

THE TEMPLE ROOTS OF THE LITURGY¹

© Margaret Barker, 2000

At the centre of Christian worship is the Eucharist, yet its origins are still a matter for speculation. It used to be fashionable to seek the roots of Christian prayers and liturgy only in the synagogue or the prayers and blessings associated with communal meals. Only a generation ago, Werner could write: 'It is remarkable how few traces of the solemn liturgies of the High Holy Days have been left in Christian worship'², and before that, Oesterley had stated that 'Christ was more associated with the synagogue type of worship than with that of the temple'³. The association of the Last Supper with the Passover has often led to Passover imagery being the only context considered for the context of the Eucharist. Since the New Testament interprets the death of Jesus as atonement (e.g. 1 Cor.15.3) and links the Eucharist to his death, there must have been from the start some link between Eucharist and atonement. Since Jesus is depicted as the great high priest offering his blood as the Atonement sacrifice (Heb.9.11-12), and the imagery of the Eucharist is sacrificial, this must have been the high priest's Atonement sacrifice in the temple, rather than just the time of fasting observed by the people.

The Day of Atonement

It is true that very little is known about temple practices, but certain areas do invite further examination. The Letter to the Hebrews, where Christ is presented as the high priest offering the atonement sacrifice⁴, provides the starting point for an investigation into the temple roots of the Christian Liturgy. Christ's offering as the great high priest on the Day of Atonement was vividly enacted by the mediaeval popes each Maundy Thursday in the Lateran basilica, which claimed to house many temple relics, including the ark of the covenant encased in the high altar. 'Despite the doubts regarding the historical veracity of the temple spoils, every visitor to the Lateran basilica in the high Middle Ages would have noticed that this church wanted to be seen as the direct successor of the temple of Jerusalem'. On Maundy Thursday the Pope commemorated the origin of the Eucharist by performing a unique ritual. 'After the Creed, the assisting cardinals remove the table (*mensa*) of the altar... then the pope approaches the altar. From the cavity of the altar block he takes a reliquary containing some blood of Christ and shows this to the people. ... then the pope celebrates the Eucharist alone on the hollow altar... The ceremony with the *mensa*, the blood relic and the hollow altar is specific to the Lateran.'. The earliest record of this ceremony is in the *Liber de Vita Christiana*, written by Bonizo, Bishop of Sutri, who died in 1095, although there is a seventh century reference to the 'hollow altar'⁵. A blood offering over the 'ark' on Maundy Thursday can only have been developed from the Day of Atonement⁶, linking the origin of the Eucharist to that ritual. This was 'the high priest of the new covenant... as he performed his most exclusive liturgical function... It was above the physical remains of the cult of the old covenant that the pope was celebrating'⁷.

But what had this atonement sacrifice been? William Robertson Smith, in his *Lectures on the Religion of the Semites* (delivered in 1888-89 and first published in 1894) was certainly correct when he concluded: 'The worship of the second temple was an antiquarian resuscitation of forms which had lost their intimate connection with the national life and therefore had lost the greater part of their original significance'⁸. According to the Jewish Encyclopaedia atonement was 'the keystone of the sacrificial system of post-exilic Israel'. In other words, the extent of our ignorance about the Day of Atonement, the central rite of atonement, is the extent of our ignorance about Israel's religion, and furthermore, what we read of it in the post exilic texts may not be the best source of information about its original significance, nor about this root of the Eucharist. The temple roots of the Christian Liturgies lie very deep in the first temple, and have to be reconstructed from a variety of sources.

This problem is well illustrated by Dillistone's observation in his widely read book *The Christian Understanding of Atonement*: 'From the New Testament there come hints, suggestions, even daring affirmations of a comprehensive cosmic reconciliation'. *He doubted that this came from Hebrew thought* and so suggested: 'It was not until early Christian witnesses found themselves confronted by

pagan systems in which a full theory of cosmic redemption played a prominent part that the effect of the work of Christ upon the cosmos at large began to receive serious consideration'⁹. This is not the case; the original significance of the Day of Atonement was precisely this restoration of the creation, the renewal of the eternal covenant, and this is where one of the roots of the Eucharist is to be found. The pre-Christian roots of the idea of Atonement have played a very small part in the treatment of the subject; a recent report by the Church of England's Doctrine Commission dealt with atonement without mentioning Leviticus.¹⁰

There were two rituals exclusive to the ancient high priests: entering the holy of holies with the blood on the Day of Atonement and consuming the bread of the Presence¹¹. Since these two are closely linked to the elements of the Eucharist, it seems likely that the high priestly traditions are the ultimate source of the imagery. There are, however, problems reconstructing the history and traditions of the high priesthood, not least because there is no certain reference to Aaron nor to his priests in any pre-exilic text. Even Ezekiel, who was a priest in the first temple, does not mention him. The Elephantine texts, which give a glimpse of Jewish life in Egypt in the sixth and fifth centuries, often mention priests but never Aaron, nor Levi nor the Levites¹². Any rites and duties associated with Aaron probably came from the older royal priesthood of Melchizedek. The one appearance Melchizedek himself makes in the Old Testament is to bring out bread and wine (Gen.14.18) which the Midrash says were a symbol of the laws of priesthood, the bread being the bread of the Presence¹³ (Gen.R XLIII.6). Philo, when discussing the hospitality gifts of bread and water said of him: 'Let Melchizedek offer wine instead of water' (Allegorical Interpretation III 82) an obvious link to the miracle at Cana, which, according to John, was the first manifestation of Jesus' Glory (John 2.11).

The Eucharist has frequently been linked to the Passover, because the Last Supper is linked to that festival¹⁴, John set the crucifixion at the time of the Passover sacrifices, and Paul wrote to the Corinthian church that 'Christ our Passover has been sacrificed' (1.Cor.5.7). But there are immediate and obvious problems trying to link the Eucharist with Passover to as we recognise it: **the Passover was the only sacrifice not offered by a priest** (*m. Pesahim* 5.5ff on Exod.12.6), and the essential element was that the offering was whole (Exod.12.46), whereas the descriptions of the Last Supper in their various forms emphasise that the bread was broken¹⁵. Further, the cup at the Last Supper is linked to the covenant [except the Western text of Luke¹⁶], and the Letter to the Hebrews links the death of Jesus to the covenant renewed on the Day of Atonement (Heb.9.11-15). Matthew's form of the words 'My blood of the covenant poured out for many for the *aphesis* of sins' (Mat.26.28) suggests the same context, since *aphesis* was the translation for *d'ror*, liberty, the characteristic of the Jubilee which was inaugurated on the Day of Atonement (LXX Lev.25.10; Isa.61.1 also Luke 4.18). Since the great Jubilee at the end of the second temple period was associated in the Qumran Melchizedek text with the appearance of Melchizedek and his atonement sacrifice (11QMelch), we have here a possible contemporary context for the words of institution.

The early liturgies do not use the Passover/Exodus imagery of being the Chosen people and being liberated from slavery. In the *Didache*, for example, there is thanksgiving for the gifts of knowledge and eternal life, and for the Sacred Name dwelling in the hearts of those who have received the spiritual food (*Didache* 9-10). This is priestly Wisdom imagery. The hope for the ingathering of the scattered Church into the Kingdom is a Jubilee image derived ultimately from the covenant restoration on the Day of Atonement. Bishop Sarapion (mid 4th century Egypt) prayed that his people would become 'living', i.e. resurrected, and able to speak of the mysteries, that the spiritual food would be the medicine of life to heal every sickness. 'Make us wise by the participation of the body and the blood'.

