

The Wilderness Sanctuary as the Archetype of Continuity between the Pre- and the Postexilic Temples of Jerusalem

Dominik Markl

The sheer splendour of the wilderness sanctuary, the many tons of gold, silver and wood, and the precious cloth that Israel purportedly used to construct it at Mount Sinai (Exod 25; 35), made critics doubt the sanctuary's historicity as early as the beginning of the nineteenth century.¹ Today, the great majority of scholars are *d'accord* that the sanctuary is symbolic,² idealized or utopian rather than historical.³ Its origin and function, however, have been disputed. Are the descriptions of the sanctuary a preexilic "result of converging streams of tradition that included the physical experience ... of the post-Ahaz temple of Jerusalem", as Cory D. Crawford recently argued?⁴ Are they a reaction to the loss of the temple and an expression of "how the Priestly writers realized their claims for a new social relationship among the exiles in Babylon", as Mark K. George claims?⁵ Or are they rather a postexilic "copy ... of the temple at Jerusalem", as Julius Wellhausen classically assumed?⁶

¹ VATER, *Commentar*, 658–659 (1805); DE WETTE, *Beiträge*, vol. 1, 258–261, vol. 2, 259–262 (1806). Besides my co-editors, I thank Norbert Lohfink and Herbert Niehr for valuable comments on this manuscript.

² On the sanctuary's symbolism see JACOB, *Exodus*, 855–922; CHILDS, *Exodus*, 537–539; JENSON, *Holiness*, 111–114; FISCHER / MARKL, *Exodus*, 277–284.

³ The only recent exception is, to my knowledge, HOMAN, *Tents*. According to this position, P, dated to the seventh century BCE (133), is "acting as a responsible historian. Far from inventing the structure, he is using written texts, composed several centuries earlier, which record in detail an elaborate tent shrine. P's source would be records describing an actual structure dating to the Late Bronze II/Iron I" (134). As Homan indicates, this view is strongly informed by CROSS, "Tabernacle" (1947).

⁴ CRAWFORD, "Shadow", 130. A generally pre-exilic date is also proposed, e. g., by KNOHL, *Sanctuary*, who attributes portions of the tabernacle texts to the "Priestly Torah" (which he dates "between the mid-tenth century BCE and the mid-eighth century BCE", *ibid.*, 229), while allowing for later additions by the "Holiness School", whose work "was apparently accomplished during the Babylonian exile or during the period of the return to Zion" (*ibid.*, 224). For Propp, "P makes the most sense as a *protest* against the Temple hierarchy", being "implicitly antimonarchical ... and anti-Temple" from the "late monarchic period, attaining their final form in the exile or early restoration" (*Exodus 19–40*, 732). A pre-exilic date for the sanctuary texts is considered possible by LISS, "Sanctuary", esp. 688–689.

⁵ GEORGE, *Tabernacle*, 44. For a similar position see BARK, *Heiligtum*, 121–122.

⁶ WELLHAUSEN, *Prolegomena*, 37 (and 38). For a helpful review of diverse positions see UTZSCHNEIDER, *Heiligtum*, 55–70; *idem*, "Tabernacle"; HOUTMAN, *Exodus*, 325–332; for

I shall argue here that one of the central purposes of the sanctuary texts in their latest stages⁷ is to create continuity between the cults of the pre- and the postexilic temples of Jerusalem. The argument will be introduced by brief expositions of examples of the construction of cultic continuity both in extra-biblical and biblical texts. I will then focus on the historical role of two central objects from the sanctuary – the ark and the menorah.⁸ The contradictory result of this analysis will lead to a historical reconstruction that, finally, is to be evaluated with regard to its implications for the Torah's rise after the fall of Jerusalem.

1. Cultic Continuity: Some Extra-Biblical Evidence

Before entering into my central argument, I shall justify an assumption that could – but maybe should not – be taken for granted: that cultic continuity was often expressed in the ancient world through continuity in the measurements of the architecture and the paraphernalia of temples that were held (or claimed) to be of divine origin. While I shall go on to explore biblical evidence, this will be contextualized here by extra-biblical examples. I will limit myself to quoting from two texts from the Neo-Babylonian period and Hellenistic Judaism that may well have historical affinities to cultic attitudes found in the Pentateuch: the *Sippar Cylinder of Nabonidus* and the *Letter of Aristaeas*.

In the background to Ancient Near Eastern attitudes towards temple architecture lies an assumption that Claus Ambos summarizes as follows: “As the gods themselves had built their original temples ... the (re)construction of a sanctuary was merely the restoration of a primeval structure created in a mythical age”.⁹

earlier research on the sanctuary see the overview in CHILDS, *Exodus*, 529–537 and 547–550, and, e.g., SCHMITT, *Zelt* (1972); GÓRG, *Zelt* (1967). For the discussion on the date of “P” see esp. ZENGER, *Einleitung*, 189–214; OTTO, “Forschungen”.

⁷ Although the textual witnesses (esp. MT and LXX) differ strongly, which implies a great many difficulties reconstructing their history, my main argument will not be compromised by these issues. On the textual questions see esp. WADE, *Consistency* (2003); WEVERS, *History*, 117–146 (1992); systematically on Exod 35–40); *idem*, *Notes*, 391–516, 574–652 (1990); LE BOULLUEC / SANDEVOIR, *Exode*, 61–69, 250–317, 346–378 (1989); GOODING, *Account* (1959); POPPER, *Bericht* (1862).

⁸ Since the argument will involve both the analysis of historiography as presented in biblical texts and the reconstruction of historical processes, I request readers to follow me closely when I shift between these factually connected but methodologically distinct modes of proceeding.

⁹ AMBOS, “Rituale”, 19. Evidence for this idea is found in prayers recited in connection with the construction of temples (cf. *ibid.*, 22; MAYER, “Rituale”, 438–443; AMBOS, *Baurituale*, 193–195) and in building accounts such as the cylinder inscriptions of Gudea of Lagash; for examples see HUROWITZ, *House* (on Gudea esp. 38–40). VAN SETERS, “Fact and Ideology”, 51, considered the possibility that the Esagila Table, which gives various measurements relating to Etemenanki in Babylon (for the text see UNGER, *Babylon*, 237–249), “may reflect a priestly concern for continuity in the frequent restorations of Marduk’s temple”. MONTERO FENOLLOS, “Ziggurat”, esp. 128–134, however, has argued that the height of 90

It was common, therefore, for Babylonian kings to dig for the original foundations of a temple before reconstructing it.¹⁰ This was not merely an act of piety; harming the original divine design of the temple was considered dangerous. It could arouse the god's wrath, which might lead to the temple's collapse or some other mishap.¹¹

A particularly meticulous researcher of the original foundations of temples was Nabonidus, the last king of the Neo-Babylonian empire (r. 555–539 BCE). Or at least his scribes were eager to emphasize this, so that he has become an “archaeologist on the royal throne” in the eyes of modern scholars.¹² This *topos* should legitimize him – notwithstanding, or precisely because of, his radical religious reforms¹³ – as a “restorer of order”.¹⁴ In the Sippar cylinder,¹⁵ Nabonidus accuses Nebuchadnezzar of not having discovered the original foundations of Ebabbar, the temple of Šamaš in Sippar, before its restoration, so that it was damaged after only 45 years.¹⁶ Being greatly disturbed, Nabonidus “dug to a depth of eighteen cubits” to find the foundation of Narām-Sîn, “three thousand and two hundred years” old, and rebuilt the temple “not a finger's breadth too wide or too narrow”,¹⁷ so that he could lead Šamaš to his house “in joy and gladness”.¹⁸ The precise adherence to original measurements was an issue, it seems, that could decide between the wrath or joy of a deity.¹⁹

metres indicated in the Esagila Table cannot correspond to architectural reality. According to this interpretation, the table rather serves mathematical purposes (*ibid.*, 129).

¹⁰ On the “literary motif of ‘checking the foundation’ (*temenna ḥātu*)” see SCHAUDIG, “Restoration”, 147–149; NOVOTNY, “Temple”, 117; for a concise overview on the reconstruction of temples in the ancient Near East see DUBOVSKÝ, *Building*, 10–28.

¹¹ Cf. AMBOS, “Rituale”, 23–24. Šuma-iddina, governor of Nippur, was even accused of having deliberately made architectural changes to a sanctuary with the intention of bringing misfortune on King Esarhaddon (*ibid.*, 19–20). If a king chose to change the ground plan of a temple, specific divine legitimation needed to be adduced; cf. DUBOVSKÝ, *Building*, 11; AMBOS, “Rituale”, 25 (referring to Tukulti-Ninurta I's restoration of the temple of Ištar).

¹² Cf. SCHAUDIG, “Nabonid”, 447–448.

¹³ For a succinct summary see MACHINIST, “Imperialism”, 247–249.

¹⁴ SCHAUDIG, “Nabonid”, 491; cf. LIVERANI, “Memorandum”, 186–188.

¹⁵ The text is to be dated “after year 13, probably year 16” of Nabonidus' reign: BEAULIEU, *Nabonidus*, 42 (compare *ibid.*, 34). The many copies of the cylinder found in Sippar may indicate that it was meant to be distributed to other archives: SCHAUDIG, *Inschriften*, 415. This seems to evidence the importance attributed to the text in its purpose of serving royal propaganda.

¹⁶ Cf. AMBOS, “Rituale”, 23.

¹⁷ On the development of this motif see SCHAUDIG, “Restoration”, 149–150: “There are a few interesting texts that give every cubit, brick, and nearly every inch of the layout of the temples in Babylon and these compositions are certainly also to be seen in this context!”.

¹⁸ Quoted after Beaulieu's translation in *COS* 2:312. For the text see SCHAUDIG, *Inschriften*, 2.12 I II 47–III 7.

¹⁹ Legitimizing (even new) temples and rituals in terms of ancient traditions was very common in Babylonia, while Assyrian kings sometimes claimed to have founded new temples; cf. SCHAUDIG, “Cult”, esp. 150–152.

