SBL

Society of Biblical Literature

Ancient Israel and Its Literature

Steven L. McKenzie, General Editor

Editorial Board

Suzanne Boorer
Victor H. Matthews
Thomas C. Römer
Benjamin D. Sommer
Nili Wazana

Number 9

LEVITES AND PRIESTS IN HISTORY AND TRADITION

Volume Editor
Steven L. McKenzie

LEVITES AND PRIESTS
IN HISTORY AND TRADITION

Edited by

Mark A. Leuchter
and
Jeremy M. Hutton

Between Shadow and Substance:
The Historical Relationship of Tabernacle and Temple in Light of Architecture and Iconography

Cory D. Crawford

Central to the understanding of the provenance of the Priestly source (P) of the Pentateuch is the question of the relationship between the wilderness tabernacle and the Jerusalem temple. The similarities between the two structures have hardly been lost on anyone, though the nature of this relationship remains unclear. By now the historical impossibility of a newly nomadic group procuring materials for the production of a lavish tent sanctuary is so well rehearsed as to need little comment, though the corresponding problem of the *Sitz im Leben* of the group responsible for the tabernacle texts remains a point of controversy.[1] At issue, of course, is not simply the source or inspiration of

1. The following two statements from differing ideological camps serve to illustrate the point: "Very strange is the contrast between this splendid structure [i.e., the tabernacle], on which the costliest material is lavished and wrought in the most advanced style of Oriental art, and the soil on which it rises, in the wilderness amongst the native Hebrew nomad tribes, who are represented as having got it ready offhand, and without external help. The incompatibility has long been noticed, and gave rise to doubts as early as the time of Voltaire" (Julius Wellhausen, *Prolegomena to the History of Israel, with a reprint of the article Israel from the Encyclopedia Britannica* [foreword by Douglas A. Knight; Scholars Press Reprints and Translations; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1994], 39; repr. of *Prolegomena to the History of Israel* [trans. J. Sutherland Black and Allan Menzies; Edinburgh: A&C Black, 1885]; trans. of *Prolegomena zur Geschichte Israels* [2nd ed.; Berlin: G. Reimer, 1883]). Cf. the similar comment of Menahem Haran, who proposes a Priestly *Sitz im Leben* entirely different from that proposed by Wellhausen: "It is evident that as depicted in P the tabernacle is largely imaginary and never existed in Israel. Anyone who believes that the semi-nomadic tribes who made their way from Egypt to Canaan were capable of erecting such a magnificent edifice in their midst violates the laws of historical reality, and it is up to him to substantiate his argument" (*Temples and Temple-Service in Ancient Israel: An Inquiry into Biblical Cult Phenomena and the Historical Setting of the Priestly School* [1978; repr., Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 1985], 189). See also the lengthier discussion of this specific prob-

the tabernacle construction narratives in Exod 25–30; 35–40 but also the historical location the author(s) of the narratives and the light it casts on the history of Israelite institutions and religion in the first millennium B.C.E. The purpose of this paper is to reexamine the relationship between tabernacle and temple—and thereby a slice of Israelite religious history—via, first, a survey of the problems in current stances toward the issue and, second, a discussion of two overlooked points related to the architecture and iconography of each that help to elucidate the historical relationships involved.

I. Temple and Tabernacle in Recent Research

It is customary to begin with the work of Julius Wellhausen, since the position he voiced has come to dominate the conversation, either in commanding assent or in engendering protest. For our purposes, especially in a volume dedicated to priests, it is worthwhile to reproduce a passage that lays out the implications of the relationship between tabernacle and temple for understanding the priesthood:

> To bring the sons of Aaron into comparison with the sons of Zadok, as a proof of their higher antiquity, is just as reasonable as to bring the tabernacle into comparison with the temple of Jerusalem for a similar purpose. The former are priests of the tabernacle, the latter of the temple; but as in point of fact the only distinction to be drawn between the Mosaic and the actual central sanctuary is that between shadow and substance, so neither can any other be made between the Mosaic and the actual central priesthood. In the Priestly Code the ancient name is introduced instead of the historical one, simply in order to maintain the semblance of the Mosaic time.[2]

Unmistakable here is the language of the book of Hebrews, wherein the tabernacle is also relegated to the status of a shadow (σκιά, Heb 8:5) and compared with the substance, that is, for Hebrews, Christ.[3] It is precisely this assertion of the immateriality of the tabernacle to which much scholarly attention has been turned, and therefore the bases and assumptions that led Wellhausen to this view are worth reviewing briefly. Wellhausen argued for a historical understanding based on a careful comparison of the sources of the Pentateuch and other texts, finding that P assumed a centralized cult,

---

lem in Mark K. George, *Israel's Tabernacle as Social Space* (SBLAIL 2; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2009), 3–5.

2. Wellhausen, *Prolegomena*, 125.

3. In German the allusion is stronger, with shadow opposed explicitly to body: "Jene nämlich sind die Priester der Stiftshütte, diese die des Tempels; wie aber faktisch kein anderer Unterschied zwischen dem mosaischen und dem wirklichen Centralheiligtum besteht, als der zwischen Körper und Schatten, so auch kein anderer zwischen der mosaischen und der wirklichen Centralpriesterschaft" (Wellhausen, *Prolegomena zur Geschichte Israels*, 129).

whereas D had been forced to argue for it. Applying the same logic to Ezekiel, he found that assumptions made by P had to be asserted by the exilic prophet, and therefore P must have postdated both D and Ezekiel.[4] A second point is Wellhausen's Hegelian framework leading to the view that the cultic legislation at the core of P is the result of a long process of ossification or denaturalization of a once vibrant, spontaneous religion, and (in yet another assumption) since the sources represent stages in Israel's "national" story, they can be arranged to follow that development, with P occupying the final position.

