

Too Much of a Bad Thing:
Legal Blend and Intermarriage in 1 Kings 11:1–4
Copyright © 2019
Gary Edward Schnittjer

Scriptural exegesis of scripture advances revelation. God reveals his redemptive will at many times and in many ways. Scriptural exegesis of Torah enjoys a prominent place within progressive revelation. This includes the exegetical indictment of Solomon.

Scriptural authors sometimes use one legal instruction as leverage to reinterpret another. Legal exegesis often goes beyond mere explanation to include expansions, extrapolations, inferences, and other adjustments.¹ Legal blends make up a vital subset of interpretive blends that appear throughout scripture.²

Torah models exegetical advances of authoritative legal instructions as the norm. Exodus houses the covenant renewal collection (Exod 34:11–26) that reinterprets key elements of the ten commandments and covenant collection (20–23). Leviticus and Numbers feature numerous reinterpretations of legal standards, especially the series of episodes where Yahweh himself sets precedent and adjusts his own laws, even re-adjusting the adjustments (Lev 24:10–23; Num 9:1–14; 15:32–36; 27:1–11; 36:1–12).³ Deuteronomy refers to itself as Torah “explained” (Deut 1:5), “presented” (4:44), and “taught” (6:1). There is no such thing as legal instructions without exegetical upgrades in any book of Torah.

Torah does hold a monopoly on legal advancements but expects continuity of authoritative interpretation through divinely ordained prophets (18:18; cf. 13:1–5). The frequent exegetical use of Torah in scriptural narratives, prophets, and psalms preserve authoritative residual testimony of lively interpretation of Torah in ancient Israel. Sorting out the myriad of concerns with detecting actual allusions and determining direction of dependence needs to be based on an evaluation of the evidence in every case. The present study focuses on one heavy-laden interpretive blend in the opening of 1 Kings 11.

The narrator of the book of Kings splices together several legal standards from Torah to explain the circumstances of the spectacular downfall of Solomon.⁴ Interpretations like Solomon had too many wives and/or he had taken the wrong wives seem fine as far as they go. But the narrator of Kings uses Torah to explain how exactly too many wrong wives ruined Solomon. The narrator accomplishes this in 1 Kings 11:1–4 by an allusion to the law of the assembly (Deut 23:3–8 [4–9]), an interpretive paraphrase of the law of the king (17:17), and prohibitions against intermarriage (7:1–4; Exod 34:16). Close attention to the legal blend in 1 Kings 11:1–4 supports several implications that go beyond the cul-de-sacs of interpretations that do not adequately attend to these allusions. The next two sections will evaluate the evidence of this complex set of

¹ The terms “exegesis” and “interpretation” are here used identically in the broad sense inclusive of explanation, expansion, adjustment, advancement, and the like. On the broader sense of exegesis see Jeffrey H. Tigay, “An Early Technique of Aggadic Exegesis,” in H. Tadmor and M. Weinfeld, eds., *History, Historiography and Interpretation: Studies in Biblical and Cuneiform Literatures* (Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1983), 170, n. 3 [169–89].

² The concept of interpretive blend is broader than but based on “legal blend” coined by Michael Fishbane, *Interpretation in Ancient Israel* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1985), 110–19, 134–36.

³ See Simeon Chavel, *Oracular Law and Priestly Historiography in the Torah* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2014).

⁴ The narrator of Kings may be thought of as author, compiler, editor, and redactor. The use of the term narrator here connotes the coherence and unity of Kings and is inclusive of the collaborative authorship across time that produced the narrative. The term “Deuteronomistic narrative” herein refers to the four-part serial housed in Joshua-Judges-Samuel-Kings.

relationships followed by implications. A comment must come first concerning the troubled textual basis of 1 Kings 11.

A detailed evaluation of a couple of the most thoroughgoing textual studies of 1 Kings 11, as they apply to the first four verses, is housed in the appendix of this study. The textual problems in 1 Kings 11:1–4 include substantial variant readings as well as reorganized elements in the Septuagintal and Masoretic versions. Gary Knoppers favors a heavily emended text akin to a reconstructed *Vorlage* of the Septuagint. Jan Joosten works out critical eclectic Hebrew texts for both the proto-Masoretic and *Vorlage* of the Septuagintal versions. Joosten favors the originality of the Masoretic text in the majority of cases. Relative to the present study it needs to be noted that none of the textual difficulties relates to the scriptural allusions themselves in 1 Kings 11:1–4. That is, the main argument of this study does not require assent to any speculative textual reconstructions. The present study works with the Masoretic version of 1 Kings 11:1–4 without emendation as explained in the appendix.

1 Kings 11:1 and the Law of the Assembly

Heading Solomon's problematic treaty wives with those from Egypt, Moab, Ammon, and Edom not so subtly alludes to the law of the assembly by listing all four of the people groups therein (Deut 23:3–8 [4–9]). Notice the parallels (bold refers to verbal parallels and italics to synonyms).⁵

Ammonites and **Moabites** shall not enter the assembly of Yahweh. Even to the tenth generation those belonging to them shall not enter the assembly of Yahweh forever ... You shall not despise **Edomites**, for they are your relatives. You shall not despise *Egyptians*, for you were residing foreigners in their land (Deut 23:3, 7 [4, 8]).

Now, king Solomon loved many foreign women along with *the daughter of pharaoh*, **Moabites**, **Ammonites**, **Edomites**, Sidonians, and Hittites (1 Kgs 11:1).

In the law of the assembly Moabites and Ammonites are perpetually banned from entry into the assembly of Yahweh based on the treachery of their ancestors against Israel in the wilderness (23:3–6 [4–7]). Meanwhile, Edomites and Egyptians could assimilate into the assembly of Yahweh in three generations (23:8 [9]). The distinction of two kinds of others in the law of the assembly accords with similar distinctions between two kinds of others elsewhere in Torah, the prophets, and postexilic restoration narratives.⁶ Whereas the distinction between excluded and included others enjoys wide currency in scripture, 1 Kings 11:1 affirms that God does not play favorites and excludes all those who do not seek after him.

