# THE ESCHATOLOGICAL THINKING OF THE DEAD SEA SECT AND THE ORDER OF BLESSINGS IN THE CHRISTIAN EUCHARIST

R. Steven Notley

The order of the Christian Eucharist is a departure from the traditional order of Jewish festive meals, including the Passover, which is the setting for the Last Supper.[1]

> And as they were eating, he took *bread*, and blessed, and broke it, and gave it to them, and said, "Take; this is my body." And he took a *cup*, and when he had given thanks he gave it to them, and they all drank of it. And he said to them, "This is my blood of the covenant, which is poured out for many." (Mark 14:22–24; emphasis added)

In the Jewish ceremonial blessing before the meal, the wine precedes the bread (*m. Ber.* 6.5–6).[2] Fifty years of scholarship on the Dead Sea Scrolls have demonstrated points of correspondence between Essene sectarian expression and that of Hellenistic Christianity.[3] These parallels between the Qumran Congregation and the Early Church apparently extended to ecclesiastical traditions regarding the Last Supper of Jesus. Indeed, the presentation of Jesus blessing the bread *prior* to the wine preserved in Mark's narrative resembles the order in the sectarian meals.[4]

---

[1] On the question of whether the Last Supper was a Passover meal, see J. Jeremias, *The Eucharistic Words of Jesus* (London: SCM, 1974), 41–62.

[2] One of the earliest discussions recorded concerning the order of blessings during Jewish meals is that between the Schools of Hillel and Shamai (*m. Ber.* 8:8). However, as we will see below the first written record of the traditional Jewish wine-bread order is that preserved in the New Testament.

[3] "The contacts with Qumran came less through John the Baptist and Jesus, than through Paul, John, and even the faithful of the second generation;" P. Benoit, O.P. "Qumran and the New Testament," in *Paul and the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. J. Murphy O'Connor and J.H. Charlesworth; New York: Crossroad, 1990), 6; D. Flusser, "The Dead Sea Sect and Pre-Pauline Christianity," in *Judaism and the Origins of Christianity* (Jerusalem: Magnes, 1988), 23–74 [henceforth: *Judaism*]; repr. from *Scripta Hierosolymitana* (vol. 4; Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1965).

[4] J. Licht, *The Rule Scroll* (Jerusalem: The Bialik Institute, 1965), 140, 270 [Hebrew]; K.G. Kuhn exaggerated the parallels between the sectarian meal and the description of meals in *Joseph and Aseneth* (8.5, 9; 15.5; 16.16; 19.5; 21.13f, 21); "The Lord's Supper and

> And when the table has been prepared for eating, and the new wine for drinking, the Priest shall be the first to stretch out his hand to bless the first fruits of the *bread* and new *wine*. (1QS 6:5–6; emphasis added)[5]

For this study we have followed Flusser's suggestion that it is the order of the Qumran meal that lies behind the Markan account of Jesus' celebration of the Passover-Last Supper.[6] Moreover, we hope to demonstrate that the reason for the common order of bread-wine shared by the Qumran Congregation and the Eucharistic practice of the Early Church is because of a common eschatological opinion. Despite these parallels, it seems likely that Jesus followed the traditional Jewish order of reciting the blessing over the wine before the bread.[7] This sequence is attested in Luke's independent source for his account of the Last

---

the Communal Meal at Qumran," in *The Scrolls and the New Testament* (ed. K. Stendahl; New York, 1957), 65ff. See the brief discussion of the issues by C. Burchard, "Joseph and Aseneth," in *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* (2 vols.; ed. J.H. Charlesworth; Garden City, New York: Doubleday, 1983–1985), 2:212 [henceforth: *OTP*] and the correctives given by A.R.C. Leaney, *The Rule of Qumran and its Meaning* (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1966), 182–184. The description in the Community Rule corresponds to the Essene meals described by Josephus, *Jewish War* 2:131, "Before meat the priest says a grace, and none may partake until after the prayer."

[5] L.H. Schiffman has objected to comparisons between the Essene meals and the Christian Eucharist. "This passage from *Rule of the Community* (6:5–6) does not describe meals at which *both* bread and wine are required, bur rather occasions at which the table is set for bread *or* wine;" *Reclaiming the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ABRL; New York: Doubleday, 1995), 336 (emphasis mine). However, Schiffman's assumption concerning the elements in the Qumran meal is based upon the corrupted reading of 1QS 6:4–6 in which lines 4–5 (including הלחם או התירוש) are repeated in lines 5–6. The resulting passage reads, "the priest shall extend his hand first to bless the first fruits of bread *or* wine" (emphasis added). Fragments from the Community Rule in Cave 4 (4QSd) preserve a shorter text and seem to be free at this point of the corruption seen in 1QS. They demonstrate that the better reading is הלחם והתירוש ("the bread *and* the wine"). See P.S. Alexander, G. Vermes, *Qumran Cave 4: XIX Serek Ha-Yahad and Two Related Texts* (DJD 26; Oxford: Clarendon, 1998), 99–102; and J.H. Charlesworth, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Vol. 1: The Community Rule and Related Documents* (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1994), 26.

[6] Flusser, "The Last Supper and the Essenes," in *Judaism*, 202–206. Yigael Yadin also suggested that the bread-wine order was preserved in the order of the sacrifices described in the Temple Scroll (11QT 43.8, 9). He cited Flusser's article to support his contention. Notwithstanding Yadin's agreement with Flusser's opinion that the sectarian order influenced the Markan account of the Last Supper, the order of the sacrificial system in the Temple Scroll is more likely dependent upon Deuteronomy 12:17; Y. Yadin, *The Temple Scroll* (3 vols.; Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 1977), 1:112–113 [Hebrew].

[7] This article reflects the trend among some scholars to acknowledge the unmistakable connections between Jesus and streams of Jewish piety identifiable within rabbinic literature; cf. Flusser, *Jesus* (3rd ed.; Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 2000).

Supper.[8] It is also reflected in first century Christian witnesses to the wine-bread order at ceremonial meals.[9]

Luke preserves Jesus' blessing over the cup before the bread. One's opinion regarding the relationship between this record and that found in Mark will to a great extent be determined by the assessment of the manuscript evidence supporting the longer or shorter versions of Luke's Last Supper.

