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WHO MIGHT SERVE AS PRIESTS ACCORDING TO THE HISTORY, LITERATURE
AND LAWS OF THE OLD TESTAMENT.

The purpose of this thesis is to find, as nearly as possible, from the information given in the history, literature and laws of the Old Testament, who might serve as priests? It is well for us to note at the very beginning that it is not an effort to determine who did serve as priests, although this will be involved to some extent, but simply who might serve as priests? We shall first note very briefly who served as priests during the Patriarchal Dispensation and afterwards who during the Jewish Dispensation.

Our information concerning the priesthood of the Patriarchal Dispensation is very limited. In the fourth chapter of Genesis, we have the account of the offerings of Cain and Abel, but there seems to be no indication that they were serving in the capacity of priests. Their offerings were more like voluntary expressions of an inward desire than like an act of priestly devotion. Noah's offering, recorded in the eighth chapter and twenty-eighth verse of Genesis is another instance of like service. Noah may have served in the capacity of a priest for the family, but this is rather to be inferred than asserted. His offering, similar to Abel's is more like a service of thanksgiving than an act of priestly devotion. The first mention that we have of a priest proper is found in Gen. 14:18, where Melchizedek is called the "priest of God Most High". Gen. 41:45, speaks of "Poti-pherah, priest of On", and 47:22 speaks of the priests of Pharaoh who had their own lands and portions assigned them of Pharaoh; but to say that either instance is proof of an organized priesthood, set apart especially for priestly services, is hardly warrantable. The possession of exempt land and the assignment of "portions" by Pharaoh does undoubtedly signify some rude
form of organization whereby those who served as priests were favored in temporal matters; but, how extensive this organization was, we cannot tell from there references. Melchizedek is called "the priest", and Potipherah is called "priest" which may be further indications of a development of a priestly dignity, which we know, from other sources (Spencers Synthetic Philosophy, Pg 251-84) to be true among the Egyptians; but about all the conclusion to which we can come from scriptural sources, is that the priesthood of the Patriarchal period among the chosen people was a slight advance beyond the practice of the head of the family serving as priest. It is certain that we cannot go far beyond this from the facts we have given in the scriptures. Abraham's willingness to offer Isaac shows that the sacrificial idea was thoroughly grounded in the Patriarchs, although there is no plan of carrying it out clearly indicated. It is altogether likely that the head of the family served as priest during this period much the same as we find the practice among all the peoples of primitive times. With this short introduction to our subject proper, we come to the discussion of the question, "Who Might Serve as Priests According to the History, Literature and Laws of the Old Testament?"

It is a striking fact in the minds of many scholars that, with so little indication of an organized priesthood in the Patriarchal dispensation, we have such a thoroughly organized priesthood set forth at the opening of the Jewish dispensation. The contention is that such an extreme step forward in organization, in so short a time, is out of harmony with the natural historical development of institutions, and therefore this organization must be the product of a later period of history than is assigned to it by the writers, compilers, or redactors of Old Testament history, literature and
law. It is not our task to try to determine whether this is true or false; but to get at the facts upon our immediate subject, no matter what bearing they have on the truth or falsity of this contention.

In the second chapter of I Samuel, the twenty-seventh and twenty-eighth verses, we have it set forth that God appeared unto the house of the father of Eli in Egypt, and chose him out of all of the tribes of Israel to be his priest. The question in hand here is who (what person) is referred to by the pronoun "him". Was it Levi or was it Aaron? They were both in Egypt. The author of Exodus tells us that the anointing of Aaron and his sons "shall surely be an everlasting priesthood throughout their generations." (Ex. 40: 15), and that "the priests' office shall be theirs for a perpetual statute" (Ex. 29:9). The heave offering is also theirs by a statute for ever, (Ex. 29:28. These passages would indicate that, beyond a doubt, Aaron was the one chosen out of Egypt if it were not for the prominence given to the Levites in other places, especially in Deuteronomy where we are first introduced to the expression "the priests the Levites". This expression occurs five times in Deuteronomy (17:9; 18:18; 18:1; 24:8; 27:9), twice in Joshua (3:3; 8:33), twice in I Chronicles (9:2; 13:2), three times in II Chronicles (5:5; 23:18; 30:27), once in Ezra (10:5), twice in Jeremiah (33:18; 21), and once in Ezekiel (43:19), or sixteen times in all. So while we have an everlasting priesthood promised to Aaron and his sons we also have great prominence given to the Levites. The conclusion reached by a close examination of the passage in I Sam. 2:28, is that Levi was the one chosen out of Egypt, and that Aaron and his sons were the ones specially chosen from among the Levites, for the most prominent positions in the priesthood.
This agrees with the choosing from among the tribes of Israel since Levi is a son of Israel and not Aaron. There seems to be very little weight to the argument that Levi comes from the Hebrew verb, "joined to," and therefore that it probably never was a tribal name; but was only an official title. Such an argument entirely ignores the account given in Gen. 49:5-7, where Jacob includes Levi among his sons in the blessing. Furthermore, this agrees with the prominence given to the Aaronic branch of the priesthood in the priestly writings and the historical books.

It is hardly possible that Aaron knew anything about his choice, to the priesthood, out of Egypt when he was chosen for a spokesman for Moses; but it is not to be concluded from this that the children of Israel were without priests until the time of the giving of the law, and the consecration of Aaron and his sons at Mt. Sinai. Exodus 19:22 says "let the priests also, that come near to sanctify themselves, lest Jehovah break forth upon them," and the same thought is repeated in the twenty-fourth verse of this chapter. Therefore there was not only a priest before the choosing of Aaron and his sons; but there were priests, and furthermore, Aaron was prominent among them as is shown by the choice of the people when they call upon him to make them gods to go before them. Following the historical order of the account all of these expressions come before the choosing of Aaron; and therefore indicate that there might have been a developing priesthood before the time of the giving of the law, and that this development had likely reached a stage where there were a number of priests with one holding a prominent leadership, if not chosen or appointed for such a position. We shall now examine the books of Exodus, Leviticus, and Numbers; and see if such a leadership as has already been given
him is a natural precedent of what we find therein recorded, if
Moses were a codifier of custom as well as an instrument of reve-
lation. If our investigation proves that this is the case it will
be added confirmation to our view of the Levitical priesthood
with Aaron at the head.

