**The Tent of Meeting in Samuel and Kings**

The term “Tent of Meeting” (*Ohel Mo’ed*)was known in Israel’s early traditions even outside of the Priestly milieu, but in those traditions, it was conceived of differently than the Priestly conception in the Torah. The Priestly Tent of Meeting is identified with the *Mishkan*, the Tabernacle, a place where the Divine presence rests, and the repository of all the cultic and holy vessels. The Tabernacle served as a central place for the nation’s sacrificial rites and the place where the deity convened with Moses. As the scholar honored in this *festschrift* has defined it, the Tabernacle also held a central role in the Priestly narrative:

CITATION OMITTED[[1]](#footnote-1)

The non-Priestly tradition of the Torah recognizes a completely different “Tent of Meeting.” The term is identical, but its description, characteristics, and role are completely different. For example, the narrative in Ex 33:7-11 describes the Tent of Meeting as מחוץ למחנה הרחק מן המחנה (“outside the camp, far from the camp,” Ex 33:7), in contrast to the Priestly Tent of Meeting which was situated within the camp (for example, Num 2:2). In this Tent of Meeting the pillar of cloud descended and spoke with Moses outside the entrance to his tent (Ex 33:10), as opposed to the meeting which takes place in the Priestly Tent of Meeting מעל הכפרת מבין שני הכרבים אשר על ארון העדת (“from between the two cherubim which are on the Ark of the Testimony,” Ex 25:22). Joshua is permanently situated in this Tent (Ex 33:11), as opposed to the Priestly sources which prohibit non-Levites from entering the Tent (Num 18:6-7). This Tent does not house any ritual items, and does not serve as a Tabernacle for the Lord and His service. This is a prophetic Tent where Divine revelations occur for כל מבקש ה' (“everyone who sought the Lord,” Ex 33:7). Other details from this tradition regarding the prophetic Tent are found in other places in the Torah as well, such as in the story of placing God’s spirit upon the seventy elders of Israel (Num 11:16-17, 28-29), in the story of Miriam and Aaron doubting the singularity of Moses’ prophecy, protesting that הרק אך במשה דבר ה' הלא גם בנו דבר (“Has the Lord indeed spoken only through Moses? Has He not spoken through us also?,” Num 12:2-15), and in the story of transferring the leadership from Moses to Joshua (Deut 31:14-15).[[2]](#footnote-2)

This means that it is only in the Priestly narrative that the Tent of Meeting serves as a Tabernacle which houses all the holy vessels and the Ark, or in the later sources, which were influenced by the Priestly narrative after the reception of the Torah during the Second Temple period (TEXTS).[[3]](#footnote-3) Therefore, the two appearances of the “Tent of Meeting” in Samuel (1Sam 2:22) and Kings (1Kgs 8:4), where it is described, as in the Priestly narrative in the Torah, as a roaming Tabernacle, are surprising, and demand explanation. The scholar we are honoring asked me many years ago whether one of these two texts, the story of bringing the Ark and the Tent of Meeting to Solomon’s Temple (1Kgs 8:4), shows that the concept of the Tent of Meeting as Tabernacle was known beyond the Priestly literature. I now offer my detailed response. These two texts are usually discussed separately in the scholarly literature, but the discussion of both together, as I demonstrate below, offers a better understanding of the literary phenomenon it reflects, where one text elucidates the other. An inclusive view of the two cases can also teach of the processes which took place in the writings of the Former Prophets during the Second Temple era, after the Torah was consolidated and accepted. The conclusions that arise from this study may be a first step toward future research on the materials in the Former Prophets which are similar to the Torah sources, especially the book of Joshua.[[4]](#footnote-4)

**1. 1 Sam 2:22**

The only mention of the term “Tent of Meeting” in the book of Samuel is found in the story of Eli’s sons. The mention of the Tent of Meeting in this verse raises several difficulties, and in addition, it is mentioned only in the MT but is missing in the Septuagint version and the Samuel scroll from Qumran:

TEXTS

Many scholars have suggested that the short version in the Septuagint reflects the earlier version. They base this on several central considerations: First, the unit which precedes this verse gives a detailed account of the sins of the sons of Eli in their violent manner of ritual worship but does not mention other sins. Their sin consisted in seizing their portion of the sacrifice before it was cooked: גם בטרם יקטרון את החלב ובא נער הכהן ואמר לאיש הזבח תנה בשר לצלות לכהן ולא יקח ממך בשר מבשל כי אם חי (“Before they burned the fat, the priest's servant would come and say to the man who sacrificed, ‘Give meat for roasting to the priest, for he will not take boiled meat from you, but raw,’” 1Sam 2:15), as opposed to the norm that was customary in Shiloh (1Sam 2:13-14). The report of their sin with הנשים הצבאות פתח אהל מועד (“the women who assembled at the door of the Tabernacle of meeting,” 1Sam 2:22) appears only in retrospect, in the description of the rumor which reached Eli (this appears only in the MT, as noted above). Second, the mention of the Tent of Meeting is very unusual. Elsewhere in the story of Eli and his sons, the place of worship in Shiloh was called בית ה' (“the house of the Lord,” 1Sam 1:7; 3:15) and היכל ה' (“the Temple of the Lord,” 1:9; 3:3),[[5]](#footnote-5) meaning a structure with doorposts (*mezuzah*, 1:9), doors (3:15), and a *sha’ar*, or ‘gate’ (4:18), with no indication that the Temple in Shiloh was constructed as a tent or included a tent.[[6]](#footnote-6) The attestation of 4QSama which does not include reference to Eli’s sons’ new sin also provides support for this version. Although the Qumran version underwent a different type of expansion (after 1Sam 4:15 there is another explicit mention of Eli’s age, בן תשעים שנה [ושמונה שנים] (“ninety years [and eight years] old,” after the words “Now Eli was very old”), it does not refer to the sexual sins of Eli’s sons and it seems that in this place the scroll version developed from an earlier version of the MT.

Most scholars propose that the words ואת אשר ישכבון את הנשים הצבאות פתח אהל מועד (“and how they lay with the women who assembled at the door of the Tabernacle of meeting”), which do not appear in the Septuagint or the scroll, were added at a later stage, and are based on the verse ויעש את הכיור נחשת ואת כנו נחשת במראת הצבאת אשר בצאו פתח אהל מועד (“He made the laver of bronze and its base of bronze, from the bronze mirrors of the serving women who assembled at the door of the Tabernacle of meeting,” Ex 38:8). The affinity between this verse and the one in Samuel is clear, as both end almost identically: הצבאות פתח אהל מועד (“who assembled at the door of the Tabernacle of meeting”). This assumption coheres with other texts which were added later on, and were formulated by mimicking the Torah style, especially that of P, which comprises a significant part of the Torah.[[7]](#footnote-7) Recently, Domenico LoSardo challenged this assumption and suggested that it is the text in Ex 38:8 which is based on the MT version of Samuel, even if 1Sam 2:22 was added relatively later on.[[8]](#footnote-8) This suggestion is based on one significant piece of evidence (see below), but the assumption that some author decided to add details of Eli’s sons sleeping with the assembled women based on the Torah’s description of the bronze laver is unconvincing. Furthermore, the plus style in Samuel is very unusual within the Former Prophet books in general, and within Samuel in particular, while it is very appropriate to the style of the Priestly material in the Torah (which describes the construction of the Tabernacle in Exodus). So, for example, the expression פתח אהל מועד (“at the door of the Tabernacle of meeting”) which appears in 1Sam 2:22 appears several times in Exodus-Numbers,[[9]](#footnote-9) but with the exception of this verse, it does not appear outside of Joshua. The verb *šv’* (צב"א) in the sense of serving in some capacity, parallel to the word-pair *“la’avod ‘avodah”* (‘be on duty’), which is also its meaning in Ex 38:8 and in 1Sam 2:22, appears only in the Priestly material (Num 4:23; 8:24).[[10]](#footnote-10) Apart from the Priestly material, this verb is used in the military sense (‘fight against’) (TEXTS).[[11]](#footnote-11) If the form of the verse is Priestly, then it is difficult to claim that the first appearance of the verse was in Samuel, and later found its way to the Torah.