> And he said to them, "I have earnestly desired to eat this Passover with you before I suffer; for I tell you I shall not eat it until it is fulfilled in the kingdom of God." And he took a cup, and when he had given thanks he said, "Take this, and divide it among yourselves; for I tell you that from now on I shall not drink of the fruit of the vine until the kingdom of God comes." And he took bread, and when he had given thanks he broke it and gave it to them, saying, "This is my body … [*which is given for you. Do this in remembrance of me." And likewise the cup after supper, saying, "This cup which is poured out for you is the new covenant in my blood.*"] (Luke 22:15–20; emphasis added)

The longer tradition (Luke 22:15–20) includes the italicized verses (22:19b–20). It is attested by numerous textual witnesses,[10] and thus is preferred by most modern text-critics.[11] On the other hand, the shorter version[12] (22:15–19a) eliminates the *necessary*[13] identification of the body

---

[8] V. Taylor, *The Passion Narrative of St. Luke* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1972), 50.

[9] The question whether the Christian meals mentioned refer to the Eucharist or simply communal meals has no bearing on the results of our study. The order of blessing at all festive Jewish meals is consistently wine-bread. Thus, deviation from that order by Gentile or Jewish Christians represents a departure from the traditional Jewish pattern.

[10] P75, a, A,B,C,K,L,T,W,X,D,Q,P,Y,063,*f* 1,13, and ancient versions (VG, SyrPal, Coptic, Armenian, and Georgian).

[11] See J.A. Fitzmyer, *The Gospel According to Luke X–XXIV* (AB 28a; New York: Doubleday, 1985), 1388 [henceforth: *Luke X–XXIV*].

[12] D,OL (a,d,ff2,i,l), Syrs,c, Marcion, Justin, and probably Tatian. See Taylor, *The Passion Narrative of St. Luke*, 50ff. It is seldom noted by scholars that the shorter version, while demonstrably not a harmonization with its synoptic counterparts, is supported by Mark 14:22 and Matthew 26:26.

[13] Without the qualifying subordinate clause of v. 19b (τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν διδόμενον), Jesus' statement can be understood to signify "the breaking" as a euphemistic metaphor. The expression τοῦτο ἐστιν τὸ σῶμά μου is a Hebraism for זה גופי. In post-Biblical Hebrew the term גוף (body) developed the added meaning of "self." "He that honors the Law is himself (גופו) honored by mankind" (*m. Avot* 4:6; cp. *m. Avot* 1:17). Thus, Jesus' reference to גופי is not intended to draw a correlation between his body and the bread. In fact, the literal sense of "body" is not even meant. His act of breaking the bread is intended to point to his impending suffering. Best has argued that Jesus could

and bread[14] (v. 19b) as well as the second cup (v. 20). More importantly, it alone of the Synoptic Gospels presents Jesus adhering to the traditional order of wine and bread.

Fitzmyer has argued in favor of the longer version of Luke's Last Supper, appealing to the principal of *lectio difficilior*, "which restores the two cups to the Lucan account."[15] Yet, he mistakenly assumes that the occurrence of two cups is the *lectio difficior*. Jeremias earlier recognized that the greater difficulty is in the shorter reading with its reversal of the normal Christian order for the Eucharist.[16] The Christian scribe responsible for the longer reading was aware that the Last Supper had multiple cups,[17] and he seems to have felt no difficulty in fusing portions

---

not be referring to the breaking, because "the breaking of bread was a normal part of the action of asking a blessing on a meal;" E. Best, *The Temptation and the Passion: The Markan Soteriology* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1965), 145. However, it is just this type of investing ordinary actions with extraordinary meaning, which is typical of rabbinical didactic style. Later that same evening, Jesus uses the customary act of greeting to drive home the treachery of Judas' betrayal, "Judas, would you betray the *son of man* (i.e. a fellow human being) with a kiss?" (Luke 22:48). The tension between the mundane act of breaking bread and the message of Jesus' passion is what contributes to the dramatic affect. The shorter reading restores this drama. "This is myself (i.e. which is to broken), but the hand of the one who betrays me is on the table …"

[14] The Fourth Gospel represents the final stage of theological development within the Gospel tradition regarding the Eucharist. There we find both the pre-Markan order and the identification of Jesus' body and blood with the elements of the meal: "So Jesus said to them, 'Truly, truly, I say to you, unless you eat the *flesh* of the Son of man and drink his *blood*, you have no life in you'" (John 6:53; emphasis added).

[15] Fitzmyer, *Luke X–XXIV*, 1388.

[16] "The two basic rules of textual criticism, 'The shorter text is the older,' and 'The more difficult reading is to be preferred,' unanimously commend the Short Text." Jeremias, *The Eucharistic Words of Jesus*, 153. Jeremias later abandoned his preference for the shorter version, and came to the conclusion that vv. 19b–20 were derived from an ancient liturgical formula which Luke and Paul independently adopted. Jeremias lacked a demonstrable explanation for the origins of the shorter version. He thus posited a hypothetical scenario assuming *disciplina arcane*, "As the actual reason for the abbreviation it can be suggested that a pagan around the middle of the second century requested a copy of the gospel of Luke; the copyist, however, was hesitant to deliver over to him the complete text of the sacramental formula and therefore omitted it after the beginning words. A small group of old Western and Syriac MSS, among which is D, goes back to the abbreviated text; so we do not have to do with a general occurrence within the broad area of diffusion of the gospel of Luke, but rather with an occurrence confined to one branch of the tradition in the West and to Syria" (159). A similar opinion is given by B.M. Metzger, *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament* (New York: United Bible Society, 1994), 148–150.

[17] On the similarities between Jewish and Graeco-Roman festive meals see G.J. Bahr, "The Seder of Passover and the Eucharistic Words," *NovT* 12 (1970): 181–202.

of the pre-Pauline tradition reflected in 1 Corinthians 11:24–25 together with elements from Mark's Gospel to create an additional cup.

| *Mark 14:24* | *Luke 22:19b–20* | *1 Corinthians 11:24–25* |
|---|---|---|
| καὶ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς τοῦτο ἐστιν τὸ αἷμά μου τῆς διαθήκης τὸ ἐκχυννόμενον ὑπὲρ πολλῶν | τοῦτο ἐστιν τὸ σῶμά μου τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν [διδόμενον] τοῦτο ποιεῖτε εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν καὶ τὸ ποτήριον ὡσαύτως μετὰ τὸ δειπνῆσαι λέγων τοῦτο τὸ ποτήριον ἡ καινὴ διαθήκη […] ἐν τῷ αἵματί μου τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν ἐκχυννόμενον | τοῦτο μου ἐστιν τὸ σῶμα τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν […] τοῦτο ποιεῖτε εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν ὡσαύτως καὶ τὸ ποτήριον μετὰ τὸ δειπνῆσαι λέγων τοῦτο τὸ ποτήριον ἡ καινὴ διαθήκη [ἐστὶν] ἐν τῷ ἐμῷ αἵματι |

