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MIŠKĀN and ṬŌHEL MÔʾĒD are names for the cultic dwelling place of YHWH described in Exod 25-40. This, the first of three studies on miškān and ṭōhel mōʾēd, will consider the etymologies of the terms, their lexical definitions, and parallel terms found in non-Semitic languages. Particular attention will be given to their usage in Ugaritic and their translation or interpretation in the LXX. The intention of this paper is to form some notion of the basic meaning of these terms/phrases as a foundation for a second study which focuses on their usages as witnessed within the text of Exod 25-40. A third study will present the literary structure of Exod 25-40, which these terms help to form.

1. The Etymology and Lexical Definition of MIŠKĀN.

MIŠKĀN is a nominal form of škn, a verb which has the meaning of "self-submission" (once), "settle," "rest," "stop," "live in," "inhabit," "sojourn," "dwell" (in its qal form); "let/make to live/dwell" (in the piel); "settle," "let/make to live/dwell" (in the hiphil).2 Its Assyrian cognate is šakānu ("set," "lay," "deposit") which yields the nominal form maškanu ("place," "dwelling place").3

1The author wishes to express appreciation to J. Bjørnar Storfjell, Richard M. Davidson, David Merling, and Randall W. Younker, members of the faculty of the Seventh-day Adventist Theological Seminary, Andrews University, for their patience in overseeing the preparation of this and related studies.


3BDB, 1014. See also A. L. Oppenheim and E. Reiner, eds., The Assyrian
The Hebrew noun *miskān* is generally understood to mean "dwelling place," the identity of which is determined by the context in which the term is found.4 In addition, Holladay indicates its use for "home," "tomb," and "(central) sanctuary."5 J. O. Lewis suggests that ṣkn is "rooted in the nomadic past of Israel and literally means 'to pitch a tent.'"6 He distinguishes ṣkn from yšb, noting that the latter is the normal term used for "dwelling in houses," from a basic meaning "to sit down."7 That is, ṣkn refers to a non-sedentary dwelling place (Lewis suggests a tent) while yšb refers to a sedentary dwelling place (e.g., a house). Thus, one may arrive at the preliminary conclusion that the verb ṣkn refers generally to some form of non-sedentary dwelling, perhaps "camping" in modern parlance, and that the noun *miskān* therefore refers to the place of that activity: a non-sedentary "dwelling-place," a "camp," or perhaps a "camp site." The emphasis of *miskān* is therefore on the nature of the camp—its non-sedentary nature.

---

Dictionary of the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago, volume 10, part I (Chicago: The Oriental Institute, 1977), 369-373, where the following basic definitions for *masšanu* are given: 1. threshing floor, empty lot, 2. small agricultural settlement, 3. emplacement, (normal) location, site (of a building), base (of a statue), stand (for a pot), residence, position, 4. tent, canopy; 5. fetter (for a slave), 6. pledge given as security, and 7. sanctuary (?)." Definition #4 indicates a broader meaning than simply "tent" or "canopy" (372). An appropriate interpretation may be "camp," as suggested by at least two of the seven examples given.


5Holladay lists these primary texts: Num 16:24; Isa 22:16; Lev 15:31; and notes the meaning as "(central) sanctuary (74 of 130 times), tabernacle Exod 25:9" (219).

6Lewis, 545.

7Ibid. Cf. Holladay, 146. F. M. Cross points out that the usual "priestly" word for people "dwelling" was yšb, and was never used of YHWH except when referring to His "throne" or "to enthrone" (F. M. Cross, Jr., "The Tabernacle," BA 110 [1947]: 67). M. Haran ("The Divine Presence in the Israelite Cult and the Cultic Institutions," Bib 50 [1969]: 259) concurs with a differentiated use of ṣkn and yšb in the deuteronomic writings where ṣkn speaks of "God's presence in a chosen place," but yšb refers to "his staying in heaven." For various uses of these two roots, see M. H. Woudstra, The Ark of the Covenant from Conquest to Kingship (Philadelphia: Presbyterian and Reformed Pub. Co., 1965), 69-70.
Especially important is the fact that no particular object is inherently associated (etymologically) with the term, which may apply either to a living being or an inanimate object. The breadth of the meaning of *miskān* must be taken into account in determining its use in context. To understand the meaning of *miskān*, one must ask: "Dwelling place of what or of whom? The answer must be found in the context. In practice, the answer is subject to interpretation flavored by theological and hermeneutical presuppositions.

