

Solomon and the Daughter of Pharaoh: Intermarriage, Conversion, and the Impurity of Women

SHAYE J. D. COHEN
Jewish Theological Seminary

[1] Solomon made a marriage alliance with Pharaoh king of Egypt; he took Pharaoh's daughter, and brought her into the city of David, until he had finished building his own house, and the house of the Lord and the wall around Jerusalem. (1 Kgs. 3:1)

[2] His own house where he was to dwell . . . was of like workmanship. Solomon also made a house like this hall for Pharaoh's daughter whom he had taken in marriage. (1 Kgs. 7:8)

[3] Pharaoh king of Egypt had gone up and captured Gezer and burnt it with fire, and had slain the Canaanites who dwelt in the city, and had given it as dowry to his daughter, Solomon's wife. (1 Kgs. 9:16)

[4] But Pharaoh's daughter went up from the city of David to her own house which Solomon had built for her; then he built the Millo. (1 Kgs. 9:24)

[5] Now King Solomon loved many foreign women: the daughter of Pharaoh, and Moabite, Ammonite, Edomite, Sidonian, and Hittite women, from the nations concerning which the Lord had said to the people of Israel, "You shall not enter into marriage with them, neither shall they with you, for surely they will turn away your heart after their gods"; Solomon clung to these in love. (1 Kgs. 11:1-2)

[6] Solomon brought Pharaoh's daughter up from the city of David to the house which he had built for her, for he said, "My wife shall not live in the house of David king of Israel, for the places to which the ark of the Lord has come are holy." (2 Chron. 8:11)

These six verses (given here in the RSV)¹ comprise the entire biblical record concerning Solomon's Egyptian wife. Four of the six texts ([1], [2], [4], and [6]) concern the princess' housing after her marriage. At first she lived in the city of David, presumably in the Davidic palace mentioned in [6], waiting for her husband to finish his own palace, the temple of the Lord, and the wall of Jerusalem. Finally, after the

¹ Translations in this essay are mine unless otherwise indicated. The Bible is cited from the RSV, slightly modified when necessary.

completion of the temple and the Solomonic palace,² she moved into her own palace (near the Millo? [4]) which resembled Solomon's own ([2]). The Chronicler ([6]) explains why Solomon did not want his wife to live in the city of David, a point which Kings overlooks. The other two verses ([3] and [5]) ignore the princess' housing and address other aspects of the marriage. [3], a parenthetic addition in its context (hence the pluperfect tense in the English), explains how Gezer became part of Solomon's empire: Pharaoh conquered it and gave it to Solomon as dowry for his daughter. [5] claims that Solomon's love for Pharaoh's daughter and his other foreign wives led him to abandon God.

These verses provide important clues for an analysis of the sources and composition of 1 Kings 3-11, and illustrate the complexity of the portrait of Solomon in the biblical record. A full discussion of these points would swell this essay beyond reasonable length.³ I am interested here in two sets of questions. First, was Solomon's marriage to Pharaoh's daughter a glorious achievement or a sinful deed? Was the marriage licit or not? Did she convert to Judaism? Second, why did Solomon move his Egyptian wife out of the city of David? Why could she not remain either in the old Davidic palace or in the new Solomonic one? I shall survey the answers given to these questions by Kings, Chronicles, and later Jewish tradition.

Intermarriage

Of the five passages from Kings presented above, four ([1]-[4]) contain no disapproval of the marriage of Solomon to the daughter of Pharaoh. On the contrary, the literary context of these verses implies that the marriage and the events associated with it (the conquest of Gezer and the building of a separate palace for the princess) belong to the glorious achievements of Solomon's reign. [5], however, condemns the alliance as sinful, because it led to idolatry. The tension between [5] and the other four texts reflects the ambivalence of Kings towards both the figure of Solomon and the prohibition of intermarriage. This ambivalence continued in later generations as well.

As a rule intermarriage is not a major concern to the Deuteronomic historian (Josh.-Kgs.). He notes without comment several marriages between Israelites and foreigners.⁴ Gideon had a concubine in Shechem (Judg. 8:30-31), Absalom's mother was the daughter of Talmi king of Geshur (2 Sam. 3:3 // 1 Chron. 3:2), and Rehoboam's mother was an Ammonite (1 Kgs. 14:21 // 2 Chron. 12:13). Foreign men who married

2 On the chronology, see further below. The wall of Jerusalem, mentioned by text [1], appears again only in a passing reference in 1 Kgs. 9:15.

3 The sources and structure of 1 Kings 3-11 are discussed by all the standard commentaries on Kings, many of which are cited below. For the portrait of Solomon in Jewish legend and lore, see Louis Ginzberg, *Legends of the Jews* (7 vols.; repr. Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1967-68), vols. 5 and 6 (to which I am much indebted); K. Preisendanz, "Salomo," *PWSup.* 8 (1956), 660-704 (on Solomon in the magical tradition); J. Pritchard, ed., *Solomon and Sheba* (London: Phaidon, 1974); A. Rothkoff, "Solomon in the Aggadah," *Encyclopedia Judaica* (1971), 15:106-8; M. Seligsohn, "Solomon in Rabbinical Literature and Legend," *Jewish Encyclopaedia* (1905), 11:438-44; and S. D. Seymour, *Tales of King Solomon* (London: Oxford University, 1924).

4 The following discussion complements my "From the Bible to the Talmud: The Prohibition of Intermarriage," *Hebrew Annual Review* 7 (1983), 23-39.

Israelite women are Ithra the Ishmaelite (2 Sam. 17:25 where the text has been corrupted to "Israelite"; see 1 Chron. 2:17) and the Phoenician father of Hiram the artisan (1 Kgs. 7:13-14 // 2 Chron. 2:12-13). Uriah the Hittite was married to Bathsheba, the daughter of Eliam, apparently an Israelite (2 Sam. 11:3).⁵ None of these intermarriages is condemned, either explicitly or implicitly.