The Christian scribal attempt to harmonize the synoptic tradition is easily detected in Luke 22:20. The Pauline liturgical saying, "This cup is the new covenant in my blood" is augmented with the Markan phrase, "which is poured out" (τὸ ἐκχυννόμενον). Yet, the abrupt scribal insertion leaves in question what is to be poured-out. Is it the blood or the cup? Grammatically, the cup is designated, but the blood is what was originally meant, as we see in Mark 14:24. The result is a crude attempt to provide a seamless continuity between the Markan, Lukan and Pauline traditions.[18]

Fitzmyer rightly concedes that a major difficulty exists "explaining the genesis of the other, shorter or conflate, readings, if the long text were the original."[19] The assumption of the originality of the longer reading obscures the true difficulty which challenged the Christian scribe and which was the impetus for the longer addition. *Luke's order of wine and bread in the shorter version deviated from what had become the traditional order of the Christian Eucharist.* Jesus could not be seen authenticating an order that was at odds with the prevailing practice of the Church.

[18] Additional theological reasons for the Christian scribe's inflated text can be identified with his inclusion of the propitiatory motif and the only mention in Luke's Gospel of the "new covenant." Luke in his Gospel tends to avoid reference to the "atoning sacrifice." See L. von Sybel, "Das letzte Mahl Jesu," *Theologische Studien und Kritiken* 95 (Leipzig, 1923–1924), 123; M. Kiddle, "The Passion Narrative in St. Luke's Gospel," *JTS* 36 (1935): 277. Jeremias' attempt to refute this fact is unconvincing. He interprets Luke 22:37 (cf. Isa 53:12) to allude to Jesus' atonement (cf. *The Eucharistic Words of Jesus*, 157 n. 6). However, Jeremias misunderstood the thrust of Jesus' warning to his disciples. Jesus, himself, would be considered "the transgressor" by his political opponents, and his disciples were in danger of being numbered (i.e. be implicated) with him. Space does not allow us to give full treatment to this important text, but Luke 22:37 does not allude to an "atoning sacrifice."

[19] Fitzmyer, *Luke X–XXIV*, 1388.

This alone would have been sufficient justification for the scribe to harmonize the order of Luke to that of Mark and Matthew, and to bring it into line with the order of the Christian Eucharist.

The pre-Markan[20] tradition that Jesus celebrated the Passover in the order followed by the Qumran sectarians was apparently adopted by some early Christian congregations. Paul's words indicate that he was aware of the tradition, but that he himself was not entirely comfortable with it. Unlike Mark and Matthew, Paul recounts that Jesus took the cup "after supper" (μετὰ τὸ δειπνῆσαι). In other words, Paul suggests that this was not the *qiddush* (קידוש) which occurs together with the bread prior to the meal, but the second cup, the *kos brachah* (כוס ברכה), which marked the festive occasion of the Passover.[21] This second cup followed the meal.[22] There is no hint of the Pauline innovation in the Gospel narratives themselves.[23] The insertion of μετὰ τὸ δειπνῆσαι is Paul's own hesitation to follow fully the tradition which lies behind Mark's Gospel according to which Jesus is presented reversing the traditional Jewish order.

Not only did Paul's Pharisaic background (cf. Acts 23:6; Phil 3:5) cause him unease with the portrayal of Jesus reversing the traditional

---

[20] H. Schürmann, *Quellenkritische Untersuchung des lukanischen Abendmahlsberichtes Lk. xxii. 7–38: II Der Einsetzungsbericht Lk. xxii. 29–20* (Münster, 1957), 9–14, and 17–30.

[21] During the days of the Second Temple it seems that there were only two cups during the Passover meal. There may also have been a third cup with the Hallel. However, the order described in *m. Pesahim* 10:1–7 with four cups reflects Jewish practice subsequent to the destruction of the Temple in 70 C.E. See the discussion by Shmuel and Ze'ev Safrai, *Haggadah of the Sages: The Passover Haggadah* (Jerusalem: Carta, 1998), 21–22 [Hebrew].

[22] The second cup was re-filled prior to the blessing after the meal, the *birkat hamazon* (ברכת המזון). It was thus sometimes called the "cup of blessing" (בוס ברכה). Additionally, Flusser has suggested that by the time of the Didache the ברכת המזון may have been called εὐχαριστία by Hellenistic-Greek speaking Jews (cf. *Jos. Asen.* 9.5). In 1 Corinthians 10:16, Paul used the terminology for the *birkat hamazon* (i.e. τὸ ποτήριον τῆς εὐλογίας), but he has it with the bread in the position of the *qiddush*. See also H. Gressmann "Jewish Life in Ancient Rome," in *Jewish Studies in Memory of Israel Abraham* (New York, 1927), 180.

[23] Mark's order of the meal is decidedly confused. Twice he records that Jesus and his disciples are eating (14:18, 22) prior to the blessing over the bread and wine. Mark moved the "dipping" of the *karpas* (14:20) to the end of the meal. Mark may be influenced in his ordering by Psalm 41:9, "Even my bosom friend in whom I trusted, who ate of my bread, has lifted his heel against me." Thus, the Evangelist seeks to portray Judas already eating at the table with Jesus before bringing attention to his betrayal. Similar literary influences from the Psalms are identifiable elsewhere in Mark's passion narrative (e.g. Mark 15:19: Ps 22:8; Mark 15:34: Ps 22:1).

order of the Passover meal, but the apostle himself retains the traditional order in his rhetorical questions in the previous chapter.

> The *cup* of blessing which we bless, is it not a participation in the blood of Christ? The *bread* which we break, is it not a participation in the body of Christ? (1Cor 10:16; emphasis added)

This Pauline sequence may reflect the practice in some Jewish-Christian circles of the Early Church attested also in the Didache 9.1–3.[24]

> But as touching the Eucharistic thanksgiving give thanks thus. First, as regards the *cup*: We give You thanks, O our Father, for the holy vine of Your son David, which You made known to us through Your Son Jesus; Yours is the glory for ever and ever. Then as regards the broken *bread*: We give You thanks, O our Father, for the life and knowledge which You made known to us through Your Son Jesus; Yours is the glory for ever and ever. (Emphasis added)

The traditions found in 1Corinthians 10:16 and Didache 9:1–3, thus, represent an independent and variant ordering of Christian ceremonial meals from the order that eventually became normative Christian practice. The continuity of Christian meals in accordance with Jewish order further raises doubt whether Jesus himself broke with the traditional Jewish manner of the blessings when he celebrated the Passover.