Let us now consider the words of Bishop Sarapion's contemporary, St Basil of Caesarea, who died 379CE. In his treatise *On the Holy Spirit*, he emphasised the unwritten traditions of the Church. Where, he asked, do we find in writing anything about signing with the cross (at baptism), or about turning to the east to pray? 'Which of the saints has left us in writing the words of invocation (*epiklesis*) at the offering of the bread of the Eucharist and the cup of blessing? For, as it is well

known, we are not satisfied with saying the words which the Apostle and the Gospel have recorded, but, before and after these words we add other words, on the grounds that they have great strength for the mystery. And these words we have received from the unwritten teaching.’ (*On the Holy Spirit* 66)

Origen had written something similar a century or so earlier, in his Homily 5 on Numbers. He compared these same Christian practices - praying towards the East, the rites of baptism and the Eucharist - to the secrets of the temple which were guarded by the priests. Commenting on Numbers 4, the instructions for transporting the tabernacle through the desert, he emphasised that the family of Kohath were only permitted to carry the sacred objects but not to see them. Only Aaron the high priest and his sons were permitted to see what was in the holy place; then they had to cover the sacred objects with veils before handing them to others, who were only permitted to carry them. The mysteries of the Church were similar, ‘handed down and entrusted to us by the high priest and his sons.’ Origen does not say who this high priest was; we assume it was Jesus and his disciples, but Origen could have known a continuity between the Christian mysteries and those of the temple priesthood. Origen had close contact with the Jewish scholars in Caesarea and he knew at least one of what we nowadays call the Dead Sea Scrolls¹⁷.

The duties of the priests were defined as ‘guarding all matters concerning the altar and what was within the veil’ (Num.3.10; 18.7 LXX *phulaxein, diaterein* respectively), and as early as the letter of Ignatius to the Philadelphians, we read: ‘Our own high priest is greater (than the priests of old) for he has been entrusted with the Holy of Holies and to him alone are the secret things of God committed’ (*Philadelphians* 9). Clement of Alexandria used similar imagery: those who have the truth enter by drawing aside the curtain (*Miscellanies* 7.17). He knew that there were ‘among the Hebrews some things delivered unwritten’ (*Miscellanies* 5.10). Origen too spoke often of the unwritten or secret tradition (e.g. *Against Celsus* 3.37; 6.6; *Preface to First Principles*), the mystery ‘established before the ages’ (*On Matthew* 7.2)¹⁸. ‘Before the ages’ indicates the holy of holies, since whatever happened there was deemed to be beyond time and thus outside the material creation. One of the secrets of the holy of holies was resurrection, the state beyond time and matter, and so Jesus described the resurrected as sons of God, angels (Luke 20.36).

Of the examples given by Basil, facing the east to pray and signing with a cross can be identified as customs dating back to the first temple. During Tabernacles in the second temple, a procession would turn back at the eastern gate and face towards the temple saying: ‘Our fathers when they were in this place turned with their backs towards the temple of the LORD and their faces towards the east and they worshipped the sun towards the east; but as for us, our eyes are turned toward the LORD’ (*m.Sukkah* 5.4). This refers to Ezekiel’s account of men in the temple facing east, holding branches before their faces and worshipping the sun (Ezek.8.16-8), presumably in a celebration akin to Tabernacles. The Therapeuts (Philo *On the Contemplative Life* 27) and the Essenes (Josephus *War* 2.128) also worshipped towards the rising sun, and the vision in Revelation 7 describes a great multitude holding palm branches, standing before the angel who came from the sunrise with the seal of the living God. Worshipping towards the east must have been a practice which distinguished the adherents of first temple customs from those favoured by the compilers of the Mishnah¹⁹. Among these would have been the Christian community depicted in the Book of Revelation who set the risen Lord in the centre of a great heavenly liturgy, and described themselves, like the priests of old, as the guardians of the commandments of God who had the testimony of Jesus. They knew what he had seen (Rev 12.17). They spoke with angels and guarded the words of the prophecies (Rev.22.9).

Signing with a cross was also a custom from the first temple. When Ezekiel received his vision of the destruction of Jerusalem, he saw the six angels of judgement and a seventh figure, who was instructed to pass through the city and mark a letter *tau* on the foreheads of those who were faithful to the LORD (Ezek 9.4). In the old Hebrew alphabet, the *tau* is a diagonal cross, the sign which was also used when the high priest was anointed on his forehead (*b.Horayoth* 12a). The anointed high priest was distinguished from the one who only wore the garments of high priesthood (*m.Horayoth* 3.4), and, since the true anointing oil had been hidden away in the time of Josiah (*b.Horayoth* 12a, *b.Kerittoth*

5b), the tradition of anointing the high priest in this way must have been another first temple custom which was not observed during the second temple.

Christian customs, then, perpetuated practices which had very ancient roots but had not been current in the second temple. Presumably the Christians also perpetuated the beliefs that accompanied those practices: the belief that Wisdom had been banished from Jerusalem when Josiah changed the temple cult (1 Enoch 93.8), that she had been known as the Queen of Heaven (Jer.44.17-19) and that the gift of Wisdom was good and made humans like gods (i.e. gave them eternal life), just as the serpent in Eden had said. Early Christian practice linked the gifts of Wisdom and Life to consuming bread and wine, and we have to ask why. We are not looking for continuity with the actual temple practices of the first century CE, but with a remembered, perhaps idealised, system that was much older. We are looking for the temple destroyed in the time of Josiah, rather than the second temple which was condemned by the Third Isaiah as a place of corrupted cult, (Isa.66); by Malachi (passim) as offering polluted bread and having an impure priesthood; and in the Enoch tradition as impure and offering polluted bread, having been built by an apostate generation (1 En.89.73; 93.9). One of the themes of the Book of Revelation is that the banished Wisdom returns with/as her new city, after the second temple Jerusalem has been burned²⁰.

Where had this ancient temple system, known to Jesus and John his prophet, been preserved? The Qumran Melchizedek Text has a possible reading about people in the last days whose teachers have been kept hidden and secret²¹; perhaps they had been preserving the older ways. The Damascus Document, another text found at Qumran, is quite clear that a remnant knew the 'hidden things in which all Israel has gone astray' and the examples given are 'his holy Sabbaths and his glorious feasts' (CD III)²². These are usually interpreted as a dispute about the calendar, and this was certainly a part of the problem. But only a part! There could well have been disputes over the significance and manner of observing those Sabbaths and feasts: 'They shall keep the Sabbath Day according to its exact interpretation and the feasts and the Day of Fasting according to the finding of the members of the New Covenant in the land of Damascus' (CD VI). The problem concerned the Sabbath and especially the Day of Fasting i.e. the Day of Atonement. This group also held a 'pure meal' of bread and wine, which had to be blessed by the priest before anyone took the first piece.²³

This remnant is very similar to the group depicted in the Book of Revelation. The Damascus remnant are 'called by Name and stand at the end of days' i.e. they are the resurrected to wear the sacred Name, just like the redeemed in the holy of holies at the end of the Book of Revelation (Rev.22.4)²⁴. They are also like those who participated in the Eucharist of the Didache, who gave thanks for knowledge and eternal life, or the congregation of Bishop Sarapion who prayed at the Eucharist that his people might become living and wise. The group depicted in the Damascus Document and the Christians believed themselves to be guardians of the true teaching 'they keep the commandments of God and have the visions of Jesus' (Rev.12. 17). The community of CD had similar concerns to those of the early Christians, although, as is well known, there were also important differences. There seems here to be a continuity, an awareness of something behind the Hebrew Scriptures (what I called *The Older Testament*²⁵) that passed into the New Testament and then into the Christian Liturgies.

Basil's third example of unwritten tradition is the *epiklesis* at the Eucharist. The later forms of this prayer, known from the time of Cyril of Jerusalem (*Catecheses* 23.7, died 387 CE), call on God the Father to send the Holy Spirit onto the bread and wine, but the earlier forms seem to have been different, calling for the Second Person²⁶, the Logos, the change the bread and wine. In Egypt in the middle of the fourth century, Bishop Sarapion prayed: 'O God of truth, let thy holy Word come upon this bread (*epidemesato*, literally 'dwell').²⁷ The Liturgy of Addai and Mari is a problem; although acknowledged as important evidence for early practice, there is no agreement on the original form of the prayers²⁸. Dix's reconstruction offers a prayer addressed to the Second Person, the LORD who 'put on our manhood': 'May there come O my Lord, thy Holy Spirit and rest upon this oblation of thy Servants.' Later prayers speak of the Spirit being 'sent', but these examples of early practice imply that the divinity addressed 'came' to the bread and wine. There is some confusion in the earliest texts

because they can call the Second Person either Word or Spirit, as did Philo for whom the Word and Wisdom were equivalents²⁹. Possibly the earliest evidence of all, apart from the New Testament, is the *Didache*, which concludes with the Maranatha, praying for the LORD to come.

