



Priesthood in the Old Testament: Historical Development, Cultic Functions, and Theological Significance

Archimandrite Iakovos Kanakis

Abstract: *The institution of priesthood has a central place in the Old Testament. However, its historical development, diversity, and theological significance are often presented through a fragmented or narrow perspective of religious tradition. This article aims to examine the institution's historical formation, religious functions, and theological significance within the broader context of the ancient Near East and biblical tradition. The paper aims to shed light on the relationships among priests, Levites, Aaronides, and Zadokites, and to investigate how these groups contributed to the organisation of Israelite worship and religious identity. The research is based on a qualitative literature review and textual analysis of the Hebrew Bible, employing philological, historical-critical, and theological approaches. Biblical texts are examined alongside contemporary scholarly literature to examine the emergence of priestly institutions, the development of sacrificial worship, the centralization of the cult in Jerusalem, the significance of the Tabernacle and the Temple, the rituals of consecration, and the relationship between priesthood, holiness, purity, covenant, justice, and Torah. Particular attention is given to the Day of Atonement, priestly teaching and judicial authority, the covenant of Levi, and the role of the high priest during the Second Temple period. The findings indicate that the Old Testament priesthood did not develop into a fixed or consistent institution but underwent continuous historical and theological transformation in response to changing religious, political, and social conditions. Priestly identity emerged through the interaction of multiple biblical traditions, while its functions extended beyond sacrificial worship to include teaching, legal authority, guardianship of sacred space, and communal leadership. The study further demonstrates that the Christian, and particularly Orthodox, reception of Old Testament priesthood preserves significant theological continuity while reinterpreting its meaning in the light of Christ and the life of the Church. By integrating historical, philological, and theological perspectives, this article contributes to a more comprehensive understanding of priesthood as a dynamic institution that shaped Israel's religious identity and continues to inform contemporary biblical and theological scholarship.*

Keywords: *Levites, Old Testament, Orthodox, Priesthood, Temple, Torah.*

I. INTRODUCTION

Old Testament priesthood belongs simultaneously to the history of religion, social history, philology, and biblical theology [19] [3]. Certainly, the priest presides over religious ceremonies at the altar. Still, he has a much wider spectrum of responsibility: he is the guardian of the sanctuary, teaches the Torah, knows the holy from the common and the clean from the unclean, utters blessings, and sometimes takes part in the judicial, economic, and political life of the community [1]. Nevertheless, the biblical books contain sources from different communities, and these sources do not always reach consensus on the origins, privileges, or duties of the priests. [24] [11]. Priesthoods were widespread throughout the ancient Near East, yet those of Ugarit, Mesopotamia, Egypt, Canaan, and Israel were not.

Interchangeable institutions [27] [8]. Even within the Hebrew Bible, the terms “priest,” “Levite,” “sons of Aaron,” and “sons of Zadok” change in meaning [15].

The present paper tries to explore five related points: the cultural environment in which the Israelite priesthood developed; the main phases of its institutional formation; its ritual, judicial, educational, and social duties; what those duties expressed theologically; and finally, the integration of Old Testament priesthood in Christianity, especially within the Orthodox Church.

II. METHODOLOGICAL AND TERMINOLOGICAL FRAMEWORK

The main Hebrew term translated “priest” is *kōhēn*. The term is not a synonym for Israelite persons: Melchizedek is called “priest of God Most High” (Genesis 14:18), Potiphera serves at On (Genesis 41:45), and Jethro is priest of Midian (Exodus 2:16; 3:1).

The term “Levite” has more than one meaning [15]. In Deuteronomy, the expression “the Levitical priests” appears, and the Levites are portrayed as a landless group economically dependent on the community (Deuteronomy 12:12, 18–19; 14:27–29; 18:1–8).

The analysis follows four axes. First, it investigates how the different traditions about the said institution emerged over time. Furthermore, it explores how priesthood is presented in terms of language and structure in the Bible. In addition, it compares priesthood in Israel with similar cultic roles in neighbouring cultures, such as Ugarit, Mesopotamia, Egypt, and Syria-Palestine. Finally, it focuses on how the Old Testament relates priesthood to important themes like holiness, covenant, and the presence of God Himself.

Manuscript received on 20 July 2026 | First Revised Manuscript received on 27 July 2026 | Second Revised Manuscript received on 16 August 2026 | Manuscript Accepted on 15 September 2026 | Manuscript published on 30 September 2026.

