Peter Dubovský, Paul Bechter

Was Solomon a Phoenician Vassal?

This paper analyzes the textual versions of 1 Kgs 5:15/3 Kgdms 5:1. The variant reconstructed as the Old Greek reads that Hiram, king of Tyre, exercised a certain control over Solomon. Using historical-critical methods, we argue that these verses are not a later addition but belong to the oldest layers of the Solomonic narrative. These results are confronted with other biblical texts and extra-biblical data. Because the Phoenician kings were interested in direct trade with Israel and Judah as well as in the trade routes that connected the coast with Arabia, we suggest that the Israelite kings needed some confirmation of their legitimacy by the Phoenician rulers. Therefore, we propose that the Old Greek not only represents a more ancient textual version, but also reflects a more realistic relationship between Phoenician cities and Israel / Judah in IA I and IA II.

Keywords: Solomon; Hiram; Vassal; Trade; Old Greek

Introduction

Was the Israelite king Solomon the vassal of a Phoenician king? Was the Israelite kingdom, Judah included, under the control of the Phoenician city states shortly after it had been established and consolidated by its first kings? Our paper will address these questions from different viewpoints. First, we will investigate whether there is any biblical text that would point out the superiority of the Phoenician rulers over Israel and Judah. The Greek text of 3 Kgdms 5:1, contrary to its equivalent in the Masoretic text 1 Kgs 5:15, claims that Hiram sent his servants to anoint Solomon. Analyzing the textual versions and the redactional strata, we will argue that 3 Kgdms 5:1 translates from a different *Vorlage* than the Masoretic text and that this verse is indeed one of the oldest layers of the Solomonic narrative. Having reached these results, our analysis will focus on the question of whether the Greek text implies Phoenician superiority over Israel and Judah. This question will be inserted into the context of other biblical texts. We will also investigate extra-biblical evidence that could corroborate or disprove the claim that the Phoenician city states exercised certain control over early Israelite and Judahite kingdoms.

Textual History of 1 Kgs 5:15/3 Kgdms 5:1

The Masoretic text (MT) reads, "King Hiram of Tyre sent his officials to Solomon *when he heard that he had been anointed king in place of his father*" (NJPS). The *Codex Vaticanus* (G[B]) and the Lucianic text (G[L]), however, contain an important difference: "And King Chiram of Tyre sent his servants *to anoint Salomon in place of his father Dauid*" (NETS). Thus, the servants in the G[BL] were sent to anoint Solomon, while in the MT they merely had heard that Solomon had been anointed. Before we propose our reconstruction of the text, let us discuss the extant textual witnesses.

Type	*Manuscripts[1]*	*Selected parts of the text*
G[BL] type	BMNbdghijklmnopqstvz Lat	χρισαι τον σαλωμων (to anoint Solomon)
	Za$_2$c$_2$e$_2$	του χρισαι τον Σολομωντα (to anoint Solomon)
	ITALA (Cod. Leg.; V. L.II.1864)	*ungere Salamonem regem pro David*[2] (to anoint Solomon king instead of David)
MT type	MT	כי אתו משחו למלך (that they had anointed him king)
	Aefmwxy[b?] <123> Arm SyrH σ'θ'	οτι αυτον εχρισαν εις βασιλεια (that they had anointed him king)
	α'	οτι αυτον ηλειψαν[3] εις βασιλεια (that they had anointed him king)
	Eth	*Ad Salomon ungere eum* (to Solomon to anoint him)
	Eth[s] (Dillmann ms "S")	*ad Salomon salutare eum* (to Solomon to greet him)

---

1   In place of Gothic capitals, we reference the witnesses here according to the notation of A. D. Brooke and A. D., McLean, *The Old Testament in Greek According to the Text of Codex Vaticanus: Supplemented From Other Uncial Manuscripts, With a Critical Apparatus Containing the Variants of the Chief Ancient Authorities for the Text of the Septuagint* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1930).

2   For other witnesses of the VL see A. M. Hernandez, *Las Glosas marginales de Vetus Latina en las Biblias Vulgatas Españolas 1–2 Reyes* (Textos y Estudios "Cardenal Cisneros" 49; Madrid: Instituto de Filología del CSIC, 1992), 101.

3   Aquila uses √ἀλειφω to translate verbal forms of √משח also in Lev 8:10; Ps 44:9; Isa 61:1; Dan 9:24. He uses √χριειν for verbal forms of √משח in 2 Sam 3:39; Jer 22:14. Cf. J. Reider, *An Index to Aquila* (ed. N. Turner; VTSup 12; Leiden: Brill, 1966), 11, 257, 290.

According to the examples presented above, it is possible to observe that, on the one hand, the testimony for the infinitive χρισαι with object τον Σολομων (Hiram sent his servants to anoint Solomon) includes manuscripts of the G^BL text type, the Old Latin (VT) and most of the representative minuscules chosen by Brooke and McLean. On the other hand, the longer form (Hiram sent his servant when he heard that Solomon was anointed king) is manifestly Hexaplaric. It mirrors the MT exactly and is found in α'σ'θ' as well as *Codex Alexandrinus*,[4] nine minuscules, the Armenian, and the Syro-Hexapla.[5]

Between these two types of the text we can situate the Ethiopic text. This text is close to the MT, yet it reflects the involvement of Hiram in the anointing of Solomon.