The law of the assembly does not spell out the mechanism for assimilation extended to Edomites and Egyptians and withheld from Ammonites and Moabites. The extremely economic legal standards of Torah frequently do not include necessary corollary laws.⁷ This ambiguity

⁵ All biblical translations mine from *Biblia Hebraica* unless stated otherwise.

⁶ See • Exod 12:43 (excluded) versus 12:48–49 (included); • Isa 52:1 (excluded) versus 56:3–6 (included); • Ezek 44:9 (excluded) versus 14:7; 47:22–23 (included); • Ezra 4:1, 4; Neh 10:30 [31] (excluded) versus Ezra 6:21; Neh 10:18 [29] (included). For key explanations of two kinds of others across the scriptures see discussions associated with Tables I4 and Ezk6 in chaps on Isa and Ezek, respectively, in my forthcoming OT reference work with Zondervan.

⁷ For example, the case laws of lying with a virgin in a town and raping a betrothed woman in open country (Deut 22:23–24, 25–27) presuppose the necessity of two or three witnesses (17:6; 19:15) as well as the interchangeability of the offenders and locales.

could open a debate between assimilation by circumcision with Exodus 12:48 or assimilation by marriage with Deuteronomy 7:3, though these are not mutually exclusive.

The reference to wives from Sidon serves a twofold purpose. First, within the context of Kings, Omri secured a notorious Sidonian treaty wife for Ahab inciting widespread Baal worship (1 Kgs 16:31–33). Mention of Solomon’s wives from Sidon serves as a smear tactic. Second, reference to women of Sidon alongside Moabite, Ammonite, and Hittite women demonstrates that the legal lists are representative rather than comprehensive.

Referring to Solomon’s wives from the Hittites connects with the two genetically related prohibitions against intermarriage in Torah (Exod 34:11; Deut 7:1). The use of the Hittites as the only one of the seven nations of Canaan in the list of treaty wives makes sense because their lands were more distant. Solomon had already put the proximate peoples of the nations of Canaan into forced labor, including any Hittites in the lands under Solomon’s control, thus eliminating any royalty the nearby former nations of Canaan may have had as well as any need for treaties with them (1 Kgs 9:20–21).

1 Kings 11:2–4 and the Prohibitions against Intermarriage and the Law of the King

The narrator of Kings marks by a quasi-citation formula an interpretive paraphrase of the prohibitions against intermarriage and the law of the king from Torah. The use of a quasi-citation formula highly favors Kings as the receptor context.

The narrator of Kings only explicitly marks and quasi-marks Torah contexts on a few occasions. For the moment explicit references to written scriptural traditions may be considered marked and references to spoken or written traditions that appear in scripture as quasi-marked.⁸ The narrator quasi-marks his blended paraphrase with “of which Yahweh had said to the sons of Israel” (אֲשֶׁר אָמַר יְהוָה אֶל־בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל) (11:2). Elsewhere Kings includes a few cases of marking and quasi-marking of traditions appearing in Torah and many quasi-marked allusions to other contexts within Deuteronomistic narratives.⁹ The important point for the present purposes stems

⁸ Fishbane regards the marking in 1 Kgs 11:2 as a “pseudo-Pentateuchal citation” since the Deuteronomist alludes to the prohibition against Ammonites, Moabites, Egyptians, and Edomites “in terms of intermarriage!” (*Biblical Interpretation*, 125–26). This is one of several examples of Fishbane’s ironic insistence upon innovation to qualify an allusion as exegetical, and yet any such marked expansion upon legal standards of Torah he disparages as presumptuously misrepresenting itself by citation formulas (see esp. 134). Fishbane thus leaves no room for legitimate progressive revelation of legal standards.

⁹ Compare similar marked and quasi-marked allusive paraphrases of Torah: **2 Kgs 14:6** [narrator] “according to what is written in the scroll of the Torah of Moses that Yahweh commanded, saying” (כְּכַתּוּב בְּסֵפֶר תּוֹרַת־מֹשֶׁה אֲשֶׁר־) marks a citation of not dying for crimes of father or son in criminal cases (Deut 24:16); **• 21:4** [narrator] “of which Yahweh had said” (אֲשֶׁר אָמַר יְהוָה) quasi-marks an allusion to the prohibition against idolatry in the place Yahweh chooses (Deut 12:5; cf. vv. 11, 21). In addition, see 2 Kgs 17:13 where the narrator makes very broad allusion to written commands.

Compare similar quasi-marked allusions to other contexts within the Deuteronomistic narrative: **• 1 Kgs 5:5 [19]** [Solomon] “as Yahweh had spoken to David my father, saying” (כַּאֲשֶׁר דִּבֶּר יְהוָה אֶל־דָּוִד אָבִי לְאֹמֶר) marks a paraphrase of Nathan’s covenant (2 Sam 7:12–13); **• 8:15** [Solomon] “which he [Yahweh] spoke with his mouth to David my father and by his hand he has fulfilled, saying” (אֲשֶׁר דִּבֶּר בְּפִי דָּוִד אָבִי וּבְיָדוֹ מָלֵא לְמַר) marks an allusion to the Davidic promise (2 Sam 7:2–3, 6–8; cf. Deut 12:5, 11, 14); **• 8:18** [Solomon] “and Yahweh said to David my father” (וַיֹּאמֶר יְהוָה אֶל־דָּוִד אָבִי) marks a paraphrased portion of Nathan’s oracle (2 Sam 7:12–13); **• 8:25** [Solomon] “that which you have spoken to him [David my father], saying” (אֲשֶׁר דִּבַּרְתָּ לוֹ לְמַר) sets up a paraphrase of David’s warning to Solomon (1 Kgs 2:4; cf. 2 Sam 7:14–16); **• 2 Kgs 8:19** [narrator] “of whom [David] he [Yahweh] had said to him” (כַּאֲשֶׁר אָמַר־לוֹ) marks an allusion to a lamp remaining for David (1 Kgs 11:36; 15:4); **• 21:7** [narrator]

from all of the cases of marking and quasi-marking as alluding to scriptural traditions already known to the narrator and his constituency. The quasi-marking of the interpretive blend in 1 Kings 11:2 thus provides the right kind of evidence to suggest direction of dependence, with the Torah traditions as donor contexts and the Kings narrative as receptor context.