There is only one passage in the entire Deuteronomistic history which seems to be an extended polemic against intermarriage, but that passage, the Samson saga (Judg. 13-16), is ambiguous. Samson becomes involved with three different Philistine women, one of whom is the cause of his ultimate downfall. Samson's parents oppose his planned marriage to a Philistine woman of Timna with the plaintive cry, "Is there not a woman among the daughters of your kinsmen, or among all our people, that you must go to take a wife from the uncircumcised Philistines?" (Judg. 14:3). But, as Samson himself discovered, appearances can be deceiving. The evil of intermarriage is not the central concern of the Samson saga. Perhaps on a metaphorical level Samson's dalliances with Philistine women represent the faithlessness of Israel towards God,⁶ but on the literal level idolatry does not figure in the story at all. Even the plaintive cry of Samson's parents is directed not so much against the impropriety of intermarriage as against the impropriety of a marriage between an Israelite and one of the hated conquerors. Similarly, during World War II French society condemned all those who consorted with Germans. At issue was not "intermarriage" but national pride. In any case, the author of the story assures the reader that the proposed marriage was part of a divine plan which the parents did not understand (Judg. 14:4), certainly not the sort of theological reflection which befits an opponent of intermarriage. The Samson saga is ambiguous.

Aside from 1 Kgs. 11:1-10 clear and explicit opposition to intermarriage in the works of the Deuteronomist appears only in Judg. 3:5-6. The Israelites fail to exterminate the original inhabitants of the land of Canaan. They intermarry with the "Canaanites, Hittites, Amorites, Perizites, Hivites, and Jebusites," and, as a result, worship foreign gods and incur the wrath of God. The same polemic appears in muted form in 1 Kgs. 16:31 (Ahab marries Jezebel, the daughter of the king of the Sidonians, and begins to worship Baal). In these two passages, Judg. 3:5-6 and 1 Kgs. 16:31, the Deuteronomist condemns foreign marriages which resulted in the practice of idolatry by the Israelite partners. It is no coincidence that these marriages involve Canaanites (a category which includes Sidonians, Gen. 10:15), since Deut. 7:1-4 (cf. Exod. 34:14-16) establishes a causal relationship between marriage to Canaanites and the practice of idolatry. The primary sin is idolatry; marriage to Canaanites is prohibited because it inevitably leads to idolatry. Judg. 3:5-6 confirms the wisdom of the Mosaic prohibition.

I return now to 1 Kgs. 11:1-2 and Pharaoh's daughter. The historian's condemnation of Solomon's marriage to Sidonian (LXX: Syrian) and Hittite (LXX adds: and Amorite) women is consistent with Deut. 7:1-4 and with the polemic of Judg. 3:5-6 (and 1 Kgs. 16:31). However, 1 Kgs. 11:1-2 also provides something new. It condemns Solomon's marriages to an Egyptian woman (Pharaoh's daughter) and to Moabite, Ammonite, and Edomite women, although these nationalities are not included in the

⁵ In 1 Chron. 3:5 the patronymic is Ammiel.

⁶ E. L. Greenstein, "The Riddle of Samson," *Prooftexts* 1 (1981), 237-60.

prohibition of Deut. 7:3–4. This condemnation is based on Deut. 23:4–9 which prohibits members of these four nations from “entering the congregation of the Lord.” The original meaning of this prohibition is obscure, but Kings assumes that it is a prohibition of marriage based on the same fear of idolatry expressed in Deut. 7:3–4 (cf. Ezra 9:1).⁷ Thus the condemnation of Solomon in 1 Kgs. 11:1–2 is based upon Deut. 23:4–9 as well as Deut. 7:3–4. The motive for the prohibition of intermarriage is that of Deut. 7:3–4 (foreign wives will lead the Israelites astray), but the phraseology echoes that of Deut. 23:4–9 (*lō³ tābō³ū* rather than *lō³ tihattēn, tiqqah* or *tittēn*). Since the sin of intermarriage is secondary to the primary sin of idolatry, Kings argues that Solomon’s intermarriage did in fact lead to idolatry. Solomon built altars in honor of the gods of Sidon, Ammon, Moab (1 Kgs. 11:5, 7; cf. 2 Kgs. 23:13), and the gods of all his foreign wives (1 Kgs. 11:8).

In its current form Kings condemns Solomon’s union with Pharaoh’s daughter just as it condemns all his foreign marriages. However, scholars have long noted that Kings’ account of Solomon’s reign and the rise of Jeroboam is the product of a long and complex evolution. This is demonstrated both by internal analysis of the narrative and by comparison with the version of the LXX. The tradition about the foreign wives in general and Pharaoh’s daughter in particular seems to have evolved through the following five stages.⁸ (a) The marriage to Pharaoh’s daughter and the building of her palace are reckoned among the glorious achievements of Solomon’s reign (see texts [1]–[4]). (b) Further evidence for the opulence and splendor of his reign is provided by his marriage to “seven hundred royal wives and three hundred concubines” (1 Kgs. 11:3a; see also LXX at 1 Kgs. 11:1). (c) Solomon’s polygamy is condemned because it turned him away from God (1 Kgs. 11:3b). The law on kingship in Deut. 17, which clearly refers to Solomon, says only (17:17) that the king “shall not multiply wives for himself, lest his heart turn away (from God).” A prohibition of foreign wives is not mentioned.⁹ (d) Solomon’s intermarriage is condemned because it turned him away from God (1 Kgs. 11:1–2). Perhaps the original condemnation mentioned only the Canaanite wives (cf. Judg. 3:5–6 and 1 Kgs. 16:31), and only later were the Moabite, Ammonite, and Edomite women included as well. Solomon sinned either by worshiping the foreign gods himself (1 Kgs. 11:4–6) or by allowing his foreign wives to do so (1 Kgs. 11:7–8). (e) Last, Pharaoh’s daughter is added to the foreign wives who led Solomon astray (1 Kgs. 11:1). Although it completes the block of four nations of Deut. 23, the reference to Pharaoh’s daughter almost certainly is a gloss. The chapter has no evidence that Solomon worshiped Egyptian gods or allowed his wife to do so. The syntax of the verse is very awkward, with the phrase *wē³et bat Par^cōh* stuck in the midst of a series of plural nouns. The rabbis of the midrash also noticed the anomaly (Sipre Deut. 52, see below).

⁷ See Cohen, *Intermarriage*, 31–34.

⁸ See the standard commentaries on Kings, e.g., J. Montgomery and H. S. Gehman, *Kings* (ICC; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1951; repr. 1967), 231–34; John Gray, *I and II Kings* (London: SCM, 1970), 270–74; E. Würthwein, *Das Erste Buch der Könige* (ATD 11/1; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1977), 131; M. Noth, *Könige* (BKAT 9/1; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 1983), 247.

