COMPLETION PHRASEOLOGY IN THE SOLOMON NARRATIVE AND IN MESOPOTAMIAN ROYAL INSCRIPTIONS

Biblical redactors employed specific phraseology to express the concept that a building was completed. These completion formulas and phrases have often been overlooked in recent commentaries. A closer reading of the Solomon narrative shows that Hebrew and Greek manuscripts contain various types of completion formulas and located them in different places. Hence, I start with exploring a typology of completion phraseology. The comparison of completion formulas and the division of the completion formula into three groups allow me to approach a more complex question: What is the role of the completion formulas in the biblical texts? Since the narrative and rhetorical analysis should examine a concrete text, I intentionally have chosen the four most representative manuscripts. Thus, this paper analyses the role of the completion formulas in the Masoretic text of the *Codex Leningradensis* (MT), the *Codex Vaticanus* (G[B]) [1], the Antiochian text (G[Ant.]) [2], and the *Codex Alexandrinus* (G[A]) [3]. The presence and absence of the completion formulas points to different narrative and rhetorical strategies in the Greek and Hebrew versions of the Solomon narrative [4]. The different strategies leave us with unanswered questions: Are these formulas pure literary devices invented by the Israelite scribes? Can we reconstruct the original Urtext? Even though the primary goal of this article is not to discuss the textual history of the Hebrew and Greek manuscripts nor to reconstruct the Old Greek nor to address the complex discussion regarding the pre-Masoretic and proto-Masoretic text, these questions

---

[1] Cf. A.E. Brooke – N.M.A. McLean – H.J. Thackeray, *I and II Kings*, vol. II/II (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 1930). When referring to biblical manuscripts, I will use the siglas proposed in this book.

[2] Cf. N.F. Marcos – J.R. Busto Saiy, *El Texto antioqueno de la Biblia Griega: 1–2 Reyes*, vol. II (Madrid 1992).

[3] Cf. the edition of J.J. Breitinger – J.E. Grabe, *Vetus Testamentum ex Versione Septuaginta Interpretum Olim ad Fidem Codicis Ms. Alexandrini* (Tiguri Helvetiorum 1730).

[4] For a more detailed methodological introduction into the relation between the textual history and the rhetorical analysis of the Hebrew and Greek versions of 1–2 Kings and 3–4 Kingdoms, see the author's forthcoming article in *New Avenues in Biblical Exegesis in Light of the LXX* (eds. L. Pessoa – D. Scialabba) (The Septuagint in its Ancient Context; Turnhout 2022).

inevitably lead my research to a diachronic analysis [5]. The examination of similar formulas occurring in the ANE inscriptions allows me to formulate a hypothesis on the cultic origin of the completion formulas and their reception in Greek and Hebrew manuscripts.

I. TYPOLOGY OF COMPLETION PHRASEOLOGY

A characteristic feature of the completion formulas in the MT is the occurrence of the verbs כלה and בנה. An examination of these verbs allows us to divide the completion formulas into three groups [6]. A clearly distinguishable completion formula [7] (Type I) is "(Solomon) built (ויבן) the temple and completed it (ויכלהו)" [8]. This formula occurs in 1 Kgs 6,9a.14 and both verbs are in *wayyiqtol*. Type II formulas occur in 1 Kgs 3,1 (עד כלתו לבנות) and 9,1 (ויהי ככלות שלמה לבנות). Both verbs are in infinitive construct. Finally, there are partial formulas in 1 Kgs 6,1 and 6,37-38 (referring to the completion of the temple), in 7,1 (the completion of Solomon's palace), in 7,22 (the completion of the pillars), and in 7,40 (the completion of vessels), which are labeled as Type III in this paper [9].

1. *Completion formula of Type I*

Table 1 presents manuscripts containing the completion formula of Type I:

MT (1 Kgs)	G^B.Ant. (3 Kgdms)	G^A (3 Kgdms)
	6,8	6,3d
6,9a	6,14a	6,9a
6,14		6,14

Table 1: Occurrences of the Type I completion formula.

---

[5] For a helpful introduction to these problems and a good bibliography, see articles in *THB* 1B, 301-453.

[6] J. Walsh noticed the importance of the completion formulas for the structure of the temple-palace building account; however, he did not distinguish among different types of formulas and their role: J.T. WALSH, *1 Kings* (Berit Olam. Studies in Hebrew Narrative & Poetry; Collegeville, MN 1996) 103.

[7] I call this phrase a formula. The technical term "formula" refers to a short literary genre whose common feature is linguistic similarity. A formula is often fixed and stereotyped; see G.M. TUCKER, *Form Criticism of the Old Testament* (Philadelphia, PA 1971) 14. While the formulas of Type I match the definition of the literary critics, the formulas of Type II and III are not formulas in the strict sense of the word. The formulas of Type II and III represent stylistic and gramatical variants that share the verbs "to build" and "to complete" and are applied to buildings.

[8] All translations are my own.

[9] J. GRAY, *I & II Kings*. A Commentary (Old Testament Library; London 1976) 150; M. NOBILE, *1–2 Re* (I Libri Biblici, Primo Testamento; Milano 2010) 102-103.

Based on this list four conclusions can be drawn. First, all Greek manuscripts [10], but no Hebrew manuscripts, locate the Type I formula at the end of 3 Kgdms 6,8 in the G$^{B,Ant.}$ (cf. 1 Kgs 6,3) [11]. Second, all Hebrew and Greek manuscripts have the formula in 1 Kgs 6,9a (3 Kgdms 6,14a in the G$^{B,Ant.}$) [12]. Third, the MT and some Greek manuscripts [13] locate the formula in 1 Kgs 6,14/3 Kgdms 16,14 in the G^A). Third, contrary to Type II and III formulas, the Type I formula occurs exclusively in the temple building account (1 Kings 6/3 Kingdoms 6). Finally, some Greek manuscripts, namely G^A [14], harmonize the MT and the G$^{B,Ant.}$ and as a result there are three Type I formulas.

1.1. Functions of the Type I Completion formula in the MT

Type I formulas divide the temple narrative into minor units. Thus, the location of the Type I completion formula indicates which elements should be grouped together. Accordingly, we have three ways to group the architectural elements of the temple (the formula is in bold) [15]:

MT	6,2-8.**9a**.9b-13.**14**.15-36
G$^{B,Ant.}$	6,6-7.**8**.9-13.**14a**.14b-34
G^A	6,2-3c.**3d**.4-8.**9a**.9b-13.**14**.15-36

In the MT the Type I formula appears for the first time in 1 Kgs 6,9a. Even though some scholars believe that the formula in 6,9a is out of place [16], it seems that the formula serves to separate the work in stone from the work in wood, since wood is mentioned for the first time in 1 Kgs 6,9b just after the first occurrence of the formula. This observation by J. Walsh [17] should be further nuanced. Before the first formula (1 Kgs 6,9), the building material is stone. Between the first and the second formula (1 Kgs 6,9.14), the building materials are wood and probably also stone (the supporting

---

[10] Except minuscule 236.

[11] Manuscript 44 omits and changes some words, but the formula is preserved.

[12] Minuscule i (56 in Rahlfs) and x (247 in Rahlfs) insert the formulas at the equivalent of 1 Kgs 6,3.14 and thus created a unit 6,4-14 that does not exist in other manuscripts.

[13] Manuscripts AMNd-gjnpyzAS 44, 64, 74, 242, 244.

[14] Cf. also manuscripts MNd-gijnpxyzAS 44, 64, 74, 242, 244. The Greek texts in these manuscripts contain several different readings that will not be studied in this paper.

[15] An exception is manuscript ix that divides the narrative in 3 Kgdms 6,2-3c.3d.4-13.14.15-36. Since this manuscript is of minor value, this option is not discussed in this paper.

[16] For the discussion of this issue, see R. KITTEL – W. NOWACK, *Die Bücher der Könige* (Göttingen 1900) 48; D.W. GODDING, "Temple Specifications: A Dispute in Logical Arrangement between the Mt and the Lxx," *VT* 17 (1967) 146-152; E. WÜRTHWEIN, *Das Erste Buch der Könige: Kapitel 1–16* (ATD 11.1; Göttingen 1977) 64; V.O. FRITZ, *1 & 2 Kings* (Continental Commentaries; Philadelphia, PA 2003) 72.

[17] WALSH, *1 Kings*, 103.

structure). After the second formula (1 Kgs 6,14), the building materials are wood and precious metals, but stone is not mentioned.

Beside the type of building material, the Type I formula points out how the parts of the temple should be grouped together. The MT puts the windows together with the surrounding structures [18]. Consequently, the first formula groups together all of the exterior elements — the general layout, porch, windows, walls, and surrounding structures (1 Kgs 6,2-8) [19].

The second formula appears in the MT in 1 Kgs 6,14. This formula performs two different functions in the narrative. It closes God's direct speech (1 Kgs 6,11-13), and, at the same time, as M. Cogan and H. Tadmor observe, the double completion formula (1 Kgs 6,9.14) forms a *Wiederaufnahme* separating the unit describing the outer shell of the temple (1 Kgs 6,2-8) from the unit describing the construction of its interior (1 Kgs 6,15-35) [20]. Their proposal can be further developed. The *Wiederaufnahme* creates a space for inserting a theological comment (6,11-13) in addition to listing three building activities, namely the construction of the roof [21], the supporting structures around the whole temple, and the paneling of the walls with cedar wood (1 Kgs 6,9b-10). These three building activities focus on the completion of the external shell of the temple. Putting these observations together we can conclude that the MT divides the temple architecture into three groups:

(1) The construction of the external shell: outline, porch, windows, walls, and surrounding structures (1 Kgs 6,2-8); *stonework*.

(2) The completing of the external shell: the roof, supporting structures, and fastening the temple with cedar wood (1 Kgs 6,9b-10); *stonework and woodwork*.

(3) The interior and the decoration of the temple (1 Kgs 6,15-38); *woodwork and precious metalwork*.

---

[18] For discussion of the temple windows, see J. LUST, "Solomon's Temple According to 1 Kings 6,3-14 in Hebrew and in Greek," in *After Qumran. Old and Modern Editions of the Biblical Texts — the Historical Books* (eds. H. AUSLOOS – B. LEMMELIJN – J.C. TREBOLLE BARRERA) (Leuven – Paris – Walpole, MA 2012) 273.