Exodus 28,1, says "bring thou near unto thee Aaron, thy
brother, and his sons with him, from among the children of Israel,
that he may minister unto me in the priest's office", and verses 2,
3,4,29,30,35,38,41, and 43 of the same chapter point to the leader-
ship of Aaron. Chapters 35:19 and 39:41, both speak of him as "Aaron
the priest" and chapter 29 distinguishes between him and his sons
in the matter of their garments. According to Leviticus 1:10-17
Aaron's sons sprinkle the blood about the altar and arrange the
offering and "the priest" burns it, except in the case of the fowl
when "the priest" assumes the whole service. By a close examination
of the entire book of Leviticus, we find that the expression "the
priest" occurs one hundred and sixty-nine times. "Aaron's sons
the priests" occurs three times (2:2;21:1; 3:2), "Aaron and his
sons" sixteen times (6:9;16;20;25;8:2;6,14,18,22,31,36;9:1,17:2;
21:24;22:2,18), "high priest" once (21:10) and "Aaron the priest" once
(21:21). The indications throughout the book are that Aaron is
counted "the priest" and that his sons serve somewhat in the capacity
of assistants arranging the offering and sprinkling the blood
about the altar; but not rising to the dignity of the high priest
or even "the priest". They served as priests; but they are seldom
spoken of as "the priest", (not at all, except in a collective
sense). In the book of Numbers their position is slightly digni-
ified when the whole tribe of Levi is set aside for priestly service.
the extra work of caring for the tabernacle would have required an
additional number of priests, and in this addition there would be
required a more thorough organization and a consequent promotion of the leading priests. Their duties now, we find, are keeping their priesthood, (3:10; 18:7), taking down the covering of the veil (4:5), covering the sanctuary and the vessels (3:31), serving within the veil (18:7), taking charge of the heave offering (18:8), and Eleazar was given the special dignity of "chief over the chief of the Levites" (The Kohathites, 3:32). At the death of Aaron (20:28), Eleazar is appointed priest in his father's stead and from the twentieth chapter to the close of the book, he is termed "Eleazar the priest", twenty times. This expression is not used of him but three times before Arron's death, and these are in the short time immediately preceding Aaron's death when they seem to be serving in common as "the priest". The expression "the priest" is used twenty-seven times throughout the book, in the following passages: (5:8, 9, 10, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 23, 25, 30; 6:10, 11, 16, 17, 19, 20; 15: 25, 28; 19:6, 7, 31:21, 26). "Aaron the priest" is used eleven times: (3:6, 32; 4:16, 28; 33; 7:8; 16:37; 18:28; 25:7; 11; 26:1). "Eleazar the priest" occurs twenty times, as I have already said: (16:39; 19:3, 4; 26:3, 63; 27:2, 19, 21, 22; 31:6, 13, 29, 31, 41, 51, 54; 32:2, 28; 34:17) and the expression "the high priest" is found three times in 35:25, 28. Our conclusion, therefore reached from the data taken from these books is that they present no radical departure from the choosing of the Levites out of Egypt, notwithstanding the emphasis placed upon the Aaronic branch of the priesthood. Aaron was a Levite; and so were his sons, and the rest of those who served in less important positions. Aaron's leadership is a natural consequence of the position held by him, before the giving of the laws at Mt. Sinai. The emphasis placed upon a leading priest, by such expressions as "the priest", "the high priest", Aaron the priest", is found both within and without these laws proper: the
proportion being about one to ten. There seems to be very little indication anywhere of a plurality of high priests or better, of an equality among the leading priests and the Levites. It is in Deuteronomy that we first meet with the expression, "the priests the Levites" and "the priests the sons of Levi". The priestly writer makes a distinction between "the priests the sons of Aaron" and the Levites, but this distinction is one of position rather than of eligibility. He does not hesitate to call the Levites priests; but they are priests of a lower order. With him Aaron and his sons are "the priests" and Aaron is "the priest", not because his priesthood is distinctly Aaronic, but because Aaron's family is chief among the Levites in primacy of service and dignity of official position. Korah's revolt, (Num.16-17) does not prove that the Levites of the priestly code were ineligible to the leading priestly positions. This would be out of harmony with the tenor of the code in giving to the tribe of Levi the priestly office. This revolt plainly shows the inferior position given to the Levites who were set apart for Aaron; but it is not proof that they were ineligible to higher positions. They were all Levites and as such they were eligible to any office in the priestly organization except as practice had fixed the higher offices upon a certain line of descent in the Levitical family. This is not far from the position set forth in Deuteronomy, even though it makes free use of the expression "the priests the Levites", and "the priests the sons of Levi". Deuteronomy evidently places all Levites upon an equality for priestly offices and at the same time recognizes a leading priest. It contains the expression "the priest", even more often than the foregoing expressions, and also speaks of a central place
of worship (16:6), besides making one definite statement about the "priest that shall be in that day". It appears therefore, that there is no radical conflict between the Levitical and Deuteronomistic codes, upon the question of the Aaronic or Levitical priesthood. Each holds all Levites as priests, and each has a leading priest with its inferior priests. If the development of the priesthood were a natural growth, it is natural that the later account or law would be the one to recognize more clearly the equality among the Levites for priestly offices. While the priestly offices were held by one branch of the Levitical family, emphasis would be given to that branch; but after the whole tribe had been set apart for priestly service, the more comprehensive name would be the more appropriate. "The priests the sons of Aaron" was sufficiently comprehensive, when Aaron and his sons were about all that were really doing service; but not so when the service was done by the whole tribe. The expression "the priests the Levites" was inclusive of the whole tribe; but the expression "the priests the sons of Aaron" particularized. Deuteronomy does not minimize the office of the Aaronic line; but it does use the more comprehensive term for the enlarged serving priesthood. The slight difference in the expressions used may be explained by saying that the one places emphasis upon all priestly service being given to the Levites, while the other places emphasis upon all Levites being given to priestly service. The latter would naturally be a later development under an enlarged priesthood.

