Yahweh's statutes, ordinances and laws, which are enshrined in the "law of Moses," and upon whose execution the further continuation of the Davidic dynasty depends (1975:25-26).

Langlamet, in his immensely patient and detailed work, "*Pour ou contre Salomon*" (1976), is in essential agreement with Würthwein and Veijola. For Langlamet, however, the final redaction was undertaken not by a Dtr. editor but by a priest writing in the late pre-exilic period (1976:528). Langlamet does, however, agree with Veijola insofar as he regards David's legitimation of Solomon (I Kings 1:46-48) as an addition to the original story (see Veijola 1975:16-18 and Langlamet 1976:490-94). Once the redaction of I Kings 1:46-48 is admitted, however, other passages that suggest David's piety and Solomon's rightful accession to the throne are also to be labelled as redactional (see Gunn 1978:117).

It would appear, then, that all three redactionists agree that contradictory evidence or "narrative tension" is to be explained by reference to different historical settings and intentions of the author/redactor. All passages that show Solomon in a negative light are to be explained as the product of the first redaction, which was sympathetic to Adonijah's party (Würthwein 1974:11ff; Langlamet 1976:506; see also Noth 1968:39). This early document was rewritten at a later

time, probably in the late pre-exilic period (Langlamet 1976:527-28), in order to justify the kingship of David and legitimate his successor.

As I have already argued in chapter one, I do not accept that multiple "viewpoints" imply multiple authorship. According to the redaction critics, the assumption of intentionality or *Tendenz* lies at the heart of the discussion of the redactional solution to narrative tension: differing viewpoints imply differing authorial intentions.[45] The possibility that a single author could have presented the reader with points of view which are both favourable and hostile to Solomon is rarely entertained. Langlamet (1976:340-44) does, however, try to come to grips with this problem by postulating that the tension within the narrative may be the working out of some divine plan:

> This powerful, even scandalous, message is not the invention of exegetes: it is at the centre of the biblical account that we have received; it is thus the word of God about the history of mankind, an unexpected light in the night and in the chaos. The author of these theological remarks, which are few in number, knows what he is doing when he underlines the primacy of the divine action (1976:342).

Nevertheless, Langlamet is still convinced that the tension in the narrative was the result of a final editing process:

> Would our theologian have been content to present these contradictory points of view without getting involved, and without questioning the final victory of God's plan? It is clear that he did not do so: the actual narrative is no longer neutral; it is, when all is said and done, pro-Solomonic. This overall impression, however, is still not able to eliminate the tensions indicated above (1976:344).

It is apparent, however, that the text is only open to the possibility of multiple layers of redaction if one is looking for an unambiguous answer to the problem of narrative tension or, as Gunn writes, "envisaging the text only in terms of a

---

[45] See here a related discussion by Fokkelman (1986:3) who abruptly dismisses the notion that one could ever try to discern the intentionality of the author from the SN. To do so would be to commit the "intentional fallacy" See also p. 44 above.

religious *tract*" (1978:25).[46] It may well be the case that the text is deliberately ambiguous (as I shall argue) in order to establish a particular proposition or teaching.

This claim brings up the related question, discussed at length in chapters one and two, of whether the narrative itself is meant to be read as history, or at least as a source for religious or political history (see Würthwein 1974), or political propaganda (Whybray 1968). The suggestion that the narrative may not be "history" in the narrow sense of the word changes the type of question the reader puts to the text. To assume the narrative's historical character predisposes the investigator to ask historical questions and seek historical solutions — in other words, to seek data that are not inherent in the text (cf. Gunn 1978:87; Whitelam 1979:93). A literary approach, by contrast, seeks only to describe the literary features of the narrative without trying to determine authorial *Tendenz*. My structural analysis of the frame story in I Kings 1-2, for example, revealed only how Solomon consolidated his power (i.e., by the elimination of three royal enemies: Joab, Shimei and Adonijah). It did not seek to determine authorial intention in so doing.[47] To divide the narrative into sources which express only one viewpoint apiece is to destroy its unity and literary context, and precludes any investigation of the purpose of the text in its present form.[48]

---

[46] Appropriate here too is the comment by Nelson, in his review of Würthwein's commentary *Die Bücher der Könige: 1. Kön. 17 - 2. Kön. 25*: "its main value, however, may turn out to be as a clear witness to the internal tensions and irregularities in Kings. Whether Würthwein's source-critical hypothesis is a way to explicate these tensions, however, remains to be seen" (1986:709). See also the comment made by Brayley in his review of Veijola's *Die Ewige Dynastie*: "one is not confident that the author has altogether avoided those twin dangers of his method of analysis, excess of subtlety and excess of rigidity. He has undoubtedly produced an interesting work, but this reviewer remains unconvinced by his thesis" (1976:438).

[47] It will also be recalled that the description of Solomon's rise to power was parallelled by a description of the breakup of Solomon's kingdom and the appearance of three royal enemies (Hadad, Rezon and Rehoboam; 11:14-43).

[48] P.K. McCarter is on the right track when he argues that the SN is "apologetic", that is, it describes "unfavourable circumstances forthrightly in order to cast a favourable light on them by

The preceding discussion has shown that the narrative tension discerned by historical-critical scholars was ascribed to multiple redactions. And although the discussion was limited to the first two chapters of I Kings, the implications of the discussion were such that the contradictions and inconsistencies found elsewhere in the Solomonic material (i.e., I Kings 3-11) would be treated in a similar manner. For the redaction hypothesis to be valid, it must be admitted *a priori* that an author or editor can only have one point of view and that the author's intention is tied directly to his historical situation (see discussion in chapter two). If those assumptions are not granted, the conclusion of multiple authorship/redaction does not automatically follow. Thus, although the work of the redactionists is helpful insofar as it reveals tensions in the narrative, their resolutions of these tensions are inappropriate to the method and argument of this thesis.

A holistic approach seeks to integrate the structure (as laid out in chapter three) and content of I Kings 1-11. Such an approach will seek to explain the tension in the narrative by describing its principal themes in relation to the narrative structure. This method will try to answer, more specifically, the question, "why is an ambiguous description of Solomon given in I Kings 1-11?" This question, therefore, will be pursued without recourse to historical-critical concerns about the author's intention, setting or time of composition.

---

a variety of literary means. By its very nature, then, it holds conflicting ideas in literary tension. The elimination of the literary blandishments of the author by appeal to higher critical or other considerations, therefore, will inevitably produce a recital of unfavourable circumstances, but it will also distort the writer's intended product beyond recovery. It is a mistake to rely heavily on the criterion of narrative tension for identifying redactional material in these stories [i.e, the SN], when such tension is the very essence of the writer's technique" (1981:360 n.12).

The Ideal King

Since the historical-critical solution as outlined above is inappropriate to the nature and scope of this thesis, I now intend to suggest an alternative solution to the problem of narrative tension in the Solomonic material. Such a solution will try to integrate both the form and content of I Kings 1-11 in a manner that is consistent with the holistic approach outlined in chapter two. I have already shown, in chapter three, that a bipartite structure characterizes I Kings 1-11; chapters 1-8 are favourable to Solomon and 9-11 are hostile to him. My task is now to expose the thematic concerns that are present in both the favourable and hostile descriptions of Solomon.

Perhaps the most obvious theme that emerges from a reading of I Kings 1-11 is the portrayal of Solomon as king: how he becomes king and how he functions as king. My specific concern with Solomon's kingship, and a concern which follows naturally from the bipartite structure of the narrative, is to account for Solomon as both the ideal and the apostate king. In order to pursue this inquiry, I will first describe the Israelite conception of the ideal king with particular reference to the Dtr. texts (i.e., Joshua-II Kings).[49] Having proposed a model of the

[49] Other biblical texts such as the Psalms, Proverbs and some prophetic material will also be of some value in determining a composite picture of the ideal king. Nevertheless, there is a danger in relying too heavily on those biblical texts which are not part of the Dtr. history. To do so would be to jeopardize my hermeneutical control, insofar as the thesis is mainly concerned with a description of Solomon in the Dtr. history (see pp. 56-57). It turns out, however, that the description of the ideal king in both the Dtr. and the non-Dtr. texts is remarkably uniform. A problem of much greater significance, and one which I intend to avoid altogether, would be to compile a description of the ideal king on the basis of extra-biblical material drawn from surrounding ancient Near Eastern cultures. This scholarly activity, which was a preoccupation of the "Myth and Ritual School" (a phrase introduced by S.H. Hooke in an essay entitled "The Myth and Ritual Pattern of the Ancient East" [1933]), attempted to discern a homogeneous "myth and ritual pattern" in the ancient Near East in which the king played a decisive role in the cult. These scholars argued that at each annual New Year festival, the king, by ritually identifying himself with a dying and rising god, would bring about the re-creation of the world and the renewal of life. Such studies have been pursued by both British (Johnson, Snaith) and Scandanavian (Engnell, Mowinckel, Bentzen and Widengren) scholars with varying degrees of success. Nevertheless, without denying the legitimacy of such studies in determining the divinity of kingship in Egypt,

ideal king, I then intend to show how well Solomon measures up to that ideal through an exegesis of chapters 3-8, and how Solomon falls away from the ideal model in chapters 9-11. In conclusion, I will draw on my literary analysis to elucidate the unity of form and content in I Kings 1-11.

In order to determine the Israelite conception of the ideal king as presented by the Dtr. history, a good place to start is the story of the origin of the monarchy. When the Israelites asked Samuel to give them a king, they wanted someone who would judge them (I Samuel 8:5), that is, someone who would render "justice" (*mišpāṭ*) over the realm (see De Vaux 1965:151). Samuel illustrates the "high ethical demands" (Irwin 1977:351) that are placed upon the ruler in his valedictory address to the people:

> "Here I am; testify against me before the LORD and before his anointed. Whose ox have I taken? or whose ass have I taken? or whom have I defrauded? Whom have I oppressed? or from whose hand have I taken a bribe to blind my eyes with it? Testify against me and I will restore it to you". They said, "You have not defrauded us or oppressed us or taken anything from any man's hand" (I Samuel 12:3-4).[50]

And although it is certainly true that Samuel's words are spoken in the context of his opposition to kingship, a key feature of his speech is the heavy responsibility that he placed upon himself as ruler. As W.A. Irwin writes:

> [authority] was not to be regarded as an opportunity for exploitation; it was a call to service. The ruler must use his office, not for personal advantage or profit, but for the benefit of the ruled (1977:351).

The origin of the conception of the ideal king as one who renders justice is

---

Mesopotamia and Canaan (see especially Engnell's *Studies in Divine Kingship in the Ancient Near East* [1967]), it is not self-evident that kingship, as presented in the Dtr. history, was influenced by the concept of divine kingship. To argue such a position would be to confuse historical matters with literary ones, or a diachronic approach with a synchronic one, something which this thesis is at pains to avoid.

[50] All biblical translations are from the Revised Standard Version (RSV) unless otherwise indicated.

embedded in the premonarchic institution of the judges. It was these judges who, as their name suggests, rendered justice over the people whom they governed. According to Mowinckel, the judges ruled by virtue of their ability to do "justice" (*mišpāṭ*) and their inherent "righteousness" (*sᵉdāqâ*) (1954:55). And although the power and authority of the judges does derive from other avenues as well (such as "the spirit of Yahweh" and their military prowess), Mowinckel here points to an important facet of rulership in premonarchic Israel. In fact, the association of justice and righteousness is implied in the book of Judges by the refrain, "in those days there was no king in Israel; every man did what was right in his own eyes" (17:6, 21:25; cf. 18:1, 19:1). In order to avoid such atrocities as the rape of the Levite's concubine and the massacre of the Benjaminites, the text implies that a king was needed to administer justice (Whitelam 1979:33).

The theme of justice as an integral part of kingship is also seen in a number of stories concerning David. In the preamble to the list of David's officials, the text states that "David reigned over all Israel; and David administered justice and equity for the people" (II Samuel 8:15). It would seem that justice is not only an integral part of the administration (De Vaux 1965:151) but that the administration of justice is so important that it cannot be delegated to senior officials (Whitelam 1979:33). There is, perhaps, no clearer statement of the necessity of a king to do justice than in the "last words of David" as recorded in II Samuel 23:3-4:

> The God of Israel has spoken,
> the Rock of Israel has said to me:
> When one rules justly over men,
> ruling in fear of God
> He dawns on them like morning light,
> like the sun shining forth upon a cloudless morning
> like rain that makes the grass to sprout from the earth.

Just as the ideal king's throne is founded on justice, so Yahweh will reward the one who establishes justice. And although justice is ultimately a principle which resides with Yahweh, it is the responsibility of the king to maintain justice. The king is required to watch constantly over his subjects and ensure that justice will be done. Thus he is in the position of the guarantor of justice; he must maintain his justice in accordance with the justice of Yahweh, upon whom he is ultimately dependent (Johnson 1967:7-13). The fact that Yahweh's throne is based upon justice (see Psalm 89:15 [RSV 89:14] and 97:2) makes it all the more imperative that the ideal king likewise pursue justice.

If, however, the king fails to implement justice, the foundation of his throne is undermined. This feature of kingship is vividly demonstrated in the case of David's rebellious son, Absalom, who exclaims, "Oh that I were judge in the land! Then everyone with a suit or cause might come to me, and I would give him justice" (II Samuel 15:4). Absalom's point in this context seems to be that if his father is no longer concerned with justice, he is not fit to rule the land or judge his people (Johnson 1960:206 and 1967:4 n.4; De Vaux 1965:151). Absalom's partial success in his *coup d'état* implies that justice does indeed lie at the heart of the monarchy.

The theme of justice as foundational to the rule of the ideal king is also evident in the non-Dtr texts, particularly the Psalms. In a thorough treatment of the subject, J.H. Eaton (*Kingship and the Psalms*, 1976) argues that the king must strive toward the ideal of justice in order to maintain his throne. In essence, the king is to convey God's justice over the realm and thus maintain the stability and prosperity of the nation (Eaton 1976:141; cf. Whitelam 1979:29). Perhaps the clearest statement of justice as foundational to kingship occurs in Psalm 72.[51] The entire Psalm demonstrates the importance of the king in

[51] For reasons that will explained below, one should note that tradition associates this Psalm

maintaining justice in the land:

> Give the king thy justice, O God
> and thy righteousness to the royal son!
> May he judge thy people with righteousness
> and thy poor with justice!
> Let the mountains bear prosperity for the people,
> and the hills, in righteousness!
> May he defend the cause of the poor of the people,
> give deliverance to the needy,
> and crush the oppressor! (72:1-4)

Often coupled with the ideal king's judicial role is the concept of "righteousness" (*s^{e}dāqâ*). Righteousness is described by Mowinckel as:

> being right, living by Yahweh's justice according to custom. In the widest sense it includes the will and the ability to maintain customs, rights and prosperity of the community under the covenant, the ability to 'judge', i.e., to rule rightly, to do the right thing, and in general to maintain due order in affairs (1954:67-68).

According to Ringgren, righteousness also includes "the total well-being of the land and the proper order of nature" (1966:228). If the king maintains righteousness, peace and prosperity will follow. Indeed, the stability of the kingdom depends on the king's ability to maintain justice and righteousness (cf. De Vaux 1965:151). These two important qualities of justice and righteousness are also found in the description of the royal throne found in the book of Proverbs (cf. Whitelam 1979:32). A few examples will suffice to show that the ideal king must maintain both righteousness and justice if he is to attain the ideal:

> Proverbs 16:12:
> It is an abomination to kings to do evil,
> for the throne is established by righteousness.

> Proverbs 20:28:
> Loyalty and faithfulness preserve the king,
> and his throne is upheld by righteousness.

---

with Solomon.

Proverbs 25:5:
Take away the wicked from the presence of the king,
and his throne will be established in righteousness.

Proverbs 29:14:
If a king judges the poor with equity,
his throne will be established for ever.

The way justice is implemented is also of consequence to the ideal king. In general, justice means care for the underprivileged — the widows, orphans and poor. The king was to maintain the causes and the rights of the weak of the society and take care of the fatherless and the oppressed (Mowinckel 1954:68,94; cf. Psalms 9:13, 10:18, 72:3-4). The fact that the king was not to be exalted above his subjects is shown in the story of the wise woman of Tekoa, whom Joab had sent to David to plead the cause of Absalom (II Samuel 14:1-20; Johnson 1960:206). Similarly, a woman whom Elisha had previously helped was able to approach the king to ask about her land rights (II Kings 8:1-6). The king, it would appear, was to be intimately involved in the affairs and needs of his subjects, regardless of their class or social status (Ringgren 1966:228). And although it may appear as if the king acted as a last court of appeal in this latter case, other examples show that appeal could be made directly to the king (De Vaux 1966:152). As Irwin argues, the right of appeal from even the lowest of the land and the restraints that were placed upon the king's conduct (cf. Deuteronomy 17:18-20) were checks against the abuse of his power: "we may assert that the great achievement of the Hebrew people, practically unparallelled as it was in the ancient world, was the attainment of a limited monarchy" (1977:352-53).

Although kings were supposed to strive for this ideal, in practice matters were sometimes very different. The prophet Jeremiah more than once condemns King Jehoiakim for his failure to uphold the rights of the underprivileged:

> Do you think you are a king
> because you compete in cedar?
> Did not your father eat and drink
> and do justice and righteousness?
> Then it was well with him.
> He judged the cause of the poor and needy;
> then it was well.
> Is not this to know me?
> says the LORD.
> But you have eyes and heart
> only for your dishonest gain,
> for shedding innocent blood,
> and for practising oppression and violence. (22:15-17)

The disastrous consequence of the failure to uphold the rights of the underprivileged, i.e., the failure to uphold justice and righteousness, is stated earlier in Jeremiah (22:3-5):

> Thus says the LORD: Do justice and righteousness, and deliver from the hand of the oppressor him who has been robbed. And do no wrong or violence to the alien, the fatherless, and the widow, nor shed innocent blood in this place. For if you will indeed obey this word, then there shall enter the gates of this house kings who sit on the throne of David, riding in chariots and on horses, they, and their servants, and their people. But if you will not heed these words, I swear by myself, says the LORD, that this house shall become a desolation.

Inextricably bound up with the ideals of justice and righteousness is the king's willingness and ability to carry out the law of Yahweh. The idea that the king must live under the laws of Yahweh is embedded in the concept of the ideal king. The king who followed God's commands ensured the welfare of his people. If the king turned from following the commandments of God, then the people were doomed. The fate of the people was, in effect, in the king's hands. The ideal king, therefore, was one who represented the ideals of justice and righteousness, manifest in the law of Yahweh (Kenik 1976:391-403; cf. Psalm 101). He was a man after "Yahweh's own heart" and one who, by practising the law of God, maintained the covenantal relationship between God and his people (Widengren 1957:16ff.). As Mowinckel summarizes:

> Israel's own interpretation of her ideal of kingship is given by the author of the Deuteronomic history in his view of history; if a king abides by Yahweh's law, the people will prosper; if the king breaks the law and fails Yahweh, the ruin of the people will follow (1954:95).

In another study, Kenik suggests that the ideal king according to the Dtr. history is the king who is "under Torah" (1983:121,194,200). The term "Torah", as used by Kenik, refers to the statutes, ordinances and laws contained in the Pentateuch (cf. her discussion in 1983:84-88, 133-40, 162-69).[52] Kenik argues that it was part of the Dtr. narrative technique to present a king who was under Torah, that is, a king whose interest was in following the laws of God. And although Kenik does, to a certain extent, combine her description of the narrative technique of the Dtr. with a description of the history of the transmission of the text, her study is important inasmuch as it stresses the importance of the relation of Torah to the ideal king, especially with respect to Solomon. She writes:

> The ideal of kingship that is imagined of Solomon links the kingship of Solomon with the kingship that is modelled by Josiah who found the Torah in the Temple and who immediately responded to its contents by following Yahweh obediently. ... Solomon, as leader and as one among the people is charged with "keeping all the words of the law and these statutes, and doing them, that his heart may not be lifted up above his brethren ..." (Deut. 17:19b-20). Thus, the Dtr. king is a king under *Torah*. (1983:206-07).

The idea that the king is to abide by the law of Yahweh is explicitly stated in Deuteronomy 17:14-20. The king was to abide by the law in order to govern his people; to depart from the law would necessarily result in harm, not only for the king but to his kingdom as well (Eaton 1976:141-42). It was therefore crucial for the community that the king study the law of Yahweh.