*Correspondence Author

Archimandrite Iakovos Kanakis (ThD)*, Department of Holy Church of the Transfiguration of the Saviour in Moschato, Athens, Holy Archdiocese of Athens, Greece. Email: iakovoskanakis@yahoo.com ORCID ID: [0009-0006-4974-3341](https://orcid.org/0009-0006-4974-3341)

© The Author. Published by Lattice Science Publication (LSP). This is an open access article under the CC-BY-NC-ND license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>)



III. PRIESTHOOD: THE HISTORICAL DEVELOPMENT AND FUNCTIONS

A. The Religious Milieu of the Ancient Near East

Temples, altars, sacred estates, and specialized cultic personnel were familiar features of ancient Near Eastern societies [8]. People of Israel progressed within a shared cultural context. The Bible presents the change toward the exclusive worship of Yahweh as a process that took place not instantly but gradually, and was characterized by tension, opposition, and conflict [2]. Comparison among these cultures makes clear the uniqueness of Israel in terms of monotheism and cultic practices [7]. The priest in Israel is not an independent owner of a magical technique but rather the minister of God [31].

B. From Family Worship to the Formation of Priestly Groups

The narratives of Genesis present the patriarchs as building altars, invoking the name of the Lord, and offering sacrifices: Noah after the flood (Genesis 8:20), Abraham at various stages of his journey (Genesis 12:7–8; 13:18; 22:13), Isaac at Beersheba (Genesis 26:25), and Jacob at Shechem and Bethel (Genesis 33:20; 35:7). The text describes functions that would later be associated with the priesthood, without always attributing a technical office [15].

Two figures in the Old Testament, Melchizedek and Jethro, who did not originate from Israel, are very important. Jethro, priest of Midian and father-in-law of Moses, is depicted in Genesis as offering a sacrifice to God and participating in a sacred meal with Moses' brother Aaron and the elders of the community (Exodus 18:1–12).

In the book of Judges as well as during the early monarchy, the picture is not that clear. Among the Israelite judges of the community, the story of Micah and the Danite Levite (Judges 17–18) testifies to a private sanctuary, the use of an ephod and teraphim, and the employment of a Levite as a priest in a household.

C. Levites, Aaronides, and Zadokites

Genesis presents the Levites as descendants of the third son of Jacob and Leah. They are very dedicated to their religious duties, full of zeal and separated from family duties. They were to serve exclusively God and worship Him. According to the Priestly Tradition, Aaron and his sons are selected by God Himself to serve as priests (Exodus 28:1). In Exodus 28–29 and Leviticus 8–9, we read in detail about their consecration. The Levites are given to Aaron and his sons to assist with the duties in the Tabernacle, to guard it, transport it when needed, and always be careful not to approach the most consecrated objects (Numbers 1:48–53; 3–4; 8:5–26).

In Deuteronomy, we see a different perspective on the “Levitical priests,” who appear to be a broader group [17]. Every Levite who arrives from his townlets to the location that God will determine is authorized to perform there and to share in the priestly incomes (Deuteronomy 18:6–8).

In Ezekiel 40–48, we see another dimension; the “sons of Zadok” are awarded because, from the prophet's perspective, they held the assistance of the sanctuary, whereas the other Levites are downgraded to auxiliary duties because of their connection with idolism (Ezekiel 44:10–16) [12]. Thus, we

see that lineages are not merely physical records [28].

D. Tabernacle, Local Sanctuaries, and the Temple of Jerusalem

In the final shape of the Pentateuch, the tabernacle works as a mobile sanctuary. The placement of the tribes around it and of the Levites between the sanctuary and the people presents the priesthood as a protective boundary: it enables access to God while at the same time safeguarding the community from a disorderly encounter with the holy [17].

The historical relationship between the biblical Tabernacle and the actual temples of Israel remains a matter of debate. The Priestly Tradition probably reworks earlier memories of a mobile sanctuary through categories that also reflect temple worship.

Before the exclusive elevation of Jerusalem, the biblical texts know of many places of worship: Shechem, Bethel, Gilgal, Mizpah, Shiloh, Dan, Beersheba, and others. Deuteronomy 12 requires sacrifice at “the place that the Lord will choose,” and the Deuteronomistic History evaluates the kings according to their attitude toward the high places and the exclusivity of Jerusalem [13].