Few today would admit to an agreement with the teleology implicit in the latter, but arguments based on the relative dating of the sources continue to the present. In a most recent treatment of the tabernacle, Mark George understands the social setting of the Priestly authors to be precisely exilic, in which priests are attempting to make sense of the loss of both temple and sovereign, and thus advance the idea of a social structure based on the memory of the Jerusalem temple, knowledge of ancient Near Eastern tent sanctuaries, and the JE document.[5] Occupying a more extreme position, William Propp, in his 2006 commentary on Exodus, agrees with Terence Fretheim's view that, since P "knows" no monarchy, it must have been an anti-monarchic and, more properly, anti-temple protest, "advocating worship in a tent [without a king] as in days of yore."[6] This position, for which Propp can only find "implicit" evidence, exemplifies the perpetuation of Wellhausen's assumptions that P's narrative behaves like the other sources. If D shows itself concerned with monarchy and centralization, and P does not, it must be because by the time P wrote these were no longer important political issues.[7] In order to make this case, other comparative issues must be ignored. The fact that P deliberately attempts to avoid anachronism, such as in its pre-Mosaic lack of the divine name and of sacrifice, urges caution in comparison to the author of Deuteronomy especially, who is unabashed when it comes to placing contemporary

---

4. "The distinction between priest and levite which Ezekiel introduces and justifies as an innovation, according to the Priestly Code has always existed; what in the former appears as a beginning, in the latter has been in force ever since Moses, —an original datum, not a thing that has become or been made. That the prophet should know nothing about a priestly law with whose tendencies he is in thorough sympathy admits of only one explanation, —that it did not then exist" (Wellhausen, *Prolegomena*, 124).

5. George, *Israel's Tabernacle as Social Space*; see esp. the discussion on pp. 10–11.

6. William H. C. Propp, *Exodus 19–40: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (AB 2A; New York: Doubleday, 2006), 732; cf. Terence E. Fretheim, "The Priestly Document: Anti-Temple?" *VT* 18 (1968): 313–29.

7. Propp, *Exodus 19–40*, 732; of course, Wellhausen was not the first nor the only to make these assumptions. Since, however, he most rigorously associated the sources and the development of Israelite religion, becoming a figure with whom scholars continue to grapple and whose views are among the most widely known in academic circles, I engage his work in order to draw out commonly held assumptions and arguments.

concerns in the mouth of Moses. It also ignores, or at least undertheorizes, the contradiction in the position that posits, on the one hand, that the muting of royal power in the narrative was evidence of a historical (exilic or postexilic) period but, on the other, that the elaborate descriptions of the tabernacle are the opposite, a fiction.

Recent studies in source criticism have driven home the point not only that one cannot assume these points about the sources, but that such assumptions directly contradict the evidence at hand. Joel Baden argues that in the original stratum of P one detects no trace of a parenetic rupture in the fourth wall, such as is found in D and even in P's successor, the Holiness Code (H).[8] Thus, the absence of obvious royal concerns, at least at the narrative level, may be the result of nothing more than P's more particularly attuned sense of history, in which even the sacrificial system has its chronological limits. Even without this observation, one is confronted still with the assumption of the extent to which P behaves like D or H. Must priests (at Jerusalem or otherwise) develop a sweeping narrative that actively and positively eliminates other cult sites from consideration? Must it propose a plan by which these competing sanctuaries will be eliminated, or is to ignore them enough? Once these old assumptions are recognized as unwarranted and P is cut loose from its conceptual moorings to J, E, and especially D, a different picture can take its place, one that might have P as the articulation, by priests and, with Menahem Haran, *for* priests, of the basis for a contemporary cult in the history of Israel.[9]

As George and Propp show, at the heart of conclusions made about the historical setting of the priests lie these assumptions regarding the literary character of pentateuchal sources, especially as they relate to one another. For Wellhausen as for many others since, the main pentateuchal sources could not have been coeval in origin and therefore must have been composed in series, not in parallel.[10] Outgrowths of these ideas include Martin Noth's view that P looked back and revised the earlier JE traditions and Frank Moore Cross's influential argument that P was not a narrative source but rather a redactional layer.[11] These hypotheses have been strongly refuted in recent source-critical

---

8. Joel S. Baden, "Identifying the Original Stratum of P: Theoretical and Practical Considerations," in *The Strata of the Priestly Writings: Contemporary Debate and Future Directions* (ed. Sarah Shectman and Joel S. Baden; AThANT 95; Zurich: TVZ, 2009), 13–29.

9. Haran, *Temples and Temple-Service*, 142–48; idem, "Behind the Scenes of History: Determining the Date of the Priestly Source," *JBL* 100 (1981): 321–33.

10. See Baden's treatment of the development of the relative dating of the sources, especially of "JE": *J, E, and the Redaction of the Pentateuch* (FAT 68; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2009), 1–98, as well as his excursus on the relationship of P to J and E (ibid., 197–207).

11. Martin Noth, *Pentateuchal Traditions* (trans. Bernhard W. Anderson; Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall, 1972), 234; Frank Moore Cross, *Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic: Essays in the History of the Religion of Israel* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1973), 293–325. For others who view P as a redactional layer, see, e.g., John Van Seters, *The*

scholarship: Klaus Koch and Baruch Schwartz have mounted serious challenges to the view of P as a redactional stratum, and Baden has recently built on these studies, demonstrating that no separate JE redaction existed prior to the full composition of the Pentateuch and that there is no basis for understanding P as a response to J, E, or D.[12] The only sources to be clearly dependent on the others are D, who apparently knows J and E (though separately), and H, who probably revised the literary legal corpora of E and D.[13]

If P, then, is not only *not* the redactor but is not derivative of these sources, the date of P cannot be correlated with the other sources in the way that European and North American scholars have argued.[14] The basis for the exilic or postexilic composition of P is thus seriously undermined, and the major obstacles for a preexilic P are removed. What remains, for our purposes, is the problem of the historical relationship of P to the monarchy and cult, and one of the crucial hinges on which this question turns is still whether and how the Jerusalem temple and the tabernacle are related—indeed, given the relatively few clear indications of datable political concerns, this nexus is vital to the inquiry.