---

[52] Throughout this thesis, I will also use the term "Torah" to refer to statutes, ordinances, and laws. See an interesting article by Westerholm (1986) who defines "Torah", in the Deuteronomistic literature, as "the substance of the Deuteronomic code, the sum of the covenant responsibilities imposed upon the people of Israel by their Sovereign on Mount Sinai, and accompanied by fearful sanctions" (1986:334).

In the Psalms it is clear that the ideal king must be obedient to Yahweh. By obeying the divine law the king is able to render justice and righteousness to the people. As such, he is the mediator of the divine law (cf. Psalm 72:1ff.). The king is therefore required to keep Yahweh's stipulations (Psalm 132:12) in order to preserve the royal throne and in order to maintain his stature as a good king, as in Psalm 18:21:

> For I have kept the ways of the LORD,
> and have not wickedly departed from my God.
> For all his ordinances were before me,
> and his statutes I did not put away from me.
> I was blameless before him,
> and I kept myself from guilt.
> Therefore the LORD has recompensed me according
> to my righteousness,
> according to the cleanness of my hands in his sight.

Another characteristic of the ideal king was his wisdom. Wisdom, as described in the Wisdom Literature, is the "fear of Yahweh" (Prov. 1:7, 9:10; Ps. 11:10; cf. Job 28:28; Sirach 1:14). According to this teaching, to "fear Yahweh" is to be obedient to him and to depend upon him. As Kalugila writes, "the fear of Yahweh is the total dependence upon Yahweh and absolute obedience to Him, who is the source of *ḥokmà* (1980:103).[53] The wise king, therefore, would be the king who is obedient to Yahweh or who carries out his divine commandments: "obedience to Yahweh's commandments made a king wise" (Kalugila 1980:103).

That wisdom is central to the concept of the ideal king is alluded to by Wisdom herself who exclaims:

> I have counsel and sound wisdom,
> I have insight, I have strength.
> By me kings reign,
> and rulers declare what is just;

[53] Cf. also McKane, who writes, "without this basic reverence for Yahweh, and submission to him, there can be no acquisition of wisdom" (1970:264).

By me princes rule,
and nobles govern the earth (Proverbs 8:14-16).

The importance of wisdom to the throne cannot be overemphasized. As one scholar claims, "she is the power behind the throne" (McKane 1970:348), and another remarks, "wisdom to maintain social order and to administer justice was the essential endowment of the king, whether as the incarnate deity in Egypt, or as viceregent of God in Mesopotamia and Israel" (Scott 1971:72; quoted in Kalugila 1980:126).

David and Solomon are the kings especially endowed with the gift of wisdom. David's wisdom is explicitly mentioned on two occasions, in connection with the story of the wise woman of Tekoa (II Samuel 14:17,20). The woman describes David as a man who is "like the angel of God to discern good and evil" (14:17) or "to know all things that are on earth" (14:20). As such, wisdom constitutes an important part of David's judicial capacity (Kalugila 1980:104-05). Furthermore, in his "last words" to Solomon, David acts as an imparter of wisdom. He reminds Solomon to keep the ways of Yahweh (I Kings 2:1-4; cf. Gray 1970:99), and he thereby indirectly perpetuates the wisdom that graced his throne (Kalugila 1980:105).

Yet not only does wisdom surface in the reign of David, wisdom surfaces during the leadership of Joshua as well. Joshua is said to have possessed the spirit of wisdom (Deut. 34:9), which he received from Moses. Kalugila, following Widengren (1957:12-15), calls this act of conferring wisdom on Joshua "the ideology of the sacred kingship" (1980:124). He argues further that because Joshua possessed the law, it was his duty to study it (Joshua 1:7) and to instruct his people in it (Joshua 8:34f.). Joshua also acts as a mediator between God and the Israelites by making a covenant at Shechem according to the law (Joshua 24:25-

28). In his capacity as possessor of wisdom, of law, and as maker of the covenant, Joshua is described as the "wise leader and as a prototype of the Israelite king" (1980:124).

Unfortunately, however grand the expectations were of an ideal king, no one emerged to match the description of the ideal. It is possible that these thwarted expectations may have given rise to the idea of a future eschatological king, i.e., a Messiah, who would fulfill the requirements of the ideal king at a future time.[54] Although the concept of an ideal eschatological king does not have a direct bearing on my thesis insofar as I intend to argue that Solomon is *expected* to be the ideal king (i.e., I Kings 3-8), a description of the ideal eschatological king will be helpful when it becomes apparent that Solomon is *not* the ideal king (i.e., I Kings 9-11). Solomon's failure to live up to the ideal of kingship shows the inevitable relegation of the ideal to some future age.

I have already discussed how important justice, law and wisdom were to the description of the ideal king found in the Dtr. and Wisdom literature. As might be expected, there is nothing radically dissimilar about the description of the ideal king of the future as contained in the prophetic material. The future ideal king is one who is noted for his ability to usher in the new age as an age of justice, righteousness, law, and wisdom. In an oracle against Moab, the prophet

---

[54] For a discussion of the use of the term "Messiah" in the Hebrew Bible see Mowinckel *He that Cometh* (1954) and Ringgren *The Messiah in the Old Testament* (1956). According to Mowinckel (1954:96-124), the failure of a king, or of kingship in general, to live up to its expected ideals, meant that the kingly ideal had to be postponed to some future time. The "Messiah" then, according to Mowinckel, is the "crystallization of the kingly ideal" (1954:99), whose intervention in man's affairs was expected sometime in the near future. As Mowinckel summarizes, "'Messiah' is the ideal king entirely transferred to the future, no longer identified with the specific historical king, but with one who, one day, will come" (1954:123). Although much of Mowinckel's discussion concerning the ideal king pertains to the ancient near eastern conception of an ideal king, his discussion is appropriate inasmuch as it clearly establishes a relationship between the ideal king and the "Messiah".

Isaiah writes about a future time when:

> a throne will be established in steadfast love
> and on it will sit in faithfulness
> in the tent of David
> one who judges and seeks justice
> and is swift to do righteousness (16:5; cf. 32:1).

The prophet Jeremiah also envisages the future messianic age as an age of justice. He writes, "Behold, the days are coming, says the LORD, when I will raise up for David a righteous Branch, and he shall reign as king and deal wisely and shall execute justice and righteousness in the land" (21:5; cf. 33:15). Insofar as justice is concerned, therefore, the description of the future ideal king as depicted by Isaiah and Jeremiah would seem to fulfill the requirements of the ideal as described in the Dtr. and Wisdom literature (Whitelam 1979:34-35). Along with the ability of a future ideal king to uphold justice, his wisdom is also emphasized. In Isaiah, for instance, the judicial wisdom of the messianic figure enables him to perform the tasks that were laid upon the Davidic king:

> And the Spirit of the LORD shall rest upon him,
> the spirit of wisdom and understanding,
> the spirit of counsel and might,
> the spirit of knowledge and the fear of the LORD.
> And his delight shall be in the fear of the LORD (11:2-3a).

The association of justice, wisdom, and obedience to the law are features which we have already come across in the Dtr. description of the ideal king. Similarly, the messianic figure described in Isaiah 9:6 also combines the ideals of justice and wisdom:

> For to us a child is born; to us a son is given;
> and the government will be upon his shoulder,
> and his name will be called
> "Wonderful counsellor, Mighty God,
> Everlasting Father, Prince of Peace."
> Of the increase of his government and of peace
> there will be no end,
> upon the throne of David, and over his kingdom,

to establish it, and to uphold it
with justice and with righteousness
from this time forth and for evermore.

The messianic prophecies of Isaiah which depict an ideal eschatological king combine the ideals of justice and wisdom as well as those of law and order. As Noth writes:

> Just as it is said in *Isa.* ix.6 that law and justice will be the basis of the promised kingdom of the future, in *Isa.* xi.1-5 the new David, who is to proceed from the stem of the house of David, is also depicted as one specially endowed with the spirit of God, who, on the basis of this gift, shall pass judgements in a perfect way. ... The promised king is depicted as being endowed with the holy spirit of God, as a result of which he will bring justice, law and order (1967:245).

Similarly, Porteous, in a provocative study entitled "Royal Wisdom" (1955:247-261), cites a number of passages from Proverbs, Isaiah, Jeremiah and Sirach to show that wisdom was part of the royal function. In particular, the messianic prophecies are imbued with the concept that wisdom is to be part of the judicial function of the ideal king (1955:254; cf. Ringgren 1965:231).

Just as the concrete expression of the historical king's judicial function is his care for the underprivileged, so too the ideal expression of the eschatological king's judicial function is his care for the underprivileged. In Isaiah 11, the prophet describes the care for the needy as the specific function of the ideal king (11:3b-5):

He shall not judge by what his eyes see,
or decide by what his ears hear;
but with righteousness he shall judge the poor,
and decide with equity for the meek of the earth;
and he shall smite the earth with the rod of his mouth,
and with the breath of his lips he shall slay the wicked.
Righteousness shall be the girdle of his waist,
and faithfulness the girdle of his loins.

The future ideal eschatological king will be able to care for the underprivileged by relying upon his divine wisdom and, concomitantly, his ability to

follow the divine law of Israel. Indeed, this wise, eschatological king will be able to perform his functions without the need of corroborating testimony on the part of witnesses (Whitelam 1979:36; Kalugila 1980:127). Such a king, who embodies the ideals of justice, wisdom and law, is the ideal king of the future.

The preceding study has shown that the Israelite concept of the ideal king proclaims him both as judge and as administrator of the divine law. In his capacity as judge, the ideal king had to care for the underprivileged and ensure that justice and righteousness were meted out. In his capacity as one who was under the divine law of the Torah, he was to ensure that the people were observant of its statutes and ordinances. In this last instance, the fate of the people was uniquely bound to the fate of the king: if the king obeyed the law, all would be well; if he disobeyed, retribution was sure to follow. Implied in these two aspects of kingship was the notion that a divine wisdom or knowledge enabled the king to execute justice and law in a manner that was consistent with his office. These features, that is, the ideal king as bearer of the divine law, as judge who renders justice over the nation, and as wise man who uses his wisdom to execute both justice and law, were found in the Dtr. texts as well as in Psalms and Proverbs. Finally, the prophetic descriptions of the ideal eschatological king corresponds to the ideals set forth in the Dtr. texts: the messianic king is one who will render justice (especially in his capacity to take care of the underprivileged), who will be obedient to the divine law, and who will possess divine wisdom. Any attempt to describe who or what constitutes the ideal king in biblical literature must take into account these three salient features of his rulership.

The next stage of this argument, therefore, will try to determine how well Solomon matches the ideal portrait as indicated above. This discussion will mainly concern I Kings 3-8, wherein Solomon is presented in a favourable light.

In my structural analysis of I Kings 3-8, I discussed four narrative units: the "Dream Theophany" (3:1-15), Solomon's "Domestic Policy" (3:16-5:14 [RSV 3:16-4:34), Solomon's "Labour Relations" (5:15-33 [RSV 5:1-18]), and Solomon's "Attitude to God" (chs. 6-8). In those four units, Solomon does indeed measure up to the standards of the ideal king, which suggests, in the words of N. Snaith, that "Solomon longed to be the perfect Deuteronomic king" (1954:42).

Solomon as the Ideal King

Dream Theophany (I Kings 3:1-15)

In this episode, Solomon speaks to God for the first time and receives his gift of wisdom from him (3:12). Many scholars are of the opinion that the dream is a divine legitimation of Solomon's kingship, inasmuch as his unexpected succession to the throne was not the result of his own charisma, as in the case of Saul, or based on a divine covenant, as in the case of David.[55] Leaving the question of legitimacy aside, however, a much more pertinent question to pursue for the purpose of this thesis is to ask, as does Kenik in her detailed analysis of I Kings 3:4-

[55] See the discussion in Gray 1970:115; Görg 1975:113; Whitelam 1979:156; Blenkinsopp 1983:96; Long 1984:66; Jones 1984:120. The general consensus is that the dream narrative is political propaganda intended to provide a theological justification of Solomon's reign (see Whitelam 1979:56-57). Further support for the "legitimation theory" is found in extra-biblical evidence, especially Egyptian texts (cf. Herrmann 1953-54:51-62; Gray 1970:121-22; Görg 1975:51-65). A most striking parallel to Solomon's dream revelation is found on the "Sphinx Stele" of Thutmose IV (1421-1413 B.C.E.), which records the Pharaoh's divine revelation in a dream (ANET, p.449). According to Herrmann, this episode belonged to the genre of "royal novel" (*Königsnovelle*), a literary form intended to legitimize royal innovations. After a king received his revelation, he went out to a holy city to offer sacrifices and to communicate his revelation to the people (Herrman 1953:53-54). Although a number of similarities are evident between the two dreams, there is an obvious danger of overworking the parallels. As emphasized throughout this thesis, the literary context in which a given narrative is situated must first be dealt with before evidence on the alleged borrowing or antiquity of the material can be substantiated. For a discussion on the related scholarly material pertaining to parallels between the biblical and Egyptian texts, see Kenik 1983:27-34.

15 (1983), whether God's revelation to Solomon embodies the ideal of kingship.[56] If such is the case, the themes of justice, wisdom and law will not only pervade the dream narrative, but should also be found throughout I Kings 3-8 as well.

The theme of justice is amply demonstrated by the political nature of Solomon's request. His request for "an understanding mind to govern" (3:9, *lēb šōmēa' lišpōṭ*; literally, "a hearing heart to judge") is indicative of his desire to render justice. The depiction of the king as "judge" (*šōpēṭ*) is consonant with the ideal description of the king's duties. As Kenik writes, "when Solomon requests the 'attentive heart' for the task of 'governing', he is naming the duty of the king as it was understood in practice" (1983:135-36). And although the precise meaning of the phrase "hearing heart" is difficult to define,[57] taken in the context of the word "judge", it usually means "the general skills of leadership necessary of the king" (Whitelam 1979:158). Solomon's request, therefore, is a political one which is commensurate with his role as a just king.

The request of a "hearing heart to govern" is further elaborated by Solomon in his desire "to discern between good and evil" (3:9b, *l^ehābîn bên-ṭôb l^erā'*). The phrase "good and evil" has been given a legal interpretation by W.M. Clark (1969:266-278), in the sense that Solomon asks for skill in distinguishing between right and wrong in a judicial sphere (1969:268).[58] The judicial meaning of "good

---

[56] In her thesis, Kenik argues that the Dtr. makes free use of the Egyptian *Königsnovelle* model in setting out a programmatic design for kingship in the dream theophany. Many of her conclusions are sound and subtle ones, and I will make frequent use of her findings throughout this portion of my thesis.

[57] The expression "hearing heart" is attested to in Egyptian wisdom literature in the *Instruction of Vizier Ptah-hotep* (ANET, p. 412-14; cf. Brunner 1954:697-700). In this connection, the phrase is closely allied with the Pharaoh's ability to govern (see discussion in Kenik 1983:132-34; Whitelam 1979:158). A number of other scholars, however, argue that the phrase derives from Israel's heritage, as exemplified in Proverbs 22:17, 23:12, 19 (see Herrmann 1953-54:57a). Nevertheless, whether or not this phrase derives from an Egyptian or Israelite millieu, the expression is always associated with an ability or capacity to govern.

[58] This interpretation is followed by Weinfeld (1972:247) and Mettinger (1976:240-41), but not by Whitelam (1979:159) or Jones (1984:127).

and evil" is also evident in the case of the woman from Tekoa who comes to David in order to settle a family blood feud (II Samuel 14:4-11). The woman thinks that the word of the king will be "like the messenger of God to discern good and evil" (14:17; see Clark 1969:268). Clark also argues that the passage in II Samuel 13:22, where Absalom does not speak with Amnon "from evil unto good", has a similar meaning. According to Clark, the phrase implies that Absalom failed to take legal responsibility to seek amends for the rape of his sister. Again, when Deut. 1:39 refers to "children, who this day have no knowledge of good and evil", the text is referring to minors who are not yet legally responsibility for their actions (i.e., those not over twenty; see Clark 1969:274).

The judicial background of the phrase "good and evil" is taken one step further by Kenik to indicate not only decision-making, but decision-making which is based on Torah:

> [the phrase good and evil] has been appropriated to the description of the king's role specifically to indicate the responsibility of the king for making choices on the basis of Torah. Especially in the practice of judging cases, the king is charged to decide whether the situation is in accord with Torah or whether it violates Torah (1973:137).

According to Kenik then, Solomon's request to discern between good and evil is a request to be able to make judgements which are based on Torah. As previously argued, complying with Torah is a mark of an ideal king; accordingly, Solomon's request in 3:9 indicates his desire to *be* the ideal king.

One final aspect of Solomon's request in 3:9 remains to be examined, that is, his characterization of the people over whom he will govern as "this heavy people" (*'amm^{e}kâ hakkābēd hazzeh*, 3:9b). The idea that Solomon asks to rule over the people whom he calls "*kābēd*" may strike the reader as strange, especially in light of the fact that he has previously described then as a "chosen people"

(*bāḥārtā*), "a great people" (*'am-rāb*), and a people "not able to be counted" (*lō' yimmāneh w'lō' yissāpēr*, 3:8). Nevertheless, this anomaly disappears once it is realized that Moses, the lawgiver, is also associated with the characterization of the people as being "heavy" (*kābēd*). In Exodus 18:18, Moses' father-in-law, Jethro, suggests to Moses that he appoint judges to help him rule over the people:

> You and the people with you will wear yourselves out, for the thing is too heavy (*kābēd*) for you; you are not able to perform it alone.

Here it appears that Moses' difficulty in ruling stems from the great numbers of the people, a situation to which Solomon also alludes. Another example of Moses' difficulty in ruling the people is in Numbers 11:14. Here Moses laments over his inability to appease the people who are constantly complaining about their food in the wilderness (11:1-9). Moses says, "I am not able to carry all this people alone, the burden is too heavy (*kābēd*) for me" (11:14; see discussion in Kenik 1983:129-31). It would seem then, that a parallel is drawn between Moses and Solomon by the common use of the term *kābēd* to refer to the task of rulership over the chosen people.

That Solomon's request in 3:9 is reminiscent of Moses, or at least associates him with Moses, is confirmed in a parallel passage in Deut. 1:9-18.[59] Here, the people "are as the stars of the heaven for multitude" (1:10). There would thus be a need to have wise, understanding and intelligent men (1:13) to assist Moses

---

[59] In his commentary on Exodus (1974:324-25), B.S. Childs argues that Deut. 1:9-18 is a composite of Exodus 18 and Numbers 11. Whether or not it is a composite, all three texts are concerned with the problem of governing the *kābēd*. In Exodus 18, the problem is resolved by having Moses choose trustworthy men to assist him; in Numbers 11, God solves the problem by enabling some of Moses' spirit to be distributed to 70 elders who will assist him in the task of governing; in Deut. 1, the people choose "wise, understanding and experienced men" (1:13) whom Moses appoints to act as judges (1:15).

in the task of governing. In this context, we can see that Solomon's request for wisdom (3:9) in order to govern the people, "who cannot be numbered or counted for multitude" (3:8), has parallels to an earlier episode involving Moses.[60] Both leaders, furthermore, must judge by a standard which originates in God: in Deut. 1:17, Moses reaffirms that "justice is God's" (*hammišpāṭ lē'lōhîm*; cf. Mettinger 1976:244); in I Kings 3:14, God admonishes Solomon to keep the law ("walk in my ways, keeping my statutes and my commandments"). Solomon and Moses, therefore, are both assigned a difficult task of ruling a multitude; they both see the necessity of wisdom and understanding for ruling; and they both must rule in conformity to some standard which is not their own, but divine. The three ideals, justice, wisdom and law, are inextricably bound with Solomon's request in I Kings 3:9, a request which is reminiscent of the characteristics of Moses' leadership.[61]

Solomon's request for "an understanding mind" (or, "hearing heart") underlies his request to be the ideal king. God, in turn, responds not by giving Solomon a "hearing heart", but a "wise and understanding heart" (*lēb ḥākām w^enābôn*, 3:12). Although Solomon's request implies an ability on his part to listen to divine instruction, God would seem to grant Solomon wisdom directly. And although it is true that an ability to listen and gain wisdom are certainly related (cf. Proverbs 13:1, 19:20; and Kenik 1983:141), wisdom (*ḥokmâ*) in this context refers to the ability of "discrimination in judgement, and an open-mindedness to find out the facts of a case" (Gray 1970:126).[62] The term *nābôn*

---

[60] These parallels have also been noted by Weinfeld (1972:246-47), Heaton (1974:21), Kenik (1983:143-45), and Jones (1984:120-21).