The more difficult issue in 1 Kings 11:2–3 turns on determining the specific donor context or contexts the narrator has in mind. The shared language amounts to a few extremely common terms as well as thematically related elements. In spite of the limited verbal parallels the nature of the evidence favors allusion to the prohibitions against intermarriage from Exodus 34:11–16 and Deuteronomy 7:1–4 blended together with the prohibition against too many wives in the law of the king in Deuteronomy 17:17. Compare the shared elements of the donor contexts (bold and underlining signify verbal parallels, italics similar concepts, and broken underlining shared syntax).

And when you take from their daughters for your sons, and their daughters whose after their gods, then they will cause your sons to whore after their gods (Exod 34:16).

You shall not intermarry with them. You shall not give your daughters to their sons or take their daughters for your sons. For they will turn your sons from **following after** me and they will serve **other gods**. Then the anger of Yahweh will be kindled against you and will quickly destroy you (Deut 7:3–4).

He [the king] shall not *multiply wives* for himself so that his heart will not turn away (Deut 17:17a).

Now, king Solomon loved many foreign women ... from the nations of which Yahweh had said to the Israelites, “You shall not come into them, and they shall not come into you, otherwise they will turn your heart after their gods.” Solomon clung to them in love.³ He had 700 royal *wives* and 300 concubines. And his wives turned his heart away.⁴ When Solomon grew old his wives turned his heart away after other gods and his heart was not wholly devoted to Yahweh his God like the heart of his father David (1 Kgs 11:1a, 2–4).

The evidence strongly favors a genetic relationship between the prohibitions against apostasy marriages in Exodus 34:11–16 and Deuteronomy 7:1–4.¹⁰ The direction of dependence may be debated between these prohibitions by excavative diachronic approaches. Proponents of excavative conjectures in this case offer competing reconstructions based on the same evidence.¹¹ Since sorting out these theoretical reconstructions does not bear on the present

“of which Yahweh had said to David and to Solomon his son” (אֲשֶׁר אָמַר יְהוָה אֶל־דָּוִד וְאֶל־שְׁלֹמֹה בְּנוֹ) alludes to Nathan’s oracle and the second theophany to Solomon (1 Kgs 9:3, 6–7; 2 Sam 7:10; cf. Deut 12:5); • **23:27** [narrator] “of which I [Yahweh] had said” (אֲשֶׁר אָמַרְתִּי) alludes to second theophany to Solomon (1 Kgs 9:3; cf. Deut 12:5).

¹⁰ See Gary Edward Schnittjer, “Legal Exegesis Storylines of Exodus 34 and Deuteronomy 7,” unpublished conference paper, ETS far west regional meeting, Riverside, CA, March 2019.

¹¹ For a critical assessment against numerous offsetting conjectures about the relative earliness versus lateness of Exod 34:11–26 see David Carr, “Method in Determination of Direction of Dependence: An Empirical Test Case of Criteria Applied to Exodus 34,11–26 and its Parallels,” in Matthias Köckert and Erhard Blum, eds., *Gottes Volk am Sinai. Untersuchungen zu Ex 32–34 und Dtn 9–10* (Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlaghaus, 2001), 108–13 [107–140]. It is easy to agree with Carr’s assessment of the dead end of the excavative studies he evaluates. Carr’s own proposed

argument it is enough to note the exegetical advancements between these genetically related laws within the context of Torah. The covenant renewal prohibits taking daughters-in-law from the nations of Canaan. Deuteronomy exegetically advances the prohibition by banning intermarriage for both genders (*italics refers to verbal parallels and bold additions*).¹²

When *you take* some of their daughters *for your sons* (Exod 34:16a).

Do not give **your daughters** to their sons or *take their daughters for your sons* (Deut 7:3).

The narratives of the restoration repeatedly emphasize the prohibition as applying to both genders (Ezra 9:12; Neh 10:30 [31]; 13:25). This reinforces the implied direction of dependence from a prohibition focused on one gender to explicit mention of both genders.

Both of the prohibitions against intermarriage use causative stem verbs to explain the rationale for legal standards in terms of these marriages resulting in idolatry.¹³ Exodus 34:16 uses the Hifil of the unsavory term *נָהַ* appropriately glossed by the King James Version as “make thy sons go a whoring.” The Hifil use of “cause to whore” applied to males does not occur elsewhere in Torah. The anxiety of the law stems from Canaanite wives as madams waiting for Hebrew husbands to pimp after their own gods. “When you take their daughters for your sons and the daughters whore after their gods, then they will cause your sons to go a whoring after their gods” (Exod 34:16).¹⁴ The related prohibition in Deuteronomy also uses a causative stem but with a less racy verb: “for they [the forbidden spouse] *will turn aside* (*סוּר* Hif) your children from following after me” (Deut 7:4).