That they are indeed related can be visually established by a glance at any of the ubiquitous reconstructions of the tabernacle (Exod 25–30; 35–40) and the temple of Solomon (1 Kgs 6–7). Both are rectangular, long-axis type constructions similarly divided and apportioned. Both have outer courtyards possessed of an altar and a laver. Both show an interior space itself divided in two: an antecella with golden lampstands, golden incense altar, and golden table, and an inner sanctum in which golden cherubim directly mark the presence of the deity. In addition, the bronze altars of the temple and tabernacle

---

Life of Moses: The Yahwist as Historian in Exodus–Numbers (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1993); Rolf Rendtorff, *The Problem of the Process of Transmission in the Pentateuch* (trans. John J. Scullion; JSOTSup 89; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1977); Erhard Blum, *Studien zur Komposition des Pentateuch* (BZAW 189; Berlin: de Gruyter, 1990).

12. Klaus Koch, "P — Kein Redaktor! Erinnerung an zwei Eckdaten der Quellenscheidung," *VT* 37 (1987): 446–67; Baruch J. Schwartz, "The Priestly Account of the Theophany and Lawgiving at Sinai," in *Texts, Temples, and Traditions: A Tribute to Menahem Haran* (ed. Michael V. Fox et al.; Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 1996), 103–34; Baden, *Redaction*.

13. On the revision of H, see Jeffrey Stackert, *Rewriting the Torah: Literary Revision in Deuteronomy and the Holiness Legislation* (FAT 52; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2007).

14. Arguments for preexilic P have, on the contrary, been advanced especially by Israeli biblical scholars, since the latter half of the twentieth century. See Yehezkel Kaufmann, *The Religion of Israel: From Its Beginnings to the Babylonian Exile* (trans. and abridg. Moshe Greenberg; Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1960); Haran, *Temples and Temple-Service*; Israel Knohl, *The Sanctuary of Silence: The Priestly Torah and the Holiness School* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1995); see also the similar position of Richard E. Friedman, "Torah (Pentateuch)," *ABD* 6: 614. For a summary of other studies pointing to a preexilic origin of P, see Ziony Zevit, "Converging Lines of Evidence Bearing on the Date of P," *ZAW* 94 (1982): 481–511.

courtyard are the only two bronze altars mentioned anywhere in the Hebrew Bible.[15] Haran shows that the homologies go even deeper, as a careful look at both demonstrates a distinct material gradation that marks the spaces as increasingly holy from the outer court to the inner sanctum.[16]

These similarities notwithstanding, and notwithstanding the aforementioned historical problems associated with a nomadic wilderness group's access to resources and means of production, many treatments of the tabernacle in the past sixty years have emphasized the differences between tent and temple, adducing historical analogues that have complicated the issue of the origin of the tabernacle considerably, resulting in a more complex (if less certain) picture of the historical origin of the tabernacle construction narratives. Haran himself noted that "however clear the connection is between P's tabernacle and Solomon's temple there is actually no reason to suppose that P's description is *altogether* a late retrojection. It also has a certain substratum of ancient and quite authentic tradition."[17] He goes on to argue that, since P never even mentions Jerusalem and never gives the slightest hint that the tabernacle should be superseded by Solomon's temple, we should understand the basis of the tradition to be found in the sanctuary at Shiloh, which was overlaid with Solomonic details after Shiloh was destroyed.[18]

To this one would add the proliferation of attempts to explain the tent shrine on the basis of ancient Near Eastern archaeological, iconographic, and textual data in an effort to argue that the view of the tabernacle as a straightforward retrojection of the Jerusalem temple into the wilderness wandering traditions is no longer tenable. Cross's 1947 article in the *Biblical Archaeologist* was one of the broadest attempts since Wellhausen to set the tabernacle structure on a historical footing, making use of philology, archaeology, and ethnoarchaeology even while locating the composition of P in the exile. Since then, the search for the basis of the tabernacle narratives has proceeded largely independent of source-critical argumentation. Ancient analogues have been adduced with the more famous candidates including the tent of El known from Ugarit, the "battle tent" of Ramesses II, the Timna valley shrine, and analogous structures mentioned in Mari texts.[19] These studies show what is already

---

15. The bronze altar is not described in the temple construction narrative of 1 Kgs 6–7, but it is mentioned explicitly in 1 Kgs 8:64; 2 Kgs 16:14. See discussion in Haran, *Temples and Temple-Service*, 191.

16. Ibid., 158–65, 189–94.

17. Ibid., 195 (emphasis mine).

18. Ibid., 194–204.

19. Frank Moore Cross, "The Priestly Tabernacle and the Temple of Solomon," in *From Epic to Canon: History and Literature in Ancient Israel* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1998), 84–95; Kenneth A. Kitchen, "The Tabernacle—A Bronze Age Artifact," *ErIsr* 24 (1993): 119*–29*; Michael M. Homan, *To Your Tents, O Israel!: The Terminology, Function, Form, and Symbolism of Tents in the Hebrew Bible and the Ancient Near*

apparent in the Hebrew Bible itself: for all their similarities, tabernacle and temple differ sharply from each other in many respects. The very dimensions of the tent and of the main temple building, for example, are not equivalent, and efforts to discover the equation relating the measurements have largely failed. Thus, the frequent refrain of studies of this type is one that emphasizes the differences between the two: "Thus the tabernacle has many connections with second millennium BC tent shrines and cannot be understood as a later creation artificially designed to (pretend to) anticipate the temple,"[20] or, more succinctly put, "if P modeled the Tabernacle on the Temple, why did he do such a poor job of copying?"[21]