The building of the Temple by Solomon, as mentioned in 1 Kings 5–8, connects the sanctuary with the lineage of King David, the ark, and national unity. The priests serve in a freedom of unique holiness, but godly freedom remains essential.

i. The Deuteronomic Centralization of Worship and the Question of Local Priests

The prerequisite in Deuteronomy 12 that the religious sites of the nations be eliminated and that sacrifices be offered only “in the place which the Lord shall choose” marks a turning point in the history of Israelite worship [29]. This regulation does not initially anoint Jerusalem exclusively, but it clearly favours centralisation in the temple of the capital. In 2 Kings 22–23, Josiah's reform is presented as the performance of the “book of the covenant”: regional sanctuaries are nullified, objects associated with foreign religions are removed, and the Passover is celebrated with exceptional centrality. The historical scope and effectiveness of this reform remain much debated. The narrative itself is theological in character and evaluates the whole of earlier history based on Jerusalem's exclusive legitimacy.

Nevertheless, its very controversy suggests that local sanctuaries were deeply rooted in social and religious life. Centralization was not merely an evolution of location; it once more organized the practices of pilgrimage, sacrificial economies, family traditions, and networks of local authority. This conversion had direct results for the priests of regional sanctuaries. In Deuteronomy 18:6–8, we read that a Levite who comes from any of his townlets to the defined place to serve may serve “in the name of the Lord” and receive an equal portion with his brothers. The requirement sets out an integrative timetable, under which the annulment of local altars should not exclude their representatives from the new central religion.

On the other hand, 2 Kings 23:9 states that the priests of the high places did not ascend to the altar of the Lord in Jerusalem, although they ate unleavened bread among their



brothers. This difference may reflect a gap between the legislative ideal and historical implementation, or different phases of negotiation between major and peripheral local communities. In the latter priestly practice, we find a separate resolution of the discrepancy between Aaronide priests and Levitical associates: it incorporates the Levites into the sanctuary's service while limiting their access to the altar [18]. Thus, the centralization of worship does not by itself justify the total record of the priesthood. Still, it is a critical framework for understanding genealogical claims, the social defenselessness of the Levites, and the later hierarchical organization of the Temple.

The social dimension of the reform is also important. The local priest did not lose only an altar, but often the grid of kinship, reputation, and subsistence that had formed near the sanctuary. In Deuteronomy, there is a concern about the Levite, together with the refugee, the orphan, and the widow, which suggests that centralization created new forms of insecurity that the community was obliged to address through taxes, communal meals, and solidarity expressed in its institutions and regulations [9].

E. Anointing, Priestly Vestments, and Holiness

The anointing of Aaron and his sons in Exodus 29 and Leviticus 8 is a complex transitional ceremony. The vestments described in Exodus 28 indicate the public and figurative aspect of the office. The idea of "graded holiness" helps to interpret the system [26]. The Holy of Holies, the Day of Atonement, and the high priest constitute the highest point of cultic concentration. In Leviticus 16, the high priest enters the inner sanctuary once a year, after first offering a sacrifice to eliminate his sins and those of his household.

However, there is also a "threat" of the sacred. The stories of Nadab and Abihu (Leviticus 10), the revolution of Korah (Numbers 16–17), and the offence of Uzzah (2 Samuel 6:6–8) express this in a surprising form. Within the priestly world, they signify that the godly presence is not available for private allocation and that the limits of ritual service protect both the sanctuary and the people of the community [23].

F. The Main Duties of the Priesthood

The first and foremost duty of the priest is service at the altar. He must offer a precise service, as it serves a theological goal: it keeps the place of encounter with God pure. It makes possible the continuation of the covenant within an unholy community that keeps sinning [6]. A second duty is the difference between the holy and the vulgar, the unclean and the clean (Leviticus 10:10). This distinction keeps away the moralization of every infection. It demonstrates the social character of priestly verdict and judgment. Teaching is the third duty. Deuteronomy 33:10 explicitly associates the Levites with the teaching of verdicts and of the Torah. Then we have the utterance of blessings to the people on God's behalf. A fifth duty is the seeking of divine judgment. The Urim and Thummim are placed in the breastpiece of judgment of the high priest (Exodus 28:30) and are linked to Levi as we see in Deuteronomy 33:8. A sixth duty is the guarding and administration of the sanctuary. The Chronicler's lists reflect the need of a post-exilic community to organise the Temple as a centre of identity, education, and economic administration.