We have now come to a place in our investigation where we shall turn from the study of the laws upon our subject to a study of the history of the operation of these laws. We have examined the laws concerning the priesthood and found that the answer to our
question according to these laws is, quite certainly, that all Levites who were physically and morally qualified might serve as priests. There are, however, other matters for consideration, which may prove to be of equal importance with what we have already studied. The laws are fairly clear in setting forth who might serve as priests; but since any additional confirmation that may be had from the history of the period when these laws were in operation will be of value, it is well that we also make a study of the application of these laws. Laws may quite clearly define who are eligible to certain positions, and yet not exclude others from the same position. In such a case, others might fill these positions without a violation of the laws. If they define who are eligible to a position and only imply that others are not, then we can only imply that the service of others would be a violation; but if they define who are eligible to a position so as to plainly exclude all others, then we can plainly assert that the service of others would be a violation. It is not certain that this last position prevails exclusively in the laws which we have studied, but it certainly has the preponderance of evidence. The priestly offices are given to Aaron and his sons for an everlasting priesthood throughout their generations. (Ex. 29:9). The covenant of an everlasting priesthood is given to Phinehas for heroic service (Num. 25:8), and the heave offering is also theirs by a statute forever, (Ex. 29:28). Therefore, while we shall not say that the laws found in the Pentateuch absolutely exclude all except Levites from priestly offices, it appears that this is the case from the foregoing passages, especially when taken in connection with (Num. 18:7) which says: "I have given your priests office unto you as a service of gift, and the stranger that cometh nigh shall be put to death". This fact is interesting and important in connection with our study of the priesthood in the
historical and prophetic books to which we now turn.

The study upon which we now enter is important in as much as it will help us to find out whether the conditions and spirit of the laws are reflected in the practices and teachings of the people. If they are, they will give confirmation to our interpretation but if they are not then either our interpretation must be wrong or the laws must not have been in force, or if they were in force, they must not have commanded full respect.

Owing to the diversity of the facts found in the books which give us the history of the conquest and the period of the judges; and those which give us the history following these periods, I have chosen to consider them separately. The first group includes only Joshua and Judges.

The organization of the book of Joshua is very similar to what we have already found in the foregoing study. The Aaronic feature of the priesthood is still emphasized (21:4,19), and the idea of a leading priest is very evident. Eleazar is called "the priest" six times (14:1; 19:51; 21:1; 22:13,31,32), and the high priest is referred to in Joshua 20:6, in the same connection as in Num.35:25-28. The term "the priest" is used twenty-two times, but always with reference to a number of the priestly body if not with reference to all. It is not used of two or three priests as leaders or leading priests, in contradistinction to the entire body. "The priests the Levites" is used, in Chapters 3:3 and 8:33 in the same sense that it is used in Deuteronomy. Phinehas is once called "the priest" (22:30); but not in a sense that exalted him above Eleazar. It is in connection with a special service assigned to him with regard to Reuben's building of the altar by Jordan. As principal priest for this service he is called "the priest". That Eleazar is still the leading
priest even over him, is plainly shown in the 13th and 31st verses of the same chapter, where Phinehas is mentioned as "the son of Eleazar the priest". The most important fact that we have in the book of Judges that bears on the priesthood is found in the account of Micah's priest recorded in the 17th and 18th chapters. Micah was an Ephraimites who consecrated one of his sons to be priest; but who, when he had an opportunity to get a Levite for his priest, very diligently sought him. The interesting feature in the account is the diligence with which Micah desired to have a Levite for his priest. His act of consecrating his own son to the priesthood was a violation of the law which gave the priestly office to the Levites; but his desire to have a Levite priest bears evidence that it was a violation which his conscience approved rather than be without a priest. It is a rather small matter but it quite plainly sets forth the importance placed upon the Levitical priesthood in these times. With regard, therefore, to the priesthood of the period covered by Joshua and the Judges, Joshua gives clear evidence that it was that prescribed in the Pentateuch and the evidence found in Judges is confirmatory and not contradictory.

Thusfar, we have found that the practices of the people were quite closely in accord with the laws for the priesthood, given in the Pentateuch; but we now enter upon the study of a period in which this may be questioned. Beginning with I Samuel and running through the history covered by I and II Samuel, I and II Kings, and I and II Chronicles, we find evident violations of the priestly laws of the Pentateuch; and in the light of this fact it will be necessary for us to find, if possible, whether these violations were in harmony with the teaching of these times, upon our subject, and if not, whether they were generally approved or disapproved by the
leading teachers. Such a discovery will be valuable in helping us to determine the influence of these laws during this period.

In considering the violations of the priestly laws of the Pentateuch, found in this period, it is well for us to note that they are not a sudden and radical departure from the practices of the period of the Judges. We learn from Judges 17:5, that Micah, an Ephraimite, in a case of emergency, appointed his sons to the priestly office, and from Judges:6:24, that Gideon of Manassah built an altar and made an offering. The account is not explicit enough to make sure that he himself performed the priestly functions, and in this respect it is similar to several of the accounts in the books of Samuel, Kings and Chronicles. The actual service may have been performed by an attending priest under his direction or at his command, and still be spoken of as his service. Similar instances will be considered more elaborately in connection with offerings "made" by David and Solomon. Another instance that should be mentioned with the foregoing is found in Judges:13:19. We have here that Manoah, who was a Danite, "took the kid with the meal offering and offered it upon the rock unto Jehovah" in the presence and with the approval of an angel of Jehovah. The angel's approval would seem to indicate that the violation of the law, strictly providing for a Levitical priesthood, was not strictly inexcusable on all occasions and the violation itself indicates that even in the period of the Judges we find traces of the grosser violations of the period of the Kings.

It is not our purpose to discuss elaborately all of the actual and purported violations, of the Pentateuchal laws of the priestly family, following the period of the Judges. It is necessary, however, that we discuss quite elaborately enough of the more
important ones so as to justify a well founded conclusion. These I take it, are the ministering of Samuel (I Samuel:2:18); the act of Uzzah (II Samuel:6:6); the offering of sacrifices by David (II Samuel:6:17-18); the offering of sacrifices by Solomon (I Kings:3:4; 8:5;62-64); Jereboam's appointment of others than Levites to priestly offices (I Kings:12:31-32); the offering made by Ahaz (II Kings:16:12); and the offering made by Elijah (I Kings:18:30).