Nabonidus' royal ideologies may have been observed by Judean exiles in Babylonia before their return to Jerusalem. When they rebuilt the temple and restored its paraphernalia, they did concern themselves with architecture, measurements and their theological justification. Interestingly enough, the concern for continuity seems to be attributed to Persian temple restoration policy in the "Cyrus decree" of Ezra 6:3: "Let the house be rebuilt on the place [אתר] where they used to offer sacrifices and let its *foundations* be retained [ואשוהי מסובלין]."²⁰

A late, extra-biblical witness to this concern from the realm of Hellenistic Judaism is found in the *Letter of Aristeas* (*Let. Aris.*), which is most commonly dated to the second half of the second century BCE.²¹ Having related Ptolemy's request for translators of the Hebrew Law (*Let. Aris.*, 34–40) and the High Priest Eleazar's response (41–50), Aristeas portrays Ptolemy as making donations to the temple of Jerusalem (51–82). Driven by a strong impulse to show generosity, the king first intends to send a table five times larger than the previous one (52–53). Having conducted serious inquiries, however, and wishing for the table to serve the purposes of the cult, he finally decides that "the correct measure must neither be deviated from nor surpassed Where there were written prescriptions their measurements were to be adhered to" (55–56).²² Consequently, the dimensions and materials of the table are described, employing paraphrases from the instructions given in the Law: δύο γὰρ πῆχων τὸ μήκος τὸ δεῦρος πῆχος καὶ ἡμίσεος, "two cubits in length and a cubit and a half in height" (57, cf. LXX Exod 25:23).²³ Miming the words of an Egyptian king, the *Letter of Aristeas* bears witness to the author's genuinely Jewish concern. The cult in Jerusalem was to embody the divine prescriptions found in the Pentateuch.

²⁰ Translation of WILLIAMSON, *Ezra*, 68; cf. notes *ibid.*, 71. Another passage that contains the idea of the continuity of measurements is the restoration of the temple under Joash in 2 Chr 24:13: "They restored the house of God to its original design [מתכנתו]", more literally, "according to the appropriate measurement". Cf. KLEIN, *2 Chronicles*, 343.

²¹ Cf., e.g., BICKERMAN, "Datierung"; HADAS, *Aristeas*, 3–54; SCHIMANOWSKI, *Juden*, 30. The implied author, both a committed Jew and immersed in the Hellenistic culture of Alexandria, is a "citizen of two worlds": TCHERIKOVER, "Ideology", 84; HONIGMANN, *Septuagint*, 145–148. HACHAM, "Letter", 2: "The core of the ideology is easily discernible: a combination of total loyalty to Judaism and deep and active involvement with the Hellenistic world and culture".

²² Translation from HADAS, *Aristeas*, 123. The precision by which the instructions are to be followed actually evokes the canon formula (Deut 4:2) and mirrors the precision with which the translation is made (*Let. Aris.*, 310): KOVELMAN, *Alexandria*, 117–118.

²³ See the analysis by MEECHAM, *Letter*, 316–317; KOVELMAN, *Alexandria*, 117–118. According to LXX, the table is to be made out of pure gold; while according to MT it was to be made of acacia wood and overlaid with gold. This could be an indication that LXX "corrected" the Hebrew text, adjusting it to the reality of the Hellenistic table, perhaps the one restored under Judas Maccabeus (1 Macc 4:49), which may have replaced a simpler version from the Persian period. If this is the case, the text of LXX in itself would provide an example of the importance of the correspondence between divine instruction and cultic reality.

These two examples from the Neo-Babylonian and the Hellenistic Jewish worlds show that whoever was engaging in the construction of temples and cultic objects in the ancient Near East was confronted with delicate questions concerning the theological justification of his design. On what basis could one be sure that the house and objects made for a deity were pleasing to that deity? The need for the justification of continuity and adherence to divine designs evident in these texts may help us understand biblical treatments of sanctuaries and their paraphernalia, on which we shall now focus our interest.

2. Constructions of Cultic Continuity in Biblical Historiography

Moving the focus to the Hebrew Bible, I shall now look at how cultic continuity is construed in historiographical texts, concentrating on two major transitions, from the wilderness sanctuary to Solomon's temple and from the pre- to the postexilic temple.

2.1 Continuity between the Wilderness Sanctuary and Solomon's Temple (1 Kgs 8:1–11)

The construction of the temple in Jerusalem having been completed (1 Kgs 6–7), its dedication (1 Kgs 8) is introduced by a series of events (vv. 1–11) which connect Solomon's temple with the establishment of the cult at Sinai / Horeb, as narrated in the Pentateuch. The central subject of the passage is the transport of the ark, which is introduced as the purpose of the assembly (v. 1); the ark is brought to the temple (vv. 3–4), honoured by sacrifices (v. 5) and moved to its place in the Holy of Holies (v. 6), where its appearance (vv. 7–8) and content (v. 9) are contemplated.²⁴

Read against the background of the Pentateuch and the narratives of Joshua to Kings, the transfer of the ark connects Solomon's temple with the introduction of the ark at Mount Sinai (Exod 25), mediated though a narrative thread created by the repeated reference to its movement.²⁵ While the transfer of the ark is an event that readers may expect, more surprisingly, further objects are mentioned: "They brought up the ark of YHWH, and the tent of meeting, and all the vessels of the sanctuary that were in the tent" (1 Kgs 8:4). The reference to the tent may be surprising²⁶ because it had not appeared on the stage of the narrative

²⁴ "Ark" is the *Leitwort* of the passage, with eight occurrences in 1 Kgs 8:1–9. It is introduced most solemnly as the "ark of the covenant of YHWH", and this solemn expression is also used at the climax of its transport into the Holy of Holies (v. 6; cf. the preparation in 6:19). Otherwise it is simply called "the ark" (vv. 3, 5, 7, 9) or "the ark of YHWH" (v. 4).

²⁵ Cf. e.g. Num 10:33, 35; Josh 3–4; 6; 1 Sam 4–6; 2 Sam 6; 15. While Deuteronomy introduces the Levites as the carriers of the ark (10:8; 31:9, 25), the theme of carrying the ark appears in the sanctuary texts in the motif of the poles (Exod 25:14; 37:5).

²⁶ FRIEDMAN, "Tabernacle", esp. 295, is unusual in considering the placement of the tabernacle in the Solomonic temple historically possible.

since 1 Sam 2:22 in Shiloh.²⁷ Since then, the ark had seemed to be travelling alone and, according to 2 Sam 6:3, it had not been kept in the tent, but in the house of Abinadab. Even more surprising may be the appearance of the vessels, which have not shown up since the book of Numbers (18:3; 31:6). Still more so, since the account of the construction of the temple had specified in great detail how Hiram and Solomon made “all the vessels” for the temple (1 Kgs 7:40, 45, 48, 50).²⁸ This seems to suggest that a double set of cultic vessels are provided for the temple – the ones freshly produced by Hiram, and the others from the tent of meeting, produced by Bezalel and his helpers at Mount Sinai.²⁹ This may raise suspicion. Was the account of the construction of the temple only secondarily, redactionally connected with the tent of meeting and its vessels from Mount Sinai?³⁰

Some motifs connect the transfer of the ark specifically with priestly texts, especially the “Holy of Holies” (v. 6)³¹ and the “poles” of the “ark” (vv. 7–8).³² Most prominently, the sanctuary texts provide the only explanation for the curious fact that the poles are not removed from the ark after its final transport, and for why so much attention is paid to their presence.³³

²⁷ This tension was smoothed out by the Chronicler, who introduced the tent at an earlier point: 2 Chr 1:3–13, which strengthens the analogy between the tent of the meeting and Solomon’s temple: “Die beim Zelt der Begegnung in Gibeon, der bisherigen Wohnung Jahwes, empfangene Weisheit erlaubt ... den Bau des Zedernhauses für Jahwe und seinen Namen in Jerusalem” (MOSIS, *Untersuchungen*, 135). On further aspects see also KLEIN, *2 Chronicles*, 22; JAPHET, *Chronicles*, 526–527.

²⁸ Cf. especially 1 Kgs 7:48: “all the vessels that [belong to] the house of YHWH”: כל הכלים אשר בית יהוה.

²⁹ COGAN, *1 Kings*, 279: “Rabbinic tradition spoke of their being stored away (*b. Sotah* 9a), and this was a reasonable surmise, since these vessels comprised an almost duplicate set”. As MULDER, *1 Kings*, 385, notes, Josephus (*Ant.* VIII 4.1 [104]) expands on the narrative of 1 Kgs 8 by claiming that the priests “set the lampstand, the table, and the golden altar in the sanctuary in front of the *adytum*, in the same positions they had occupied when they were situated in the tent” (JOSEPHUS, *Antiquities* 8–10, 29). Josephus seems to follow the Chronicler’s tendency to combine Solomon’s temple account with Moses’ sanctuary, while he might, at the same time, be alluding to the Herodian temple.

³⁰ NOTH, *Könige*, 177: “Die Erwähnung des ‘Begegnungszeltes’ und der ‘heiligen Geräte’ in 4aß ist schon nach der Formulierung ein offensichtlicher Zusatz im Sinne von P, mit dem die Kontinuität zum Wüstenheiligtum der Mosezeit hergestellt werden soll.” Cf. COGAN, *1 Kings*, 291; DEVRIES, *1 Kings*, 124.

³¹ The combination of “Holy of Holies” (קדש הקדשים) and “ark” (ארון) connects Exod 26:33–34; 1 Kgs 8:6 // 2 Chr 5:7 exclusively. In addition to these texts, the “Holy of Holies” (referring to the innermost sanctum) occurs in Num 4:4, 19; 1 Kgs 6:16; 7:50; 1 Chr 6:34; 2 Chr 3:8, 10; 4:22; Ezek 41:4. DUBOVSKY, *Building*, 117, considers the use of the expression in 1 Kgs 6–8 a redactional link with the tabernacle texts; cf. GRAY, *Kings*, 209: “a late gloss of the P redactor”. On the role of the Holy of Holies in the sanctuary’s “graded holiness” see HUNDLEY, “Spaces”.

³² The “poles” (בדים) of the “ark” (ארון) are referred to, besides 1 Kgs 8:7–8 // 2 Chr 5:8–9, exclusively in the sanctuary texts of the book of Exodus: 25:14–15; 35:12; 37:5; 39:35; 40:20.

³³ GRAY, *Kings*, 210: “The note on the projection of the staves left in the ark seems to be influenced by the priestly direction in Ex. 25.15”.

Exod 25:14–15: “And you shall put the *poles* into the rings on the sides of the *ark*, by which to carry the ark. The *poles shall remain* in the rings of the ark; *they shall not be taken from it.*”

1 Kgs 8:7–8: “And the cherubim made a covering above the *ark* and its *poles*. The poles were so long that the ends of the *poles were seen* from the holy place in front of the inner sanctuary; but they could not be seen from outside; *they are there to this day.*”³⁴

Some other motifs, however, are specifically reminiscent of Deuteronomistic language;³⁵ especially the reference to Moses’ placing the “tablets” into the “ark” “at Horeb” (v. 9), which creates a strong link with the scene as related by Moses in Deuteronomy:³⁶

Deut 10:5 “And I turned and came down from the mountain, and put the *tablets* in the *ark* ...”