Thus far, we have witnessed the hand of the Christian scribe harmonizing Luke's narrative to agree with the bread-wine order of Mark. Jesus himself, as others of his followers, however, maintained the traditional Jewish pattern for ceremonial meals. Still, a vexing question remains concerning the motivation for the reversal of order in the tradition reflected in Mark's narrative. The Evangelist clearly presents the Passover-Last Supper in the order observed also among the Dead Sea Sect. Yet, what reason was there to alter the presentation of Jesus in his celebration of the meal? Likewise, why did the Dead Sea Sect itself deviate from the traditional Jewish pattern?

Even though scholarship has recognized the sectarian change in order, scarce attention has been given to the reason for the change. While the description of the meal in the Community Rule (1QS 6:5–6) represents the daily life of the community, the sectarians also held that the priestly Messiah would follow the same order in the eschatological banquet. At the eschatological banquet, the Congregation would dine with the priestly Messiah and the Messiah of Israel.

---

[24] See Didache 10:3.

> [This shall be the ass]embly of the men of renown [called] to the meeting of the Council of the Community when [the Priest-]Messiah shall summon them … And [when] they shall gather for the common [tab]le, to eat and [to drink] new wine, when the common table shall be set for eating and the new wine [poured] for drinking, let no man extend his hand over the first-fruits of *bread* and *wine* before the Priest; for [it is he] who shall bless the first-fruits of *bread* and *wine*, and shall be the first [to extend] his hand over the bread. (1QSa 2:16–20; emphasis added)

Daily meals in the community were thus an anticipation of the eschatological banquet in the future[25] at which time the priestly Messiah would lead in the blessing of the first-fruits of bread and wine.[26]

> Reflecting its deep messianic consciousness, the sect participated in the communal meals as a central eschatological ritual, enacting daily the messianic banquets expected to be presided over by the priest and the messiah of Israel. These meals were viewed as a foretaste of the world to come.

Yet, how did the community arrive at the conclusion that the priestly Messiah would bless the bread first and then the wine? The scrolls give no explanation, but the answer may lie in their speculation concerning the identity of the eschatological priest.

The recent publication of 11Q13 (11QMelch)[27] revisits the question of the messianic expectations of the Dead Sea Sect.[28] Of particular interest is the appearance of Melchizedek with a specified eschatological role. Belief in the return of Melchizedek also appears in *2 Enoch*. According to a Jewish legend, his priestly father—the apocryphal Nir—is told that the child is to be taken to Paradise to escape the coming flood in the generation of Noah, "For the time is now very near when I shall let loose all the waters over the earth, and all that is on the earth shall perish; and I will give him a place of honor in *another generation*,[29] and

---

[25] F.M. Cross, *The Ancient Library of Qumran* (New York: Doubleday, 1958), 35f; and M.A. Knibb, *The Qumran Community* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987), 116, and 154.

[26] Schiffman, *Reclaiming the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 339; idem, *Sectarian Law in the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1983), 200.

[27] F.G. Martinez, E.J.C. Tigchelaar, and A.S. Van der Woude, *Cave 11 II (11Q 2–18, 11Q 20–31)* (DJD 23; Oxford: Clarendon, 1998), 221–241 [henceforth: *DJD 23*].

[28] See J.J. Collins, *The Scepter and the Star: The Messiahs of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Other Ancient Literature* (ABRL; New York: Doubleday, 1995); and Knibb, "Messianism in the Pseudepigrapha in the Light of the Scrolls," *DSD* 2 (1995): 165–184.

[29] In the longer recension (version J), the generation is defined as "the *last* generation" (71:34; emphasis mine). See F.I. Andersen, "2 Enoch," *OTP*, 1:208.

*Melchizedek shall be chief priest in that generation*."[30] In the longer recension (version J) of the Melchizedek legend, we are told he "will perform miracles, greater and more glorious than all previous ones" (*2 En.* 71:34). This description of the future miraculous work of Melchizedek reflects the expectation heard also in the eschatological prayer of Ben Sira 36:1–22.

> Show signs anew and work further wonders,
> make Thy hand and Thy right arm glorious. (Sir 36:6–7)

Both of these traditions attest to this hope, Israel's future salvation would be accomplished through the hands of an appointed redeemer, who would do greater works than those witnessed in the redemption from Egypt.[31]

Melchizedek's return in 11Q13 is likewise placed at the dawning of the redemptive era with the structure of events shaped by the sectarian division of history into periods.[32] Thus, the column opens with a combined citation of Leviticus 25:10 and Deuteronomy 15:2, both of which concern the Jubilee year. The significance of the Jubilee for the author is two-fold. According to Leviticus 25:10, it is in that year that the people of God "shall proclaim liberty (דְּרוֹר) in the land." The time of redemption is also related to the fact that this year will be a time of

---

[30] *2 Enoch* 23:34. *The Apocryphal Old Testamaent* (trans. A. Pennington; Oxford: Clarendon, 1989), 362 [= *2 En.* ver. A, 71:34; *OTP* 1:209]. The tradition heard in *2 Enoch* that Melchizedek's return still lies in the future may be behind the statement in Hebrews 7:3: "and (Melchizedek) has neither beginning of days *nor end of life*" (μήτε ζωῆς τέλος ἔχων). The identity of Melchizedek as the high priest during the final generation in *2 Enoch* and 11Q13 is at odds with the esteem voiced for the Aaronic priesthood heard elsewhere in the Qumran library. Although we cannot be certain how the Congregation reconciled the differences between the Aaronic and Melchizedek priestly orders, the Epistle to Hebrews indicates that religious communities at that time were aware of the tension. The New Testament letter provides an example of one way in which the change in priestly orders was justified. "Now if perfection had been attainable through the Levitical priesthood (for under it the people received the law), what further need would there have been for another priest to arise after the order of Melchizedek, *rather than one named after the order of Aaron*?" (Heb 7:11; emphasis added). Another example of fluidity in contemporary messianic ideas can be seen in Jesus' rejoinder to the popular expectation of the Messiah son of David, "How can they say that the Christ is David's son?" (Luke 20:41). Note particularly Jesus' subsequent citation of Psalm 110:1 (in Luke 20:42–43), which as we will see below was understood by some readers at the time to be about Melchizedek himself!