Thus, one finds, on the one hand, source-critical studies about the tabernacle narratives that are less concerned with the historical realities of P and, on the other, studies concerned with the historical reconstruction of the tabernacle that tend to ignore the implications for P and the Jerusalem temple. The dearth of rigorous historical studies of P in the thirty years since Haran's work has coincided almost perfectly with the unraveling of the consensus not just on the literary background of pentateuchal texts but also on the ability even to call them discrete sources.[22] Tacit proof of this might be found in the steady stream of studies on the tabernacle that almost totally eschew the historical question in favor of other methodologies and interests.[23] Nevertheless, both

---

East (CHANE 12; Leiden: Brill, 2002), 89–128; Daniel E. Fleming, "Mari's Large Public Tent and the Priestly Tent Sanctuary," *VT* 50 (2000): 484–98; Richard S. Hess, *Israelite Religions: An Archaeological and Biblical Survey* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2007), 202–3.

20. Hess, *Israelite Religions*, 205; see also Cross, "Priestly Tabernacle and the Temple of Solomon," 84–85 and passim. Note that this is the conclusion reached already by Haran on purely literary grounds.

21. Homan, *To Your Tents*, 124; cf. the nearly identical question raised by Jonathan S. Greer: "If such descriptions were merely a retrojection of an idealized Jerusalem temple, should we not expect to find more congruence?" ("An Israelite *Mizrāq* at Tel Dan?" *BASOR* 358 [2010]: 28 n. 3).

22. On this see Baden, *Redaction,* 1–10.

23. For quite recent studies of the tabernacle that avoid or entirely omit the historical problem in favor of other questions, in addition to George, *Israel's Tabernacle*, see Michael B. Hundley, *Keeping Heaven on Earth: Guarding the Divine Presence in the Priestly Tabernacle* (FAT 2/50; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011); Amy Cooper Robertson, "'He Kept the Measurements in His Memory as a Treasure': The Role of the Tabernacle Text in Religious Experience" (Ph.D. Diss., Emory University, 2010); Myung Soo Suh, *The Tabernacle in the Narrative History of Israel from the Exodus to the Conquest* (Studies in Biblical Literature 50; New York: Peter Lang, 2003). Homan, for his part, is clearly keen to elucidate the historicity of the tabernacle itself, but understandably leaves off situating the implications of his study within the work of P as a whole (see the comparatively brief summary in *To Your Tents*, 129–37). One detects hints of the implications of recent source-critical studies in, for example, the work of George, whose self-designated "agnostic position" represents a middle way between the emerging analyses, though it is not without its challenges. He sees the tabernacle as the production of a group of exilic priests who, as mentioned above, drew on

the realignment of historical focus away from the Jerusalem temple and the important reevaluation of pentateuchal sources might productively be recombined and the fruits of each applied to the question of the historical *Sitz im Leben* of the tabernacle narratives and, by extension, of the Priestly source.

II. Architecture and Iconography in Temple and Tabernacle

To bring the conclusions of source criticism and material culture to bear on the understanding of the horizon of the tabernacle texts, it is useful to add two points of comparison that, it will be concluded, help to clarify the picture of the Priestly school.

The first concerns an apparent divergence of dimensions. One expects that the invention of one structure on the basis of the other would show a relatively clear coherence in dimensions, since so much attention is given to the measure of sacred space in the Hebrew Bible. The dimensions of the tent itself, to which most want to compare temple dimensions, are never clearly given; instead the width of its constituent frames (קרשים) is given (1.5 cubits), as well as the number of frames (Exod 26:15–35; 36:20–30). Besides the question of exactly how these frames are assembled, one must also decide how the corners relate to the sides, whether one is to understand six frames across the back or eight.[24] Uncertainty over how the frames structuring the tent are related to each other has resulted in varying interpretations: since antiquity a 10 × 30 (cubit) structure has been favored, though, as Homan notes, this has been largely motivated by a desired measure (i.e., one proportional to the temple of Solomon) rather than by a careful reading of the text.[25] Others, such as Richard

---

a variety of sources that may have included memories and oral traditions as well as textual materials. This allows him to maintain the exilic composition of the text while accounting for the preexilic analogues, and, what is more, to argue for a priestly promulgation of a utopian social structure—one that had no hope of a reconstitution of any temple—cloaked in the garb of a fictive, composite shrine (*Israel's Tabernacle*, 12–13). While this may be seen as a way of bringing archaeology into conversation with source criticism, the advances in the latter described above suggest that the situation may not be so neatly parsed, since George's assumption of an exilic setting on the basis of lack of attention to monarchy and temple is, as discussed above, not the best explanation for the narrative contours of the document. In the end, however, as with the other studies, for George the historical question is clearly secondary to the application of critical space theory, which nevertheless, as will be shown below, draws important conclusions about the tabernacle as a structuring agent for P's ideal society.

24. See Propp, *Exodus 19–40*, 503–4.

25. Homan, *To Your Tents*, 166–67 (see also the preceding discussion on 142–65). Homan points out that even were the 10 × 30 footprint meant to evoke one-half the dimensions of the temple, one is still left with a (10-cubit) height that would exist in a different proportion to given temple dimensions, since the temple measured 30 cubits in height.

Friedman, posit a 6- or 8-cubit wide × 20 cubit long footprint on the basis of overlapping קרשים, or a 12 × 30 cubit enclosure on the assumption that the frames were abutted.[26] Homan proposes yet another understanding: 31.15 × 10.9 cubits.[27] The fact that still no clear consensus exists on the dimensions of the tent stands in stark contrast to the dimensions of the court enclosure and even of its gate, which are explicitly and plainly noted: 100 cubits × 50 cubits the court (Exod 27:9–13; 38:9–13), 20 cubits the gate (Exod 27:16; 38:18).