Eth	*ad Salomon ungere eum*
Eth^s (Dillmann ms "S")	*ad Salomon salutare eum*[6]

Thus, the retroverted Hebrew based on the Ethiopic text would be: וישלח חירם מלך־צור את־עבדיו אל־שלמה למשח אתו תחת דויד אביהו, "Then Hiram king of Tyre sent his servants to Solomon to anoint him after David his father." One possible explanation for this Ethiopic text is that the scribe omitted the MT כי שמע via haplography. In that case the Ethiopic text would have had to also read MT משחו as a construct infinitive + 3msg suffix (rather than MT's vocalization of 3mpl *qatal*): וישלח חירם מלך־צור את־עבדיו אל־שלמה כי שמע כי אתו מָשְׁחוֹ. Although this would require the unusual syntactical interpretation of כי אתו מָשְׁחוֹ as meaning "in order / him / to anoint (him),"[7] one could, with some effort, read this MT phrase as having

---

4 It is well known that for 1–4 Kgdms, Codex A is heavily influenced by Hexaplaric readings. Burkitt even calls it "often little more than a transcript of the fourth column of the Hexapla, but without the critical signs." F.C. Burkitt, *Fragments of the Books of Kings According to the Translation of Aquila* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1897), 19.

5 Intriguingly, the Syro-Hexapla does not have a critical sign here. It could be that this is evidence of one of Origen's *alterations* of the OG text, rather than his *additions*. Though perhaps impossible to prove, this would indicate that for Origen, the shorter variant with the infinitival form was not the true form of the OG. Cf. Burkitt, *Fragments of the Books of Kings*, 19, n. 1: "It is worthy of notice that though Origen's *additions* were placed between critical signs, his *alterations* of the LXX do not seem to have been provided with any mark to warn the reader."

6 The reading of Eth^s *ad Solomon salutare eum*, which is not due to a different *Vorlage* than the OG but rather to the discomfort of the translator with the loaded word "to anoint." It seems this translator chose rather to soften the theological significance by translating it with "to greet."

7 With resumptive use of the object suffix on the infinitive.

the same sense as the Ethiopic text. Another possible explanation is that the MT is an expansion of the Ethiopic text.

As argued above, the G^BL and the VL, however, display variants that cannot be explained by scribal error when translating the MT.[8] In particular, both the G^BL and the VL have Solomon as the direct object of the verb "to anoint," whereas the MT links the proper name Solomon with the verb "to send." To link Solomon with the verb "to anoint" would require moving the proper name שלמה (in italics below) after the verb משח. The verb "to anoint" in Greek is an infinitive of purpose that would require the preposition *lamed* in Hebrew, which the MT does not have. Moreover, the MT has the preposition אל "to Solomon" that is not attested in the G^BL nor in the VL since they have Solomon as a direct object. Furthermore, the G^BL and the VL do not have an equivalent of the MT למלך. Finally, the MT has a suffix 3msg אתו that is not in the VL and the G^BL. The differences can be summarized as follows:

וישלח חירם מלך־צור את־עבדיו אֶל־שלמה כי שמע כי אתו משחו לַמלך תחת דויד אביהו

In sum, to interpret the G^BL as derived from the MT, one would have to suppose a "free" translation style that allows for a significant reordering of elements and simplification of syntax. Given the implausibility of such scribal gymnastics, the literal style of the Greek, and the near-identical testimony of the G^BL and the VL, it seems impossible to maintain that χρισαι τον Σολομων is merely an "abbreviation"[9] of the translators or that it could be due to some other inner-Greek dynamic.[10] We conclude therefore, in accordance with other scholars, that the G^BL and the VL represent the Old Greek (OG) that preserves a reading in its *Vorlage* which is different than the MT.[11] Based on J. Kuan's study[12] our retroversion into Hebrew is as follows:

---

8 Cf. P. S. F. van Keulen, *Two Versions of the Solomon Narrative: An Inquiry into the Relationship between Mt 1 Kgs. 2–11 and LXX 3 Reg. 2–11* (VTSup 104; Leiden: Brill, 2005)*,* 100–101.

9 M. J. Mulder, *1 Kings: I. 1 Kings 1–11* (HCOT; Leuven: Peeters Press, 1998), 208.

10 Van Keulen, despite concluding that "the form of the Greek text [is] intentional," is not so enthusiastic: "It is by no means certain that 3 Reg. 5:15 actually goes back to a Hebrew text different from MT, however." Van Keulen, *Two Versions*, 101.

11 This would be consistent with the findings of text-critical scholars such as Trebolle Barrera, Torijano Morales, Schenker, Hugo, and Kreuzer, who argue that the G^BL preserves a prior edition of 1 Kings; for instance: A. Schenker, *Septante et Texte Massorétique dans l'Histoire la Plus Ancienne du Texte de 1 Rois 2–14* (CahRB 48; Paris: Gabalda, 2000); P. Hugo, *Les deux visages d'Élie: Texte massorétique et Septante dans l'histoire la plus ancienne du texte de 1 Rois 17–18* (OBO 217; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2006); S. Kreuzer, *The Bible in Greek: Translation, Transmission, and Theology of the Septuagint* (SCSt 63; Atlanta: SBL Press, 2015).

12 J. Kuan, "Third Kingdoms 5.1 and Israelite-Tyrian Relations During the Reign of

וישלח חירם מלך־צור את־עבדיו למשח את־שלמה תחת דויד אביהו, "Then Hiram king of Tyre sent his servants to anoint Solomon after David his father".

Textual History

Based on this analysis we can reconstruct the textual history of this verse. The G^{BL}/VL represents an older version of the text than the MT. At the present stage of the extant manuscripts it is also possible that there was another variant circulating that is reflected in the Ethiopic translations.[13]

Regardless of whether the OG is reconstructed from the G^{BL}/VL or from the Ethiopic text, it suggests that Hiram sent his servants to anoint Solomon (see below). Obviously, such a reading raises eyebrows, since it contradicts the presentation of Solomon in 1 Kings 4–5. Therefore, it stands to reason that the MT corrected the OG. The MT seems to expand the Ethiopic version or rewrite significantly the G^{BL}/VL. The expansion can be noticed, in particular, in the phrase כי שמע כי אתו which is an explanatory clause added to clarify why Hiram sent his servants to Solomon.[14] The MT version was adopted by the Hexaplaric texts, the Peshitta,[15] and the Vulgate.