1 Kgs 8:9 “There was nothing in the *ark* except the two *tablets* of stone that Moses had placed there at Horeb.”³⁷

The transfer of the ark is finally concluded by a theophany scene, which is most closely related to the priestly scene of the fulfilment of the tabernacle with the glory of God:³⁸

³⁴ The final words “to this day” are curious indeed, and explanations of them are extremely diverse. CHILDS, “Formula”, 292, suggests that the formula was derived from the “Book of the Acts of Solomon”. NOTH, *Könige*, 180, tries to argue that the expression refers to the narrated time and not to the time of the narrator (but he refers to Josh 4:9, which he seems to consider contradicting his own theory). SCHENKER, “Ark”, esp. 108–109, holds that the formula was first introduced by the Chronicler. Since it is not the task of the present paper to solve the riddle, it may suffice to note that the formula in any case emphasizes the correspondence between the instruction of Exod 25 and the cultic practice in Solomon’s temple.

³⁵ NOTH, *Könige*, 174, considers the expression יהוה ברית ארון כרת an “unequivocal trace of deuteronomistic work”.

³⁶ The combination of the terms “tablets” (לוחות) and “ark” (ארון) occurs, besides 1 Kgs 8:9 // 2 Chr 5:10 exclusively in Deut 10:1–3, 5. The sanctuary texts refer to the “testimony” (עדות) that Moses put into the ark (Exod 40:20). Moreover, the expression “at Horeb” (בחרב) echoes the introduction of the Mosaic account of these Horeb events in Deut 9:8. And finally, the precise expression “the two tablets of stone” with the article (שני לוחות האבנים) occurs, besides 1 Kgs 8:9, exclusively in Deut 9:10–11. The same expression, without the article, occurs in Exod 34:1, 4; Deut 4:13; 5:22; 10:1–3. On the narrative connection see also SONNET, *Book*, esp. 67. One could further add that the relative clause at the end of 1 Kgs 8:9 is strongly reminiscent of Deut 29:24:

Deut 29:24 **אשר כרת עמם בהוציאן אתם מארץ מצרים**
1 Kgs 8:9 **אשר כרת עם בני ישראל בצאתם מארץ מצרים**

³⁷ In the new context, the tablets may acquire a new symbolism as the (otherwise missing) foundation stone of Solomon’s temple; cf. SONNET, “Salomon”, 131.

³⁸ The two passages are connected by a cluster of motifs: “the cloud” (הענן); the “glory of YHWH” (כבוד יהוה); the “filling” (מלא) of the sanctuary and the inability (ולא יכלו / ולא יכלו) of ministers to enter the sanctuary. Moreover, the “dwelling” (שכן) of the cloud (Exod 40:35) is paralleled by God’s dwelling in 1 Kgs 8:12. On the contexts and development of the motif of the divine *shekinah* see JANOWSKI, “Einwohnung”.

Exod 40:34–35

And the cloud covered the tent of meeting, and the GLORY OF YHWH **filled** the tabernacle. And Moses *was not able* to enter the tent of meeting for [ׁ] the cloud settled upon it, and the GLORY OF YHWH **filled** the tabernacle.

1 Kgs 8:10–11

When the priests came out of the sanctuary, the cloud **filled** the house of YHWH, and the priests *were not able* to attend to minister because of the cloud: for [ׁ] the GLORY OF YHWH **filled** the house of YHWH.

Reading 1 Kgs 8:1–11, one might have the impression of hearing a Deuteronomistic and a priestly voice narrating this passage together, complementing each other.³⁹ This may well be the result of redactional processes. The function of both voices, however, is unequivocal. All these connections show a concerted effort to portray the inauguration of the Solomonic temple as both the continuation and re-institution of the divine presence as it was initiated at Sinai / Horeb during the very foundation of Israel. Various techniques are employed to imply this continuity. Cultic objects such as the ark, the tent and its vessels play a key role, but intertextual resemblances such as those between the theophany scenes leave no doubt for readers who perceive the macro-narrative that Zion is now becoming a new Sinai.

2.2 Continuity between the Pre- and the Postexilic Temples: The Vessels

A similar concern for cultic continuity, mediated through temple vessels, is seen in texts that explicitly engage with the restoration of the cult in Jerusalem after the Babylonian exile. Peter Ackroyd was the first to analyse the temple vessels as “a continuity theme”, and the respective texts have received further attention.⁴⁰ It may suffice here, therefore, to summarize some essential observations.

While the end of the Deuteronomistic version of history emphasizes the partial destruction and complete loss of the temple vessels as Babylonian booty (2 Kgs 24:13; 25:13–17, elaborated in even greater detail in Jer 52:17–23),⁴¹ the end of Chronicles draws a less disruptive picture, the purpose of which is seen at the beginning of Ezra. According to Chronicles, some of the vessels were taken to Babylon under Jehoiakim and prominently placed in Nebuchadnezzar’s

³⁹ Compare NOTH, *Könige*, 174, according to whom it is “kaum noch möglich, diese verschiedenen Schichten sauber von einander zu trennen”. COGAN, *1 Kings*, 291: “Considering that the inauguration of the temple was a foundational moment in the history of the Israelite cult, it is not surprising to find that several traditions converge at this juncture”.

⁴⁰ Cf. ACKROYD, “Vessels”; KALIMI / PURVIS, “Jehoiachin”; WEITZMAN, *Surviving*, esp. 13–25.

⁴¹ For an analysis see FISCHER, *Jeremia 26–52*, 647–650; and for a systematic analysis of the versions *idem*, *Stand*, 29–31.

“temple” (היכל, 2 Chr 36:7).⁴² Then, vessels were taken away under his son Jehoiachin (v. 10)⁴³ and finally, under Zedekiah, “all the vessels of the house of God, large and small” (v. 18) were brought to Babylon. According to the Chronicler, not a single vessel was destroyed! This is the literary prerequisite for their splendid restoration under King Cyrus.⁴⁴ “King Cyrus brought out the vessels of the house of YHWH that Nebuchadnezzar had carried away from Jerusalem and placed in the house of his gods The total of the gold and silver vessels was five thousand four hundred” (Ezra 1:7–11; cf. 6:5).⁴⁵

This historiographical conception of the Chronicler is given a dramatic prophetic background in the book of Jeremiah (MT). Both of the two relevant prophecies (Jer 27:16–22; 28:1–9) are located at the beginning of the reign of Zedekiah (27:1; 28:1). We shall here concentrate on the first and longer prophecy.⁴⁶ Jeremiah first rejects the opinion of false prophets who announce that the vessels taken away with the first deportation will soon be returned (27:16–17). He rather advises them to pray for the remaining vessels not to be taken away (v. 18), for YHWH declares that they will be taken to Babylon (vv. 19–22), “and there they shall stay, until the day when I give attention to them, says YHWH. Then I will bring them up and restore them to this place.”⁴⁷ This final note of hope may well be the prophecy whose fulfilment the Chronicler was seeking to portray,⁴⁸ since he presents Jeremiah as the authoritative prophet in regard to the Babylonian exile (2 Chr 36:22).

⁴² היכל most probably refers to a temple rather than to a palace in 2 Chr 36:7, since Chronicles frequently uses the term to refer to the temple of YHWH (e.g. 2 Chr 26:16; 27:2; 29:16). Accordingly, the expression בירושלם די היכלא די בבבל is used parallel to היכלא די בבבל in Ezra 5:14: “the gold and silver vessels of the house of God, which Nebuchadnezzar had taken out of the temple in Jerusalem and had brought into the temple of Babylon”. Therefore, these expressions are in accordance with Ezra 1:7 (בבית אלהיו), “in the house of his gods”. Historically, it is likely that booty was brought to temples in Babylon, especially to Esagila, as attested in Nebuchadnezzar’s inscriptions; cf. FRIED, “Temple”, 320.

⁴³ This idea seems to depend on Jer 27:20; 28:3–4: KALIMI / PURVIS, “Jehoiachin”, 453.

⁴⁴ Cf. ACKROYD, “Vessels”, 177–179; KALIMI / PURVIS, “Jehoiachin”, 455; KLEIN, 2 *Chronicles*, 543. On the symbolic meaning of the vessels see BECKING, “Witness”, esp. 273–276.

⁴⁵ If any such restoration ever happened, this figure attracts suspicion of being exaggerated. The Cyrus Cylinder is evidence that the restoration of deities to their temples was early Persian state ideology: “I made the gods, who had dwelled therein return to their places” (translation according to VAN DER SPEK, “Cyrus”, 263; for the text see SCHAUDIG, *Inschriften*, K2.1 32). Texts such as this “make clear that the god’s return is an absolutely necessary precondition for rebuilding a sanctuary devastated by foreign conquest” (FRIED, “Temple”, 323). A symbolic restoration of cultic vessels should thus not be considered historically impossible. For a quite confident view see ALBERTZ, *Israel*, 123.

⁴⁶ Jer 28:1–9 is a more concrete repetition of Jeremiah’s opposition to the false prophecy already contradicted in 27:16–17, dramatized in Jeremiah’s confrontation with Hananiah.

⁴⁷ The parallel text in LXX Jer 34:13–18 is much shorter and does not contain any prospect of the vessels being returned.

⁴⁸ Cf. KALIMI / PURVIS, “Jehoiachin”, 454–455.

The historicity of many aspects of events described in these texts relating to the temple vessels is highly doubtful. What we can gather from these observations, though, without any doubt, is the significance that was attributed to their restoration. They are supposed to be material remnants of the preexilic cult, and their restoration – even if only a literary one – creates continuity between the pre- and the post-exilic cults.⁴⁹ The Chronicler – the most systematic among the creators of continuity – seems even to bring the postexilic cult into continuity with the pre-Salomonic cult, right back to its original, Mosaic institution.⁵⁰

3. The Sanctuary's Ark and Menorah: Historical Evidence?

Having found ample evidence of cultic objects serving as guarantors of continuity in the historiographical works of the Hebrew Bible, it might be worth considering the function of the divinely inspired archetype of the cult found in the sanctuary texts of the book of Exodus. Did these texts intend to legitimate the divine origin of the historical objects of the cult in Jerusalem? The following analysis will focus on two central objects from the wilderness sanctuary, which will produce surprisingly different results with regard to their potential historical reality.⁵¹

3.1 *The Ark: Historical Reality in the Preexilic Temple*

Within Israel's grand narrative, the ark is introduced by the divine voice on Mount Sinai (Exod 25:10–22). The ark accompanies Israel as a *leitmotif* on its journey to the Promised Land until it is brought into Solomon's temple (1 Kgs 8:1–9, 21), where it is mentioned for the last time in Kings;⁵² and it remains conspicuously unmentioned in the account of the temple's destruction (2 Kgs 25). The ark's disappearance from the scene of Israel's history has sparked

⁴⁹ This is just one detail of the great project discernable in Chronicles: to situate the origins of the cult of the Second Temple in the history of the First.