At first glance, there is no apparent congruence with the dimensions of the temple; rather it seems that a situation obtains opposite to that of the tabernacle dimensions: there are no courtyard dimensions given for the temple; only interior dimensions of the building itself are listed. They are given in 1 Kgs 6:2–4 as 30 cubits high × 60 cubits long × 20 cubits wide. Thus, by comparison, a 12 × 30 cubit tabernacle would constitute roughly half of the interior space of the main hall of the temple, whereas a 6 × 20 cubit version puts one in the range of the interior dimensions of the holy of holies, as Friedman famously argued.[28] Neither of these solutions fits a known temple dimension precisely, and thus, without careful consideration of 1 Kgs 6, it would appear that this aspect of the comparison would be evidence of the use of divergent source material in the composition of the tabernacle texts.

The temple dimensions, however, are misleading indicators of overall size when taken by themselves, since the measurements constitute *interior* dimensions. They do not include the dimensions of the three-tiered יציע surrounding the main hall on three sides, nor do they explicitly account for the thickness of the walls. This is most apparent in the increasing width of the three tiers of the surrounding structure, described in 1 Kgs 6:5–6 as widening from the bottom story (5 cubits) to the top (7 cubits) as they go up so as to account for the greater thickness of the walls at the bottom, thus constricting the *interior* space where the walls are thickest.[29] This width is clearly not intended to be

---

This assumes, though, that the 30-cubit measure is of a piece with the horizontal (interior) dimensions. One expects otherwise, since the holy of holies was said to be 20 cubits high, fitting the same proportions as would a 10 × 30 cubit tent. I do agree with Homan generally, however, in his analysis of the other difficulties in proposing a 10 × 30 cubit tent.

26. Yohanan Aharoni, "Arad: Its Inscriptions and Temple," *BA* 31 (1968): 25; Richard Elliot Friedman, *The Exile and Biblical Narrative: The Formation of the Deuteronomistic and Priestly Works* (HSM 22; Chico, Calif.: Scholars Press, 1981), 50–51; Propp, *Exodus 19–40*, 505.

27. Homan, *To Your Tents*, 180. Though Homan's argument is carefully reasoned from textual, archaeological, and botanical evidence, I doubt his conclusions, since nowhere else do we find dimensions given in such fractional units. See discussion of temple measurements below.

28. Richard Elliot Friedman, *Who Wrote the Bible?* (New York: Summit, 1987), 181–87; see discussion in Homan, *To Your Tents*, 167–77.

29. The dimensions in LXX differ from those in the MT: 25 cubits high × 40 cubits long × 20 cubits wide. These are most likely corruptions caused initially by a misunder-

included in the 20-cubit width of the house. In order to assess accurately the
width of the entire temple building, then, one must take into account, at the
very least, twice (once for each side) the thickness of the walls of the *bayît*,
twice the interior width of the surrounding structure, and twice the thickness
of the outer walls of the surrounding structure. Although the thickness of the
walls is not given in 1 Kings, Ezekiel accounts for wall thicknesses of between
5 and 6 cubits (e.g., Ezek 41:2, 5, 12).

Adding everything together, we are confronted with a building whose full
exterior width is most likely 50 cubits, which is the width proposed also by,
for example, Th. Busink and Michael Chyutin.[30] By similar reasoning, the total
length of the building approaches 100 cubits, although we know less about
the axial dimensions of the building, especially in the way the vestibule relates
to a likely staircase and platform like those mentioned in Ezek 40:49; 41:8. A
100-cubit length is supported also by the fact that other monumental buildings
in Israelite tradition are explicitly given these dimensions: the royal "House
of the Forest of Lebanon," whose 50-cubit width and 30-cubit height would
also correspond to the Solomonic temple (1 Kgs 7:2; note its 50-cubit width
and 30-cubit height) as well as to the temple of Ezekiel's vision (Ezek 41:15).
These are not surprising data since, as R. B. Y. Scott notes, ancient Near Eastern
building traditions in general demonstrate a textual and material affinity for
round numbers.[31] Thus, one should not look to the tent itself to replicate temple
dimensions, but rather to the courtyard dimensions and temple footprint.

In sum, while efforts to correlate the main hall of the temple with the tent
sanctuary itself yield no apparent congruency, one does find the strong pos-
sibility of correlation in the overall exterior dimensions of the temple building
and the tabernacle court, as well as in the tabernacle entrance screen with the
20-cubit width of the temple vestibule and main hall. If this obtains, one might
entertain the possibility that the core spaces of the temple and tabernacle were

---

standing of the construction of the interior shrine in MT 6:16 and by an attempt to make
sense of the five-cubit "storied structure" (יציע; 6:10 [*qere*]), which D. W. Gooding thinks
the LXX understands as a loft above the interior ceiling. See his intricate discussion in
"Temple Specifications: A Dispute in Logical Arrangement between the MT and the LXX,"
VT 17 (1967): 168–72. On the dimensions as interior measurements, see ibid., 156–57;
Mordechai Cogan, *1 Kings: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (AB 10;
New York: Doubleday, 2000), 237.

30. Twenty cubits (interior hall) + 10 cubits (north and south hall walls) + 10 cubits
(north and south widths of bottom story "stepped structure") + 10 cubits (north and south
exterior walls). Th. Busink, *Der Tempel von Jerusalem von Salomo bis Herodes: Eine archäol-
ogisch-historische Studie unter Berücksichtigung des westsemitischen Tempelbaus* (2 vols.;
Studia Francisci Scholten memoriae dicata 3; Leiden: Brill, 1970, 1980), 1:165–66; Michael
Chyutin, *Architecture and Utopia in the Temple Era* (trans. Richard Flantz; Library of Sec-
ond Temple Studies 58; New York/London: T&T Clark, 2006), 62.