A further stage of correction is seen in 2 Chronicles 2, which represents a new, rewritten, version. The Chronicler eliminated any doubt that Hiram might have been involved in the anointing ceremony of Solomon and inserted parts of 1 Kgs 5:15 (underlined below) into Hiram's letter sent to Solomon: "Then King Hiram of Tyre answered in a letter that he sent to

---

Solomon," *JSOT* 46 (1990): 33. To our knowledge, Jeffrey Kuan is the first to have seriously attempted a reconstruction of this anointing formula. After noting certain syntactical difficulties in the MT, he suggested למשח את־שלמה based on the parallel constructions in 1 Kgs 1:39, which is rendered וימשח את־שלמה in the MT and ἐχρισεν τον Σαλωμων in G^B and G^L (cf. 2 Sam 25:39). He notes that in this construction there is no secondary object governed by על־, as is usual, nor is there the common complement of למלד. Finally, he notes that in 2 Kgs 23:30b, a form of √מלד + direct object is followed by תחת אביו, which closely mirrors our passage in all but the Hiphil finite form of the verb: וימליכו אתו תחת אביו.

13 We express our gratitude to J. Trebolle Barrera who analyzed the Ethiopic manuscripts and concluded that in several cases the Ethiopic texts reflect the OG. His analysis will be published as part of the Göttingen edition of the Books of Kings.

14 "When Hiram heard" should not be interpreted as a temporal clause, which would instead read as ויהי כי שמע חרם כי משחו שלמה למלד וישלח את עבדיו לו. We would like to express our deep gratitude to Prof. A. Gianto for his precious insights regarding the Hebrew syntax.

15 The Peshitta follows the MT and interprets לְמֶלֶךְ as the verb: "Hiram king of Tyre sent his servants to Solomon, because he heard that they anointed him so that he might rule in his father's stead."

Solomon, 'Because the LORD loves his people he has made you king over them.'" (2 Chr 2:10; in the NRSV 2:11)

Redactional Analysis

Having argued that the OG, not the MT, represents the most ancient text, our investigation logically leads towards the question of whether 1 Kgs 5:15/3 Kgdms 5:1 is a later addition or whether it belongs to a pre-Deuteronomistic stratum.

Even a quick look at the extant manuscripts of 1 Kings 4–5 shows that these two chapters did not have a fixed textual form before they were translated into Greek.[16] Moreover, parts of 1 Kgs 5:7 are repeated in 1 Kgs 4:7 and there are several disruptions in the texts (see below). Based on these and other arguments, scholars agree that chapter 1 Kings 4–5 in both its Greek and Hebrew forms are the result of a long and complex redactional process.[17] Taking into consideration scholarly research we suggest that there are at least four layers of the texts that originated in different historical eras. The first layer to be distinguished is the Wisdom Stratum (1 Kgs 4:9–14; 5:21, 26a).[18] This stratum presents Solomon and his deeds as the expression of his superior wisdom, be it intellectual, diplomatic, or organizational. The second layer, quite clearly distinguishable, is the Treaty Stratum. 1 Kgs 5:20, 22–25, 26b focus on a contract between Hiram and Solomon. 1 Kgs 5:26b describes the treaty in general terms, whereas 1 Kgs 5:20–21 specify that the treaty concerned the exchange of timber for שָׂכָר "salary" and that Solomon's servants would collaborate with Hiram's in wood cutting.

---

16 Chapters 4 and 5 are divided in different ways in Greek and Hebrew. Moreover, 1 Kgs 4:17 follows 4:18 in Greek; 1 Kgs 4:20–5:1 are not attested in the G^{BL}; 1 Kgs 5:5–8 are in 3 Kgdms 4:20–21 in the G^B and in 3 Kgdms 4:21–22 in the G^L; 3 Kgdms^B 4:31–33 are located in 1 Kgs 5:7–8 of the MT. Moreover, Kgs 5:31–32 reads "31 Solomon gave the orders and they quarried large stones, quality stones to lay the foundation of the temple with hewn stones. 32 Solomon's builders and Hiram's builders and the Gebalites fashioned (them). They prepared the timber and the stones to build the temple." whereas the G^B reads "And he prepared the stones and the timber for three years." For more detailed study see P. S. F. van Keulen, *Two Versions*.

17 N. Na'aman recently argued that a part of the Solomon narrative must have been available to the Deuteronomist and he proposed to date some verses, in particular 5:32, to Sargon II's period; N. Na'aman, "Hiram of Tyre in the Book of Kings and in the Tyrian Records," *JNES* 78 (2019): 76–85.

18 J. Gray, *I & II Kings: A Commentary* (2nd ed.; OTL; London: SCM, 1970), 149; S. DeVries, *1 Kings* (WBC 12; Waco: Word Books, 1985), 80; E.A. Knauf, *1 Könige 1–14* (HThKAT; Freiburg: Herder, 2016), 217–221.