⁵⁰ ACKROYD, "Vessels", 180: "The Chronicler indeed utilises the temple vessels theme as one of those by which ... he endeavours to establish the reality of the link between his contemporaries and the original establishment; and by implication and sometimes by statement right back before that to the Exodus period". This point is corroborated by the fact that the Chronicler shapes the account of the construction of Solomon's temple in great proximity to the wilderness sanctuary: VAN SETERS, "Account"; MOSIS, *Untersuchungen*, 136–150; for a summary see KLEIN, *2 Chronicles*, 44; on further aspects of the Chronicler's "recapitulative historiography" see BODA, "Legitimizing", 316–318.

⁵¹ A preliminary version of the following considerations has been presented in MARKL, "Funktion", 73–78.

⁵² The Chronicler makes the motif reappear once more in Josiah's speech at the passover (2 Chr 35:3). The Chronicler's great interest in the ark inspired BEGG, "Ark", to ask if the Chronicler might have hoped for its restoration (esp. 142–145).

numerous accounts of its fate, which attest to the great interest in the ark and the abundance of creativity employed to explain its mystery.⁵³

Was there really an ark in the temple of Jerusalem? Three observations suggest that an ark did in fact exist for some time in the preexilic temple. First, the many references to the ark (about 200) in a great variety of contexts and traditions are not likely all to be based on fiction.⁵⁴ Second, the evidence of chest sanctuaries in the cultural environment of ancient Israel renders the cultic function of an ark plausible in the context of the preexilic temple.⁵⁵ Third, Jeremiah expresses conflicting views regarding the ark: after the return to Zion, “says YHWH, they shall no longer say, ‘The ark of the covenant of YHWH’. It shall not come to mind, or be remembered, or missed; nor shall another one be made.” (Jer 3:16) The passage both expresses a strongly negative attitude to the ark and attests to its value to some. It seems unlikely that such conflicting attitudes should be constructed regarding a merely fictional literary motif; Jer 3:16 most probably reflects a historical conflict about the potential restoration of a real, lost cultic object. In accordance with these observations, it is commonly held that an ark existed in the preexilic temple.⁵⁶

It is impossible to reconstruct with certainty how the ark disappeared from the temple, but one may reasonably assume, with the majority of scholars, that the ark was either destroyed during the Babylonian demolition of the temple or had already been removed at some earlier time.⁵⁷ After the loss, the radical change of attitude towards the ark and the deliberate decision not to renew it expressed in Jer 3:16 are also likely to reflect historical reality, since the ark indeed seems not to have been restored. There is no single reference to it in any text that relates to the postexilic temple. It is not mentioned among the cultic objects that were purportedly restored to Jerusalem (Ezra 1:7–11). The Holy of Holies, according to our sources on the late postexilic temple, was empty.⁵⁸

What, however, was the reason why the ark, despite its prominent role, was not restored in the postexilic temple? It seems plausible that the cherubim connected with the ark transgressed against the prohibition of images that became increasingly important during the Exile, so that an ark protected by cherubim became undesirable for the rebuilt temple.⁵⁹ Whatever the reasons for it, the non-restoration of the

⁵³ Cf. DAY, “Ark”; KALIMI / PURVIS, “Hiding”; WEITZMAN, *Surviving*, 25–28.

⁵⁴ For the occurrence and distribution of the motif in Exod to Kgs see the chart below (p. 238); moreover, the motif also occurs 48 times in Chronicles as well as in Jer 3:16; Ps 132:8.

⁵⁵ See, e.g., STAUBLI, *Image*, 222–229; for the debate on the function and symbolic meaning of the ark see JANOWSKI, *Sühne*, 281–286. On portable thrones in Egypt as comparative material see METZGER, *Königsthron*, 361–362.

⁵⁶ Cf., e.g., KEEL, *Geschichte*, 215; PORZIG, *Lade*, 294–295.

⁵⁷ Cf. DAY, “Ark”, 261–265.

⁵⁸ Cf., e.g., KEEL, *Geschichte*, 1033–1034; PORZIG, *Lade*, 296–297.

⁵⁹ Cf. SCHÄFER-LICHTENBERGER, “Verlust”, 241. Moreover, one could ask if the ark might not have been a rather magical cultic object in the First Temple (just like other examples from its ancient Near Eastern environment), which seemed embarrassing to exilic

ark was an example of a significant discontinuity in the official cult of Jerusalem. We can safely assume, on the historical level, that an ark played a prominent cultic role for a certain period in the preexilic temple of Jerusalem, but that it was not restored in the postexilic temple.

3.2 The Menorah: Historical Reality in the Postexilic Temple

The menorah enters the stage of the Pentateuch at Sinai, following the ark closely. It is presented to the eyes of Moses and of readers by divine revelation, after the Table of Showbread, with an elaborate description (Exod 25:31–39). If we try to trace the menorah beyond Sinai, however, the evidence is quite different: there is none. Here is a chart that displays the distribution of both motifs in the books of Exodus to Kings:

	Ark (אֲרוֹן)	Menorah (מְנוֹרָה)
Exod	25:10, 24–16, 21f; 26:33f; 30:6, 26; 31:7; 35:12; 37:1, 5; 39:35; 40:3, 5, 20f	25:31–35; 26:35; 30:27; 31:8; 35:14; 37:17–20; 39:37; 40:4, 24
Lev	16:2	24:4
Num	3:31; 4:5; 7:89; 10:33, 35; 14:44	3:31; 4:9; 8:2–4
Deut	10:1–3, 5, 8; 31:9, 25f	-
Josh	3:3, 6, 8, 11, 13–15, 17; 4:5, 7, 9–11, 16, 18; 6:4, 6–9, 11–13; 7:6; 8:33	-
Judg	20:27	-
1 Sam	3:3; 4:3–6, 11, 13, 17–19, 21f; 5:1–4, 7f, 10f; 6:1–3, 8, 11, 13, 15, 18f, 21; 7:1f; 14:18	-
2 Sam	6:2–4, 6f, 9–13, 15–17; 7:2; 11:11; 15:24f, 29	-
1 Kgs	2:26; 3:15; 6:19; 8:1, 3–7, 9, 21	[7:49: ten lampstands!]

theologians. This could explain the remarkably negative view of it expressed in Jer 3:16. The portrayal of the ark as the container of the two tablets (and thus the centre of the Sinaitic expression of the divine will) could well be a theological reinterpretation (which is particularly present in Deuteronomy: WILSON, “Container”). For a recent reconstruction of the development of the theological significance attributed to the ark see MCCORMICK, “Box”, against the background esp. of VON RAD, “Tent” and VAN DER TOORN / HOUTMAN, “David”; see also VON RAD, “Deuteronomium-Studien”, 128–129; VAN DER TOORN, *Image*, 241–242.

The menorah is not mentioned even once between Deuteronomy and Kings.⁶⁰ Where we might expect some reference to the menorah – in the context of the construction of the temple (1 Kgs 6–8), we find “ten lampstands” instead of one (7:49).⁶¹ Moreover, the menorah is not mentioned among the spoils taken away by the Babylonians (2 Kgs 24:13; 25:13–17).⁶² The parallel account in Jeremiah does fill the gap, but with “lampstands” in the plural (Jer 52:19; in accordance with 1 Kgs 7:49). The only reference to “*the* menorah” allegedly in the time of the preexilic temple is provided by the Chronicler in Abijah’s speech, according to which care is taken in Jerusalem “for the golden lampstand so that its lamps may burn every evening” (2 Chr 13:11). This is an obvious retrojection of the postexilic cult into the First Temple period, and thus evidence of the menorah’s importance at the time of the composition of Chronicles.⁶³

While texts that claim to speak about the preexilic temple (with the single exception of 2 Chr 13:11) remain silent about the seven-armed menorah, we have ample evidence of its importance in the late postexilic temple. We are told about Antiochus’ removal of “*the* lampstand” in 167 BCE (1 Macc 1:21), and its restoration under Judas Maccabeus (1 Macc 4:49).⁶⁴ The menorah is mentioned

⁶⁰ 1 Sam 3:3 mentions a “lamp of God” (נֵר אֱלֹהִים) in the “temple of YHWH” in Shiloh. Most commentators see a connection here with the “continuous lamp” (נֵר תָּמִיד) of Exod 27:20. Within the sanctuary texts of Exodus, the “lamp” is connected with the menorah through the term “light” (compare מֵאוֹר in 27:20 with “the menorah of the light”, מִנְרֵת הַמְּאוֹר, in Exod 35:14). Thus, read within the canon of the Hebrew Bible, the “lamp of God” of 1 Sam 3:3 can be read in terms of the menorah of the wilderness sanctuary. The unique expression “lamp of God”, however, seems very unlikely to have originally referred to the seven-armed menorah. Originally, it rather referred to a single lampstand. Cf. HACHLILI, *Menorah*, 12.

⁶¹ These are seen to be stands for a single lamp: HACHLILI, *Menorah*, 17 (*contra* HARAN, *Temples*, 192). For examples of lampstands from archaeology see HACHLILI, *Menorah*, 13–15. For the rabbinic solution to the issue of the missing menorah in Solomon’s temple see MEYERS, *Menorah*, 36: “You must ... say that [candelstick] of Moses stood in the middle with five [candlesticks] to the right of it and five to the left of it” (*Menahot* 98b).

⁶² 2 Kgs 24:13 claims that “all the vessels of gold in the temple of YHWH, which King Solomon of Israel had made” were affected. Since, according to 1 Kgs 6–8, the seven-armed menorah was not among the objects constructed under Solomon, it cannot be intended here. 2 Kgs 25:14–15 mentions many vessels made of bronze, but also objects of gold and silver. If the author(s) of these verses had seen the seven-armed lampstand, one would expect that they would have explicitly mentioned it.

⁶³ Compare KLEIN, *2 Chronicles*, 203, on 2 Chr 13:11: “The series of rituals mentioned here match best with the tabernacle account and thus make the temple cult in Jerusalem the direct continuation of and therefore the legitimate successor to the cult of the tabernacle”. Cf. in greater detail KNOPPERS, “Battling”, 519–520.