Given the temple and priestly context of Basil's other 'unwritten' traditions, it is likely that the *epiklesis* also originated there, in the prayers for the LORD to 'come' to the temple. The tabernacle had originally been built so that the LORD could 'dwell' there (Exod.25.8 Lxx 'appear') and could speak to Moses from between the cherubim on the ark (Exod.25.22). When the tabernacle was completed, the Glory of the LORD *came* to fill the tabernacle (Exod.40.34), as it also *came* to fill the newly built temple (1 Kgs 8.11). Ezekiel later saw the Glory leaving the polluted temple (Ezek.11.23). Isaiah had seen the LORD enthroned in the temple (Isa.6); and the Third Isaiah prayed that the LORD would rend the heavens and *come* down (Isa.64.1)³⁰. When David brought the ark to Jerusalem, he appointed certain Levites to praise, thank and invoke, *l'hazkiyr* the LORD (1 Chron.16.4). Several passages in later Jewish mystical texts, the Merkavah texts, have suggested to scholars that drawing the LORD or the Shekinah down into the temple was a major element of the temple service. Moshe Idel concluded: 'We can seriously consider the possibility that temple service was conceived as inducing the presence of the Shekinah in the Holy of Holies'³¹. So where might the Maranatha prayer have originated? And whose presence was there with the bread of the Presence?

The rituals performed in the Holy of Holies are still as veiled as they ever were, but we can glimpse their original setting. The tabernacle/temple replicated the days of the creation³². Moses began to erect it on the first day of the year, and each stage corresponded to one of the days of creation (Exod.40.16-33). The veil corresponded to the firmament set in place on the second day, to separate what was above from what was below. Everything beyond the veil corresponded to Day One, beyond the visible world and beyond time.³³ The creation of the angels on Day One (Jubilees2.2) was a sensitive issue, as were their names, and so the subjects prohibited by the Mishnah - the story of the creation, the chapter of the chariot, what is above, beneath, before and hereafter (*m.Hagigah* 2.1) - were in fact the secrets of the holy of holies which the priests had to guard.³⁴ The rituals of the holy of holies were thus taking place outside time and matter, in the realm of the angels and the heavenly throne, and those who functioned in the holy of holies were more than human, being and seeing beyond time. The priests were the angels and the high priest was the chief of the angels, the Lord of Hosts.

The royal rituals in the holy of holies, beyond time, are the setting of the Eucharist, although it is not clear how the various parts of the originals fitted together. Psalm 110 (LXX 109), is obscure (perhaps obscured) in the Hebrew, but the Greek describes how the king is born as the divine son in the glory of the holy ones, i.e. in the holy of holies, and declared to be the Melchizedek priest. This must have been the original setting for Isaiah 9.6-7: 'Unto us (the angels) a child is born... and the government shall be on his shoulder, and his name shall be called...' There follow in the Hebrew the four throne names, but in the Greek there is just one title, The Angel of Great Counsel. This 'birth' in the holy of holies changed the human into an angel and gave him great Wisdom. The last words of David describe him as one through whom the Spirit of the LORD has spoken, a man who was anointed and raised up (*qwm, anesthesan kurios*), a word that could also be translated 'resurrected' (2 Sam.23.1). This is how it seems to have been understood at the end of the second temple period, because the Letter to the Hebrews contrasts the Levitical priests and Melchizedek: the former have their position due to descent from Levi, but Melchizedek has been *raised up (anistatai) with the power of indestructible life* (Heb.7.15-16). The Chronicler's account of Solomon's enthronement says that he sat on the throne of the LORD as king, and the people worshipped the LORD and the king (1 Chron.29.20-23³⁵). In the holy of holies, then, a man had been resurrected and enthroned, and was then worshipped by his people as God and King. That the Davidic monarchs had indeed become 'God and King' in the holy of holies, and that this had not been forgotten, is confirmed by Philo's extraordinary statement about Moses: he became God and King when he entered the darkness where God was (*Life of Moses* I.158).. In his vision, Ezekiel had seen this divine and human figure enthroned, the glory of the LORD in human form wreathed in a rainbow (Ezek.1.26-28), and the later

account of the tabernacle in Exodus 25 remembered the king on his cherub throne as the voice of the LORD above the *kapporet*, between the cherubim (Exod.25.22). 'God and King' is the phrase used to describe the transformed human; it is also used in the Liturgy .

The holy of holies was the place of the light of Day One which preceded the light of the visible creation. In the temple this was in fact the darkness of the divine presence in the holy of holies. Texts which speak of what happened before the world was created, or what happened in eternity, are describing rituals in the holy of holies, presumably the secrets from beyond the curtain which Jesus the great high priest is said to have taught (e.g. Clement *Miscellanies* 6.7; 7,17; Origen *Against Celsus* 3.37: 'Jesus beheld these weighty secrets and made them known to a few': Origen *On Matthew* 7.2 '...the mystery established before the ages'). Thus Psalm 110 is telling us that the divine son was 'born' and enthroned in eternity. When Enoch's second parable says that the Son of Man was named in the presence of the LORD of Spirits, before the sun and signs were created, it indicates a naming ritual in the holy of holies, most likely when the human figure was given the Sacred Name (1 En.48.2-3)³⁶. After this he was enthroned, and for his people he was Immanuel, God With Us. The reference in Philippians 2.6-11 shows that the sequence of this ritual was known at the end of the second temple period, and used to set the death of Jesus in one particular context. The Servant has been exalted and given the Name because he accepted death. He nevertheless reigns in heaven and receives homage whilst enthroned. In other words, the one who bears the Name is resurrected, just as David had claimed in his 'last words', and just as the writer to the Hebrews claimed for Melchizedek. There is a similar pattern in Daniel 7, where the human figure goes with clouds - the clouds of incense with which the human figure entered the holy of holies - and is offered (*haqr^ebuhiy*) before the Ancient of Days (Dan.7.13)³⁷. He is then enthroned and given the kingdom of eternity. A similar sequence also appears in the second parable of Enoch, where the Man figure goes to the Head of Days and the blood of the Righteous One is offered (1 En.47.1)³⁸.

The LORD was enthroned on the *kapporet* over the ark, the place of atonement. Ark and throne are the same symbol. The ascent of the human figure in Enoch's parable was associated with the offering of blood before the throne, which must have been the offering on the Day of Atonement. What, then, happened on the Day of Atonement? This was one of the issues on which Israel had gone astray, according to the Damascus Document. It used to be said that the ritual prescribed in Leviticus 16 was a relatively late addition to the lore of the temple, but scholars are now moving towards the view that this was one of the most ancient practices³⁹, and so, if Robertson Smith was correct, likely to have lost its original significance in the second temple. Few details are given in Leviticus, although the shape of the ritual is clear enough; it was outwards from the holy of holies. The high priest took blood into the holy of holies and *as he emerged*, he sprinkled certain parts of the temple 'to cleanse it and hallow it from all the uncleannesses (*tum'ot*) of the people of Israel' (Lev.16.19). He entered the holy place in great fear, because the LORD would appear to him over the *kapporet* (Lev.16.2). Since the temple was a microcosm of the whole creation, atonement was a ritual to cleanse and renew the creation at the beginning of the year. The Mishnah gives more detail of where the blood was sprinkled, and adds that what was left was poured out at the base of the altar (*m.Yoma* 5.4-6, hence the souls of the martyrs under the altar, part of the great atonement Rev.6.9). The high priest also prayed when he was in the temple, but what he said is not recorded. Only the words used outside the temple appear in the Mishnah.

The meaning of atonement, what the high priest was 'doing' when he took blood into the holy of holies has to be pieced together from many sources. Certainty is impossible, and so what follows is a hypothesis consistent with the evidence. According to Numbers 25.6ff, the family of Aaron was given the 'covenant of eternal priesthood' because Phineas had been zealous to preserve the covenant. Atonement was acting to protect the covenant of peace, elsewhere described as 'the eternal covenant' or 'the everlasting covenant between God and every living creature' (Gen.9.16). Isaiah described how the pollution of human sin caused the covenant to collapse (Isa.24.4-6) with heaven and earth withering away. Atonement renewed it. Aaron protected the people from the consequences of breaking the covenant by burning incense: 'Take your censer... and make atonement for them... for

wrath has gone forth from the LORD (Num.17.46 English numbering⁴⁰). More commonly, as on the Day of Atonement, atonement was effected by blood: 'I have given blood for you upon the altar to make atonement for your souls...(Lev.17.11). Blood renewed the eternal covenant which had been destroyed by human sin. Since the temple was the microcosm of the creation, the temple ritual to renew the covenant also renewed the creation. Hence the famous words attributed to the high priest Simeon the Just: 'By three things is the world sustained: by the Law, by the temple service and by deeds of loving kindness' (*m.Aboth* 1.2). On the Day of Atonement the eternal covenant was renewed, and blood was sprinkled and smeared, to remove the effects of sin and to heal⁴¹. The blood was brought out from the holy of holies; in temple symbolism, this was new life brought from heaven to renew the earth.