1 Kgs 5:22–25 elaborate the details of the contract. That "the salary" שָׂכָר meant agricultural goods is specified only in the narrator's explanation (1 Kgs 5:24–25). It is to be noted that 1 Kgs 9:11 interprets "the salary" שָׂכָר as twenty towns in Galilee, which significantly changes the meaning of the contract. None of these verses explicitly mention the construction of the temple. Only 1 Kgs 5:27–32[19] as well as the Deuteronomistic speech in 5:19 interpret the trade contract as a part of Solomon's project to build the temple (*Baubericht*).[20] Finally, the Deuteronomistic layer is distinguishable by its specific vocabulary and themes, such as "to build the house for the name of *YHWH*" (1 Kgs 5:17, 19), a reference to David as Solomon's father (1 Kgs 5:19, 21), the reference in 1 Kgs 5:17–19 to a discussion between David and God as in 2 Sam 7, Ps 132, and 1 Kgs 8:19, and finally, several expressions in 1 Kgs 5:21 such as "this day," "Blessed be the Lord," "(The Lord) who gave David a son," "over this numerous people." The redactional process can be summarized in four phases:

Treaty stratum (Proto-Dtr)	1 Kgs 5:20, 22–25, 26b
Baubericht	1 Kgs 5:27–32 and in 1 Kgs 5:15–21
Deuteronomistic redaction	in 1 Kgs 5:17–21
Wisdom redaction	in 1 Kgs 4:9–14; 5:21, 26a

In sum, the oldest stage does not contain Deuteronomistic language and does not mention the construction of the temple; it concerns rather the treaty between Hiram and Solomon. This source was later inserted into the *Baubericht*, interpreting the trade contract as part of Solomon's construction project, and was then reshaped by the Deuteronomist. This narrative was finally adjusted according to the Wisdom model, emphasizing Solomon's international, administrative, and architectural prowess as a consequence of the divine wisdom he requested in 1 Kings 3.[21] Since most markers of the redactional interventions are present in the Greek manuscripts as well, it makes sense to conclude that the most extensive redaction of the text had taken place before the translation into Greek had started.

---

19 M. Noth, *Könige: I. Teilband* (BK 9,1; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 1968), 87; E. Würthwein, *Das Erste Buch der Könige: Kapitel 1–16* (ATD 11,1; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1977), 51–52. J. Gray concluded that the corvée in Israel as preparation for the buildings of Solomon represents a distinct stratum (1 Kgs 5:27–32); cf. Gray, *I & II Kings*, 154.

20 DeVries, *1 Kings*, 80.

21 A similar redactional activity can be noticed in 1 Kgs 9–10.

1 Kgs 5:15/3 Kgdms 5:1 and Scribal "Political Correctness"

The analysis presented above shows that 1 Kgs 5:15–22 went through at least four levels of redaction. In the light of this conclusion, it can be rightly expected that 1 Kgs 5:15 was not an exception. Indeed, scholars have noticed that 1 Kgs 5:15 gives the impression of being independent.[22] J. Gray even suggested that this verse might have been an extract from ancient Judahite annals.[23] Though it is impossible to prove whether 5:15 was an excerpt from the ancient Judahite annals as argued by J. Gray, there are good reasons to conclude that this verse belongs to the most ancient textual stratum of chapters 4 and 5. First, E. A. Knauf showed that 5:15 belongs to the pre-Chronistic stage, since 2 Chronicle 2 substantially rewrote the whole passage, making it acceptable for the second temple audience. Moreover, in contrast to 5:14–24, 5:15 contains no sign of Deuteronomistic redaction. Even though 5:15 and 5:16–23 contain similar words, such as שלח and עבד, there are also significant differences. The verb שלח does not have a direct object in 5:16, 22, 23 as it has in 5:15. The noun עבד assumes two different meanings. In 5:15 עבד refers to the ambassadors, in 5:23 to workers.[24] These remarks can be considered sufficient to conclude that 1 Kgs 5:15/3 Kgdms 5:1 was composed before Chronicles and before the Deuteronomistic revision of 1–2 Kings.

In order to complete this analysis, we have to turn our attention to 2 Sam 5:11, which reads, "King Hiram of Tyre sent messengers to David, along with cedar trees, and carpenters and masons who built David a house." This verse is strikingly similar to what Solomon is credited with, namely the trade agreement between the king of Jerusalem and the king of Tyre. Does 2 Sam 5:11 prove that such an agreement existed already during David's time? First, we can observe that 2 Sam 5:11 reflects the language and theology of Chronicles.[25] Second, except for this verse, there is no reference to Hiram in 1–2 Samuel. Third, Hiram sent his messengers to Jerusalem twice. Fourth, this verse is only very loosely connected with the surrounding verses in 2 Sam 5. Similar observations are often a sign of redactional intervention. Let us explore this possibility. T. Römer has convincingly argued that the biblical scribes used to attribute the actions of one king to the other king because of theological or ideological reasons. Thus, it was in the case of

---

22 Mulder, *1 Kings*, 207–208.

23 DeVries, *1 Kings*, 80.

24 DeVries, *1 Kings*, 79.

25 The Chronicler elaborately credited David with more activities, such as preparing the material for the construction of the temple (2 Chr 22–27).

Jeroboam II and I as well as for Joash and Jehu.[26] Following Römer's study we suggest that 2 Sam 5:11 is a later addition that credits David with his son's accomplishments. In this way Solomon's trade agreements with Tyrian king Hiram are perfectly justified, since his father had already done it. In sum, 2 Sam 5:11 would be an example of a later redaction of 1 Samuel–2 Kings.

Finally, let us address 1 Kgs 5:26b. This verse is only loosely connected with the wisdom stratum in 1 Kgs 5:26a. Verse 5:26b refers to a treaty concluded with Hiram, a pagan king of Tyre. Reading this note in the light of controversy in 1 Kgs 16–20 and 2 Kgs 21:13, it is difficult to imagine that a treaty with Tyre would be the product of a post-exilic redactor.[27]

Meaning of 1 Kgs 5:15/3 Kgdms 5:1

Despite the fact that 1 Kgs 5:15 and 26b are coming from a different, more ancient source, both verses are well incorporated into the final narrative and form a treaty frame for the Hiram-Solomon correspondence. The treaty dimension of 1 Kgs 5:26b is obvious in the affirmation of the scribes that "the two of them made a treaty." Furthermore, the term שָׁלֹם functions often as a synonym for treaty.[28] The root *slm / šlm* is used also in the Assyrian prophecies to describe vassal-relationships.[29] A closer examination of 1 Kgs 5:15 shows that it also contains treaty language. In particular, in this case the verb אהב, as stated by M. Cogan, is "not an expression of endearment but a term for the treaty relationship between the two kingdoms."[30] Taking into consideration these scholarly arguments, we suggest that the frame (1 Kgs 5:15, 26b) belongs to the oldest stratum of the text and that it postulates a treaty between Solomon and Hiram.