[19] For a similar proposal, see S. GAROFALO, *Il Libro dei Re* (Roma 1951) 60-68; J.A. MONTGOMERY, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Books of Kings* (ICC; Edinburgh 1951) 143-159; GRAY, *I & II Kings*, 150-166.

[20] Cf. M. COGAN, *1 Kings. A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (AB 10; New York 2001) 240.

[21] The difficult expression ויספן את הבית גבים is interpreted as a construction of the roof by GRAY, *I & II Kings*, 156; COGAN, *1 Kings*, 240; however, other interpretations have been proposed by M.J. MULDER, *1 Kings* (HCOT; Leuven 1998) 248-250.

1.2. Functions of the Type I Completion formula in the Greek manuscripts

Table 1 shows that the $G^{B,Ant.}$ divide the temple into three groups, as does the MT, yet the groups are different. The Type I completion formula is inserted after 3 Kgdms$^{B,Ant.}$ 6,8 (cf. 1 Kgs 6,3). However, the $G^{B,Ant.}$ have a description of the foundations in 3 Kgdms 6,2-5 that does not occur in the MT nor in the G^A. Thus, the Type I formula in the $G^{B,Ant.}$ groups together the foundations, general outline of the temple, and the *ailam* (3 Kgdms $^{B,Ant.}$ 6,6-7). The second formula is in 3 Kgdms$^{B,Ant.}$ 6,14 (cf. 1 Kgs 6,8). These two formulas create a space for the description of building activities that concern the external shell of the temple: windows, walls, roof-beams, rib-structures around the temple, and stonework (3 Kgdms$^{B,Ant.}$ 6,9-13). After the second completion formula the text describes the construction of bonds and bondings, the interior of the temple, and its decoration (6,14b-34 [22]). In the same way, the MT, the $G^{B,Ant.}$ distinguish the type of material used for the construction of the building. Before the first formula (3 Kgdms$^{B,Ant.}$ 6,8), the text mentions only large stone blocks used for the foundations. The verses 3 Kgdms$^{B,Ant.}$ 6,9-13 mentions stones and wood, and the final section (3 Kgdms^B 6,14b-34/ 3 Kgdms$^{Ant.}$ 6,14b-36) mention wood and precious metals. Putting these observations together we can conclude that the $G^{B,Ant.}$ divide the temple in three sections:

(1) The fundamental parts of the temple: foundations, outline, and porch (6,2-7); *large foundation stone blocks,*
(2) The exterior shell: walls, windows, roof, and rib-structures around the temple (6,9-13); *stone and wood,*
(3) The additional building activities: fixing the temple, interior, and decoration (6,14b-34^B/36$^{Ant.}$); *wood and precious metals.*

Finally, Table 1 shows that the G^A and other manuscripts have three formulas, instead of two. Like the MT, the G^A does not have the description of the foundation of the temple. In this way the temple architecture is divided into four groups:

(1) Essential parts of the temple: outline and porch (3 Kgdms^A 6,2-3c),
(2) Exterior of the temple: walls, windows, roof-beams, and rib-structure around the temple (3 Kgdms^A 6,4-8),

---

[22] J. LUST ("Solomon's Temple," 273) discusses the different grouping caused by the insertion of the formula at the end of verse 3. He suggested that the position of the windows is at the right place following the completion formula in the G^B, because they are the features pertaining to the temple walls.

(3) The completion of the exterior of the temple: roof and bondings (3 Kgdms^A 6,10-13),

(4) The completion of the interior of the temple: interior and decoration (3 Kgdms^A 6,15-35).

2. Completion formula of Type II

It is the syntax that distinguishes the completion formula of Type I from that of Type II. While the completion formula of Type I has both verbs בנה and כלה in *wayyiqtols*, the formula of Type II has the verbs in infinitive construct. As a result, the completion formula of Type II is a part of a temporal clause. Moreover, this formula refers to the completion of both the temple and the palace. Similar formulas occur also in the Greek manuscripts as shown in Table 2:

MT (1 Kgs)	G^B (3 Kgdms)	G$^{Ant.}$ (3 Kgdms)	G^A (3 Kgdms)
	.	2,3	
3,1			3,1
		5,1	
	8,1	8,1	
	8,53a	8,53	8,53
9,1	9,1	9,1	9,1

Table 2: Occurrences of the Type II completion formula.

2.1. Functions of the Type II Completion formula in the MT

While the Type I formula functioned as a marker dividing the temple narrative in 1 Kings 6 into smaller units, the Type II formula is incorporated in the introductory paragraphs that open Solomon's first and second dreams (1 Kings 3 and 9), which are built as parallel chapters [23]. Solomon's dream is central to both chapters. To buttress scholarly consensus, we can add some additional elements that point out an editorial intention to link these two chapters:

Appearance (root ראה)	3,5	9,2
Conversation with the Lord in a dream	3,5-15	9,3-10
Gibeon	3,5	9,2
Pharaoh and Solomon	3,1	9,16

---

[23] B.O. LONG, *1 Kings. With an Introduction to Historical Literature* (FOTL 9; Grand Rapids, MI 1984) 57-60.

Pharaoh's daughter	3,1	9,16.24
The city of David	3,1	9,24
Sacrifices	3,2	9,25

Besides these elements there are other intertextual links between larger units, namely between 1 Kings 3–5 and 1 Kings 9–10:

Solomon's administration	4,1-19	9,23
Bringing tribute and supplying the court	4,7; 5,2-8	10,14-21
Solomon's wisdom	5,9-14	10,1-10
Hiram	5,15-26	9,11-14.26-28; 10,11
Solomon's force labor	5,28-32	9,15.20-22

Even though there are many differences between 1 Kings 3–5 and 9–10, the elements listed above suggest that the final redactor made a great effort to link both narrative blocks [24]. Thus, the completion formula of Type II functions in the MT as one of several elements that link the narrative blocks of 1 Kings 3–5 and 1 Kings 9–10. The meaning of these links is to frame the temple building account (1 Kings 6–8).

2.2. Functions of the Type II Completion formula in the Greek manuscripts

The Type II formula is rendered in Greek ὡς συνετέλεσεν Σαλωμων οἰκοδομεῖν/οἰκοδομῆσαι. The G^A, alike the MT, has the formula in 3,1 and 9,1 and thus maintains its role as a narrative link between the blocks 3 Kingdoms 3–5 and 9–10. However, the link between 3,1 and 9,1 is absent in the G$^{B,Ant.}$.

Indeed, the differences in chapters eight and nine between the G$^{B,Ant.}$ and the MT show that not only the content but also the structure is different. The G^B inserts the formula only after the construction of the temple (3 Kgdms 8,1.53a and 9,1). The formula thus introduces three narratives in the G$^{B,Ant.}$: Solomon's dedication of the temple (3 Kgdms 8,1-66), Solomon's quote (3 Kgdms 8,53a), and Solomon's second dream (3 Kgdms 9,1-9). The G^B reads [25]:

---

[24] For the role of Solomon's wisdom and administrative skills in the MT, see S.J. DeVries, *1 Kings* (WBC 12; Nashville, TN 2003) 47-50; K. Bodner, *The Theology of the Book of Kings* (Cambridge 2019) 57-65.

[25] The formula is omitted in ANvxA. While the G^B has the formulas that are almost identical, the G$^{Ant.}$ has some minor variants:

Καὶ ἐγένετο ἐν τῷ συντελέσαι Σαλωμῶντα τοῦ οἰκοδομῆσαι τὸν οἶκον κυρίου καὶ τὸν οἶκον αὐτοῦ (8,1).

Τότε ἐλάλησεν Σαλωμων ὑπὲρ τοῦ οἴκου, ὡς συνετέλεσεν τοῦ οἰκοδομῆσαι αὐτόν (8,53a).

Καὶ ἐγένετο ὡς συνετέλεσε Σαλωμων οἰκοδομῆσαι τὸν οἶκον κυρίου καὶ τὸν οἶκον βασιλέως (9,1).

Καὶ ἐγένετο ὡς συνετέλεσεν Σαλωμων τοῦ οἰκοδομῆσαι τὸν οἶκον κυρίου καὶ τὸν οἶκον ἑαυτοῦ (8,1) [26]

Τότε ἐλάλησεν Σαλωμων ὑπὲρ τοῦ οἴκου, ὡς συνετέλεσεν τοῦ οἰκοδομῆσαι αὐτόν (8,53a) [27]

Καὶ ἐγενήθη ὡς συνετέλεσεν Σαλωμων οἰκοδομεῖν τὸν οἶκον κυρίου καὶ τὸν οἶκον τοῦ βασιλέως (9,1) [28]

The verbatim repetition of Καὶ ἐγένετο ὡς συνετέλεσεν Σαλωμων and the reference to both Solomon's palace and temple in 8,1 and 9,1 distinguish this formula from that in 8,53a. In fact, the formula in 8,53a refers only to the temple and is linked with verse 8,54:

Τότε ἐλάλησεν Σαλωμων ὑπὲρ τοῦ οἴκου, ὡς *συνετέλεσεν τοῦ οἰκοδομῆσαι αὐτόν* (8,53a)
    Quote from the Book of the Song
Καὶ ἐγένετο ὡς *συνετέλεσεν* Σαλωμων προσευχόμενος πρὸς κύριον (8,54) [29]

The repetition of the expression ὡς συνετέλεσεν functions as *Wiederaufnahme* and creates a narrative space allowing the redactors to quote the Book of the Song in the midst of the dedication ceremony. The formula in 8,53a and its resumption in 8,54 separates the quotation in 8,53b from the rest of the narrative, but does not introduce another narrative [30].

Moreover, links between 8,1 and 9,1 in the G^{B,Ant.} suggest that the dedication ceremony and the second dream have a similar narrative function. If so, then the consecration and completion of the temple had three stages in the G^{B,Ant.}:

(1) Solomon's prayer (8,1-52)
(2) God's confirmation through the prophecy (8,53)
(3) God's confirmation through the second dream (9,3-9).

In other words, the G^{B,Ant.} propose that the dedication of the temple was not completed without Solomon's second dream. The dream in fact represents God's response to Solomon's prayer and dedication ceremony.

---

[26] And it happened as Solomon completed building the house of the Lord and his own house [...].

[27] Then Solomon spoke concerning the house when he had completed building it.

[28] And it happened, when Solomon completed building the house of the Lord and the house of the king [...].

[29] And it happened when Solomon finished praying to the Lord [...].

[30] This interpretation is also buttressed by the G^A which has the resumption in 8,53 and 54 but does not have a formula in 8,1.