[31] Flusser, *Jesus*, 275, n. 45.

[32] On the division of history see Licht, "Time and Eschatology in Qumran," *JJS* 15 (1965): 177–182; and D. Dimant, "The 'Pesher on the Periods' (4Q 180) and 4Q 181," *IOS* 9 (1979): 77–102.

"the Lord's release" (שַׁמְטָה לַיהוָה:■ Deut 15:2). While the biblical verse speaks of a release from debts, the sectarian spiritual interpretation of שמטה is defined by the fact that redemption will be inaugurated on "the Day of Atonement (Leviticus 25:9: בְּיוֹם הַכִּפֻּרִים) at the end of the tenth Jubilee" (11Q13 2.7). Thus, the tenth Jubilee begins with an atonement for past iniquities (עוונותיהמה), and culminates in redemption with divine vengeance brought upon Belial and his lot.

Mention of the proclamation of liberty (וְקָרָאתֶם דְּרוֹר) in Leviticus 25:10 allows the author to introduce Isaiah 61:1 where liberty is also proclaimed (לִקְרֹא לִשְׁבוּיִם דְּרוֹר). This period of redemption is called שנת רצון למלכי צדק alluding to Isaiah 61:2: שְׁנַת־רָצוֹן לַיהוָה וְיוֹם נָקָם לֵאלֹהֵינוּ, and anticipating Melchizedek's role in executing divine vengeance. He arises (ומלכי צדק יקום) to accomplish the vengeance of God's judgments (נקם משפטי א[ל]) in a fashion very similar to the priestly redeemer of the *Assumption of Moses*.[33]

> Then will be filled the hands[34] of the messenger,[35]
> who is in the highest place appointed.[36]
> Yea, he will at once avenge them of their enemies.
> For the Heavenly One will arise from his kingly throne.[37]
> Yea, he will go forth from his holy habitation
> with indignation and wrath on behalf of his sons. (*Ass. Moses* 10:2–3)

---

[33] See J. Tromp, *The Assumption of Moses: A Critical Edition with Commentary* (SVTP; Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1993), 228–234.

[34] Exodus 28:41; 29:9, and 35; and Leviticus 16:31. In the *Aramaic Prayer of Levi*, the patriarch likewise stretches out his hands as he prays to receive the Holy Spirit which is further defined in terms of Isaiah 11:2. Traditionally this verse was associated with the Davidic Messiah (צמח: Jeremiah 23:5; Zechariah 6:12). See M.E. Stone, J.C. Greenfield, "The Prayer of Levi," *JBL* 112 (1993): 247–266; idem, *Parabiblical Texts, Part 3* (DJD 22; ed. J.C. Vanderkam; Oxford: Clarendon, 1996), 29.

[35] Here the messenger (*nuntius* = מלאך) is a priestly human figure and *not* an angel. His designated task to execute divine judgment may itself necessitate his humanity. As we hear in the *Testament of Abraham* (13:5, and 8), "It is not I (God) who judge you, *but by man shall every man be judged* … For all men have their origin from the first man; and so by his son they are first judged" (emphasis added). Marc Turnage has drawn my attention to a similar notion in the dominical statement of John 5:22, "The Father judges no one, but has *given all judgment to the Son*" (emphasis added).

[36] Ascent to the heavenly heights (למרום) is elsewhere depicted of human redemptive figures, sometimes using phraseology similar to Psalm 7:8–9 from Psalm 68:19 [E 68:18]: עָלִיתָ לַמָּרוֹם. This latter verse is cited in *Avot de Rabbi Nathan* concerning Moses and his ascent to receive the Torah. Paul also applies the verse in Ephesians 4:8 to the ascension of Christ. See Collins, *The Scepter and the Star*, 136–153.

[37] Although the Heavenly One seated in the *Assumption of Moses* is God, note below in *Ezekiel the Tragedian*, 68–76 that it is the human figure Moses who is enthroned. See note 42.

Throughout 11Q13, the author utilized words and phrases from Isaiah 61:1–3, which he then combined by linguistic association with other Old Testament verses. Psalm 82:1 is cited in 11Q13 2:10 to take advantage of the double occurrence of אלהים: אֱלֹהִים נִצָּב בַּעֲדַת־אֵל בְּקֶרֶב אֱלֹהִים יִשְׁפֹּט. In both biblical and post-biblical Hebrew אלהים can mean merely "judge," and is not always intended to suggest a heavenly being.[38]

Contrary to Van der Woude's suggestion which was based upon a late medieval Jewish midrash, Psalm 82:1 is not intended to identify Melchizedek as a heavenly being (i.e. the archangel Michael).[39] Indeed, the object (כאשר כתוב עליו) of the citation is not Melchizedek at all but הקץ,[40] which is defined as a time for the "administration of judgment"

---

[38] So also we find the understanding of אלהים in the Jewish midrash, *Mekilta de Rabbi Ishmael* on Exodus 21:6: "■Then the master shall bring him (the slave) to God (אֶל־הָאֱלֹהִים). For the biblical אל־האלהים non-matching quote the midrash reads אצל דניינים. The *Mekilta de Rabbi Ishmael* is supported in its interpretation by *Targum Onkelos* (ויקרביניה רבוניה לקדם דינייא). The reading of the LXX provides further insight into the thinking of these interpreters: προσάξει αὐτὸν ὁ κύριος αὐτοῦ πρὸς τὸ κριτήριον τοῦ θεοῦ. The judge is understood to be the one who executes God's judgment; see also Exodus 22:8, 9, and 28; 1Samuel 2:25; and Judges 5:8.

[39] M. De Jonge and A.S. Van der Woude, "11Q Melchizedek and the New Testament," *NTS* 12 (1965–1966): 301–326; P. Kobelski, *Melchizedek and Melchiresa* (CBQMS 10; Washington, 1981); J.T. Milik, "Milki-sedeq et Milki-resa," *JJS* 23 (1972): 95–144; and J.A. Sanders, "The Old Testament in 11QMelchizedek," *JANESCU* 5 (1973): 373–382.