⁹ Therefore, after paraphrasing Deut. 17:17, the Temple Scroll 57:15–16 adds the prohibition that a king may not marry any of the daughters of the gentiles.

Which of these stages represents the original author of the book of Kings, and which represents his sources and his later editors, is a question which need not be discussed here. Nor do I need to determine the historical truth which may be lurking behind these verses.¹⁰ But even if these five stages do not accurately reflect the genetic history of the current text of 1 Kgs. 11:1–10, they do accurately reflect the varied and contradictory elements within the narrative. When the Jews of later generations came to interpret Solomon's marriage to Pharaoh's daughter and his other foreign wives they found warrant in the text to glorify, exculpate, or condemn the king for his deed. Later tradition faithfully mirrors the ambiguity of its biblical source.

(a) and (b): In the first two stages of Kings, the marriage with Pharaoh's daughter and the acquisition of a large harem were considered glorious achievements of Solomon's reign. As far as I have been able to determine, although later legend knows the opulence and splendor brought to Solomon's court by Pharaoh's daughter and the harem, it does not admire these marriages. The role of the exotic foreign princess who consorts with Solomon king of Israel is taken in legend not by Pharaoh's daughter but by the Queen of Sheba.¹¹

Even if they did not praise Solomon for these marriages, many Jews refused to censure him for them. The author of Chronicles knows of Solomon's Egyptian wife (text [6]) but does not condemn the union, and does not even mention the other foreign wives and their altars.¹² The Greek version of Kings includes an extra set of verses after 2:35 (known as the "first miscellany") which rewrites Solomon's accomplishments as a builder. The marriage to Pharaoh's daughter and the building of her palace are included (LXX 2:35c = text [1] above, and LXX 2:35f. = [4]), but the author, who behaves somewhat freely with the biblical text, does not add a hint of disapproval.¹³ Although the Greek version contains the pejorative reference to Pharaoh's daughter in 1 Kgs. 11:1, it claims in another addition to the Hebrew text, that Pharaoh gave his wife's sister in marriage to Jeroboam (LXX 12:24e, clearly inspired by 1 Kgs. 11:19). The point of this midrash is to make Jeroboam (like Haddad) a worthy opponent to Solomon, since

10 Most scholars accept as genuine the claim that Solomon married the daughter of a Pharaoh; see Gray, *Kings*, 118–20 and A. R. Green, "Israelite Influence at Shishak's Court?" *BASOR* 233 (1979), 59–62. The tradition about the polygamy is puzzling since there are no references to numerous children; the only known son of Solomon is his successor Rehoboam. The tradition about the foreign wives is of uncertain origin, perhaps, as some scholars have suggested, spun out from the tradition about Pharaoh's daughter and the Ammonite mother of Rehoboam.

11 See the chapter by L. Silberman in Pritchard, *Solomon and Sheba*.

12 The notion of "Solomonic Apologetic in Chronicles," discussed by R. Braun, *JBL* 92 (1973), 503–16, is secondary to the primary fact that Chronicles, unlike Ezra-Nehemiah, does not condemn intermarriage. See H. G. M. Williamson, *Israel in the Books of Chronicles* (Cambridge: University, 1977), 60–61; and Sara Japhet, *The Ideology of the Book of Chronicles* (Jerusalem: Mosad Bialik, 1977), 295–99 [Hebrew]. Perhaps in order to explain the sacrilege committed by the two conspirators who assassinated Joash, 2 Chron. 24:26 claims (contrast 2 Kgs. 12:22) that they were the sons of foreign women, but explicit criticism of intermarriage is absent from Chronicles.

13 D. W. Gooding, *Relics of Ancient Exegesis: A Study of the Miscellanies in 3 Reigns 2 (SOTSMS 4; Cambridge: University, 1976)*, esp. 66–73. This crucial point, which separates the LXX miscellany from rabbinic midrash, is not appreciated by Gooding. See below.

both were married to the royal house of Egypt.¹⁴ This author had, at the least, a neutral stance towards the marriages with the Egyptian women. The *Syriac Apocalypse of Baruch* §61 praises king Solomon and says nothing of his marriages or idolatry. Some rabbis insist that Solomon did nothing wrong in marrying his foreign wives (see below).

(c) In the third stage of Kings, Solomon's polygamy is condemned. Similarly, many later sources condemn Solomon for his polygamy but not for his intermarriage. Ben Sira 47:19–20 writes of Solomon as follows: "But you have given your trust (or: loins, or: folly, KSLYK) to women, and you have put them in command of your body. You put a stain upon your honor, and defiled your bed, so that you brought wrath upon your children and grief upon your couch." For Ben Sira Solomon's sin was lust, not intermarriage (not even idolatry),¹⁵ perhaps because in his time the prohibition of intermarriage did not yet attain the status it would enjoy in the post-Maccabean period. But even in rabbinic times, when the prohibition of intermarriage was absolute, some rabbis in their homilies spoke of Solomon's polygamy and ignored his intermarriage.

R. Simeon b. Yohai taught: The book of Deuteronomy ascended and prostrated itself before the Holy One, blessed be He, and declared before him, "Master of the Universe, Solomon has uprooted me and made me into a forgery, because every testament in which two or three items have been made void is made void in its entirety. But King Solomon is attempting to uproot a *yud* from me. It is written 'He shall not multiply (*yarbeh*) wives for himself' but he has multiplied (*hirbâ*) wives for himself. 'He shall not multiply (*yarbeh*) horses for himself' but he has multiplied (*hirbâ*) horses for himself. 'He shall not multiply (*yarbeh*) silver and gold' for himself but he has multiplied (*hirbâ*) silver and gold for himself." Said the Holy One, blessed be He, to him, "Go forth, for Solomon and one hundred others like him shall become void but a *yud* of yours shall never become void."

Solomon tried to void the *yud* of the prohibition of *yarbeh*, but God assures the book of Deuteronomy that Solomon will fall into disaster. Following the lead of Deut. 17:17, this midrash, and others like it, emphasizes the sin of polygamy and ignores the sin of intermarriage.¹⁶

(d) In this stage, Kings condemns Solomon for his intermarriage. Many later texts view Solomon as one of the most prominent transgressors of the prohibition of intermarriage. In his speech against intermarriage Nehemiah quotes Deut. 7:3–4 and continues, "Did not Solomon king of Israel sin on account of such women? Among the many nations there was no king like him, and he was beloved by his God, and God made him king over all Israel; nevertheless, foreign women made even him to sin" (Neh.