3. *Completion formulas of Type III*

While the formal elements, in particular, the syntax and the vocabulary, mark Type I and II formulas, this is not the case for Type III formulas. We will use Type III as an umbrella for all other completion notes [31]. In other words, these completion notes, labeled as Type III completion formulas in this paper, contain one of the verbs or other expressions suggesting that an aspect of the construction of a building was completed. For practical reasons, these formulas are divided according to their function into three subcategories: sandwich, break, and hinge formulas.

3.1. Sandwich formulas

A particular type of completion formula represents a split formula that contains both roots בנה and כלה in 1 Kgs 6,1.37-38. Since one part of the formula occurs at the beginning and the other part of the formula is placed at the end of a narrative block, we label this rhetorical device a sandwich completion formula. Similar formulas also occur in the Greek manuscripts.

MT (1 Kgs)	G^B (3 Kgdms)	G^Ant (3 Kgdms)	G^A (3 Kgdms)	Bracketing
6,1.37-38			6,1.37-38	Temple building
		6,1.4		Foundations
	7,38.50	7,38.50		Palace

Table 3: Occurrences of the sandwich completion formula.

Temple in the MT

Examining the verbs employed by the scribes and editors in chapters 1 Kings 6 scholars notice the connections between 1 Kgs 6,1 and 6,37-38 [32]:

ויהי בשמונים שנה וארבע מאות שנה לצאת בני ישראל מארץ מצרים בשנה הרביעית
בחדש זו הוא החדש השני למלך שלמה על ישראל ויבן הבית ליהוה (1 Kgs 6,1)

It happened in the 480th year (after) the sons of Israel went out from the land of Egypt, in the 4th year, in the month Ziv, that is the 2nd month, of King Solomon reigning over Israel, he built the temple for the Lord.

---

[31] Even though we opted for the division Type I, II, and III formulas in this paper, the reader should keep in mind that Type III is very different from the other kinds of completion formulas. Another possible division might be: Category A (Type I and II formulas) and Category B (Type III formulas).

[32] Cf. MONTGOMERY, *Books of Kings*, 143.

[Temple building account in verses 6,2-36]

בשנה הרביעית יסד בית בית יהוה בירח זו ובשנה האחת עשרה בירח בול הוא החדש
השמיני כלה הבית לכל דבריו ולכל משפטו ויבנהו שבע שנים (1 Kgs 6,37-38)

In the fourth year the temple of the Lord was founded, in the month of
Ziv. In the eleventh year, in the month of Bul, that is the eighth month, he
completed the temple according to all its details and all its specifications.
He built it in seven years.

The links between the opening and the closing part of the temple build-
ing account are constructed by means of time-information, namely, when
the temple was built and how long the construction lasted. Besides these
temporal indicators, the redactors also used the verbs typical for the com-
pletion formulas. 1 Kgs 6,1 and 6,38 can be considered a combination
of Type I and II, for the verb בנה is in *wayyiqtol* (cf. Type I), but they are
inserted into temporal clauses (cf. Type II). 1 Kgs 6,37-38 use three verbs,
יסד, בנה, and כלה, which refer not only to building and completing the
temple but also to laying the foundation of the temple [33]. The verb בנה and
the temporal indications supplied in 1 Kgs 6,1 open the temple building
account. Verses 1 Kgs 6,37-38 repeat the verb בנה and add the verbs יסד
and כלה, as well as other temporal indications. Thus the formulas in verses
1 Kgs 6,1 and 6,37-38 mark an *inclusion*, which frames the description
of the temple building:

    A   Opening part of the sandwich formula (1 Kgs 6,1)
        B   Temple building account (1 Kgs 6,2-36)
    A' Closing part of the sandwich formula (1 Kgs 6,37-38)

Solomon's palace in the G^B,Ant.

A similar sandwich completion formula appears in the palace building
account in 3 Kgdms 7,38.50 in the G^B,Ant.. The G^B,Ant. move the palace
building account to the end of 3 Kingdoms 7, contrary to the MT and the
G^A. Moving the palace building account to the end of the building nar-
rative, the redactors used new narrative strategies to separate the palace
account from the temple account. The G^B,Ant. open the palace building
account with the verb οἰκοδομέω (3 Kgdms 7,38) and closes the account

---

[33] For a more detailed comparison between the MT and the Greek versions, see
P.S.F. VAN KEULEN, *Two Versions of the Solomon Narrative*. An Inquiry into the Relation-
ship between MT 1 Kgs. 2-11 and Lxx 3 Reg. 2-11 (VTSupp 194; Leiden – Boston, MA
2005) 113-130. The author of this monograph advocates the priority of the MT over the
Greek versions. Despite the important contribution of this study, the author did not study
in depth the differences occurring in the Greek manuscripts, which means that Greek and
Hebrew narratives need to be revaluated.

with the verb συντελέω (3 Kgdms 7,50). On the contrary, the MT and the G^A have both בנה and כלה in verse 1 Kgs 7,1, and the last verses of the palace building account 7,10-12 do not have a completion formula (see below), whereas the G^B,Ant. have a sandwich completion formula that frames the palace building account (3 Kgdms 7,39-49):

> [38]And as for the house Solomon built (it) for himself [34] in (his) 13[(th)] year.
> [Palace building account in vv. 39-49]
> [50]And Solomon completed his whole house.

Temple foundations in the G^Ant.

Another sandwich formula occurs in the description of the temple foundations in the G^Ant. (3 Kgdms 6,1-4). Only the first part of this section exists in the MT and in the G^A. Verse 6,1 in the G^Ant. has a temporal reference, as do other versions, and the verb οἰκοδομέω [35] (*and he built the house for the Lord*). Verse 6,4 concludes with the verbs θεμελιόω and συντελέω [36], which gives the G^Ant. a sandwich formula to frame the foundation building account. This narrative strategy not only puts emphasis on the foundation of the temple, which is missing in the MT, but also separates the foundations of the temple (3 Kgdms^Ant. 6,2-3) from the rest of the temple account (6,5 – 7,37).

> [1]And it happened in the 480th year of the departure of the sons of Israel from Egypt, in the 4th year, in the 2nd month, when king Solomon was reigning over Israel, *and he built the house for the Lord*,
>   [Foundation building account]
> [4]In the 4th year *he founded* the house of the Lord, in the 2nd month, in the month of Neiso. In the 11th year, in the month of Baad, this is the 8th month, the house *was completed* in all its plan and in all its arrangement.

3.2. Break formulas

Partial completion formulas are often employed in the building accounts to mark the completion of a certain building activity before the narrative moves to another one. Although the formula thus functions as a narrative break in the building account, it does not represent a complete stop in the narrative but usually signals a transition from one section to the other (Table 4).

---

[34] The G^Ant. reads the genitive "his house".
[35] This part is missing in the G^B.
[36] This structure is only partially preserved in the G^B which does not have the verb οἰκοδομέω in verse 6,1.

MT (1 Kgs)	G^B (3 Kgdms)	G$^{Ant.}$ (3 Kgdms)	G^A (3 Kgdms)	Old/new activity
6,22 (תמם)	6,21	6,21	6,21	Interior/cherubs
7,9 (merism)	7,46	7,46	7,9	Palace/courtyard
7,22 (תמם)			7,22	Pillars/molten sea
7,40b (כלה)	7,26b	7,26b	7,40b	Objects/pillars
7,51a (שלם)	7,37	7,37	7,51a	Construction/transfer
9,10				Miscellanea

Table 4: Occurrences of the break formulas.

The first break formula is inserted in the MT in 1 Kgs 6,22 (cf. 3 Kgdms 6,21 [37]). The MT has the verb תמם "until (he had) finished the entire temple". The G$^{B,Ant.,A}$ have the verb συντελέω, thus interpreting it as a partial completion formula. By introducing the break formula, the redactors separated the construction of the interior of the temple and the first set of decoration work from special temple objects (the second set of decoration work, the cherubs, and the doors) and the courtyard.

Another break in the narrative is introduced in the MT and the G^A after the long description of the pillars (7,15-22a). Verse 7,22b also employs the verb תמם and reads "[t]he work of the pillars was finished". The G^A translates the phrase with the verb τελειόω, not with συντελέω. In this case the break formula separates the description of the pillars from the long account of temple objects (molten sea, stands, lavers). This break is not in the G$^{B,Ant.}$ that continues directly with the description of the temple objects and thus forming one larger unit (3 Kgdms$^{B,Ant.}$ 7,3-26b).

A further break is introduced after a long description of the temple objects in 1 Kgs 7,40b employing the verb כלה and reads, "Hiram completed doing all the work that he was doing for King Solomon in the temple of the Lord". The G^A translates the phrase with the verb συντελέω. Thus, this break separates the temple objects (7,23-40a) from the second description of the temple pillars and another set of temple utensils (7,41-50).

Another break in the temple building account is in 1 Kgs 7,51a. The narrative uses the root שלם that marks the conclusion of the building account. Verse 7,51a concludes the bronze work that started in 7,13.

Similarly the root שלם occurs in 9,25 in the MT and G^A but not in the G$^{B,Ant.}$. It seems that the formula in 9,25 functions as both the sandwich

---

[37] This break formula is attested in all extant manuscripts.

formula and the break formula. The phrase "he finished the temple" separates the sacrifices Solomon conducted in the temple from the account of how he built and outfitted ships at Ezion Geber (9,26-27). The MT, thus, suggests that the temple was indeed finished only in ch. 9 after Solomon completed other constructions in his kingdom, which then made it possible to organize the system of sacrifices. Following the Mesopotamian pattern, the temple was not considered complete until the king began to offer sacrifice in it.

Besides the break formulas that contain the verbs כלה and בנה, there are two other completion formulas that also function as a break in the building accounts. The first formula is in 1 Kgs 7,9 and 3 Kgdms 7,46. The formula "from the foundation to the (roof) cornices" is a typical completion formula in the Mesopotamian royal inscriptions (cf. below) that describes the completion of a part or the whole of a building. The function of the formula in the MT/G^A and $G^{B,Ant.}$ seems to be different. The MT and G^A have a triple merism (7,9):

> [9]All these (edifices) were of choice stones hewn according to (exact) measures, sawed with saws
> *inside and out,*
> *and from the foundation to the (roof) cornices,*
> *and from the outside to the great courtyard.*

The $G^{B,Ant.}$ have a double merism (7,46):

> All these (were) of costly stones carved at intervals on the inside
> *and from the foundation to the (roof) cornices*
> *and from the outside into the great court.*

The double merism separates the description of a series of buildings (Solomon's palace, house of Lebanon, *ailams*, the palace of Solomon's daughter) from the great courtyard. In this way the $G^{B,Ant.}$ present the great courtyard as a separate construction that nevertheless belongs to the royal palace complex. The MT/G^A mention the temple in 1 Kgs 7,12b [38]. This note is missing in the $G^{B,Ant.}$. Consequently, verses 7,10-12a become ambiguous and can refer to the temple or to the palace. If the former was the case, then the triple merism separated the palace complex from the temple complex.