[40] Much of scholarship still assumes that the antecedent for the pronomial suffix of עליו is מלכי צדק [A.S. Van der Woude, "Melchisedech als himmlische Erlösergestalt in den neugefundenen eschatologischen Midraschim aus Qumran Höhle XI" *OS* 14 (1965): 364; De Jonge and Van der Woude, "11 Q Melchizedek," 304; and Sanders, "Dissenting Deities and Phil. 2:1–11," *JBL* 88 (1969): 286] or משפט [Fitzmyer, "Further Light on Melchizedek from Qumran Cave 11," *JBL* 86 (1967): 36]. F.L. Horgan argued against Fitzmyer's reading on the grounds that "it is extremely unusual for the *nomen rectum* of a construct chain (i.e. לממשלת משפט) to serve as the antecedent of a following pronominal suffix;" *The Melchizedek Tradition* (SNTSMS; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1976), 74. Horgan did not note, however, that this same argument also precludes Melchizedek from being the antecedent for עליו, since the proper noun likewise serves as a *nomen rectum* in a chain of construct phrases. Unfortunately, scholarship has not fully realized the implications of Yadin's correction of Van der Woude's earlier reconstruction at the beginning of line 9: הואה חקק. According to Van der Woude's reconstruction, Melchizedek (i.e., הואה) is the Rod (cf. CD 6:9) and serves as the *nomen regens* of the construct chain. Since Yadin's article ("A Note on Melchizedek and Qumran," *IEJ* 15 (1965): 152–154), however, there has been scholarly consensus that the lacuna should read הקץ הואה (see *DJD 23*, 225). Thus, it is not Melchizedek at all but "the (final) period" which serves as the *nomen regens* of the construct chain and the subject of line 9. The citation of Psalm 82:1 in line 10 is not intended to define Melchizedek but "the (final) period" and to support the author's belief that it will be a time of divine judgment executed by Melchizedek and the Congregation.

(**לממשלת משפט**) in which the eschatological Priest plays a role. Nothing in the thematic pesher indicates that Melchizedek is intended to signify anyone other than the historical figure of Genesis 14:18–20. Instead, Psalm 82:1 serves simply as a literary device for introducing the *dramatis personae* that belong to the Congregation's hope for imminent redemption and revenge against its enemies.

According to the sectarian thinking at Qumran, Melchizedek would not be the only instrument of divine judgment. Instead, he sits among the **עדת־אל**, an epithet that only appears again in the Qumran library in the *War Scroll* (1QM 4.9). The title is there inscribed on the ensign of the Congregation in preparation for the eschatological battle.[41] Occurring in the structural parallelism of Psalm 82:1 where the **עדת־אל** are also called **אלהים**, the title's singular appearance in the Hebrew Scriptures provided the author of 11Q13 with an opportunity to define both Melchizdek and the Congregation in their future role as **אלהים**. The idea of the Congregation's participation with Melchizedek in rendering judgment is further enunciated in lines 2:13–14.

> And Melchizedek will carry out the vengeance of God's judgments [and on that day he will f]r[ee them from the hand of] Belial and from the hands of all the s[pirits of his lot]. And all the Oaks [of Righteousness: **אלי הצדק**: cf. Isa 61:3][42] are his help (**ובעזרו**) …

The author thus utilized the parallelism inherent in both Isaiah 61:2 and Psalm 82:1 to create a bi-partite presentation in which both Melchizedek and the Congregation will be executors of divine judgment on the Day of Vengeance.

| | *Isaiah 61:2* | *11Q13 2:9* | *Psalm 82:1* |
|---|---|---|---|
| Melchizedek: | (A) לִקְרֹא שְׁנַת<br>רָצוֹן לַיהוָה | (A) לשנת רצון<br>למלכי צדק | (A) אֱלֹהִים נִצָּב<br>בַּעֲדַת־אֵל |
| Congregation: | (B) וְיוֹם נָקָם<br>לֵאלֹהֵינוּ | (B) וליום [נקם]<br>קידושי אל | (B) בַּעֲדַת־אֵל בְּקֶרֶב<br>אֱלֹהִים יִשְׁפֹּט |

Mention of **עדת אל** from Psalm 82:1 led to the introduction of Psalm 7:8–9 [E 7:7–8] which includes the sectarian counterpart **עֲדַת לְאֻמִּים** and the motif of divine judgment. The sectarian author presents Mel-

[41] See Yadin, *The Scroll of the War of the Sons of Light Against the Sons of Darkness* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1962), 276–277.

[42] *DJD 23*, 232.

chizedek enthroned on high: **למרום שובה** [ה]**עלי**ו (1Q13 2.6–7: Ps 7:8), but once again this does not mean that the King of Salem is a heavenly being. Similar enthronement depictions are witnessed in other Jewish apocalyptic writings in connection with historical figures.[43]

> On Sinai's peak I (Moses) saw what seemed a throne so great in size it touched the clouds of heaven. Upon it sat a man of noble mien, becrowned, and with a scepter in one hand while with the other he did beckon me. I made approach and stood before the throne. He handed o'er the scepter and he bade me mount the throne, and gave to me the crown; then he himself withdrew from off the throne. (Eusebius, *Praep. ev.* 9.29.4–6)

Instead, the priestly figure is seated above the Congregation of the Nations (ו[ה]**עלי**) as the executor of divine judgment. The whole episode resembles Psalm 110 where we hear reference both to Melchizedek and to one seated in judgment, "The Lord said to my lord: 'Sit at my right hand, till I make your enemies your footstool'" (Ps 110:1). It seems that the sectarians read Psalm 110 as addressed to Melchizedek, himself: "You are a priest forever, *according to my words* (**עַל־דִּבְרָתִי**), O Melchizedek!" (Ps 110:4; emphasis added).[44]

The notion that Melchizedek himself would be the eschatological judge seems to be the fruit of a creative exegesis of the consonantal text of Psalm 110.[45] In the un-pointed reading of **אדני** in 110:5, the Dead Sea Sect and other early Jewish interpreters understood the term to signify not the Lord (**אֲדֹנָי**) as read by the Massoretes, but the human figure (**אֲדֹנִי**) already mentioned in Psalm 110:1: "The Lord (**יְהוָה**) said to my lord (**לַאדֹנִי**), 'Sit at my right hand …" This non-Massoretic reading also better suits the figure's seated position at the right hand of God, "My lord (**אֲדֹנָי**) is at Your (i.e. the Lord's) right hand …" (Ps 110:5). Thus read, Psalm 110:5 presents the identical seated description to that of the opening verse. Consequently, it is not the Lord who executes judgment

---

[43] R.G. Robertson, "Ezekiel the Tragedian," *OTP*, 2.811–812; and P.W. Van der Horst, "Moses' Throne Vision in Ezekiel the Dramatist," *JJS* 34–35 (1983–1984): 21–29. See the crowning of Enoch in *3 Enoch* 12:1–5. Josephus also reports the legend that the infant Moses seizes Pharaoh's crown and smashes it to the ground (*Ant.* 2:233–234). *Exodus Rabbah* 1:26 knows a similar tradition. However, Moses takes the crown of Pharaoh and crowns himself, "as he was destined to do when he became great." C.R. Holladay, *Fragments from Hellenistic Jewish Authors, Vol. II: Poets* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1989), 362–365, n. 77.