The causative stem of a different verb “to turn, incline, stretch” (*נָטָה*) appears three times in 1 Kings 11:1–4 to overemphasize the role of Solomon’s women in bending his heart away from Yahweh.¹⁵ The blended legal interpretive paraphrase warns, “otherwise *they will turn your*

solution (Exod 34:11–26 as one of the latest layers in Torah) is even weaker than the views he tries to overturn. Carr uses untenable empirical models, namely, a series of late second temple sectarian extremist texts that lack the breadth or functionality of exegesis within the scriptures. The empirical models Carr uses are proto-Samaritan Pentateuch (4Q22), Reworked Pentateuch (4Q366, 4Q367), Samaritan Pentateuch, and the Temple Scroll (11Q19/11QT^a). The first three of Carr’s five criteria (the other two are irrelevant) for detecting later texts based on the late sectarian texts are: (1) expansion of otherwise close verbal parallels; (2) combining elements otherwise found separately; and (3) filling perceived gaps. In scripture later texts often do not expand but abridge—*contra* criteria 1 and 3 (Neh 13:1–2; cf. Deut 23:3–6 [4–7]). In scripture sometimes later texts consolidate (cf. 1 Chron 11:1–9//2 Sam 5:1–10; 1 Chron 1:10–47//2 Sam 23:8–39) and at other times they spread out donor texts (e.g., the series of narrative vignettes cobbled together in 2 Samuel regarding David’s anointing, taking Jerusalem, defeating the Philistines, and bringing the ark to Jerusalem run parallel to widely dispersed counterparts in Chronicles [cf. 2 Sam 5:1–10//1 Chron 11:1–9; 2 Sam 5:11–25//1 Chron 14:1–17; 2 Sam 6:1–11//1 Chron 13:5–14; 2 Sam 6:12–18//1 Chron 15:25–6:6; 2 Sam 6:19//1 Chron 16:43])—*contra* criterion 2. In short, the limited range of exegetical tendencies in Carr’s selected empirical models does correspond with the wide range of legal exegesis in scripture. The bad fit of Carr’s empirical models distorts rather than clarifies the direction of dependence in scriptural exegesis.

¹² For other advancements of Exod 34:11–16 in Deut 7 including the insertion of the language of *herem* (*חרם*) warfare see Schnittjer, “Legal Exegesis Storylines.”

¹³ By contrast Deut 17:17 uses the Qal stem of “turn aside” (*סוּר*).

¹⁴ See Schnittjer, “Legal Exegesis Storylines.”

¹⁵ Carasik makes the point that in scripture the heart needs to be “deliberately directed” whether as the object of Qal or Hifil verbs. See Michael Carasik, *Theologies of the Mind in Biblical Israel* (New York: Peter Lang, 2006), 106.

heart after their gods” predictably followed by “his wives *turned* his heart *away*. When Solomon grew old his wives *turned away* his heart after other gods” (1 Kgs 11:2, 3, 4, emphasis mine). The importance of the syntactic parallel of the causative stem verbs between the counterpart prohibitions against intermarriage and the use of this syntax to get at the coercive role of Solomon’s treaty wives has not been adequately appreciated. The repeated allusion by means of the Hifil stem underscores that these women did not “convert” to Israel and made no pretense at assimilation. Instead each treaty wife individually twisted Solomon’s heart this way and that after the gods of the royal brides’ respective homelands. This suggests what Solomon loved.

The last phrase of 1 Kings 11:2 says “Solomon clung to them in love.” The third person plural masculine pronominal suffix “them” (הֵם) could refer collectively to the many nations from which his wives hailed. But the threefold use of the Hifil “cause to turn” to refer to the twisting of Solomon’s heart affirms equally as well their gods as the objects of Solomon’s affections. The third person masculine pronominal suffix appears on the end of gods, namely, “their gods” (אֱלֹהֵיהֶם) to refer to the wives’ gods.¹⁶ Consider “them” as referring to the wives versus their gods as the possible antecedent in the second half of 1 Kings 11:2, ““You shall not come into *them* (בָּהֶם), and *they* (הֵם) shall not come into you, otherwise they will turn your heart after *their gods* (אֱלֹהֵיהֶם).” Solomon clung *to them* (בָּהֶם) in love” (emphasis mine). The narrator may try to provoke his constituents to wonder if Solomon loved his women or loved their gods.¹⁷

The narrator of Kings explains in detail the idolatrous infidelity to which Solomon’s treaty marriages led. This idolatry is sin. But the quasi-citation formula emphasizes that the apostasy marriages themselves violate the covenant.¹⁸ Solomon’s sinful marital matches lead to sinful infidelity against Yahweh.¹⁹

The possible allusion in 1 Kings 11 verses 1 and 3 to the prohibition against too many wives in the law of the king does not include strong verbal parallels if considered in isolation. The commonplace shared root “many” (רבה) appears in its verbal form in the law, “do not have too *many* wives” and as an adjective in the narrative, “Solomon loved *many* foreign women” (Deut 17:17; 1 Kgs 11:1, emphasis mine). The immediate context in 1 Kings includes additional parallels to the law of the king disguised as ironic praise for importing too many horses from Egypt and accumulating too much silver (1 Kgs 10:26–29; cf. Deut 17:16–17).²⁰ This set of

Other uses of Hif of “turn, direct” (נטה) with the heart as object appear in Ps 119:36; 141:4; Prov 2:2 (see “נטה,” Hif no. 9, HALOT).

¹⁶ Also note that the wives collectively serve as subject of the pair of masculine verbs “they turned away” (טו) Hif impf 3mp (1 Kgs 11:2) and (טו) Hif wci 3mp (11:3).

¹⁷ On intentional ambiguity in biblical narrative see Meir Sternberg, *The Poetics of Biblical Narrative: Ideological Literature and the Drama of Reading* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1985), 186–99.

¹⁸ *Contra* Shaye J. D. Cohen, “Solomon and the Daughter of Pharaoh: Intermarriage, Conversion, and Impurity of Women,” *Journal of the Ancient Near Eastern Society* 16–17 (1984–85): 30 [23–37]. Also see J. Liver, “The Book of the Acts of Solomon,” *Biblica* 48 (1967): 91–92 [75–101].