⁶⁴ 1 Macc 1:20–21: “After subduing Egypt, Antiochus returned in the one hundred forty-third year. He went up against Israel and came to Jerusalem with a strong force. He arrogantly entered the sanctuary and took the golden altar, the lampstand for the light, and all its utensils.” 1 Macc 4:49: “They made new holy vessels, and brought the lampstand, the altar of incense, and the table into the temple”.

by (Pseudo-)Hecataeus,⁶⁵ and Josephus provides descriptions of it.⁶⁶ Moreover, there is iconographic evidence for it, some of the earliest examples being coins under Antigonus Mattathias (40–37 BCE).⁶⁷ Most prominently, the menorah and the table represent the most prestigious spoils from Jerusalem according to a relief on the Arch of Titus in Rome.⁶⁸

These sources provide ample evidence for the importance of the menorah⁶⁹ in the cult of the postexilic temple in the Hellenistic and Roman periods, up to the temple's final destruction in 70 BCE. On the other hand, there is a complete lack of evidence for the existence of the seven-armed menorah in the preexilic temple. Having collected and evaluated the available historical and archaeological data, Rachel Hachlili comes to the conclusion that "the seven-armed menorah does not antedate the Second Temple period".⁷⁰ More concretely, it "originated in the time span between the Return to Zion and the Hasmonean period".⁷¹ The menorah was an "innovation" of the Second Temple.⁷²

3.3 How Do the Descriptions Relate to Historical Reality?

The preceding analysis tried to make plausible that both the ark and the menorah described by the voice of God at Sinai (Exod 25) did have some historical basis in the temples of Jerusalem; an ark existed for some time in the preexilic temple, but it was not restored in the postexilic temple. The menorah, contrarily, did not exist in the preexilic temple, but it played a prominent role in the postexilic one. But how do the written descriptions of these objects from the desert sanctuary relate to the respective cult items in the temple of Jerusalem?

⁶⁵ Referring to the temple in Jerusalem, this source mentions "an altar and a lampstand; both are golden, and their weight two talents" (quoted after HAYWARD, *Temple*, 20; compare JOSEPHUS, *Apion*, 114). While the philosopher Hecataeus lived in the days of Alexander the Great and Ptolemy I (cf. BAR-KOCHVA, *Pseudo-Hecataeus*, 7–18), Bar-Kochva argues that the source quoted by Josephus is not authentic and that it rather dates to between 103 and 93 BCE (see esp. 249).

⁶⁶ *Bell.* VII.5.5 (148–149); *Ant.* III.6.7 (144–146); cf. YARDEN, *Spoils*, 43–46. On the latter passage see the comments in JOSEPHUS, *Antiquities* 1–4, 269–270. For Jewish sources on the late history of the menorah see SPERBER, "History", 140–159.

⁶⁷ For these and other early representations see HACHLILI, *Menorah*, 41–50.

⁶⁸ See the detailed analysis and reconstruction in YARDEN, *Spoils*. The arch may be dated to the reign of Domitian, probably soon after 81 CE and before 96 CE.; cf. PFANNER, *Titusbogen*, 91–92.

⁶⁹ MEYERS, *Menorah*, 36–38, rightly observes that there were probably several specimens of the seven-armed candelabrum during the Second Temple period. Moreover, she analyses the different representations that do not match the description of Exod 25 in every detail. Their typical seven-armed shape, however, leaves no doubt, in my view, that this type of menorah is meant to *represent* the one described in Exod 25.

⁷⁰ HACHLILI, *Menorah*, 9.

⁷¹ HACHLILI, *Menorah*, 36.

⁷² ALBERTZ, *Exodus*, 162: "Der alleinige siebenarmige Leuchter... war somit eine reform-priesterliche Innovation."

It seems very likely that the descriptions are genetically related to their physical counterparts. Theoretically, there are three options for how written descriptions could relate to their physical realizations. a) The description was created before and independently of its physical realization as some sort of cultic vision, and the historical object was produced on the basis of the text. b) The description and the object were fashioned at the same time, the text being the literary expression of an artistic design created for the temple. c) The object was created first and independently from the text; the text is in fact a later description of the object.

The first option generally seems less likely than the second and the third. There is great historical probability that, in the course of making a new cultic object, a text may be produced that provides its theological justification – as could be seen in the case of Nabonidus' propaganda texts that accompanied his restoration of temples. It seems much less likely that an ideal description of a cultic object would have only later been realized – contrary to what the authors of ideal portrayals of such objects (e.g. in Exod 25) wish to make readers believe.⁷³ These preliminary considerations prepare us to try to imagine the historical development that led to the composition of the sanctuary texts.

4. Historical Reconstruction: The Wilderness Sanctuary as an Archetype of Continuity

For any historical reconstruction, we rely on the sources that we collect and evaluate, and on our imagination (interpretative framework), which we try not to confuse with objective reality.⁷⁴ If we imagine Jerusalem's temple burning in 587 BCE,⁷⁵ we cannot overestimate the impact that the temple's destruction had on the minds of those who had seen in it the dwelling place of their God, the protector of Jerusalem and Judea.⁷⁶ What did it mean for the priesthood? With the temple they not only lost the source of their income and the splendour of their prestige, but the very foundation of their religious self-understanding.⁷⁷

⁷³ Descriptions may, of course, be used as justification for the production of replacements for old or lost objects; for which the *Letter of Aristeas* provides an (invented) example (see above, p. 230).

⁷⁴ For a fine reflection on historical method see KNAUF, "History", esp. 57–79.

⁷⁵ The burning of the temple seems to be one of the most credible pieces of information that has come down to us in biblical historiography (comparable perhaps to Jesus' crucifixion), since it is the greatest imaginable embarrassment, which any writer would have avoided relating had it not really happened. On the criterion of "embarrassment" after Schillebeeckx cf. MEIER, *Jew*, 168–171.

⁷⁶ Cf. COHN, "Responses". On pre-exilic temple ideology see, concisely, BEDFORD, *Temple*, 2–4.

⁷⁷ Although we have to assume that Jerusalem's priesthood formed part of the intellectual elite of Judean society, their minds were not contaminated by Darwins, Nietzsches or Freuds. They were purely and naturally religious to the core.

The burning of the temple must have been a religious and existential nightmare for them.

The catastrophe gave rise to radically new ideas that attributed a much less prominent role to the temple: "Heaven is my throne and the earth is my footstool. What is the house that you would build for me, and what is my resting place?" (Isa 66:1). What was needed, first of all, was a theological explanation of this catastrophe. A radical one was given in YHWH's own words to Solomon. In the case of Israel's disobedience, YHWH says, "This house will become a heap of ruins" (1 Kgs 9:8)!⁷⁸ During the Babylonian exile, the temple survived in memories and in texts, some of which may have been carried to Babylon by the priests,⁷⁹ while others may only have been written down there to preserve sacred memory.⁸⁰

But what if, surprisingly, after five decades, YHWH was to choose the Persian Cyrus as his "Messiah" (Isa 45:1) and to allow Judeans to return to their home country and rebuild the temple? The priests' sons and grandsons,⁸¹ who had heard their fathers tell stories about the marvellous temple in Jerusalem and its cult, had to re-imagine a temple and a cult for themselves. On the one hand, they would try to recover whatever they could find from written and oral memories to restore the splendid reality of the past. On the other hand, some elements of the ancient cult would have been irretrievably lost; and some cultic ideas they had learned from their fathers might not have made sense in the context of their radically changed cultural experience. They might well have seen the necessity of creating a new cult upon its ancient ruins.

⁷⁸ To save their religious worldview, priests had to explain disaster by justifying YHWH; this led to theodicy as one of the main historiographical outlooks of DtrH as analyzed by Martin Noth (*History*, esp. 142–143). This, however, did not suffice. What was urgently needed was a perspective for a future of the people (cf. WOLFF, "Kerygma"; MARKL, "Future").

⁷⁹ For a reflection on possible sources see VAN SETERS, "Fact and Ideology", 49–51.

⁸⁰ VAN SETERS, "Fact and Ideology", 57, considered the possibility that the building account of the building of Solomon's temple (1 Kgs 6–7) may have been written down after the temple's destruction to "provide a model for its reconstruction". Moreover, the account should construct continuity of the pre-exilic temple from Solomon to its destruction, which is corroborated by the "retrospective reference in 2 Kgs 25:16–17 ... to Solomon's work on the temple, as well as the repetition of the description of the bronze pillars" (*ibid.*, 56).

⁸¹ It remains difficult, of course, to know when the rebuilding of the temple really was finished. Ezra 6:15 dates its completion to Darius' sixth year. Despite the confident acceptance of this date by many authors (cf. e.g., STEVENS, *Temples*, 43–58), one should take the theological vision of this date into consideration: "The current dating scheme almost certainly is intended to link the rebuilding of the temple to the fulfilment of the predictions in the book of Jeremiah concerning the rebuilding of Jerusalem more generally" (EDELMAN, "What Can We Know", 455; see also *eadem*, *Origins*, 80–131). GRABBE, *Judaism*, 128, is sceptical about the date, since "the resources available were unlikely to have been sufficient to allow completion so soon". See also *idem*, "Reality", esp. 305. For a detailed argument for a date to the early years of the reign of Darius I see BEDFORD, *Temple*, 183–299; for the minority view that favours Darius II (423–404 BCE) as the rebuilder, see, e.g., DEQUEKER, "Darius", 68.

This mutual interplay between the necessity of discontinuity and the necessity of establishing continuity between the pre- and the postexilic temples of Jerusalem is the most probable setting for the literary construction of the wilderness sanctuary. The sanctuary is a priestly squaring of the circle, a solution to the conundrum of discontinuity versus continuity. Postexilic priestly scribes portrayed a “paradigmatic”⁸² sanctuary which was placed at the origin of Israel, at Sinai, and which contained important cultic objects relating to the ancient temple that oral or literary tradition had preserved, such as the ark, together with innovative objects, such as the menorah,⁸³ that they were designing themselves assisted by divine inspiration. The need for imagined continuity is the very reason why priestly scribes combined in the sanctuary what historically never belonged together.⁸⁴

The sanctuary seems to have been redactionally connected with the inauguration scene of the ‘Salomonic’ temple (see above on 1 Kgs 8) and thus to have been shown as the origin of the cult of Jerusalem. Although the sanctuary’s ark was lost, its menorah, table, vessels and priestly vestments could come to real life in the new temple. If this reconstruction comes close to historical reality,⁸⁵ the wilderness sanctuary indeed provided an archetype of continuity between the pre- and the postexilic temples of Jerusalem.

5. Implications for the Rise of the Torah

The Fall of Jerusalem may lie behind seemingly unsuspected texts of the Pentateuch, such as the descriptions of the tabernacle; the temple seems to be burning, as it were, between the ark and the menorah. Historical research on the Pentateuch has suffered from a lack of hard historical criteria. The above analysis is an attempt to contribute an argument that is based on “external” evidence – external at least to the Pentateuch. The argument’s central observations focused on the ark and the menorah described in the sanctuary texts in the book of Exodus because they allow for comparative investigation in biblical historiography. Since the seven-armed menorah did not appear in Jerusalem’s

⁸² For a fine reflection on the “paradigmatic” and “historiographical” character of “P” see BOORER, “Nature”.