But whose life effected this renewal? Two goats were necessary for the Day of Atonement rituals, and the customary rendering of Leviticus 16.8 is that one goat was 'for the LORD' and the other goat 'for Azazel'. This way of reading the text has caused many problems, not least why an offering was being sent to Azazel. One line in Origen's *Contra Celsum* may provide vital evidence here. He says that the goat sent into the desert was *Azazel*⁴², meaning, presumably *represented* Azazel. If this was correct, then other goat, the sacrificed goat, must have represented the LORD. The *l'* meant 'as the LORD' not 'for the LORD', and Israel did not, after all, make an offering to Azazel. The blood which renewed the creation was new life from the LORD. Since the high priest himself represented the LORD, wearing the Sacred Name on his forehead, we have here a ritual in which the LORD was both the high priest and the victim in the act of atonement, another Eucharistic image. The argument in the Letter to the Hebrews implies that the older practice of substitution had been superseded, and that the annual rite was no longer necessary: 'When Christ appeared as a high priest... he entered once for all in to the holy place, taking not the blood of goats and calves, but his own blood thus securing an eternal redemption...' (Heb.9.11-12).

The high priest had entered heaven with the blood of the great atonement, and the origin of the Parousia expectation was that he would emerge again from the holy of holies to complete the atonement and renewal of the creation. Hence Peter's speech in Solomon's portico: 'Repent, therefore, and turn again, that your sins may be blotted out, that times of refreshing may come from the presence of the LORD, and that he may send the Christ appointed for you, whom heaven must receive until the time for establishing all that God spoke through the mouth of his holy prophets...' (Acts 3.12-23).

The story of the Last Supper depicts Jesus renewing the Eternal Covenant. As the great high priest it was his own blood that would renew the covenant and put away sins. None of the other covenants described in the Hebrew Scriptures concerns putting away sin⁴³. Hence when the 'Last Supper' was repeated in early worship, they prayed for the return of the high priest to complete the great atonement: 'Maranatha'. As time passed and the Parousia hope faded, the significance of the original *epiklesis* changed, and what had begun as a temple ritual fulfilled in history, returned to being a ritual. One of the roots of the Eucharist lies in the Day of Atonement, understood as the renewal of the creation, and this, as we shall see, passed into the words of the Liturgies. This was the 'comprehensive cosmic reconciliation' which Dillistone could not find in Hebrew thought.

There are other echoes of the Atonement rituals in the temple. When the priest prepares the bread of the sacrifice, he removes the central portion which is later used for the Communion. An exactly similar procedure was used for the sin offering, according to the Letter of Barnabas 7. Quoting from an otherwise unknown prophet, he wrote: 'Let them eat of the goat offered for their sins at the fast (i.e. the Day of Atonement), and let all the priests but nobody else, eat its inward parts, unwashed and with sour wine.' This is different from the regulations in Leviticus, where the central portion of a sin offering has to be removed and burned (e.g. Lev.4.8-10). Of the pair of goats used in the Day of Atonement ritual, the sacrificed goat was also known as the sin offering (Lev.16.25) and its central portion also had to be burned. The Letter of Barnabas, described as a Levite from Cyprus (Acts 4.36), says that it was this goat of the sin offering on the Day of Atonement whose inner parts were

consumed raw with sour wine. Something similar, however, appears in the Mishnah. If the Day of Atonement fell on a Friday, the goat of the Atonement was consumed at evening, i.e. after the fast. The Babylonians, possibly an abusive term for the Alexandrians, used to eat it raw, presumably because they could not cook on the Sabbath⁴⁴. Barnabas linked this mixing of the unwashed [and therefore both bloody and uncooked] inner parts with sour wine to the incident reported in the gospels (Mat.27.48; Mk.15.36; John 19.30), that Jesus drank some sour wine just before he died. The Letter of Barnabas offers a glimpse of a very early Christian community, when the Jews were attempting to rebuild the temple after their revolt against Rome (Barn.10). He quotes what appear to be otherwise unknown words of Jesus, perhaps a fragment of an early Christian liturgy celebrated on the Day of Atonement: 'When I am about to offer my body for the sins of this new people of mine, you will be giving me gall and sour wine to drink. That is why you shall be the only ones to eat, while the people of Israel are fasting and lamenting in sackcloth and ashes.' Whether or not Barnabas is a genuine text from the Apostolic age⁴⁵, it shows how the early relationship between the Eucharist and the Day of Atonement was believed to be. It would be pressing coincidence too far to suggest that the central portion of the sacrifice, the holiest part which was mixed with sour wine, was unrelated to the practice of mixing the bread and the wine in the chalice. Barnabas' evidence also shows that blood was consumed in temple ritual, something often presented as an insuperable barrier to seeking the roots of Eucharistic practice in the temple.

The Bread of the presence

The Eucharist is not an annual celebration, and so another root may lie in the other high priestly ritual, eating the 'Bread of the Presence' which placed in the temple each Sabbath⁴⁶. Twelve loaves made from fine flour were set out in the temple every Sabbath on a table of gold, and incense was set with them⁴⁷. It was described as a most holy portion for the high priests (Aaron and his sons Lev.24.9), to be eaten in a holy place on the Sabbath. As with the other temple furnishings and rituals, nothing is said about meaning, and we have to guess. Even the manner of preparing the Bread of the Presence was never revealed: it was the hereditary duty of the house of Garmu and they kept their secret (*m.Yoma* 3.11). The huge amount of detail in the Mishnah and the Talmud concerns how the bread was placed in the temple, what shape it was, and how it was balanced on the table. It is clear that the shape and the meaning of the bread were not known, or could not be disclosed.

First, the bread was spread on a table in the temple, the only cereal offering to be taken inside. The Mishnah records that there were two tables in the porch outside the temple; 'On the table of marble they laid the Bread of the Presence when it was brought in, and on the table of gold they laid it when it was brought out, since what is holy must be raised and not brought down' (*m.Menahoth* 11.7)⁴⁸. In other words, the bread had acquired holiness whilst it was in the temple, and could no longer be placed on the marble table. The bread which had been in the temple was classed as 'most holy' (Lev.24.9), and would have imparted holiness to the men who consumed it⁴⁹. Items described as 'most holy' were deemed to impart holiness e.g. the altar (Exod.29.37), its vessels (Exod.30.29), and the cereal offering eaten in the holy place (Lev.6.17-18, English numbering). Others who even came near the most holy things were in danger of death (Num.4.19). The priests who ate the goat of the sin offering, also described as most holy, were enabled thereby to bear the iniquity of the congregation and thus make atonement for them (Lev.10.17). When Aaron wore the Name of the LORD on his forehead; he was empowered to bear the 'guilt' of the offerings⁵⁰ (Exod.28.38). Those who ate the Bread of the Presence must have acquired some power.

All the cereal offerings had a special significance, although the details are now lost. In a recent study, Alfred Marx⁵¹ has suggested that the cereal offerings and the blood offerings were two parallel systems of sacrifice, combined in the Priestly writings during or after the exile. *The cereal offerings took precedence* and were mentioned first. They were ranked with the sin offering *hatta'th* and the guilt offering *ʿasam*, and appeared at the head of the list (Num.18.9; Ezek.44.29). They had to be stored and eaten in the holy chambers within the temple court (Ezek.42.13). The bread of the Presence, like the other cereal offerings, was described as an *ʿazkarah*, although exactly how this was

understood is not clear. The word is usually translated ‘memorial offering’, but ‘invocation offering’ is another possibility⁵². The titles of Psalms 38 and 70 are both *l' hazkiyr*, translated ‘for the memorial offering’, (RSV) or ‘to bring to remembrance’ (AV), but the subject a matter of those psalms suggests that ‘invocation’ was the more likely intention. ‘Make haste to help me’ (Ps.38.22) and ‘Hasten to me O God’ (Ps.70.5) both suggest ‘invocation’ rather than remembrance. The Lxx Ps.38 renders the title *eis anamnesin peri sabbatou*, showing that one of the key words in the New Testament account of the Eucharist, *anamnesis*, ‘remembrance’ (Luke 22.19; 1 Cor.11.24) was the translations used for this `azkarah offering. Perhaps the bread of the Presence on the Sabbath was the context for Psalm 38.

