The acute observation that 2 Sam. ix.-xx. ; 2 Kings i. ii. 1-9, 13 sqq., were evidently incorporated after the Deuteronomic re­daction of the books of Samuel (K. Budde, *Samuel,* p. xi.) is con­firmed by the framework of Kings with its annalistic material similar to that preserved in 2 Sam. v.-viii., xxi.-xxiv. ; 1 Kings ii. 10-12. With this may belong iii. 3 (the compiler’s judgment) ; and especially v. 3 sqq., where reference is made to David’s incessant wars (2 Sam. viii.). That 2 Sam. ix.-xx., &c., had previously been omitted by the Deuteronomic redactor himself (Budde) cannot be proved. These post-Deuteronomic narratives preserve older material, but with several traces of revision, so that 1 Kings i. ii. now narrate both the end of David’s reign and the rise of Solomon (see î. Benzinger’s commentary on Kings, p. xi.; C. Holzhey, *Buch d. Könige,* p. 17). The latter, however, is their present aim, and some attempt appears to have been made in them to exculpate one whose accession finds a Judaean parallel in Jehoram (2 Chron. xxi. 1-4). Thus it has been held that David’s charges (ii. 1-9) were written to absolve Solomon, and there is little probability in the story that Adonijah after his pardon really requested the hand of Abishag (ii. 13-25), since in Oriental ideas this would be at once viewed as a distinct encroachment upon Solomon’s rights as heir (cf. W. R. Smith, *Kinship and Marriage,* 2nd ed., p. 110).

Every emphasis is laid on the wisdom of Solomon and his wealth. Yahweh appeared to Solomon in a dream and offered to grant whatever he might ask. Confessing his inexperience, the king prayed for a discerning heart, and was rewarded with the gift of wisdom together with riches and military glory. There follows an example of his sagacity: the famous story of the steps he took to determine which of two claimants was the mother of a child (iii. 16-28).@@1 His wisdom excelled that of Egypt and of the children of the East; by the latter may be meant Babylonia, or more probably the Arabs, renowned through all ages for their shrewdness. Additional point is made by emphasizing his superiority over four renowned sages, sons of Mahol; but the allusion to these worthies (who are incorporated in a Judaean genealogy, 1 Chron. ii. 6) is no longer intelligible. He is also credited with an interest in botany and natural history (iv. 33), and later Jewish legend improved this by ascribing to him lordship over all beasts and birds and the power of understanding their speech. To this it added the sovereignty over demons, from a wrong inter­pretation of Eccles. ii. 8 (see Lane, *Arabian Nights,* introd., n. 21, and ch. 1, n. 25). As his fame spread abroad, people came to hear his wisdom, and costly presents were showered upon him. The sequel was the visit of the Queen of Sheba (1 Kings iv. 29-34; x.). The interesting narrative appears in another light when we consider Solomon’s commercial activity and the trading intercourse between Palestine and south Arabia.@@2 His wealth was in proportion to his wisdom. Trad­ing journeys were conducted with Phoenician help to Ophir and Tarshish. With the horse-breeding districts of the north he traded in horses and chariots (x. 28 seq.; see Mizraim), and gold accumulated in such enormous quantities that the income for one year may be reckoned at about £4,100,000 in weight (x. 11 seq., 14 sqq.). Silver was regarded as stones; the precious cedars of Lebanon as sycamores. His realm extended from Tiphsah (Thapsacus) on the Euphrates to the borders of Egypt (iv. 21, 24), and it agrees with this that he gains important conquests in the north (2 Chron. viii. 3 seq.; but see 1 Kings ix. 18). He main­tained a very large harem (xi.), and among his wives was the daughter of an Egyptian Pharaoh. For his distinguished con­sort, who brought Gezer as a dowry, a special palace was built (iii. I, ix. 16, 24), and this was only one of many building enter­prises.