We also need to note that the priesthood inevitably has

social and financial dimensions. Priests and Levites live from portions of sacrifices, first fruits, tithes, and dedicated offerings (Numbers 18; Deuteronomy 18).

i. The Day of Atonement as the Climax of High-Priestly Ministry

In the Pentateuch, Leviticus 16 shows us many aspects of priestly ministry in a single annual ceremony. Here we can read about the innermost sanctuary. We understand that it was a perilous duty rather than an intuitive privilege. The high priest cleans himself thoroughly, wears linen garments, offers first for himself and his household, enters the Holy of Holies, and spreads blood to the sacred space. Only then does he offer atonement for his people. It is clear that the ritual is public and metaphorical: it mends the requested relationship among God, sanctuary, and people. The Hebrew verb *kippēr* and its related vocabulary continue to generate debates. Readings that reduce atonement to the appeasement of anger or the transfer of punishment do not reflect the ritual reasoning of the book of Leviticus [22] [4]. Sin and some forms of impurity affect not only an offender but the sacred environment in which God dwells among the people [6]. Blood is considered to have divinely given life (Leviticus 17:11); it is applied to fundamental religious locations, while the live goat bears revealed misdeeds away from the camp. Purification of the sanctuary and atonement of sin are thus combined movements. Forgiveness restores collective and spatial order. Modern literature varies on details while agreeing that the rite should not be reduced to a single later doctrinal procedure.

The Day of Atonement also adorns the social role of priesthood. Once a year, the community is summoned to "afflict itself" and to cease working, while the high priest acts on behalf of the entire community (Leviticus 16:29–34). The rite creates a shared memory of guilt and a shared possibility of a new beginning. It does not eliminate the differences between deliberate and involuntary sin, nor does it substitute the rehabilitation of injustice. Still, it states that the covenant provides a God-given course of repentance and restoration of the relationship between God and His people.

Historically, the emphasis on a central annual rite is connected with the formation of the Jerusalem temple as the unique sanctuary and with the post-exilic need to reconstitute the community. From a theological perspective, it presents a vibrant understanding of purity: the sanctuary is not a place that remains unaffected by people's lives, but rather a relational space that requires continual preservation and rehabilitation. Later Christian reception, especially in Hebrews, would claim this language for Christ's unique high-priestly offering.

ii. Priestly Teaching, Judicial Decision-Making, and Knowledge of the Torah

Priestly teaching is not a secondary duty to sacrificial service, but an essential component of the identity of the priest [17]. According to Deuteronomy 33:10, the Levites teach the "judgments" of the law, while in Malachi 2:7 we read that the lips of the priest are guardians of knowledge, from whom the community seeks the Law of Yahweh and His will. For this reason, priestly teaching is linked to judicial

authority.

The shift from prophecy to the ever-growing authority of the written Torah does not mean that religion was replaced by “legalism.” In earlier traditions, the priest could seek a divine decision through the ephod, the Urim and Thummim, or other acknowledged practices (1 Samuel 14:41 in the broader textual context; 23:9–12; 30:7–8). The figure of Ezra, who is a priest and scribe, embodies this conjunction. Priestly knowledge is therefore a ministry under judgment [20].

iii. The Priestly Blessing, the Name, and Peace

In Numbers 6:22–27, the writer preserves the priestly blessing which clearly reflects the relationship between liturgical authority and divine action. The key for its interpretation lies in the final phrase, where we see that the priests utter the name of the Lord upon Israel, but Yahweh Himself is the one who blesses [25].

The liturgical word does not function as a magical spelling, nor does it turn the priest into the commander of the divine blessing. The continual gift of divine peace is what preserves the community, and people have the chance to be reminded of that within worship. Their existence is secured not merely by institutions, earthly possessions, or military strength, but by the continual gift of godly peace. This structure also offers a theological measure for priestly ministry more generally: the minister bears a word that blesses, without claiming the authority of the blessing.

G. Priesthood, Monarchy, and Prophetic Rebuke

There is a strong relationship between the priesthood and the monarchy, but this relationship was not always characterised by harmony. The biblical records express the difference between institutions and the opposition of priestly tradition to the complete absorption of the sacred by monarchical authority [15].

The prophets do not deny priesthood or worship, but they denounce their corruption and alienation from the covenant [5]. This is clear in the book of Hosea, which links the lack of knowledge of God to the collapse of the priesthood: “Because you have rejected knowledge, I also reject you from being a priest to me” (Hosea 4:6).

Prophets insist on denouncing the idea that correct ritual operates autonomously. Worship needs to be integrated into the truth of the covenant so that priesthood is valid. The institution fails every time it deviates from God's will, as clearly depicted in the Torah.

Without having the same role and purpose, it is exactly here that priest and prophet meet. The priest contributes to continuity, order, memory, and repeated action. It requires the stability of priestly Torah and the renewing critique of the prophetic word.