[44] This is also the understanding of the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews 7:3: "He (Melchizedek) remains *a priest forever*."

[45] I am grateful to Marc Turnage for bringing this to my attention.

in the following verse but the appointed human redeemer (אֲדֹנִי), or as he is identified in the non-Massoretic reading of Psalm 110:1–5 and 11Q13—Melchizedek, "He will execute judgment among the nations, filling them with corpses; he will shatter chiefs over the wide earth" (Ps 110:6). So we hear in 11Q13 2.13 that Melchizedek will "render the vengeance of God's judgment" (יקום נקם משפטי אל). In effect, through Melchizedek God will judge the nations (אל ידין עמים: cf. Ps 7:9), a description which closely resembles the intermediary role the of the redeemer figure in Psalm 110:6, who likewise will judge the nations (יָדִין בַּגּוֹיִם).

It is at this juncture in the sectarian presentation that the eschatological prophet—the Anointed One of the Spirit (משיח הרוח: 1Q13 2.15–20)—is introduced. His prophetic tasks are presented through a phrase-by-phrase citation of Isaiah 52:7. He appears standing upon the mountains, which we are told represent the biblical prophets (ההרים [המה] הנביאים). Similar to the eschatological message of the *Psalms of Solomon* 11:1–2,[46] he announces salvation to Zion. He is to proclaim, "Your God is King." The consonantal phrase (מלך אלהיך) is creatively interpreted to read, "Your ELOHIM (= judge) is MELECH" (= Melchizedek)."■ non-matching quote Column two ends with a return to Leviticus 25:9, "And you shall blow the trumpet (of the Jubilee) in all the land …" Thus, the coming of the prophetic Anointed One of the Spirit precedes the inauguration of the Jubilee and the advent of the priestly Messiah—Melchizedek.

Thus far, we have witnessed that at least some within the Congregation thought that the eschatological priest would be none other than Melchizedek.[47] Could it be that this opinion caused the change in order of the ceremonial meals? In their reading of the biblical references to Melchizedek they would have seen that the Priest-King had already established the right order. Genesis records that Melchizedek brought gifts to Abraham in the precise order of the Qumran meals:

> And Melchizedek king of Salem brought out *bread* and *wine*. He was priest of God Most High. (Genesis 14:18; emphasis added)

Like other issues of doctrine and practice, the sectarians felt that the nation had been led astray by the false teachings of the present religious leadership. Only those in the Congregation had been granted true

[46] H.E. Ryle and M.R. James, *Psalms of the Pharisees* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1891), 101.

[47] Flusser, "Melchizedek and the Son of Man," in *Judaism*, 186–192.

insight. They were a persecuted and rejected minority who lived in hope of the day of divine visitation when judgment would be meted out to their opponents and the teachings of the sect would be vindicated (1QS 4:15ff). Although a minor point, one element of that truth was the proper order of the ceremonial meals.

Let us now return to the question of the Christian Eucharist. Collins has followed Van der Woude's suggestion that Melchizedek was in reality the archangel Michael.[48] He noted the resemblance between the role of Melchizedek and the Son of Man (אֱנָשׁ בַּר) in Daniel 7:13, whom he likewise identified with Michael. For a moment the question of identity aside, Puech and others have rightly recognized the fusion of eschatological roles in which Melchizedek is presented both as the hoped-for redeemer and the enthroned eschatological judge, "C'est un cadre comparable à la scène du Jugement dernier qu'exécutera le Fils de l'Homme en *Mat.* 25,31 ss ou dans *1 Hénoch.*"[49] As we have noted, this fusion is a result of the identification of Melchizedek with אֲדֹנָי in Psalm 110:1 and the subsequent reading of אֲדֹנָי (not אֲדֹנָי) in Psalm 110:5 to present the King of Salem himself as the executor of the divine judgment described in Psalm 110:6.

The tripartite *theologoumenon* composed of Melchizedek, the Messiah and the Eschatological Judge/Son of Man is found only in 11Q13 and the christological speculation preserved in the Epistle to Hebrews.[50] The affinities between these two works indicate a common world

---

[48] Collins (*The Scepter and the Star*, 142–143) is one of the leading proponents of the notion that the figure Melchizedek in 11Q13 is the angel Michael. See De Jonge and Van der Woude, "11Q Melchizedek and the New Testament," 305–306; and Kolbelski, *Melchizedek and Melchiresa*, 71–74. Collin's argument assumes a similar identification of בַּר אֱנָשׁ in Daniel 7:13 to be Michael; cf. *Daniel* (Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress, 1993), 304–310. However, there is no evidence that Melchizedek in 11Q13 is intended to signify anyone other than the historical figure introduced in Genesis 14:18–20. We have already noted the parallels between the presentation of Melchizedek here and the priestly (*human*) redeemers of the *Aramaic Prayer of Levi* and the *Assumption of Moses*. Regarding the existence of exalted human figures in the thinking of the Qumran community see E. Eshel, "*4Q471B*: A Self Glorification Hymn," *RevQ* 17 (1997): 175–202; and M. Smith, "Two Ascended to Heaven and the Author of 4Q491," in *Studies in the Cult of Yahweh: New Testament, Early Christianity, and Magic* (ed. S.J.D. Cohen; Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1996), 68–78. On Melchizedek's role as the eschatological judge see Flusser, "Melchizedek and the Son of Man," 186–192.

[49] É. Puech, "Notes sur le Manuscrit de XIQMelkisédq," *RevQ* 48/12 (1987): 513. See *1 Enoch* 45:3–46:6.