14 R. P. Gordon, "The Second LXX Account of Jeroboam: History or Midrash," *V/T* 25 (1975), 368–93, esp. 385–88.

15 This point is unappreciated by M. Z. Segal, *Sēper ben sîrā? haššālēm* (repr. Jerusalem: Bialik, 1972), 328.

16 Leviticus Rabba 19.2, pp. 420–21, ed. Margalioth. For parallel texts see Margalioth's notes and the notes of A. Shinan to his edition of Exodus Rabba 6:1, p. 182. For later versions see Micha Joseph Bin Gorion, *Mimekor Yisrael: Classical Jewish Folktales*, trans. I. M. Lask and Dan Ben Amos (3 vols.; Bloomington: Indiana University, 1976), #70 with the notes. *TB Sanh.* 21b also ignores the intermarriage. Surely this fact does not imply varying attitudes toward intermarriage, no matter what Ginzberg says (*Legends*, 6:282, n. 16, and 299, n. 81).

13:26). Josephus similarly emphasizes (*Ant.* 8.7.5 §§191–94) the enormity of Solomon's sins, both the intermarriage and the consequent idolatry.¹⁷

(e) In its final stage, Kings includes Pharaoh's daughter among the foreign wives who led Solomon astray. In the rabbinic passages which highlight Solomon's sin in the marriage of the foreign women, Pharaoh's daughter plays a special role. She was the greatest idolater of them all, and the marriage to her was the greatest sin of all.

"Now King Solomon loved many foreign women: the daughter of Pharaoh, etc." Since Pharaoh's daughter was included (in the phrase "many foreign women"), why was she mentioned specifically? In order to teach that Solomon loved her more than all the others and that she caused him to sin more than all the others. (Sipre Deut. 52, p. 119 ed. Finkelstein)

In two different midrashim Solomon's marriage to Pharaoh's daughter is said to be responsible for the destruction of the temple.

Rabbi Yudan said: For all those seven years during which Solomon was building the temple he did not drink wine. When he built the temple and took Pharaoh's daughter, that night he drank wine. There were two parties there, one festivity for the building of the temple and the other festivity for Pharaoh's daughter. Said the Holy One, blessed be He, "Whose festivity should I attend? Of these or of the others?" At that moment it entered his mind to destroy (the temple).¹⁸

The midrash goes on to narrate the wickedness of Pharaoh's daughter and her expertise in idolatry. According to R. Yudan, Solomon did not defile the construction of the temple either by wine or by intermarriage. Since Scripture does not state exactly when Solomon married Pharaoh's daughter, R. Yudan states, perhaps on the basis of a creative misreading of *ad* in 1 Kgs. 3:1, that he married her immediately after the temple was completed, so that the day which marked the inauguration of the temple also marked the beginning of the end for Solomon himself and for the temple which he built.¹⁹ According to another midrash, Solomon's marriage to Pharaoh's daughter was responsible for the ultimate destruction of the second temple by the Romans:

At the moment when Solomon took Pharaoh's daughter Gabriel (in some versions: Michael) descended and stuck a reed into the sea, and it gathered a bank of land around it, on which the great city of Rome was built.²⁰

17 L. H. Feldman has not convinced me that Josephus is trying to minimize the extent of Solomon's misdeeds. See his "Josephus as Apologist to the Greco-Roman World: His Portrait of Solomon," in E. S. Fiorenza, ed., *Aspects of Religious Propaganda in Judaism and Early Christianity* (Notre Dame: University, 1976), 69–98, esp. 76–77.

18 Leviticus Rabba 12.5, pp. 262–63, ed. Margalioth. For parallels, see Margalioth's notes.

19 Gooding, *Relics*, 72, and "The Septuagint's Version of Solomon's Misconduct," *VT* 15 (1965), 325–35, esp. 329–30, misinterprets the midrash and overinterprets the LXX. On the chronology see below.

20 *TB Šabb.* 56b; *TB Sanh.* 21b; *TY Abod. Zar.* 1.2 39c; Song of Songs Rabba 1.6. See Ginzberg, *Legends*, 6:280, n. 11; P. Rieger, "The Foundation of Rome in the Talmud," *JQR* 16 (1926), 227–36; S. Krauss, *Persia and Rome in the Talmud and Midrashim* (Jerusalem: Mosad haRav Kook, 1948), 14–19 [Hebrew]. For the connection between the marriage to Pharaoh's daughter and the destruction of the temple see also *TB Nid.* 70b.

Solomon built the temple, but through his marriage to Pharaoh's daughter he was also responsible for its destruction.

Conversion

In the eyes of Kings, polygamy and intermarriage induced Solomon to commit the sin of idolatry. In the eyes of the rabbis, however, polygamy and intermarriage were not merely contributing factors in Solomon's theological downfall, but were sins in their own right. There were few ways by which an exegete could remove the blot of idolatry from Solomon's record. He could ignore it (a, b, and c above), or he could argue that Solomon did not engage in idolatry himself but merely allowed his foreign wives to do so (*TB Sabb.* 56b).²¹

The removal of the sin of intermarriage was a little bit easier. When confronted by marriages of the biblical period between an Israelite hero and a foreign woman rabbinic exegetes had two basic possibilities. They could argue that the woman only appeared to be foreign, since she really was the descendant of Israelite stock (see, e.g., the legends about Tamar, the consort of Judah). Or they could argue that the woman converted to Judaism before her marriage (see, e.g., the legends about Asenath, the wife of Joseph).²² In biblical times, of course, there was no ritual of "conversion" for either man or woman. Foreign women were assimilated into the people of Israel through marriage with an Israelite husband. Upon her marriage she joined his house and his clan, and would normally accept his way of life. The idea that a woman could "convert" to Judaism in her own right, through a ritual of immersion, and that her Jewishness was independent of that of her husband, did not emerge until the first century B.C.E. or C.E.²³ Although foreign women of the biblical period never "converted" to the religion of Israel, rabbinic exegetes, seldom bothered by a historical perspective, found conversion for them in scripture.