Another break formula appears in the miscellanea in 1 Kgs 9,10.25. The MT starts with the phrase "At the end (ויהי מקצה) of twenty years, in which Solomon had built two houses, the temple of the Lord and the

---

[38] Cf. also manuscripts xAS.

house of the king" (1 Kgs 9,10). It separates Solomon's second dream from the rest of the narrative [39]. However, the G^{B,Ant.,A} omit the phrase "At the end (ויהי מקצה) of" and thus do not mark a break in the narrative.

3.3. Hinge/link formulas

There are several variants of the Type III completion formula whose primarily function was to establish narrative links between various parts of the Solomon narrative (cf. Table 5).

MT (1 Kgs)	G^B (3 Kgdms)	G^{Ant.} (3 Kgdms)	G^A (3 Kgdms)	Links
	2,35c	2,3 (Type II)	2,35	Pharaoh's daughter
	4,31-32	5,1 (Type II)		Pharaoh's daughter
6,38 and 7,1			6,38 and 7,1	Temple/palace
7,51 9,25 [40]	7,37	7,37	7,51	Dedication of the temple

Table 5: Occurrences of the hinge completion formulas.

The completion formula of Type II establishes a link in the G^{B,Ant.} between 3 Kgdms 8,1 and 9,1. This link presents the dedication of the temple and Solomon's second dream as two equally important parts of God's acceptance of the temple (cf. 2.3.2). This idea is further underlined by the occurrence of the Type III completion formula containing the verb שלם appearing in 1 Kgs 7,51 and 9,25. This indicates that according to the MT the temple was really completed only in 9,25, after temple sacrifices had been organized.

Temple-palace link

A hinge formula occurs in the MT that links 1 Kgs 6,38 and 7,1. Thus, the verbs בנה, and כלה link chapter 1 Kings 6, the construction of the temple, with 1 Kings 7, the construction of Solomon's palace, forming a chiastic structure.

6,38 ובשנה האחת עשרה [...] כלה הבית לכל דבריו ולכל משפטו ויבנהו שבע שנים

7,1 ואת ביתו בנה שלמה שלש עשרה שנה ויכל את כל ביתו

---

[39] Two completion formulas in 1 Kgs 9,1 and 9,10 have also been interpreted as a frame completion formula by WALSH, *1 Kings*, 109.

[40] This formula occurs only in the MT.

Links to Pharaoh's daughter

The so-called miscellanea have been studied from different view-points [41]. The G[B,Ant.] have a higher concentration of the Type III [42] formula in the pre-temple miscellanea (cf. 3 Kgdms[B] 2,35c, g; 4,31-32). Besides the break formula in 3 Kgdms 2,35g (cf. 2.4.2), all other occurrences of the Type III completion formulas in the miscellanea are attached to the notes on the Pharaoh's daughter. These formulas address the religiously problematic presence of the Egyptian princess at Solomon's court and in the holy city of Jerusalem (Table 5).

MT (1 Kgs)	G[B] (3 Kgdms)	G[Ant] (3 Kgdms)	G[A] (3 Kgdms)
	2,35c (yes; Type III)	2,3 (yes; Type II)	2,35 (yes; Type I, III)
	2,35f (no)	2,6 (no)	2,35 (no)
3,1 (yes; Type II)			3,1b (yes; Type II)
	4,31-32 (yes; Type III)	5,1 (yes; Type II)	
7,8 (no)	7,45 (no)	7,45 (no)	7,8 (no)
	9,9 (no)	9,9 (no)	9,9 (no)
9,11 (no)			9,11 (no)
9,16 (no)			9,16 (no)
9,24 (no)			9,24 (no)
11,1 (no)	11,1 (no)	11,1-2 (no)	11,1 (no)

Table 5: Pharaoh's daughter in the Solomon narrative.

The table indicates that the G[B,Ant.] and the MT have two different strate-gies in presenting the story of Pharaoh's daughter. Except for verse 3,1, the majority of references to Pharaoh's daughter are moved to the sections that follow the temple building account in the MT. This makes it appear that Pharaoh's daughter was brought to Jerusalem after the construction of the temple and other palaces. The organization of the chapters in the MT does not require introducing the completion formula because the temple had already been completed. The MT thus suggests that Pharaoh's inva-sion and Solomon's marriage to his daughter was the beginning of Solo-mon's fall.

---

[41] Cf. D.W. GOODING, *Relics of Ancient Exegesis*. A Study of the Miscellanies in 3 Reigns 2 (SOTSMonS 4; Cambridge 1976); E. TOV, "The LXX Additions (Miscellanies) in 1 Kings 2 (3 Reigns 2)", *Textus* 11 (1984) 89-118; VAN KEULEN, *Two Versions*, 36-81.
[42] As presented in the table, the G[Ant.] transforms the partial formula of Type III into the Type II completion formula.

By contrast, there are several notes on Pharaoh's daughter in 3 Kgdms^B 2,35a-n (cf. 2,1-14 in the G$^{Ant.}$) and in 3 Kgdms^B 4,1-33 (cf. 4,1 – 5,3 in the G$^{Ant.}$) that the MT places in 1 Kings 9. The organization of the G$^{B,Ant.}$ presents the conflict with the Pharaoh of Egypt and his invasion as part of the succession narrative and interprets Solomon's marriage to Pharaoh's daughter as an example of Solomon's superior administrative skills. In this account, Solomon had to resolve both internal conflicts in his realm and the external problems with Egypt before he could start constructing the temple. In the G$^{B,Ant.}$ account, Solomon's marriage to Pharaoh's daughter is portrayed as the result of Solomon's sublime wisdom, which was also a prerequisite for the construction of the temple. However, the relocation of references to Pharaoh's daughter before the construction of the temple in the G$^{B,Ant.}$ required new narrative strategies. One of them was the use of the completion formulas. The formulas function as explanatory notes that direct the attention of the audience to the later parts of the Solomon narrative. Following this logic, verse 3 Kgdms$^{B,Ant.}$ 7,45 states that Solomon built a palace for Pharaoh's daughter, 9,9 relates that she was brought to her palace in Jerusalem (anticipated in 3 Kgdms^B 2,35c.f; cf. 2,3.6 in the G$^{Ant.}$), and 11,1 reports that she was one among many foreign wives and concubines who led Solomon astray.

II. IMPLICATIONS FOR THE INTERPRETATION OF THE SOLOMON NARRATIVE

The analysis presented above has above all an impact on the synchronic reading of the Solomon narrative. A narrative and structural analysis examines the narrative strategies and rhetorical devices of a given text. Therefore, omissions and additions in versions, even though considered later additions or even scribal mistakes, play an important role in determining the structure and the narrative strategies of a given text.

1. *Structure of the Solomon narrative in the MT*

As argued in 2.3.1 the Type II completion formula occurs in the MT and in the G^A (3,1 and 9,1) and it represents one of the rhetorical devices that link together two larger narrative blocks, specifically, 1 Kings 3–5 and 9–10 [43]. Both blocks contain Solomon's dreams and the account of

---

[43] The structure of the G^A follows that of the MT with a few nuances. The G^A introduces Type I formula also in 6,3d and thus separates external parts of the temple from the exterior of the temple (cf. 2.2.1). The Type II formula in 8,53 in the G^A creates a narrative space that allows the introduction of a quote from the Book of the Song.

Solomon's glory. These blocks frame the temple and palace building accounts, on the one hand; on the other hand, they set apart chapters 1 Kings 1–2 [44] and 11, which assume the role of the beginning and the end of the Solomon narrative. 1 Kings 1–2 describes Solomon's rise to power and the succession struggles, whereas 1 Kings 11 describes Solomon's downfall. Thus, the Type II completion formula is one of the elements that sets the main contours of the Solomon narrative [45]. This analysis shows that the MT organized the Solomon narrative in the form of a concentric structure that put the building account in the center:

> A   Solomon's rise to power (1 Kings 1–2)
>   *Type II formula (1 Kgs 3,1)*
>   B   Dream and Solomon's glory (1 Kings 3–5)
>   C   Temple building account (1 Kings 6–7; 8)
>   *Type II formula (1 Kgs 9,1)*
>   B' Dream and Solomon's glory (1 Kings 9–10)
> A' Solomon's downfall (1 Kings 11)

Structure of 1 Kings 6–9

The analysis presented above has showed that the MT organized the Solomon narrative in the form of a concentric structure that put the building account in the center.

The MT has the palace building account inserted in the middle of the temple building account. The chiastic link formula in 6,31 and 7,1 opens a narrative space for the palace building account. The merism break formula puts a narrative stop in 7,9, and so verses 7,10-12 function as a transition between the palace and the temple building account [46]. Thus, the palace building account can be interpreted as a digression inserted into the midst of the temple building account [47]. After a short digression describing the construction of the royal palace (7,1-11), the temple building account resumes in 7,12b. Verses 7,13-50 describe the work in bronze and other temple objects. The completion formula containing the verb שלם in 7,51a concludes the temple building account (1 Kings 6–7) and opens the

---

[44] Some scholars prefer to start the temple building account in 2,12b, following the G^Ant.; see WALSH, *1 Kings*, 45.

[45] It has been suggested to divide the Solomon narrative in other ways: the account englobes the Jeroboam narrative 1 Kgs 2,10 – 14,20, including Solomon's construction of the temple complex and royal palace; see M.A. SWEENEY, *I & II Kings* (OTL; Louisville, KY 2007) 62, 104. Some scholars include the preparatory work within the temple building account of 1 Kgs 5,15 – 9,9; see NOBILE, *1–2 Re*, 80-93.

[46] Cf. GRAY, *I & II Kings*, 166-171. Some scholars see a transition only in v. 7,12b; see WALSH, *1 Kings*, 105.