¹⁹ The scriptural evidence favors David as responsible for Solomon’s early treaty marriage to Naamah the Ammonitess. Naamah’s son Rehoboam was forty-one years of age when he began to rule after Solomon’s forty-year rule (1 Kgs 11:42; 14:21, 31). This means Rehoboam was born a year before David’s death and Solomon’s treaty marriage to Naamah at least nine months earlier yet. See Abraham Malamat, “Naamah, the Ammonite Princess, King Solomon’s Wife,” *Revue Biblique* 106.1 (1999): 36, 39 [35–40]. Also see b. Yebamoth 77a (suggesting Rehoboam as an infant sat on David’s lap).

²⁰ See Liver, “Book of the Acts of Solomon,” 92, n. 3; J. Daniel Hays, “Has the Narrator Come to Praise Solomon or Bury Him?: Narrative Subtlety in 1 Kings 1–11,” *JSOT* 28.2 (2003): 156–57 [149–74]; Zipora Talshir, “1 Kings and 3 Kingdoms—Origin and Revision Case Study: The Sins of Solomon (1 Kgs 11),” *Textus* 21 (2002): 82 [71–105]. For an opposing view, based on an argument from silence, that the Deuteronomist does not consider as a problem

parallels taken together provides adequate evidence of the narrator intentionally building this portion of Solomon's story around the law of the king.

The narrator spells out "seven hundred royal wives" which one may hope is hyperbole (1 Kgs 11:3). But commentators note that other ancient harems were even larger.²¹ The law of the king does not explain how many is too many. Whether literal or hyperbole any reader would consider Solomon's womanizing as beyond the permissible allowances, even for a king with unparalleled wealth, fame, and wisdom.

The limitation of the number of wives a king may take does not speak to whether they are from Israel or outsiders (Deut 17:17).²² The law makes the point that too many wives of itself can turn away the king's heart. The narrator of Kings seems to use the shared dangerous outcomes of turning away from Yahweh in the law of the king and the prohibitions against intermarriage as a basis for connecting them together to explain Solomon's downfall.²³

In sum, the opening of 1 Kings 11 features evidence to support a composite allusion to at least one of the genetically related prohibitions against intermarriage, the law of the king, and the law of the assembly. The quasi-citation formula suggests all three (or four) laws, more or less as they are known in Torah, as donor contexts and 1 Kings 11:1–4 as receptor context. The exegetical blend effectively condemns Solomon as well as advancing a number of implications.

Implications

The legal blend in the opening of 1 Kings 11 features evidence that supports several implications. No attempt is made here to be exhaustive.

First, the narrative use of a quasi-citation formula in 1 Kings 11:2 offers the right kind of evidence to establish direction of dependence with a high level of confidence. The paraphrastic interpretive blend presupposes familiarity by narrator and constituents with one or both of the prohibitions against intermarriage (Exod 34:11–16; Deut 7:1–4), the law of the king (Deut 17:17), and the law of the assembly (23:3–8 [4–9]). This evidence of itself does not support a particular date of authorship, only relative dating.

Second, all four of the peoples from the law of the assembly in the opening of Deuteronomy 23 get lumped together as excluded others at the head of the list of Solomon's treaty wives (1 Kgs 11:1). In accord with all other scriptural allusions to the law of the assembly

hoarding wealth and accumulating too many horses and wives, see Gary N. Knoppers, "The Deuteronomist and the Deuteronomic Law of the King: A Reexamination of a Relationship," *ZAW* 108 (1996): 337, 343 [329–46]. For a sharp criticism against the self-defeating logic of Knoppers' contrast between the Deuteronomic law of the king and the Deuteronomist's ideology, see Bernard M. Levinson, "The Reconceptualization of Kingship in Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomistic History's Transformation of Torah," *VT* 51.4 (2001): 526–27, n. 41 [512–34]. Levinson favors a contradiction between Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomistic History and criticizes Knoppers from this perspective.

²¹ See James A. Montgomery, *The Book of Kings*, ICC, ed. Henry Snyder Gehman (Edinburgh: T.&T. Clark, 1951), 234–35; and see Isaac Kalimi, *Writing and Rewriting the Story of Solomon in Ancient Israel* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2019), 90. Compare the more modest harems of Rehoboam with eighteen wives and sixty concubines (2 Chron 11:21), Abijah's fourteen wives (13:21), and a royal harem in Song of Songs with sixty queens and eighty concubines (Song 6:8).

²² See Talshir, "1 Kings and 3 Kingdoms," 80.

²³ The uses of "turn aside" (סור Hif) in Deut 7:4 and "turn aside" (סור Qal) in 17:17 may have served as a catchword to attract combining them in 1 Kgs 11:2. But the use of a different term "stretch, twist" (נטה Hif) leaves the basis of connection open as well as making room for allusion to "cause to whore after" (זנה Hif) in Exod 34:16.

the ethnicities do not get interpreted literally but symbolically.²⁴ In this case, even those people groups who could enter Israel in three generations get counted as non-assimilating excluded others in line with the forbidden spouses of the prohibitions against intermarriage.

Third, the narrative in 1 Kings 11:1 regards the law of the assembly as referring to assimilation by marriage (Deut 23:3–8 [4–9]). This judgment gets affirmed by Nehemiah’s allusion to 1 Kings 11 to condemn wrongful marriages to women of Ammon, Moab, and Ashdod in the declining days of the restoration (Neh 13:26–27).²⁵

Fourth, the only one of the forbidden Canaanite nations included in the list is the Hittites (1 Kgs 11:1; Deut 7:1). Nonetheless, the use of the Hittites with Ammonites, Moabites, Egyptians, and Edomites in the same list of forbidden others demonstrates that the law of the assembly (Deut 23:3–8 [4–9]) and the prohibition against intermarrying with the nations of Canaan (7:1–4; cf. Exod 34:11–16) are mutually enriching counterparts.