Did the foreign wives of Solomon convert to Judaism upon their marriage? Maimonides (1135-1204) writes the following:

Do not think that Samson, the savior of Israel, or Solomon king of Israel, who was called "beloved of God," married foreign women in their gentile state. But the secret of the matter is the following. When a male or female convert comes to be converted, it is the proper observance of the commandment that they (the rabbinic court) should investigate whether he has come to enter Judaism because of money which he would receive or because of power which he would gain or

21 This became the classic defense of Solomon and was adopted by Maimonides (see below). Of course this exegesis did not convince everyone. Some rabbis suggested that Solomon ought to have been included on the list of kings who have no share in the world to come: *TB Sanh.* 104b and *TY Sanh.* 10.2 29b. Ginzberg, *Legends*, 6:294-95, n. 59, suggests that intermarriage, especially the marriage to Pharaoh's daughter, was the sin which impelled these rabbis to count Solomon among the wicked kings. His idolatry is a more likely explanation, as the context indicates.

22 S. J. D. Cohen, "The Origins of the Matrilineal Principle in Rabbinic Law," *AJS Review* 10/1 (1985), n. 22 (forthcoming).

23 Cohen, *Origins*, and "Conversion to Judaism in Historical Perspective: From Biblical Israel to Postbiblical Judaism," *Conservative Judaism* 36/4 (Summer 1983), 31-45.

because of fear . . . If no extraneous reason for the conversion be found, they make known to him the burden of the yoke of the Torah . . . Therefore, the rabbinic court did not accept converts during the entire period of David and Solomon, in the Davidic period lest they were converting out of fear, and in the Solomonic period lest they were converting for the sake of the political power, prosperity and greatness which Israel had . . . Nevertheless, many converts did convert to Judaism in the period of David and Solomon before lay courts, and the supreme rabbinic court had suspicions about their status. They did not reject them, since they at least had undergone immersion, but they did not accept them until they should see what would become of them. And since Solomon and likewise Samson converted women and married them, and the fact was well known that the women converted only for an extraneous reason and were not converted by a rabbinic court, Scripture regards them as if they were gentiles and still forbidden. Furthermore, their end proves the nature of their beginning, in that they worshiped their pagan gods and built altars for them, and Scripture reckoned it as if he (Solomon) had built them.²⁴

Throughout his exegesis Maimonides is answering a series of non-legal questions about Solomon. How is it possible to imagine that Solomon, sage and king of Israel, married gentile women? If they had converted to Judaism, why did they still worship foreign gods and lead Solomon astray? These questions were bothering Maimonides when he wrote these paragraphs, but his strained exegesis clearly does not fit the text. R. David Qimhi (known as Radaq, 1160–1235) and R. Levi ben Gerson (known as Gersonides, 1288–1344), in their commentaries on 1 Kgs. 3:1, 3:3, and 11:1, argue that Pharaoh's daughter must have converted to Judaism, since two verses after recording the marriage 1 Kgs. 3:3 writes "Solomon loved the Lord, walking in the statutes of David his father," but that the numerous foreign women whom Solomon married at the end of his life obviously remained idolaters.

The ritual of conversion might save Solomon's reputation, but it does not solve a serious legal problem. As I discussed above, Solomon's foreign wives fall into two categories: the Canaanites prohibited by Deut. 7:3–4, and the four nations prohibited by Deut. 23. According to *TB Yeb.* 76a–b, even Canaanites who have converted to Judaism are prohibited by Deut. 7:3–4 from marrying native born Jews. In order to explain the biblical statement that "Solomon *married* the daughter of Pharaoh," the Talmud suggests that the princess was able to contract a valid marriage because she had converted to Judaism. Had she remained an Egyptian, Scripture would not have said that Solomon "married" her, since gentiles, according to rabbinic legal theory, are incapable of contracting valid marriages.²⁵ This is the source for Maimonides' idea that Solomon's foreign wives converted to Judaism. But unlike Maimonides, the Talmud is not interested in exculpating Solomon. The Talmud admits that the conversion of Pharaoh's daughter explains the validity but not the permissibility of Solomon's marriage to her. She was an Egyptian, and marriages of native born Jews to Egyptian or Edomite converts were prohibited by Deut. 23:8–9; only third generation converts could "enter the congregation of the Lord." Thus, according to the Talmud, Solomon was prohibited from marrying Egyptian, Edomite, and Canaanite women, whether converted or not.

²⁴ *Mishneh Torah, Laws of Forbidden Intercourse* 13:14–16.

²⁵ For a discussion of this rabbinic theory, which is not understood by Gooding, see Cohen, *Matrilineal Principle*.

The only rabbinic way to legitimate the marriage of Solomon to Pharaoh's daughter is to argue that Deut. 23:8-9 prohibits only *male* Egyptian and Edomite converts from entering the matrimonial congregation. In order to legitimate the marriage of Boaz to Ruth, a Moabite "convert," the rabbis argue that the prohibition of Ammonites and Moabites (Deut. 23:4) applies only to the men, not the women. Male Ammonite and Moabite converts may never marry a native born Jew, but female Ammonites and Moabites, immediately after their conversion to Judaism, are permitted to be married to native born Jews (*M. Yeb.* 8:3).²⁶ R. Simeon, perhaps in order to legitimate Solomon's marriage to Pharaoh's daughter, tried to extend a parallel exegesis to the prohibition of Egyptians and Edomites, but his view was rejected. Solomon was left to wallow in his sin.²⁷

In *TY Sanh.* 2.6 20c R. Simeon b. Yohai suggests that Solomon "loved," i.e., had sex with, his foreign wives but did not actually marry them. Hannanya, the nephew of R. Joshua, states that Solomon did marry them. These two views have their analogues in the parallel discussion in *TB Yeb.* 76a-b. But then the Yerushalmi quotes the amazing view of R. Yosi, "(Solomon married the foreign women) in order to attract them to the words of the Torah and draw them near under the wings of the divine presence." In other words, Solomon hoped to convert them to Judaism by marrying them. This view, like that of Maimonides, is far from the simple meaning of the text but close to the social reality of Jewish relationships with gentiles. We may imagine that R. Yosi knew some Jewish men who excused their marriages to gentile women on the grounds that the marriages would bring the women close to Judaism. Solomon tried that too, R. Yosi is saying, and look what happened to him.²⁸

The Impurity of Women

The daughter of a Pharaoh needs a palace of her own. Kings does not need to explain why Solomon built her a separate palace. But why does Kings insist that Solomon built it outside of the city of David? Here explanation is required. Chronicles suggests the following: "Solomon brought Pharaoh's daughter up from the city of David to the house which he had built for her, for he said, 'My wife shall not live in the house of David king of Israel, for the places to which the ark of the Lord has come are holy'" (2 Chron. 8:11 = [6]). This explanation is difficult and itself requires explanation.