[61] Although justice and law are ultimately rooted in God, their administration falls upon the lawgiver (Moses) or king (Solomon). See also Psalm 72:1-2 and Mettinger 1976:244.

[62] The noun *ḥokmâ*, from which the adjective *ḥākām* is derived, occurs 318 times in the Hebrew Bible. To give a detailed analysis of the term in its many usages would go well beyond the scope of the thesis. Useful studies are to be found in the *IDB*, the *IDB Supplement*, and Kalugila

("understanding") also refers to discrimination in judgement (Gray 1970:126) but, more importantly, it describes one who has knowledge and discernment (Kenik 1983:143). God's grant of a "wise and discerning mind" is knowledge that is appropriate to a king, both in the sense of obedience to the divine word and an ability to render justice. It is knowledge that is most appropriate for an ideal king (cf. Porteous 1955:249 and Scott 1955:270).

Another interesting juxtaposition of the terms *ḥākām* and *nābôn* occurs in the Joseph narrative. A brief examination of its use in Genesis 41, where the two words occur in verses 33 and 39, is helpful in understanding the gift that God gave Solomon.[63] In Genesis 41, the text relates that Joseph had been granted a position of considerable political power, that of a vizier, because the Pharaoh had seen that he was "discreet and wise" (*nābôn wᵉḥākām*) As such, Joseph was in charge of the provisions to ensure that they were distributed with equity and justice. Again, the phrase *nābôn wᵉhākām* applies to a person who is in a position of power and who must use that power wisely in order to maintain justice.

A similar use of the the terms "wise and understanding" (*ḥākām wᵉnābôn*) occurs in the passage in Deuteronomy where the people are to choose "wise and understanding men" to act as judges (Deut. 1:13). The association of wisdom, justice, and political power with Torah is obvious since these people must render justice on the basis of God's judgement (Deut. 1:17).

A further instance where the terms "wise and understanding" occur together is in Deuteronomy 4:6. This passage is crucial for an understanding of the con-

---

1980:69-90. In general, *ḥokmâ* denotes superior ability in either handicraft, knowledge, politics or counsel, and it can be given as a gift or acquired by skill or training (Kalugila 1980:90).

[63] The connection between Solomon's "wise and understanding mind" and Joseph's has been pointed out by Kenik (1983:141-43).

cepts of Torah and wisdom:

> Behold I have taught you statutes and ordinances, as the LORD my God commanded me, that you should do them in the land which you are entering to take possession of it. Keep them and do them; for that will be your wisdom and your understanding (*ḥokmàtkem ûbînatkem*) in the sight of the peoples, who, when they hear all these statutes, will say, "Surely this great nation is a wise and understanding (*ḥākām wᵉnābôn*) people".

Here, the people are charged with keeping the statutes and ordinances, which means that they are to be obedient to the Torah. Obedience to the Torah means "wisdom and understanding" for the people, which, in turn, will be acknowledged by people from foreign lands (see Kalugila 1979:83-84). The identification of Torah and wisdom implies that one's wisdom is contingent upon one's ability to follow the law (Weinfeld 1972:256). This nexus of Torah and wisdom is crucial not only for the Solomon story but for presentation of subsequent events in Israel's history as well.

The dream narrative in I Kings 3 makes it clear that Solomon's wisdom is not the result of his diligent study, but a gift from God. Solomon must endeavour to maintain his wisdom by compliance with the law (3:14). Other gifts which Solomon receives from God, including riches, honour and a long life, are also conditional on his obedience to the Torah (Kalugila 1980:115). These latter gifts are consonant with the first gift of wisdom insofar as he who chooses the path of wisdom will be given "long life" and "riches" (Proverbs 3:16; cf. Weinfeld 1972:257). Wisdom, as personified in chapter three of the book of Proverbs, points out that "length of days and years of life" (3:2; cf. 9:11), "favour and good reports" (3:4), as well as "having your barns filled with plenty, and your vats filled with wine" (3:10), are the consequences of following the teachings of wisdom (3:1; cf. Kenik 1983:160). Thus, God's first gift to Solomon (*ḥākām wᵉnābôn*) implies his second, that of "riches, honour and long life" (I Kings 3:13),

according to the teachings of Wisdom in the book of Proverbs. It is, nevertheless, striking that the gifts of riches, honour and long life did not originate from Solomon's request in 3:9, but were the result of a divine favour, which was conditional on obedience to God's "statutes and commandments". Far from implying that the magnificence of Solomon's reign was attributable to his own avarice, the text unambiguously asserts that the splendour is the result of a divine gift which, in itself, presupposes Solomon's obedience to the Torah (cf. Long 1984:66-67).

We have already seen how Torah is intimately connected with justice (insofar as the ruler must rule in conformity with the divine law) and wisdom (insofar as "fear of Yahweh" or a study of the divine law leads to wisdom). Thus, it is not surprising that Torah is at the heart of the dream theophany to Solomon. Solomon's wisdom and judicial perspicacity are contingent upon his obedience to Torah.

That Solomon realizes the necessity of following the Torah is evident in the preamble to his request, where he recalls the actions of his father David (3:5-8). Solomon tells God that David "walked before you in faithfulness, in righteousness, and in uprightness of heart" (3:6a). To "walk before" (**hālak lipnê*) God is apparently to denote some special status that a person has with God. It is used of Abraham (Gen. 24:40) and Jacob (Gen. 48:15-16) to indicate loyal service before God. God himself tells Abraham to "walk before me and be blameless" (Gen. 17:2) to indicate the proper attitude that Abraham should have prior to God's making a covenant with him. David, too, admonishes Solomon to "walk before" God (I Kings 2:4) in order to secure the promise of the Davidic dynasty. To "walk before" means to live according to the law of God in order to secure some future gain (see Kenik 1983:72-81). The obedient servant can anticipate some future blessing or promise on the part of God because of his fidelity to God

(Weinfeld 1972:253).[64]

The word "walk" (*hālak*) occurs a second time in the dream theophany when it describes God's conditional statement to Solomon, after He had given him the gift of wisdom, riches and honour: "and if you will walk in my ways, keeping my statutes and commandments, as your father David walked, then I will lengthen your days" (3:14). Here, as in 3:6, to walk in Yahweh's ways denotes obedience on the part of the "walker" in return for some future gain. Furthermore, to keep God's statutes and ordinances, is to "walk in the way" of God.[65] In this passage, God admonishes Solomon to be obedient to the Torah in order that his days may be lengthened. As previously noted, the Wisdom Literature often claims that a long life is the reward for listening to wisdom (Proverbs 3:2; 4:20, 22; cf. Kenik 1983:163), and, as well, "the promise is given as a reward on the condition that the king keeps Torah" (Kenik 1983:166). The admonition to keep the Torah in order to secure some future reward (be it wisdom or justice, or riches or honour), is contained in both Solomon's request (3:9) and God's response (3:12-14). God's condition to Solomon, therefore, applies to all that Solomon does, by virtue of the fact that it comes at the end of the dream. Solomon must walk in the ways of God in order to ensure the perpetuation of his judicial wisdom and the magnificence of his kingship; in short, the ideal king is to be obedient to Torah.

The necessity of the king to be subservient to Torah confirms the suspicion that Solomon is the ideal king. The dream theophany admirably sets out those

[64] The only other instances of the phrase "walk before" in the Dtr. history occur in I Kings 8:23,25, 9:4 and II Kings 20:3 (Kenik 1983:76 n.47). All cases of "walk before" (four referring to Solomon and one to Hezekiah) concern obedience to the divine will and loyalty to Yahweh (Kenik 1983::79-80). Weinfeld has even discerned an Assyrian background to the phrase "walk before" (i.e., in Akkadian, "*ina pani alaku/attaluku*", 1972:77 n.4) whereas Kenik has detected a Hittite background to the phrase (i.e, in Hittite, *A-NA PA-NI DINGIRMES*, 1983:75). Regardless of its origin, both Kenik and Weinfeld agree that the phrase does indicate "loyalty" or "loyal service".

[65] See the discussion and numerous citations of the synonyms in Kenik 1983:167.

three requirements of the ideal king, justice, wisdom, and obedience to the law, with the stipulation that, in order to assure his judicial wisdom, the king must be obedient to Torah. It may indeed be true that the dream theophany in I Kings 3:4-15a sets out a programmatic design for the Dtr. ideal king, as Kenik argues, but the extent to which Solomon matches that ideal is not pursued in her study. It is significant, however, that the three ideals of justice, wisdom and law are amply attested in the dream narrative. It will now be my purpose to show how Solomon measures up to the ideal as set forth in the dream theophany.

Domestic Policy (3:16-5:14 [RSV 3:16-4:34])

The episode in which Solomon is called upon to arbitrate between the two harlots (3:16-28) is the one most often cited by scholars who want to show a practical instance of Solomon's judicial capacity (see Gray 1970:127). The story revolves around two harlots who each claim to have given birth to the same child. The story itself has widespread parallels and has often been classified in the genre of "folk-tale".[66] Nevertheless, the literary context in which the story is situated will be more important for my purposes than the determination of the source of the story or its historical context.

The notion that justice is central to the Israelite ideal of kingship is vividly demonstrated in the case of the two harlots. The episode concludes with a statement which ties together both Solomon's justice and his wisdom:

> And all Israel heard of the judgement (*hammišpāṭ*) which the king had rendered (literally, "judged" [*šāpāṭ*]); and they stood in awe of the king,

[66] Gressmann (1907:211-228) has listed twenty-two instances of the use of a similar story and Montgomery (1950:108-09) adds a number of others. So many widespread parallels make determining the source of the borrowing and the dating of the story virtually impossible. Most scholars, however, tend to argue that, in spite of its folk tradition, the judicial language used in the story betrays a particular Israelite stamp (Whitelam 1979:162).

> because they perceived that the wisdom (*ḥokmâ*) of God was in him to do justice (*mišpāṭ*) (3:28).

The king is shown here as the judge *par excellence*. Indeed, some scholars have even argued that Solomon's judicial discernment in this particular case is infallible.[67]

Solomon's judgement, in this case, has opened up an interesting historical argument about whether the king has appropriated power that had hitherto belonged to the priesthood. This is the argument presented by Noth, who also points out that the king could now solve a difficult legal case by virtue of his wisdom rather than rely on the old sacral procedure of lot-casting (1955:230-37). Previously, priests had used the Urim and Thummim to decide difficult cases (I Samuel 14:41), but, significantly, the use of Urim and Thummim seems to have ended with David (Mettinger 1974:243; Whitelam 1979:163). Thus, the monarchy was now involved in the sacro-judicial sphere, which had previously belonged to the priesthood. As Whitelam writes:

> I Kgs iii 16-28 appears to testify to the culmination of a protracted process whereby the king eventually replaced the jurisdiction of the priests and their oracular devices by monarchical judicial authority. This development is entirely consistent with and corollary to the ideological advance ... whereby the judicial functions of the king were elevated above the conception of the warrior-king (1979:163).

Whether, from an historical viewpoint, this trend represents the secularization of the legal process (so Noth 1955:230-37) or whether it is an encroachment of the monarchy into the sacral realm (Whitelam *loc. cit.*), the literary context indicates

---

[67] This is point made by Mettinger (1976:243ff.; cf. Whitelam 1979:163) who argues that "the king's legal decision has the same quality of inerrancy as is attached to oracular consultations and prophetic utterances" (1974:244). On the same page, however, Mettinger somewhat contradictorily admits that "the administration of justice belongs to God. But on earth, the king has the role of a mediator. In his judicial task the king is the vice regent of God." Whitelam has also noted that the infallibility of the king is parallelled in Egyptian sources (1979:163-64), but he also points out that unlike the king in Israel, the Pharaoh in Egypt was considered to be divine.

that the people agree to Solomon's arbitration (i.e., "they stood in awe of") because they surmised that "the wisdom of God was in him to render justice" (3:28). The episode unambiguously asserts that Solomon is the judge *par excellence*, asserting his credentials as the ideal king.

The depiction of an approachable king, and a king as defender of the rights of the underprivileged, were also characteristic judicial features of the ideal king. Even harlots can approach the king to ask for justice. Similarly, the king's defense of the weaker members of the society is also evident (Kalugila 1980:116). Whether or not this story reflects actual historical circumstances is beside the point: the text depicts a king who is not beyond the approach of even the lowest of citizens and, in fact, he goes out of his way to defend their rights.

Solomon's judicial acumen is also emphasized in the episode concerning his administrative system (4:1-5:14 [RSV 4:1-34]). His list of senior officials (4:1-6) is reminiscent of the list of David's officers of state in II Samuel 8:15-18 (Montgomery 1950:112; Gray 1970:130; Jones 1984:184). The description of David's list was preceded by the words, "and David reigned over all Israel; and David administered justice and equity to all the people" (8:15), whereas Solomon's list is only introduced by the words, "King Solomon reigned over Israel" (4:1). De Vaux argues, however, that since the story of Solomon's famous judgement in the case of the harlots immediately precedes the list of senior officials, the implication is that justice is an integral part of Solomon's administration (1965:151-52). And although this argument may appear forced, the justice of Solomon's administrative system will be confirmed in other passages.

There are some scholars, however, who would argue that Solomon's bureaucratic system belies his attempt to maintain justice. G.E. Wright (1967:58-68) claims that the twelve administrative districts (4:7-19) were an attempt to

eliminate the twelve traditional tribal boundaries in order to establish new districts of equal economic worth.[68] A more conservative hypothesis is found in Alt (1953:76-89), who argues that Solomon's list shows a reverence for the old tribal system. Similarly, Gray (1970:134-40), for the most part, follows the divisions of territory as set forth by Alt. Yet the scholarly debate over the relationship between the administrative districts and the tribal boundaries may overlook a much more central point in the description of Solomon's territory. The text relates that the territory over which Solomon ruled extends "from the Euphrates to the land of the Philistines, and to the border of Egypt" (5:1 [RSV 4:21]). This description matches the ideal of Israel's dominion as given to Abraham (Genesis 15:18) and reiterated by Moses (Deut. 1:7) and Joshua (Joshua 1:4).[69] The extent of Solomon's territory is repeated again in 5:4 (RSV 4:24) as if to emphasize that the promise to Abraham has been fulfilled during the reign of Solomon. The extent of the territory, coupled with the fact that "there was peace on all sides round about [Solomon]"[70] is another indication of Solomon's portrayal as the ideal king. The ideal king, it will be recalled from the messianic passages described in the preceding section, is he who will usher in peace (cf. Isaiah 9:6; 11:6-8). The ideal extent of Solomon's dominion, the peace which characterizes it, and the Israelites' "happiness" (4:20) during the administration of Solomon,

[68] Cf. also Mettinger (1971:111-27), who makes the additional point that "the list is the expression of a Solomonic policy, of repressive character, directed against the house of Joseph which was the political kernel of the northern tribes, and that these measures were taken by Solomon in order to counteract the dualistic nature of the state" (1971:119).

[69] See especially the summary in Jones 1984:146. There are some syntactical difficulties with the Hebrew inasmuch as the phrase "to the land of the Philistines" is believed to be a gloss in order to explain where the border of Egypt was (Montgomery 1950:127; Gray 1970:141 n.b). Whichever reading is preferred, the extent of Solomon's territory is unmistakable.

[70] Scholars are quick to point out that this information contradicts that given in 11:25. Rather than solving this contradiction by attributing the work to various Dtr. redactors (Gray 1970:280-81; Noth 1968:75-76, 245), however, the literary schema advanced in this thesis proposes that the contradiction is deliberate in order to contrast two sides of Solomon's kingship.

are all hallmarks of Solomon's ideal kingship.

The wisdom that Solomon displays in his conduct of domestic affairs bolsters his image as the ideal king. Just as the story of the two harlots attests to Solomon's judicial power, it also exemplifies his wisdom. The gift of wisdom in 3:12, it will be recalled, is described only as incomparable; no specific function is assigned to it. The implication, then, is that although Solomon initially seeks wisdom in order to "judge" (3:9), the gift itself is more open-ended. In 3:28, however, the king's use of wisdom is consistent with his initial request: in 3:9 Solomon had asked for "a hearing heart to judge" (*lēb šōmēaʿ lišpōṭ*) and in 3:28 the people saw that "the wisdom of God was in [Solomon], to render justice" (*ḥokmàt ʾĕlohim bᵉqirbô laʿᵃśōt mišpāṭ*). Although the rendering of justice is not the only use to which wisdom can be put (as will be evident in I Kings 9-11), Solomon's judicial wisdom is a characteristic of an ideal king. Solomon's judicial wisdom marks him not only as the "just king *par excellence*" (Whitelam 1979:66), but also as the wise king *par excellence* (Long 1984:69). Indeed, the three characteristics of ideal kingship, justice, wisdom and law, are vividly presented in the story of the two harlots. As Kalugila writes, "Solomon's judgement is meant to show his divine *ḥokmà* as a true *šofeṭ*, and imparter of the *torah*" (Kalugila 1980:116). These three concepts are almost inseparable. Solomon is given the gift of wisdom, which manifests itself in rendering justice. Nevertheless, the gift of wisdom must be subsumed under the Torah in order to be effective. As Kenik writes:

> The critical issue in the dream, however, is that the wisdom and intelligence [from God] are transformed by Torah. The abilities displayed by Solomon to render justice, to negotiate peace, to provide for the welfare of the people in the realm are not simply indications of human capability or having successfully benefited from the learned experience of the past; these abilities and successes are effectual on the basis of having complied with Torah (1983:203).

Just as Solomon's judicial perspicacity is contingent upon his obedience to Torah, so his sagacity is likewise efficacious only when it is yoked to Torah. When his wisdom is no longer under Torah, however (as in chapters 9-11), it loses its effectiveness, even though he still may be considered "wise" (cf. 10:7, 23) in some sense.

A more historical approach to the problem of the relation between wisdom and Torah in the Solomonic material has been advanced by Moshe Weinfeld. According to Weinfeld, in the earliest stages of the literary activity of the Dtr. school (i.e., the period of Hezekiah in the eighth century; see 1972:161), wisdom and law were two separate disciplines. Wisdom was secular whereas law was sacred (1972:255). The two disciplines, however, were brought together in the seventh century in the book of Deuteronomy. The law was now to be identified with wisdom (Deut. 4:6). Weinfeld argues that the account of Solomon's wisdom was originally secular in nature, and depicted him as a man of "prodigious knowledge" (5:9-14) and "natural shrewdness" (3:16-27). The scribes of the seventh century, however, began to conceive of Solomon's wisdom in a legal or judicial sense. The story concerning his cunning (3:16-27) was placed against a wider literary backdrop to emphasize his "judicial intellect", and the story concerning his knowledge (5:9-14) was taken to be the reward for his obedience to Torah (1972:256-57).

Without entering into the debate with Weinfeld on an historical level (i.e, regarding matters such as the dating of the literary activity of the authors), I do agree with Weinfeld inasmuch as the concepts of Law and Wisdom are brought together in the *narrative* concerning the kingship of Solomon, regardless of who wrote it and for what purpose. The nexus of law and wisdom contributes to the picture of Solomon as the ideal king. I will later demonstrate that the sundering

of law and wisdom contributes to the picture of Solomon as the apostate king.

The wisdom of the ideal king is further described in 5:9-14 (RSV 4:29-34).[71] Solomon's great knowledge is "entirely human-oriented" (Alt 1976:103) inasmuch as it appears to be of "a liberal, humanistic character" (Gray 1970:146), intended to edify others. It is not wisdom in the service of Solomon himself, or his own self-aggrandizement.

The text also reaffirms that Solomon's wisdom is a gift from God (5:9 [RSV 4:29]) and, as such, fulfills the promise of 3:14. Significantly, the phrase "wisdom and understanding" (*ḥokmâ ûtᵉbûnâ*) is used in 5:9, thereby further indicating that the promise of a "wise and understanding mind" (*lēb ḥākām wᵉnābôn*) has been confirmed. Solomon's fame and honour, which were also promised in the dream (3:13), are similarly attested in this passage. Solomon's wisdom exceeds that of the people of the East (5:10 [RSV 4:30]) and his fame has spread to "all nations round about" (5:11 [RSV 4:31]). The mention of other nations in 5:10-11 anticipates and accounts for Hiram's praise of Solomon in 5:21. Finally, since Solomon's success was contingent upon his obedience to Torah (3:14), the manifestations of success in 5:9-14 (RSV 4:29-34) imply that he has indeed been obedient.