However, the verse in Exodus also raises several difficulties: (1) Our attention is drawn first to the fact that in the MT manuscripts, the verse in Ex 33:8 is singled out between two line breaks (*‘parashot setumot’*). (2) Second, the mention of the Tent of Meeting in Ex 33:8 assumes it obvious that the Tent of Meeting already exists, and it is from there that they took the materials used for the construction of the bronze laver; whereas according to the wider context which is dedicated to the description of the construction of the Tent of Meeting, this institution was naturally not yet completed. (3) In addition, the description of the construction of the Tabernacle vessels is usually brought parallel to the description of the commandment for their construction, both in order and in formulation. So, for example, the commandment to build the altar and the courtyard which appear in Ex 38 almost completely repeat the commandment which appears in Ex 27 following the same order, though the commandment to construct the bronze laver does not appear in Ex 27:

TABLE

Instead, the commandment to construct the bronze laver is found in Ex 30 (17-21), separated from the rest of the commandments of preparing the vessels for the Tabernacle, and only after the commandment to pay the half-shekel (Ex 30:17-21). Furthermore, as opposed to most of the other Tabernacle vessels, the commandment and the execution differ in many details. The commandment is longer and more detailed and includes a reference to the priests, which is absent in the execution. On the other hand, the commandment does not refer to the mirrors from which the laver was to be constructed. This detail appears only in the execution of the במראת הצבאת אשר צבאו פתח אהל מועד (“the bronze mirrors of the serving women who assembled at the door of the Tabernacle of meeting,” 38:8). This is not the place to discuss all the details of the commandment to build the Tabernacle, their execution, and the different versions found in these chapters,[[12]](#footnote-12) but even this information suffices to give the impression that the verse in Ex 38:8 does not belong there, even though it resembles the Priestly style which characterizes these chapters.

In light of all the above, there is room to suppose that the notice of the bronze laver in Exodus was added to the Tabernacle section by a later Priestly hand.[[13]](#footnote-13) However, as noted above, the similar verse in 1Samuel is also anomalous and missing in some of the versions. We might then ask whether this is an independent ‘roaming’ tradition about the ‘women/mirrors who assembled at the door of the Tabernacle of meeting’ which entered both books independently, during one of their stages of development. Similar phenomena of ‘roaming texts’ are also found in other places in the Bible, and can be identified by their anomaly within the places they appear – in each version in a different place, and occasionally in different books.[[14]](#footnote-14) In contrast to the other cases of ‘roaming texts,’ the verse in Ex 38:8 and in 1Sam 2:22 are not identical or sufficiently similar. In addition, the terminology of this verse is Priestly, and its style coheres well with this section of the Torah. Furthermore, the topic of the bronze laver is broadly developed in Exodus, but it is anomalous in Samuel. Therefore, it seems that this difficult verse (Ex 38:8) developed earlier within the Priestly text which was embedded in the Torah. The puzzling character of the text, and its isolation within the pericope (as emerges from the spacings of the closed portions which border it), led to homiletic (*midrash*) interpretations. As is often seen in Rabbinic literature, a difficult text, which seems to conceal a fuller story, serves as a springboard for creative midrashic exegesis.[[15]](#footnote-15)

Indeed, the verse in Ex 38:8 is difficult to understand, and its form as we have it today may be corrupt. The word *mar’ot* is usually interpreted as ‘mirrors,’ though in this sense it is unique in the Bible.[[16]](#footnote-16) The root *šv’* (צב"א) is used, regarding Levites, parallel to *‘eved* (slave) and in the sense ‘to be on duty’ (Num 4:23; 8:24); therefore, this verse was always interpreted as speaking of the ‘mirrors’ which served the women who fulfilled some sort of role at the entrance to the Tent of Meeting.[[17]](#footnote-17) However, it is difficult to understand what the women were doing there, or why the Tent of Meeting is mentioned when it had not yet been constructed. This led the ancient translations and the Sages to broaden this puzzling notice in Ex 38:8. The more literal translations, such as the Vulgate, added the word ‘women’ before *ha-šove’ot*, as clarification: TEXT.[[18]](#footnote-18) Other translations, such as Onkelos, tried to explain what the women were doing there: TEXT;[[19]](#footnote-19) whereas looser translations, as well as Rabbinic homiletics, tried to deal apologetically with the notions of vanity and the arousal of lust that are associated with the mention of the women and the mirrors. So, for example, Pseudo Jonathan translated: TEXT.[[20]](#footnote-20) It is therefore possible that the inserted verse in 1Sam 2:22 which adds the extra sin of the sons of Eli with the women who were at the Tent of Meeting is an earlier homiletic which developed on the basis of the verse in Exodus and the narrative in Samuel, both as an attempt to explain the obscure verse in Ex 38:8, and as a theodicy within the narrative context in Samuel which tries to justify the harsh punishment of Eli’s sons and the termination of this entire branch of priests (1Sam 2:27-36). In any case, the textual witnesses clearly show that this sentence was added in one of the phases of the development of Samuel, after the textual tradition had already split into the branches of the Septuagint and the Qumran scroll on the one hand, and the pre-Masoretic text on the other.