Fifth, the narrator includes Phoenicians among the forbidden others demonstrating that those people listed as forbidden in the prohibitions against intermarriage and the law of the assembly are merely representative (1 Kgs 11:1; cf. Exod 34:11; Deut 7:1; 23:3 [4]). In like manner, the use of Edomites and Egyptians as excluded demonstrates that even expressly included others may be excluded if they do not seek assimilation by covenantal fidelity (1 Kgs 11:1; cf. Deut 23:7 [8]).²⁶

Sixth, though the law of the king does not state a specific limit on the number of wives, Solomon’s narrator infers that 700 treaty wives are too many (1 Kgs 11:3; cf. Deut 17:17).

Seventh, the threefold use of the causative stem verb “turn” with Solomon’s wives as subject shows as well as tells the disastrous ends of getting into bed with forbidden others (1 Kgs 11:2, 3, 4). The repeated use of causative syntax, though subtle, takes good advantage of the causative verbs in the warnings of the kindred prohibitions against apostasy marriages in Torah (Exod 34:16; Deut 7:4).

Eighth, the narrative of 1 Kings 11:1–4 presupposes that legal standards of Torah may be combined and extrapolated to evaluate the actions of the people of God. The laws of Torah do not stand at the end of progressive revelation, but they are more like a starting point.

Ninth, exegesis of scripture within scripture serves as an engine of progressive revelation. The authoritative presentation of a legal blend like the one in 1 Kings 11:1–4 suggests scriptural exegesis within scripture advances revelation of God’s redemptive will.

Appendix: Text Critical Evaluations of 1 Kings 11:1–4

The Masoretic and Septuagintal versions of 1 Kings 11:1–4 (and the entire chapter) feature many differences. These differences include alternate arrangements of some of the elements as well as several variations in details. The purpose of this appendix is to review selected text critical assessments of the evidence. This assessment does not speak to the general relationship of the Masoretic and Septuagintal versions of Kings, but strictly relates to 1 Kings 11:1–4 for the

²⁴ For examples of the prohibition against assimilation of Ammonites and Moabites applied to other people groups see, e.g., allusions in Isa 52:1; Lam 1:10; Neh 13:1–3.

²⁵ See Gary Edward Schnittjer, “The Bad Ending of Ezra-Nehemiah,” *BSac* 173 (2016): 43–44 [32–56].

²⁶ The exegetical advancement of excluding marriages to Egyptians is also observed by Cohen, “Solomon and the Daughter of Pharaoh,” 25–26. Jeon fails to observe the allusion to the law of the assembly in Deut 23:3–8 [4–9] but awkwardly argues that the narrator of Kings builds a case against the daughter of pharaoh around a return to Egypt theme in the early chapters of 1 Kings. See Yong Ho Jeon, “The Retroactive Re-evaluation Technique with Pharaoh’s Daughter and the Nature of Solomon’s Corruption in 1 Kings 1–12,” *TynBul* 62.1 (2011): 29–32 [15–40].

present purposes. The present discussion will primarily critically evaluate two of the more thoroughgoing comparative studies of the evidence by Gary Knoppers and Jan Joosten.²⁷

Knoppers basically follows the Septuagintal *Vorlage* of 1 Kings 11:1–4 but with additional surgical procedures grafting in elements from the Masoretic version as well as excising other elements appearing in both versions. Knoppers' text critical decisions do not run into trouble with his other studies of the Deuteronomistic authorship of 1 Kings 11 since the Deuteronomistic idiom applies to both the Septuagintal and Masoretic versions.²⁸ While in other studies Knoppers seems reticent to perform emendations without textual evidence, his text critical decisions on this context betray an uncharacteristic heavy-handedness.

Note Knoppers' translation of 1 Kings 11:1–4 as well an interaction with many of his text critical decisions.²⁹

Now, king Solomon loved women^a and he had 700 wives^b and 300 concubines.^c And he took foreign wives:^{de} Moabites, Ammonites, Arameans,^f Edomites, Phoenicians, and Amorites.^g from the nations of which YHWH said to the Israelites, “You shall not have sexual relations with them nor they shall have sexual relations with you; truly,^h they will turn your heart after their gods.” Solomon clung to these in love. When Solomon became old, his heart was not completely with YHWH as was the heart of David his father and his wives turned his heart after otherⁱ gods (1 Kgs 11:1–4).

^a 11:1 Knoppers omits “many foreign” based on a multistage sequence of accidental and purposeful scribal interventions starting with a single word haplography from “women” (נשים) to “women” (נשים) in 11:1 still seen in 11:1 LXX *Vorlage* (141, n. a). Based on this multistage conjecture Knoppers favors the LXX *Vorlage* for 11:1.

^b 11:3 MT Knoppers omits “royal” (שָׂרֵי) as a gloss in the MT (141, n. b).

^c Knoppers follows LXX Vaticanus with “he had 700 wives and 300 concubines” in 11:1 versus 11:3 (so also 11:1 BHK n. a [retained in BHS]).

^d 11:1 MT Knoppers omits “many” (רבות) preferring LXX Vaticanus (141, n. c).

^e Knoppers omits “daughter of pharaoh” (ובת פרעה) as a scribal “correction” to include pharaoh's daughter with the wives (141, n. d). For an older version of this conjecture see C. F. Burney, *Notes of the Hebrew Text of the Books of Kings* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1903), 154. 1 Kgs 11:1 BHS n. c is more circumspect leaving as an open question if either “pharaoh's daughter” or the rest of the list is a gloss, namely, “Moabites, Ammonites, Edomites, Sidonians, and Hittites.” The logic behind this possibility infers scribal interest in aligning the wives of Solomon with the prohibitions in Torah. The fatal flaw of this line of logic is that the textual evidence

²⁷ Due consideration is also given to the extensive interaction with the contexts, including a conjectured Hebrew *Vorlage* of the LXX, by Talshir, “1 Kings and 3 Kingdoms,” 85–87, *et passim*. Talshir consistently favors the Masoretic version of 1 Kgs 11:1–8 as more original. Talshir effectively refutes proposals that the editorial revising was done in Greek, but demonstrates that the main changes can only be explained by adjustments in the Hebrew *Vorlage* of the LXX.