[47] Cf. WALSH, *1 Kings*, 104-106; his assumption is further supported by the conclusion in 7,51, which does not mention the palace.

dedication ceremony that starts with the transfer of the utensils (7,51b) [48].
However, the completion formulas do not appear in chapter 8, which is
set aside and which has its own specific structure [49].

    C Temple building account (6–7; 8)
       I. Temple building (6,1-38)
             Link formula (6,38 – 7,1)
          Palace digression (7,1-9a)
             Merism formula (7,9b)
          Transition (7,10-12)
       II. Temple furnishings (7,13-51)

As argued above, the Type I formula occurs only in the temple building
account (6,1-38). The sandwich formula (6,1.37-38) frames 1 Kings 6 and
presents the temple building account as a separate unit. Taking into con-
sideration the occurrences of the Type I formulas (cf. 2.4.1) we propose
to interpret the temple building account as a concentric narrative [50]:

    I. Temple building (6,1-38)
       α   Frame 6,1; *sandwich formula*
          β   The construction of the external shell out of stone (6,2-8);
             Type I formula (6,8)
             γ God's speech, the completion of the external shell: (6,9b-10);
             Type I formula (6,14)
          β' The interior of the temple (6,15-36)
       α' Frame (6,37-38); *sandwich formula*

    By this rhetorical device, the redactors of the MT made the Deuterono-
mistic addition in 1 Kgs 6,11-13 the center of the Solomon narrative. The
speech interrupts the temple building account and presents the conditions
under which God would be present among the Israelites. The speech is simi-
lar to that of early prophets (cf. 1 Kgs 13,20; 16,1; 17,2.8; 18,1; 21,17.28)
and focuses exclusively on the commandments and statutes. It sets the
standards according to which the actions of the king and his people would
be judged.
    Furthermore, the account on the interior of the temple (β' 6,15-36)
contains another break formula in 6,22b that splits the unit into two parts:

    β' The interior of the temple (6,15-36)
       i Interior section of the temple and the first set of the decoration (6,15-22a)
         Break formula (6,22b)
       ii Special objects and the second set of the decoration (6,23-36)

---

[48] Cf. WALSH, *1 Kings*, 123.
[49] See the author's forthcoming article in *New Avenues in Biblical Exegesis in Light of the LXX* (eds. L. PESSOA – D. SCIALABBA) (The Septuagint in its Ancient Context; Turnhout 2022).
[50] For similar structures, see DEVRIES, *1 Kings*, 88-90.

The MT has other break formulas in 7,22.40b.51a. Besides the formulas, the MT has the word מלאכה that occurs at the beginning of the narrative (7,13) and then reappears in 7,22.40.51. By means of these narrative devices the section is divided into three subunits:

II. Temple furnishings (7,13-51a)
　　Introduction (7,13-14)
　　　Pillars I (7,15-22a)
　　　　Break formula (7,22b)
　　　Temple objects I (7,23-40a)
　　　　Break formula (7,40b)
　　　Pillars II and objects II (7,41-50)
　　Conclusion with *the break formula* (7,51a)
　Transportation of the temple objects (7,51b)

Finally, there are two break formulas that suggest the following division of 1 Kings 9:

B' Solomon's dream and glory (1 Kings 9–10)
　　Type II formula (1 Kgs 9,1)
　Dream (9,1-9)
　　Break formula (9,10a)
　Solomon's great deed (9,11 – 10,29)
　　Solomon's glory and sacrifices (9,11-25a)
　　Hinge formula (9,25b)
　　Solomon's international relations (9,26 – 10,29)

This structure puts emphasis on Solomon's second dream. The central part of the dream is God's long speech, rendered in typical Deuteronomistic language and centered on the commandments, the blessings and the curses, the preservation of Davidic dynasty, Moses, exodus, and exile. The MT, contrary to the G[B,Ant.], inserted a similar conditional promise voiced in the Deuteronomistic language already in 1 Kgs 6,11-13 and in 2,1-4. Thus, in the MT Solomon's second dream concludes with a series of instructions imparted to Solomon through David (1 Kgs 2,1-4), through the direct speech of God (1 Kgs 6,11-13), and now through the dream (1 Kgs 9,3-9). The triple series of instructions emphasized the gravity of Solomon's deviation from the Lord's directives (1 Kings 11).

2. *Structure of the Solomon narrative in the G[B,Ant.]*

The completion formulas point out several differences between the structure and narrative strategies of the MT and the G[B,Ant.]. The fundamental difference concerns the temple and palace building accounts.

The completion formulas are markers that point out the overall organization of the Solomon narrative in the $G^{B,Ant.}$ as well. There are two Type III completion formulas (cf. 2.4.3) that occur in the miscellanea (3 Kgdms^B 2,35c, 4,31-32) that are changed into Type II formulas in the $G^{Ant.}$. These formulas should be contextualized.

The $G^{B,Ant.}$ have a first group of miscellanea in the midst of 3 Kingdoms 2. The miscellanea are located between the execution of Joab and Shimei (3 Kgdms 2,35a-o in the G^B, equivalent of 2,1-5 in the $G^{Ant.}$). As showed in 2.4.3, the G^B has a hinge/link formula of Type III in 3 Kgdms 2,35c; the $G^{Ant.}$, however, transforms this formula into a Type II formula.

The second group of miscellanea occurs at the end of chapter two (3 Kgdms^B 2,46a-l; cf. 2,26-37 in the $G^{Ant.}$). However, this group does not contain any completion formulas.

The third group of additional miscellanea occur in 3 Kgdms^B 4,20-21.31-33 (cf. 4,20-21 and 5,1-3 in the $G^{Ant.}$). These two sections are part of a longer narrative on Solomon's administrative skill and wisdom (3 Kgdms^B 4,1-33; cf. 4,1 – 5,3 in the $G^{Ant.}$). A link completion formula of Type III occurs at the end of this section (3 Kgdms^B in 4,31). The $G^{Ant.}$ transforms it once again into a Type II formula (5,1).

The last and larger group of miscellanea occurs in the $G^{B,Ant.}$ not in chapter 9 as in the MT, but in chapter 3 Kingdoms 10, after the Queen of Saba episode (3 Kgdms 10,23-33). This group has no completion formula.

As mentioned earlier, the $G^{B,Ant.}$ transfer some miscellanea before the construction of the temple (3 Kingdoms 2 and 4) and at the very end of the narrative, after the Queen of Saba episode (3 Kingdoms 10). This suggests that Solomon's wisdom and administrative skill were a frame that encompassed chapters 1–10. This narrative strategy sets 3 Kingdoms 11 apart and does not treat it as the the end of the Solomon narrative but as the beginning of the Jeroboam narrative. 3 Kgdms 11,1-13 function as transitional verses that, while referring to the episodes from Solomon's life, gradually move the focus of the narrative to Jeroboam. This strategy is even evident in the $G^{Ant.}$, which moves 1 Kgs 1,1-11 to the end of 2 Sam 24 and creates three separate cycles:

  I. David narrative (ends in 2 Kgdms$^{Ant.}$ 24,36; cf. 3 Kgdms^B 1,11/1 Kgs 1,11)
  II. Solomon narrative (3 Kgdms$^{Ant.}$ 1,1 – 10,33)
  III. Jeroboam narrative (3 Kgdms$^{Ant.}$ 11,1ff)

The redactional interventions evident in the $G^{Ant.}$ (cf. Type II formula in 2.3) use Type II formulas in 2,3; 5,1; 8,1; 8,53; 9,1. These editorial revisions suggest that the temple building account in the $G^{Ant.}$ was framed by Solomon's actions that were on a similar narrative level. According to the $G^{Ant.}$ the temple building account was completed in three phases:

(1) Dedication ceremony (8,1-52)
      Formula Type II
(2) Confirmation in a vision (8,53)
      Formula Type II
(3) Confirmation in a dream (9,1-9)

Similarly, two occurrences of the Type II formula in 2,3 and 5,1 indicate that the construction of the temple could not start without Solomon's preparatory work. The Type II formulas in 2,3 and 5,1 in the G$^{Ant.}$ underline key aspects of Solomon's preparatory work:

(1') Solomon's elimination of his opposition (1,1-24 [51])
       Transition with Type II formula (2,1-3)
(2') Solomon's supreme wisdom and administrative skills (2,4 – 4,31).
       Transition with Type II formula (5,1-3)
(3') Solomon's preparatory work (5,4-20)

As a result, these blocks combine a linear progression of the Solomon narrative with the concentric structure that results in a parallel structure:

II. Solomon narrative (3 Kgdms$^{Ant.}$ 1,1 – 10,33)
   A   Preparatory work for the temple (3 Kgdms$^{Ant.}$ 1–5)
       B   Construction of the temple (3 Kgdms$^{Ant.}$ 6–7)
   A' Dedication and acceptance of the temple (3 Kgdms$^{Ant.}$ 8,1 – 9,9)
       B' Other constructions (9,10 – 10,33)

2.1. Structure of 3 Kingdoms 6–7 in the G$^{B,Ant.}$

The G$^{B,Ant.}$, contrary to the MT, have two sandwich formulas that create special subunits (cf. 2.4.1). The first sandwich formula appears in 6,1b and 4 in the G$^{Ant.}$, presenting the foundations of the temple as a separate unit that does not exist in the MT. The second sandwich formula is employed to separate the palace building account (7,38-50) from the temple building account (6,1 – 7,37). Thus, the overall structure of 3 Kingdoms 6–7 is partially different in the G$^{B,Ant.}$. The narrative is divided into three equal blocks that in a linear way describes the construction of the temple-palace complex. First, the foundations of the temple were laid, then the temple was built, and only once the temple and its utensils were completed, Solomon built his palace. Thus, contrary to the MT, the temple foundations and the palace are put on the same narrative level. Moreover, the temple building account creates a compact narrative (3 Kgdms 6,6 – 7,37), contrary to the MT that has the palace finished before the temple furnishings.

---

[51] As mentioned above, 3 Kgdms$^{Ant.}$ 1,1 starts with the elimination of the enemies, which corresponds to 1 Kgs 2,12. Consequently, the Solomon narrative starts with "sitting on the throne" and the first episodes of 3 Kgdms$^{Ant.}$ describe the cleansing of the royal court.