---

26 T. Römer, "Jeroboam II and the Invention of Northern Sanctuaries and Foundation Stories," in *Stones, Tablets, and Scrolls: Periods of the Formation of the Bible* (ed. P. Dubovský and F. Giuntoli; ArcB 3; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2020), 128–135.

27 DeVries, *1 Kings*, 79–80. F. Briquel-Chatonnet, *Les Relations entre les cités de la côte Phénicienne et les royaumes d'Israël et de Juda* (OLA 46; Leuven: Peeters Press, 1992), 41.

28 F. Briquel-Chatonnet suggested that the relation described in these verses is based on real events; *Les relations*, 40.

29 LÚ.*sa-al-mu-ti ina ma-da-na-ti ina* IGI GÌR.2-*šú ub-ba-la*; "I will bring vassals with tribute before his feet" (SAA IX 2 iii 24'–25'); cf. also a similar use of the term in the Mari archive (*ARM* II, 37, 13–14).

30 M. Cogan, *1 Kings: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (AB 10; New York: Doubleday, 2001), 226. Cf. also M. Noth who suggested that the term had a political meaning Noth, *Könige: I. Teilband*, 89.

But what was the role of Solomon in this treaty? While Chronicles as well as the Wisdom and Deuteronomistic redactions of 1 Kgs 5:15–26 make Solomon superior to Hiram, such a conclusion is not so evident from 1 Kgs 5:15, 26b/3 Kgdms 5:1, 12. The OG and VL of 3 Kgdms 5:1 contain the infinitive χρισαι / *ungere* that is an infinitive of purpose, namely, that Hiram's servants were sent "in order to anoint." This infinitive would correspond to למשח, which is also an infinitive of purpose, i. e. stating the purpose of the main verb: "Hiram sent … in order to anoint."[31] In sum, Hiram acted as a superior king who claimed his rights to anoint the local king Solomon.

A similar conclusion can be drawn from 1 Kgs 5:24–25, 26b. While the later addition in 5:26a interprets the contract between Hiram and Solomon as the sign of Solomon's wisdom, this is not so obvious if 1 Kgs 5:24–25 and 26b are read independently.[32] A part of the treaty concluded between Solomon and Hiram was that Solomon had to pay an annual tribute to Hiram. Even though the exchange of goods was in question, the conditions of the treaty were anything but favorable for Solomon.

A similar impression comes forth from 1 Kgs 9:11b–13. These verses are separated from 9:11a by the particle אז, which is a marker of discontinuity. They indicate that the trade exchange was disadvantageous for Solomon since he had to give away twenty cities. Hiram's comments indicate that it was not Solomon, but the Tyrian king who was the more powerful partner of the treaty. Obviously, this was unacceptable for the Chronicler, who completely rewrote these verses: "Solomon rebuilt the cities that Huram had given to him and settled the people of Israel in them" (2 Chr 8:2).

Verse 1 Kgs 9:13, however, suggests that Solomon could not have been a vassal king of Hiram, since Hiram calls Solomon "my brother." A similar expression occurs in 1 Kgs 20:32, where Ahab (who had just defeated Ben-Hadad) similarly referred to him as "my brother." According to 1 Kgs 20:4, 9 Israel was a vassal of Aram, after the defeat of Aram, the relationship was

---

31 For uses of the infinitive in Septuagint Greek, see T. Muraoka, *A Syntax of Septuagint Greek* (Leuven: Peeters Press, 2016), § 30b–bh; 337–358. Furthermore, according to Muraoka, the final-resultative is often expressed both with and without τοῦ, such that "in very many cases no functional opposition exists between a bare inf. and a τοῦ inf.," and thus, "it is not correct to say that […] the gen. article specifically marks the inf. as final-resultative." Muraoka, *Syntax,* § 30baa; 338–339. He is responding to those who would try and draw a hard distinction between articular and anarthrous infinitives in Septuagint Greek, perhaps along the lines of Classical Greek use, cf. § 30; 364–366, esp. 365, n. 4.

32 They bear no traces of the Deuteronomistic vocabulary, contrary to 1 Kgs 5:16–23. Moreover, this entire passage is rewritten in 2 Chr 2 and so they represent a pre-Chronistic layer.

changed, and they called each other brothers. Similarly, Kulamuwa called the surrounding kings "my brother kings" (*KAI* 216). These occurrences indicate that the term "my brother" does not have to imply an equal relationship as in the case of the Hittite annals, but rather that it designated a neighboring king who could have been stronger or weaker but was not a vassal.

Putting the results of this analysis together, we conclude that the OG of 3 Kgdms 5:1 presents Solomon as dependent on Hiram, since he had played a part in anointing Solomon. This verse belongs to the earliest stratum of chapter 5 so it cannot be dismissed as a later addition. The impression that Hiram was the more powerful among the treaty partners is also seen in 1 Kgs 5:24–25, 26b and 9:11b–13, both of which are pre-Chronistic and pre-Deuteronomistic strata. In sum, the earliest strata of the biblical text show that there was a treaty between Hiram and Solomon, and that it was Hiram who was the more powerful treaty partner. Since these verses contradicted Solomon's ruling over the entire Levant (1 Kgs 5:1, 4), the MT and the Chronicler felt obliged to correct it. However, 1 Kgs 9:13 suggests that we cannot consider this a vassal relationship.