**2. Solomon brings the Tent of Meeting to the Temple (1Kgs 1:8)**

Another mention of the Tent of Meeting beyond the Priestly material in the Torah (and in Joshua) is found in the story of Solomon bringing the Ark to the Temple. In 1Kgs 8:4 we read that the Ark was brought to the Temple together with the Tent of Meeting and all the holy vessels which were in the Tent, in terms similar to those which are used in the Priestly account in the Torah: ויעלו את ארון יהוה ואת אהל מועד ואת כל כלי הקדש אשר באהל (“Then they brought up the Ark of the Lord, the Tabernacle of meeting, and all the holy furnishings that were in the Tabernacle”).[[21]](#footnote-21) Similar to the previous case in Samuel, here too the significant textual differences between the MT and the Septuagint in this chapter show that the text underwent various stages of development. However, in contrast to the previous case, here the text which speaks of the Tent of Meeting is found in all the main textual witnesses. How can this be explained? Does the mention of the Tent of Meeting belong to the earlier stratum of the account of transferring the Ark, or is the entire unit influenced by Priestly materials (and we should therefore not place too much importance on the version of the Septuagint, as it may have reflected a later adaptation of the MT)? The first option is supported by, for example, R.A. Friedman, who describes, using complex mathematical calculations, the special place in the Temple which was prepared for the Tent of Meeting. Friedman views the notice regarding the Tent of Meeting as an integral part of the ancient story of bringing the Ark to the Temple, and perhaps even a reliable reflection of a memory or some ancient tradition. The other approach is supported by Menachem Haran, who notes that these verses contain a series of Priestly texts, but he does not use the Septuagint as evidence for any indication of identifying the Priestly-style additions.[[22]](#footnote-22)

The forthcoming analysis, using the textual witnesses and a complex of literary-historical considerations, shows that the text in Kings which relates the construction of the Temple inspired different authors over different time periods to add slight additions in the Priestly style, probably over two stages of the textual transmission. One stage can be examined through the differences in the text of chapter 8. This textual witness teaches of the integration of short additions in the Priestly style which entered the text at a later stage, after the separation of the pre-Masoretic and pre-LXX texts (section 2.1, below). The additions such as those found in chapter 6 entered at this stage as well. A different, probably earlier stage, which occurred before the separation of the central textual witnesses of Kings, can be examined through a series of literary-historical considerations (section 2.3, below). The text that mentions the Tent of Meeting in 1Kgs 8:4, which stands at the center of this discussion, entered at this stage as well. I will present the meaning and intention of the P-like texts in the following survey.

**2.1 Late stage of quasi-P additions: LXX and MT 1Kgs 8:1-5**

A comparison between these two textual witnesses shows that the Septuagint preserves a shorter version of this story than the MT, with the exception of the first verse, where the Septuagint includes a more extensive addition. In the following table the pluses are indicated in bold, while the minor changes between the two versions appear in italics:

TABLE

 The LXX contains a long plus in the first part of verse 1, which Charles F. Burney posited to be an addition by the Greek translator.[[23]](#footnote-23) However, the obviously Hebraist character of some expressions in this half-verse points to a Hebrew *Vorlage*.[[24]](#footnote-24) This half-verse may also reflect a better reading omitted by a later scribe who was uncomfortable with the idea that Solomon brought the Ark into the Temple only after he had finished building his palace, thirteen years after he completed the Temple (twenty years in total). The MT in chapter 8 gives the impression that the Ark was brought into the Temple immediately after its completion (1Kgs 7:51), although reading 1Kgs 7:1–12 in its current position may support the LXX chronology. Further on in the story, the MT includes a broader text, where here too it seems that the MT reflects a later stage in the text’s development. If we remove the marked expansions from the MT, we are left with a logical and natural sequence that appears to preserve the relatively ancient account of bringing the Ark from the City of David to Solomon’s Temple in the month of Ethanim. As in MT 1Sam 2:22, the additional stratum in the MT contains linguistic elements characteristic of the Priestly strata of the Pentateuch. In a previous study, I called these elements “quasi-Priestly” additions, as they imitate the style of the legal sections of the Torah (of which P constitutes a major component), but they do not constitute part of the Pentateuchal P story. In MT v. 1, the words את כל ראשי המטות נשיאי האבות (“and all the heads of the tribes, the leaders of the ancestral houses of the Israelites”) were added to describe the audience.[[25]](#footnote-25) The terms מטות (“tribes”), ראשי מטות (“heads of the tribes”), and נשיא (“leader, prince”) are all typical of P but rare in other biblical texts.