B Temple-palace building account (6,1b – 7,50)
   1. Foundations (6,1-4 in the G$^{Ant.}$)
      Frame; *sandwich formula* (6,1b in the G$^{Ant.}$)
         Foundations of the temple (6,2-4 in the G$^{Ant.}$)
      Frame; *sandwich formula* (6,1b in the G$^{Ant.}$)
   2. Temple building account (6,6 – 7,37 in the G$^{B,Ant.}$)
   3. Palace building account (7,38-50 in the G$^{B,Ant.}$)
      Frame; *sandwich formula* (7,38a in the G$^{B,Ant.}$)
         Construction of the palace (7,38b-49 in the G$^{B,Ant.}$)
      Frame; *sandwich formula* (7,50 in the G$^{B,Ant.}$)

Further nuances in the structure of the temple-palace building account can be pointed out when other completion formulas are taken into account. The G$^{B,Ant.}$ divide the temple building account into two major parts: (A) construction of the temple (6,6-34); and (B) temple furnishings (7,1-36). The first part starts with giving the measurements of the temple and finishes with hanging the curtain in the completed temple 6,6.34). The second part is opened with a short introduction (7,1-2) that shifts the focus from Solomon to Hiram and concludes with a break formula and the repetition of the key word ἔργον (cf. 7,1-2.37).

Like the MT, the G$^{B,Ant.}$ also employ the Type I and III formulas to break the temple building account into smaller units. Thus, the Type I formula in 6,8 and 14a divides the story of the construction of the temple into three blocks (cf. 2.3.2). A break formula in 6,21b separates the temple interior from the cherubs, followed by the description of the decorations, doors, courtyard, and curtain (6,22-34). Similarly, the break formula in 7,26b separates the temple furnishings account I from the pillars account II. Taking into consideration these elements the structure of the temple building account in the G$^{B,Ant.}$ is:

   2. Temple building account (6,6 – 7,37 in the G$^{B,Ant.}$)
      A. The building of the temple (6,6-34)
         Fundamental parts of the temple (6,6-7)
             Type I (6,8)
         Exterior shell (6,9-13)
             Type I (6,14a)
         The additional building activities (6,14b-34^{B}/36$^{Ant.}$)
            Interior parts of the temple (6,14b-21a)
                Break formula (6,21b)
            Cherubs and decoration (6,22-34)
      B. Temple furnishings (7,1-36)
         Introduction (7,1-2)
             Pillars I, temple furnishings I (7,3-26a)
                Break formula (7,26b)
             Pillars II, temple furnishings II (7,27-37)
         Conclusion with the break formula (7,37)

There are a few important implications of the completion formulas for the understanding of the palace building account in the G^{B,Ant.}. The MT links the building of the temple and palace together. After the buildings are completed, the narrative describes the utensils and pillars of the temple. By doing so, the utensils are set apart in the MT. This procedure sets the stage for the looting of the temple (cf. 1 Kgs 14,25-26; 2 Kgs 12,18-19; 16,5-9; 18,14-16). Even though the temple utensils were removed, the temple was still able to function. Similarly, in the first invasion of the Babylonians only the temple vessels and objects were taken away. According to this logic, the second invasion destroyed the temple itself.

The G^{B,Ant.} seems to follow a different logic. Supplying the utensils and building the temple were intrinsically connected, although both are separated from the foundation section. These narrative strategies, like other ANE accounts, deal with both the looting and the destruction of the temple. The temple of Jerusalem fits the pattern of most ANE temples, which were regularly looted and destroyed [52]. According to this logic, the G^{B,Ant.} implies in 4 Kingdoms 24–25 that the temple, like most ANE temples, could have been rebuilt because the Babylonians did not touch the foundations of the temple.

III. COMPLETION TERMINOLOGY IN MESOPOTAMIAN INSCRIPTIONS

Completion formulas similar to the biblical ones often occur in ANE texts, in particular in the royal inscriptions. A survey of ANE inscriptions shows that different cultures developed and formalized different traditions of completion formulas and fixed phrases [53], as in Kassite Babylonia [54], Urartu [55], Suhu [56], as well as in Achaemenid and Seleucid Persia [57]. The

[52] When Sennacherib wanted to declare that he completely demolished the city of Babylon, he said: "I destroyed, devastated, (and) burned with fire the city, and (its) buildings, from its foundations to its crenellations. I removed the brick(s) and earth, as much as there was, from the (inner) wall and outer wall, the temples, (and) the ziggurrat, (and) I threw (it all) into the Araḫtu river" (RINAP 3 223:50-54).

[53] In Sumerian inscriptions there is no completion formula, except the repetition of words for building, as in extant west-Semitic inscriptions.

[54] For example, "(I have) built and restored"; cf. MSKH 1, IM 617,1; 677,1.

[55] Thus, in Urartu the formula reads mar-gi-iš-ti-še ^mmì-nu-a-ḫi-ni-še i-ni É.GAL ba-du-si ši-di-iš-tú-ni; "PN built this fortress to perfection" (CTU 1 A 08-17,3; cf. also CTU 1 A 02-7,1, 02-11,1).

[56] The kings of Suhu used a fixed expression for describing the completion of the Akitu temple *ana-ku a-ki-ʾtu₄ʾ UR₅-tú ú-šak-lil-ma*; "I completely (re)built this Akitu temple" (RIMB 2 S.0.1002.2 iv 5'-6').

[57] Artaxerxes I's inscription 2 r. 10-11 reads *e-te-pu-uš u ul-tak-lil* "I have built and completed". The formula is similar to that of the Assyrian formula, omitting "from

completion formulas were used more frequently in Mesopotamian royal inscriptions. The Babylonian tradition opted for the phrases such as É *šá-a-šu eš-šiš e-pu-uš-ma ú-šak-lil ši-pí-ir-šú*; "I built that temple anew and completed its construction" (AOAT 256 2.8 iii 33 [58]). Even though the completion formulas occur in Babylonian royal inscriptions, they became a whole mark of the Assyrian royal inscriptions that had different variants of the expression *ul-tu uš-še-šu a-di gaba-dib-bé-e-ʾšu arʾ-[ṣi-ip ú]-šak-lil* "I have built and completed it from its foundations to its crenelations" (RINAP 1 5:2).

1. *Completion formulas in Assyrian inscriptions*

The oldest attested fixed formula is attributed to the Old Assyrian king Puzur Aššur III (c. 1502-1479 BCE): "I built (it) from its foundations to its top (lit. "to its lip" *ša-ap-ti-šu*)" [59]. This variant was used till 9th c. BCE (Shalmaneser III, RIMA 3 A.0.102.43:7) and then was replaced by the formula with *gabadibbu*: "I built and completed (it) from (its) foundation to (its) crenellation" [60]. This variant appears for the first time in a middle Assyrian inscription dated to the reign of Shalmaneser I (13th c. BCE; RIMA 1 A.0.77.4:37-39). This formula and its variants became the most frequently used completion formula until Sin-šarru-iškun (622-612 BCE;

its foundation to its crenellation". Cyrus II's inscription n. 1:39-41 follows the Babylonian style *eš-ši-iš e-pu-uš-ma* [*ú-šak-lil ši-pir-ši*]-*in*; "I built anew and completed their construction". The 3rd c. BCE Seleucid royal inscriptions also contain a fixed formula written in a stereotyped way DU₃*ᵘˢ-ma* ʾE₂ʾ-*ta-nu u₂-šak-li-il*; "I built and completed XY" (Anu-uballit Kephalon 1:14; cf. also Nikarchus 1:10.15; for all inscriptions cf. ORACC website).

[58] Cf. also other Nabonidus' inscriptions AOAT 256 2.12 ii 5, iii 4; 2.13 iii 36; 2.14 i 20, ii 7, iii 3. See also its variants *ina ši-pir* ᵈ*kulla ar-ṣip ú-šak-lil* (RIMB 2 B.6.31.11,16). There is a variant that mixed the Assyrian and Babylonian formula: É.KUR *šu-a-tim ul-tu te-me-en-ni-šu a-di gaba-dib-bi-šú e-eš-ši-iš ab-ni-ma ú-šak-lil ši-pir-šu*; "I built that temple anew from its foundation(s) to its crenellation and completed its construction" (AOAT 256 2.12 ii 8-9). This mixed style is probably inspired from the Babylonian inscriptions of the Assyrian king Esarhaddon, who, even though writing in Babylonian, still used a variant of the Assyrian formula (cf. RINAP 4 114 iv 16-24).

[59] The formula existed in two variants ʾiš-ʾ-tu uš-še-šu ʾqaʾ-du ša-ap-ti-šu e-pu-uš; "I built (it) from its foundation together with its top" (RIMA 1 A.0.69.1:10) and in variant *iš-tu uš-še-šu a-di ša-ap-ti-šu e-pu-uš*; "I built (it) from its foundation to its top" (RIMA 1 A.0.70.1:10-11).

[60] Besides this expression there are also other variants such as *a-na si-ḫir-ti-šú ar-ṣip* [*ú-šak-lil*]; "I built and [completed] it in its entirety" (RINAP 4 12:17), *a-na iš-šu-ti* DÙ-*uš* "I built it anew" (RIMA 3 A.0.102.26,24), or "I completely (re)built (it) with the work of the god Kulla according to its ancient specifications (and) raised its top (as high) as a mountain" (RINAP 4 133:30-33).

RINAP 5 1:13'). Later Neo-Assyrian inscriptions sometimes have the *naburru* "battlements" instead of the term *gabadibbu* [61].

A standard *gabadibbu* formula took the verbs expressing "to build", *epēšu/banû/raṣāpu*, and "to complete", *šuklulu* [62]. However, the fixed formula was quite flexible. Sometimes one of the verbs was omitted (RIMA 1 A.0.78.6,34-35) or the word order was changed (RIMA 1 A.0.78.5:81-82).

In most cases the formula refers to the completion of a temple (cf. for example RINAP 3 10:18-19) and a palace (RINAP 3 10:18-19). It also referred to a city (RINAP 1 2001:6b-7), a city wall (RIMA 1 A.0.70.1:10), a storehouse (RIMA 1 A.0.76.17,4-12), or a chamber of a temple (RINAP 3/2 166:27-30). It was used for both new construction (RINAP 3 36 r.3'-10') or for the reconstruction of a dilapidated building (RIMA 3 A.0.102.10 iv 40-50).

The copies of the royal inscriptions show that one building account used the formula while the other copy did not [63]. Similarly, the same building account used different formulas in attested textual variants [64].

Beside the fixed formula a partial completion formula is used in subordinate clauses, as for example the phrase *ul-tu šip-ri* É.GAL *šú-a-tú ag-mur-ú-ma* [65] *ú-qa-tu-u ši-pir-šá*: "After I finished the work on that palace and completed its construction" (RINAP 4 93:32).