H. Exile, Restoration, and Post-Exilic Restructure

After the Babylonians destroyed Solomon's Temple, Israel underwent a deep crisis, with the priests losing the central space of their sacred duties. At the same time, the community began to wonder about the true relationship among the godly presence, the land, and the temple. After the return from exile, Joshua, son of Jozadak, strongly supported Zerubbabel in the effort to rebuild the temple, enabling the community to regain its lost religious identity (Haggai 1–2; Zechariah 3–4). Governors, elders, scribes, imperial officials, priests, and

Levites continued to share and contest public responsibilities.

When reading the books of Ezra and Nehemiah, we find that the Torah, the Temple, and the construction of communal identity are interconnected. The priests in the post-exilic period become the bearers of Scripture, education, and identity, not only of ritual and cultic ceremonies [10]. In Chronicles, the writer presents an ideal narrative of worship, recording David as the organiser of the priestly divisions, Levites, singers, gatekeepers, and treasurers (1 Chronicles 23–26). We could say that the rule of the Temple works as a miniature of a community looking to recover its unity after the destruction of Jerusalem.

i. The High Priesthood during the Second Temple Period

During the Persian period, the high priesthood was a symbol of the Temple's continuity rather than merely of its replacement by the monarchy. He represented the legitimacy of worship and the memory of the community, but his political power depended on changing relations with the conquerors and with other local nobility [14]. The books of Ezra and Nehemiah preserve both cooperation and tension among priests, Levites, scribes, officials, and the people. The genealogical lists, the signatures of the covenant in Nehemiah 10, and the regulations concerning tithes and the Temple storerooms show that purity of descent, the economic maintenance of the sanctuary, and institutional accountability were interconnected issues. Sirach 50 offers one of the fullest literary portraits of the high priest during the Second Temple period. Here the high priest embodies not a private spirituality, but the unity of the Temple, the priestly order, and the community.

In the Hellenistic and especially in the Maccabean period, the high priesthood had a more evident political role. For the history of Old Testament priesthood, the Second Temple period is critical because it reveals both the possibilities and the dangers of an institution that simultaneously embodies worship and public representation.

I. The Theological Significance of Old Testament Priesthood

The first theological significance of the institution is the maintenance of people's holiness. Priesthood exists because God desires to dwell among his people and because proximity to the holy requires distinction, purification, and order [23]. The second category is mediation, as the priest mediates between the divine and the human. The third category is representation. The vestments of the high priest, the portions of the sacrifices, the public blessing, and the entrance into the Holy of Holies show that one person may act symbolically on behalf of the whole. The Torah is addressed to the entire people, and the covenant requires both collective and individual fidelity. The priest concentrates the relationship, but he does not replace the community. The fourth category is the unity of word and rite. Priesthood is not confined to the altar, nor is the Torah reduced to abstract instruction. The fifth category is the memory of grace. Priesthood is, from this perspective, a ministry of divine condescension.





i. The “Covenant of Levi”, “Covenant of Peace” and of “Perpetual Priesthood”

In the book of the prophet Malachi 2:4–8, the expression “covenant of Levi” gathers together earlier biblical traditions and offers a theological interpretation of the priestly mission [30]. Precisely for this reason, Malachi can use the covenant of Levi as the basis for an accusation against the priests. Also, in Numbers 25:10–13, Phinehas receives a “covenant of peace” and a “covenant of perpetual priesthood” in response to his zeal for the community's holiness.

J. Christian and Orthodox Reception

The New Testament receives Old Testament priesthood through complementary patterns. It refers to the Tabernacle, the Day of Atonement, Melchizedek, sacrifice, and the high priest as a means of interpreting Christ's person and work (Hebrews 4–10). It focuses on both continuation and powerful transformation: Christ is not simply another Levitical priest. He is the unique high priest whose voluntary sacrifice and heavenly ministry give new meaning to the Old Testament's language and symbols of Israeli worship. The earlier sacrificial system provides the language for understanding Christ, but it is not continued in the same form.

At the same time, 1 Peter 2:5, 9 transfers terminology of Exodus 19:6 to the Christian community: believers are a “spiritual house,” a “holy priesthood,” and a “royal priesthood.” This collective priestly calling does not eliminate ecclesial service, but reminds us that every particular ministry exists within the body. The biblical tension between the special priesthood and the holiness of the whole people remains fruitful from a theological perspective.

Orthodox liturgy incorporates several elements of Old Testament worship: sacred architecture, the Holy Table, incense, vestments, entrances, blessings, and sacrificial language. Orthodox Fathers and liturgical interpretation apply a Christological and ecclesiological lens to the Tabernacle and Temple. It is very important to observe, though, that such typology should not be thought of as a direct legacy from Aaronic priesthood to Christian ministry [21]. Apostolic ministry, Eucharistic presidency, and ordination belong to the ecclesial order of the New Testament, even when Israel's Scriptures enrich their language and symbolism.

