

Ex. 25:1 The LORD spoke to Moses, saying: 2 Tell the Israelite people to bring Me gifts; you shall accept gifts for Me from every person whose heart so moves him. 3 And these are the gifts that you shall accept from them: gold, silver, and copper; 4 blue, purple, and crimson yarns, fine linen, goats' hair; 5 tanned ram skins, dolphin skins, and acacia wood; 6 oil for lighting, spices for the anointing oil and for the aromatic incense; 7 lapis lazuli and other stones for setting, for the ephod and for the breastpiece.

Nahum Sarna, *Exodus* (JPS Torah Commentary), 122

Dolphin Hebrew *tehashim* (sing. *tahash*), with one exception, [Ezek 16:10, “sandals of *tahash*-leather”] always refers to the coverings of the Tabernacle.... A suggestion to equate the term with Akkadian *dušu* (= *tahšia*), the name of a precious stone of either yellow or orange color, seems more plausible since that word is also used to describe leather that is dyed and tanned the color of the stone.

“Hebrew *tahaš*, Akkadian *duḫšu*, Faience and Beadwork,” Stephanie Dalley, *JSS* 2000

I suggest that Hebrew *tahas* ... denotes beading and attaching pendants, and inlaying in stone, metal, faience and glass, and is usually made on leather but sometimes also wool or linen, or as cloisonné in precious metals, timber, etc.

Nathan Mastnjak, “Hebrew *tahaš* and the West Semitic Tent Tradition,” *VT* 66 (2016): 1-9

[Dalley’s] identification of *duḫšu* as faience and beadwork is not compelling. This argument is based on conjectures drawn from material remains, and lexicography on such a basis is fraught with difficulty. Durand’s conclusion [which is the same as the “suggestion” noted by Sarna] that the term, which refers to both a stone and a textile dyed the color of the stone, remains more persuasive.

Durand, in his recent study of the textiles at Mari, cites four texts in which *tuḫšum/duḫšum*, identified as a woven fabric, is used in the construction of a large royal tent (*ḫurpatum*) for Zimri-Lim.

Daniel Fleming, “Mari’s Large Public Tent and the Priestly Tent Sanctuary,” *VT* 50 (2000): 484-498

[He notes that this tent is “set up” (*shakanum*) and that the unusual *qerashim* of the Tabernacle match Mari *qersu*.]

Laconic as the Mari text is, its technical tent-making terminology suggests a remarkable continuity with the biblical tradition of the priestly tabernacle.

Mastnjak

While Dalley had already marshaled important philological arguments in favor of a parallel between the Hebrew term and the Mari textile *tuḫšum/duḫšum*, she overlooked the most significant functional parallel between the terms: both were used for the covering of palatial tents.

The shared West Semitic tent tradition attested at Mari, Ugarit, and Judah suggests that the term may not have been borrowed directly into Mari Akkadian and then later from Akkadian into Hebrew. Instead, the shared tradition suggests that this term, along with several others, existed in West Semitic prior to its adoption in Mari Akkadian and was independently preserved in both Mari Akkadian and Hebrew.

This parallel between the Mari *ḫurpatum* of woolen *tuḫšum* and the Israelite tent of *tahaš* leather shows that the authors of the priestly literature did not invent the appearance of their tent out of thin air. As they described the tent sanctuary, they drew on an ancient West Semitic tradition that recalled, among other things, a color appropriate for the deity’s luxurious abode. We may be correct in imagining this color as greenish-blue.

e-mail: torah-talk@earthlink.net

iTunes: <https://itunes.apple.com/us/podcast/torah-talk/id291683417>

web: <http://mcarasik.wordpress.com/category/podcast/>

Donate: <http://www.gofundme.com/s78nbc>

<http://www.nebraskapress.unl.edu/product/Commentators-Bible-Exodus,675297.aspx>

Unless otherwise identified, English translations are from *Tanakh* by permission of the Jewish Publication Society.