Other instances of Solomon's obedience to Torah in his domestic policy are by implication. The text mentions that "the people of Judah and Israel were as

---

[71] The question of the historical reliability of 5:9-14 has been challenged in recent years. Scott (1955:263 n.3) gives a list of scholars who disclaim its authenticity and Scott himself argues that the material is post-deuteronomic (1955:266), that is, after the tradition concerning Solomon as the sage *par excellence* was firmly established. On the other hand, Alt (1976:102-110) stresses the authenticity of the material, basing his argument on the well attested "nature — wisdom *gattung*" (onomastica) in Egyptian and Babylonian texts, which are earlier than when Solomon is believed to have reigned. My purpose, nevertheless, is to determine the literary rather than the historical context of the material.

many as the sand by the sea; they ate and drank and were happy" (4:20). In a similar passage in Genesis, God tells Abraham that a sign of the blessing will be when his descendants are as numerous as "the sand which is on the seashore" (22:17). Jacob uses the same metaphor to remind God to fulfill His part of the covenant saying, "But you did say, 'I will do you good, and make your descendants as the sand of the sea, which cannot be numbered for multitude'" (32:13). While the metaphor of "sand" to indicate large numbers of people is used on other occasions as well (Joshua 7:12, 11:4; I Samuel 13:12; II Samuel 17:11; Isaiah 10:22, 48:19; Jeremiah 33:22; Hosea 2:1 [RSV 1:10]), the central thrust of the message is that a great multitude is the sign of the covenant blessing (cf. Joshua 11:14). The text of I Kings 4:20 thus indicates that the Solomonic kingdom is especially blessed. The designation of the great numbers of people (*ʿam rāb*) in the narrative description of kingdom of Solomon (3:8a; 4:20; 5:21 [RSV 5:7]) is unparallelled in the Dtr. history (Kenik 1983:94). It would thus seem that the great population of Solomon's kingdom represents a fulfillment of the promise to Abraham. As Kenik writes:

> When the Dtr. describes the people as too numerous to be counted, his intention is obviously to pinpoint the people of Solomon's kingdom as the descendants that had been promised to Abraham. The nation under the rulership of Solomon is thus related in the scheme of promise—fulfillment to the great nation that had been promised to Abraham (1983:96).

It appears that Solomon is heir to the promise given to Abraham by virtue of his just rule, his wisdom, and his obedience to Torah. Further instances of Solomon's justice and wisdom, as well as his obedience to Torah may be observed in the next narrative unit, which concerns Solomon's "Labour Relations".

Labour Relations (5:15-32 [RSV 5:1-18])

The section on Solomon's "Labour Relations" is a prelude to the marvelous description of the Temple in chapters 6-8: it deals with the labour used in the Temple (5:27-32 [RSV 5:13-18]) and the means of acquiring it (5:15-26 [RSV 5:1-12]).

An example of Solomon's justice is found in his contract with Hiram (5:15-26 [RSV 5:1-12]). By virtue of the peace that surrounds him, Solomon prepares to build the Temple, but first he needs to acquire the skilled labour to do so (5:20 [RSV 5:6]). Solomon thus makes a contract with Hiram (*kārat b^{e}rit*, 5:26 [RSV 5:12]), whereby Solomon sends wheat and oil to Hiram in exchange for the building material for the Temple. The justice of the contract may be inferred from the peace (*šālōm*, 5:26 [RSV 5:12]) that ensues. As Kalugila remarks:

> This *šālōm* does not mean simply the absence of war, but indicates friendship, treaty and cooperation between Solomon and Hiram and, consequently, between their kingdoms (1980:120).

Similarly, Mettinger (1976:227) sees the contract as a kind of "parity treaty", whereby both parties are considered equal in the contract. Solomon thus deals fairly and justly with his neighbours. Although the scope of Solomon's activity expands beyond the borders of Israel, he acts in a way that is consonant with his role as the ideal king.[72] The peace and good fortune that characterized Solomon's kingdom are confirmed by Hiram (5:18 [RSV 5:4]), which again implies that God has blessed Solomon and his kingdom.

A second instance of Solomon's justice concerns the corvée, which provides

---

[72] Solomon, in this instance, uses his influence to bring peace and wisdom to the world (cf. the promise to Abraham [Genesis 12:1-3] and the eschatological prophecies in Isaiah 9 and 11). When the direction of influence is reversed (i.e., through foreign entanglements and borrowing), trouble ensues.

the labour for the Temple construction. There are a number of textual problems associated with this passage (see Montgomery 1950:137-38), not the least of which is its lack of agreement with 9:20-22.[73] Regardless of the numbers and the nationality of the people involved in the corvée, a period of rest is taken into consideration in the assignment of the work. In fact, the labourers rest more than they work as they are "a month in Lebanon [doing the work] and two months at home" (5:28 [RSV 5:14]). Solomon's ability to initiate building projects without resorting to slave labour stands in contrast to the slave labour required for the building projects described in 9:20-22. This institution of slavery recalls the life of the Israelites in Egypt, a situation to which the Dtr. is decidedly hostile (Deut. 5:15; 15:15; 16:12; 24:18,22; see p.138 below). The justice of Solomon's rule in 5:15-32 is therefore evident by virtue of the fact that he did not use an Egyptian model as the basis for his corvée.

Solomon's role as a wise king is confirmed by Hiram's assessment of him: "Blessed be the LORD this day, who has given to David a wise (*ḥākām*) son to be over this great people" (5:21 [RSV 5:7]). In this speech, Solomon's role as the ideal king is explicit: he is the leader of a "great people" (*ʿam rāb*, fulfilling the promise to the patriarchs) and he is a "wise" person (*ḥākām*, fulfilling God's promise of 3:12). Hiram thus reaffirms that Solomon is the ideal king. There is additional confirmation of Solomon's wisdom in 5:26 [RSV 5:12]), explicitly linked

---

[73] The text at 5:27 (RSV 5:13) says that the corvée was "throughout all Israel" yet, in 9:20-22, only non-Israelites are said to be conscripted. These discrepancies can be resolved if it is understood that two different types of forced labour are being referred to. The corvée (*mas*) of 5:27 (RSV 5:13) is a temporary conscription which does not involve slavery (Gray 1970:155); the corvée (*mas ʿōbēd*) of 9:21, however, does involve slavery of some kind and it was applied to the non-Israelites (Gray 1970:155; Jones 1984:158). There is also a problem in regard to the disproportionately large numbers of conscripts as given in chapter five, and the more "realistic" account as given in chapter nine (Montgomery 1950:137). For the literary significance of the disparity, see above p. 76-77.

to his treaty of peace with Hiram. As Montgomery writes, "it is wisdom of a political character ... the wisdom with which Solomon was endowed 'to judge this thy great people' included diplomacy and the erection of splendid buildings" (1950:134). Again, this is another instance of Solomon using his wisdom (in both its judicial and political senses) for the benefit of the people (cf. Kalugila 1980:119). Solomon's divinely bestowed wisdom, at this stage, is shown in an entirely positive light. This will be in sharp contrast to the description of the use of his wisdom in the second part of the narrative.

Solomon's labour policies are directly related to his devotion to the will of God. Because God had given Solomon rest from his adversaries (cf. 5:5 [RSV 4:25] and 11:25), Solomon takes the initiative to build the Temple "for the name of Yahweh my God" (5:20 [RSV 5:5]). Solomon would thus be seen as fulfilling Nathan's prophecy to David (cf. II Samuel 7:4ff.). Indeed, Solomon's actions are in accord with Nathan's prophecy, and thus a fulfillment of the divine promise.

Attitude to God (6:1-8:66)

The fourth narrative unit, which describes the building of the Temple, its elaborate furnishings, and Solomon's dedicatory prayer, represents the height or climax of Solomon's role as the ideal king. The text glorifies both Solomon and God (Long 1984:84). And although the reader can expect to see instances of Solomon's justice and wisdom, the idea of the king acting in accord with Torah is predominant.

The building of the Temple is regarded as one of the high points in Israelite history "because it is highlighted both by the sheer impressiveness of the development and by the united nature of all tribes at that time" (Carmichael 1985:29). As such it is the fulfillment of the scheme as laid out in Deut. 12:2-7, whereby

the high places would be eliminated, and sacrifices and offerings would take place at one central location. As Carmichael remarks, "the Jerusalem sanctuary should therefore be regarded as the norm for religious orientation" (1985:29).

That the building of the Temple is central to Israelite history is indicated by the use of the number "480" to demarcate the length of time from the Exodus to the laying of the foundations of the Temple (I Kings 6:1). The use of the number "480" is considered by most scholars to be more theological than historical. It is a conventional figure arrived at by the multiplication of the number of years for a generation (i.e., "40"; cf. Deut. 1:3 and references in Judges 3:11, 5:31, 8:28) by the number of the tribes in Israel, one for each generation (see Gray 1970:159; Jones 1984:163). Moreover, "480" is the halfway point between the Exodus and the laying of the foundation stones of the second Temple.[74]

Solomon's wisdom and justice are inextricably bound to his building projects. It was observed above that one of the traits that distinguished him as a wise king was his ability to erect magnificent buildings (Montgomery 1950:134).[75] It is also interesting to observe the way in which the structures were built:

> When the house was built, it was with stone prepared at the quarry; so that neither hammer nor axe nor any tool of iron was heard in the temple, while it was being built (6:7).

The building of the Temple without metal tools reflects the Torah's prohibition against the use of an iron tool in constructing an altar (Exodus 20:28; Deut. 27:5).

---

[74] See Gray 1970:159 and Burney 1970:59-61. Martin Noth makes great use of the fictional figure 480 to suggest that a Dtr. composed a unified chronology to lend coherence to his material (1981:18-25). The building of the Temple was so significant for the Dtr. that he reckoned all other dates in relation to it (1981:19).

[75] Montgomery also cites extra-biblical evidence to argue that, in certain circumstances, one's wisdom was attributable to one's building skills. More pertinent, however, is the example of the incident concerning Hiram the craftsman, who is considered to be "full of wisdom, understanding, and skill" (7:14) by virtue of his ability to work in bronze (cf. Isaiah 11:2 where similar words are used to describe the Messiah).

And, whatever the historical circumstances surrounding this prohibition (see Gray 1970:165 and Jones 1984:165-66), the text stresses that the building of the Temple is conducted in accordance with the Torah. Thus Solomon is depicted once again as the ideal king who upholds Torah, no matter how impractical it may be to do so.

Another notable feature of Solomon's building projects was the erection of a Hall of Justice, "where he was to pronounce judgement" (7:7). The administration of justice is integral to the conception of the ideal king (Whitelam *passim*; Gray 1970:199; Jones 1984:179), and the text emphasizes that Solomon's Temple had a distinct and separate area for the dispensing of justice. The theme of justice also forms part of Solomon's dedicatory prayer (see 8:31-53). The prayer emphasizes that justice ultimately belongs to God (8:32), and that mercy and forgiveness should also play a part in God's justice. Although I will deal more fully with the prayer and its relation to Torah below, Solomon's enlightened version of justice should not go unnoticed. The building of the Temple, therefore, emphasizes Solomon's justice and his wisdom and, above all, shows him to be obedient to the Torah.

The high point of Solomon's obedience to Torah occurs in chapter eight. In my description of narrative structure, I divided this chapter into three sections to indicate Solomon's attitude to the tradition: first as its preserver (8:1-11); second, in his prayer to God (8:12-61); third, in his sacrifice to God (8:62-66). All three sections will show that Solomon's actions are in such accord with the Torah as to demonstrate that he is here presented as the ideal king.

It goes without saying that the great achievement of Solomon was the construction of the Temple and the transfer of the ark to the Temple (8:1-11). It is crucial, therefore, to keep in mind that the Temple was built to house the ark

(De Vaux 1965:320; Gray 1970:163). Throughout Israel's history, the ark was an important symbol for the divine presence (De Vaux 1965:297-302). As well as accompanying the Israelites in their exodus from Egypt (Numbers 10:35-36), the ark served both an important military (I Samuel 4:3) and religious (II Samuel 6) purpose. Thus, by bringing the ark into the "most holy place" (I Kings 8:6), Solomon would, in a sense, bring the divine presence into the Temple (cf. I Kings 8:10-12). And although it may be true, as Kenik argues, that "the ark has been transformed by the Dtr. from being the throne for the God of Israel to being a receptacle for the Torah" (1983:194), the text also indicates that the installation of the ark into the Temple allows the glory of God to fill the Temple (8:10-11; cf. Jones 1984:196; Long 1984:97).

The ark is explicitly said to contain the Law of Moses:

> There was nothing in the ark except the two tablets of stone which Moses put there in Horeb, where the LORD made a covenant with the people of Israel, when they came out of the land of Egypt (8:9).

The text here clearly identifies Solomon with the Torah. The ark has now been installed in the innermost sanctuary of the Temple, so that the ark and the law become the heart of Solomon's kingship. Thus, Torah is manifested in Solomon's kingdom both through Solomon's piety and by the physical presence of the tablets of Moses in the Temple.

Solomon's prayer (8:12-61) is yet another example of his adherence to Torah. Scholars have long recognized that the subjects and divisions of the prayer recall the lists of curses found in Deut. 28:15-68 (Burney 1970:112). Similarly, the review of the past and the prediction of the future, which had marked two other important speeches in the Dtr. history (Moses [Deut. 1:29-31] and Joshua [Joshua 24:1-25]), give Solomon's speech a "Deuteronomistic stamp" (Gray 1970:213).

Furthermore, Weinfeld's detailed analysis of Dtr. phraseology in the prayer of Solomon (1972:35-39) also indicates that the speech may be of Dtr. origin. Rather than trying to untangle the different layers of Dtr. redactions in this passage, however,[76] I will investigate the literary significance of the prayer for the presentation of Solomon as the ideal king. By echoing phrases and using the language of the tradition, be it Dtr. or otherwise, Solomon emphasizes the obligations that are upon himself to obey the Torah.

Much of the language used in the prayer recalls the dream theophany of Solomon in 3:1-15, and so lends further support to the structural divisions of the narrative advanced in chapter three of this thesis. Solomon reminds God of His covenant obligations to establish an everlasting dynasty inasmuch as Solomon has built a Temple in which to house the ark (cf. I Kings 3:6). Solomon prays:

> Now the LORD has fulfilled his promise which he has made, for I have risen in the place of David my father, and sit upon the throne of Israel, as the LORD promised, and I have built the house for the name of the LORD, the God of Israel. And I have provided a place for the ark, in which is the covenant of the LORD which he made with our fathers, when he brought them out of Egypt (8:20-21).

Solomon argues that because he has fulfilled Nathan's prophecy (II Samuel 7), he has complied with the divine plan. Solomon explicitly says that he has followed the divine will, that is, Torah, in his building of the Temple. He argues that since God shows "steadfast love to his *servants* who walk before [him] with all their heart" (8:23; i.e., those who follow Torah), God should uphold his promise of an everlasting dynasty, because Solomon has indeed followed Torah. Solomon

---

[76] The literary history of Solomon's prayer has been the focus of attention for most biblical scholars, especially in light of the fact that 8:41-53 seems so "obviously" post-exilic (see Burney 1970:113-129; Montgomery 1950:192-95; Gray 1970:213-14; Dietrich 1972:74; Jones 1984:197-98). Noth argues that the entire speech may be the work of the Dtr. (1981:5-6), occurring as it does during a pivotal time in Israel's history.

has identified himself with David, as a servant who walks before Yahweh (cf. 3:6) and he can expect that the promise of a son to inherit the throne will apply to himself as well (cf. Kenik 1983:77):

> Now, therefore, O LORD, God of Israel, keep with thy servant David my father what thou hast promised him, saying, "There shall never fail you a man before me to sit upon the throne of Israel, if only your sons take heed to their way before me as you have walked before me." Now, therefore, O God of Israel, let thy word be confirmed, which thou hast spoken to your servant David my father (8:25-26).

A more subtle instance of Solomon's obedience to the Torah occurs in the petition proper (8:31-51). Long (1984:103) has noticed that the formula "xx: if there is Y with regard to xx" (i.e., verse 31 literally reads: "a famine: if there be in the land a pestilence ...") is indicative of the formulaic language used in Leviticus (cf. Lev. 13:2,18,24,29,38,47). By casting the petition in language which is similar to Leviticus, Solomon's position as disseminator of the Torah is enhanced. The text would thus align Solomon with the Mosaic tradition in an effort to depict Solomon as the "new Moses", or at least as a leader who is intimately aware of the importance of Torah.

A number of Torah elements are also discernible in Solomon's closing benediction (8:54-61). The kingship of Solomon is portrayed as the fulfillment of God's words to Moses, promising rest to the people (8:56; cf. Deut. 12:9-10). Similarly, the kingship of Solomon is the time when all people obey the Torah (8:57,61; cf. Deut. 10:13; 11:22-23). And although the words are those of Solomon and not the narrator's, Solomon's perception of himself as obedient to Torah and as the one through whom the prophecies of Moses are fulfilled, is consistent with the point of view of the narrator.

One final instance of the association between Solomon's actions and the Torah occurs during the dedicatory sacrifice (8:62-66). The text records that

Solomon held a great sacrifice and a feast on the occasion of the dedication of the Temple. This action recalls Deuteronomy 12:7,12,18, which enjoin the worshipper to rejoice in the cultic life (cf. Carmichael 1985:30). The dedication of the house is also in line with Torah (cf. Deut. 20:5), as is the feast itself, presumably the feast of Tabernacles (cf. Deut. 16:13-15; Long 1984:107). The statement that "all Israel" (8:65) joins Solomon in his feast indicates that, for at least one brief moment in Israel's history, the entire nation is united under its ideal king. And by acting in accord with the Torah, it is reaping rewards:

> and [all Israel] went to their homes joyful and glad of heart for all the goodness that the LORD had shown to David his servant and to Israel his people (8:66).

We have here a picture of "Solomon the righteous king standing at the apex of his royal and priestly powers on behalf of the people" (Long 1984:104). There remains, however, one passage in "Solomon's Attitude to God" that has not been analysed, that is, God's oracle to Solomon (6:11-13). The oracle seems to stand outside the unit itself,[77] yet its position in the fourth episode of the pro-Solomonic portion of the narrative is crucial for the unfolding of subsequent events. The literary setting of the oracle is during the description of the building of the Temple (6:12) and, as such, it effectively foreshadows its completion (cf. Kenik 1983:113 n.149). The oracle is divided into two parts. God first tells Solomon that if he obeys the Torah, God's promise of the completion of the Temple and the establishment of the Davidic dynasty will be fulfilled. As Gray writes, "the stability of the dynasty and the completion of the Temple are conditional on the obedience to God" (Gray 1970:167). Reading ahead, the fact that the Temple was built indicates that Solomon, at least up until the time of the

[77] Most scholars attribute this passage to either the work of the Dtr. redactor (Gray 1970:158), a priestly redactor (Burney 1970:68), or a nomistic redactor (Dietrich 1972:71).

completion of the Temple (i.e., 8:66), had been obedient to Torah.

The second part of the oracle states that God will dwell among his people and not forsake them if Solomon continues to comply with the Torah. Yet, the fulfillment of the second half of the promise (excluded in some Greek manuscripts [and also by some scholars]), is not explicitly stated in the text. If, however, Kenik is correct in arguing that Yahweh can only dwell among his people when the king "represents YHWH to the people by his demeanor and his conduct" (1983:114), the second half of the promise will not be fulfilled by Solomon in chapters 9-11. It is precisely because Solomon, in the second half of the narrative (i.e., 9:1-11:43), fails to "walk in the ways of Yahweh" that Yahweh will withhold the second part of his promise.

Conclusion to Solomon as the Ideal King

The narrative of I Kings 3-8 clearly presents Solomon as Israel's ideal king. The text consistently emphasizes Solomon's adherence to the principles of justice, wisdom and law, in order to show that for Solomon's justice and wisdom to be efficacious, they must be subservient to Torah. In fact, Solomon's justice and wisdom are gifts from God that are contingent upon his obedience to Torah.