[50] See Flusser, "Melchizedek and the Son of Man," 189–191. On other affinities between the Epistle to the Hebrews and the Dead Sea Scrolls, see, Yadin, "The Dead

of eschatological notions that existed among Jews of the Second Commonwealth. However, they also help us to understand the possible motivation by segments of the Early Church to present Jesus celebrating the Passover-Last Supper blessing the bread prior to the wine. According to the faith of the Early Church, "Jesus has gone as a forerunner on our behalf, having become a high priest for ever after the order of Melchizedek" (Heb 6:20).[51] He was thus portrayed celebrating the Passover-Last Supper in the pattern established by Melchizedek. By the way, similar motives may be at work in the portrayal of the ordination of Levi. In the *Testament of Levi*, Levi is presented with "bread and holy wine" (*T. Levi* 8:5).[52]

It should not surprise us to see these seminal notions resurface in subsequent theological speculation by the Church Fathers. At first, they were more interested in developing the messianic themes initiated by the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews.[53] Later, however, their speculation extended beyond the ideas presented by the epistler, and Clement of Alexandria (d. 216) is the first to interpret Melchizedek's actions in the biblical narrative as a type of the Eucharist.[54]

> "For Salem is, by interpretation, peace; of which our Savior is enrolled King, as Moses says, Melchizedek king of Salem, priest of the most high God, who gave *bread* and *wine*, furnishing consecrated food for a *type of Eucharist*." (Emphasis added)

An interesting deviation from this trend is the record of Melchizedek found in the *Palaea Historica*.[55] There the King of Salem is presented going out to meet Abraham, and "he gave him privately a cup of

---

Sea Scrolls and the Epistle to the Hebrews," *Scripta Hierosolymitana* (vol. 4; Jerusalem: Magnes, 1957), 36–55.

[51] See Hebrews 5:1–10, and 6:20–7:10. See J. Moffat, *Epistle to the Hebrews* (ICC; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1952), 90–95.

[52] See the comments of H.C. Kee, "Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs," *OTP* 1:791, n. 8c.

[53] Justin, *Dial.* 33.1–2; Tertullian, *Marc.* V, 9; Origen, *Comm. Jo.* I, 11; XIII, 146; XIX, 118; Eusebius, *Dem. ev.* IV, 15, 33–39; V, 3,7.13–20; John Chrysostom, *Hom. Heb.*

[54] Clement of Alexandria, *Strom.* IV, 161, 3; see also Cyprian of Carthage (d.258) "In Genesis, therefore, that the benediction, in respect of Abraham by Melchizedek the priest, might be clearly celebrated, the figure of Christ's sacrifice precedes, namely, as ordained in *bread* and *wine*; which thing the Lord, completing and fulfilling, offered *bread* and the *cup* mixed with wine, and so He who is the fullness of truth fulfilled the truth of the image prefigured" (emphasis added).

[55] See J.P. Migne, *Patrologia Graeca* (vol. 28; Paris: Garnier, 1894), 523–530; A. Vassiliev, *Anecdota Graeco-Byzantina* (Moscow: Universitatis Caesareae, 1892), 206–214.

wine, putting down for him a piece of bread …"[56] Flusser has suggested that this Christian compilation of legendary material is in part redacted from earlier Hellenistic Jewish sources.[57] The presentation of Melchizedek presenting gifts to Abraham in the order of Jewish ceremonial meals (wine-bread), which stands in the reverse order to that depicted both in the biblical account and the Christian Eucharist supports Flusser's argument for its original Jewish provenance. What we witness in this narrative is a creative reshaping of Melchizedek's actions in the biblical account to accord with the practice of the Hellenistic Jewish community in a manner very similar to that accomplished by the Hellenistic Church in its tradition concerning the Last Supper of Jesus.

In the Byzantine period, Melchizedek is pictured in Christian art in connection with the Eucharist. He appears in a mosaic preserved in the Justinian (sixth century C.E.) church of San Vitale in Ravenna, Italy.[58] There Melchizedek is portrayed offering bread and wine as if celebrating the Christian Eucharist. Interestingly, he appears together with Abel. The son of Adam likely appears in the Byzantine mosaic because he offered an "acceptable sacrifice." Nevertheless, it is worth noting that in the *Testament of Abraham* Abel is identified as the eschatological judge.[59] The first century writer employed Abel's patronymic, Son of Adam, and played upon the ambiguity of the Hebrew, where אדם can mean either the proper name or simply "man" (i.e. Son of Man). The Byzantine mosaic, then, is a visual re-presentation of the eschatological pairing of Melchizedek and the Son of Man/Adam first mentioned in the creative fusion of writings from Qumran and other Jewish apocalyptic literature[60] and which penetrated into the speculation of the Hellenistic Church.

---

[56] S.E. Robinson, "The Apocrypal Story of Melchizedek," *JSJ* 16–18 (1985–1987): 31.

[57] Flusser, "*Palaea Historica*—An Unknown Source of Biblical Legends," *Scripta Hierosolymitana* (vol. 22; Jerusalem: Magnes, 1971), 48–79.

[58] Otto G. von Simson, *Sacred Fortress* (Chicago: University of Chicago, 1948), 25.

[59] *Testament of Abraham* 13.3–5, "And the Prince said, Most holy Abraham, do you see the terrifying man who is sitting on the throne? He is the son of the first man Adam, and is called Abel, and he was killed by the wicked Cain. He sits here to judge every creature, examining both righteous and sinners, because God has said, It is not I who judge you, but by man shall every man be judged." See Flusser, "Reflections of Jewish Messianic Beliefs in Early Christianity," in *Messianism and Eschatology* (Jerusalem: Ben Zvi Institute and Hebrew University, 1989), 108 [Hebrew].

[60] *2 Enoch* records that in the future Melchizedek will be buried where Adam also buried his son; "And in connection with that archpriest (Melchizedek) it is written how

The association between Melchizedek and the Eucharist is brought to its final stage of ecclesiastical integration when Melchizedek was incorporated into the Roman Canon.[61] There is heard the declaration that God accepts the elements of bread and wine at the Eucharist as he accepted "the sacrifice that Your high priest Melchisedek offered." These liturgical innovations evolved with no apparent knowledge that long before others had pondered the connections between the biblical narrative of Melchizedek and the order of Jewish ceremonial meals. It was these early seminal notions concerning the King of Salem that contributed to the change in order in the pre-Markan tradition of the Last Supper and consequently the order of blessing during the Christian Eucharist. Though rich in theological speculation, these changes of order have little to do with the Jesus of history.

he also will be buried there, where the center of the earth is, just as Adam also buried his own son there—Abel, whom his brother Cain murdered …" (*2 En.* 71:36).

[61] Elements of the Roman Canon are cited with reference to Melchizedek by Ambrose (d. 397) in *De sacramentis* 4.10. The Canon was brought close to its present form at the hands of St. Gregory the Great (590–604). "Canon of the Mass," in *The Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church* (2d. ed.; ed. F.L. Cross and E.A. Livingstone; Oxford: Clarendon, 1974), 231–232.