As a case in point, considerable discussion has been generated concerning how *miskān* relates to the dwelling place of YHWH as described in the biblical text. R. Friedman defines *miskān* as the "inner fabric" over which is the "outer fabric" (*ōhel*), both comprising a "single structure." F. M. Cross defines škn "to encamp" or "to tent"; therefore, he suggests that *miskān* originally meant "tent" and later came to mean "the" tent par excellence. On the basis of Ras Shamra evidence, G. E. Wright defines *miskān* as "tent-dwelling." G. H. Davies takes a broader view, defining *miskān* as "tabernacle, dwelling, dwelling-place, habitation, abode, encampment"; however, he allows that the term may refer to the "shrine as a whole" (Exod 25:9) or "virtually the holy of holies" (Exod 26:1). Here then is provided the prevalent scope of definition: as specific as the "inner fabric" within the tent, yet as broad as "abode" or "encampment."

To add confusion, *miskān* is often translated "tabernacle," which in turn, is derived from the Latin Vulgate's *tabernaculum*, meaning

---

8 R. E. Friedman argues that the Mosaic construction was just the right size to fit into the Most Holy Place of the Solomonic Temple ("The Tabernacle in the Temple," BA 43 [1980]: 243, 245). Friedman's "outer tent" (*miskān*)/"inner tent" (*ōhel mōqed*) idea is clearly at odds with their relationship described in Exod 26:7 (see below, in the main text).

9 Cross, 65-66.


11 G. H. Davies, "Tabernacle," in IDB, 1962 ed., 4:498. The breadth of this definition is not justified in Exod 25-40. Certainly Exod 26:1 is not only the "holy of holies," as Davies suggests. The larger context of which Exod 26:1 is a part (Exod 26:1-37; especially v. 33) includes both haqqōdeš ("the holy") and qōdeš haqqōdeš ("the holy of holies"). In Exod 26:1, *miskān* refers to the two-compartment unit.
"tent." Since there is a completely different Hebrew word for "tent" (šèhèl), this use of tabernaculum is problematic. Inappropriate translation conveys a notion of synonymity, not evident in the Hebrew, but adopted in modern theology. If the two terms are identical, the meaning of phrases like Exod 26:7, "tent over the tabernacle" (NIV), might remain obscure. However, as the Hebrew for that verse is שְׁלֹחָן עֵרֶב אֶל הַמִּקְדָּשׁ נָאָם, "to/for [the] tent on/over the dwelling place," the distinction is apparent. While it is certainly true that the furniture within the miškān suggests a habitation or a dwelling, the term itself is not synonymous with "tent.

The trend of scholarly definition of miškān is correct; however, as a broad term, it has often recived too narrow a definition. Miškān almost always is automatically taken to mean "The dwelling of God" or even redefined as "sanctuary," "tabernacle," or "temple," without regard for the actual terminology. It would be safer to state that miškān connotes a special type of habitation; the term indicates the presence of the dweller while emphasizing the temporary nature of the dwelling place. In anthropological terms, this is a matter of sedentary or nonsedentary habitation.

If the dwelling place itself is nonsedentary, the dweller may be seen as nonsedentary as well. This choice of nonsedentary terminology may reflect the inculturalization of YHWH's commands in Exod 25-40, since the people to whom YHWH uttered the command to build the miškān were, as the biblical record shows, nonsedentary. A command to build a permanent, sedentary dwelling (such as the later Solomonic hēkāl, "temple" or "palace") might well become a modern translation option.

12See modern English translations: JB, KJV, NEB, NIV; see also Davies 4:498-506.


14Holbrook, 23. That the earthly dwelling is "movable" does not mean the spiritual counterpart is also movable, much less does it describe the heavenly Dweller. To draw extended theological conclusions from the choice of terminology about the nature of the spiritual analogue may unfairly overlook the inculturalization of YHWH's commands in Exod 25-40. This choice of terminology may indicate less about YHWH's heavenly mobility than about His mode of communication with finite humans.
have been incomprehensible or even reprehensible, given the circumstances of the earlier period. The writer called the dwelling place by a term which was immediately understandable within his cultural framework. Miškān, it seems, calls to mind a nonsedentary type of dwelling place: the “camp,” not particularly a structure itself, but a place where an object or a being abides.