The text of Leviticus 24.7 implies that the incense on the table was the `azkarah, but the Targums⁵³ here imply that the bread itself was the `adkarah before the LORD’. If `azkarah is to be understood here as ‘invocation’, and the Name had been invoked over the bread⁵⁴, this would explain the extreme holiness of the bread of the Presence. It would also explain why, when the desert tabernacle was moved, the ark and the table of bread of the Presence were the only items to have three covers (Num.4.5-8). The lamp, the incense altar and the other sanctuary vessels were wrapped in a blue cloth and a leather cover, but in addition to these, the ark was first covered by the veil, and the table by a scarlet covering. T. Onkelos Lev.24 describes the bread of the Presence as the most sacred of the offerings, showing that the special nature of this bread was known to the Targumist, i.e. in the Christian era.

There is also the question of the bread described in Leviticus 21, a chapter dealing with the special holiness of the sons of Aaron, the high priests. The high priest, upon whom was the crown of the anointing oil of his God (Lev.21.12 translating literally), offered ‘the bread of their God’ (Lev 21.6) or ‘the bread of your God’ (Lev.21.8), and this was the reason why he had to be especially pure. This bread is not described as an offering *to* God, but as the bread *of* God.

The bread in the temple was an eternal covenant, *bryt 'lm* (Lev.24.8) and the command that Aaron and his sons had to eat it was an eternal statute, *hoq 'lm* (Lev.24.9). The regulations in Leviticus are brief and enigmatic. The Sabbath itself was described as an eternal covenant, marking the completion of the creation (Exod.31.16), and another sign of the eternal covenant was the rainbow: ‘and when the bow is in the clouds, I will look upon it and remember the eternal covenant between God and every living creature’ (Gen.9.16). One possibility is that the bread set before the LORD each Sabbath, the day when the creation was completed, *was a memorial of the eternal covenant*. The cult of the second temple was described as placing impure bread on the table before the holy of holies (‘the tower’ 1 En.89.73). Malachi warned the priests that they had despised the Name of the LORD, because by offering polluted bread they had polluted *him*. ‘Seek the presence/face of God and he will be gracious to us. With such a gift he will not lift up his presence/face upon you’ (Mal.1.7-9 translating the Hebrew text literally). The Bread of the Presence had become polluted at the beginning of the second temple period and could no longer function,. The implication is that it could no longer be the vehicle of the Lord’s presence, because with polluted bread the Lord could not be present. The oracle which follows became the prophecy used by the Church to describe the Eucharist: ‘From the rising of the sun to its setting, my name is great among the nations and in every place incense is offered to my name and a pure offering (Mal.1.11). The bread of the Presence had been an offering with incense, and the Christian context implies that the Eucharist was the new bread of the Presence (e.g. Justin Trypho 41), the new bread of the eternal covenant.

[The rainbow of the eternal covenant came to be seen as a sign of the divine presence; Ezekiel had described the Glory of the LORD as a rainbow (Ezek.1.28) and stories were later told of a rainbow appearing as the great rabbis were teaching (e.g. *b.Hagigah* 14b). In the later Merkavah texts, the Servant who bore the Sacred Name was wrapped in a rainbow⁵⁵, as had been the high priest Simeon when he emerged from the sanctuary on the Day of Atonement (Ben Sira 50.7). The heavenly throne in Revelation was wreathed in a rainbow (Rev.4.3) and the Great Angel in John’s vision of the Parousia returned from heaven wrapped in a cloud and a rainbow, with his face shining like the sun (Rev.10.1)⁵⁶.]

If the bread of the Presence had similarly been a sign of the eternal covenant, the term *lehem panim*, bread of face/presence must have meant more than just 'bread put out before the LORD', which is how it is often understood. There are several places in the Hebrew Scriptures where *panim* was used as a circumlocution for the LORD himself, as can be seen from the LXX. Thus 'My presence will go with you' (Exod.33.14) was translated in the Greek as 'I myself will go...*autos*' and Moses' response 'If your presence will not go with me...' became 'If you yourself, *autos*, do not go with me...'. 'He brought you out of Egypt with his own presence (Deut.4.37) became 'He himself, *autos*, led you out'. 'The Angel of his presence saved them' (Isa.63.9) became 'Not an ambassador nor an angel, but he himself saved them'.⁵⁷ This latter is emphatic; the angel of the Presence was the LORD himself. Perhaps this is how 'Bread of Presence' should be understood. It was the bread of the Lord. Such an understanding would certainly account for the lines in Malachi, that the LORD could not be present with polluted bread. It would explain the great holiness of the bread of the Presence and the special status of the table on which it rested⁵⁸, and would add weight to the suggestion that *`azkarah* was an invocation rather than a memorial⁵⁹. [Bread of his God]

So much information about the temple has disappeared and has to be reconstructed from allusions elsewhere. There were, for example, libation vessels kept on the bread of the Presence table (Exod.25.29 c.f. 1 Kgs 7.50), but there is no record of how these were used in the temple⁶⁰. There had at one time been meals in the temple; the elders who saw the God of Israel on Sinai and ate and drank in safety before him is an encoded reference to this (Exod.24.11). So too, perhaps, Psalm 23: the table set before the anointed one, who would dwell in the house of the LORD forever, and the belief that the ruler in Israel would come forth from the House of bread, *beth lehem* (Mic.5.2). For the rest, we look in the shadows and listen for echoes. In the *Midrash Rabbah* we find: 'Melchizedek instructed Abraham in the laws of the priesthood, the bread alluding to the Bread of the Presence and the wine to libations'(Gen.R. XLIII.6). 'The House of Wisdom is the tabernacle, and Wisdom's table is bread of the Presence and wine (Lev.R. XI.9). 'In this world you offer before me Bread of the Presence and sacrifices, but in the world to come I shall prepare for you a great table' (followed by a reference to Ps 23, Num.R.XXI.21)⁶¹. A gloss in T Neofiti to Exodus 25.29-30 says that the vials of anointing oil were also kept on the table. [Insert oil from tree of life]

Another mystery is the investiture described in the Testament of Levi. Levi saw seven angels giving him the insignia of high priesthood and he described the ritual: he was anointed, washed with water and then fed 'bread and wine, 'the most holy things'⁶², before eventually receiving the incense (*T.Levi* 8.1-10). Since the most holy bread reserved for Aaron and his sons was the bread of the presence, (Lev.24.5-9) this is probably what Levi received from the angels in his vision., and he received it with wine. These rituals bear some resemblance to the ordination rituals in Leviticus 8 insofar as both texts describe washing, vesting, crowning and anointing, but there is nothing in the Testament of Levi about smearing blood and eating the boiled flesh of the offerings. Instead there is bread and wine. Did the Testament of Levi recall the older ritual, the Melchizedek ritual which involved the bread and wine? This would be consistent with the implications of the papyri from Elephantine, that an earlier cult had not offered animal sacrifices. And if this is so, who had preserved this knowledge since the destruction of the first temple?⁶³

Those papyri found at Elephantine offer a glimpse of a Jewish community in the fifth century BCE. The colony in the south of Egypt had had a temple since 525 BCE and this temple had been burned and looted in 411 BCE by the Egyptians who objected to blood sacrifices there because their god was a ram god. When permission came from the governor to rebuild the temple, only meal offerings and incense were to be allowed (Pap.32) Another papyrus states that no sheep, bulls or goats were to be sacrificed there, only meal, incense and drink offerings (Pap 33). What does this imply? There had been a temple there for more than a century, with apparently no objections to its practices. Shortly after an edict from Darius in 419 BCE (Pap 21) ordering Passover (?) to be observed, there were riots protesting at animal sacrifices and the temple was destroyed. One construction on this evidence could be that the 'Jews' had not offered animal sacrifice until the Passover type of religion had been

commanded, i.e. the Moses and Aaron religion with which we are familiar. They had offered only cereals, libations and incense. This accords with the picture of the refugees who fled to Egypt and argued with Jeremiah about their traditional offerings for the Queen of Heaven, described as ‘incense, libations and cakes to represent her (Jer.44.19). Is it possible, then that the Elephantine colony brought with them to Egypt from Jerusalem and Judah, an older form of religion which did not offer animal sacrifice?