⁸³ GUTMANN, “Menorah”, 290, also sees the “effort of the priestly writers to legitimize the menorah they saw in the Second Temple” in the background of its description in Exod 25. Gutmann’s contribution was integrated by BLUM, *Studien*, 303.

⁸⁴ My overall view of the sanctuary texts, therefore, comes close to Rainer Albertz’s assessment; he considers the sanctuary texts a “program” for the temple’s “critical revision” (ALBERTZ, *Exodus*, 24) and attributes their basic conception to his first Priestly redaction (PB¹), which he dates to the last third of the sixth century BCE, “when the Second Temple was planned and built” (*ibid.*, 13; my translations).

⁸⁵ This historical scenario is not new, of course. It was basically outlined by Julius Wellhausen. In the process of my research, however, I did not set out to defend his theory, but I have become a convert to this view by collecting and evaluating data.

temple cult before its restoration under Persian rule, its detailed description is unlikely to originate from before that time. If one accepts this line of argument, one cannot but reflect on its consequences for dating texts in the Pentateuch.

While the description of the ark may rely on some source that preserved sacred memory of its dimensions and design, its theological explanation as the container and space of divine revelation (Exod 25:22) may well be a later idealization. The menorah was most likely conceived only for the cult of the postexilic temple.⁸⁶ If this is the case, the descriptions of the ark and the menorah in Exod 25 could provide an exemplary case for how the conception of the sanctuary texts should be understood. They are likely to incorporate information about the preexilic cult that was handed down to its authors by their priestly ancestors, be it orally or in written sources. Yet the very conception of the sanctuary as originating at Sinai and its portrayal as an archetype, a “model” (Exod 25:9: תבנית; παράδειγμα) revealed to Moses, is most likely to have originated with the need to create theological foundations for the new temple after Exile.⁸⁷ These texts systematically combine knowledge preserved from the preexilic cult with the developing postexilic cult and frame them in the (imaginary) archetypal scenery at Sinai.⁸⁸ The conception of Israel as generous, voluntary artisans in the sanctuary texts aptly fits the situation of a postexilic citizen-temple community.⁸⁹

If “P” be seen as an originally independent source, if it be considered a (set of) redactional layer(s), the latest stages of its development clearly show an effort to root postexilic cultic reality at Sinai and, not least, in creation.⁹⁰ The

⁸⁶ While the menorah is a clear example of a post-exilic item in Jerusalem’s temple cult, this may similarly be true for other elements of the cult described in the sanctuary texts. The prominent role attributed to the table of shewbread among the first items to be described in Exod 25 (compare, by contrast, its late and brief appearance in 1 Kgs 7:48) seems to be mirrored in evidence of the late postexilic cult: the table appears together with the menorah on the coins of Antigonus Mattathias and on the Arch of Titus: cf. YARDEN, *Spoils*, 71–92.

⁸⁷ The role of Moses as mediator of divine revelation of the sanctuary in a pre-monarchic situation helps to legitimize the reconstruction of the temple in the post-monarchic period, when there is no longer a king anymore, who would be usually supposed to establish a temple according to divine instruction. Cf. BERLEJUNG, “Handwerker”, esp. 155; UTZSCHNEIDER, *Heiligtum*, 152–159.

⁸⁸ Despite the imaginary setting, the sanctuary texts presuppose a very concrete conception of the cult. Cf. BLUM, *Studien*, 304: “Nimmt man die priesterliche Tradition beim Wort, dann geht es ihr gerade um die konkrete Gottesgegenwart, die aber ohne ebenso konkrete, ‘dingliche’ Räume, Institutionen, Regelungen usw. weder für den heiligen Gott noch für das Volk, das dessen Gegenwart ausgesetzt ist, tragbar wäre!” Thus, Blum considers the idea of a “representation of the sanctuary in the word” in the sense of “spiritualization” of the cult in the sanctuary texts (cf. FRITZ, *Tempel*, esp. 153) a “modern projection” (BLUM, *Studien*, 304).

⁸⁹ Cf. UTZSCHNEIDER, *Heiligtum*, 292–297; BERLEJUNG, “Handwerker”, 160, 168; WEINBERG, *Community*.

⁹⁰ See, e.g., JANOWSKI, “Tempel”; GEORGE, *Tabernacle*, 181–189. This is especially clear regarding the Sabbath Commandment: GRUND, *Entstehung*, esp. 229; TIMMER, *Creation*,

Chronicler⁹¹ shortens the Deuteronomistic description of Solomon's temple while emphasizing elements from the tabernacle (2 Chr 3–4).⁹² Could this indicate that the tabernacle texts emerged only later than the Deuteronomistic description and that only then the Chronicler harmonized the "Solomonic" temple with postexilic cultic reality?⁹³

Cultic continuity grounded on measurements of divine origin or on objects related to divine presence was a general feature in ancient Near Eastern temple ideologies. It was expressed with particular emphasis in Neo-Babylonian ideology to which Judean exiles were exposed. The same ideas continued in the Persian empire and clearly influenced the reconstruction of the temple in Jerusalem (see esp. Ezra 6:3–5). Early Jewish texts such as the *Letter of Aristeas* attest to the cultural continuity of such concerns. The detailed descriptions of the sanctuary and its cult in the priestly Sinaitic texts of the Pentateuch seem to respond to the same need for cultic continuity,⁹⁴ even if on a high level of literary abstraction: the projection of both old and new as a literary mirage⁹⁵ that creates an archetype in the original past in which the first and the second temples of Jerusalem merge into symbolic unity.

Texts that try to portray an ideal original past are bound to conceal or, at least, symbolize, the "diluvian" disaster that caused their creation. The destruction of Jerusalem and the temple by the Babylonians proved to be a highly creative gap⁹⁶ that inspired priestly intellectuals to create a bridging historiography. The rise of the Torah as a grand project of literary restoration went along with the physical restoration of the temple in Jerusalem. In other words: had Jerusalem not fallen, the Torah, as we have it, would not have risen.

esp. 63–74; MARKL, *Dekalog*, 116–117; *idem*, "Ten Words", 22–23. For the early reception of the connection between Sabbath and sanctuary see CALAWAY, *Sabbath*.

⁹¹ On the role for Chronicles for Pentateuch studies cf. JONKER, "Paraleipomenon".

⁹² See KLEIN, *2 Chronicles*, 44.

⁹³ The Chronicler's conception is just a short step away from the view expressed in the *Wisdom of Solomon*: "You have given command to build a temple on your holy mountain, and an altar in the city of your habitation, a copy of the holy tent that you prepared from the beginning" (μίμημα σκηνης αγίας ην προητοιμασας απ' αρχης; Wis 9:8).

⁹⁴ The description of the preexilic ark represents a literary treasure of sacred memory that continued to inspire Early Jewish and Christian minds; cf. n.53 and ANDERSON, "Theology". In a similar vein, Qumran's *Copper Scroll* seems to have hidden imagined temple treasures after the second and final destruction of Jerusalem's temple (70 C.E.); cf. WEITZMAN, *Surviving*, 101–108.

⁹⁵ For this metaphor cf. PROPP, *Exodus 19–40*, 710.

⁹⁶ While the sixth century BCE has been aptly called a "creative age" (ACKROYD, *Exile*, 7–12) and exile a "catalyst" (KLEIN, *Israel*, 1), the creativity sparked by the challenges of the sixth century continued well beyond that time.

Literature

- ACKROYD, P. R., *Exile and Restoration*, London 1968.
- , “The Temple Vessels – A Continuity Theme”, in: *idem*, *Studies in the Religion of Ancient Israel* (VT.S 23), Leiden 1972, 166–181.
- ALBERTZ, R., *Israel in Exile: The History and Literature of the Sixth Century BCE* (trans. by D. Green; SBL Studies in Biblical Literature 3), Atlanta 2003.
- , *Exodus 19–40* (ZBK.AT 2.2), Zürich 2015.
- AMBOS, C., *Mesopotamische Baurituale aus dem 1. Jahrtausend v. Chr.*, Dresden 2004.
- , “Rituale beim Abriß und Wiederaufbau eines Tempels”, in: K. Kaniuth et al. (eds.), *Tempel im Alten Orient: 7. Internationales Colloquium der Deutschen Orient-Gesellschaft 11.–13. Oktober 2009, München* (CDOG 7), Wiesbaden 2013, 19–31.
- ANDERSON, G. A., “Towards a Theology of the Tabernacle and Its Furniture”, in: R. A. Clements / D. R. Schwartz (eds.), *Text, Thought, and Practice in Qumran and Early Christianity* (STDJ 84), Leiden 2009, 161–194.
- BAR-KOCHVA, B., *Pseudo-Hecataeus On the Jews: Legitimizing the Jewish Diaspora*, Berkeley 1996.
- BARK, F., *Ein Heiligtum im Kopf der Leser: Literaturanalytische Betrachtungen zu Ex 25–40* (SBS 218), Stuttgart 2009.
- BEAULIEU, P.-A., *The Reign of Nabonidus King of Babylon 556–539 B.C.* (YNER 10), New Haven 1989.
- BECKING, B., “Silent Witness: The Symbolic Presence of God in the Temple Vessels in Ezra and Nehemiah”, in: N. MacDonald / I. J. de Hulster (eds.), *Divine Presence and Absence in Exilic and Post-Exilic Judaism: Studies of the Saffa Kovalevskaja Research Group on Early Jewish Monotheism*, vol. 2 (FAT II 61), Tübingen 2013, 267–281.
- BEDFORD, P. R., *Temple Restoration in Early Achaemenid Judah* (JSJ.S 65), Leiden 2001.
- BEGG, C. T., “The Ark in Chronicles”, in: M. P. Graham / S. L. McKenzie / G. N. Knoppers (eds.), *The Chronicler as Theologian*. FS R. W. Klein (JSOT.S 371), Sheffield 2003, 133–145.
- BERLEJUNG, A., “Der Handwerker als Theologe: zur Mentalitäts- und Traditions-geschichte eines altorientalischen und alttestamentlichen Berufstands”, *VT* 46 (1996) 145–168.
- BICKERMAN, E., “Zur Datierung des Pseudo-Aristeas”, in: *idem*, *Studies in Jewish and Christian History I* (AGJU 9,1), Leiden 1976, 109–136 (= *ZNW* 29 [1930] 280–296).
- BLUM, E., *Studien zur Komposition des Pentateuch* (BZAW 189), Berlin 1990.
- BODA, M. J., “Legitimizing the Temple: The Chronicler’s Temple Building Account”, in: *idem* / J. Novotny (eds.), *From the Foundations to the Crenellations: Essays on Temple Building in the Ancient Near East and Hebrew Bible* (AOAT 366), Münster 2010, 303–318.
- BOORER, S., “The ‘Paradigmatic’ and ‘Historiographical’ Nature of the Priestly Material as a Key to its Interpretation”, in: M. A. O’Brien / H. N. Wallace (eds.), *Seeing Signals, Reading Signs: The Art of Exegesis*, FS A. F. Campbell (JSOT.S 415), London 2004, 45–60.
- CALAWAY, J. C., *The Sabbath and the Sanctuary* (WUNT II 349), Tübingen 2013.
- CHILDS, B. S., “A Study of the Formula ‘Until this Day’”, *JBL* 82 (1963) 279–292.
- , *Exodus* (OTL), Philadelphia 1974.
- COGAN, M., *1 Kings: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (AncB 10), New York 2000.
- COHN, R. L., “Biblical Responses to Catastrophe”, *Judaism* 35 (1986) 263–276.
- CRAWFORD, C. D., “Between Shadow and Substance: The Historical Relationship of Tabernacle and Temple in Light of Architecture and Iconography”, in: M. Leuchter / J. M. Hutton (eds.), *Levites and Priests in Biblical History and Tradition*, Atlanta 2011, 117–133.