 The second verse originally only included the ancient local name of the month Ethanim as the date of this event.[[26]](#footnote-26) The additional stratum in the MT clarifies this for later readers: הוא החֹדש השביעי (“which is the seventh month”). This phrase not only simplifies the ancient date but also adds new content, identifying the transfer of the Ark into the Temple and the festival celebrating this event (1Kgs 8:65) with the Sukkot festival of the seventh month mentioned in the Priestly texts. Only the Priestly schools (Lev 23:33–44 [H]; Num 29:12–39 [P]) give a fixed date for the festival of the seventh month, while Deuteronomy and other non-P sources do not mention any specific date. The verses in Exodus provide an undefined date: בצאת השנה באספך את מעשיך מן השדה (“at the end of the year, when you gather in from the field the fruit of your labor,” Ex 23:16), or תקופת השנה (“at the turn of the year,” Ex 34:22), as does Deut 16:13 באספך מגרנך ומיקבך (“when you have gathered in the produce from your threshing floor and your winepress”).[[27]](#footnote-27)

According to the LXX form of the text of v. 3, “the priests carried the Ark.” The author of the plus in the MT, who is familiar with the Priestly texts, repeats this information in v. 4, rewrites it and adds “and the Levites.” It seems that he may have sought to emphasize that it was the Levites who carried the Ark, in accordance with the Priestly regulation (Num 3–4, 7:4–9, 18:1–7).[[28]](#footnote-28)

The LXX v. 5 also comprises a more convenient text than the MT. Instead of the shorter version וכל ישראל (“and all Israel”), MT uses the redundant וכל עדת ישראל הנועדים עליו אתו (“the congregation of Israel who had assembled before him with him”). Here, too, עדה and הנועדים are characteristic of Priestly terminology: compare לכל העדה הרעה הזאת הנועדים עלי (“to all this wicked congregation gathered together against me,” Num 14:35) and אתה וכל עדתך הנעדים על ה' (“all your congregation have gathered together against YHWH,” Num 16:11).[[29]](#footnote-29)

In addition, it is worth noting that 1Kgs 8:4 mentions the Tent of Meeting, which stands at the focus of this study, even in the short version found in the LXX. I will discuss this issue after analyzing another text in the Temple account (1Kgs 6-8) which is missing from the most important manuscript of the LXX, manuscript B -- 1Kgs 6:11–14.

**2.2. A Late Stage of Quasi-P additions: LXX and MT 1 Kgs 6:11–14**

This is a relatively larger unit (three verses plus one extra, which serves as a resumptive repetition, or *Wiederaufnahme*) and not a series of short additions as in the previous case. However, it seems that this unit was produced by the same hand which added the pluses in 1Kgs 8:1-5, as both cases show a familiarity with the terminology of the Priestly strata of the Torah, and the texts in both cases are absent from the Septuagint. As I mentioned in another study,[[30]](#footnote-30) the description of Solomon’s construction of the Temple is interrupted in MT by YHWH addressing Solomon regarding the Temple (1Kgs 6:11-13). The text then returns to Solomon completing the construction of the Temple, with a resumptive repetition noted in bold, as can be seen here:

TEXTS

 Verse 15, which depicts the overlay of the structure with boards of cedar, clearly follows most naturally after 6:1–10, which detail the construction of the Temple. Since no plausible reason exists for the deletion of vv. 11–14 by the LXX translator,[[31]](#footnote-31) nor can we reconstruct a “scribal accident” in its Hebrew *Vorlage*, it is much more reasonable to assume that 1Kgs 6:11–14 was added to the Hebrew text at a later stage of its development, which is the reason these verses are absent from the LXXB.[[32]](#footnote-32) This thesis is supported by a number of considerations. First, these verses clearly do not constitute a coherent narrative unit. The circumstances in which they were uttered are not clear, nor is there any indication of Solomon’s response. Second, the text in 1Kgs 9:2 relates that God “appeared to Solomon a *second time* as He had appeared to him at Gibeon,” referring to the revelation described in 1 Kings. This text seems to be unfamiliar with any Divine speech given to Solomon in 1Kgs 6.