Where the RSV reads "the places," the Hebrew simply has "they" (*kî qōdeš hēmmâ*). The RSV translation might imply that Solomon thinks that all places ever visited by the ark during its many peregrinations remain too sacred to be frequented by his Egyptian wife. This is not very likely. Other translators and commentators suggest

26 This exegesis also legitimates Solomon's marriage to the Ammonite and Moabite women (if they first converted to Judaism).

27 *Sipre Deut.* 253, p. 279, ed. Finkelstein. This is the midrashic source quoted by Radaq on 1 Kgs. 3:3, which is unknown to Ginzberg, *Legends* 6:281-82, n. 16.

28 In *The Prohibition of Inter-marriage*, I argued that intermarriage was not a major issue for the rabbis of the Mishnah and Talmud. This view requires confirmation.

that the antecedent of the plural pronoun is either the various "houses" which comprised the palace of David, or the "city of David" and the "house of David" together. I see no other possibility.²⁹

Solomon declares that the city/house of David is too sacred to serve as a residence for Pharaoh's daughter. Was the ark still in the city/house of David when Solomon made this declaration, or had it already been transferred to its new home in the Solomonic temple? In other words, did Solomon build the palace for Pharaoh's daughter before or after the completion of the temple?³⁰

1 Kgs. 9:24 (text [4] above), which parallels 2 Chron. 8:11, does not answer this question. 1 Kgs. 9:10 is a chronological indicator ("at the end of twenty years, in which Solomon had built the two houses, the house of the Lord and the king's house") that introduces a brief section on the relations between Solomon and Hiram (9:10–14). The next verse (9:15) begins a section on Solomon's building projects and the forced labor used to complete them (9:15–23). 9:24 seems to be an appendix to this section. It is a solitary verse that describes the regular cycle of sacrifices offered by Solomon in the temple. Thus, although 9:10 and 25 explicitly refer to the completion of the temple and the palace, the intervening thematic section treats the period both before and after the completion. That Pharaoh's daughter went up from the city of David only after the construction of the temple and the Solomonic palace cannot be deduced from 9:24. It can, however, be deduced from 1 Kgs. 3:1 (text [1] above) which clearly implies that Pharaoh's daughter left the city of David only after Solomon had finished building his own house, the house of the Lord, and the wall around Jerusalem.

If the author of Chronicles intended his account to supplement that of Kings, then 2 Chron. 8:11 presupposes the data provided by 1 Kgs. 3:1 (a verse which is unparalleled in Chronicles) that Solomon removed Pharaoh's daughter from the city of David only after the erection of the temple. Before the temple was built the ark resided in a tent in the city of David (2 Sam. 6:16–17 // 1 Chron. 15:29–16:1), presumably somewhere near the Davidic palace. When the temple was completed, the ark was brought out of the city of David (1 Kgs. 8:1 // 2 Chron. 5:2) and placed in its permanent home. Thus, according to 2 Chron. 8:11, as long as the ark of the Lord remained in its tent in the city of David, Pharaoh's daughter was able to reside nearby in the palace of David. After the ark was removed from the city of David, Solomon's wife had to be removed as well because, it is

29 See Qimhi and (Rashi) ad loc. The LXX reads "My wife shall not dwell in the *city* of David king of Israel, because *it* is sacred." This translation is the product of exegesis; assimilation of *bêt dāwid* to *‘ir dāwid*, as argued by L. C. Allen, *The Greek Chronicles II: Textual Criticism* (VTS 27; Leiden: Brill, 1974), 92, is only part of the explanation. The new JPS version reads "for (the area) is sacred."

30 Various chronological details about Solomon's relationship with Pharaoh's daughter were debated by later exegetes. If Solomon married Pharaoh's daughter before embarking on his building program, the plain implication of 1 Kgs. 3:1, the Egyptian princess lived more than twenty years in the city of David (1 Kgs. 6:38–7:1 and 9:10). The *Seder ‘ōlām rabbā* 15, pp. 32b–33a, ed. Ratner, states that Solomon brought Pharaoh's daughter to his palace immediately upon beginning the construction of the temple. In *Leviticus Rabba*, however, he does not marry her until after the temple is completed (see above). The first Greek miscellany (1 Kgs. 2:35c) suggests that the building of the temple, palace, and walls of Jerusalem, lasted only seven years instead of twenty. (This midrash has nothing to do with the rabbinic ones just cited, *pace* Gooding, 71–72.)

now discovered, the city had been sanctified by the ark. The logic of the argument is remarkable.³¹

If, however, the author of Chronicles intended his account to be an independent narrative, the logic of his argument can be improved. Chronicles has no parallel to 1 Kgs. 3:1, and taken by itself 2 Chron. 8:11 might mean that Solomon removed his Egyptian wife from the city of David while the ark was still in the city, i.e., *before* the completion of the temple. Sense is thereby restored to 2 Chron. 8:11, but this explanation too has its problems because 2 Chron. 8 also has no parallel to 1 Kgs. 9:15, the verse which shows that 1 Kgs. 9:15-24 is thematic rather than chronological. The author of 2 Chron. 8 seems to think that the material of 1 Kgs. 9 is arranged chronologically.³² If so, 2 Chron. 8:11 refers to an event which took place after the dedication of the temple (the same implication yielded by 1 Kgs. 3:1), and my second explanation fails.

Even if the precise logic of 2 Chron. 8:11 remains obscure, its fundamental point is clear. Pharaoh's daughter did not merely "go up" (*ʿālētā*) from the city of David; Solomon "brought her up" (*heʿēlā*)³³ because the city/house of David had become too sacred for her. The Chronicler often emphasizes that the priests and Levites "sanctified themselves" (*hitqaddēšū*) before engaging in various sacred rituals.³⁴ Impure priests and Levites were not to enter the temple (2 Chron. 23:19). The Chronicler does not, however, seem to be as concerned with the possibility that the cult might become polluted through the impurity of lay Israelites (except at the Pesah sacrifice, 2 Chron. 30:17-18). Even while detailing the dramatic confrontation between Uzziah the King and Azariah the High Priest, the Chronicler does not accuse the king of polluting the temple; the sole cause of the king's leprosy was his usurpation of the priestly right to offer incense at the altar (2 Chron. 26:16-20). The concern evinced by 2 Chron. 8:11 is unusual, if not unique, in the book of Chronicles. What is the nature of the pollution that in the person of Pharaoh's daughter threatens the sacred?