Historical Background of Israelite-Phoenician Relations

The harmonization of biblical stories with historical periods has proved to be a slippery slope. While remaining vigilant towards potential pitfalls, the following paragraphs will build upon archaeological and textual evidence to point out overlaps between the Solomon narrative and extra-biblical data. Let us focus on three aspects. First, chapters 1 Kgs 4–5; 9–10 take for granted that there was collaboration between the Phoenician city states and Israel and Judah and that the trade between the Phoenician city states and Israel was regulated by a treaty. Second, the OG preserved a version according to which Hiram was involved in the anointing of an Israelite king, a detail which indicates that the two kings were not of equal rank.

I. Trade and Treaty

Since A. Gilboa and S. Hasegawa have already examined the archaeological data in this volume, we present only a few references to show that the trade between Phoenician cities and Israel as well as Judah can be traced in archaeological remains as well.

At the end of the Late Bronze Age, many Levantine cities were destroyed and the Hittite and Egyptian kingdoms that had been controlling the region

for centuries were either destroyed by the so-called "Sea People" or had to adapt to a new geopolitical reality. Most littoral cities of the northern Levant, however, were not destroyed, but rather benefitted from their newfound independence.[33] Moreover, some new cities emerged in the 12th and 11th c. BCE. Despite their rivalries, both the old and new littoral cities, called Phoenicia (Φοινίκη) by the Greeks, played a key role in the Mediterranean trade.[34] The Phoenicians controlled the coastal region and northern Israel not by means of military campaigns but by trade and commerce.[35]

After analyzing the archaeological remains, E. Pappa concluded that the Phoenician maritime trade with Iberia goes back to the pre-colonial era. Since the archaeological finds in Iberia cannot be explained only by the exchange of gifts, she argued that they point to a period of trade that took place already in ca. 11th c. BCE.[36] A similar conclusion was reached from the analysis of the isotopes of the hoards found in the Levant that proved that there was a trade of silver controlled by the Phoenician city states through Iron Age I and II.[37] Studies on pottery confirmed that the Phoenician cities were involved in the trade of pottery since Iron Age I.[38] Without entering into further detail, these three examples should suffice to insert our study within the scholarly consensus that the Phoenician city states were already

---

33 A. D. Killebrew, "Canaanite Roots, Proto-Phoenicia, and the Early Phoenician Period: Ca. 1300–1000 BCE," in *The Oxford Handbook of the Phoenician and Punic Mediterranean* (ed. B. R. Doak and C. López-Ruiz; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2019), 43.

34 R. Stieglitz, "The Geopolitics of the Phoenician Littoral in the Early Iron Age," *BASOR* 279 (1990): 9.

35 J. Kamlah, "Neuere Forschungen zur Archäologie in Südphönizien," *HeBAI* 1 (2012): 113.

36 E. Pappa, *Early Iron Age Exchange in the West: Phoenicians in the Mediterranean and the Atlantic* (ANESSup; Leuven: Peeters Press, 2013), 5–47.

37 J. R. Wood *et al.*, "The Origin of Tel Dor Hacksilver and the Westward Expansion of the Phoenicians in the Early Iron Age: The Cypriot Connection," *Journal of Eastern Mediterranean Archaeology and Heritage Studies* 8 (2020): 4–5.

38 See for example A. Gilboa, "The Dynamics of Phoenician Bichrome Pottery: A View from Tel Dor," *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* 316 (1999): 1–22; D. Namdar *et al.*, "Cinnamaldehyde in Early Iron Age Phoenician Flasks Raises the Possibility of Levantine Trade with South East Asia," *Mediterranean Archaeology and Archaeometry* 12 (2013): 1–19; A. Gilboa and Y. Goren, "Early Iron Age Phoenician Networks: An Optical Mineralogy Study of Phoenician Bichrome and Related Wares in Cyprus," *Ancient West and East* 14 (2015): 73–110; A. Gilboa *et al.*, "Fluctuations in Levantine Maritime Foci across the Late Bronze/Iron Age Transition: Charting the Role of the Sharon-Carmel (Tjeker) Coast in the Rise of Iron Age Phoenician Polities," in *"Sea Peoples" up-to-Date: New Research on Transformation in the Eastern Mediterranean in 13th–11th Centuries BCE* (Vienna: Austrian Academy of Sciences Press, 2017): 285–298.

involved in the Mediterranean trade in Iron Age I. The full-scale trade between the West and the Phoenician cities is, however, dated to the 9th–8th c. BCE. They traded copper from Cyprus, precious metals from the Eastern Mediterranean in exchange of timber, wine, and purple dye and luxury objects, many of which were locally produced.

However, can such a trade relationship be postulated for Israel and Judah as well?[39] The geography of the Levant determined the sphere of the Phoenician's interest. The northern Phoenician states Arwad and Byblos aimed at Anatolia and northern Syria as their trade partners, primarily because of trade routes and their geographical proximity with these regions. The southern Phoenician cities, Sidon and Tyre, were instead accessed via the southern coastal roads and the Jezreel and Jordan valleys. Thus, it can be expected that the Tyrian and Sidonian merchants did business with the southern Levant, namely, with Philistia, Israel, Judah, and Jordan. A. Gilboa and I. Sharon showed that the coast of Carmel and Sharon was involved in the Phoenician maritime trade already in the early Iron Age.[40] N. Schreiber analyzed the Black-on-Red pottery (BoR) and pointed out a high volume of the BoR pottery of Level I dated to 10th and 9th c. BCE in Israel and Judah.[41] The appearance of the BoR in Israel and Judah presupposes a trade exchange between the kingdoms, namely between Cyprus, the Levantine coastal regions as well as Judah and Israel. Comparing the occurrences of BoR in Syria and Anatolia, it seems that Israel and Judah were involved in the trade exchange in the 10th and 9th c. BCE. A similar conclusion can be drawn from the analysis of the Phoenician bichrome pottery that was also found in Israel in Judah in IA I and II.[42] The analysis of the precious metal hoards in Israel and Judah showed that the silver had travelled through Phoenician cities.[43] These and other finds[44] showed that IA I–II Israel and Judah were in trade contact with Phoenicia.[45] Even though we do not have any extant

---

[39] For the discussion see Briquel-Chatonnet, *Les Relations*, 44–47.