The Queen of Heaven was remembered as Wisdom by people who shared the history recorded in the Hebrew Scriptures, but told it differently. The Enochic Apocalypse of Weeks, which summarises the history of Israel without mentioning the Exodus and so is free of any Moses/Aaron/Deuteronomy influences, describes thus the changes in the time of Josiah, when the refugees in Egypt claimed that the Queen had been abandoned. ‘In the sixth week all who live in it (the temple) shall become blind and the hearts of all of them shall godlessly forsake Wisdom (1 Enoch 93.8). Wisdom’s first gift had been the vision which was eternal life, and this loss of vision was remembered as the significant change at the end of the first temple period. Wisdom was forsaken and vision was lost.

[Later Jewish tradition remembered that the Shekinah had gone into exile at that time and this may be the key to understanding Ezekiel’s vision by the river Chebar. To say that this is an obscure text is an understatement, but it was certainly forbidden reading in later times. This may be because it was a vision of Wisdom leaving Jerusalem, Later Christian art seems to have understood it in this way. Ezekiel saw a figure on the throne above the firmament, but underneath the firmament he saw the four living ones and something fiery in their midst. The main mover in this vision was the Spirit, and where she went, the ‘wheels’ went. These rings were brilliant and full of points of light (‘eyes’) They were a wheel within a wheel, concentric rings of light. When they moved, it was the sound of Shaddai, a word which can mean breasts. In Ezekiel 10, we read that the wheels moved with the Spirit of Life who was in them. This curious description of the One enthroned above the firmament and the fiery female spirit beneath became the ikon of the Holy Wisdom, traditionally depicted as a winged angel of fire, crowned and enthroned. She is surrounded by two concentric rings of light, and these are radiant with points of light. She holds a scroll.

Wisdom and her house is another recurring theme with the bread of the Presence. This suggests it was an element in the cult of the first temple, where Melchizedek had been high priest, and Wisdom the Queen of Heaven, the patroness of Jerusalem⁶⁴. The importance of the bread of the Presence in that cult may account for the later silence in ‘official texts’ and the consistent echoes elsewhere. The offerings to the Queen had been ‘cakes’, libations and incense (Jer.44.18-19 cf 7.18), and the refugees in Egypt, after 586BCE, reminded Jeremiah that this cult had been abandoned with disastrous consequences for Jerusalem. These offerings are described as cakes ‘to portray’ or ‘to depict’ her, *l’ha-^asibah*, (whence the word for an idol, ‘*eseb*). Moulds have been found elsewhere which are thought to be the pans for baking such shaped bread⁶⁵, and, irrespective of what image was imprinted on them, the cakes offered in Judah and Jerusalem were intended to depict the Queen. The bread of the Presence was also baked in a special mould, although nobody seemed to remember what this mould was (*b.Menahoth* 94ab), one of the meanings suggested for the term *lehem panim*, literally bread of faces, was that it had faces (*b.Menahoth* 96a). Shaped loaves were offered to female divinities elsewhere⁶⁶; but it would be wrong to assume that this was an unfortunate import into the religion of Judah and Jerusalem, and that the goddess must have been known by a foreign name such as Ishtar.⁶⁷

Wisdom, the Queen of Heaven, invited devotees to her table (Prov.9.5); the poem in Proverbs 9 is much interpolated, but it is still clear that Wisdom offers the bread and wine of her table to those who seek the way of insight (Prov.9.5-6)⁶⁸. This is one of the themes in the orthodox service for Maundy Thursday. Ben Sira promised the man who had Wisdom that she would meet him like a mother and welcome him like a wife, feeding him with the bread of understanding and the water of wisdom (Ben Sira 15.2-3). Wisdom herself promised: ‘Those who eat me will hunger for more’ (Ben Sira 24.21), and we know from elsewhere that the gift of Wisdom brought eternal life (e.g. Wisdom 8.13).

What might have been said to those who consumed the bread made in the image of the Queen? ‘Take, eat, I am giving myself to you’ perhaps⁶⁹? When the bread of the presence was brought out of the temple, the accompanying incense was burned with the daily whole offering, and then the bread was divided and each priest took a piece. The remainder was taken out to the priests who were blemished and unable to enter the court of the priests (j.Menahoth 11). It is interesting that from the earliest days of the Church, the Eucharistic elements have been taken by the deacons to those who were unable to be present at the celebration (Justin Trypho 67). And what might have been said to those priests who consumed the bread of Presence and acquired power and holiness as a result? That this was bread from heaven which gave heavenly life? Or even that this was the bread of God which came from heaven to give life? Both these phrases are used in the Fourth Gospel when John’s Jesus contrasts the manna and the bread which he offers (John 6) A recent writer on Liturgy suggested something remarkably similar to these hypothetical words for the distribution of the bread of the Presence. ‘In the short text of Luke’s Last Supper, the Eucharistic word of Jesus is given only to the bread, ‘This is my body’. What Jesus is saying in this logion is, “This is myself which I am giving to you.” The bread becomes the vehicle of Jesus’s presence.’⁷⁰ Recall the prayers of Bishop Serapion, that his people would become ‘living’ i.e. resurrected: ‘Make us wise by the participation of the body and the blood’.

It has long been recognised that the Fourth Gospel presents Jesus as Wisdom⁷¹, and that in the post-Deuteronomic scheme, Torah was offered as a replacement for Wisdom. Thus in the Fourth Gospel, Jesus offers himself as the bread from heaven, in contrast to the manna which was the heavenly bread offered by Moses, this should be understood as a return to the heavenly bread by which Wisdom offered herself to her devotees and gave them eternal life. Cyril of Alexandria (died 444CE), in his commentary on John (4.2) said that manna was the shadow of the bread to come, the bread of angels which was spiritual and of Wisdom. This bread gave life. He then explained how the Saviour was ‘pre-typified as Bread by the Law, and the Apostles again as cakes by their likeness to him’. The twelve loaves of the bread of the Presence were the twelve disciples surrounding their Master, and as the bread of the Presence was the Sabbath bread, so too the bread is the food of the last times in the world. Cyril returns to this theme later, explaining that Christ is co-figured by the Menorah, and the Bread of the Presence in the tabernacle, Although the bread of the Presence was food for the priests, when David took it to feed his men, (1 Sam 21.6) he pre-figured its being given to others too (c.f. Luke 6.12-5) where Jesus mentions the same story).

Jerome (died 420CE) in his commentary on Psalm 135 implies a similar understanding . of the bread of the last times, the great Sabbath rest which is yet to come. ‘In the Hebrew Gospel according to Matthew, it is thus: “Our bread of the morrow, give us this day” that is, the bread which Thou wilt give us in thy kingdom, give us this day’. What then might epiousios mean? Not ‘daily’ as in the familiar English ‘Give us this day our daily bread’.