Several commentators have suggested that Solomon wished to protect the ark from any contact with foreigners.³⁵ Ezek. 44:7-9 prohibits foreigners (*ben nēkār*) from entering the temple, a prohibition which was implemented during second temple times. The sectarian legislator of Qumran similarly prohibits the "Ammonite, Moabite, *mamzēr*, gentile (*ben nēkār*) and proselyte (*gēr*)" from entering the temple to be built in the messianic future.³⁶ Since Pharaoh's daughter was an Egyptian, Solomon wanted to

31 Well observed by W. Rudolph, *Chronikbücher* (HAT 21; Tübingen: Mohr [Siebeck], 1955), 220. Perhaps Solomon means that the city of David has been sanctified by the entry of the ark into the temple, but the words put in his mouth by Chronicles do not say that.

32 The chronological setting is further strengthened by the *ʿāz* which opens 2 Chron. 8:12.

33 Assimilation to 2 Chron. 8:8b and 12?

34 See the list of passages assembled by Sara Japhet, "The Supposed Common Authorship of Chronicles and Ezra-Nehemiah," *VT* 18 (1968), 330-71, esp. 341-43; 1 Chron. 15:12-14; 2 Chron. 5:11; 29:5, 15, 34; 30:3, 15, 24; 35:6.

35 Montgomery, *Kings*, 210 (on 1 Kgs. 9:24); C. F. Keil and F. Delitzsch, *Biblical Commentary on the Old Testament: The Books of Chronicles*, trans. A. Harper (repr. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, n.d.), 336; E. L. Curtiss, *Books of Chronicles* (ICC; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1910; repr. 1965), 353.

36 J. M. Baumgarten, "The Exclusion of 'Netinim' and Proselytes in 4Q Florilegium," *Revue de Qumran* 8 (1972), 87-96, esp. 89-93, and "Exclusions from the Temple," *JJS* 33 (1982), 215-25, esp. 215-18. See Y. Yadin, *The Temple Scroll* (3 vols.; Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 1977), 1:191-92.

exclude her from the sancta of Israel. Perhaps 2 Chron. 8:11 understood the Deuteronomic prohibition of “entering the congregation of the Lord” (Deut. 23), a prohibition which applies *inter alia* to Egyptians, to refer to entry into the temple.³⁷ However, it is most unlikely that Solomon is defending the ark’s sanctity from his wife’s foreignness, because Solomon does not refer to her foreign origin. He says not *lō^ʿ tēšēb nokrūt* (“a foreign woman shall not dwell”) but *lō^ʿ tēšēb ʿiššā lî* (“my wife shall not dwell”).³⁸

Rudolph argues that in 2 Chron. 8:11 Solomon is trying to distance menstrual pollution from the ark.³⁹ According to the priestly code a menstruant is impure for seven days, and a *zābā* is impure for as long as her flow continues (Lev. 15:19–30). The primary concern of the priestly legislator is to ensure that the Israelites do not pollute the sanctuary (Lev. 15:31). He ordains that the leper, the *zāb/zābā*, and the person defiled by contact with a corpse be sent outside the camp (Num. 5:1–4). Many biblical texts refer to the exclusion of lepers from the camp (i.e., the city), but the exclusion of *zābīm* (a category which probably includes menstruants) and those who suffer corpse-impurity is mentioned nowhere else aside from the utopian demand of Num. 5:1–4.⁴⁰ In fact, nowhere else in the Hebrew Bible is there a reference to the pollution, or possible pollution, of the sancta by a menstruant.⁴¹ Every seven years the entire nation, “men, women, and children,” were to gather at the central shrine in order to hear God’s teaching (Deut. 31:11–13). This proceeding was meant to mimic the revelation at Mount Sinai (cf. Deut. 4:10) which was attended by the “entire nation” (Exod. 19:8), including women.⁴² Once during an emergency all of Judah, including women and children, gathered in the temple in order to pray for relief (2 Chron. 20:13). After Ezra finished his penitential prayer before the temple, a large crowd of Israelites gathered about him, including women and children (Ezra 10:1). Hannah prays before the Lord at Shiloh (1 Sam. 1:9–18). The wicked queen Athalia enters the temple, there to discover that she has been deposed; the high priest, concerned lest he defile the temple with corpse-impurity, orders her to be removed first and then killed (2 Kgs. 11:13–16 // 2 Chron. 23:12–15). Exod. 38:8 and 1 Sam. 2:22 refer to the women who “ministered” before the Lord at the central sanctuary.⁴³ None of these passages evinces any concern that the women involved might be impure and might pollute the sacred through their impurity.⁴⁴

If Rudolph is correct, then, 2 Chron. 8:11 is the earliest expression of a fear of menstrual pollution which in the Bible is otherwise attested only in Lev. 12, Lev. 15, and Num. 5, but which assumes a much larger role in the piety of post-biblical Judaism.

37 Cohen, *Intermarriage*, 31–32.

38 The Chronicler also has no objection if foreigners from distant lands pray to (or at) the temple (2 Chron. 6:32–33 // 1 Kgs. 8:41–43).

39 Rudolph, 220–21, followed by Japhet, *Ideology*, 298, n. 295, and J. M. Myers, *II Chronicles* (AB; Garden City: Doubleday, 1965), 49–50.

40 M. Haran, *Temples and Temple-Service in Ancient Israel* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1978; repr. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1985), 11, n. 11.

41 Ezekiel uses the figure “the impurity of the *niddā*” (22:10 and 36:17; cf. 7:19–20; 16:6; and Lam. 1:8 and 17), but not in order to illustrate the pollution of the sacred. In 2 Chron. 29:5 (and elsewhere) *niddā* means “filth” or “pollution.”

42 This point is made explicit by rabbinic midrash on Exod. 19:3.

43 For a discussion of women in the cult, see R. de Vaux, *Ancient Israel* (NY: McGraw Hill, 1961), 383–84.

44 This fact was used in medieval times to prove that a menstruant may recite the Shema; see *Sefer halakhot gedolot*, ed. Ezriel Hildesheimer (Jerusalem: Mekize Nirdamim, 1971), 1:40–41 with n. 53.