While somescholars view the unit as Deuteronomistic,[[33]](#footnote-33) the terminology is characteristic neither of Kings nor of Deuteronomistic works. In fact, it recalls the Priestly document in the Pentateuch and the terminology of the H strata and Ezekiel.[[34]](#footnote-34) Both the idiom ללכת + בחקתי (“walk + in My statutes”) and the term משפטי (“My ordinances”) in v. 12 are prominent H expressions.[[35]](#footnote-35) The concluding verse of the speech, ושכנתי בתוך בני ישראל (“I will dwell among the children of Israel,” v. 13), reflects the key Priestly principle of God’s physical dwelling among the Israelites via His presence in the Temple (see especially ועשו לי מקדש ושכנתי בתוכם, “And have them make me a sanctuary, so that I may dwell among them,” Ex 25:8, cf. 29:46).[[36]](#footnote-36) As is well known, the Deuteronomistic stratum in Kings promotes precisely the opposite idea, insisting that it is God’s “name” that resides in the Temple rather than God Himself. According to the Deuteronomistic view, השמים ושמי השמים לא יכלכלוך (“Even heaven and the highest heaven cannot contain you”; 1 Kgs 8:27).[[37]](#footnote-37) The passage in 1 Kgs 6 thus appears to have been written by a scribe closely familiar with Priestly concepts and terminology. In addition, the first part of v. 11 (“Then I will establish My promise with you, which I made to your father David”) betrays the author’s knowledge of God’s words to David through Nathan (2Sam 7).[[38]](#footnote-38)

In addition to the attempt to tie the Solomonic Temple to the Pentateuchal Tabernacle, similar to the addition in 1Kgs 8:1–5, it seems that the scribe who added God’s words within the description of the construction of the Temple sought to convey another message. The Divine words added in 1Kgs 6 adduce a vital condition, in accord with Lev 26:1–13. This passage makes the Temple’s permanency conditional even before its construction has begun. The author, obviously writing during the post-Destruction period, sought to justify the events by addressing a warning found in Scripture itself.[[39]](#footnote-39) This is why the scribe inserted God’s words to Solomon in vv. 11–13, linking them to the context via v. 14, which serves as a *Wiederaufnahme* and rewrites the first part of v. 9: “When he finished building the House.” This condition fits here precisely, given the following verses which deal with the construction of the holy of holies “in the innermost part of the House …” (1 Kgs 6:19), where the Ark of the covenant and cherubim would rest, symbolizing the Divine presence.[[40]](#footnote-40)

**2.3. An Early Stage of Quasi-P additions: 1 Kgs 8:4, 10-11**

The cases discussed above were a group of texts written in the Priestly style (including H) which are absent in the Septuagint and are therefore clearly later additions. However, as noted above, in the account of the construction of Solomon’s Temple and bringing the Ark to Jerusalem, there are texts that appear to have a Priestly style but are documented in all the textual witnesses. This is the case in 1Kgs 8:4 which recounts that besides the Ark, which was brought to Jerusalem, the Tent of Meeting and all the holy vessels were brought as well: “and the Tabernacle of meeting, and all the holy vessels that were in the Tabernacle.”[[41]](#footnote-41)