In the case of the ministering of Samuel the contention rests upon the meaning of the word "minister". It appears from I Sam.1:1, that Samuel was not a Levite but an Ephraimite, but the conflict between ISam. 1 and I Chron. 6:28 makes it difficult to determine which is correct. If this be correct and if he did priestly service it is evidently a departure from the Levitical family, but there is a question whether we can say, from what we have in the account, that his ministry was strictly a priestly service. In the first place, it is altogether unlikely that Eli would have chosen him for any important priestly office when he is "yet a child" and in the second place we learn that the term "ministry" is not only used of priests, but of Levites and other subordinate attendants as well, (Num.1:50;8:26; I Chron.15:2;16:4,37). His ministry was undoubtedly a subordinate one and it is not impossible that his position might have been something similar to that of Ira (IISam.20:26), who was "chief minister" unto David when Zadock and Abiathar were priests. Concerning the wearing of the "linen ephod", as every reference to it shows (Ex.28:6;I Sam.2:28;23:6,9;30:7) was something distinctive and different from the 'linen ephod' which was worn by ordinary priests, (I Sam.22:18), but not by them exclusively: (II Sam.6:14). The me'il, or robe, again, was a long sleeveless tunic, "worn", says Gesenius 'by women of rank: (II Sam.13:18), by men of rank and birth:
(Job:1:20; 2:12), by Kings: (I Chron.15:27; I Sam. 18:4; 24:4,11), therefore no peculiar property of the priest". (The problem of the Old Testament, Page 190).

However, the question of Samuel's priestly service does not rest upon his ministry before Eli, or his wearing of the linen ephod or the little robe. The fact that he served in a priestly capacity before he became a Judge of Israel may be questioned; but the fact that he served in such a capacity afterwards is beyond question. The evidence from I Samuel 17:9 cannot be set aside. Addis also refers to I Samuel 7:17,9:12 and 16:5, as proof that Samuel served as a priest, but such a conclusion in the case of these passages is far fetched. The fact that he built an altar does not necessitate that he built it himself or that he made an offering upon it; nor does his blessing of the sacrifice of the people before the meal involve a priestly service. We say that Solomon built the temple; but we do not mean that he did the work. The case with Samuel is a great deal similar. It is certain that he did it upon the entreaty of the children of Israel in a time of fear and impending danger. We cannot conclude from a single isolated instance, that he actually filled the office of a priest in the completeness sense, even if I Sam. 1:1 be correct and I Chron.6:28 be incorrect, which is not at all certain.

The purported usurpation of priestly functions by David and Solomon are so similar in character that I shall discuss them together. In the case of David the record says: "and David offered burnt-offerings and peace-offerings before Jehovah and when David had made an end of offering the burnt-offering and the peace-offerings,
he blessed the people in the name of Jehovah of hosts". (II Sam. 6:17,18). I Kings:3:4, says: "And the king went to Gibeah to sacrifice there; for that was the great high place: a thousand burnt-offerings did Solomon offer upon that altar". This passage is valuable in our discussion, not because of the place where the offering is made, (for that is not our subject), but because of the size of the offering. I Kings:8:5, says: "And King Solomon and all the congregation that were assembled unto him, were with him before the ark sacrificing sheep and oxen, that could not be counted nor numbered for multitude", and verses 62 and 63 of the same chapter say: "And the king and all Israel with him, offered sacrifice before Jehovah. And Solomon offered for the sacrifice of peace-offerings which he offered unto Jehovah, two and twenty thousand sheep." These passages together with I Chron. 16:1,2, which indicates that the priests who brought in the ark for David also made the offering, make it impossible to say that either David or Solomon served in a priestly capacity. If they did, then the whole congregation, "that were assembled", and "all Israel" also offered sacrifices. But that is most improbable. In the case of David, I Chron. 16:1 tells us that the priests made the offering just the same as it tells us that they carried the ark. The record plainly says that they who "brought in the ark" (for David) "offered burnt-offerings and peace-offerings before Jehovah". If they who "brought in the ark" refer to the whole congregation, which is a possible grammatical construction, then the whole congregation made the offering; but if it refers to the Levitical priests who actually carried the ark, then they made the offering. The only reasonable conclusion that can be drawn seems to be that David and Solomon, and "all the congregation" undoubtedly participated in furnishing the offering; but that it is
very unlikely that they actually filled the priestly office in making it. It is unreasonable to say that Solomon actually did all the work of making such a large offering or that the whole congregation participated in it regardless of priestly lines.

The passage which tells us that Jeroboam "made priests from among all the people, that were not of the sons of Levi," needs very little comment; for the context itself tells us that "this thing became a sin". It bears testimony to our position that only Levites might serve as priests. It was a sin to appoint others.

The offering made by king Ahaz (II Kings:16:12), when his high priest Urijah was right at hand, is exceptional. The account is so simple and clear that it hardly seems possible to say of it what has been said of the offerings of David and Solomon. It tells us that "he drew near unto the altar. And he burnt his burnt-offering and his meal offering, and poured his drink offering, and sprinkled the blood of his peace-offerings upon the altar". There is nothing here unexplained or inharmonious from the standpoint of the king's ability to do all that is mentioned; but it does seem quite unexplainable and inharmonious that he should serve as priest when his own high priest is immediately at hand. The second verse of this same chapter tells us that "he did not that which was right in the sight of Jehovah his God", and that is about all that can be said of his action here. It is possible to conceive that he is represented as offering the sacrifices which he only furnished for the priest to offer; but the text is so clear that this would be no small distortion. It is more reasonable to explain his conduct here in the light of his conduct in general. If he was careless in other matters, he might also have been in the matter of the priestly office.
The act of Uzzah and the offering of Elijah are of so little import in determining who might serve as priests, that a few words only will suffice. With regard to Uzzah, there seems to be no violation of the family line of the priesthood; but only a violation in an overt act by one who was not especially appointed to the priestly office. It is quite certain from I Sam 7:1, that he was a Levite; but that his brother, Eleazar, and not he, was appointed "to keep the ark". His fate upon assuming priestly authority, indirectly emphasized a specific family line of the priesthood by showing how severe was the punishment for overreaching authority even in that line. Uzzah's sin was one of overreaching authority, and not of violating the line of the Levitical priesthood, but we cannot say this of Elijah; for we are not able to determine his tribal relations. We learn from I Kings:17:1;21:17; and II Kings:9:36, that he was a Tishbite; but this is more likely the name of the town from which he came than that of any family or tribe. According to some late tradiations, he has been identified with Phinehas the grandson of Aaron, but this position has no sound support. It is held by some that he was from Tishbe or Tishbi of Gilead, by others that he was from Tishbe of Naphtali, and by still others that he was from Tishbon of Gilead. We know that he was of the "sojourners of Gilead" (I Kings:17:1) and this being true, it would seem that he was likely from Tishbi of Gilead; but even this gives us no clue to his tribal relations. He might have been a sojourner of Gilead and yet not have been a Gileadite, just as Micha's "young man from Bethlehem-Judah" was a Levite and a sojourner in Ephraim. In fact, it is not possible to say that he was or was not a Levite; but the favor shown toward his offering on Mt. Carmel (II Kings:18:25-40)
and the honor bestowed upon him by New Testament writers (Matt. 11:14; 17:3; Mark: 9:4; Luke: 9:30; John 1:25; II Peter: 1:18) clearly indicate that he was held in high esteem both in his own time and in New Testament times. He was likely a Levite for his exalted position as a prophet was sufficient to make it certain that he must have known of the priestly laws and very improbable that he would have voluntarily violated the Levitical line of the priesthood, on an occasion when he was placing special emphasis upon the true worship of the true God.