2. The Etymology and Lexical Definition of Òhel Môìd

The genitival construct Òhel môìd is often translated “tent of meeting” in modern versions.15 The Hebrew word Òhel means “tent.”16 Variations of the word are found in Aramaic (râhalâ’), Phoenician (Ìl), Ugaritic (Ìl), and Egyptian [Ì(a)har(u)].17 The Assyrian cognate is âlu.18 The Vulgate translates both Òhel and miškān as tabernaculum (occasionally, tentorium), obscuring the discrete meaning of the Hebrew terms.19 The term môìd is a nominal form of the verb yâd: “designate,” “appear,” “come,” “gather,” “summon,” “reveal oneself.” Its basic meaning is “appointed time/place/sign,” “meeting place,” “place of assembly,” or “to meet by appointment.”20 The word occurs in Ugaritic (môìду) and Egyptian (mwâd).21

15NIV, RSV, KJV = “tent of the congregation”.


18BDB, 13. Oppenheim and Reiner indicate that âlu had four basic meanings: “1. city; 2. city as a social organization; 3. village, manor, estate; 4. fort, military strong point” (Assyrian Dictionary, volume 1, part I, 379). In each case, âlu refers in some respect to either a sedentary dwelling or sedentary dweller (ibid., 379-390). This may indicate a sedentarized origin for the nonsedentary Hebrew Òhel.

19Davies, 4:498.


Combining the two words, the phrase דָּמַקְדּוֹ מְשֶׁכָּן carries the notion “tent of the place of meeting/assembly/appointment,” or perhaps more interpretively: “tent where YHWH reveals Himself.” Brichto calls this the “Tent of Encounter” or “rendezvous.” This tent was the place of appointed gathering, known more by the event associated with it (meeting, gathering, or assembly) than by its physical character (hides over a wooden frame). In the YHWHistic cult, it was perceived to be the location of the ultimate cult event. With דָּמַקְדּוֹ מְשֶׁכָּן, the focus is on the event: “meeting/assembly/appointment/revelation.” This is quite distinct from מְשֶׁכָּן, which focuses on the place rather than the event.

3. Parallel Terms in Ugaritic Sources

The Ugaritic language provides a lexical cross-reference for Semitic-language documents written in the Middle Bronze III (IIIC)/Late Bronze I time frame. Useful for this study are cognates for מְשֶׁכָּן and דָּמַקְדּוֹ מְשֶׁכָּן which appear in the Ugaritic corpus, especially instances in which the terms are found in close literary formation.


The Egyptian equivalent for דָּמַקְדּוֹ מְשֶׁכָּן (mw’t) is also found in the Tale of Wen-Amon (ca. 1100 B.C.E.), referring to a city “assembly,” and in a document from Byblos (7th cent. B.C.E.); see Mullen, 129, n. 31; and Wilson, 245. For more on these two documents, see Cross, 65; R. J. Clifford, “The Tent of El and The Israelite Tent of Meeting,” CBQ 33 (1971): 225; and H. Goedicke, The Report of Wenamun (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1975), 123.
The verb form škn occurs sixteen times in Ugaritic literature; its noun form (mškn\textit{t}) appears twice.\textsuperscript{24} The paucity of occurrences of mškn\textit{t} makes definition problematic. Both occurrences of the noun are plural and both seem to refer to the multitudinous gods' private "dwelling places," not a meeting chamber or council place.\textsuperscript{25} The Ugaritic equivalent of mō\textit{ qed} is limited to a single occurrence of the phrase \textit{puhru mō\textit{ idu} meaning "the gathered assembly."}\textsuperscript{26} An equivalent to the Hebrew phrase \textit{ōhel mō\textit{ qed} does not appear in Ugaritic texts.

The equivalent term for \textit{ōhel} (Ugaritic, \textit{ḥl}) does occur and is especially important for this study in that the term occurs in association with mškn\textit{t} in each of its two occurrences.\textsuperscript{27} Two lines of the Keret epic read:

\textit{ti’tayu ḫluma la-ṭahlīhum,}
\textit{daru ḫl la-miškānatiḥum.}\textsuperscript{28}

Mullen provides the following translation, noting the association of la-ṭahlīhum and la-miškanatiḥum:

The gods proceed to their tents
The assembly of Ḫl to their dwellings.\textsuperscript{29}

\textsuperscript{24}For a list of occurrences of škn, see R. E. Whitaker, \textit{A Concordance of the Ugaritic Literature} (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1972), 594. For the occurrences of mškn\textit{t} see p. 436.


\textsuperscript{26}Mullen, 117, 129 (CTA 2.I.14, 15, 16-17. 20, 31). Also Clifford, 224-225. See I. Al-Yasin, \textit{The Lexical Relation Between Ugarit and Arabic}, Shelton Semitic Series, no. 1 (New York: Shelton College, 1952), 75. For a note on Ḫl, see ibid., 37.