According to both Josephus and rabbinic law a menstruant was forbidden to enter the temple mount; even a non-menstruating woman was permitted to go no further than the “court of women.”⁴⁵ The author of the Temple Scroll is more extreme; he makes no provision for the residence of women in the temple city, apparently because they were allowed to visit but not to live there. The female residents of other cities were to remove to special places outside of their cities during the periods of their impurity.⁴⁶ Josephus remarks (apparently on the basis of Num. 5:2–3) that Moses excluded the menstruant from the camp for seven days (*Ant.* 3.11.3, §261). In his paraphrase of Gen. 31 (Rachel steals her father’s *tērāpīm* and pretends to have her period), Josephus adds the comment that “Laban desisted from further search, never supposing that his daughter in that condition would approach the images” (*Ant.* 1.19.10, §323). Later rabbinic law and custom introduced many practices designed to ensure the separation of the menstruant from the sacred.⁴⁷ 2 Chron. 8:11 is a harbinger of this type of religiosity.

Rudolph’s interpretation, although attractive, does not exhaust the content of the verse, because it ignores the small word *lī*. Solomon does not say *lō^ʔ tēšēb ʔiššā*, “a woman shall not dwell in the house of David,” but *lō^ʔ tēšēb ʔiššā lī*, “my wife shall not dwell.”⁴⁸ Solomon emphasizes the fact that Pharaoh’s daughter is his *wife*, not merely that she is a woman. This implies that Solomon was trying to avoid the pollution which results from the relations between husband and wife. Num. 5:1–3 demands that the Israelites expel the *zāb* from the camp. The rabbis argue that this category includes the ejaculant (*ba^cal qerī*), and the parallel law in Deut. 23:10–12 shows that they probably are correct (*TB Pesah.* 67b–68a). Several biblical texts demonstrate that the concern about the defilement of the sacred by an ejaculant had real social implications in pre-exilic Israel. Before the revelation at Mount Sinai, Moses forgot to warn the women about menstrual impurity (as we have just seen), but he did remember to warn the men not to approach a woman for three days (Exod. 19:15). When David is absent from the New Month celebrations, Saul thinks that he might have become impure through an emission (1 Sam. 20:26). Fleeing from Saul, David assures Ahimelek the priest that he and his men have abstained from sexual relations and therefore are pure enough to eat sanctified bread (1 Sam. 21:5–6). In second temple times the ejaculant, like the menstruant, was prohibited from entering the temple mount. The Qumran legislator

45 E. Schürer, *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ*, vol. 2, ed. G. Vermes, F. Millar, et al. (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1979), 285, n. 58. For a discussion of “the court of women” see A. Büchler, “The Forecourt of Women,” *JQR* 10 (1898), 678–718, with the corrections of T. Busink, *Der Tempel von Jerusalem von Salomo bis Herodes* (2 vols.; Leiden: Brill, 1980), 2:1073–79.

46 Yadin, *Temple Scroll*, 1:223–24 (discussion of 45:11–12), 235–38 (discussion of 46:16–18 and 48:14–17). Various details in Yadin’s interpretation of these passages have been disputed, but these debates do not affect my point.

47 Y. Dinari, “The Defilement of the Sacred by a Menstruant and the Enactment of Ezra,” *Te^cuda III: Studies in Talmudic Literature* (Tel-Aviv University, 1983), 17–37 [Hebrew]. I hope to return to this elsewhere.

48 Or, in the new JPS version, “No wife of mine shall dwell in a palace of David.” The Targum translates “it is not fitting that a woman dwell there,” using *lī* only in an interpolated phrase (“it is not possible that a woman have dominion over me in the palace of David”). See R. Le Déaut and J. Robert, *Targum des Chroniques* (*An. Bib.* 51; 2 vols.; Rome: Biblical Institute, 1971), 2:99. On the use of *lī* as a possessive, see Gesenius’ *Hebrew Grammar*, ed. E. Kautzsch and A. E. Cowley (Oxford: Clarendon, 1910; repr. 1956), §129.

forbade sexual relations in the entire city of Jerusalem, because it was the city of the temple.⁴⁹ According to rabbinic tradition Ezra prohibited the ejaculant from studying Torah (*TB B. Qam.* 82a–b). Rabbinic law prohibited him from reciting the daily prayers (*M. Ber.* 3:4).⁵⁰ 2 Chron. 8:11 anticipates these rulings.⁵¹

Conclusion

The Biblical legacy concerning the marriage of Solomon to Pharaoh's daughter illustrates well the continuity and discontinuity between the religion of biblical Israel and the Judaism of the second temple and rabbinic periods. In the earliest strata of the book of Kings, the marriage is hailed as a great achievement, one of the glories of a glorious reign. Gradually, however, the assessment began to change. The rebellion of the northern tribes against the kingdom of Judah was interpreted in part as punishment for Solomon's idolatry, and that sin was attributed to the baneful influence of his foreign wives. By the time our current Hebrew text of Kings was edited, Pharaoh's daughter had been added to the list of foreign wives who led Solomon astray. The marriage to her contributed to his downfall.

During the Second Temple period many Jews began to look at intermarriage not merely as potentially dangerous but as inherently sinful, and began to look at Solomon as one of the most conspicuous of such sinners. By rabbinic times intermarriage was regarded as so great a sin that exegetes began to ask how Solomon, the builder of the temple and the great sage, could have violated the prohibition so flagrantly. One rabbi suggested that Solomon was hoping that his foreign wives would convert after the marriage. Apologetic activity of this type reached its climax with Maimonides who argued that the wives did in fact convert to Judaism before their marriage. Solomon still violated many rabbinic laws by these marriages, but these violations, at least, were relatively venial. Neither Kings nor Chronicles knows anything about "conversion," but rabbinic exegetes routinely read into Scripture their own laws and institutions.

In one respect the biblical record about Pharaoh's daughter does anticipate the religiosity of a later time. Solomon's concern in Chronicles that his Egyptian wife not reside in an area sanctified by the ark is a forerunner of the kind of piety which later developed in rabbinic Judaism and, in more extreme form, at Qumran. The author of Chronicles does not condemn either the marriage or any other act of Solomon. In his account, Solomon's treatment of his Egyptian wife is a lesson in piety from a model king and husband.

49 *Temple Scroll* 45:11 and *Damascus Covenant* 12:1–2; see Yadin (n. 46).

50 See Dinari (n. 47).

51 This was suggested sixty years ago by L. Ginzberg, *An Unknown Jewish Sect* (New York: Jewish Theological Seminary, 1976), 74.