Having now examined some of the grosser practices of the people in violation of the pentateuchal laws of the Levitical line of the priesthood, during the time following the period of the Judges, it next devolves upon us to examine the teaching of the writers of this time. If this teaching supports these practices, then our position, that only Levites might serve as priests, is weakened; but if it opposes them, then it is strengthened.

Our conclusion concerning the organization of the priesthood according to the Pentateuch was, that all Levites were eligible to all priestly offices; but that until the time of Deuteronomy, when the serving priesthood was enlarged, much emphasis was placed upon the Aaronic line. This was shown by the use of the expression, "the priests the sons of Aaron" in place of the broader expression "the priests the Levites". It is also true that the Aaronic line of the high priest is especially emphasized throughout Joshua and Judges and that the subordinate priests are generally spoken of as Levites. What we wish to do, therefore, in our further study, is to find if these same distinctions still "hold", in the minds of the people following the period of the Judges, or if they are unknown and
unrecognized to such an extent, that such violations as we have just been studying are virtually sanctioned and unreprieved; and the Levitical line of the priesthood largely ignored.

That the authors of I and II Samuel, I and II Kings, I and II Chronicles, Ezra and Nehemiah, were cognizant of the distinctions we have noted in the priesthood, is apparent from their frequent use of terms descriptive of those distinctions. The distinctions of the leading priest, superior to all others at any one time is clearly set forth by the very frequent use of such expressions as "the priest": (I Sam. 2:14,15; 14:19; 21:1,4,5,6,9; 22:11,18,19,21; II Kings:11:10,18; II Chron.23:14), "Eli, the priest"(I Sam.1:9): "Ahimelech the priest" (I Sam.21:1,2; 22:11), "Zadok the priest" (II Sam.15:27; I Kings:1:8,26,32,34,39; 2:35; I Chron. 24:6), "Abiathar the priest" (I Kings:1:7,19,25,42; 2:26,27), "Jehoiada the priest" (II Kings:11:9,15; 12:2,7; I Chron. 27:5; II Chron.22:11; 23:8,9; 24:2,20, 25), "Urijah the priest" (II Kings:16:10, 11,15, 16), "Hilkiah the priest" (II Kings:22:10,12,14;23:24; II Chron.34: 14,18), "Hilkiah the high priest" (II Kings:22:4,8; 23:4; II Chron. 34:9), "the high priest" (II Kings:12:10), "the chief priest" (II Kings:25:18), "Ezra the priest" (Ezra:7:10; 10:16), "Uriah the priest" (Ezra:8:33), "Eliashib the high priest" (Neh.3:1,20; 13:28), "the priest with Urim and Thumim" (Neh.7:65), and "the priest the son of Aaron" (Neh.10:38).

It should be noted here that those expressions are distributed quite generally throughout each and all of these books and therefore not peculiar to any one or any part of one. They occur eighteen times in I Samuel (Chapters 1,2,14,22,23,30), once in II Samuel: 15, twelve times in I Kings (1,2) nineteen times in II Kings, Chapters 11,12,16,22,23,25, three times in II Chronicles (Chapters 24,27,29),
ten times in II Chronicles (Chapters 22, 23, 24, 34), three times in
Ezra (Chapters 7, 8, 10) and five times in Nehemiah (Chapters 3, 7, 10,
13). The occurrence and distribution of these expressions through-
out all of these historical books is evidence that the idea of a
leading priest, superior to all others must have run through the
entire period of history from Samuel to Ezra notwithstanding some
other expressions, found in these same books, that appear to imply
an equality of authority with two or more priests. A considera-
tion of these expressions together with a careful study of the organi-
zation of the priesthood given in these books and the prophetical
books of this period will help us to ascertain how near this seeming
status of the priesthood during this period approaches the real
status.

The expressions found in II Samuel: 8:17; 15:35; 17:15; 19:11;
20:25, and I Chronicles: 15:11; 18:16;—where it is stated in two
instances that "Zadock the son of Ahitub and Ahimelech the son of
Abiathar were priests," and in seven instances that "Zadock and
Abiathar were priests,"—must not be interpreted to imply an
equality of priestly authority with two men at the same time. At
first sight this would seem to be the case; but in the light of the
context in these books, and the account of Adonijah's attempt
to usurp the throne, given in the first and second chapters of I Kings
it is evident that Zadock and Abiathar were not priests with the
same authority at the same time. The fact that they are mentioned
in coordination in a number of passages indicates a close relation-
ship between them in the priestly office; but not an equality, for
Zadock is also mentioned in these same connections as "Zadock the
priest" (IISam. 15:27; II Chron. 24:6; 29:22), and both Zadock and
Abiathar are frequently termed "the priest" in the account of
Adonijah's revolt.
The condition at this time is such that it is the natural thing to speak of both of them as "the priest" at the same time, although in reality, they are not. Abiathar is "the priest" until the time of the revolt; but when he joins with Adonijah the priest's office proper is left vacant. He is really "the priest", but his absence necessitates a substitute, and Zadock as his closest associate steps into the position as acting priest, at least, during the revolt and as real priest at the close of the revolt as is shown by Kings:12:36, which reads: "And Zadock the priest did the king put in the room of Abiathar". If he had ever been on an equality with Abiathar in authority, such a statement would have no meaning. We must conclude therefore that what seems to be a co-ordination of authority in several passages, must have been only a close association in service. It may be a dim foreshadowing of the very extensive organization that is given us in Nehemiah: where we have "Eliashib the high priest with his brethren the priests" (3:1), "chiefs of the priests" (12:7), "the priests and the Levites (8:13; 9:38;11:20;12:1,44;13:30), "the priests the Levites" (11:20), and the priests, the Levites, the porters, the singers and the Nethinim" (10:28). It is certainly a very logical precedent to the status of the priesthood, suggested by Jeremiah, when he speaks of "Seraiah the chief priest and Zephaniah the second priest", (Jer.52:24).