\textsuperscript{27}Whitaker, 436, reads: \\textit{tity. ilm.l ahl hm.} / ḫl il.1 mškn\textit{t hm} . . . . The word Ḫl [cf. ahl\textit{l}] occurs in CTA 17.V.32; CTA 15.III.18; CTA 19.IV.214; CTA 19.IV.222; CTA 19.IV.212; ibid., 9. Mškn\textit{t} occurs in CTA 17.V.32 and CTA 15.III.19; ibid., 436.

\textsuperscript{28}CTA 15.III.18-19.

\textsuperscript{29}Ibid. Mullen states that there is "here the parallelism of ṭahlīhum and miškanatum, thus equating the tent with the tabernacle structure (note 42). The same
Here ṛkalihum ("their tents") is poetically associated with miškanatihum ("their dwelling places"). However, there is no equivalent Ugaritic phrase for ṭhel ṣmōed. The lack of an exact parallel demands an interpretive step by the reader. The terms are associated in the Ugaritic, but perhaps not in the same way as they are in the Hebrew. One would expect identical phrases if the Ugaritic and the Hebrew were synonymous or identical. In fact, the narrative speaks of a plural number of gods going to their plural tents. This is quite unlike the context of Exod 25-40 (and of the whole MT which allows no plurality of true gods). In line 19, the "assembly" is going to a plural number of "dwellings." The tents are not "tents of assembly," or of "meeting," or of "appointment," or of "revelation." They are simply personal tents, private tents, not a community tent.

The word mšknṭ also appears in the Ugaritic Aqhat epic:

\[
\begin{align*}
& h.tbc.kfr. 1 ahl, \\
& h.hyn.tbc.l mšknṭ
\end{align*}
\]

H. Ginsberg provides the following translation:

- Kothar departs for/from his tent,
- Hayyin departs for/from his tabernacle.

Although "tabernacle" is a poor translation for ṭngknt (better would be "dwelling" or "dwelling place"), the terms ḥl and mšknṭ clearly associate linguistically, in poetic parallelism. This parallelism, however, does not necessarily imply synonymity. The absence of the equivalent for the Hebrew ṭhel ṣmōed limits this passage's possibility of clarifying the Hebrew text. Thus, an in-depth analysis of this Ugaritic text is unnecessary for the current study.

Parallelism is common in Hebrew literature (cf. Num 24:5; Isa 54:2; Jer 30:18; etc, where ṭhel and miškān are in parallel)." Mullen accepts that the miškān "may be equated with" the ṭhel, a conclusion accepted without critical evaluation (pp. 168-175, passim) and therefore misunderstands the term as used in the Hebrew text. Poetic parallelism should not be confused with synonymy, either in the Hebrew text or in the Ugaritic material, especially since there is a difference in actual terminology (ṭhel ṣmōed compared with the Ugaritic ḥl) and a perceived contextual connotative nuance.

\[CTA \text{17.V.31-33; Whitaker, 436.}\]

\[\text{H. L. Ginsberg, "Ugaritic Myths, Epics, and Legends," in ANET, 151. See his n. 19 for the "for/from" alternative reading.}\]
Summarizing: the Ugaritic literature witnesses two instances of mšḳnt, both times in close connection with †hl. While clearly in poetic association, the words need not be synonymous. So, little additional definition from Ugaritic sources is added to the definition of mšḳān and †öhel môʾēḏ already obtained from Hebrew (by way of lexica and word studies). No occurrence of “tent of assembly” (†hl mḏ) is witnessed in Ugaritic materials currently available. In short, the Ugaritic evidence shows a similarity in basic meaning between the two terms (that is, both are places to inhabit), but does not offer additional insight in regard to the nuance of their definitions.

The Ugaritic language makes no clear distinction in meaning between the words mšḳnt and †hl, whereas the Hebrew clearly does. The reason for this may be related to cultural factors. The texts quoted above are normally dated in the Middle Bronze III (IIC)/Late Bronze I, between the 17th and 15th centuries B.C., when Ugarit was already an urban center. The chapters in Exodus, according to traditional views on the authorship of the book and the internal chronology of the book, deal with the late 15th century. Israel was at the time a pastoral and nonsedentary people who became sedentarized much later. Given these divergent cultural conditions, it is possible that mšḳnt and †hl did not convey the nonsedentary/sedentary differentiation simply because of cultural constraints. Furthermore, it is possible that the mšḳān and †öhel môʾēḏ phraseology typical of contemporary Late Bronze Semitic cultures may have been redefined when adopted into the terminology of the YHWHistic religion. Terms commonly used by surrounding peoples, who had a pantheon of gods, were inadequate—without redefinition—to convey the appropriate theological meaning within the YHWH cult.