- CROSS, F. M., "The Priestly Tabernacle", in: D. N. Freedman / G. E. Wright (eds.), *The Biblical Archaeologist Reader*, New York 1961, 201–228 (BA 10 [1947] 45–68).
- DAY, J., "Whatever Happened to the Ark of the Covenant?", in: *idem* (ed.), *Temple and Worship in Biblical Israel* (LHB 422), London 2005, 250–270.
- DEQUEKER, L., "Darius the Persian and the Reconstruction of the Jewish Temple in Jerusalem (Ezra 4.24)", in: J. Quaegebeur (ed.), *Ritual and Sacrifice in the Ancient Near East: Proceedings of the International Conference organized by the Katholieke Universiteit Leuven from the 17th to the 20th of April 1991* (OLA 55), Leuven 1993, 67–92.
- DEVRIES, S. J., *1 Kings* (WBC 12), Nashville 2003.
- DUBOVSKÝ, P., *The Building of the First Temple: A Study in Redactional, Text-Critical and Historical Perspective* (FAT 103), Tübingen 2015.
- EDELMAN, D., *The Origins of the "Second" Temple: Persian Imperial Policy and the Rebuilding of Jerusalem*, London 2005.
- , "What Can We Know about the Persian-Era Temple in Jerusalem?", in: J. Kamlah (ed.), *Temple Building and Temple Cult: Architecture and Cultic Paraphernalia of Temples in the Levant (2.-1. Mill. B.C.E.)* (ADPV 41), Wiesbaden 2012, 343–368.
- FISCHER, G., *Jeremia 26–52* (HThKAT), Freiburg i.Br. 2005.
- , *Jeremia: Der Stand der theologischen Diskussion*, Darmstadt 2007.
- FISCHER, G. / MARKL, D., *Das Buch Exodus* (NSK.AT 2), Stuttgart 2009.
- FRIED, L. S., "Temple Building in Ezra 1–6", in: M. J. Boda / J. Novotny (eds.), *From the Foundations to the Crenellations*, 319–338.
- FRIEDMAN, R. E., "Tabernacle", *ABD* 6 (1992) 292–300.
- FRITZ, V., *Tempel und Zelt. Studien zum Tempelbau in Israel und zu dem Zeltheiligtum der Priesterschaft* (WMANT 47), Neukirchen-Vluyn 1977.
- GEORGE, M. K., *Israel's Tabernacle as Social Space* (SBL Ancient Israel and Its Literature 2), Atlanta 2009.
- GOODING, D. W., *The Account of the Tabernacle: Translation and Textual Problems of the Greek Exodus* (TaS 6), Cambridge 1959.
- GÖRG, M., *Das Zelt der Begegnung. Untersuchung der sakralen Zeltradition Altisraels* (BBB 27), Bonn 1967.
- GRABBE, L. L., *Judaism from Cyrus to Hadrian*, vol. 1, *The Persian and Greek Periods*, Minneapolis 1992.
- , "The Reality of the Return: The Biblical Picture Versus Historical Reconstruction", in: J. Stökl / C. Waerzeggers (eds.), *Exile and Return: The Babylonian Context* (BZAW 478), Berlin 2015, 292–307.
- GRAY, J., *I and II Kings*, Philadelphia 1970.
- GRUND, A., *Die Entstehung des Sabbats: Seine Bedeutung für Israels Zeitkonzept und Erinnerungskultur* (FAT 75), Tübingen 2011.
- GUTMANN, J., "A Note on the Temple Menorah", *ZNW* 60 (1969) 289–291.
- HACHAM, N., "The Letter of Aristeas: A New Exodus Story?", *JSJ* 36 (2005) 1–20.
- HACHLILI, R., *The Menorah, the Ancient Seven-Armed Candelabrum: Origin, Form, Significance* (JSJS 68), Leiden 2001.
- HADAS, M. (ed.), *Aristeas to Philocrates (Letter of Aristeas)* (JAL), New York 1951.
- HARAN, M., *Temples and Temple-Service in Ancient Israel: An Inquiry into Biblical Cult Phenomena and the Historical Setting of the Priestly School*, 2nd edn, Winona Lake 1985.
- HAYWARD, C. T. R., *The Jewish Temple: A Non-Biblical Sourcebook*, London 1996.
- HOMAN, M. M., *To Your Tents, O Israel! The Terminology, Function, Form, and Symbolism of Tents in the Hebrew Bible and the Ancient Near East* (Culture and History of the Ancient Near East 12), Leiden 2002.

- HONIGMANN, S., *The Septuagint and Homeric Scholarship in Alexandria*, London 2003.
- HOUTMAN, C., *Exodus*, vol. 3, *Chapters 20-40* (HCOT), Kampen 2000.
- HUNDLEY, M. B., "Sacred Spaces, Objects, Offerings, and People in the Priestly Texts: A Reappraisal", *JBL* 132 (2013) 749–767.
- HUROWITZ, V., *I Have Built You an Exalted House: Temple Building in the Bible in Light of Mesopotamian and Northwest Semitic Writings* (JSOT.S 115), Sheffield 1992.
- JACOB, B., *Das Buch Exodus* (ed. S. Mayer), Stuttgart 1997.
- JANOWSKI, B., "Tempel und Schöpfung", *JBTh* 5 (1990) 37–69.
- , *Sühne als Heilsgeschehen: Studien zur Sühnetheologie der Priesterschrift und zur Wurzel KPR im Alten Orient und im Alten Testament* (WMANT 55), 2nd edn, Neukirchen-Vluyn 2000.
- , "Die Einwohnung Gottes in Israel. Eine religions- und theologiegeschichtliche Skizze zur biblischen *Schekina*-Theologie", in: *idem* / E. E. Popkes (eds.), *Das Geheimnis der Gegenwart Gottes: Zur Schekina-Vorstellung in Judentum und Christentum* (WUNT 318), Tübingen 2014, 3–40.
- JAPHET, S., *I and II Chronicles: A Commentary* (OTL), London 1993.
- JENSON, P. P., *Graded Holiness: A Key to the Priestly Conception of the World* (JSOT.S 106), Sheffield 1992.
- JONKER, L. C., "From Paraleipomenon to Early Reader: The Implications of Recent Chronicles Studies for Pentateuchal Criticism", in: C. M. Maier (ed.), *Congress Volume Munich 2013* (VT.S 163), Leiden 2014, 217–254.
- JOSEPHUS, FLAVIUS, *Judean Antiquities 1–4* (trans. and comm. L. H. Feldman; Flavius Josephus 3), Leiden 2000.
- , *Judean Antiquities 8–10* (trans. and comm. C. T. Begg / P. Spilsbury; Flavius Josephus 5), Leiden 2005.
- , *Against Apion* (trans. and comm. J. M. G. Barclay; Flavius Josephus 10), Leiden 2007.
- KALIMI, I. / PURVIS, J. D., "King Jehoiachin and the Vessels of the Lord's House in Biblical Literature", *CBQ* 56 (1994) 449–457.
- , "The Hiding of the Temple Vessels in Jewish and Samaritan Literature", *CBQ* 56 (1994) 679–685.
- KEEL, O., *Die Geschichte Jerusalems und die Entstehung des Monotheismus* (2 vols.), Göttingen 2007.
- KLEIN, R. W., *Israel in Exile: A Theological Interpretation* (OBT), Philadelphia 1979.
- , *2 Chronicles. A Commentary* (Hermeneia), Minneapolis 2012.
- KNAUF, E. A., "From History to Interpretation", in: *idem*, *Data and Debates: Essays in the History and Culture of Israel and Its Neighbors in Antiquity* (ed. H. M. Niemann et al.; AOAT 407), Münster 2013, 57–83 (= D. Edelman [ed.], *The Fabric of History: Text, Artefact and Israel's Past* [JSOT.S 127], Sheffield 1991, 26–64).
- KNOHL, I., *The Sanctuary of Silence: The Priestly Torah and the Holiness School*, Minneapolis 1995.
- KNOPPERS, G. N., "'Battling against Yahweh': Israel's War against Judah in 2 Chr 13:2–20", *RB* 100 (1993) 511–532.
- KOVELMAN, A., *Between Alexandria and Jerusalem: The Dynamic of Jewish and Hellenistic Culture* (The Brill Reference Library of Judaism 21), Leiden 2005.
- LE BOULLUEC, A. / SANDEVOIR, P., *La Bible d'Alexandrie 2. L'Exode*, Paris 1989.
- LISS, H., "The Imaginary Sanctuary: The Priestly Code as an Example of Fictional Literature in the Hebrew Bible", in: O. Lipschits / M. Oeming (eds.), *Judah and the Judeans in the Persian Period*, Winona Lake 2006, 663–689.
- LIVERANI, M., "Memorandum on the Approach to Historiographic Texts", *Or.* 42 (1973) 178–194.