The extensive organization of Nehemiah's priesthood is to a certain degree peculiar to itself, but not exclusively so. Ezra also speaks of the priests, the Levites, the singers, the porters, and the Nethinim (2:70;7:7); "the priests and the Levites" (1:5;2:70; 3:8,12;6:20;7:7;8:9;15;9:1); "the chiefs of the priests" (10:5); "the priest with Urim and Thummim (2:63); "Ezra the priest" (7:11; 10:16); and "Uriah the priest" (8:3); making the variation in the use
of term so slight that it is virtually imperceptible. Furthermore, it must not be concluded that these expressions and this organization are exclusively peculiar to Nehemiah and Ezra. Numbers (3:32) speaks of Eleazar as "prince of the princes of the Levites"; II Samuel (18:26), II Kings:(7:10), and I Chronicles :(9:21,2), speak of "the porter", "the porter of the city", "the porter of the door of the tent of meeting" and the Nethinim"; and numerous passages in both the historical and prophetic books give prominence to the Aaronic and Levitical features of the priesthood in such expressions as "the priest the son of Aaron" (Neh.10:38), "the priests the sons of Aaron and the Levites" (II Chron. 26:18;29:21;35:14), "the sons of Aaron and the Levites" (II Chron. 13:9), "the priests the Levites" (I Chron.9:2;13:2; II Chron. 5:5;23:18;35:7 Ezra:2:70;7:7; Neh.10:28,34; Jer.33:18,21; Ezek.43:19), and "the priests and the Levites", (I Chron. 15:14;23:2;26:13,21; II Chron. 11:13;23:4;24:5,29:4;30:15,25; 31:2,4,9; 34:30;35:18; Ezra:1:5; 2:70; 3:8,12; 6:20; 7:7; 8:29,30; 9:1; Neh. 7:73,39; 8:13; 9:38; 11:3,20; 12:1,30,44; 13:30).

The prophetic books do not place special emphasis upon the Levitical priesthood; but neither do they emphasize any other priesthood. The priesthood of Jeremiah is certainly Levitical (Jer.33:18-21), and so is that of Ezekiel (43:19; 44:9,10, 15; 45:5; 49:11,12, 13). It should be noted that Ezekiel's priests are "the priests the Levites the sons of Zadock" (44:15); but none the less Aaronical and Levitical for this fact. I Samual (2:34,35), predicts the downfall of the line of the priesthood of Eli, which is fulfilled in the deposition of Abiathar (I Kings:2:27). The deposition of Abiathar is not a deposition of the Aaronic priesthood, but only a change from
the line of Ithamar to the line of Eleazar. Abiathar was de-
posed because of complicity in a plot to get the throne and Zadok
was put in his place. Zadok was just as much an Aaronite and
Levite as was Abiathar and Abiathar was just as much an Aaronite
and Levite as was Zadok. The emphasis placed upon the Zadok
priesthood by Ezekiel is not because of a change from the Aaronic
or Levitical priesthood to another line; but because of a change from
a corrupt to an incorrupt priesthood. Isaiah speaks of "Uriah the
priest"(8:2), Amos speaks of "Amaziah the high priest" (7:10,17)
and Haggai and Zechariah speaks of "Joshua the son of Jehozadak the
high priest" (Hag.1:1;12,14; 2:2,4), and "Joshua the high priest",
(Zach:3:1,8; 6:11). These expressions bear directly upon the
Levitical line of the priesthood in so far as the priests mentioned
were levites. And we know that this was true of Joshua and Amaziah
from I Chron. 6:15,45.

In our study of the practices of the people, during the period
of the kings, we found some very evident violations of the Levitical
line of the priesthood. Our purpose in studying the teaching of the
historical and prophetical books has been directed toward discover-
ing whether it approves or disapproves of those violations. We are
aware that this study has not exhausted the available information to
be found in these books; but we feel that it has been sufficiently
through to warrant our drawing some very definite conclusions.
These conclusions are (1) that the leading historians and prophets
emphasized the Levitical line of the priesthood, (2) that they clearly
recognized the equal qualification of all Levites for priestly
offices, and (3) that they do not approve of the violations of the
period of the Kings. Therefore, having reached these conclusions
concerning the information found in the history and literature,
inclusive of and following I Samuel, we also feel that we have a safe basis for a general conclusion upon our initial question. Accordingly, in answer to the question "Who Might Serve as Priests" we say, (1) that the history, literature and laws of the Old Testament bear us out in affirming that from the time of the choosing of the Levites out of Egypt, the priesthood was their distinctive possession and, (2) that the line of Aaron was peculiarly favored with the leading positions, not because of special appointment, but because of natural consequences.

In defence of this conclusion, it is also affirmed that the priesthood of the Pentateuch, as a whole, is not discordant and unnatural in its setting forth of the relationship between the Aaronites and Levites; but that it is concordant and natural, and that it sets forth the exact relationship that is predominant throughout the succeeding history and literature of the Old Testament. And furthermore, that the violations of the Pentateuchal laws of the priesthood are not so voluntary and numerous, during the period of the Judges and Kings, as they are made to appear to be by some scholars; but that they are rather scarce and generally involuntary, and unapproved. "Addis" holds that I Kings:15:14;22:43 and II Kings:12:3;14:4;15:4,34,35; and 16:4 show that Asa, Jehosaphat, Joash, Amaziah, Azariah, Jotham, and Ahaz maintain the sacrifice of the people at the "high places". This is an unwarrantable conclusion from these passages. It is making them say something that a logical interpretation cannot possibly make them say. They only say that the "high places were not taken away". The import is not that the sacrifice at the high places was maintained but that it was endured or tolerated. This is evidently shown by I Kings: 15:14, which reads as follows: "the high places were not taken away; nevertheless the heart of Asa was perfect with Jehovah all his days".
It would be a queer paradox to condemn this maintainance of the "high places" in the beginning of a sentence and say at the close that his heart was perfect with Jehovah all his days. And this is not only true with respect to the passage relative to Asa, but it is also true with respect to each of these passages: for they each say that "the king did that which was right in the eyes of Jehovah" in immediate connection with saying that "the high places were not taken away". We repeat, therefore, that Addis’ conclusion is unwarrantable and that the import of these passages is not that these kings maintained the sacrifice of the people at the high places but rather that they endured or tolerated it. This was a natural consequence of the divided kingdom. When Jeroboam drew off the ten tribes and set up a separate kingdom, he purposely built altars at Bethel and Dan to keep the people from going to Jerusalem to sacrifice (I Kings:12:27). This act undoubtedly had its influence upon the kingdom of Judah and it is not unlikely that the sacrificing of the people at the high places was against the will of these kings and against their power to prevent it. This is the only reasonable basis upon which it could be said of them that they failed to take away the high places, but notwithstanding, did that which was right in the eyes of Jehovah. This is our conclusion concerning these minor, purported violations of the Levitical line of the priesthood and we have already discussed the more gross violations. So, in all, we find no valid objection against our position, for many of the purported violations do not appear to be violations at all and even the evident violations are not approved by the basic teaching of the times.
We stated at the outset that the purpose of this thesis was to find, as nearly as possible from the information given in the history, literature and laws of the Old Testament, "who might serve as priests?" We have tried to keep very close to this one purpose throughout the discussion, but owing to the conclusion reached, without taking into special consideration some of the advanced theories concerning the dates and composition of the Old Testament books; it is necessary for us to deviate slightly to discuss our object with respect to these theories. We call them theories because we feel that the difficulties that yet attend them are too grave to permit of calling them established conclusions, especially with respect to our discussion, and because of the divergent and constantly changing opinions of advanced scholars.