Recall too the words of the Damascus Document, that a remnant had kept the true ways when Israel had gone astray over the Sabbath and the Day of Atonement. The temple ritual for the Sabbath was the renewal of the bread of the Presence, a high priestly ritual, and the Day of Atonement was the major high priestly ritual. There is a conspicuous silence about both of these in the surviving sources, but such fragments as can be recovered correspond to elements in Christian ritual; to liturgies and related writings, and even, at a later period, to church architecture and to the way of preparing the bread. By the eighth century, Germanus of Constantinople in his *On the Divine Liturgy* was able to show exact correspondences between church and temple practice. This may have been a conscious imitation of the temple at a later stage⁷², rather than an unbroken tradition from earliest times. Such a sceptical position, however, has to explain away the earlier references to temple tradition and symbolism, and to account for the expert knowledge not only of the temple, but of the first temple traditions which had been the cause of controversy at the end of the second temple period. It is more likely that the temple tradition in Christian Liturgy came through from the time when these were still

living issues⁷³, and gave rise to the original claim that Jesus was the Melchizedek high priest. The high priest was the twofold incarnation of the LORD. The God of Israel took two forms; male and female, and the high priest was the human manifestation of both. Hence Jesus was described as Christ, the *Power of God and the Wisdom of God* (1 Cor.1.24). Jesus is depicted as taking the great rituals of each aspect of the God of Israel: the atonement blood of the LORD and the Bread of the Presence of Wisdom, and combining them into his own ritual⁷⁴. It is more likely that this inspiration was from Jesus himself rather than from the liturgy makers of the early Church.⁷⁵

Now for a few comparisons. First, with the bread of the Presence, associated with Wisdom and her invitation: 'Those who eat me will hunger for more' (Ben Sira 24.21), and with Melchizedek the resurrected high priest. The bread of the Presence was originally eaten every Sabbath by the high priests who wore the Sacred Name,⁷⁶ and it was their most holy food. Cyril of Jerusalem wrote that the Bread of Heaven had replaced the bread of the Presence (*Catecheses* 22.5). One of the mysterious ikons of the Holy Wisdom depicts her enthroned over the apostles celebrating the Eucharist, whilst Jesus and Mary stand beneath her⁷⁷. Eusebius wrote: 'Our Saviour Jesus, the Christ of God, even now today performs through his ministers sacrifices after the manner of Melchizedek (*Proof of the Gospel* 5.3). In the *Didache* they gave thanks over the bread for 'life and knowledge', and after partaking, gave thanks for the Sacred Name dwelling in their hearts, knowledge, faith and immortality (*Didache* 9-10)⁷⁸. These could well have been the thanks of the high priests when they had eaten the bread of the Presence. Bishop Sarapion prayed: 'Make us wise by the participation of the body and the blood'. The prothesis prayer of the Coptic Jacobites preserves the bread of the Presence tradition: 'Lord Jesus Christ... the living bread which came down from heaven... make thy face shine upon this bread and upon this cup which we have set upon thy priestly table.' Perhaps the words which Luke and Paul (Luke 22.19; 1 Cor.11.24) attributed to Jesus: 'Do this in remembrance of me' were originally 'Do this as my *`azkarah*', my invocation, and the bread was the new bread of the Presence, the sign of his presence 'Maranatha'.⁷⁹ Leviticus 24.7 *l`azkarah* became in the Lxx *eis anamnesin*, the words used by Luke and Paul (Luke 22.19;1 Cor 11.24). The two possible meanings for this word could explain the divided tradition: 'In memory of me' or 'to invoke me'.

Second, the Day of Atonement, when the high priest, who was the LORD, entered 'heaven' carrying blood which represented the life of the LORD. It was sprinkled on the ark, the 'throne', and then brought out into the visible world to renew the eternal covenant and restore the creation. The ritual represented and anticipated the Day of the LORD, when he would judge those on earth, banish evil and establish his kingdom. A key text was Deuteronomy 32.43: the LORD emerging from heaven to judge his enemies and atone the land⁸⁰. The Day of Atonement is the only possible source of the 'both high priest and victim' belief associated with the Eucharist⁸¹. Thus Narsai (*Homily XVIIIA*, late fifth century): 'The priest... celebrating this sacrifice, bears in himself the image of our LORD in that hour...' Origen interpreted the Eucharist as the Day of Atonement offering: 'Christ the true high priest who made atonement for you... hear him saying to you: "This is my blood which is poured out for you for the forgiveness of sins"' (*On Leviticus* 9). As early as the Letter of Barnabas, the Day of the LORD was linked to the goat offered on the Day of Atonement (Barnabas 7) and Justin knew that the sacrificed goat prefigured the Parousia, the Second Coming (*Dialogue with Trypho* 40), Cyril of Alexandria wrote: 'We must perceive the Immanuel in the slaughtered goat... the two goats illustrate the mystery (Letter 41). Bishop Sarapion's Eucharist was the Day of Atonement; he prayed for 'the medicine of life... and not condemnation.' He prayed for angels to come and destroy the evil one and establish the Church, in other words, for the banishing of Azazel and the establishing of the Kingdom. The Liturgies of Addai and Mari, of John Chrysostom and of James all have similar themes: remission of sins, enlightenment, access to the LORD, life in the Kingdom.

A recurring theme is fear and awe, the fear which the high priest felt as he entered the holy of holies on the Day of Atonement. Thus Narsai (*Homily XVIII A*): 'The dread mysteries... let everyone be in fear and dread as they are performed.. the hour of trembling and great fear.' Cyril of Jerusalem speaks of 'the most awful hour' and 'the most awful sacrifice' (*Mystagogical Lectures* 5.4,9). The Nestorian Liturgy speaks of 'the great fearful holy life giving divine mystery', and the priest prays in

the words of Isaiah in the temple: 'Woe is me. . . for mine eyes have seen the LORD of Hosts' and, like Moses before the ark he says 'I have seen the LORD face to face'. Throughout the liturgies, the imagery is of the holy of holies and the angel hosts. Just as the ancient kings had been 'born' in the glory of the holy ones, and were thus 'raised up' i.e. resurrected, so too the bread and wine was raised up/resurrected at the moment of consecration. Thus Narsai having described the awe and stillness in the sanctuary at the moment of consecration, continued: 'The Spirit which raised him from the dead comes down now and celebrates the mysteries of the resurrection of his body'. The consecration was the resurrection: the power of the Godhead comes upon the oblation, 'and completes the mystery of our LORD's resurrection from the dead'. Thus the LORD emerging from the holy of holies on the Day of Atonement, accompanied by the angel hosts, became the procession when the bread and wine were brought from the sanctuary. Narsai again: 'Thousands of Watchers and ministers of fire and spirit go forth' with the resurrected LORD, and the people rejoice 'when they see the Body setting forth from the midst of the altar.' (*Homily XVIIIA*),

The Setting

Finally, in the setting of the Liturgy, it is clear that the rituals and traditions of the ancient holy of holies passed into Church. The altar in the Christian sanctuary corresponded not to the incense altar of the temple, nor to the great altar of sacrifice, which had been outside in the temple court. It corresponded to the ark with its two cherubim in the holy of holies, beyond the veil in the desert tabernacle, and in some traditions, drawing a curtain to screen the holy place is still a part of the liturgy.⁸² Some early sources speak of the cherubim of the altar⁸³ and in Ethiopian churches there is an ark in the sanctuary. This was the place where the Lord appeared (Exod.25.22; Lev.16.2). In the temple, this was the role of the throne in the holy of holies, where the human king sat as the Lord with his people, Immanuel (1 Chron.29.23), after he had been born as the divine Son, and resurrected, raised up. Thus the Christian altar was both the ark and the throne, but it was also seen as the tomb from which the Lord was resurrected. A tomb, however, has no place in temple ritual.

This fusion of the images of throne and tomb probably arose in the time of Constantine, when the site of Jesus' tomb became the centre of the new Christian Jerusalem, and the Church of the Resurrection began to function as the new temple. Eusebius has left a report of the address when the great new church at Tyre was dedicated, and this shows that that building was a conscious imitation of the temple, with its builder a new Bezalel. Eusebius also knew that the earthly temple represented the heavenly reality: 'In the regions above the heavens are the models of everything on earth'⁸⁴ In one sense, then, every church was a new temple, and the places where Christians worshipped were consciously modelled not on the synagogues, but on the temple. Since there had been considerable hostility to the actual temple in Jerusalem, with Jesus' prophecy of its destruction (Mark 13.2 and parallels) and Christian prophets condemning both the city and the temple as a harlot and rejoicing when it was burned (Rev.17.1-19.3)⁸⁵, it would have been surprising if the church-as-temple claims had been an attempt to revive the second temple. Although the early Christians rejected the contemporary temple in Jerusalem, it was not a sign that they were rejecting 'the old covenant'⁸⁶, but that they were rejecting what the temple had become since its rebuilding in the sixth century BCE. They were claiming to renew the original covenant, the eternal covenant, which had been eclipsed by emphasis on the covenant at Sinai. When the Christians deliberately adopted the ways of the temple, it was the first temple, with its royal cult of the Anointed One and the eternal covenant that shaped their world view and their liturgy⁸⁷. It may not be coincidence that the two events in the life of Jesus, his birth and his resurrection, which could have been interpreted in terms of the ancient royal rituals in the holy of holies, were each marked by churches with temple proportions, the holy site in each case being in the place of the holy of holies.⁸⁸

When Constantine had the great church built at the site of Jesus' tomb, the few surviving texts show that this was a conscious replacement for the ancient temple, and a statement about his new Jerusalem.⁸⁹ When a tomb had been identified as the tomb of Christ, the surrounding rock was cut away and a chapel known as the *edicule*, (*aedicula* = the little house) was built over the sacred spot.