The Rabbinic literature (BT *Sotah* 9a), as well as some modern exegetes, suggest that the Tent of Meeting was brought to Solomon’s Temple and placed in a defined place within it.[[42]](#footnote-42) However, other than the solitary verse in Samuel, which is a later addition as demonstrated above, there is no previous mention in the Samuel or Kings accounts of the Ark being placed in the Tent of Meeting, as in the Torah. Quite the opposite; the account in 2Sam 6 which tells of the Ark being moved to the City of David (from whence Solomon was said to bring it to the Temple) recounts that David put up a temporary tent for the Ark that he brought to Jerusalem, “So they brought the Ark of the Lord, and set it in its place in the midst of the Tabernacle that David had erected for it…” (2Sam 6:17; 7:2 cf. v. 6). Furthermore, the style of the verse attests that it, too, was formulated with an awareness of the Priestly style in the Torah. The expression כלי הקדש (“the holy vessels”) which appears here is found outside of this place only in the Priestly texts in the Torah, and even then, only in the relatively later strata of the Priestly materials (TEXT), or in Chronicles which was influenced by the same materials (TEXT). The story of the Ark moving to Solomon’s Temple, without the words which are absent in the Septuagint version and without v. 4 which also includes explicitly Priestly terminology, would be similar to the pattern of Ark stories in Samuel (bringing the Ark to the home of ‘Oved Edom, and from there to the City of David), and would also complete them:

TEXT

Two central issues emerge from the comparison to the other stories of the transfer of the Ark. The first is the date of the transfer, which is mentioned only in the Kings account, and the second is the mention of the Tent. The use of the ancient name of “the month of Ethanim” shows that this is part of the earlier tradition regarding the date when the Ark was brought to the City of David. It was only at a later stage that this event was identified with the festival of Sukkot. This detail was unique to the account of the Ark in Kings. The second unusual detail is the notice of the Tent of Meeting being transferred in addition to the Ark. Here the situation is different: the account of the Ark’s removal from the house of ‘Oved Edom indicated that it was placed in a temporary tent, and not in the Tent of Meeting which traveled with them from the desert and entered the land. It seems that a later author who related the story of transferring the Ark to the City of David identified the temporary tent, which is mentioned in the David stories of the Ark (2Sam 6:17), with the Tent of Meeting from the Torah, and added the mention of the Tent of Meeting. With this, he also connected between the Tabernacle and the Temple and created a continuum between the two such that Solomon’s Temple became the continuation of the Tabernacle mentioned in the Torah. These words in v. 4 which, as noted above, were of the Priestly style, were probably added even before the branch of the Septuagint broke off, and therefore appear in all the main textual witnesses.

The Solomon story has several other verses which can be identified as belonging to the same author who was influenced by the Priestly style, and who wished to present Solomon’s Temple as the continuation of the desert-era Tabernacle.[[43]](#footnote-43) The continuation of this chapter includes a relatively lengthy text recounting the events after the Ark was brought into the Temple (1Kgs 8:10–11). Most commentaries and studies on Kings analyze this section only briefly and do not offer a convincing explanation for the presence of such a P-like text in the book of Kings.[[44]](#footnote-44) A comparison of this text with the parallel depiction of the bringing of the Ark into the Tabernacle at the end of Exodus (40:34–35) indicates the close affinities between these two texts:

TEXT

These texts surely depend on one another. While one may suggest that the Priestly description in the Pentateuch (usually regarded as a late work) had been influenced by the description of Solomon’s Temple, the distinctive Priestly expressions in this unit, which are quite rare in Kings, indicate that the latter was influenced by the Priestly account, rather than vice versa. Thus, for example, כבוד יהוה (“the Glory of YHWH”) is a distinctively Priestly expression that occurs frequently in P and in Ezekiel, but only once in Kings—in our unit.[[45]](#footnote-45) In addition, this description of the entry of the Divine presence (כבוד) into the Temple has no further mention in Kings; in fact, Solomon’s prayer (1Kgs 8:22–53) repeatedly refers to God’s “dwelling place in the heavens,” in seeming direct contradiction to the notion of God’s presence in the Temple. The parallel passage in Exodus, however, fits nicely into the P sequence. Lev 1:1 resumes from Moses’ inability to enter the Tabernacle because of the Divine presence. YHWH calls him from within the Tabernacle, ויקרא אל משה וידבר ה' אליו מאהל מועד לאמר (“and YHWH called to Moses and spoke to him from the Tent of Meeting, saying”) and gives him a series of ritual laws. Following the priests’ ordination, the Divine presence (כבוד) appears to all the people (Lev 9:23). In the Priestly account this scene parallels and continues the story of the Divine presence which dwelt on Mount Sinai for six days, and on the seventh day called Moses and instructed him to build the Tabernacle (Ex 24:15b—18a; 25:1ff.)