This distinction also allows for a mature pastoral application. Biblical priesthood shows that ministry is a calling, public responsibility, and service to the community. At the same time, the severe judgments against Eli, his sons, corrupt priests, and careless ministers ban every overly optimistic comprehension. The holiness of the institution does not make persons unfailing nor does it exclude the institution from human abuse. The faith of the Church is not built upon the moral perfection of every cleric, but this does not reduce the request for accountability and repentance. The Old Testament connection between privilege and judgment gives a vital criterion for every contemporary theology of ministry [16].

IV. CONCLUSIONS

The Old Testament priesthood resembles a developing institution rather than a fixed and rigid one throughout Israel's history. The Pentateuch, priestly literature, Ezekiel,

and Chronicles preserve different responses to particular historical pressures and theological concerns.

However, despite that diversity, significant commonalities remain: Priests represent the divine presence, and people are gathered around it. They offer sacrifice, help guide the community so that they remain pure, serve as Torah teachers and interpreters, bless, mediate, pronounce judgments, guard, and administer sacred space.

Theologically, priesthood expresses both the possibility and the danger of closeness to the Holy One. Old Testament priesthood therefore remains a living field of inquiry into holiness, authority, worship, memory, and accountability—not just a remnant of an outdated religious past.

In Orthodox reception, the priestly traditions of the Old Testament continue to enrich Christian worship through their language, symbols, and theological themes. In this way, the Orthodox tradition recognises both the continuity of biblical symbolism and the institution's transformation within the life of the Church.

DECLARATION STATEMENT

Some of the cited references are older and explicitly noted as [7], [10], [14], [18], [19], [20], [21], [25], [26], [27], [29], [30], and [31]. Nonetheless, these works remain essential for the current study. However, these works remain significant for the current study, as they are pioneering in their fields.

After aggregating input from all authors, I must verify the accuracy of the following information as the article's author.

- **Conflicts of Interest:** Based on my understanding, this article has no conflicts of interest.
- **Funding Support:** This article has not been sponsored or funded by any organization or agency.
- **Ethical Approval and Consent to Participate:** The data provided in this article are exempt from ethical approval or participant consent requirements.
- **Data Access Statement and Material Availability:** The adequate resources of this article are publicly accessible.
- **Author's Contributions:** The authorship of this article is contributed solely.

REFERENCES

1. Achenbach, Reinhard. “Priestly Law.” *The Oxford Handbook of Biblical Law*, edited by Pamela Barmash, Oxford University Press, 2019, pp. 177–198. DOI: [10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199392667.013.26](https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199392667.013.26)
2. Anderson, Yan. “Tension between Monotheism and Polytheism in the Hebrew Bible and in Ancient Israel.” *Vox Scripturae*, vol. 27, no. 3, 2019, DOI: [10.25188/2447.7443.2019v27n3.14](https://doi.org/10.25188/2447.7443.2019v27n3.14)
3. Fuad, Chelcent. “Priestly Disability and Centralization of the Cult in the Holiness Code.” *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament*, vol. 46, no. 3, 2022, pp. 291–305. DOI: [10.1177/03090892211032245](https://doi.org/10.1177/03090892211032245).
4. Greenberg, A. James. *A New Look at Atonement in Leviticus: The Meaning and Purpose of Kipper Revisited*. Penn State University Press, 2019. DOI: [10.1515/9781646020539](https://doi.org/10.1515/9781646020539)
5. Groenewald, Alphonso. “‘But Let Justice Roll Down Like Waters, and Righteousness Like an Ever-Flowing Stream’ (Am 5:24): Social Justice versus Cult Criticism in Amos 5:21–24 and Isaiah 1:10–20: A Trauma Perspective.” *HTS Teologiese Studies / Theological Studies*, vol. 75, no. 3, 2019, pp. 1–8. DOI: [10.4102/hts.v75i3.5629](https://doi.org/10.4102/hts.v75i3.5629).
6. Harper, G. Geoffrey. “Endangered or Dangerous? YHWH's Presence and Impurity in Levitical Perspective.” *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament*, vol. 46, no. 3, 2022, pp. 357–76.