It is a well known fact that most of the conclusions of higher criticism to the present day are the result of an attempt to find the historical facts of all scripture prior to or in the day of the writer, or to find an evolutionary development in the growth of the civil, religious and literary life of the Jews, or to seek explanations for attendant difficulties, or to find simply the facts set forth. Our discussion of the present subject has been an attempt to find simply the facts set forth. And although we have made no effort to seek out a natural rise and growth for the priesthood of the Old Testament, we feel that we have at least found no very serious difficulties standing in the way of its quite natural rise and growth, without making any radical rearrangement, of the time for the origin of these laws on the priesthood, from that assigned them by their places in the body of the narrative of the Old Testament.
We shall first note some of the reasons for determining upon a late date for the origin of the priesthood of the Pentateuch and afterwards give our own reasons for preferring the early date. We do not aim to discuss this question except in its bearing upon our subject.

In the present discussion the late date of Deuteronomy has its bearing but does not radically effect our conclusion since it is not for the early date of Deuteronomy alone or Deuteronomy as a book that we are contending, but only for the early date of the priesthood of the Pentateuch as a whole. With this in mind it will be clearly seen how the reasons for claiming a late date for Deuteronomy likewise effect our conclusion only indirectly.

With respect to Deuteronomy it is quite generally held, by advanced critical scholars, that it has its origin in or about the time of the exile: (1) because of the likeness between Deuteronomy and Ezekiel, and (2) because of the literary style of Deuteronomy. It is generally agreed upon that the author of one of the systems of laws in these books must have depended upon the other: but which was the original system, is not so generally agreed upon. It is claimed by some that Ezekiel's system is the more primitive and by others that Deuteronomy is the more primitive, and strange to say both claims are based upon the differences between the two systems. These differences tersely stated are (1) differences by additions and (2) differences by disagreement. The differences by additions generally mentioned are: the tithe for the Levites and the tithe of the tithe for the priests, mentioned in Numbers: 18:21-32; and the requirement concerning the tenth and first born, mentioned in Levi: 27: 32; Ex. 13: 2; 12; 22: 29; 34: 19, 20; Num. 3:45; and Deut. 18:19. There is nothing in either of these additions that would prove the
priority of one system over the other, but they favor the priority of the system in the Pentateuch especially on the requirement concerning the first born since this idea carries us back toward Egypt and since the historical references to this requirement show that it was later replaced by the choosing of the Levites upon condition. The killing and flaying of the animal by the laymen according to Leviticus 1; but by the Levites according to Ezekiel 44:11; and the distribution of Levitical lands among cities distant from Jerusalem according to Num.35:3,4, but the concentration of their land about Jerusalem according to Ezekiel: 45:1 are differences on matters common to both systems. One addition to Ezekiel's system not found in the system of the Pentateuch is the mention of door-keepers among the temple attendants. It would seem that this addition, together with the differences on common grounds, indicates the priority of the system of the Pentateuch if it indicates the priority of either; at least this would be true for those who hold to the late date for the introduction of the more thorough organization. In our own mind, these differences and additions indicate little or nothing definite concerning the matter of priority and this is borne out by the conflict of opinion on the part of those who try to prove different views by using these same differences for their proof. Therefore although there has been a great deal written on these differences between Ezekiel and the Pentateuch, it has been largely a matter of drawing them out to fit personal opinions. The likeness between Deuteronomy and Ezekiel may have its effect upon Deuteronomy as a book but not necessarily upon the part that it contributes to the priesthood of the Pentateuch. And since this is also true of the question
of its literary style we shall pass it by and turn now to our own reasons for claiming the early date for the priesthood of the Pentateuch.

It is held by Driver, Baudissan, et al. that Deuteronomy was prior to Ezekiel, and also prior to Josiah's reform in B.C. 621. This takes us one step from the Exile toward the Exodus and we have reasons for taking still another if there can be any evidence from the influence of the growth of ethical ideas upon the cruder practices of a people. It is easily seen that the late date for the origin of a thoroughly organized priesthood and sacrificial system involves a conflict with the growth and influence of ethical ideas. It implies that the Children of Israel who had been in bondage for several hundred years, to a nation (Egypt) that had a thoroughly organized priesthood, knew less about an organized priesthood and had less inclinations to fall into such an organization immediately after escaping this bondage than they did several hundred years later. Instead of setting forth a gradual decline from what is naturally repulsive to an increasing sense of ethical principles it sets forth that these repulsive features of worship grew more and more into prominence and reached their highest degree of favor at a time when the Israelitish nation had gone through the period of its highest ethical attainments. From the standpoint of a natural development of ethical principles such a position is untenable. And since it is for such a development that they whomost radically rearrange the Old Testament, are contending they themselves strike the most severe blow at their contentions by exactly reversing the order of development that would naturally be expected. It would seem more reasonable to allow the introduction of a very thoroughly organized system of sacrificial worship
early in the history of the nation, just after it comes from under such a system, and to look for a gradual falling away from this system with the development of ethical ideas. It cannot be claimed that this is exactly the case when the date of the origin of Deuteronomy is allowed to stand at the period of the Exodus, but it is more nearly the case than when its date is removed to the time of Manasseh's reign.