The description of the magnificent temple of Jerusalem,

which occupies considerable space in Solomon’s history (v.- viii.), appears in more elaborate form in the chronicler’s later work. The detailed record stands in contrast to the brief account of his other buildings, *e.g.* the palace, which, from an Oriental point of view, was of the first importance (vii. 1-12). But the Temple and palace were adjoining buildings, separated only by a wall (cf. Ezek. xlii. 20, xliii. 7 seq.), and it cannot be said that the former had originally the prominence now ascribed to it. Nor can the accounts given by Deuteronomic writers of its significance for the religious worship of Israel be used for an estimate of contemporary religion (v. 1-6, viii.). Whatever David had instituted at Jerusalem, it is at Gibeon that Solomon observed the opening sacrificial ceremonies, and there he received the divine revelation, “ for that was the great high-place ” (iii. 4 sqq.). Though this is justified by a late writer (iii. 2), subsequent history shows that the high-places, like the altars to heathen deities in Jerusalem itself, long re­mained undisturbed; it was the Deuteronomic reformation, ascribed to Josiah, which marked the great advance in the religion of Yahweh, and under its influence the history of the monarchy has been compiled. Moreover, with the emphasis which is laid upon the Jerusalem Temple is to be associated the new superiority of Zadok, the traditional ancestor of the Zadok- ites, the Jerusalem priests, whose supremacy over the other Levitical families only enters into the history of a much later age (see Levites) .

In fact, Solomon, the pious saint, is not the Solomon of the earlier writings. Political, commercial and matrimonial alli­ances inevitably left their mark upon national religion, and the introduction of foreign cults which ensued is characteristically viewed as an apostasy from Yahweh of which he was guilty *in his old age@@.3* The Deuteronomic writer finds in it the cause of the subsequent separation of the two kingdoms (xi. 1-13), and he connects it with certain external troubles which prove to have affected the *whole* course of his reign. The general impression of Solomon’s position in history is in fact seriously disturbed when the composite writings are closely viewed. On the one side we see genial internal conditions prevailing in the land (iv. 20, 25), or the exalted position of the Israelites as officials and overseers, while the remnant of the pre-Israelite inhabitants serve in labour gangs (ix. 20 sqq.). On the other hand is the mass of toiling Israelites, whose oppressed condition is a prelude to the later dissensions (1 Kings v. 13 sqq.; cf. 1 Kings xii.; see the divergent tradition in 2 Chron. ii.). The description of Solomon’s administration not only ignores the tribal divisions which play an important part in the separation of Israel from Judah (xii. 16; cf. 2 Sam. xix. 43-xx. 2), but represents a kingdom of modest dimensions in which Judah apparently is not included. Some north Judaean cities might be named (iv. 9 seq.), but south Judah and Hebron the seat of David’s early power find no place, and it would seem as though the district which had shared in the revolt of Adonijah was freed from the duty of furnishing supplies. But the document has intricate textual peculiarities and may be the Judaean adaptation of a list originally written from the standpoint of the north-Israelite monarchy. Further speculation is caused when it is found that Solomon fortifies such cities as Megiddo, Beth-horon and Tamar, and that the Egyptian Pharaoh had slain the Canaanites of Gezer (ix. 15 sqq.). We learn, also, that Hadad, a young Edomite prince, had escaped the sanguinary campaign in the reign of David (2 Sam. viii. 13 seq.), and had taken refuge in Egypt. He was kindly received by Pharaoh, who gave him the sister of his queen Tahpenes to wife. On David’s death he returned and ruled over Edom, thus not merely controlling the port of Elath and the trade-routes, but even (according to the Septuagint) oppressing Israel (xi. 14-22, 25, see Septuagint on υ*.* 22).@@4 Moreover, an Aramaean dependant

@@@1 For parallels, see R. Flint in Hastings s *Dict. Bib.* iv. 562, n. 1. For the Pompeian wall-painting representing Solomon’s judgment (the figures are pygmies!), see A. Jeremias, *Altes Test. im Lichte d. alt. Orients* 2nd ed., p. 492 seq. (with illustration and references).

@@@2 For Mahommedan stories of Solomon, the hoopoe and the queen of Sheba, see the Koran, Sur. xxvii., which closely follows the second Targum to Esther i. 2, where the Jewish fables may be read in full. On this story, see also J. Halévy, *École pratique des hautes études* (1905), pp. 5-24, and the Chinese parallel in the *Mittheilungen* of the Berlin Seminar for Oriental Languages (1904), vii. i. pp. 117-172. For the late legends of Solomon see Μ. Grün- baum, *Neue Beiträge zur sentit. Sage,* ρρ. 198-237 (Leiden, 1893); G. Salzberger, *Die Salomo-Sage in der semitischen Literatur* (Berlin, 1907).

@@@3 On the relation between trade and religion in old Oriental life, see the valuable remarks by G. A. Smith, *Ency. Bib.* col. 5157 seq.

@@@4 The narrative contains composite features (see the literature cited in article Kings). There is a curious resemblance between one form of the story and the Septuagint account of the rise of Jeroboam (*q.v.*).