The formulas in the Assyrian royal inscriptions do not seem to be located randomly in the Assyrian texts, but rather in clearly determined parts of the building accounts, and they assume a specific role. The formulas frequently substitute for a building account [66] or they open or close it [67]. The formulas can also occur in the midst of building accounts, where they function as a narrative break. Thus, the formulas can separate the description of the temple from its entrance (RIMA 2 A.0.87.1:89-90) or from its decoration (RIMA 2 A.0.98.3:11-12). The formula is often inserted

---

[61] In the Neo-Assyrian period the words *gabadibbu* and *naburru* were interchangeable; thus Sennacherib's scribes used both to describe the construction of the temple Egallammes (*gabadibbu* in RINAP 3/2 214:1; 216,5-6; *naburru* in 213:64).

[62] Cf. for *epēšu* RIMA 1 A.0.77.4:37-39; for *banû* RIMA 1 A.0.78.11:52-55; for *raṣāpu* RIMA 2 A.0.98.3:11-12.

[63] Referring to the city of Ḫumut: with formula RINAP 1 5:1-4; without formula RINAP 1 47:10-11.

[64] Referring to the city of Ḫadattu: the verbs *raṣāpu* and *šuklulu* are used in RINAP 1 53:19, whereas the verbs *banû*, *raṣāpu*, and *šuklulu* in RINAP 5 2001:7. The descriptions of Sennacherib's Akītu house in Aššur have at least three variants (longer: RINAP 3/2 168:31-33; shorter: RINAP 3/2 171:4-7; different verbs: RINAP 3/2 174:1-6).

[65] The verb *gamāru* would be an equivalent of the Hebrew שלם.

[66] RIMA 1 A.0.76.15:9; A.0.77.6,8; RIMA 2 A.0.101.45:13-19.

[67] In RIMA 2 A.0.87.10:64 the building account follows the formula.

before the deposition of the foundation inscription (RIMA 1 A.0.77.4:37-39) and before the construction of the roof (RINAP 4 12:17). Sometimes it appears before the description of setting up the throne for the divinity (RIMA 2 A.0.101.40:35). It was also employed to separate the description of the main hall of the temple from the temple's inner sanctuary, in which Ishtar would dwell (RIMA 1 A.0.78.16:47-50).

Normally the formula occurs only once in inscriptions and only rarely twice in the same inscription [68]. There are also occurrences when the formula functions as an *inclusion* framing a building account (similar to a sandwich type of formula) [69]. An *inclusion* was also used for framing a section of the building narrative, such as the foundations [70]. The *inclusion* could even frame the narrative that contained another completion formula [71].

2. *Origin of the formula*

As demonstrated above, the Mesopotamian inscriptions inserted the completion formula before the entire building had been completed. Why speak about the completion of the temple before the temple had been completed? Were these completion formulas only literary markers introduced by scribes to divide the building into sections, or did the formulas have another meaning?

The answer to these questions can be sought in a comparison of the various inscriptions. As an illustrative example, we present Nabonidus' inscription (AOAT 256 2.12 i 41-ii 43; the English translation is from ORACC). The completion formula is inserted between the account of the construction of the foundation and that of the roof of the temple. However, the formula speaks about the completion of the temple (to its crenellation) even before the roof was constructed.

---

[68] For example, in Tiglath-pileser I's inscriptions (RIMA 2 A.0.87.1 vii 85-86, 96-97).

[69] RINAP 3/1 22 iv 37 and vi 71-72.

[70] *I strengthened its foundation(s) with massive (blocks of) mountain stone.*
I made that wall thicker than the previous one (and) I heaped (it) up like a mountain. I built (and) completed (it) from its foundation(s) to its crenellations.
I strengthened its foundation(s) more than previously (RINAP 5 3 viii 65-69).

[71] I took Tušḫa in hand for renovation. I cleared away its old wall, delineated its area, reached its foundation pit, *(and)built (and) completed (and) decorated in a splendid fashion a new wall from top to bottom.* A palace for my royal residence I founded inside. I made doors (and) hung (them) in its doorways. That palace *I built (and) completed from top to bottom* (RIMA 2 A.0.92.17 ii 6-14).

Introduction	In a favorable month, (on) an auspicious day, that the gods Šamaš and Adad had revealed to me through divination, using the wisdom of the gods Ea and Asalluhi, through the craft of the incantation priest, (and) with the craft of the god Kulla, the lord of foundation(s) and brickwork, during joyous celebrations,
Ritual	I laid its foundations in silver, gold, a selection of precious stones, (and) crushed pieces of wood (and) cedar aromatics, (precisely) on the foundation(s) of Ashurbanipal, king of Assyria [...] I blended šallaru-plaster with beer, vine, oil, (and) honey, and mixed (it into) its revetment.
Formula	I made its structure stronger than that of the kings, my ancestors, and had its construction more expertly executed. **I built that temple anew from its foundation(s) to its crenellations and completed its construction.**
Roof	I had long beams of cedar grown on Mount Amanus stretched out over it (for its roof). I had doors of cedar, whose scent is sweet, installed in its gates. I had its walls clad with silver and gold and made (them) radiate like the sun.
Placement of protective deities and dedication	I stationed a wild bull of shiny zaḫalû-metal, which aggressively gores my foes (to death), in his inner sanctum. I firmly planted two long-haired heroes of ešmarû-metal, who overwhelm my enem(ies), in the Gate of the Rising Sun, (on) the right and left. I took the deities Sîn [...], my lords, by the hand, (leading them out) of Šuanna (Babylon), the city of my royal majesty, and I made (them) reside inside the residence of (their) happiness during joyous celebrations.
Offerings	I offered pure, sumptuous offerings before them [...]
Prayer	O Sîn, king of the gods of heaven and earth, without whom no city or land can be abandoned or restored (lit. "returned to its place") [...]. (As for) me, Nabonidus, king of Babylon, the one who **completed** this temple — may the god Sîn, king of the gods of heaven and earth, look with pleasure upon me with his favorable glance and monthly, at sunrise and sunset, make my signs auspicious. May he lengthen my days, increase my years, (and) make my reign endure. May he conquer my enemies, cut down those hostile to me, (and) flatten my foes. May the goddess Ningal, mother of the great gods, speak laudatory word(s) about me in the presence of the god Sîn, her beloved. May the god Šamaš and the goddess Ištar, his bright offspring, say good thing(s) about me to the god Sîn, the father who created them. May the god Nusku, the exalted vizier, hear my prayers and intercede (on my behalf).

Nabonidus' inscription is not the only royal inscription that refers to a ritual. Similar rituals are mentioned in both Babylonian and Assyrian inscriptions [72], such as mixing clay with various substances (honey, fine oil, resin, beer, wine [73]), the anointing of older inscriptions, and depositing ritual objects into foundations [74]. Besides the royal inscriptions the Neo-Assyrian letters also confirm that the construction process was often interrupted by rituals (SAA X 354:13; XII 86:9-11). The importance of the rituals during the building process can be inferred from the Assyrian royal inscriptions that mention that the construction of a temple required not only specialized workers but also cultic personnel (RINAP 5 10:27-33). The reason for introducing appropriate building rituals was that the king wanted to avoid angering the gods and guarantee that they would accept the temple or the palace.

The building rituals are not only directly or indirectly mentioned in the letters and in the royal inscriptions, but some building rituals have been preserved. C. Ambos' reconstruction of building rituals shows which were performed during various phases of building the temple. At the very beginning of the construction, when the substructure of the temple was laid down, the priests performed *namburbi* called *enūma* IM.DÙ.A *tapattiqu*, "When you lay down the substructures" [75]. Rituals were also performed when the foundations of the temple were completed [76]. Another important ritual was performed when the doors were completed [77]. Finally, when the entire temple was finished the priest performed the ritual known as *enūma Kulla eštessû*, "When Kulla was brought out" [78]. Thus Ambos' reconstruction of the building rituals indicates that important phases of the temple or palace were accompanied by such ceremonies [79].

---

[72] The rituals connected with the construction and completion of various parts of the temple were known also in the Hittite texts; G. BECKMAN, "Temple Building among the Hittites", in *From the Foundations to the Crenellations*. Essays on Temple Building in the Ancient near East and Hebrew Bible (eds. M.J. BODA – J.R. NOVOTNY) (AOAT 366; Münster 2010) 71-89.

[73] Cf. RIMA 1 A.0.77.1:141-148.

[74] See for example the inscription of Shalmaneser I: "I deposited my monumental inscriptions. I anointed with oil the monumental inscriptions of my forefathers, made sacrifices, and returned them with stones, silver, and gold to their places" (RIMA 1 A.0.77. 4:39-43).

[75] C. AMBOS, *Mesopotamische Baurituale aus dem 1. Jahrtausend v. Chr.* (Dresden 2004) 118-121.

[76] AMBOS, *Mesopotamische Baurituale*, 9, 132-141.

[77] AMBOS, *Mesopotamische Baurituale*, 10.

[78] AMBOS, *Mesopotamische Baurituale*, 94-109.

[79] Even though no extant ritual was performed before or after the construction of the roof, the roof played an important role in the building rituals; see AMBOS, *Mesopotamische Baurituale*, 114-116.

As shown above, the completion formulas have a rhetorical function above all else. They summarize the whole building narrative, break the account into smaller sections, and anticipate what would happen next. Without undermining the rhetorical role of the completion formulas in the Mesopotamian inscriptions, we advance a proposal that links the building rituals with the completion formulas. If the moments when the rituals were performed — according to C. Ambos, tearing down the old temple, re-building new foundations, roofs, doors, cells, and completing the decoration — are compared with the most frequent occurrences of the completion formulas in the royal inscriptions, it is reasonable to conclude that the Mesopotamian completion formulas could in some cases mark the moments when such rituals were performed. This hypothesis can be supported by the fact that both the royal inscriptions described above and the building rituals employ the same elements such as aromatic essences, oil, honey, wine, milk, etc. [80], relied on the same cult personal (*kalû* priests [81]), and used the verb *šaklulu* "to complete" [82] as well as the expression "to build anew" [83].

As the royal inscriptions did not always include the description of the rituals, so the completion formulas referring to a ritual may have been left out. This conclusion does not mean that in some cases the completion formulas were not merely rhetorical devices, in particular, when the formula is a merism for the construction of the whole temple or when it frames the building account or its parts.