- MACHINIST, P., "Mesopotamian Imperialism and Israelite Religion: A Case Study from the Second Isaiah", in: W. G. Dever / S. Gitin (eds.), *Symbiosis, Symbolism, and the Power of the Past: Canaan, Ancient Israel, and Their Neighbors from the Late Bronze Age through Roman Palaestina*, Winona Lake 2003, 237–264.
- MARKL, D., *Der Dekalog als Verfassung des Gottesvolkes: Die Brennpunkte einer Rechtshermeneutik des Pentateuch in Exodus 19–24 und Deuteronomium 5* (HBS 49), Freiburg i.Br. 2007.
- , "The Ten Words Revealed and Revised: The Origins of Law and Legal Hermeneutics in the Pentateuch", in: *idem* (ed.), *The Decalogue and its Cultural Influence* (HBM 58), Sheffield 2013, 13–27.
- , "No Future without Moses: The Disastrous End of 2 Kings 22–25 and the Chance of the Moab Covenant (Deut 29–30)", *JBL* 133 (2014) 711–728.
- , "Zur literarischen und theologischen Funktion der Heiligtumstexte im Buch Exodus", in: M. Hopf / W. Oswald / S. Seiler (eds.), *Heiliger Raum. Exegese und Rezeption der Heiligtumstexte in Ex 24–40. Beiträge des Symposiums zu Ehren von Helmut Utzschneider, 27.–29. Juni 2014* (Theologische Akzente 8), Stuttgart 2016, 56–87.
- MAYER, W., "Seleukidische Rituale aus Warka mit Emesal-Gebeten", *Or.* 47 (1978) 431–458.
- MCCORMICK, C. M., "From Box to Throne: The Development of the Ark in DtrH and P", in: C. S. Ehrlich / M. C. White (eds.), *Saul in Story and Tradition* (FAT 47), Tübingen 2006, 175–186.
- MEECHAM, H. G., *The Letter of Aristeas: A Linguistic Study with Special Reference to the Greek Bible* (PUM 241), Manchester 1935.
- MEIER, J. P., *A Marginal Jew: Rethinking the Historical Jesus*, vol. 1, *The Roots of the Problem and the Person* (AYBRL), New York 1991.
- METZGER, M., *Königsthron und Gottesthron. Thronformen und Throndarstellungen in Ägypten und im Vorderen Orient im dritten und zweiten Jahrtausend vor Christus und deren Bedeutung für das Verständnis von Aussagen über den Thron im Alten Testament* (AOAT 15/1), Neukirchen-Vluyn 1985.
- MEYERS, C. L., *The Tabernacle Menorah: A Synthetic Study of Symbol from the Biblical Cult* (ASORDS 2), Missoula 1976.
- MONTERO FENOLLÓS, J. L., "La ziggurat de Babylone: un monument à repenser", in: B. André-Salvini (ed.), *La tour de Babylone : études et recherches sur les monuments de Babylone. Actes du colloque du 19 avril 2008 au Musée du Louvre, Paris* (Documenta Asiana 10), Roma 2013, 127–146.
- MOSIS, R., *Untersuchungen zur Theologie des chronistischen Geschichtswerkes* (FThSt 92), Freiburg i.Br. 1973.
- MULDER, M. J., *1 Kings*, vol. 1, *1 Kings 1–11* (HCOT), Leuven 1998.
- NOTH, M., *Könige I. Teilband* (BK.AT 9/1) Neukirchen-Vluyn 1968.
- , *The Deuteronomistic History* (2nd edn; trans. J. Doull *et al.*; JSOT.S 15), Sheffield 1991.
- NOVOTNY, J., "Temple Building in Assyria", in: M. J. Boda / J. Novotny (eds.), *From the Foundations to the Crenellations: Essays on Temple Building in the Ancient Near East and Hebrew Bible* (AOAT 366), Münster 2010, 109–139.
- OTTO, E., "Forschungen zur Priesterschrift", *ThR* 62 (1997) 1–50.
- PFANNER, M., *Der Titusbogen. Mit einer Bauaufnahme von Ulrike Hess und Fotografien von Helmut Schwanke* (Beiträge zur Erschließung hellenistischer und kaiserzeitlicher Skulptur und Architektur 2), Mainz 1983.
- POPPER, J., *Der biblische Bericht über die Stiftshütte: Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Composition und Diaskeue des Pentateuch*, Leipzig 1862.

- PORZIG, P., *Die Lade Jahwes im Alten Testament und in den Texten vom Toten Meer* (BZAW 397), Berlin 2009.
- PROPP, W. H. C., *Exodus 19–40* (AncB 2A), New York 1998.
- , “Deuteronomium-Studien”, in: *idem, Gesammelte Studien zum Alten Testament II* (TB 48), München 1973, 109–153.
- RAD, G. VON, “The Tent and the Ark”, in: *idem, The Problem of the Hexateuch and other Essays*, New York 1966, 103–124 (ET of: “Zelt und Lade”, *Kirchliche Zeitschrift* 42 [1931] 476–498).
- SCHÄFER-LICHTENBERGER, C., “‘Sie wird nicht wieder hergestellt werden’. Anmerkungen zum Verlust der Lade”, in: E. Blum (ed.), *Mincha*. FS Rolf Rendtorff, Neukirchen-Vluyn 2000, 229–241.
- SCHAUDIG, H., *Die Inschriften Nabonids von Babylon und Kyros’ des Großen samt den in ihrem Umfeld entstandenen Tendenzschriften: Textausgabe und Grammatik* (AOAT 256), Münster 2001.
- , “Nabonid, der ‘Archäologe auf dem Königsthron’”, in: G. J. Selz (ed.), *Festschrift für Burkhard Kienast* (AOAT 274), Münster 2003, 447–497.
- , “The Restoration of Temples in the Neo- and Late Babylonian Periods: A Royal Prerogative as the Setting for Political Argument”, in: Boda / Novotny (eds.), *From the Foundations to the Crenellations*, 141–164.
- , “Cult Centralization in the Ancient Near East? Conceptions of the Ideal Capital in the Ancient Near East”, in: R. G. Kratz / H. Spieckermann (eds.), *One God – One Cult – One Nation: Archaeological and Biblical Perspectives* (BZAW 405), Berlin 2010, 145–168.
- SCHENKER, A., “The Ark as Sign of God’s Absent Presence in Solomon’s Temple: 1 Kings 8:6–8 in the Hebrew and Greek Bibles”, in: *idem, Anfänge der Textgeschichte des Alten Testaments. Studien zu Entstehung und Verhältnis der frühesten Textformen*, Stuttgart 2011, 99–109.
- SCHIMANOWSKI, G., *Juden und Nichtjuden in Alexandrien* (MJS 18), Berlin 2006.
- SCHMITT, R., *Zelt und Lade als Thema alttestamentlicher Wissenschaft*, Gütersloh 1972.
- SONNET, J.-P., *The Book within the Book: Writing in Deuteronomy* (BilnS 14), Leiden 1997.
- , “Salomon construit le Temple. 1 Rois 5–10”, in: C. Focant (ed.), *Quelle maison pour Dieu?* (LeDiv), Paris 2003, 111–142.
- SPEK, R. J. VAN DER, “Cyrus the Great, Exiles, and Foreign Gods: A Comparison of Assyrian and Persian Policies on Subject Nations”, in: M. Kozuh *et al.* (eds.), *Extraction and Control*. FS M. W. Stolper (SAOC 68), Chicago 2014, 233–264.
- SPERBER, D., “The History of the Menorah”, *JJS* 16 (1965) 135–159.
- STAUBLI, T., *Das Image der Nomaden im alten Israel und in der Ikonographie seiner seßhaften Nachbarn* (OBO 107), Freiburg, Schweiz 1991.
- STEVENS, M. E., *Temples, Tithes, and Taxes: The Temple and the Economic Life of Ancient Israel*, Peabody 2006.
- TCHERIKOVER, V., “The Ideology in the Letter of Aristeas”, *HThR* 51 (1958) 59–85.
- TIMMER, D. C., *Creation, Tabernacle, and Sabbath: The Sabbath Frame of Exodus 31:12–17; 35:1–3 in Exegetical and Theological Perspective* (FRLANT 227), Göttingen 2009.
- TOORN, K. VAN DER, *The Image and the Book: Iconic Cults, Aniconism, and the Rise of Book Religion in Israel and the Ancient Near East* (CBET 21), Leuven 1997.
- TOORN, K. VAN DER / C. HOUTMAN, “David and the Ark”, *JBL* 113 (1994) 209–231.
- UNGER, E., *Babylon: Die Heilige Stadt nach der Beschreibung der Babylonier*, Berlin 1931.
- UTZSCHNEIDER, H., *Das Heiligtum und das Gesetz: Studien zur Bedeutung der sinaitischen Heiligtumstexte* (Ex 25–40; Lev 8–9) (OBO 77), Freiburg 1988.
- , “Tabernacle”, in: T. B. Dozeman / C. A. Evans / J. N. Lohr (eds.), *The Book of Exodus: Composition, Reception, and Interpretation* (VT.S 164), Leiden 2014, 267–301.

- VAN SETERS, J., "Solomon's Temple: Fact and Ideology in Biblical and Near Eastern Historiography", *CBQ* 59 (1997) 45–57.
- , "The Chronicler's Account of Solomon's Temple-Building: A Continuity Theme", in: M. P. Graham *et al.* (eds.), *The Chronicler as Historian* (JSOT.S 238), Sheffield 1997, 283–300.
- VATER, J. S., *Commentar über den Pentateuch II*, Halle 1805.
- WADE, M. L., *Consistency of Translation Techniques in the Tabernacle Accounts of Exodus in the Old Greek* (SBL.SCS 49), Leiden 2003.
- WEITZMAN, S., *Surviving Sacrilege: Cultural Persistence in Jewish Antiquity*, Cambridge, MA 2005.
- WEINBERG, J., *The Citizen-Temple Community* (trans. D. L. Smith-Christopher; JSOT.S 151), Sheffield 1992.
- WELLHAUSEN, J., *Prolegomena to the History of Israel*, Atlanta 1994 [1885].
- WETTE, W. M. L. DE, *Beiträge zur Einleitung in das Alte Testament*, Hildesheim 1971 [1806–1807].
- WEVERS, J. W., *Notes on the Greek Text of Exodus* (SCSt 30), Atlanta 1990.
- , *Text History of the Greek Exodus* (AAWG.MSU XXI), Göttingen 1992.
- WILLIAMSON, H. G. M., *Ezra, Nehemiah* (WBC 16), Waco 1985.
- WILSON, I., "Merely a Container? The Ark in Deuteronomy", in: J. Day (ed.), *Temple and Worship in Biblical Israel*. Proceedings of the Oxford Old Testament Seminar (LHB 422), 2nd edn, London 2007, 212–249.
- WOLFF, H. W., "Das Kerygma des deuteronomistischen Geschichtswerks", in: *idem*, *Gesammelte Studien zum Alten Testament* (ThB 22), München 1973, 308–324 (repr. from *ZAW* 73 [1961] 171–186).
- YARDEN, L., *The Spoils of Jerusalem on the Arch of Titus: A Re-Investigation* (Skrifter utgivna av Svenska Institutet i Rom 8), Stockholm 1991.
- ZENGER, E. *et al.*, *Einleitung in das Alte Testament* (ed. C. Frevel; StTh 1,1), 8th edn, Stuttgart 2012.