Solomon, moreover, is heir to two very important traditions, that of Moses and of David.[78] As David's successor, Solomon is heir to the promise of an "everlasting dynasty", and to the teachings, instructions and wisdom which marked David as a successful ruler. The narrative of I Kings 3-8 depicts Solomon as the

[78] The conflation of Mosaic and Davidic traditions in the person of Solomon has already been suggested by Kenik (1983:88,169). Although her study is confined to the dream narrative only, the workings out of her insight can be seen in the ways the royal tradition (i.e., that of justice and wisdom) and the priestly tradition (i.e., that of law-giver) have manifested themselves throughout my discussion of chapters 3-8.

wise ruler *par excellence*, and a worthy successor to David.

A number of parallels can also be drawn between Moses and Solomon, in which Moses acts as a prototype for Solomon. Moses and Solomon both judge Israel (Ex. 18; I Kings 3), set up bureaucracies (Nums. 2-4; I Kings 4), act as law-givers (Ex. 19-24; I Kings 8), build Yahweh a throne (Ex. 25-31) or a Temple (I Kings 6), and promise reward for obedience to the law and punishment for disobedience (Deut. 12-26; I Kings 8). Nevertheless, although Moses leads the people out of Egypt, Solomon adopts Egyptian customs and practices, thereby taking Israel symbolically back to Egypt (I Kings 9-11).[79] Thus Solomon is heir to two very important traditions in Israelite history: he is the ruler *par excellence* in the line of David, and the law-giver *par excellence* in the line of Moses.

Not only do the Davidic and Mosaic traditions converge in the descriptions of Solomon in I Kings 3-8, but so do the ideals of judicial wisdom and Torah. Solomon is repeatedly shown as the wise king who can effect good government and keep the people happy by virtue of his wise decisions. Similarly, Solomon is shown to be obedient to the law (cf. David's admonishment in I Kings 2:3), and as the disseminator of the law. The ideals of wisdom and law, essential for the just governing of the people, converge in the person of Solomon. They converge, on the one hand, because "wisdom to govern" is given by God, and, on the other hand, because Solomon has shown himself obedient to and purveyor of Torah. The unstable blend of law and wisdom, however, will soon prove to be too volatile to be contained in one man: in chapters 9-11 Solomon's wisdom will no longer be yoked to Torah and disaster will follow.

---

[79] A number of these parallels were suggested by A.M. Cooper.

Solomon as the Apostate King

Dream Theophany (9:1-10)

The second dream theophany to Solomon[80] introduces the second, or anti-Solomonic, section of the narrative. The text itself explicitly recalls the first the dream ("the LORD appeared to Solomon a second time, as he had appeared to him at Gibeon", 9:2), and, like the first dream, the second dream anticipates themes of the second section of the narrative. Having established, in the first dream, that Solomon's justice and wisdom (or judicial wisdom) are conditional upon his obedience to Torah, the text in the second dream focuses upon that condition itself. If Solomon does not act in accord with Torah, his judicial wisdom is in jeopardy. By focusing on that condition, the second dream theophany prepares the reader for Solomon's apostasy and his characterization as the antithesis to the ideal king.

The establishment of Yahweh's name among the people (9:3), and the promise of the everlasting dynasty of David (9:5), however, also recall the oracle in 6:11-13. A sophisticated literary or narrative logic unifies the oracle and dream revelation: the dream is concerned with the second part of the oracle; that is, the

---

[80] There are a number of literary-critical problems associated with 9:1-9. Beginning with Burney (cf. 1970:129ff.), most scholars are of the opinion that the material is deuteronomistic in language and content. The division at the end of verse 5, where God's address switches from the second person singular (i.e., to Solomon) to the second person plural (i.e., to Solomon and his descendants, or Israel [9:9]), is believed to indicate at least two redactors (Jones 1984:209). Furthermore, the juxtaposition of the eternity of the Davidic dynasty (9:3) with the imminent destruction of the Temple and the loss of the land (9:6-9), is also thought to indicate a pre-exilic redactor and a post-exilic redactor respectively (Burney 1970:130). Noth, however, argues for the essential unity of the passage (1968:196), as does Dietrich, who assumes the dream to be the work of DtrN. (1972:72). A complicated explanation for the literary history of the passage is arrived at by Görg (1975:116-177). By transposing 9:3ab and 9:5a to Solomon's prayer in 8:12 (see especially 1975:120-25, 135-41), Görg hopes to show the influence of Egyptian literature on the composition of the Solomonic material (1975:142-74). Leaving questions of literary history aside, however, my purpose will be to demonstrate the thematic continuity of the second dream theophany with both the oracle in 6:11-13 and the first dream theophany in 3:4-15.

extent to which Solomon continues to "walk in the ways of the LORD" (cf. 6:12 and 9:4), and the extent to which Yahweh will dwell among his people (cf. 6:13 and 9:7-9). In an ironic sense, the second dream recalls the first part of the oracle, where the promise of the completion of the Temple is contingent upon Solomon's obedience to Torah. The second dream, however, states the reverse: the Temple will be destroyed if Solomon does not adhere to the Torah. The second dream theophany thus prepares the reader for the negative assessment of Solomon's reign in chapters 9-11 through its allusions to the oracle in 6:11-13.

In a much more explicit way, the second dream theophany anticipates the downfall of Solomon by its allusions to the first dream theophany. And although scholars have seen a literary relation between the two dream theophanies, few actually describe what that relation entails. The following remarks culled from the commentaries are exemplary. Montgomery calls the second dream "a late postlude to the vision in 3:5ff." (1950:203-04), but he does not describe how the second dream is a conclusion to the first. Gray argues that "this passage, modelled on 3:4-15, is a typical exhortation and admonition such as the Deuteronomist liked to insert at a critical point in the history of Israel" (1970:235). Gray, however, fails to draw out, in any systematic way, how the second dream is "modelled" on the first. Jones, likewise, sees the two dreams as being "deuteronomistic" (1984:209), but his exegesis contains few references to the first dream. Long, on the other hand, agrees that the second dream "is similar in structure to 3:4-15" (1984:108), but an examination of the structures of the two dreams which he proposes (pp. 62-63 and p. 108) reveals few similarities. Finally, Noth argues that although the second dream is deuteronomistic in origin, it is a pale imitation of the first:

> The author could not be the same as the one who wrote 3:4-15; [the text] only shows that the history of 3:4-15 was already available to the author of 9:1-9 and was used by him as a type of pale imitation (1968:195).

Yet, in spite of his concern to isolate the various Dtr. traditions in the text, Noth is the only scholar to my knowledge who has discerned the bipartite structure of the Solomonic narrative. In his study of the Dtr. history (1981), he writes that the Dtr.:

> makes God appear to Solomon at Gibeon again (9:1-9) on the analogy of the traditional story of 3:4-15; in this vision, coming in response to the prayer of dedication, God warns Solomon severely against future apostasy and threatens to destroy people and temple if this warning is not heeded. This introduces the second part of the story of Solomon, the beginning of his apostasy (1981:60).

In his commentary, Noth also argues that there is a chronological division in Solomon's forty-year reign: the first twenty years (which included the building of the Temple [7 years, 6:38] and his own house [13 years, 7:1]) were favourable to Solomon and that the last twenty years were hostile to him:

> It is most likely that the reference to "20 years" in 9:10 has the effect of dividing Solomon's entire reign into two equal halves. With the exception of 6:1, 37, one expects that Solomon had begun his reign with the building of the House of Yahweh and the Royal House. If this division into two halves was intended, it has to be attributed to a redactor who rendered the Dtr.'s view of a positive and a negative half to the reign of Solomon more precisely. Thus, the transition occurred, chronologically, in the midst of his reign because the divine address (9:1-9) occurred exactly at this point-in-time (1968:209).

Thus, the twenty year division to which Noth refers (9:10a) is an appropriate chronological introduction to the second half of Solomon's reign. And even though Noth does not work through the implications of his insight in any systematic way, credit must be given to Noth for realizing that the two dream theophanies are introductory to their respective sections.[81]

---

[81] See also the discussion on p. 66-68.

Of particular significance for my comparison of the two dreams, however, is the meaning of the phrase "walk before" (**hālak lipnê*, 9:4), which occurs in both dream theophanies, and in 8:23,25.[82] In all cases, the example of David is the one which Solomon should follow. The text at 9:4, however, significantly includes the conditional particle "if" (*'im*). Thus, without ever denying that Solomon has obeyed the Torah, the text implies that obedience is an ongoing thing. One must always be obedient to the Torah in order to be granted certain rewards. It is only at this juncture that the text implies that the rewards of obedience may be revoked. As Nelson (1981:102f.) argues, the conditional statement in the dream theophany prepares the reader for the loss of the northern tribes, which is a direct result of Solomon's disobedience (cf. 11:9-13).

On the two other occasions where obedience is conditionally expressed (2:4 and 8:25), David and Solomon, respectively, are quoting Yahweh. In 9:4, however, the text records God's direct speech to Solomon, as if to emphasize the necessity of Solomon's continued obedience, and, possibly, to foreshadow the imminent decline in the relationship between Solomon and God. As Kenik writes:

> the Dtr. portrayed [Solomon] as an obedient servant in the one instance when he was obviously in covenant — at the dedication of the temple. This situation was to change in the progress of history. The author prepared for Solomon's change of heart by foreshadowing with conditional statements the possibility of Solomon's subsequent disloyalty to Yahweh (1983:81).

Yet the conditional statement in 9:4 is included not only to indicate the rewards that would follow as a result of obedience to the Torah (i.e., "if you walk in my ways, you will be rewarded", cf. 3:14 and 6:12), but the condition is also

---

[82] See also the discussion on p. 112-13.

used to indicate the punishment for disobedience. This is the first time in the Solomonic narrative where the consequences of the violation of Torah are spelled out. The list of disastrous consequences in 9:6-9 is ironically juxtaposed with the list of rewards for obedience in 3:10-14. Even though there is as yet no record of any of Solomon's actions or policy, an intimation of disaster introduces the second section of the Solomonic material.

The general crime of not following God's commandments and statutes is specified by the second dream as the act of "going to serve other gods and worship them" (9:6; cf. Deut. 11:16; 17:3). For the Dtr., this is the ultimate crime. Solomon's subsequent worship of foreign gods (11:5-8) is thus anticipated by the second dream theophany. And although the punishments foretold in 9:7 (loss of the land and Temple) cast a pall over the rest of the Dtr. history, they do not transpire during the reign of Solomon.[83] The threats that foreigners will regard Israel as a "proverb and a byword" (9:7) and that they will be "astonished" at the actions of Yahweh (9:8-9), are foretold in Deut. 28:37 and 29:24-27. The passages in Deuteronomy are especially appropriate in this context as they are concerned with the consequences of serving other gods (28:36; 29:18).

By his violation of Torah, Solomon instigates the rupture of Israel's covenant with God. And although at this stage, the text presents Solomon's apostasy only as a possibility, not a reality, it is a possibility that is contingent with the promises and threats in Deut. 28-29, and with the ultimate fate of Israel as described in II Kings 25. The dream theophany is pivotal not only for the Solomonic

[83] The extent to which Solomon's apostasy and syncretism influenced subsequent kings is indicated in II Kings 23:13. The text here records that the altars which Solomon had built to foreign gods were still standing, three hundred years later: "And the king [Josiah] defiled the high places that were east of Jerusalem, to the south of the mount of corruption, which Solomon king of Israel had built for Ashtoreth the abomination of the Sidonians, and for Chemosh the abomination of Moab, and for Milcom the abomination of the Ammonites."

material but for the entire Dtr. history as well. It both recalls the Torah's precepts (Deut. 28-29) and points ahead to the disastrous consequences of their violation (II Kings 25).

Labour Relations 9:10-28[84]

Having established that Solomon's contraventions of Torah will have dire consequences, the text now deals with the specific instances of Solomon's violations. In so doing, the text recalls two earlier episodes which concern Solomon's "Labour Relations", the agreement with Hiram (5:15-26 [RSV 5:1-12]) and the corvée (5:27-32 [RSV 5:13-18]). My analysis of the two parallel episodes in the second section (i.e., 9:10-14 and 9:15-28) will concentrate on Solomon's violations of the Torah and the consequences thereof.

While the first contract with Hiram initiated a series of events which culminated in the building and dedication of the Temple (Long 1984:112), the second contract is strategically placed at the beginning of Solomon's downfall. The first contract between Hiram and Solomon had been characterized by wisdom (5:22 [RSV 5:7]), justice, and peace (5:27 [RSV 5:12]), but the second contract is characterized by unwise dealings and injustice. The narrative records Hiram's complaint about the cities he had purchased (9:12) for 120 talents of gold (9:14).[85] And although the text does not specify the reasons for Hiram's displeasure (only adding enigmatically that the cities are called the "land of Cabul" [or

---

[84] In my division of the text into various episodes, I have indicated that 9:10 functions both as a conclusion to the second dream theophany and as an introduction to the second agreement with Hiram. I agree with Gray that "v.10 has no real grammatical sequence" (1970:239) insofar as it does not pertain solely to what precedes it or what follows it, but has a double function.

[85] The monetary value of the gold is enormous, considering the weight of a talent can range anywhere from 20-60 kgs. (so Gray 1970:241). Even if Noth's more precise estimate of a talent as 35-40 kgs. is correct (1968:212), Hiram would have given Solomon 4200-4800 kgs. of gold for the cities.

"sterility"?; cf. Gray 1970:241]), it seems logical to assume it was because he had been swindled. It is, then, an example of bad faith or an injustice on Solomon's part, in marked contrast to his earlier just dealings.

For those who would use the episode of the contract with Hiram to glorify Solomon's shrewd business dealings, there is a difficult problem to resolve. By selling cities in the land of Galilee to Hiram, Solomon would not only be relinquishing "a valuable thirty-mile stretch of Israelite coastal hinterland" (Heaton 1974:65), but, more importantly, would also be destroying the *ideal* territory over which he should have dominion (cf. 5:1,5 [RSV 4:21,25]). Any sale of land, no matter how remunerative, affects the land's integrality, and undermines the promise of the Torah. As Jones remarks, "the loss of territory was a heavy blow for Israel, and this account contributes indirectly to the negative assessment of King Solomon" (1984:213).

The episode of the corvée (9:15-28), which recalls the corvée of section one (5:27-32 [RSV 5:13-18]), offers further evidence for the change in Solomon's character. Solomon's violations of Torah are much more explicit in this episode, and his regime exhibits tendencies that are much more characteristic of a tyrannical dictatorship than a "limited monarchy" (see Irwin 1977:353). The main reason for this characterization of Solomon's regime is his institution of slavery in the form of the *mas ʿōbēd* (9:21). This institution of slavery is Solomon's first subtle look in the direction of Egypt. The Israelites, once again, are enslaved as they had been in Egypt, a situation from which Yahweh had taken great pains to rescue them (cf. Eslinger 1985:276-77). Samuel's anxieties about the cost of kingship are now realized (see I Sam. 8:17). And although the text may suggest that it was the Canaanites (9:20), rather than the Israelites (9:22), who were the slaves, the situation in I Kings 12 shows that this apparently was not the case.

Furthermore, the Hebrew words *ʿōbēd* in 9:21 and *ʿābēd* in 9:22a, are translated "slave". Yet *ʿăbādāyw*, applied to the Israelites in 9:22b, is usually translated as "officials", in light of 9:22a. The text, however, is unclear on the status of the Israelites in 9:22b.[86]

The non-Israelite slaves included Amorites, Hittites, Perizzites, Hivites and Jebusites (9:20).[87] The same peoples (together with "Canaanites") are mentioned in the laws concerning the waging of holy war in Deut. 20:16-18:

> But in the cities of these people that the LORD your God gives you for an inheritance, you shall save alive nothing that breathes, but you shall destroy them, the Hittites and the Amorites, the Canaanites and the Perizzites, the Hivites and the Jebusites, as the LORD your God has commanded; that they may not teach you to do according to all their abominable practices which they have done in the service of their gods, and so to sin against the LORD your God.

According to the law, then, Solomon should have exterminated the foreigners (as Joshua had done; cf. Josh. 10:40; 11:12-15), rather than subject them to slavery. Solomon's inability to exterminate the foreigners (9:21) implies that he did not implement the law, as Weinfeld suggests (1972:166-67). Ironically, the Pharaoh, rather than Solomon, is the one who destroys Canaanites (9:16), indicating that Solomon was unable or unwilling to carry out the law, or had to rely on foreign aid to execute the law. His inability to maintain Torah, in this instance, allows for the possibility of syncretism, something with which the text is particularly concerned.

---

[86] See the numerous definitions of the word *ʿăbādāyw* in Gray 1970:77. While *ʿăbādāyw* may not mean "slaves" in 9:22b, the text does introduce an ambiguity at this point which is finally resolved in I Kings 12:4.

[87] It is of interest to note that the laws concerning slavery in Deuteronomy are incredibly humane. Slaves were to be released after six years of servitude (Deut. 15:12-18) and they seem to have been treated as citizens, or as brothers (*ʾāḥ*, 15:12; cf. Weinfeld 1972:282-83). Nevertheless, the fact that the Canaanites continued to be slaves until the time of the writing of the text (i.e., "until this day", 9:21) indicates that the practice of the liberation of slaves was not followed.

One final point that should be made in regard to the corvée is to note the number of projects for which the labour is intended. The concern of the first corvée was to build the Temple (5:31 [RSV 5:17]), whereas the concern of the second corvée was to build store-cities to house Solomon's chariots and horsemen, a special house for Pharaoh's daughter, and a fleet of ships. The building of the store-cities seems to be motivated by military purposes (see Gray 1970:243-49), the house for Pharaoh's daughter by prestige (Montgomery 1950:210), and the fleet of ships by wealth (9:28). These three concepts of "power, prestige and money" typify the new regime, and are indicative of the extent to which Solomon has departed from Torah. The purposes for which Solomon was to use his wisdom have become seriously misdirected, as will be evident in the following section.

Foreign Policy 10:1-29

Solomon's foreign policy stands in marked contrast to his domestic policy as recorded in 3:16 -5:14 [RSV 3:16-4:34]. Whereas the domestic policy was characterized by a concern with justice (3:16-28), effective administration (4:1-5:8 [RSV 4:1-4:28]), and wisdom (5:9-14 [RSV 4:29-34]), the qualities of justice and good government are conspicuously absent in the description of his foreign policy. Nevertheless, Solomon's wisdom is still operative to a certain extent (10:1-10 and 10:23-25). This curious shift of emphasis can be explained by Solomon's acting in accord with Torah in the former section, and his violations thereof in the latter section. The discussion of Solomon's "Foreign Policy" will thus concern itself with the absence of Torah in two episodes, one concerning the Queen of Sheba (10:1-13), and the other concerning the function of his wisdom (10:14-25).

The Queen of Sheba's visit to Solomon to hear his wisdom recalls an earlier

event in 3:16-28, when two harlots came to Solomon to hear his wise judgement. Both episodes concern women and wisdom and both stories are considered by scholars to be "legendary" or of the genre "folktale".[88] Leaving questions of literary transmission aside, however, I will discuss the relevance of the episode to the theme of Solomon as the apostate king.

At first glance, it appears as if this episode presents a picture of Solomon as the ideal king. After her "riddles" or "sharp questions" (*ḥiddôt*)[89] have been solved, the Queen of Sheba tells Solomon that his wisdom surpasses the reports she has heard (10:7). She further adds that the people are fortunate to have such a leader as Solomon:

> Happy are your wives! Happy are these your servants, who continually stand before you and hear your wisdom! Blessed be the LORD your God, who has delighted in you and set you on the throne of Israel! Because the LORD loved Israel for ever, he has made you king, that you may execute justice and righteousness (10:8-9).

In this passage, Solomon seems to manifest all the qualities of the ideal king; he has wisdom, he "executes justice and righteousness", the people are happy, and God takes great delight in Solomon. A more explicit description of Solomon as the ideal king is hard to find.

The problem with this description is that it represents the Queen of Sheba's perception of Solomon and not the narrator's. The two points of view should not be confused. The Queen of Sheba's judgement is coloured by what she has heard and by what she sees, whereas the narrator offers judgement from an omniscient

---

[88] The story of the Queen of Sheba, like that of the two harlots, has numerous extra-biblical parallels (see Pritchard 1974:104-14, and Egyptian parallels cited in Long 1984:119). Thus, there is no unanimity among scholars about the source of the tradition or its historical context, although many have tried to determine the historicity of the Queen of Sheba (see Gray 1970:259-60; Jones 1984:221).