31. R. B. Y. Scott, "The Hebrew Cubit," *JBL* 77 (1958): 205–14; idem, "Postscript on the
Cubit," *JBL* 79 (1960): 368.

similarly buffered on all sides: in the case of the tabernacle, the courtyard sur-rounds the main sanctuary while the stepped structure and the vestibule of the temple similarly surround the main hall and cella. Of course, the homol-ogy proposed here cuts across the relationship of the outer courts, lavers, and bronze altars in each structure, but flexibility is one of the advantages of anal-ogy, which requires only enough correspondence to draw the connection. It is possible, then, that the courtyard measurements were another way the link between tabernacle and temple was strengthened, and the observation thus would reinforce the idea that the one had the other in mind, if not in view.

The second point to be made concerns the shared visual repertoire of temple and tabernacle. The temple of Solomon is described in 1 Kgs 6–7 as having been adorned with a variety of images and patterns. The courtyard boasted a huge bronze sea, cast like a lotus cup (כוס פרח שושן; 7:26), under which were installed twelve bovine (בקר), three facing each cardinal direction (7:25). Also in the courtyard of the temple, the ten wheeled stands (מכנות) that supported basins had frames (שלבים) decorated with lions, bulls, cherubim, and possibly palmettes (7:29).[32] The pillars Jachin and Boaz, on the portico, had lotus capitals that were also adorned with hundreds of pomegranates and geometric patterns (שבכה; 7:17–20). Wooden doors leading into the antecella and cella, as well as the walls enclosing each of these spaces, bore carved and gilded cherubim (6:32–33), palmettes (תמרת; 6:29), and rosettes (פטורי צצים; 6:29). The aforementioned lampstands were, as is well known, described with floral imagery (7:29).

The visual elements of the tabernacle, for its part, also included floral ico-nography of the type discussed above. The lampstand is described in vegetal terms (cf. Exod 25:31–35), and if one admits priestly vestments, we find pome-granates (Exod 28:33–34; 39:24–26) and at least one rosette (ציץ; Exod 28:36; 39:30) as part of the repertoire. The singular figural images in the tabernacle, described at various points, were the cherubim, depicted on portals and in the holy of holies (cf. Exod 25:18; 26:1, 31). Thus, all of the main imagery of the tabernacle is also indicated in the temple of Solomon, but the opposite is not true, at least not when looking only at the record in 1 Kgs 6–7.

What to my mind is most interesting about temple iconography, however, and is never discussed in treatments of the relationship between temple and tabernacle, is that the preexilic temple iconography changed over time in not insignificant ways. Though several Judean monarchs were said to have manip-ulated, refurbished, or remodeled the temple, the one that is most clearly rel-evant to the original temple appearance seems to be that of Ahaz in the eighth

---

32. The note about the cherub–palmette pair in 7:36 may in fact be attributed to a secondary source that was influenced by the imagery of the house interior (in 1 Kgs 6:29), and may even have wished to avoid the bovine imagery of 7:25, 29. See Cogan, *1 Kings*, 272, and John Gray, *I & II Kings: A Commentary* (2nd ed.; OTL; London: SCM, 1970), 191–92.

century. Most commentators understandably do not designate this a reform, especially since it involved the incorporation of an apparently Assyrian altar, but the effects of the change on the items described in such detail in 1 Kgs 6–7 should not be overlooked. One of the major transformations he effected, besides the import of the altar most infamous for the Deuteronomistic Historian, involved the removal of the twelve bronze bulls from underneath the sea as well as a removal of the frames of the basin stands, which were decorated with lions and bulls, and the basins themselves (2 Kgs 16:17), leaving the bronze sea and ten wheeled stands with no figural imagery and no basins. This is most often either summarized by scholars as political or economic necessity generated by Assyrian imperial expansion—which it certainly appears to have been, though scholars treat it mostly as culturally insignificant—or assumed, with the usual assessment of the Deuteronomistic Historian, to be further evidence of Ahaz's lack of concern for Israelite religious tradition. Since he is not marked as a reformer bringing a straying populace in line with some normative ideal, the change must have been undesired by all but the royal elite. A careful reading, however, reveals that no such criticism of this particular move is present in 2 Kgs 16. Indeed, when put in the context of the Deuteronomistic Historian's crusade to impugn especially this monarch, the silence speaks strongly. One might even go so far as to read between the lines a tacit acceptance of this act, which can be explained by reference to other known influences in the Israelite dialogue with images.

Elsewhere in the Hebrew Bible the removal or manipulation of imagery is framed in overtly iconoclastic terms. The stories of Aaron and the gold calf (Exod 32), Jeroboam and the calves (1 Kgs 12), Hezekiah and the bronze serpent (2 Kgs 18), and Josiah and Asherah and the chariots of the sun (2 Kgs 23) all explain the addition or removal of imagery in terms of adherence to or deviation from orthodox religious practice. With these episodes in mind, one wonders why no clear explanation is given for the targeting of these particular items, especially when certain items were apparently left by Ahaz, namely, the wheeled stands (now basically unadorned). Perhaps the robbery of the temple imagery, like that of Hezekiah and Josiah, was not an undesired development, especially when one considers the problem presented by bovine imagery elsewhere in the Deuteronomistic History, but the generally negative portrayal of Ahaz had to be maintained. Whatever the case, it is important to recognize that, while this removal can be understood as a desperate economic measure targeted at available bronze, it was nevertheless a carefully selective removal that produced significant changes in the iconographic system of the temple. Removing the bulls and the frames meant that all faunal imagery, save cherubim, was now absent not just from the courtyard but also from the temple itself. One is forced to ask, then, which constraints forced or allowed Ahaz to remove these particular items and not others.