- DOI: [10.1177/03090892211061175](https://doi.org/10.1177/03090892211061175).
7. Hayward, Robert. "Priesthood, Temple(s), and Sacrifice." *The Oxford Handbook of Biblical Studies*, edited by J. W. Rogerson and Judith M. Lieu, Oxford University Press, 2008, pp. 319–350.
DOI: [10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199237777.003.0018](https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199237777.003.0018). Works remain significant; see the [Declaration](#)
 8. Hieke, Thomas. "Ritual Experts and Participants in the Ancient Near East and the Hebrew Bible." *The Oxford Handbook of Ritual and Worship in the Hebrew Bible*, edited by Samuel E. Balentine, Oxford UP, 2020, pp. 179–193. *Oxford Handbooks Online*, DOI: [10.1093/oxfordhb/9780190222116.013.10](https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780190222116.013.10).
 9. Hoffmeier, James K. "Egyptian Religious Influences on the Early Hebrews." *Did I Not Bring Israel Out of Egypt? Biblical, Archaeological, and Egyptological Perspectives on the Exodus Narratives*, edited by James K. Hoffmeier, Alan R. Millard, and Gary A. Rendsburg, Penn State University Press, 2016, pp. 3–36.
DOI: [10.1515/9781575064307-003](https://doi.org/10.1515/9781575064307-003)
 10. Janzen, David. "The 'Mission' of Ezra and the Persian-Period Temple Community." *Journal of Biblical Literature*, vol. 119, no. 4, 2000, pp. 619–643. DOI: [10.2307/3268487](https://doi.org/10.2307/3268487). Works remain significant; see the [declaration](#)
 11. Jeon, Jaeyoung, editor. *The Social Groups behind the Pentateuch*. SBL Press, 2021. URL: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/366399435_Jaeyoung_Jeon_ed_Social_Groups_behind_the_Pentateuch_Ancient_Israel_and_its_Literature_44_Atlanta_SBL_Press_2021
 12. Jeon, Jaeyoung. "The Levites and Idolatry: A Scribal Debate in Ezekiel 44 and Chronicles." *Chronicles and the Priestly Literature of the Hebrew Bible*. De Gruyter, 2021.
DOI: [10.1515/9783110707014-017](https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110707014-017).
 13. Lemański, Janusz. "Hezekiah and the Centralization of Worship (2 Kgs 18:4.22)." *Collectanea Theologica*, vol. 92, no. 1, 2022, pp. 29–62.
DOI: [10.21697/ct.2022.92.1.02](https://doi.org/10.21697/ct.2022.92.1.02)
 14. Lemche, Niels Peter. *Ancient Israel: A New History of Israelite Society*. Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2015.
<https://www.bloomsbury.com/uk/ancient-israel-9780567662798/>
Works remain significant, see the [declaration](#)
 15. Leuchter, Mark. "The Levites in the Hebrew Bible." *Religion Compass*, vol. 11, nos. 5–6, 2017, article e12235. DOI: [10.1111/rec3.12235](https://doi.org/10.1111/rec3.12235).
 16. Levin, Christoph. "The Pentateuch: A Compilation by Redactors." In *The Formation of the Pentateuch: Bridging the Academic Cultures of Europe, Israel, and North America*, edited by Jan C. Gertz, Bernard M. Levinson, Dalit Rom-Shiloni, and Konrad Schmid, pp. 579–588. Mohr Siebeck, 2016. URL: <https://www.mohrsiebeck.com/en/book/the-formation-of-the-pentateuch-9783161538834>
 17. MacDonald, Nathan. "Priests, Levites, and Levitical Priests in Deuteronomy." *The Oxford Handbook of Deuteronomy*, edited by Don C. Benjamin, Oxford University Press, 2021, pp. 219–232.
DOI: [10.1093/oxfordhb/9780190273552.013.15](https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780190273552.013.15)
 18. Nicholson, Ernest. "Josiah and the Priests of the High Places (II Reg 23,8a.9)." *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*, vol. 119, no. 4, 2007, pp. 498–507. DOI: [10.1515/ZAW.2007.035](https://doi.org/10.1515/ZAW.2007.035); works remain significant, see the [declaration](#)
 19. Nihan, Christophe. "The Titles of the High Priest of Jerusalem in the Pre-Hasmonean Period." *Religions*, vol. 14, no. 4, 2023, article 529.
DOI: [10.3390/rel14040529](https://doi.org/10.3390/rel14040529). Works remain significant, see the [declaration](#)
 20. akkala, Juha. *Ezra the Scribe: The Development of Ezra 7–10 and Nehemiah 8*. De Gruyter, 2004. DOI: [10.1515/9783110915624](https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110915624). Works remain significant, see the [declaration](#)
 21. Regev, Eyal. "Priestly Dynamic Holiness and Deuteronomic Static Holiness." *Vetus Testamentum*, vol. 51, no. 2, 2001, pp. 243–261.
DOI: [10.1163/156853301300102129](https://doi.org/10.1163/156853301300102129). Works remain significant, see the [declaration](#)
 22. Rendtorff, Rolf. "Atonement in the Old Testament." *Theology Today*, vol. 75, no. 2, 2018, pp. 169–178. DOI: [10.1177/0040573618776096](https://doi.org/10.1177/0040573618776096)
 23. Scarlata, Mark W. "Inhabiting Sacred Space (Leviticus 8–10, 24–27)." *The Theology of the Book of Leviticus*, Cambridge University Press, 2025, pp. 114–156. DOI: [10.1017/9781108980319.006](https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108980319.006)
 24. Schwartz, Baruch J. "The Documentary Hypothesis." *The Oxford Handbook of the Pentateuch*, Oxford University Press, 2021.
DOI: [10.1093/oxford/9780198726302.013.10](https://doi.org/10.1093/oxford/9780198726302.013.10)
 25. Smoak, Jeremy D. *The Priestly Blessing in Inscription and Scripture: The Early History of Numbers 6:24–26*. Oxford University Press, 2015.
DOI: [10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199399970.001.0001](https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199399970.001.0001). Works remain significant, see the [declaration](#)
 26. Stackert, Jeffrey. *A Prophet like Moses: Prophecy, Law, and Israelite Religion*. Oxford University Press, 2014.
DOI: [10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199336456.001.0001](https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199336456.001.0001). Works remain significant, see the [declaration](#)
 27. Taggar-Cohen, Ada. "Priests and Priestesses, Ancient Near East." *The Encyclopedia of Ancient History*, edited by Roger S. Bagnall et al., Wiley-Blackwell, 2015. *Wiley Online Library*, DOI: [10.1002/9781444338386.wbeah25085](https://doi.org/10.1002/9781444338386.wbeah25085). Works remain significant, see the [declaration](#)
 28. Tiemeyer, Lena-Sofia. "Zadok." *Oxford Bibliographies in Biblical Studies*, Oxford University Press, 2017,
DOI: [10.1093/obo/9780195393361-0229](https://doi.org/10.1093/obo/9780195393361-0229).
 29. Udoekpo, Michael Ufok. "A New Contextual Look at the Place the Lord Has Chosen as His Own in Deuteronomy 12:13–19." *E-Journal of Religious and Theological Studies*, vol. 11, no. 5, 2025, pp. 210–221.
DOI: [10.38159/erats.20251154](https://doi.org/10.38159/erats.20251154). Works remain significant, see the [declaration](#)
 30. Van der Woude, Annemaré Kotzé. "The Priests and the Descendants of Levi in the Book of Malachi." *Acta Theologica*, vol. 35, no. 1, 2015, pp. 205–20. DOI: [10.38140/at.v35i1.2702](https://doi.org/10.38140/at.v35i1.2702). Works remain significant see the [declaration](#)
 31. von Rad, Gerhard. *Old Testament Theology*. Vol. 1, translated by D. M. G. Stalker, Harper & Row, 1962. URL: https://openlibrary.org/works/OL7286063W/Old_Testament_theology?edition=key%3A/books/OL27867953M, works remain significant, see the [declaration](#)