²⁸ On the Deuteronomistic idiom of 1 Kgs 11:1–4 see Gary N. Knoppers, “Dynastic Oracle and Succession in 1 Kings 11,” *Proceedings* 7 (1987): 160 [159–72].

²⁹ See Gary N. Knoppers, *Two Nations Under God: The Deuteronomistic History of Solomon and the Dual Monarchies*, vol. 1, *The Reign of Solomon and the Rise of Jeroboam* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1993), 140–43, hereafter cited parenthetically.

definitively supports the interpretive allusion to Torah in 11:2 with a citation formula. Thus, the author himself was interested in aligning Solomon's downfall with Torah. This eliminates the need to speculate from silence about these glosses by copyist scribes.

^f Knoppers suggests that "Arameans" (ארמית) of 11:1 LXX is more original and was omitted by *homoioarkton* before Edomites (אדמית) (141, n. e). The opposite view, that Arameans (ארמית) is an accidental doublet of Edomites (אדמית), seems more economical and easier to explain (Burney, *Notes*, 154; Talshir, "1Kings and 3 Kingdoms," 90–91).

^g Knoppers affirms a fuller list than either the MT or LXX by including both "Sidonians," which he says was omitted from the LXX, and "Amorites," which he says was omitted from MT (141, nn. f, g).

^h Knoppers affirms "truly" (אָמֵן) versus "lest" (פֶּן) in 11:2 as the more likely since it is the more difficult reading (142, n. h).

ⁱ Knoppers affirms "other gods" (אלהים אחרים) with 11:4 MT versus "their gods" (אלהיהן) with 11:4 LXX because "their gods" may be assimilated from 11:2, 8 in this case (142, n. k). It is worth noting, however, that 11:2 MT uses mp "their gods" (אֱלֹהֵיהֶם) while 11:8 uses fp "their gods" (לְאֱלֹהֵיהֶן).

Knoppers' general preferences for the Septuagintal text is unlikely based on his multistage conjecture with no evidence, starting from the slimmest possibility of a single word repetition causing a substantial omission (see note a above). Based on Vroom's re-evaluation of the mechanics of ancient scribal errors grounded in cognitive theory, Knoppers' conjectured starting point is implausible. Namely, "working memory" and the mental "visuospatial sketchpad" make it unlikely that a scribe would look to a different part of the scroll he was copying.³⁰ Even if this scribal omission is granted, Knoppers' series of additional speculations piled on top of it offer little merit.

The suggestions of scribal glosses to explain "royal" wives and "daughter of Pharaoh" seem to get things backwards (see notes b and e). It makes much more sense to see the mention of pharaoh's daughter as a starting point for a narrative explanation of Solomon's problematic marriages. The repeated appearance of pharaoh's daughter, including the intervention of her father (9:16; cf. 3:1; 7:8; 9:24), provides an excellent reason to start the list of foreign wives with her (11:1). Knoppers' suggestions for a fuller list of foreign wives than either the Septuagintal or the Masoretic versions of 11:1 seems to badly miss the mark (see notes f and g). Lists tend to grow by scribal interventions and corruptions rather than shrink.

In sum, Knoppers' extremely detailed and far-reaching emendations tend to go against text critical wisdom. The absence of evidence to support his most important conjectures does not help. With the exception of one or two minor suggestions (see note h), Knoppers' speculative emendations of 1 Kings 11:1–4 are almost entirely without merit. These judgments against Knoppers' textual criticism on 1 Kings 11:1–4 stand apart from his major contributions to textual criticism elsewhere, like his commentaries on 1 Chronicles.

³⁰ See Jonathan Vroom, "A Cognitive Approach to Copying Errors: Haplography and Textual Transmission of the Hebrew Bible," *JSOT* 40.3 (2016): 270–72; 275–78 [259–79].

Joosten worked out critical eclectic texts of 1 Kings 11:1–8 of both the Masoretic and the *Vorlage* of the Septuagintal versions.³¹ Note annotated literal translations of Joosten’s eclectic texts of 1 Kings 11:1–4.

Masoretic Text

Now, king Solomon loved many foreign women along with the daughter of pharaoh, Moabites, Ammonites, Edomites, Sidonians, and Hittites,

² from the nations of which Yahweh had said to the Israelites, “You shall not come into them, and they shall not come into you, surely they will turn your heart after their gods.” Solomon clung to them in love.

³ He had 700 royal wives^c and 300 concubines. And his wives turned his heart away.

⁴ When Solomon grew old his wives turned his heart away after other gods and his heart was not wholly devoted to Yahweh his God like the heart of his father David.

Vorlage of Septuagint

Now, king Solomon was a lover^a of women. He had 700 of royal birth and 300 concubines. And he took^b foreign wives along with the daughter of pharaoh, Moabites, Ammonites, Arameans^c, Edomites, Hittites, and Amorites,^c

² from the nations of which Yahweh had said to the Israelites, “You shall not come into them, and they shall not come into you, lest^d they turn your heart after their gods.” Solomon clung to them in love.

Solomon clung to them in love.

⁴ When Solomon grew old then his heart was not wholly devoted to Yahweh his God like the heart of his father David. And his foreign^f wives turned away his heart after their gods.

^a Joosten re-vocalizes verb of 1 Kings 11:1a LXX *Vorlage* as “he was a lover of” (אָהֵב Q ptc) on the analogy of Tg Jonathan (359), though Joosten regards “many” (רבות) as a plus in the proto-MT (360). Talshir suggests “lover of women” (φιλογύναιος) LXX reflects “he loved many women” (אָהֵב נָשִׁים רבות) in its *Vorlage* (“1 Kings and 3 Kingdoms,” 88).