I would argue that the particular selection of the faunal imagery, coupled with the relative paucity of demonstrable references to these items, suggests that the conceptual need for the imagery was declining, if not outright reversed.[33] It is possible that, given the origin of this imagery in an Iron Age artistic *koine*, significant cultural attachment to it never fully developed or had, as noted above, become explicitly problematic.[34] It is even more likely that the imagery, particularly the lions and bulls, became problematic in the context of an increasingly fraught battle over political identity that played itself out in the arena of visual representation.[35] Whatever the case, Ahaz's changes brought the temple into accordance with a particular understanding of the "second" commandment. Exodus 20:4–5 forbids the Israelites from making "a sculpted image (פסל) or any likeness (תמונה) of what is in the skies above or in the earth below or in the waters under the earth," and not to worship them. Deuteronomy 4:15–19 interprets this injunction as including not just anything that one might find in the skies, on the earth, or in the oceans, but also particularly figural imagery: "the representation of a man or woman, any beast on earth, the representation of any winged bird that flies in the sky or of anything that crawls on the ground, or of any fish in the waters under the earth." As Brian Schmidt points out in reference to these verses, not explicitly forbidden are "images derivative of the inanimate world, floral forms, and *Mischwesen* (composite forms comprising theriomorphic and anthropomorphic elements)."[36]

---

33. One is tempted to add here the intriguing possibility that the decline of figural imagery coincides somehow with the apex of Assyrian reluctance to represent deities anthropomorphically, a trajectory outlined in Tallay Ornan, *The Triumph of the Symbol: Pictorial Representations of Deities in Mesopotamia and the Biblical Image Ban* (OBO 213; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2005).

34. On the artistic *koine* that gave rise to Iron Age forms, see, e.g., Marian H. Feldman, *Diplomacy by Design: Luxury Arts and an 'International Style' in the Ancient Near East, 1400–1200 BCE* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2006). On the use of foreign artistic forms in the temple of Solomon, one finds statements frequently made in histories of ancient Israel, such as: "the temple plan, decorations, and furnishings were fairly typical of the Iron Age, and eclectic. This is what one would expect, of course, for a sacred precinct constructed and decorated by Phoenician craftsmen" (J. Maxwell Miller and John H. Hayes, *A History of Ancient Israel and Judah* [2nd ed.; Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2006], 217). For a more explicit discussion of the imagery in the context of ancient Near Eastern forms, see Philip J. King and Lawrence E. Stager, *Life in Biblical Israel* (Library of Ancient Israel; Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2001), 330–38.

35. See, e.g., Nathaniel Levtow, *Images of Others: Iconic Politics in Ancient Israel* (Biblical and Judaic Studies from the University of California, San Diego 11; Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 2008).

36. Brian Schmidt, "The Aniconic Tradition: On Reading Images and Viewing Texts," in *The Triumph of Elohim: From Yahwisms to Judaisms* (ed. Diana Edelman; Kampen: Kok Pharos, 1995), 82.

Here Schmidt unintentionally describes the categories of temple imagery operative *after* the removal of the lions and bulls: namely, inanimate objects, flora, and composite creatures. Surely it is no coincidence that the prohibition of certain types of images permitted the configuration of imagery (known independently) of the temple in the wake of Ahaz's changes. Thus, this evidence, too, suggests that, by his specific targeting of the figural imagery, Ahaz was either acting in response to or actively participating in the reshaping of cultural norms concerning representation in the Israelite religious milieu. Either the paradigm described by Schmidt was a rubric allowing (or even necessitating) the removal of those particular images, or the removal of the images helped to engender such a classificatory schema.[37] Either way, Ahaz's actions constitute an important statement in the conversation about visual representation in Judah, one that, in my view, had important consequences for the textual representation of the tabernacle.

It is striking that the collective visual repertoire of the tabernacle closely matches not as much that of the temple as described in 1 Kgs 6–7, but rather the version understood to have existed after Ahaz's remodeling: there was no figural imagery besides cherubim, only one water vessel stood in the courtyard—on a stand with no apparent adornment, no less. This observation, together with that concerning the temple dimensions discussed above, adds weight to the argument that the description of the tabernacle was shaped in reference to knowledge of the first Jerusalem temple. The implications of this observation merit further comment.

First, if the points about Ahaz are to be admitted, the iconographic correlation suggests that if the tabernacle texts were indeed crafted with the temple in mind, they were done so after Ahaz. While for most scholars this would constitute a point so basic as to be nearly irrelevant, it also leads to another observation, namely, that the shaping of these texts was not the result of literary analysis on the part of a Priestly author. That is, the authors of the tabernacle descriptions did not rely on a text like 1 Kgs 6–7 in projecting their temple-like construction into the corporate past, since a copy of 1 Kgs 6–7 would have yielded proportions of $20 \times 30 \times 60$ cubits and faunal imagery in the courtyard. Rather, I hold the final tabernacle narrative to be a result of converging streams of tradition that included the physical experience—not the literary copy—of the post-Ahaz temple of Jerusalem. A purely literary exercise

---

37. One notes here too that, if one understands the bronze serpent to have been erected in the temple courtyard, Hezekiah may have been contributing to the same conversation by his removal of Nehushtan (2 Kgs 18:4). It would have fallen under the category of *Mischwesen*, therefore permissible as an image, but it was the particular behavior before the image, not the inherent qualities of the image itself, that became problematic. Thus, according to 2 Kgs 18:4, it was a different prohibition under which Nehushtan became a target, viz., that which forbade Israelites from bowing down to or serving an image.

would have looked much more like the convergence of temple and tabernacle in the Chronicler's work. This evidence, then, would not detract from Haran's view of the origin of the Priestly source in Hezekiah's reign.