[89] For the translation of *ḥiddôt* as "sharp questions", involved in a display of wits or showmanship, see Kugel 1981:12.

perspective. It is left up to the reader to resolve the tension between the opposing points of view.[90]

There are a number of difficulties with taking the Queen's testimony at face value. In the first place, her motivation for requesting an audience with the king is suspect. Far from approaching the king in order to settle vital familial matters, as in the case of the harlots, she comes to the king in order to see if he can solve riddles (*ḥiddôt*, 10:1). Compared with the motive of the harlots, that of the queen appears trivial.[91] A further comparison of the two episodes dealing with women and wisdom suggest that Solomon has become preoccupied with wealth. Whereas the text at 3:16 did not report that the harlots needed money to be able to approach the king, the text at 10:2 records, in considerable detail, the spices, gold and precious stones that the queen brings to Solomon. The text suggests that an audience with the king comes at a very high price (cf. 10:23-25).

This concern with wealth colours the queen's perception of Solomon. The queen is "overwhelmed" (NIV)[92] by her visit to Solomon. She is overwhelmed not only because of Solomon's wisdom and the house which he built (10:4), but also by "the food of his table, the seating of his officials, and the attendance of his servants, their clothing, his cupbearers, and his burnt offerings" (10:5a). In other words, it is not only Solomon's wisdom but the opulence of his court that prompts the queen to praise Solomon in such glowing terms. As such, her testimony is even more suspect as it is based on external displays of wealth and

---

[90] For a general consideration of the problem of "point of view" (or "focalization") in narrative, see Chatman 1978:151-58, and Genette 1980:161-211. For the relationship between point of view and the biblical narrative, see Eslinger (1985:149-65), and Berlin (1983:43ff.).

[91] The answering of riddles appears to be a "contest" or "game" that was popular in court circles (Long 1984:118).

[92] Or, as Montgomery (1950:217) translates, "left breathless by her amazement" (9:5c literally reads, "there was no more spirit in her" [*wᵉlō'-hāyâ bâ 'ôd rûaḥ*])

ostentation.

The queen's speech is suspect for another reason. Her perception is only of the court and its finery. It is only the court attendants (i.e., Solomon's men [*nāšekā*] and servants [*bādeykā*], 10:8a) who are happy, a conclusion verified by the use of the demonstrative pronoun "these" (*ʾēlleh*, 10:8a), and the phrase "who continually stand before you and hear your wisdom" in 10:8b. The text neither confirms nor denies that the rest of the people were happy, as was the case at 4:20. One also suspects the quality of the happiness of the attendants if they are only privy to Solomon's entertaining display of wisdom. It certainly does not seem to be a happiness that is based on a reading of the "law of Yahweh", as in Psalms 1:2 and 119:16 for example. The queen also implies that Yahweh's delight in Solomon is a result of his wisdom, not his observance of the Torah (10:8-9). It is, however, most peculiar that Yahweh would take delight in Solomon because of a gift for which he is responsible in the first place (3:12). If the queen is aware of the divine gift, her praise of Solomon is superfluous, or, if she is unaware of the gift, she does not understand that the function of wisdom is not merely to entertain. In either case, her praise of Solomon is not as damaging to my argument as it first may appear. Finally, the queen does not admit that Solomon *practices* "justice and righteousness" (*laʿăśôt mišpāṭ ûṣdāqâ*), but only that he *should* practice justice and righteousness.[93] In any event, the text offers no clear indication of what the queen may understand by "justice and righteousness", nor how she would know if Solomon was acting "justly", never having seen Solomon's "justice" in action.

What the queen's testimony does is confirm that God's gifts of wisdom and

[93] For the use of the *lamed* with the infinitive to express purpose, see G—K 1982:348.

fame to Solomon are still in effect. Nevertheless, according to the narrator, the purpose of Solomon's wisdom has shifted from rendering justice (3:28) to entertaining and accumulating wealth (10:1-10). Solomon's wisdom increases his wealth by another 120 talents of gold, precious stones, and spices (10:10). The harnessing of wisdom to Torah, which had led to the characterization of Solomon as the ideal king in chapters 3-8, is no longer evident. Solomon's wisdom is in the service of his own self-aggrandizement and his Torah violations will become increasingly flagrant.

That Solomon's wisdom has become severed from Torah is also demonstrated in the second episode of the "Foreign Policy", which I have called "The Function of Wisdom". Unlike the episode concerning the Queen of Sheba, the narrative in 10:14-29 appears to be miscellany of loosely knit materials (Montgomery 1950:219 calls it "*membra disjecta*"; cf. Gray 1970:262 and Jones 1984:225). But, as Long observes, the material is held together by the theme of Solomon's great wealth; "the incomparability of Solomon's wealth occurs [as a motif] throughout, like a golden thread" (1984:116).

The episode includes a description of Solomon's income (666 talents of gold, 10:14), the uses for his wealth (shields, 10:16-17; a throne, 10:18-20; drinking vessels, 10:21), and the sources of his income (trading partners, 10:15a; Arabia, 10:15b; shipping, 10:22; kings who come to hear Solomon's wisdom, 10:23-25). The episode concludes with a list of Solomon's provisions (10:26-29), which parallels and contrasts with the list of provisions given earlier (5:2-3,6-8 [RSV 4:22-23,26-28]; cf. discussion on p. 73-74 above).

Although the wealth pouring into the king's coffers is enormous, the text is careful not to specify that it is used to benefit the people in any way. Instead, it is used to decorate the king's already elaborate furnishings.[94] The narrator, in

[94] A number of scholars have detected a note of syncretism in the description of the king's or-

10:24-25, reports:

> And the whole earth sought the presence of Solomon to hear his wisdom, which God had put into his mind. Every one of them brought his present, articles of silver and gold, garments, myrrh, spices, horses, and mules, so much year by year.

While confirming that Solomon still has wisdom (and so verifying the authenticity of God's gift), the narrator suggests that the purpose of Solomon's wisdom is to accumulate wealth. The statement in 10:24-25 is to be contrasted with 5:14 (RSV 4:34), where the narrator reports that men and kings came from the ends of the earth to hear Solomon's wisdom, but with no mention of any gifts. In 10:24-25, the narrator subtly undermines Solomon's status as the ideal king by raising doubts about the use of his wisdom.

One final point which contributes to the negative portrayal of Solomon in this section concerns his explicit violations of Torah. The laws dealing with kingship in Deut. 17:16-17 read:

> [The king] must not multiply horses for himself, or cause the people to return to Egypt in order to multiply horses, since the LORD has said to you, "You shall never return that way again." And he shall not multiply wives for himself, lest his heart turn away; nor shall he greatly multiply for himself silver and gold.

The only king in the entire Dtr. history who is guilty of these four violations is Solomon. It is Solomon who conducts horse trading with Egypt (10:28), who has numerous wives (11:3), who has an annual income of 666 talents of gold (10:14), and who makes "silver as common in Jerusalem as stone" (10:27). Solomon's concern with wealth, his misuse of wisdom, his failure to act in accord with the Torah, and his violation of its statutes, contribute significantly to the portrayal

---

nate throne (Montgomery 1950:222; Gray 1970:266; Jones 1984:227-28). The seven levels of the throne (six steps and a dais, 10:19) are thought to reflect Babylonian cosmogony, the calf's head thought to reflect the Canaanite pantheon (Gray 1970:228), and the lions, a Syrian background (10:20, Montgomery 1950:222).

of Solomon as the apostate king (cf. Carmichael 1985:98-101; Weinfeld 1972:108-09).

Solomon's foreign policy and his labour relations are thus marked by a disregard of the people over whom he was to govern, and by an attempt to elevate the prestige and opulence of his own court. His actions are furthermore characterized by a disregard for Torah which, as we shall discover in the final section entitled "Attitude to God", will lead inexorably to the conclusion that Solomon is the antithesis to the ideal king.

Attitude to God (11:1-13)

Solomon's attitude to God in I Kings 11:1-13 constitutes the most dramatic account of his failure to act in accord with the Torah. Since, in my reading, chapters 9-10 already anticipate Solomon's apostasy, chapter 11 is not as abrupt a change as some scholars have suggested.[95] In my view, chapter 11 portrays the logical conclusion to Solomon's preoccupation with wealth, his misuse of wisdom, and his Torah violations. Moreover, chapter 11 not only concludes the section on Solomon's apostasy, but it ironically recalls chapters 6-8. The three stages of "Solomon's Attitude to God" in chapters 6-8 (i.e., "Building Projects" [6:1-10,14-7:50]; "Attitude to Tradition" [8:1-66]; "Oracle" [6:11-13]) were characterized by obedience whereas the same three stages in chapter 11 (i.e., "Building Projects" [11:7]; "Attitude to Tradition" [11:1-6,8]; "Oracle" [11:9-13]) are characterized by disobedience (see above, p. 68-71.). I shall now discuss these last three stages and their implications for the depiction of Solomon as the antithesis

[95] Most scholars fail to see a continuity between chapter 11 and the material which precedes it (cf. Montgomery 1950:231; Gray 1970:270; Jones 1984:231-32). The statement by Long is typical: "we are shocked that underneath the wealth, prosperity, and wisdom of this king, and the seeming peacefulness of unopposed and strong rule, there was transgression, a fatal weakness that for the Dtr editor-author signalled the kingdom's slide into division and turmoil" (1984:125).

of the ideal.

The magnificent description of the Temple given in chapters 6-7 is to be compared with the ominous description of the "high places",[96] which are dedicated not to Yahweh but to the gods of Solomon's foreign wives:

> Then Solomon built a high place for Chemosh the abomination of Moab, and for Molech the abomination of the Ammonites, on the mountain east of Jerusalem. And so he did for all his foreign wives, who burned incense and sacrificed to their gods (11:7).

The building of the high places is a crime of such magnitude that all subsequent kings were judged on the basis of whether or not they removed them.[97] And although it is true that Solomon sacrificed at Gibeon, "the great high place" (3:4) in the pro-Solomonic section of the narrative, he is exonerated because the Temple had not been built at that time (cf. 3:2). Once the Temple is completed, however, competitive worship at high places is not tolerated, as the narrative concerning Jeroboam I suggests (I Kings 12:25-13:34).[98] Solomon's building enterprises, therefore, are diametrically opposed in the two respective sections of the narrative. His building projects, moreover, are spiritual barometers for the rest of the Dtr. narrative, indicating the relative corruption or merit of a particular king.

In a more direct sense, Solomon's apostasy is shown by his violations of

---

[96] For a discussion of the "high places" (*bāmâ*) in biblical literature, see Albright 1957:242-58 and De Vaux 1965:284-88.

[97] See especially I Kings 13:33-34; 15:14; 22:43; II Kings 16:4; 17:7-18; 18:4; 23:4-14. In fact, Jeroboam's building of the high places at Dan and Bethel (I Kings 12:29) is a crime that leads to the destruction of the northern kingdom (II Kings 17:7-18). On the other hand, King Hezekiah (II Kings 18:4) and King Josiah (II Kings 23:4-14) merit the praise of the narrator because they removed the high places.

[98] See Kenik (1983:185) who writes, "there is clearly a before and after for the use of the 'high place' as places for worship in Dtr thought. According to Dtr evaluation, the 'high place' was the legitimate place for sacrifice prior to the building of the temple. Once the temple had been dedicated, however, worship at the 'high places' is interpreted as an act of apostasy".

Torah. Solomon's enormous harem of "seven hundred wives and three hundred concubines" (11:3)[99] violates Dtr. law (cf. Deut. 17:17, as noted above). The fact that these wives are expressly said to be "foreigners" (11:1-2) incriminates Solomon all the more. The law in Deut. 7:3-4 is explicit:

> You shall not make marriages with [foreign women], giving your daughters to their sons or taking their daughters for your sons. For they will turn away your sons from following me, to serve other gods.

The text draws our attention to this law by its nearly verbatim quotation in 11:2. Solomon's "love" (*'āhab*) for Yahweh in 3:3a is thus vividly contrasted with his "love" (*'āhab*) for foreign women in 11:1 (see Kenik 1983:186 n.30). In the one instance, Solomon is shown to be the ideal king; in the other, his apostasy is clearly evident.[100]

A few scholars have interpreted Solomon's love of foreign women to reflect his lack of concern with wisdom, or his folly. As Porten writes, "the prophetic condemnation of Solomon's folly in being led astray by his foreign wives accords with the wisdom theme of the narrative and was faithfully preserved by the editor of the book of Kings" (1954:123). The "wisdom theme" to which Porten refers is the characterization of the seductive influence of the "foreign woman"

---

[99] The historical accuracy of the number "1,000" to indicate Solomon's harem has been challenged (Gray 1970:275; Jones 1984:234), but, as Montgomery uncovers, a number of near eastern potentates also had exceptionally large harems (1950:234-35). The lack of a comparable biblical parallel to the number "1,000", however, unequivocally asserts that Solomon's numerous women are in contravention to Torah.

[100] There remains, however, one twist to explain in Solomon's marriage to foreigners, that is, his marriage to Pharaoh's daughter (3:1) in the pro-Solomonic section of the narrative. While it appears that Solomon's unblemished record in chapters 3-8 may be in jeopardy, the law in Deut. 23:8 provides for the intermarriage of an Israelite and an Egyptian of the third generation. On the other hand, marriages with Moabites and Ammonites are strictly forbidden (Deut. 23:4ff.) as are the marriages with Canaanites (Deut. 7:1ff.; cf. Porten 1954:122-23). Now although the text does not state explicitly whether the Pharaoh's daughter is a third generation resident alien or not, the ambiguity can only be considered to be a question, rather than a condemnation, that hangs over the first section. It is only later, in 11:1, when the Pharaoh's daughter is listed along with the other "foreign women", that her ineligibility for marriage is suggested.

(*'iššâ zārâ*) found in the book of Proverbs (2:16-19; 7:5; cf. 5:1-23; 6:20-35; 7:1-27; 9:13-18). The woman so described is considered dangerous and is to be avoided at all costs (cf. Kalugila 1980:121-22). Solomon's infatuation with foreign women, therefore, is folly of the greatest kind and further shows his misuse of wisdom.

A curt summary of the activities of Solomon is found in 11:6 where the text reads, "so Solomon did what was evil in the sight of the LORD, and did not wholly follow the LORD, as David his father had done". The phrase, "did what was evil in the sight of the LORD" is also used on other occasions in the Dtr. history to indicate apostasy (cf. I Kings 14:22; 15:26,34; 16:19,25,30; 22:52; II Kings 3:2; 8:27, etc.). Although it is an expression that is first used in connection with Solomon, "doing evil in the sight of the LORD" is associated with other kings to indicate, simply, violations of the Torah. Solomon would thus be portrayed as the paradigm of the infidelity to which future kings often fall prey.

The description of the sacrifice to the foreign gods merely reiterates Solomon's apostasy. The description is linked with the building of the high places, just as his sacrifice to Yahweh in 8:62-66 was linked to the description of the building and dedication of the Temple in 6:1-8:61. The two sides of Solomon's character are thus clearly evident: the proper path that one should take in regard to worship and sacrifice is demonstrated in the first section of the narrative and the improper attitude toward worship is demonstrated in the second. The manner of worship and the deity to whom the worship is directed are major themes of the Dtr. history.

The consequences of the failure of Solomon to worship correctly are specified in the second oracle (11:9-13). This second oracle implicitly recalls the first (6:11-13) and explicitly recalls the two dream theophanies (11:9). Without actually appearing to Solomon (as in the case of the two dream theophanies), Yahweh

tells Solomon of the consequence of his apostasy: the kingdom will be divided after his death. Whereas the first oracle emphasized the conditional nature of God's promise, the second oracle asserts that Solomon did not fulfill the condition. Nevertheless, in spite of Solomon's apostasy, God's promise of the eternality of the Davidic dynasty and his choice of Jerusalem are not abrogated (cf. Gray 1970:280; Jones 1984:237). The oracle, which confirms Solomon's violation of Torah (11:10-11), is careful not to rescind, but only to modify, God's promises.

The summary statement of Solomon's guilt (11:10) and the means by which it could have been avoided (i.e., by following David's example and obeying the Torah, 11:12), forms a fitting conclusion to the negative portrait of Solomon in 9:1-11:13. The failure to live in accord with Torah is predicted in the second dream theophany (9:1-10), whereas the implications of this failure to abide by Torah are demonstrated in the subsequent episodes. Through his disregard of Torah, Solomon's capacity to be Israel's ideal king is nullified. Instead, Solomon becomes, in certain ways, paradigmatic of an evil king. His wisdom, if not actually degenerating into folly as in 11:1-6, nevertheless is not used for the benefit of the people. His justice, furthermore, turns to tyranny. The ideal has become its antithesis through Solomon's failure to comply with Torah.

The Second Frame Story (11:14-43)

The second frame story deals with the practical consequence of the failure of Solomon's wisdom to be under Torah, that is, the disintegration of the kingdom as predicted in the oracle in 11:9-13. Solomon's kingdom loses its power in a way that precisely parallels its earlier rise. Instead of eliminating three enemies (2:13-46), God raises three enemies (11:14-28). Instead of a prophet to help Solomon (Nathan, 1:11-52), there is one to hinder him (Ahijah, 11:29-40).[101] And,

[101] The lack of any other prophet being mentioned during the Solomonic material, a fact which

finally, just as the narrative began with the problem of succession (1:10), the narrative closes with the problem of succession to the forefront (11:41-43).[102] The two frame stories nicely balance the pro and anti-Solomonic sections of the narrative, and lend further support to my hypothesis that this symmetry is carefully contrived. In any event, the conclusion of the narrative reaffirms that wisdom which is not under Torah is not efficacious and that political power which is not yoked to Torah leads to disaster. The kingdom is divided, never again to attain the heights achieved under the reign of Solomon, the ideal king. Israel's glory is turned sour by Solomon, the apostate king.

The concluding frame story, like the introductory one, depicts Solomon as being acted upon rather than as an actor. If the introductory frame story depicted Solomon as a pawn in the court machinations of Nathan and Bathsheba, the concluding frame story shows Solomon as a victim of God's actions: God raises three adversaries (in contrast to 5:23 [RSV 5:4]) who precipitate the collapse of the united monarchy. In a more explicit way, the mention that "David slept with his fathers and Joab the commander of the army was dead" (11:21), recalls events from the introductory frame story which had seemingly been forgotten in the Solomonic narrative proper (i.e., 3:1-11:13).

Aside from the structural similarities and literary allusions to the first frame story, the second frame story both summarizes certain themes of the Solomonic narrative and offers a prolepsis of what is to follow. The word of the prophet Ahijah to Jeroboam reiterates the theme that the breakup of the united kingdom is directly attributable to Solomon's violations of Torah:

R.B.Y. Scott calls "striking" (1971:106), provides a further clue that we are intended to compare these episodes.

[102] See the discussion on the structural similarities above, p. 63-65.

> Behold I am about to tear the kingdom from the hand of Solomon, and will give you ten tribes (but he shall have one tribe, for the sake of my servant David and for the sake of Jerusalem, the city which I have chosen out of all the tribes of Israel), because he has forsaken me, and worshipped Ashtoreth the goddess of the Sidonians, Chemosh the god of Moab, and Milcom the god of the Ammonites, and has not walked in my ways, doing what is right in my sight and keeping my statutes and my ordinances, as David his father did (11:32-33).

Gray (1970:294) has suggested that Ahijah's coming from the old cultic centre of Shiloh, where the purity of the religion of Yahweh was still maintained, indicates that he was responding to the syncretism that prevailed during Solomon's apostasy. Ahijah's message to Jeroboam does recall three important themes which we have previously encountered: God's choice of Jerusalem and the promise of the everlasting dynasty of David; the necessity of the observance of the Torah; and the problem of idolatry (see Weinfeld 1972:23 n.2).

Ahijah's summary of the cause of the disaster to befall Israel, and his explicit statement of the consequences, is nicely balanced by his prediction of the future. He speaks to Jeroboam in words that echo God's provisional statements to Solomon in 9:4-5:

> And if you will hearken to all that I command you, and will walk in my ways, and do right in my eyes by keeping my statutes and commandments as David my servant did, I will be with you, and will build you a sure house, as I built for David, and I will give Israel to you (11:38).