^b Joosten notes that 11:1b LXX *Vorlage* (= 11:3a MT) separates having many wives from marrying foreign women. Though Joosten considers the separation of these two problems as “more rational” he regards the use of the plus “and he took wives” (וַיִּקַּח נָשִׁים) in 11:1c LXX *Vorlage* as a resumptive repetition, signifying it as scribal intervention (360). Likewise, Talshir sees the *Vorlage* of the LXX as resolving the tensions of the MT by separating “many wives” from “foreign wives” (“1 Kings and 3 Kingdoms,” 92). In sum of 11:1 LXX *Vorlage* Joosten says, “Edition A [proto-MT] is a mess, edition B [LXX *Vorlage*] an unsuccessful attempt to clean it up” (360).

^c Joosten suggests the omission of Sidonian women from 11:1c LXX *Vorlage*, along with the addition of the Amorite women (אֲמֹרִית), is intentional to harmonize the list with Deut 7:1 (360; also see Talshir, “1 Kings and 3 Kingdoms,” 90–91). Joosten suggests that Aramean women (אֲרָמִית) represents a dittography of Edomite women (אֲדָמִית) (360).

³¹ Joosten’s work on 1 Kings 11:1–8 was presented as part of a preview of the now defunct Oxford Hebrew Bible project. To date only one eclectic volume of this project has been produced, namely, Michael V. Fox, *Proverbs: An Eclectic Edition with Introduction and Textual Commentary* (Atlanta: SBL Press, 2015). Joosten’s work appears in Sidnie White Crawford, Jan Joosten, and Eugene Ulrich, “Sample Edition of Oxford Hebrew Bible: Deuteronomy 32:1–9, 1 Kings 11:1–8, and Jeremiah 27:1–10 (34 G),” *VT* 58 (2008): 352–66. For Joosten’s Hebrew texts and additional notes on 1 Kgs 11:1–8 see 375–63. Joosten’s work on 1 Kings 11:1–8 hereafter cited parenthetically.

This is sensible because of the similarity of resh and dalet and the preference for the shorter text.

^d Joosten suggests “lest” (לֵּסְתָּ, 11:2 LXX *Vorlage*) may be a more original reading than “surely” (אֲכַלְמָה, 11:2 proto-MT) since elsewhere it has been updated in Late Biblical Hebrew—he cites 2 Kgs 18:32//Isa 36:17–18 (360–61). While this could work presuming scribal intervention during transmission the suggestion faces other problems. Since the evidence favors Isaiah 36–39 as derivative of 2 Kings 18–20, the shift to “lest” (לֵּסְתָּ) in Isaiah 36:18 versus “for” (כִּי) in 2 Kings 18:32 actually points in the opposite direction from Joosten’s suggestion (see treatment of Isa 36–39 in my OT reference work forthcoming with Zondervan).

^e Joosten suggests that including “wives” (נָשִׁים) in 11:3 MT versus its absence in 11:1 LXX *Vorlage* points to LXX as more original since it is easier to explain this as a scribal addition (361).

^f Joosten argues that “foreign” (הַנְּכַרִּיּוֹת) most likely represents a scribal update in 11:4 LXX *Vorlage* versus its absence in MT (361).

Most of Joosten’s general preferences for the Masoretic Text of 1 Kings 11:1–4 make good sense of the evidence.³² Joosten explains a possible rationale for re-working 11:1–4 from proto-Masoretic Text to *Vorlage* of proto-Septuagint including identifying a possible resumptive repetition at exactly the right place (see note b above). Joosten also deduces possible harmonistic impulses to explain some of the Septuagintal expansions which falls in line with the general tendencies of the Septuagint (see note c). At the same time many of Joosten’s minor suggestions this way and that regarding the Masoretic and Septuagintal versions of 11:1–4 are a tossup without sufficient evidence to affirm or deny (see notes, a, d, e, f).

In sum, the main drift of Joosten’s text critical evaluation of the Masoretic and Septuagintal versions of 1 Kings 11:1–4 favors the Masoretic version as more original. The evidence of a possible resumptive repetition and harmonization in the Septuagintal *Vorlage* supports this general conclusion. At the same time, in several minor cases the Septuagint may retain more original readings than the Masoretic 1 Kings 11:1–4.

The contrasting general evaluations of Knoppers and Joosten on 1 Kings 11:1–4 can be set aside for the moment to take note of their common affirmation of the composite allusion to scripture. Both Knoppers and Joosten retain nearly identical versions of the interpretive blended paraphrase embedded in 1 Kings 11:2. Also, both retain the marked citations formula “of which Yahweh had said” (11:2). In addition, both Knoppers and Joosten affirm the presence of at least three of the four ethnicities of the law of the assembly (Deut 23:3–8 [4–9]).³³ In short, in spite of serious text critical issues plaguing 1 Kings 11:1–4, the evidence supports an exegetical allusion cluster to the Torah’s prohibitions against intermarriage, the law of the king, and the law of the assembly. That is, the outcome of the textual difficulties do not materially bear on the investigation of the exegetical use of scripture in 1 Kings 11:1–4.

³² In 1 Kings 11:5–8 Joosten does note a couple of elements that reflect LXX *Vorlage* as possibly representing an older reading than MT (ibid., 361–62). Even with these couple of elements, the majority of the textual evidence in 1 Kings 1–8 favors MT representing an older version of the narrative. This is especially true of verses 1–4.

³³ Knoppers and Burney excise pharaoh’s daughter from 1 Kgs 11:1 without evidence to support their conjectures (see above).

Since the textual difficulties of 1 Kings 11:1–4 do not relate to the present argument on the use of scripture in this context, the present investigation uses the Masoretic version without emendation. This decision seeks to avoid contaminating the results of this study with speculative text critical outcomes. The Masoretic version has been selected in light of the strong evidence in favor of it *in general* noted above in the appendix. This pragmatic decision relates only to the needs of the present study and applies only to 1 Kings 11:1–4.