In addition to 1 Kgs 8:4, 10-11, this Temple unit drew a few additional several short phrases from the Priestly terminology of the Tabernacle chapters. The term קדש הקדשים (“the holy of holies”), for example, appears three times in 1 Kings (6:16; 7:50; 8:6). In the Pentateuch, this term frequently denotes the most sacred part of the Tabernacle, where the Ark and the cherubim stand and Moses meets with God “from above the ark-cover, from between the two cherubim” (Ex 25:22).[[46]](#footnote-46) In contrast, the chapters relating to Solomon’s Temple refer to the inner sanctum as the דביר (“inner sanctuary,” 1Kgs 6:5, 16, 19–20, 31; 7:49; 8:6, 8). According to the narrative, Solomon built this part of the Temple to house the Ark (1 Kgs 6:19), placing two huge cherubim there (1 Kgs 6:23). The phrase קדש הקדשים is twice attached to the more common term דביר:ויבן לו מבית לדביר לקדש הקדשים (“and he built this within as an inner sanctuary, as the holy of holies,” 1Kgs 6:16);ויבאו הכהנים את ארון ברית יהוה אל מקומו אל דביר הבית אל קדש הקדשים (“The priests brought the Ark of YHWH’s covenant to its place in the inner sanctuary of the house, to the holy of holies,” 1Kgs 8:6). The sense of redundancy and the smooth sequence obtained without the phrase קדש הקדשים confirm that the latter was added at a secondary stage by a scribe who identified this part of Solomon’s Temple with the holy of holies of the Tabernacle. The phrase קדש הקדשים appears one more time in the book of Kings, in 1Kgs 7:50:והפתות לדלתות הבית הפנימי לקדש הקדשים לדלתי הבית להיכל זהב (“the sockets for the doors of the innermost part of the house, the holy of holies, and for the doors of the nave of the Temple, of gold”). In this text, the phrase קדש הקדשים replicates the expression הבית הפנימי and violates the sequence of the description of the doors. As mentioned above, in all three cases the term קדש הקדשים is documented in all the major versions of Kings as it appears in 1Kgs 8:4, 10-11. All these quasi-Priestly phrases were intended to fuse the account of the building of the Temple with Pentateuchal traditions, making the Solomonic Temple a direct continuation of the Priestly Tabernacle.

**Conclusions**

The survey presented here indicates that all mentions of the Tent of Meeting in Samuel and Kings are later additions, which entered the text during one of the later transmission stages, after the stories in the Torah became accepted and authoritative within the community. The text of 1Sam 2:22 entered at a much later stage, as a sort of homiletic development of the text of the Tabernacle story, intended to serve as a theodicy for the harsh punishment given to the house of Eli, and is therefore absent in the Septuagint and 4QSama accounts. In contrast, the text in 1Kgs 8:4 entered at a relatively early stage and is therefore documented in all the principal manuscripts of Kings. This text entered together with a small group of P-type additions (such as 1Kgs 8:10-11), which were designed to connect between the Torah account and that of Solomon’s Temple and create a continuum between the two. Priestly-style additions entered Kings only in the Temple account (1Kgs 6-8), and it seems that the unique character of this unit attracted authors-copyists to enter, over time, additions such as these in the style of the Torah texts (especially P) in order to create a continuity between the Glory of God residing within the Tabernacle in the desert and its relocation to the Temple in Jerusalem.

Given the fact that all the texts in Samuel and Kings are later additions which are based on the Priestly account in the Torah, it seems that in ancient Israel only the Priestly school used the term “Tent of Meeting” to denote a magnificent Temple which escorted the nation in its wanderings. Beyond the Priestly school the term “Tent of Meeting” was used in a different sense, as a prophetic tent. Among the ancient traditions were those who refer to the Ark residing in a tent, but these traditions referred to the temporary tent which David erected for that purpose (2Sam 6:17; 7:2) or traditions of a simple tent which served the Ark during its wanderings (2Sam 7:6). It is possible that all these ideas developed over time into the Priestly account of the “Tent of Meeting” which served as a Tabernacle and a portable Temple in the desert. this issue goes beyond the scope of the current study as it diverts the discussion from the reflection of P in the later strata of the biblical historiography to the sources of inspiration for the Priestly works, a topic which deserves development in another setting.
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