Ahijah importantly leaves open the possibility of an ideal king in the north by recalling the conditional statements to Solomon. Jeroboam, like Solomon, is required to obey the Torah in order for God's promises to take place. The rest of the Dtr. history of the northern kingdom emphasizes that the failure of Jeroboam to obey the Torah accounts for the destruction of that particular kingdom. Indeed, the fact that Jeroboam flees to Egypt (11:40) may anticipate the failure of Jeroboam to consolidate the northern kingdom.

The concluding statement concerning Solomon's reign (11:41-43) is, as one scholar bemoans, "utterly normal" (Long 1984:131). One expects a summary of the glorious deeds of Solomon and his ignominious apostasy. Despite the abruptness of the summary, however, one should note that the text makes a point of mentioning Solomon's wisdom (11:41). The mention of Solomon's wisdom more than compensates for the lack of narrative judgement: wisdom is fraught with theological overtones, which can either be positive or negative. I thus disagree with Kalugila, who writes:

> By concluding the section about Solomon's life with a mention of his *ḥokmâ*, the editor would perhaps suggest that he regained his fear of Yahweh after engaging in the worship of foreign gods; unfortunately this is not explicitly documented in the text. However, we may assume that the Deuteronomist had his ground for concluding his report in a positive manner — thus emphasizing Solomon's wisdom (1980:122).

By concluding the report with a statement of Solomon's wisdom (the only king in the Dtr. history to be so associated), the text indirectly accounts for the positive and negative aspects of Solomon's reign. As I will argue, the use of the term *ḥokmâ* to summarize the reign of the man who was both the ideal king and the apostate one, is appropriate for both structural and thematic reasons.

Conclusion to Solomon as the Apostate King

I have argued that, in I Kings 3-8, Solomon is portrayed as the ideal king. As Solomon continued to act in accord with Torah, he manifested justice and used his wisdom for the benefit of the people. In chapters 9-11:13, however, when Solomon does not comply with Torah, he becomes the ideal's antithesis. His regime is noted for its "unrivalled tyranny" (Crenshaw 1981:83) and his wisdom is directed towards his own self-aggrandizement. Such wisdom is almost akin to folly.

With the contrast between the two respective portraits of Solomon, that of the ideal king and the apostate king, the text may be making a larger point about wisdom and Torah. By depicting Solomon's wisdom in the second section as that which is concerned with wealth, prestige, or glory, and not with justice and administration, as in the first section, the text emphasizes that wisdom not harnessed to Torah is not beneficial or efficacious. As such, the text offers an implicit criticism of wisdom, that is, of wisdom that is not concerned with Torah. This "shady side of wisdom"[103] may account for the negative depiction of wisdom (*hokmâ*) in the Dtr. history.[104]

The negative assessment of wisdom in the Dtr. history has been demonstrated by R.N. Whybray in two monographs, *The Succession Narrative* (1968) and *The Intellectual Tradition of the Old Testament* (1974). In his study of the SN, Whybray argues that such foolish acts as David's indiscretion with Bathsheba, Amnon's rape of Tamar, Absalom's rebellion, and Solomon's "ruthless" accession to the throne, are all associated with "wisdom" (or *ḥokmâ*). Thus, David tries to extricate himself from his predicament with acts of "wisdom" (II Sam. 11:14-25); Amnon receives counsel from Jonadab, who is "very wise" (*ḥākām me'ōd*, II Sam. 13:3), which leads him to rape his half-sister. The wise woman of Tekoa is only superficially wise, as David easily perceives the hand of Joab behind her speech (II Sam. 14:20). David, by recalling Absalom and then not reconciling himself to his son, sets events in motion which have disastrous consequences. Finally, David's demand that Solomon eliminate his opponents is

---

[103] A phrase adopted from G.E. Mendenhall's article, "The Shady Side of Wisdom: The Date and Purpose of Genesis 3" (1974:319-334).

[104] The word *ḥokmâ* is used eight times in the SN (II Sam. 9-20, I Kings 1-2), and twenty-one times in the Solomonic material (I Kings 1-11). It is not used elsewhere in Samuel/Kings (Whybray 1974:89).

also considered to be "wise" (I Kings 2:6,9; see Whybray 1968:59,60,64,85,90; 1974:90-91). Thus, according to Whybray, there is something of a negative assessment of wisdom in the narratives of the Dtr. history. As he writes:

> the author was well aware, as were the authors of Proverbs, that not everything which passes for wisdom should be accepted at its face value, and also that wickedness can assume the character of wisdom for its own purposes (1974:90).

Whybray goes on to describe wisdom in terms of "ruthless action" in his account of Solomon's use of his wisdom in the SN (1974:91). Such action is reflected in Proverbs 16:14 and 20:26, where "royal wisdom" describes the type of political expediency exemplified by Solomon (1968:90).

That wisdom has at least an ambiguous or ironic sense is clearly seen in the narrative concerning Solomon, where the word *ḥokmâ* (or its derivatives) is used twenty-one times. In the pro-Solomonic section of the narrative, wisdom is used to render justice and for the benefit of the people. It is in this section, moreover, that Solomon is under Torah. In the anti-Solomonic section of the narrative, wisdom is used in an ironic or negative sense. It leads to tyranny, an accumulation of wealth, and ultimately to folly (cf. 11:1-6). It is wisdom that is not subservient to Torah. The text would thus be proposing a negative assessment of wisdom when it is not in line with Torah, and a positive assessment when it is.

G.E. Mendenhall also argues that "wisdom" has a pejorative meaning, especially as it is understood in the SN and the Solomonic material (1974:323-25).[105] Mendenhall argues that Solomon's wisdom is incontestable, a situation which eventually leads to his establishment of a military dictatorship and the eventual disintegration of his kingdom. He remarks that:

---

[105] See also Cazelles 1963:35 for the negative assessment of Solomon's wisdom.

> the arrogant stupidity of power reinforced by access to, and control of, a wide range of technical wisdom had its logical culmination in the policies of Rehoboam, which resulted not only in the complete disintegration of the empire but also in schism of the homeland itself (1974:325).

Mendenhall further argues that the problem of wisdom is that it has no "control other than the limitation of technology and power" because "wisdom as a means of achieving goals has rarely been able to evaluate itself" (1974:331). While it may be true that an uncontrolled wisdom is a dangerous thing, the Solomonic narrative points out that the necessary control exists in the form of Torah.

The text would be offering a criticism of wisdom, that is, of wisdom that is not in accord with Torah. It is significant that wisdom is never again to be associated with an Israelite king, nor is it, for that matter, ever mentioned again in the Dtr. history. Nevertheless, wisdom does remain an ideal to be realized in an eschatological sense. Isaiah predicts the coming of a Messiah endowed with wisdom and an ability to rule (9:6; 11:1-5), who will usher in the new age. The association of wisdom with Torah, although never occurring again in the person of a reigning monarch, remains an ideal to be realized in the person of the Messiah.

Wisdom and Torah are also brought together in the Second Temple period, especially in the books of Baruch and Sirach. In Sirach, wisdom is hypostasized, preexistent, and immortal (ch. 24). It is also identified with Torah:

> [Wisdom] is the book of the covenant of the Most High God,
> the law which Moses commanded us
> as an inheritance for the congregation of Jacob (24:23).

As Joseph Blenkinsopp writes, "the identification of Torah and Wisdom was Sirach's way of attributing universal significance to Torah as the divine principle of order which has been made available to Israel" (1983:144). In the book of Baruch, the identification of Torah with Wisdom is much more explicit. Wisdom, which was with God from the beginning, came down to earth and became

identified with Torah:

> She is the book of the commandments of God,
> and the law that endures for ever,
> All who hold fast to her will live,
> and those who forsake her will die (4:1).

This association of Wisdom and Torah in Baruch and Sirach has led to an important discovery by G.T. Sheppard in his *Wisdom as a Hermeneutical Construct* (1980). Sheppard argues that in the late post-exilic period, wisdom became a theological category by which to interpret Scripture:

> at a certain period in the development of OT literature, wisdom became a theological category associated with an understanding of canon which formed a perspective from which to interpret Torah and prophetic traditions. In this sense wisdom became a hermeneutical construct for interpreting sacred Scripture (1980:13).

By investigating the "sapientializing" of originally non-wisdom texts (such as the Torah and the prophetic writings), Sheppard reveals how the authors of Baruch and Sirach attempted to integrate preexistent Wisdom with Torah in a kind of creative synthesis (1980:113). Furthermore, because of the sapientializing of non-wisdom texts, the wisdom traditions became strongly associated with and grounded upon Torah. He writes, "wisdom functions for these post-exilic writers [of Sirach and Baruch] as a hermeneutical construct to interpret Torah as a statement about wisdom and as a guide to Israel's practice of it" (1980:117). And, just as Torah reveals wisdom (cf. Deut. 4:6), so wisdom helps to "legitimate the pervasive authority of Torah" (1980:118) in a kind of symbiosis.

Sheppard also speculated that the integration of Torah and Wisdom may have influenced the redaction of the Dtr. history. Oddly enough, he does not apply his insight to Solomon, the wise king *par excellence*, but to David. In applying his thesis to David (esp. II Sam. 21-24), however, Sheppard discovers that the two narrative views about David (i.e., David under the "blessing" and

David under the "curse", as demonstrated by Carlson [1964:41f. and 131f.]) give way to a view which concerns "David's success because of his obedience to the commandments of the Torah and the dictates of wisdom" (1980:158). Had Sheppard perceived both the positive and negative sides of wisdom, he could have applied his insight to the entire Davidic narrative, rather than only to II Sam. 21-24, in order to suggest that David is under the blessing when his wisdom is in accord with Torah, and under the curse when it is not. Such a systematic study remains to be pursued.

The pattern of the identification of Torah and Wisdom was also to influence Rabbinic Judaism and the New Testament writers (see Porteous 1955:256 and Davies 1948:170ff.). And although I do not want to enter into the complex issues involved in the identification of Torah and Wisdom in the origin and the development of the New Testament, W.D. Davies has devoted an interesting chapter to this topic in his *Paul and Rabbinic Judaism* (1948).[106] Thus, it would appear that although the nexus of Torah and wisdom is too volatile to sustain in the person of a reigning monarch, the association does persist throughout biblical history, both as an ideal to be realized in the person of a Messiah and as wisdom's hypostasis and identification with Torah.

---

[106] Davies argues that by identifying Jesus with the New Torah, Paul could also attribute ideas such as eternality and creativity, which were by then associated with Wisdom, to Jesus (1948:149-51). Furthermore, the association of Jesus with the Messiah, a Messiah who embodied wisdom and followed the will of God, shows that the New Testament writers were concerned to associate wisdom and Torah with an eschatological figure (see Davies 1948:158ff.). The severing of wisdom from Torah, which is accomplished by Solomon, is thus reintegrated, both in an eschatological sense and in an ontological sense, in the person of Jesus. For the New Testament writers, Solomon is a useful foil to Jesus, a situation to which the writer of the gospel of Matthew alludes, saying that "something [i.e, Jesus] greater than Solomon is here" (12:42). See also Brown's contention that Jesus was the mediator of the New Torah (1979:lxxii) and his remark concerning the personification of wisdom in the gospel of John (1979:cxxii-cxxvi).

Conclusion

The hypothesis that the narrative of I Kings 1-11 has a unity and an integrity of its own has been confirmed. Not only does the narrative contain a coherent and well-defined structure, but a unifying theme concerning the ideal of kingship emerges from the narrative as well. In contrast to the claim by historical-critical scholars that the Dtr. presentation of Solomon is but a heterogeneous mix of legends, traditions, and archaeological data, my thesis demonstrates that the presentation of Solomon is almost exclusively preoccupied with the theme of the relation of the king to Torah. When Solomon acts in accord with Torah (as in chapters 3-8), he is the ideal king; that is, he renders justice and uses his wisdom for the benefit of the people. When Solomon violates the Torah (as in chapters 9-11), he is the ideal's antithesis; he fails to render justice and he uses his wisdom for his own self-aggrandizement.

My literary explanation to the problem of narrative tension is preferable to an historical explanation, if only because a literary explanation is primarily descriptive (and so subject to refutation or substantiation on the basis of the data within the text [Polzin 1980:16-18]), whereas an historical explanation is based on a non-verifiable hypothesis about the historical setting(s) in which the text was conceived. As chapter one demonstrated, radically different theologies could be constructed on the basis of the critic's *a priori* notion about a text's genesis. Narrative tension collapses if a multiplicity of authors is assumed, each with differing theological motivations. The historical-critical approach calls into question the integrity of the narrative to such an extent that the theology of a reconstructed secondary (and often tertiary) text supersedes that of the original.

In second chapter, I sought to articulate a methodology by which the

integrity of a text could be preserved. Tensions and irregularities in the narrative were thus *not* attributable to the vagaries of historical influence, but part of the design and artistry of a text. My reading strategy attempted to resolve the tensions into a coherent whole (Brooks 1975:190-93), and thereby maintain the text's integrity.

The third chapter demonstrated how I Kings 1-11 has an underlying structure and coherence of its own. There is a sequence and logic to the contradictory data in the text of such a kind that events described in the first eight chapters of the narrative are parallelled in the final three. Furthermore, the two dream sequences (3:1-15; 9:1-10) are introductory to two divisions in the narrative, one favourable to Solomon and one hostile to him. Every component within the first section of the narrative is parallelled (albeit with important differences) in the second.

The fourth chapter accounted for the bipartite structure, or the ambiguous portrait of Solomon, by pursuing the most consistently presented theme in the narrative: the portrayal of Solomon as king. The first section described Solomon as the ideal king whereas the second section depicted him as the apostate one. A further investigation showed that Solomon's justice and wisdom (characteristics of an ideal king) were harmoniously combined in I Kings 3-8, when Solomon's actions were in accord with Torah. When Solomon violated Torah, however, his justice gave way to tyranny, and his wisdom to folly. The consequences for both the king and the people were disastrous.

Solomon's reign is a watershed for the Dtr. history: his political achievements are unmatched by other kings, but his actions lay the foundations for the division and destruction of the kingdom. These actions also have broad theological implications in Solomon's rise and fall: ideals of wisdom and Torah, which

are combined both constructively and destructively in Solomon, persist throughout biblical literature. They are to be realized either in an eschatological figure, or by wisdom's hypostasis and identification with Torah. Wisdom that is not bound to Torah, as the story of Solomon shows, is almost the same as folly. This negative aspect of wisdom may offer a useful hermeneutic by which to interpret the "wisdom literature", but such a study remains to be pursued.

ABBREVIATIONS

AB	Anchor Bible
An Bib	Analecta Biblica
ANET	*Ancient Near Eastern Texts Relating to the Old Testament*
ASTI	*Annual of the Swedish Theological Institute in Jerusalem*
Bib	*Biblica*
BKAT	*Biblischer Kommentar: Altes Testament*
BWANT	Beiträge zur Wissenschaft vom Alten und Neuen Testament
BZAW	Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft
CeB	Century Bible
CBC	Cambridge Bible Commentaries
CHB	*Cambridge History of the Bible*
CI	*Critical Inquiry*
Con Bib	Coniectanea Biblica
CQR	*Church Quarterly Review*
DR	*Deutsche Rundschau*
EI	*Eretz Israel*
FOTL	The Forms of Old Testament Literature Series
FRLANT	*Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments*
G—K	*Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar,* rev. E. Kautzsch, ed. A.E. Cowley
HAR	*Hebrew Annual Review*
HKAT	Handkommentar zum Alten Testament
HSM	Harvard Semitic Monographs
HUCA	*Hebrew Union College Annual*
IB	*Interpreter's Bible*
ICC	International Critical Commentary
IDB	*Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible*
IDBS	Supplement to the *Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible*
Imm	*Immanuel*
Inter	*Interpretation*
JBL	*Journal of Biblical Literature*
JSOT	*Journal for the Study of the Old Testament*
JSOTS	Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series
JSS	*Journal of Semitic Studies*
JTS	*Journal of Theological Studies*
KHAT	Kürzer Hand-Commentar zum Alten Testament
LB	*Linguistica Biblica*
MR	*Modern Review*
NCBC	New Cambridge Bible Commentary
NIV	*New International Version*
Or	*Orientalia*
OTL	Old Testament Library

PT	*Poetics Today*
RB	*Revue Biblique*
RSV	*Revised Standard Version*
SBLDS	Society for Biblical Literature Dissertation Series
SBT	*Studies in Biblical Theology*
SR	*Studies in Religion*
SVT	*Supplements to Vetus Testamentum*
ThSt	*Theologische Studien*
TLZ	*Theologische Literaturzeitung*
VT	*Vetus Testamentum*
WZKMU	*Wissenschaftliche Zeitschrift der Karl-Marx-Universität*
ZAW	*Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Abrams, M.H.
1953 *The Mirror and the Lamp.* New York: Oxford University.

1981 *A Glossary of Literary Terms.* 4th. ed. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Ackroyd, P.R.
1976 "Kings I and II". *IDBS.* Nashville: Abingdon, 516-19.

1981 "The Succession Narrative (so-called)". *Inter* 35, 383-96.

Albright, W.F.
1957 "The High Place in Ancient Palestine". *Volume du Congrès. SVT* 4. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 242-58.

Alt, A.
1953 "Israels Gaue unter Salomo". *Kleine Schriften zur Geschichte des Volkes Israel II.* Munich: C.H. Beck, 76-89.

1976 "Solomonic Wisdom". tr. D.A. Knight, in Crenshaw (1976:102-112) [orig. 1951].

Alter, R.
1981 *The Art of Biblical Narrative.* New York: Basic Books.

Auerbach, E.
1953 *Mimesis. The Representation of Reality in Western Literature.* tr. W.R. Trask. Princeton: Princeton University.

Ball, E.
1977 "The Co-Regency of David and Solomon (I Kings 1)". *VT* 27, 269-79.

Bar-Efrat, S.
1978 "The Literary Modes and Methods in the Biblical Narrative in view of 2 Samuel 10-20 and I Kings 1-2". *Imm* 8, 19-31.

1980 "Some Observations on the Analysis of Structure in Biblical Narrative". *VT* 30, 154-73.

Barnes, W.E.
1908 *The Two Books of Kings.* Cambridge: Cambridge University.

Benzinger, I.
1899 *Die Bücher der Könige.* KHAT IX. Leipzig and Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr.

1921 *Jahwist und Elohist in den Königsbüchern.* BWANT 27. Berlin: Kohlhammer.

Berlin, A.
1983 *Poetics and Interpretation of Biblical Narrative.* Sheffield: Almond.

Bewer, J.A.
1922 *The Literature of the Old Testament in its Historical Development.* New York: Columbia University.

Blenkinsopp, J.
1966 "Theme and Motif in the Succession History (2 Sam. XI 2ff.) and the Yahwist Corpus". *SVT* 15. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 44-57.

1983 *Wisdom and Law in the Old Testament.* Oxford: Oxford University.

Boecker, H.J.
1980 *Law and the Administration of Justice in the Old Testament and Ancient East.* tr. J. Moiser. Minneapolis: Augsburg.

Booth, W.C.
1961 *The Rhetoric of Fiction.* Chicago: University of Chicago.

Brayley, I.F.M.
1976 Review of Veijola (1975). *JTS* 27, 427-28.

Bright, J.
1953 *The Kingdom of God.* New York: Abingdon-Cokesbury.

1971 *A History of Israel.* 2nd. ed. Philadelphia: Westminster.

Brown, R.E.
1979 *The Gospel According to John (i-xii).* AB. Garden City: Doubleday.

Brueggemann, W.
1972 "On Trust and Freedom: A Study of Faith in the Succession Narrative". *Inter* 26, 3-19.

1982 *I Kings.* Atlanta: John Knox.

Brunner, H.
1954 "Das hörende Herz". *TLZ* 79, 697-700.

Burney, C.F.
1970 *Notes on the Hebrew Text of the Book of Kings.* New York: KTAV [orig. 1903].

Carlson, R.A.
1964 *David, the Chosen King.* Stockholm: Almqvist and Wiksell.

Carmichael, C.M.
1974 *The Laws of Deuteronomy.* Ithaca and London: Cornell University.

1985 *Law and Narrative in the Bible.* Ithaca and London: Cornell University.

Cassirer, E.
1951 *The Philosophy of the Enlightenment.* tr. F.C.A. Koelln and J.P. Pettegrove. Princeton: Princeton University.

Cazelles, H.
1963 "Les Débuts de la Sagesse en Israel". *Les Sagesses du Proche-Orient Ancien.* Paris: Universitaires de France, 27-39.

1976 "Biblical Criticism, OT". *IDBS.* Nashville: Abingdon, 98-102.

