

separate Aaronic priesthood to be assisted by the Levites. The tabernacle was created with an antiquarian motive in deliberate imitation of the Mosaic tent and it was logical, at the same time, to seek the »patronage« of the first priest, Aaron, brother of Moses. David himself was capable of conceiving such an idea. After all, to bring the ark out of obscurity as a symbol of national unity was an act of genius. Further, David was not only a brilliant politician, but in addition he had the soul of a religious poet. It is to be noted that several psalms speak of the house of Aaron (Pss 115 10; 118 3 etc.) and Psalm 133 could have been the special psalm of the Aaronites.

There is very little in the content of the tabernacle sections of Exodus which could not have been written in the time of David. Perhaps the main difficulty in accepting such an idea is the description of the priest wearing a crown (29 6 and 39 30). To be sure, this could be a later addition. However, David himself may well have been regarded as head of the priesthood (cf. II Sam 6 14; Ps 110 4). It would then be natural for »Aaron« to wear the crown. This detail, however, does not affect the main argument. The sections under discussion do describe a tent, not a temple, so why not the sacred tent of David?

If the above argument is correct, then the description of the temple in I Reg 6–7, together with the picture of Solomon as high priest in the new building, both follow logically upon religious context and practice of the Davidic tabernacle. The silver and gold, and the vessels of the earlier system seem to have been transferred to the new one (cf. I Reg 7 51). The argument is also supported by the similarity in style between the description of the temple and the description of the tabernacle, both possibly finalized by the Annalist.

### 5. *The Collector and the Annalist*

It has already been stated that the process of collecting traditions probably began during David's reign. Judges, more obviously than other books, shows that the collection of local traditions did take place. David could well have inspired the collection and would, of course, make a substantial contribution to it, both as a ballad singer and as King of Judah in Hebron. It is reasonable to suppose that the traditions of Hebron went with David to Jerusalem. The most obvious source of northern traditions, though not the only one, would be the priesthood of the Shiloh line which came to Jerusalem via Nob and in the person of Abiathar (I Sam 22 20; cf. I Reg 2 27). In the later literature Zadok is also given a genealogy connecting him with the Shiloh line (Esr 7 1–6) though it is tempting to suppose he may have been a Jebusite of the Melchizedek line. In any case, some Jebusite traditions seem to have been taken over

(Gen 14 18). The main point, however, is that the time, opportunity and motive all point to David's reign as the most likely starting point for the process of collection, the motive being the development of a deeper national consciousness.

The Annalist, as he shall be called, probably lived in Solomon's reign. It is true that a historian or a theologian of this period has often been suggested as the author/collector/editor of some of Israel's early traditions. However, the Annalist as conceived here had a much wider canvas than previous theories have supposed. He composed a history which began with the creation of the world and which included the main events of the history of the Israelites up to the time of Solomon. He used the collected material of the previous reign but also created quite a lot of new material. It is suggested that the following list constitutes the main content of the Annalist's work (without prejudice to the possibility of later additions).

- |                                |   |
|--------------------------------|---|
| a) Origin of man               | Gen 1–11  |
| b) Origin of the tribes        | Gen 12–50   |
| c) Origin of Israel            | Ex 1/20 20;<br>24; 32–34                              |
| d) Israel in the wilderness    | Num 9 15–14, 45;<br>16–17; 20–25;<br>27 12–23         |
| e) Invasion of Canaan          | Joshua  |
| f) Heroes of the nation        | Proto-Judges  |
| g) Origin of the monarchy      | I Sam and II Sam 1/10                                 |
| h) Legitimation of the dynasty | II Sam 11–24<br>I Reg 1–2                             |
| i) Laws of the covenant        | Decalogue and<br>Ex 20 21–Ex 23                       |
| j) The history of worship      | Ex 25–31; 35–40 and<br>possibly sections from<br>Num. |

It is fairly obvious that there are layers of material from different periods in the above outline. Nevertheless, it is a fair assumption that a history with as wide a sweep as the above was produced during Solomon's reign. The cultural flowering which took place then, the international contacts which Solomon encouraged, the confidence of a nation newly aware of its higher place in the power structure of the Ancient Near East, the literary skills which had developed over several generations, the new temple which acted as a focus for antiquarian and liturgical studies – these and many other factors combine to justify the Annalist hypothesis.

It is true that more detailed analysis is needed to probe the various layers which precede and include the Annalist's work. For example, it may