[40] Gilboa *et al.*, "Fluctuations," 293–294.

[41] N. Schreiber, *The Cypro-Phoenician Pottery of the Iron Age* (Leiden: Brill, 2003), 214. The author used the term Black-on-Red pottery.

[42] Gilboa, "Dynamics," 1–22.

[43] Wood *et al.*, "Origin of Tel Dor Hacksilver Age," 4–5.

[44] Other signs of the Phoenician-Israelite contacts can be observed on iconography (cf. D. Prokop's article in this volume), on Hebrew language (P. Mollo's article) as well as the ashlar masonry and luxury items.

[45] The extant data would support the idea that the trade was an agreement between the kings and thus a sign of royal endeavor.

Phoenician trade treaty from 11th–9th c. BCE,[46] it makes sense that this trade would have been regulated by treaties.[47]

There is evidence, however, that Tyrian control was not always limited to mere trade, but that it also extended to a more direct control of certain regions, such as Carthage, Cyprus, etc.[48] As for the southern Levant, Phoenicia's control can be seen in the Akko plain[49] and in Horbat Rosh Zayit,[50] identified with biblical Cabul. Thus, from an archaeological perspective we can point out different kinds of Phoenician control over Israel and Judah. The northern part of Israel was under the direct control of Tyre, as can be seen from the remains unearthed in Horbat Rosh Zayit and in the Akko plain. The Phoenician style pottery found in southern regions of Israel and in the territory of Judah proves that Judah had trade contacts with Phoenicia as well. Viewing the Phoenician trade exchange with Israel and Judah in its international context, it is obvious that the Phoenician cities, not Israel and Judah, represented the more important partner of the trade.

II. Types of Kings

Isaiah put this question into the mouth of the Assyrian king: "Are not my commanders all kings?" (Isa 10:8) This interesting word play, which can be read in two ways, shows that the concept of a king in the ancient Near East was quite vague.[51] J.A. Hackett argued that the term king מלך was applied to

---

46 The first extant trade regulation via treaties and contracts (cf. SAA 19 22:23–r.2; 20 5 r. iii 19') is dated to the Neo-Assyrian period (cf. N. Morello's article).

47 It was suggested to interpret the stele found at Brej to the north of Aleppo, with the image of the god Melqart and an Aramaic inscription (*KAI* 201) as a sign of "peaceful contacts between Tyre and Bit Agusi/Arpad, possibly through North Syrian harbors." G. Bunnens, "Phoenicia in the Later Iron Age: Tenth Century Bce to the Assyrian and Babylonian Periods," in *The Oxford Handbook of the Phoenician and Punic Mediterranean* (ed. B.R. Doak and C. López-Ruiz; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2019), 63.

48 Cf. J.S. Smith, "Cyprus, the Phoenicians and Kition," in *Beyond the Homeland: Markers in Phoenician Chronology* (ed. C. Sagona; Leuven: Peeters Press, 2008), 263–302; Bunnens, "Phoenicia," 61–63.

49 G. Lehmann, "Phoenicians in Western Galilee: First Results of an Archaeological Survey in the Hinterland of Akko," in *Studies in the Archaeology of the Iron Age in Israel and Jordan* (ed. G. Mathias and A. Mazar; Sheffield: Academic Press, 2001), 94–95.

50 The remains suggest that the founders of the fort were the Phoenicians or connected with the Phoenicians and traded with Cyprus. Z. Gal and Y. Alexandre, *Horbat Rosh Zayit: An Iron Age Storage Fort and Village* (Jerusalem: Israel Antiquities Authority, 2000), 149–152.

51 P. Machinist, "'Ah, Assyria …' (Isaiah 10:5ff.): Isaiah's Assyrian Polemic Revisited," in *Not Only History: Proceedings of the Conference in Honor of Mario Liverani Held in*

different types of rulers.[52] Indeed, the term was used for the Assyrian kings who were controlling the entire ancient Near East (2 Kgs 17:24; 19:36–37), the Egyptian pharaohs (1 Kgs 11:18), major Levantine kings such as the king of Aram-Damascus (1 Kgs 20:1), the kings of the Phoenician city states (1 Kgs 5:1), but also used petty kings such as the king of Moab (Judg 3:15) as vassals (cf. Manasseh in 2 Kgs 21:11) and as rulers of small cities including their surrounding territory (cf. the king of Ai in Josh 8:1). In sum, to say that Solomon was a king does not mean that he was a king like Sennacherib or Hiram.

Furthermore, the political ballets danced by the high- and low-ranking rulers / kings are well documented in the extant sources from the second and first millennium BCE. Minor rulers had to be approved in different ways by their more powerful neighboring kings. The more powerful king's intervention into local politics varied. At the one end of the spectrum the powerful kings appointed and removed local kings at will; thus, the Egyptian pharaoh Neco removed Jehoahaz and appointed Eliakim / Jehoiakim (2 Kgs 23:31–34), and the Assyrian and Babylonian kings regularly deposed and installed local rulers (RINAP 3/1 4:39–40). The local rulers even mentioned that they needed the support of the Assyrian king, thus Kulamuwa allied with Assyria to fight his enemies (*KAI* 24). Similarly, the local ruler Azatiwada had to be empowered by Awariku, king of Danunians, in order to exercise his rulership (*KAI* 26). On the other end of the spectrum, the neighboring kings also sent their emissaries to greet a new king, thus David's emissaries were humiliated by Hanun, the new king of the Ammonites (cf. 2 Sam 10:1–5).