Chatman, S.
1978 *Story and Discourse. Narrative Structure in Fiction and Film.* Ithaca and London: Cornell University.

Childs, B.S.
1974 *The Book of Exodus. A Critical and Theological Commentary.* OTL. Philadelphia: Westminster.

1979 *Introduction to the Old Testament as Scripture.* Philadelphia: Fortress.

Clark, W.M.
1969 "A Legal Background to the Yahwist's use of 'Good and Evil' in Genesis 2-3". *JBL* 88, 266-78.

Coats, G.W.
1981 "Parable, Fable, Anecdote". *Inter* 35, 368-82.

Combs, A.E.
1983 "Spinoza's Method of Biblical Interpretation and his Political Philosophy". *Modernity and Responsibility* [George Grant Festschrift]. ed. A.E. Combs. Toronto: University of Toronto, 3-28.

Conroy, C.
1978 *Absalom Absalom!* An Bib 81. Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute.

Cooper, A.M.
1983 "The Act of Reading the Bible". *Proceedings of the 8th World Congress of Jewish Studies.* Jerusalem.

Crenshaw, J.
1969 "Method in Determining Wisdom Influence upon 'Historical' Literature". *JBL* 88, 129-42.

1976 *Studies in Ancient Israelite Wisdom.* New York: KTAV.

1981 *Old Testament Wisdom.* Atlanta: John Knox.

Crosman, R.
1980 "Do Readers Make Meaning". *The Reader in the Text.* eds. S.R. Suleiman and R. Crosman. Princeton: Princeton University, 149-164.

Cross, F.M.
1973 *Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic: Essays in the History of the Religion of Israel.* Cambridge: Harvard.

Culler, J.
1975 *Structuralist Poetics.* Ithaca: Cornell.

1981 *The Pursuit of Signs.* Ithaca: Cornell.

Culley, R.C.
1985 "Exploring New Directions". *The Hebrew Bible and its Modern Interpreters.* eds. D.A. Knight and G.M. Tucker Philadelphia: Fortress, 167-200.

Davies, W.D.
1948 *Paul and Rabbinic Judaism.* London: SPCK.

De Man, P.
1979 *Allegories of Reading.* New Haven and London: Yale.

De Vries, S.J.
1962 "History of Biblical Criticism". *IDB* I. Nashville: Abingdon, 413-18.

Delekat, L.
1967 "Tendenz und Theologie der David-Salomon Erzählung". *Das ferne und nahe Wort* [L. Rost Festschrift]. BZAW 105. Berlin: Töpelmann, 26-36.

Dietrich, W.
1972 *Prophetie und Geschichte. Eine redaktionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung zum deuteronomistischen Geschichtswerk.* FRLANT 108. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

Donner, H.
1977 "The Separate States of Israel and Judah", in Hayes and Miller (1977:381-434).

Doubrovsky, R.
1973 *The New Criticism in France.* tr. D. Coltman, with an introduction by E. Wasiolek. Chicago and London: University of Chicago.

Driver, S.R.
1913 *Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament.* 9th ed. Edinburgh: T.& T. Clark.

Eagleton, T.
1983 *Literary Theory.* Minneapolis: University of Minnesota.

Eaton, J.H.
1976 *Kingship and the Psalms.* London: SCM.

Eissfeldt, O.
1965 *The Old Testament: An Introduction.* tr. P.R. Ackroyd. New York: Harper & Row.

Engnell, I.
1967 *Studies in Divine Kingship in the Ancient Near East.* 2nd ed. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Eslinger, L.M.
1983 "Viewpoints and Points of View in I Samuel 8-12". JSOT 26, 61-76.

1985 *Kingship of God in Crisis.* Sheffield: Almond.

Fish, S.
1976 "Interpreting the *Variorum*". *CI* 2, 465-85.

Flanagan, J.W.
1972 "Court History or Succession Document? A Study of II Samuel 9-20 and I Kings 1-2". *JBL* 91, 172-81.

Fohrer, G.
1968 *Introduction to the Old Testament.* Nashville: Abingdon.

Fokkelman, J.P.
1981 *Narrative Art and Poetry in the Books of Samuel,* v. I. Assen: Van Gorcum.

1986 *Narrative Art and Poetry in the Books of Samuel,* v. II. Assen: Van Gorcum.

Forster, E.M.
1974 *Aspects of the Novel.* Harmondsworth: Pelican [orig. 1927].

Freedman, D.N.
1962 "The Pentateuch". *IDB* 3. Nashville: Abingdon, 711-27.

Frei, H.W.
1974 *The Eclipse of Biblical Narrative. A Study in Eighteenth and Nineteenth Century Hermeneutics.* New Haven and London: Yale University.

Friedman, R.E.
1981 *The Exile and Biblical Narrative. The Formation of the Deuteronomistic and Priestly Works.* HSM 22. Chico: Scholars.

Frye, N.
1982 *The Great Code.* Toronto: Academic.

Gadamer, H.G.
1975 *Truth and Method.* New York: Continuum.

Genette, G.
1980 *Narrative Discourse. An Essay in Method.* tr. J.E. Lewin. Ithaca: Cornell.

Good, E.M.
1965 *Irony in the Old Testament.* Philadelphia: Westminster.

Görg, M.
1975 *Gott-König-Reden in Israel und Ägypten.* BWANT 105. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer.

Grant, R.M.
1952 "History of the Interpretation of the Bible: Ancient Period". *IB* I. Nashville: Abingdon-Cokesbury, 106-14.

Gray, J.
1970 *I and II Kings.* 2nd. ed. OTL. Philadelphia: Westminster.

Gressmann, H.
1907 "Das salomonische Urteil". *DR* 130, 212-228.

Grobel, K.
1962 "Biblical Criticism". *IDB* I. Nashville: Abingdon, 407-13.

Gunn, D.M.
1976 "Traditional Composition in the 'Succession Narrative'". *VT* 26, 214-229.

1978 *The Story of King David.* JSOTS 6. Sheffield: JSOT.

Habel, N.
1971 *Literary Criticism of the Old Testament.* Philadelphia: Fortress.

Hahn, H.F.
1954 *Old Testament in Modern Research.* Philadelphia: Muhlberg.

Hayes, J.H. and Miller, J.M.
1977 *Israelite and Judean History.* OTL. Philadelphia: Westminster.

Hayes, J.H.
1979 *An Introduction to Old Testament Study.* Nashville: Abingdon.

Heaton, E.W.
1974 *Solomon's New Men: The Emergence of Ancient Israel as a National State.* London: Thames and Hudson.

Herrmann, S.
1953-54 "Die Königsnovelle in Ägypten und Israel". *WZKMU* 3, 51-62.

Hertzberg, H.W.
1964 *The Books of Samuel.* tr. J.S. Bowden. OTL. Philadelphia: Westminster.

Hirsch, E.D. Jr.
1967 *Validity in Interpretation.* New Haven and London: Yale.

Hölscher, G.
1923 "Das Buch der Könige, seine Quellen und seine Redaktion". *Eucharisterion* [H. Gunkel Festschrift]. *FRLANT* 19. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

1952 *Geschichtsschreibung in Israel.* Lund: C.W.K. Gleerup.

Hooke, S.H.
1958 *Myth, Ritual and Kingship.* Oxford: Clarendon.

Irwin, W.A.
1977 "The Hebrews". *The Intellectual Adventure of Ancient Man.* Chicago: University of Chicago [orig. 1946].

Iser, W.
1974 *The Implied Reader. Patterns of Communication in Prose Fiction from Bunyan to Beckett.* Baltimore and London: Johns Hopkins.

1978 *The Act of Reading. A Theory of Aesthetic Response.* Baltimore and London: Johns Hopkins.

Ishida, T.
1977 *The Royal Dynasties in Ancient Israel. A Study of the Formation and Development of Royal-Dynastic Ideology.* BZAW 142. Berlin and New York: W. de Gruyter.

1982 "Solomon's Succession to the Throne of David — A Political Analysis". *Studies in the Period of David and Solomon.* ed. T. Ishida. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 175-88.

Jepsen, A.
1956 *Die Quellen des Königsbuches.* Halle: Max Niemeyer.

Johnson, A.
1953 "*māšāl*". *Wisdom in Israel and in the Ancient Near East* [H.H. Rowley Festschrift]. *SVT* 3. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 162-69.

1958 "Hebrew Conceptions of Kingship". in Hooke (1958:204-35).

1967 *Sacral Kingship in Ancient Israel.* Cardiff: University of Wales.

Jones, G.H.
1984 *I & II Kings, v.I.* NCBC. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

Kalugila, L.
1980 *The Wise King.* Con Bib 15. Stockholm: Liber Tryck.

Kenik, H.A.
1976 "The Code of Conduct for a King: Psalm 101". *JBL* 95, 391-403.

1983 *Design for Kingship.* SBLDS 69. Missoula: Scholars.

Kittel, R.
1900 *Die Bücher der Könige.* HKAT. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

Koch, K.
1969 *The Growth of the Biblical Tradition.* tr. S.M. Cupitt. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.

Kraeling, E.G.
1955 *The Old Testament Since the Reformation.* New York: Harper & Brothers.

Krentz, E.
1975 *The Historical-Critical Method.* Philadelphia: Fortress.

Kuenen, A.
1880 "Critical Method". *MR* I, 461-88, 685-713.

1894 *Historisch-Kritische Einleitung in die Bücher des Alten Testaments* (3 vols.). tr. T. Weber. Leipzig: Schultze.

Kugel, J.L.
1981 *The Idea of Biblical Poetry.* New Haven and London: Yale.

Langlamet, F.
1976 "Pour ou Contre Salomon". *RB* 83, 114-37, 321-79, 481-528.

Lentricchia, F.
1980 *After the New Criticism.* Chicago: University of Chicago.

Long, B.O.
1984 *I Kings with an Introduction to Historical Literature.* FOTL 9. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

Mayes, A.D.H.
1983 *The Story of Israel between Settlement and Exile.* London: SCM.

McCarter, P.K.
1981 "Plots, True or False". *Inter* 35, 355-67.

McConvill, J.G.
1984 *Law and Theology in Deuteronomy.* JSOTS 33. Sheffield: JSOT.

McKane, W.
1970 *Proverbs.* OTL. Philadelphia: Westminster.

McNeil, J.T.
1952 "History of the Interpretation of the Bible: Medieval and Reformation Period". *IB* I. Nashville: Abingdon-Cokesbury, 115-26.

Mendenhall, G.E.
1974 "The Shady Side of Wisdom: The Date and Purpose of Genesis 3". *A Light unto My Path.* [J.M. Myers Festschrift] eds. H.N. Bream, *et al.* Philadelphia: Temple University, 319-34.

Mettinger, T.N.D.
1971 *Solomonic State Officials: A Study of Civil Government Officials of the Israelite Monarchy.* Lund: C.W.K. Gleerup.

1976 *King and Messiah: The Civil and Sacral Legitimation of the Israelite Kings.* Lund: C.W.K. Gleerup.

Miles, T.R.
1967 "Gestalt Theory". *The Encyclopedia of Philosophy.* v. III, ed. P. Edwards. New York and London: MacMillan & The Free Press, 318-323.

Millard, C.L.
1970 "The Concept of Political Power in Ancient Israel". *ASTI* 11, 4-24.

Miscall, P.D.
1983 *The Workings of Old Testament Narrative.* Philadelphia and Chico: Fortress and Scholars.

Montgomery, J.A.
1951 *The Book of Kings.* ICC. Edinburgh: T.& T. Clark.

Moulton, R.G.
1895 *The Literary Study of the Bible.* Boston: D.C. Heath.

Mowinckel, S.
1954 *He that Cometh.* tr. G.W. Anderson. New York: Abingdon.

Neill, W.
1963 "The Criticism and Theological Use of the Bible". *CHB* III. Cambridge: Cambridge University, 238-93.

Nelson, R.D.
1981 *The Double Redaction of the Deuteronomistic History.* JSOTS 18. Sheffield: JSOT.

1986 Review of Würthwein (1984). *JBL* 105, 708-09.

Newsome, J.D.
1984 *The Hebrew Prophets.* Atlanta: John Knox.

Noth, M.
1955 "Die Bewährung von Salomos 'Göttlicher Weisheit'". *Wisdom in Israel and in the Ancient Near East* [H.H. Rowley Festschrift]. *SVT* 3. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 225-37.

1960 *The History of Israel.* tr. P.R. Ackroyd. New York: Harper & Row.

1966 "Office and Vocation in the Old Testament". *The Laws in the Pentateuch and Other Studies.* tr. D.R. Ap-Thomas. Edinburgh and London: Oliver and Boyd, 229-49.

1968 *Könige I. BKAT* 9/1. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener.

1972 *A History of Pentateuchal Traditions.* tr. with an introduction by B.W. Anderson. Englewoood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall.

1981 *The Deuteronomistic History.* tr. J. Doull. Sheffield: JSOT.

Oesterly, W.O.E. and Robinson, T.H.
1935 *An Introduction to the Books of the Old Testament.* London: SPCK.

Peckham, M.
1976 "The Intentional? Fallacy?". *On Literary Intention.* ed. by D. Molina. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University, 139-57.

Pfeiffer, R.H.
1948 *Introduction to the Old Testament.* New York: Harper & Row.

Polzin, R.
1980 *Moses and the Deuteronomist. A Literary Study of the Deuteronomistic History.* New York: Seabury.

Porten, B.
1967 "The Structure and Theme of the Solomon Narrative". *HUCA* 38, 93-128.

Porteous, N.W.
1955 "Royal Wisdom". *Wisdom in Israel and in the Ancient Near East* [H.H. Rowley Festschrift]. *SVT* 3. Leiden: E.J. Brill.

Pritchard, J.B.
1969 *Ancient Near Eastern Texts Relating to the Old Testament.* 3rd. ed. with Supplement. New Jersey: Princeton University.

1974 *Solomon and Sheba.* London: Phaidon.

Rad, G. von
1962 *Old Testament Theology.* tr. D.M.G. Stalker. New York: Harper & Row.

1966 *The Problem of the Hexateuch and Other Essays.* tr. E.T. Dicken. Edinburgh and London: Oliver and Boyd.

1972 *Wisdom in Israel.* tr. J.D. Martin. Nashville: Abingdon.

Radday, Y.
1974 "Chiasm in Kings". *LB* 31, 52-67.

Rehm, M.
1979 *Das erste Buch der Könige.* Wurzburg: Echter.

Richardson, A.
1963 "The Rise of Modern Biblical Scholarship and Recent Discussion of the Authority of the Bible". *CHB* III. Cambridge: Cambridge University, 294-338.

Ringgren, H.
1956 *The Messiah in the Old Testament.* SBT 18. London: SCM.

1966 *Israelite Religion.* tr. D. Green. London: S.P.C.K.

Robertson, D.
1977 *The Old Testament and the Literary Critic.* Philadelphia: Fortress.

Robinson, J.
1976 *The Book of Kings.* CBC. Cambridge: Cambridge University.

Rost, L.
1982 *The Succession to the Throne of David.* tr. M.D. Rutter and D.M. Gunn. Sheffield: Almond.

Ruthven, K.K.
1979 *Critical Assumptions.* Cambridge: Cambridge University.

Sacks, R.
1980 "The Lion and the Ass: A Commentary on the Book of Genesis (chs. 1-10)". *Interpretation: A Journal of Political Philosophy* 8, 22-101.

Scott, R.B.Y.
1955 "Solomon and the beginning of Wisdom in Israel". *Wisdom in Israel and in the Ancient Near East* [H.H. Rowley Festschrift]. *SVT* 3. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 262-79.

1971 *The Way of Wisdom.* New York: Macmillan.

Seters, J. Van
1981 "Histories and Historians of the Ancient Near East: The Israelites". *Or* 50, 137-85.

1983 *In Search of History.* New Haven and London: Yale.

Sheppard, G.T.
1980 *Wisdom as a Hermeneutical Construct.* BZAW 151. Berlin and New York: W. de Gruyter.

Skinner, J.
1904 *Kings.* CeB. Edinburgh and London: T.C. & E.C. Jack.

Smend, R.
1921 "JE in den geschichtlichen Büchern des Alten Testaments". *ZAW* 39, 181-217.

Snaith, N.H.
1954 "I and II Kings". *IB* 3. New York: Abingdon-Cokesbury, 3-18.

Soggin, J.A.
1967 *Königtum in Israel.* BZAW 104. Berlin: Töpelmann.

1977 "The Davidic-Solomonic Kingdom", in Hayes and Miller (1977:332-80).

1982 "Compulsory Labour under David and Solomon", in Ishida (1982:259-68).

Spinoza, B.
1951 *A Theologico-Political Treatise.* tr. R.H.M. Elwes. New York: Dover.

Strauss, L.
1965 *Spinoza's Critique of Religion.* New York: Shocken.

1972 "Plato". *History of Political Philosophy.* ed L. Strauss and J. Cropsey. Chicago: Rand McNally, 7-63.

Szikszai, S.
1962 "Kings I and II". *IDB* 3. Nashville: Abingdon, 26-35.

Terrien. S.
1952 "History of the Interpretation of the Bible". *IB* I. Nashville: Abingdon-Cokesbury, 127-41.

Thompson, E.M.
1971 *Russian Formalism and Anglo-American New Criticism.* The Hague: Mouton.

Thorton, T.C.G.
1968 "Solomonic Apologetic in Samuel and Kings". *CQR* 169, 159-66.

Todorov, T.
1977 *The Poetics of Prose.* tr. R. Howard. Ithaca: Cornell University.

Tompkins, J. P. (ed.)
1980 *Reader-Response Criticism.* Baltimore: Johns Hopkins.

Tucker, G.M.
1971 *Form Criticism of the Old Testament.* Philadelphia: Fortress.

Vaux, R. de
1965 *Ancient Israel. v.I & II.* New York and Toronto: McGraw-Hill.

Veijola, T.
1975 *Die Ewige Dynastie. David und die Entstehung seiner Dynastie nach der Deuteronomistischen Darstellung.* Helsinki: Suomalainen Tiedeakatemia.

Weinfeld, M.
1972 *Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomic School.* Oxford: Clarendon.

Weippert, H.
1972 "Die 'deuteronomischen' Beurteilung der Könige von Israel und Judah und das Problem der Redaktion der Königsbücher". *Bib* 53, 301-39.

Weiser, A.
1960 *The Old Testament: Its Formation and Development.* tr. D.M. Barton. New York: Association.

Wellek, R.
1978 "The New Criticism". *CI* 4, 611-24.

Wellek, R. and Warren, A.
1975 *The Theory of Literature.* 3rd ed. New York and London: Harcourt, Brace and Jovanovich.

Wellhausen, J.
1899 *Die Composition des Hexateuchs und der historischen Bücher des Alten Testaments.* Berlin: G. Reimer

1973 *Prolegomena to the History of Ancient Israel.* Gloucester: Peter Smith reprint of Meridian Books edition of 1957 [orig. 1878].

Westerholm, S.
1986 "*Torah, nomos,* and the law: A question of 'meaning'." *SR* 15, 327-336.

Wharton, J.A.
1981 "A Plausible Tale". *Inter* 35, 341-54.

White, H.
1978 *The Tropics of Discourse.* Baltimore and London: Johns Hopkins.

Whitelam, K.
1979 *The Just King.* JSOTS 12. Sheffield: JSOT.

Whybray, R.N.
1968 *The Succession Narrative.* SBT 9. London: SCM.

1974 *The Intellectual Tradition in the Old Testament.* BZAW 135. Berlin and New York: W. de Gruyter.

1982 "Wisdom Literature in the Reigns of David and Solomon", in Ishida (1982:13-26).

Widengren, G.
1957 "King and Covenant". *JSS* 2, 1-32.

Wimsatt, W.K. Jr.
1954 *The Verbal Icon. Studies in the Meaning of Poetry.* Lexington: University of Kentucky.

Wolff, H.W.
1975 "The Kerygma of the Deuteronomic Historical Work". *The Vitality of the Old Testament.* tr. F.C. Prussner. ed. W. Brueggemann and H.W. Wolff. Atlanta: John Knox, 83-100.

Wright, G.E.
1967 "The Province of Solomon (I Kings 4:7-19)". *EI* 8, 58-68.

Würthwein, E.
1974 *Die Erzählung von der Thronfolge Davids — theologische oder politische Geschichtsschreibung?* ThSt 115. Zürich: Theologischer.