Moreover there are other grave difficulties in assuming that these laws were not quite thoroughly systematized before the time of Manassah's reign, even if they might not have come to their present composition in the Pentateuch before that time. It is more reasonable to think that these laws came into a systematized form before the time of the period of slack observance of law than it is to think of their taking on such a form during this period. Especially would this be true with respect to the reign of Manasseh: for his reign was exceedingly corrupt. It is not the rule that intricate systems of laws on any subject have their origin in periods of gross violation of law. In such a time the supporters of law are busied in vigorous campaigns against sin, rather than in sitting down to work out intricate systems. The Declaration of Independence came into existence before the war, but the Constitution came into existence only in a time when there were signs of a hope of putting it into operation. In the times of Manasseh there could have been no hope of putting the Deuteronomic sacrificial system into operation and therefore, from the standpoint of reason, no cause for its origin at such a time. Again it is claimed that this book of laws that had its origin (perhaps in its present form and perhaps not) at this time is the same book that was found during Josiah's reign. This seems exceedingly unlikely. It is not unlikely in that the
Deuteronomy, but it is unreasonable to think that this book that only had its existence a decade or so prior and perhaps never had been a statute of authority, should command so much respect and reverence at first sight. In case this sacrificial system that it presents had been in operation at some former time and the memories of these times are still retained in oral tradition, then the finding of such a set of laws would be an occasion of rejoicing, and they would be authoritative; but if this system, as such, had only had its origin shortly before this time, and accordingly never had been in operation, then Josiah's reverence for it is altogether unexplainable. It seems therefore that there is no time so well suited to the origin of the sacrificial system of the Pentateuch as some time before the period of the Kings. Indeed the author of the account of Josiah's reform clearly suggests that the sacrificial system of the period of the Judges was similar in character to that introduced by Josiah. He says, "Surely there was not kept such a passover from the days of the Judges that judged Israel". Such a statement can only be accounted for by at least admitting that some knowledge of an elaborate sacrificial system, during the period of the Judges is retained in the oral traditions or laws of the time.

Another indication that the sacrificial system of the Pentateuch was of early origin is found in connection with the introduction of the elaborate system in the time of Nehemiah. The account in Nehemiah tells us that "since the days of Joshua the son of Nun unto that day had not the children of Israel" dwell in booths according to the law. The significance of this statement is that it, like the other one from the account of Josiah's reform, points to a time close after the death of Moses for the most rigid observance
of the laws and ordinances of the Pentateuch. If these laws did not have their origin about that time and these ordinances were never observed at that time it is difficult to see what purpose these writers could have had in mind in making such reference to them: since their references are made as if they recalled facts of common knowledge. In the case of the writer of the account of Josiah's reform there must have been oral traditions to support his statement (if there were not actual history and laws) else it would have been meaningless, and that it was not meaningless is supported by the passage from Nehemiah. If therefore there were oral traditions to support it these traditions must have had a basis for their beginning and the acceptance of the early date for the origin of the sacrificial system supplies this basis as the late date does not.

The elaborate system of sacrificing introduced by Nehemiah and the equally elaborate one set forth in Ezekiel's state of the future are also against the position that the Deuteronomistic system had its origin just prior to the time of Josiah. Considering the natural development of ethical ideas it is difficult to account for Nehemiah's stern observance of such crude practices even though he was prompted to do so by the great calamity that had befallen the nation—certainly, as he thought, because of its slack observance of the law. This difficulty is only enhanced when we hold to the period of Josiah's reform for the date of the Deuteronomistic system. In such a case we have a gradual development and expansion of the cruder system before the time of Josiah to a more elaborate system in his time and then to a still more elaborate one in the times of Ezekiel and Nehemiah. In so far as the development of the system is "concerned this would be very natural"; but as concern-
ing the development of ethical ideas that would be repulsive to the slaughter of animals in worship, it would be altogether unnatural. On the other hand if we allow the introduction of an extensive sacrificial system at or immediately following the period of the Exodus, then the more elaborate systems of Ezekiel and Nehemiah are only the natural result of an intense religious fervor to reestablish the crude practices of the early beginnings of the nation just as there are always zealous souls that long for the glorious days of the past. According to this view the elaborate sacrificial system of the early times had gradually fallen out until an attempt is made to restore it under Josiah and a still more rigorous attempt under Nehemiah: both attempts being made because both Josiah and Nehemiah feel that the calamities that have befallen the nation are the recompence for slack observance of this system.

In closing we wish to say that it is not our contention that the Pentateuch came to its present composition at the hand of Moses or at the time of Moses. That is purely a question of "introduction", and not a question for this paper. Our contention is, however, that the most reasonable time for the introduction of the sacrificial system of the Pentateuch is at or about the time of Moses and our reasons for this in summary are as follows: (1) Because many of these laws are directly contributed to Moses, (Lev.1:1;4:1;5:14; 6:1,8,9; 9:24; 7:22,28; 8:1; 11:1; 12:1; 13:1; 14:1,3; 15:15;16:1; 17:1; 18:1; 19:1; 20:1; 21:1;22:1,17,26; 23:1,9,26,33; 24:1,13; 25:1; 27:1, Deut: 5:1; 31:1;9;24; et al.) (2) Because Deuteronomy seems to indicate that these laws are especially for the future when the people are settled in Canaan (Deut.26:1; 27:1-3,11-14) (3) Because the indication of a central sanctuary characteristic of
Deuteronomy would be the natural consequence of a change from a nomadic life to a settled life. (4) Because, Moses' "training in all the wisdom of the Egyptians" and his intimate acquaintance with their sacrificial system prepared him as well for editing such a system of laws as could anyone have possibly been prepared at a later period in history. Because this period for the origin of the sacrificial system fits naturally into the orderly. (5) Because we find no serious objections to a natural and orderly development of the priesthood of the Pentateuch when it is allowed to have its origin in the period of the Exodus. (6) Because the history, literature, and laws seem to indicate that it had its origin in this period. (7) Because this period for its origin fits naturally into the orderly development of ethical ideas. (8) Because the period of the Kings or the Exile does not fit naturally into the orderly development of ethical ideas (9) Because it is not natural that this system of laws had its origin during a period of corruption and slack observance of law. (10) Because the respect paid it by Josiah indicates that it was old, revered and authoritative. (11) Because the author of II Kings and Nehemiah both point to an elaborate sacrificial service in the time of Joshua and (12) Because the late date involves a gradual development of crude practices vs. ethical ideas.
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