4. Parallel Terms in the Septuagint

This work is concerned primarily with the contextual use of mšḳān and †öhel môʾēḏ in Exod 25-40 of the Hebrew. The way these

32 The reality of a period of Israelite nonsedentary pastoralism is currently the subject of discussion within the archaeological community. The issues are multiple and complex, but some scholars contend for some sort of nonsedentary pastoralism (see I. Finkelstein, The Archaeology of the Israelite Settlement (Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 1988).
words are translated in the LXX is surveyed in a search for further information. Miškän is translated exclusively by skēnē, while the common translation for ūhel mô̂ød is skēnē tou martyrion.\(^{33}\) Hence, both miškăn and ūhel (in the phrase ūhel mô̂ød) are translated by the same word skēnē. W. Bauer defines skēnē as "tent" or "booth."\(^{34}\) J. Thayer agrees with this definition—"tent" or "tabernacle"—and adds that skn is used "chiefly for ūhel [in the LXX and] often also for miškăn."\(^{35}\) Bauer notes the use of skēnē for both miškăn and ūhel in his definition of he skēnē tou martyrion, "the tabernacle or Tent of Meeting."\(^{36}\)

Like the English and Latin translations, the LXX shows little differentiation in its choice of terms for miškăn and ūhel mô̂ød.\(^{37}\) As a significant OT textual tradition, the LXX witnesses to an understanding of the Pentateuch which postdates its writings by many centuries. That both miškăn and ūhel mô̂ød are translated most often by skēnē may be attributed to several causes, one of which is a diluted perception of their connotational nuance. That is, by the time of the LXX, the two terms had come to mean virtually the same things; Israel had by then long been sedentarized.

5. Summary and Conclusions

The noun miškăn (derived from the verb škn) means "dwelling place." It concerns a "place" or "site" (similar to the modern word "camp"), and carries connotations of transience. It should not be

\(^{33}\) A. Rahlfs, Septuaginta (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1949).


\(^{36}\) Bauer, 754.

\(^{37}\) The argument could be made that miškăn and ūhel mô̂ød are synonymous, and therefore the single Greek term is adequate for both. The analysis of the use of these terms in Exod 25-40 clearly shows the terms to be similar but not synonymous (see note 2, above). For a more comprehensive view of the occurrences of skēnē in Exod 25-40, see G. Morrish, ed., A Concordance of the Septuagint (Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1976), 222-223.
limited to a specific form of "dwelling" (particularly not the English "tent" or Latin *tabernaculum*), as this leads to confusion with *ôhel*. The phrase *ôhel móêd* is a genitival construct meaning "tent of assembly" or "encounter." It was the name of the structure in which the Divine and human met, emphasizing the event rather than the structure.

Parallel terms found in the Ugaritic literature provide no additional information beyond that already known from the Hebrew. In fact, the Ugaritic literature offers only limited insight because the word *ôl* does not appear in genitival construction with *móêd* or its equivalent. Furthermore, the differentiation between the nonsedentary and sedentary meanings of the words in Hebrew appears to have been lost.\(^3\) As was noted, the reason for this could well have been that Ugarit, unlike Israel, was sedentary and urban.

The LXX, by translating both *mîškân* and *ôhel* by *skêné*, obscures the meaning of the Hebrew terms. It would seem that by the time the LXX was translated, the words were understood as synonyms. Again, the cultural setting of a sedentary and urban people would have assisted in eroding the differences. The Vulgate, likewise, fails to distinguish between the two.

Two future articles on *mîškân* and *ôhel móêd* will complete the study of the meaning of the words. The first will deal with the usage of the terms in Exod 25-40. The second will present an overview of the literary structure of those chapters. This introductory study has shown scholarly insensitivity to the connotational nuance of the words. The next two studies will reveal the pitfalls resulting from this insensitivity.

\(^3\)This suggestion, made to the author by David Merling, finds support in Mullen (170), who recognizes "that the deities were pictured as tent dwellers, even by the highly urbanized culture of Ugarit." Mullen wonders at this anachronism, yet misses the significance of this for interpreting the Hebrew text (see Whitaker, 436). The vital point is that a nonsedentary (tent-dwelling) culture is being described by a sedentary (urbanized) writer, thus potentially giving rise to the blurred terminological nuance posited above.