AUTHOR'S PROFILE



Archimandrite Iakovos Kanakis (ThD), The Very Reverend Archimandrite Ioannis (Iakovos) Kanakis holds degrees from the Ecclesiastical Academy of Athens and the National and Kapodistrian University of Athens, where he received his Doctorate in Theology with distinction in 2017. His dissertation examined the Suffering Servant in Isaiah and its relationship to the Child Immanuel. His academic interests include Old Testament studies, biblical hermeneutics, biblical archaeology, patristics, and liturgical theology. He has taught biblical courses at the Ecclesiastical Academy of Athens, the National and Kapodistrian University of Athens, City Unity College, the Rizarios Ecclesiastical School, and other ecclesiastical institutions. His publications include, among others, *Learning about and from the Old Testament* (2017), *Sodom and Gomorrah* (2010), *Getting to Know the Old Testament* (2024), *The Historical Course of Israel* (2024), *Homilies of Basil the Great on the Hexaemeron* (2022), and *The Lord's Discourse* (2026). He currently serves as presiding priest of the Church of the Transfiguration of the Saviour in Moschato, Athens, Greece.

Disclaimer/Publisher's Note: The statements, opinions, and data contained in all publications are solely those of the individual author(s) and contributor(s) and not of the Publisher/Journal and/or the editor(s). The Publisher/Journal and/or the editor(s) disclaim responsibility for any injury to people or property resulting from any ideas, methods, instructions, or products referred to in the content.