3. *Diachronic implications*

As argued above, the completion formulas were a regular part of the ANE building accounts. Both Mesopotamian and biblical formulas contain the verbs "to build" and "to complete". The completion formulas in the royal inscriptions (cf. 4.1) and the Type I completion formula in the biblical narrative play similar roles and occur in similar places in the building narratives. Thus, the Type I completion formulas also served to open and/or to close a building account (as in 1 Kgs 6,1.37-38). They also occur after laying the foundation of the building (as in 3 Kgdms[B,Ant.] 6,4-5) and before the description of the roofing of the temple (as in 1 Kgs 6,9a/

---

[80] AMBOS, *Mesopotamische Baurituale*, 133-141, 174-175.

[81] AMBOS, *Mesopotamische Baurituale*, 171-199.

[82] Thus, the gods are invited to complete the construction of the building; see AMBOS, *Mesopotamische Baurituale*, 184, l. D5'.

[83] A ritual was to be performed when the lower structure of the temple (IM.DÙ.A) was built anew; see AMBOS, *Mesopotamische Baurituale*, 118, l. 1-3.

3 Kgdms[B] 6,14a). They separate the main layout from the rest of the
narrative (as in 3 Kgdms[B,Ant.] 6,8) and the exterior from the interior of
the temple (as in 1 Kgs 6,14/3 Kgdms[A] 6,14). In sum, we can conclude
that the use of the Type I completion formulas in 1 Kings 6–7 corresponds
to the ancient Mesopotamian scribal use of the concluding formulas.
This correspondence allows us to suggest that the Type I formulas are
variants of the formulas known in the second and first millennium BCE.

Besides the Type I formulas, other completion formulas also display
similarities with the Mesopotamian formulas; thus, the break formu-
las (1 Kgs 6,22; 7,22, 40b) also divide the temple and palace building
accounts in smaller units, the sandwich formulas frame the founda-
tions of the temple (3 Kgdms[Ant.] 6,1-4) and the palace building account
(3 Kgdms 7,38-50), and a merism formula concludes the palace build-
ing account (1 Kgs 7,9.51a).

Moreover, Nabonidus' inscription (AOAT 256 2.12 i 41-ii 43) [84] dis-
plays several similarities with the biblical account (1 Kings 6–8). Both start
with the propitious date for building the temple and contain various types
of completion formulas. Both texts have the description of the roof, the
interior, the decoration, the sacrifices, and the king's prayer and feast. This
inscription and other Mesopotamian texts suggest that the completion for-
mulas sometimes mark the moments when sacrifices were offered. Since
the oldest biblical completion formulas also reflected the Mesopotamian
logic, the biblical completion formulas in 1 Kings 6–7 also might have origi-
nally marked the moments when some building rituals accompanied the
building of the foundations, roof, doors, decoration, and pillars, as well as
the overall completion of the temple and palace.

Based on this and the previous discussion, we suggest that the Type I
completion formula in 1 Kgs[MT] 6,9a / 3 Kgdms[B,Ant.] 6,14a reflects the
oldest version of the Hebrew and Greek text. This completion formula is
located before the description of the roof. Based on the similar occurrences
of such formula in the Mesopotamian royal inscriptions and the rituals that
were linked to the construction of the roof, we suggest that this formula
originally marked a moment for a ritual and only later became a structural
marker.

Since the location of formulas in 3 Kgdms[B,Ant.] 6,8 is confirmed by most
Greek and Ethiopic manuscripts but is missing in the MT, it can be sug-
gested that the occurrences of the Type I formula in the MT and the G[B,Ant.]

---

[84] The structural similarities between 1 Kings 6–8 and the Mesopotamian royal inscrip-
tions are not limited to Nabonidus inscription. For further study, see V.A. HUROWITZ, *I Have
Built an Exalted House*. Temple Building in the Bible in Light of Mesopotamian and North-
west Semitic Writings (Sheffield 1992) 2-190.

point to two possible streams of the development of the text: a text with two formulas as reflected in the G[B,Ant.] (3 Kgdms 6,8 and 14a) and a text with one formula as reflected in the MT (1 Kgs 6,9a).

A next stage of the development of the text reflects the Type I formula in 1 Kgs 6,14. The G[B,Ant.] do not have the divine speech as in 1 Kgs 6,11-13 nor the completion formula that closes the divine speech in 1 Kgs 6,14. Following the majority of scholars, who for good reasons consider the divine speech a later addition [85], we suggest that the completion formula in 1 Kgs 6,14 is a later addition as well, since it occurs only in the manuscripts that include the divine speech.

The formulas that occur in 1 Kings/3 Kingdoms 3, 5, 9 have a different function. They aim at creating links between various parts of 1 Kings 3–9, and it can be rightly concluded that Type II and III formulas in these chapters represent a later literary development of the text that used the formulas to tie up the Solomon narrative. The differences between 1 Kgs 8,12-13 and 3 Kgdms 8,53a suggests that the formula in 3 Kgdms 8,53 also belongs to this group [86].

A different formula is used in miscellanea (3 Kgdms[B] 2,35c, g; 4,31-32) [87]. A comparison of this formula with a similar formula in 1 Kgs 3,1 shows that the G[B,Ant.] have a reversed order. The G[B,Ant.] recount the construction of the temple first and then the palace, whereas the MT in 1 Kgs 3,1 places the palace first and the temple afterward [88]. Similarly, the sandwich formulas in 1 Kgs 9,10.25 can be considered a later development. The formula in 1 Kgs 9,10 is not in the G[B,Ant.,A], which suggests that the redactors intentionally created a narrative frame for the miscellanea in

---

[85] M. Noth, *Könige*. I. Teilband (BK IX/1; Neukirchen-Vluyn 1968) 118; J. Gray, *I & II Kings*, 157-158; Mulder, *1 Kings*, 251-253; van Keulen, *Two Versions*, 145-147.

[86] For the differences between these two speeches of Solomon, see J.C. Trebolle Barrera, "From Secondary Versions through Greek Recension to Hebrew Editions. The Contribution of the Old Latin Version", *The Text of the Hebrew Bible and Its Editions*. Studies in Celebration of the Fifth Centennial of the Complutensian Polyglot (eds. P.A. Torijano – A. Piquer Otero) (Supplements to the Textual History of the Bible 1; Leiden 2017) 160-179; M. Richelle, "How to Edit an Elusive Text? The So-Called Poem of Solomon (1 Kgs 8,12-13 MT // 8,53a Lxx) as a Case Study", *Textus* 27 (2018) 205-228; S.-F. Kató, "Der Tempelweihspruch Salomos (1 Reg 8,12-13/Lxx III Bas 8,53): Eine Neuer Vorschlag", *ZAW* 131 (2019) 220-234.

[87] It has been suggested that the miscellanea might have been based on the Mesopotamian inscriptions; see A. Piquer Otero, "The Miscellanies of 3 Kgdms 2: Archaeology and Context", in *Die Septuaginta. Geschichte — Wirkung — Relevanz* (eds. M. Meiser et al.) (Tübingen 2018) 274-287. Based on this study it can be suggested that the concluding formulas in the miscellanea were introduced later in order to create smooth links between these sections and the rest of the Books of the Kings.

[88] van Keulen (*Two Versions*, 138-140) suggested that the G[B,Ant.] adjusted the order so that it might reflect the order in chapter six and seven. Verses 2,35a-o can be interpreted as a later interpretation of Midrashic type; see Gooding, *Relics*, 34-36.

1 Kgs 9,19-25. It stands to reason to conclude that all these formulas have developed during later phases of the formation of the Greek and Hebrew text.

Finally, there are formulas in the G^A (6,3d; 8,53) that evidently harmonized the $G^{B,Ant.}$ with the MT. This harmonization of the Greek and Hebrew texts can be rightly considered one of the latest phases of the development of the biblical text. Similar later developments led to the transformation of the Type III formulas of the G^B into Type II formulas in the $G^{Ant.}$ (2,3; 5,1).

SYNTHESIS

I proposed to divide the completion formulas into three groups. Type I contains the verbs כלה and בנה *wayyiqtol* and reads "(Solomon) built (ויבן) the temple and completed it (ויכלהו)" (1 Kgs 6,9). This formula serves to divide the temple narrative into subsections and to separate different kinds of material used for the construction of the temple. The Type II formula has the verbs בנה and כלה in the infinitive construct and serves to link blocks 1 Kgs 3–5 and 9–10 in the MT, to introduce Solomon's speech in 3 Kgdms 8,53a, and to create a link between chapters 8 and 9 in the Greek manuscripts. Finally, there are the partial completion formulas labeled as Type III. These formulas have multiple functions, serving as a frame, a break, or a hinge in the Solomon narrative.

The analysis of the role of the completion formulas shows that these formulas have an impact on the structure of the Solomon narrative and its rhetoric. Since the position and the number of formulas differ in the Greek and Hebrew narratives, my analysis shows that we cannot speak about one structure and about one rhetoric in the Solomon narrative. The formulas support the division of the MT into a concentric structure while the Greek manuscripts have a parallel structure.

The last part of this paper is dedicated to the analysis of the similar formulas in the ANE royal inscriptions. The similarities between the ANE and the biblical formulas suggest that the formulas constituted an indispensable part of the building narrative since the third millennium BCE. A comparison of the location of the formula with the building rituals indicates that some formulas also serve to mark off the moments when the building rituals were performed, whereas the others had a purely literary function. A similar role of the completion formulas can be observed in the biblical texts as well. Taking into consideration these results, I have

argued that the most ancient completion formula occurs in 1 Kgs[MT] 6,9a /
3 Kgdms[B,Ant.] 6,14a while the formulas in the G[A] (6,3d; 8,53) and in the
G[Ant.] (2,3; 5,1) represent the most recent additions.

Pontifical Biblical Institute   Peter DUBOVSKÝ
Rome
dubovsky@biblico.it

SUMMARY

This paper analyses completion terminology in the Solomon narrative as pre-
served in four important types of text: the Masoretic text, the *Codex Vaticanus*,
the Antiochian text, and the *Codex Alexandrinus*. After having divided the com-
pletion formulas into three groups, the author analyzes the function of the formu-
las in Hebrew and Greek texts. Based on this analysis he examines the role of the
completion formulas for the structure of the Solomon narrative in the Hebrew and
Greek texts. The last part of the paper focuses on the development of this formula
in the light of ANE texts and shows the implications of this study for the diachronic
analysis of the Solomon narrative.