In sum, the ancient Near Eastern societies knew different kinds of superior-inferior relations. Let us mention only a few of them: Hittite kings and their Levantine treaty partners, Egyptian kings and the Syrian-Palestine vassal (Amarna period), Assyrian kings and their partners (Babylonia, Phrygia) or their vassals (Samaria before 722 BCE, Judah, Tyre), local partners / rivals Damascus and Israel, Israel and Moab, Judah and Edom, etc.

By reading the relation between Israel / Judah and Phoenician city states in this light, we can conclude that the kings of Israel were the economically weaker kings in the 10th–9th c. BCE. There is, however, as yet no evidence that Israel and Judah were Phoenician vassals.

Sapienza-Università di Roma, Dipartimento di Scienze Dell'antichita, 20–21 April 2009 (ed. G. Bartoloni *et al.*; Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 2016), 183–217.

52 J. A. Hackett, "'There Was No King in Israel': The Era of the Judges," in *The Oxford History of the Biblical World* (ed. M. D. Coogan; New York: Oxford University Press, 1998), 117–179.

Anointing was an essential part of the ascension to the throne. It was a complex process involving rituals and it might have taken place a few times and by different groups, as was the case for David's anointing.[53] In some cases, high-ranking rulers sent emissaries to anoint their vassals or subordinated rulers; thus, the Egyptian Pharaoh sent his emissaries to anoint his Syrian vassal Taku as king of Nuhasse (EA 51:4–9).

In the light of the extant data, it would be a normal procedure that a new king of Judah / Israel had to be approved by his more economically or militarily powerful neighbors. As shown above, in some cases a part of the approval was the (re-)anointing of the new king by the emissaries of the more powerful neighboring king. This, however, does not exclude that the local ruler was anointed by his own people, prophets, or priests.

Implications

In drawing conclusions from the analysis presented above, we should avoid running aground on two reefs. On the one hand, to conclude that the historical Solomon had a treaty contract with Phoenicia based on the archaeological data and inscriptions is difficult to prove.[54] Similarly, although it was a normal procedure in the ancient Near East that a more powerful king approved lower-ranking rulers and in some cases even sent emissaries to anoint them, this does not necessarily prove that Solomon was anointed by Hiram. On the other hand, the analysis presented above shows that Greek version of 1 Kgs 5:15/3 Kgdms 5:1 fits well with the practice of ascending the throne, the confirmation of local kings, and the process of anointing. Sometimes such subordination of the local king to a foreign power was publicly accepted, but other times the scribes did their best to hide it and presented the local king as a completely independent king, even if they were not.

---

53 The first time David was anointed only by Samuel and only in the presence of his family (1 Sam 16:1–13). The second time, the anointing was public and was done by the "men of Judah" (2 Sam 2:4.7). The third time David was anointed in Hebron by the elders of Israel (2 Sam 5:3) and only after this anointing does the Bible describe the king with royal investiture: "David was thirty years old when he began to reign, and he reigned forty years." (2 Sam 5:4).

54 The archaeological data covered more than one century. Thus, as E. Lipiński suggested, the whole account of Solomon-Hiram, in particular the story of Cabul, can represent the situation of the 9th and 8th c. BCE; cf. E. Lipiński, "Hiram of Tyre and Solomon," in *The Books of Kings: Sources, Composition, Historiography and Reception* (ed. A. Lemaire and B. Halpern; VTSup 129; Leiden: Brill, 2010), 260–265.

Keeping these reefs in mind, let us present our reconstruction of the relation between Israel / Judah and Phoenicia. We can safely exclude a few extremes. First, the model of full-fledged vassalage as known during the Neo-Assyrian or Amarna period cannot be applied to Israel / Judah and Phoenicia. Second, we should also exclude a relationship between two equal powers like that of Ramses II and Hattušili III, etc., since the Phoenician city states were clearly more powerful kingdoms than Israel or Judah. Third, even though the Phoenician city states were more powerful, we can also exclude the type of military control seen in the rule of Hazael over Israel and Judah in the 9th c. BCE. Fourth, while the Phoenicians controlled the Akko region and northern Galilee, it should also be excluded that Tyre or Sidon would ever directly control the Judean hill country. In fact, the Phoenician rulers were less interested in the territorial control. Their primary interest concerned rather the control of trade.

In sum, as the weaker partner of the two parties, it makes sense to conclude that the Israelite and Judahite king(s) needed some confirmation of his / their legitimacy by the Phoenician rulers, especially because the Phoenician kings were interested in direct trade with Israel and Judah as well as in the trade routes that connected the coast with Arabia. Therefore, we propose that the text in 3 Kgdms 5:1 not only represents a more ancient textual version, but also reflects a more realistic relationship between Phoenician cities and Israel / Judah in the IA I and IA II.

The later idealization of David and Solomon entailed the adaptation of the text to a new presentation of Solomon, namely as a wise king who, thanks to his wisdom and political skill, was qualified to build the temple for the name of the Lord. For that reason, 1 Kings 4–5 underwent a complex redactional process. We can recognize at least four important redactional interventions. The vestiges of this process are still traceable in the versions. As a result of the new presentation of Solomon, the MT reworded 1 Kgs 5:15 and the Chronicler completely rewrote the whole passage. This process included transposing certain actions of Solomon to David; thus 2 Sam 5:11 attributes to David what previously had been attributed to Solomon. The reattribution of actions from Solomon to David is even more evident in the Chronicles.

Peter Dubovský
Pontifical Biblical Institute

Paul Bechter
Independent Scholar