If this is correct, it not only suggests something about the possible experiential source of the correlation between tabernacle and temple, but it also reveals something about P's audience. If the author indeed intended his audience to connect temple and tabernacle, he did not lead them through a point-by-point textual comparison, but rather the comparison turned on the hinges of a shared experience of the Jerusalem temple. This is also in favor of Haran's view that, at least initially, P was a document that circulated in Priestly circles long before it was made public under Ezra in the era after the exile. It also militates against the views of Fretheim and Propp that the purpose of P was to undermine the Jerusalem priesthood by turning Solomon's temple into a wandering shrine.

Finally, these observations are most interesting, in my view, for the way they force one to ask what was gained in bringing the two structures together. In answering this question, it is important to move beyond the simple concerns about historicity that are the usual extent of the discussion. If Haran and others have correctly characterized P in calling it the promulgation of a utopian view carefully devoid of parenetic instructions for ostensibly future generations, what did it accomplish? At a most basic level, legitimation appears to be an operative force in the combination of the two structures, especially in light of the unease over the construction of a permanent place of Yahweh's dwelling expressed in opposing schools of thought (cf. 2 Sam 7). It placed tent and temple traditions on the same trajectory, locating the temple in the central events of Israel's collective memory and providing a visual reference for and material verification of the tabernacle traditions in the wake of the dismantling of the tent shrines at Shiloh and Jerusalem. To the politically informed, this congruence may have had the effect of bridging the gap between Shilonite traditions and those initiated by Solomon in effort to minimize the influence of the earlier, tribal institutions, and to mitigate the deposing of Abiathar and the Shilonite priesthood. It brings the northern priests into the picture at the same time that it subordinates them and their traditions to the current concerns of the Jerusalem temple hierarchy, resolving the discord undoubtedly created by the influx of disenfranchised cultic functionaries in the aftermath of the Assyrian destruction of the north and the abolishment of competing shrines under Hezekiah.[38]

The visual-spatial argument made by casting the tabernacle in the mold of the temple thus had political and social ramifications for *both* temple and tabernacle. It was a move that can be seen as participating in the (re-)invention of both traditions, in the sense articulated by Eric Hobsbawm. He characterizes

---

38. See discussion and notes in Stephen L. Cook's essay in the present volume.

invented traditions as "responses to novel situations which take the form of reference to old situations," and as "a process of formalization and ritualization, characterized by reference to the past, if only by imposing repetition."[39] This is most prevalently done "when a rapid transformation of society weakens or destroys the social patterns for which 'old' traditions had been designed" and for the purpose of "establishing or symbolizing social cohesion or the membership of groups, real or artificial communities."[40] The narrative that frames the lawgiving at Sinai in P, of which the tabernacle is arguably the centerpiece, co-opts the Shiloh traditions and reforms the hierarchy with the Levitical priests operating in a role subordinate to the Aaronids. Contra Wellhausen, this is not something that P needs to argue for; it is simply asserted as if it had always been the case, but not because it had already happened. The utopian picture, as pointed out by Haran, was directed initially at priests, possibly including those that now found their status diminished in the south.[41] If this is the case, one finds George's recent analysis of the graded tabernacle space as not *reflective of* but *defined by* social hierarchy particularly important, even if one disagrees with his historical placement of the tabernacle.[42] Viewed in this way, the alignment of the temple and tabernacle in the Priestly source is not the result of historical ignorance or accidence. It is the careful manipulation of history that actively seeks to construct the present.

P thus looks toward past and present simultaneously: in one motion it establishes the historical legitimacy of the temple via its identification with older wilderness traditions at the same time that it actively memorializes the tabernacle in the contemporary edifice on Mount Zion. This Janus view allows P's "utopian" world to be reified in the present while speaking ostensibly about a collective past. It materially relates contemporary structures and practice, such as Sabbath and royal institutions, to creation and theophany.[43] It is here that its character as foundation myth comes most clearly into view, not as "aggressive towards the present,"[44] as one finds in D, but instead as a document whose pur-

---

39. Eric J. Hobsbawm, "Introduction: Inventing Traditions," in *The Invention of Tradition* (ed. Eric J. Hobsbawm and Terence Ranger; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983), 1–14, here 2 and 4, respectively. Although Hobsbawm and the volume's other contributors seem mostly concerned with the complete invention of tradition—that is, from scratch—I consider the invention of tradition here to be an overhaul of previous texts and concepts that is, effectively, invention.

40. Ibid., 4, 9.

41. See Haran, "Behind the Scenes of History."

42. George, *Israel's Tabernacle,* 17–44.

43. See Moshe Weinfeld, "Sabbath, Temple and the Enthronement of the Lord—The Problem of the Sitz im Leben of Genesis 1:1–2:3," in *Mélanges bibliques et orientaux en l'honneur de M. Henri Cazelles* (ed. A. Caquot and M. Delcor; AOAT 212; Kevelaer: Butzon & Bercker, 1981), 501–12.

44. Haran, *Temples and Temple-Service*, 146.

pose might be seen as directed toward the production of space, or of a reality constructed through spatial means. To the cultically informed observer in the First Temple period, the edifice thus came to constitute a visual testimony to earlier traditions, much the way the menorah and the bronze serpent housed the cultural memories of desert theophany and the wilderness wanderings. In this connection, if we can be relatively certain of the congruence between the sacrificial system of P and the cultic service of the Jerusalem temple, the framing of these activities in a space so strongly associated with earlier traditions would have made sacrificial performance in the Jerusalem temple a regular act of social memorializing in addition to its many other functions.[45] If the Chronicler's attempts to weave these two (by then literary) traditions together more explicitly are any indication, P was ultimately successful.

---

45. On other functions and meanings, see, e.g., David Janzen, *The Social Meanings of Sacrifice in the Hebrew Bible: A Study of Four Writings* (BZAW 344; Berlin: de Gruyter, 2004), esp. 110–19. On temple sacrifice and its relation to cosmology, see Jonathan Klawans, *Purity, Sacrifice, and the Temple: Symbolism and Supersessionism in the Study of Ancient Judaism* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006), esp. 104–6.