The rediscovery of the tomb was itself regarded as a resurrection: ‘The cave, the holy of holies, took on the appearance of the Saviour’s return to life’⁹⁰ At the front of the edicule was a porch with railings, as can be seen on the little pewter flasks which were brought home by pilgrims to the shrine⁹¹. The proportions of the Church of the Resurrection, the Anastasis, show that it replicated those of the temple, with the *edicule* as the holy of holies, and its area within the complex approximately one third of the length of the whole⁹². The actual shape of the new building bore little resemblance to the older temple; but the claims and symbolism were transferred to it. The stylised depiction of the *edicule* became the symbol for Jerusalem, just as the temple had been the symbol of the older Jerusalem. Thus when the Madaba mosaic map was made (560-565 CE), the Anastasis was shown as the central feature, set in the middle of the city, even though this was not accurate. Eusebius described the new buildings as ‘in the heart of the Hebrew kingdom, on the very site of the *soterion marturion*’ perhaps meaning ‘witness of salvation’⁹³.

There is a remarkable similarity between depictions of the temple to represent Jerusalem in Jewish art and depictions of the tomb of Christ to represent Jerusalem in Christian art⁹⁴. Many of these representations of the *edicule* are on the small metal flasks used by pilgrims to bring back holy oil or water, and they show that the tomb of Christ was the major symbol for the holy places. There are many surviving depictions of the *edicule*: in the Rabbula Gospels, on a late sixth century casket in the Lateran, in mosaics found in Syria and Jordan, on a bronze censer found in Egypt, and in several other places.⁹⁵ Many of these are stylised depictions of the edicule, closely resembling what appears on Jewish coins issued during the Bar-Kochbar revolt (132-135 CE): a row of four columns in the midst of which the ark can be seen. This image on the coins must have been the holy of holies, not the temple. The holy of holies depicted in the Beth Alpha synagogue mosaic is also similar to the representations of the *edicule*. Since the Jewish representations are older than the Christian, the latter must have been imitations, using the tomb of Christ as the new Christian holy of holies.

Egeria, who was a pilgrim in Jerusalem 381-384 CE, described how the Feast of the Presentation was celebrated in the Anastasis with very special honour⁹⁶, presumably because this church represented the temple in a special way. The Anastasis and the Golgotha church were both consecrated on the date when the true cross was rediscovered, which was also the date when Solomon had consecrated his temple.⁹⁷ A letter written by two Christian women at approximately the same time as Egeria’s visit treated the tomb as the holy of holies: ‘The Jews formerly venerated the holy of holies because there were there the cherubim, the mercy seat, the ark of the covenant, the manna, the rod of Aaron and the golden altar. Does not the tomb of the Lord seem more worthy of veneration? Each time we enter, we see the Saviour on his shroud, and if we stop for a moment, we see again the angel sat at his feet and the folded cloth at his head...’⁹⁸ Egeria, however, described the cave of the tomb and the railed area around it as the sanctuary of the church, the area into which only the bishop and his clergy could go⁹⁹.

She also saw relics: the horn used for the anointing oil of the kings and Solomon’s ring, two very significant items.¹⁰⁰ Whoever produced them did not claim to have the more obvious objects like the ark or the candlestick. *These were items specific to the building of the first temple and its place as the royal shrine.* According to legend, the anointing oil had been hidden away in the time of King Josiah’s changes to the temple, together with the ark, the manna, Aaron’s rod and the coffer sent by the Philistines as a gift when they returned the ark.¹⁰¹ The anointing oil had conferred the resurrected state on the king; it was the means of apotheosis. None of these items was in the second temple, and yet Christian pilgrims were shown relics establishing a claim to the first temple and its ideology. Legend also told of a demon who had hindered the building of the temple until the Lord sent the archangel Michael to Solomon with a magic ring¹⁰², and it is interesting that Eusebius, in his *Life of Constantine*, describes as ‘demons’ those who had tried to obliterate the holy sepulchre by building another temple over it.¹⁰³

An unknown writer at the beginning of the sixth century left a brief description of these holy places. A pilgrim was still shown Solomon’s ring and the horn with which David had anointed him, but also

the altar where the holy Zechariah had been killed¹⁰⁴. By this time Golgoltha was presented as the place where Isaac was offered, and as the place where Adam had been formed from the dust¹⁰⁵. In the traditions found in the Palestinian Targums¹⁰⁶ Adam was created from the dust of ‘the place of the house of the sanctuary’ and Isaac was offered on Mount Moriah, where Solomon had built the temple (2 Chron.3.1). There can be no question that this was being presented as the new temple. .

Two liturgies are attributed to men who lived at this time: St Basil the Great (330-379CE) and St John Chrysostom (347-407CE). The imagery of the tomb and the throne in the holy of holies appears in these texts, along with a great deal of other temple imagery. It survives intact and in detail in an early eighth century text explaining the liturgy. *The Ecclesiastical History and Mystical Contemplation of St Germanus* ‘shows how the Byzantines understood the liturgy for the greater part of their history’¹⁰⁷ ‘The apse corresponds to the cave in Bethlehem where Christ was born as well as the cave in which he was buried’ (#3), just as there been two churches with temple proportions in which the holy of holies was the place of birth or the place of resurrection. ‘The holy table corresponds to the spot in the tomb where Christ was placed. On it lies the true and heavenly bread, the mystical and unbloody sacrifice... the holy table is also the throne of God, on which borne by the cherubim, he rested in the body’ (#4). Here the holy of holies of the ancient temple coalesces with the holy of holies in the Anastasis, and both were the place of resurrection. ‘The chancel barriers indicate the place of prayer: the outside is for the people and the inside, the holy of holies, is accessible only to the priests. The barriers, made of bronze, *are like those around the holy sepulchre...*’ (#9). ‘He died as a man and rose as God...’(#36)

Germanus then draws upon *the two crucial royal texts which described the birth and apotheosis of the ancient king in the holy of holies*. ‘And the priest expounds on the unbegotten God, that is, the God and Father, and on the womb which bore the Son before the morning star and before the ages, as it is written; “Out of the womb before the morning star I have begotten you” (Ps.110[109] 3). And again the priest asks God to accomplish and bring about the mystery of his Son, that is, that the bread and wine be changed into the body and blood of Christ God - so that it might be fulfilled that “Today I have begotten you”(Ps.2.7)’ (#41).

Robert Taft, in his exposition of the Liturgy of the Great Church, traces this tomb symbolism to the Jerusalem custom of commemorating events in the Gospels in the place where they occurred, as Egeria recorded of Holy Week in Jerusalem. Thus, he concluded, ‘Its application to the Eucharist was so congruous as to be inevitable.’¹⁰⁸ He describes the underlying, original imagery of the

Finally, there is the preparation the bread of the Eucharist in the Orthodox tradition. The bread is stamped with an image before it is baked¹⁰⁹. Bread stanp fopr Lord’s[raeyr.breadof the coming dasy. Placve of LP in Eucharist, at frcation. Bread from heaevn

The priest ‘sacrifices’ the loaf and then removes the central portion to mix with the wine in the chalice. An exactly similar procedure was used for the Day of Atonement sin offering according to the *Letter of Barnabas* 7. Quoting from an otherwise unknown prophet, he wrote: ‘Let them eat of the goat offered for their sins at the fast, and let all the priests but nobody else, eat of its inwards parts, unwashed and with sour wine.’ He linked this to Jesus drinking the sour wine just before he died. In other words, there is a direct link between the sacrificial portion of the sin offering and the central part of the loaf. He also says that the sacrificial portion was consumed unwashed i.e. in a temple ritual, blood was consumed.¹¹⁰ Consuming blood has often been presented as an insuperable barrier to rooting Eucharistic traditions in the temple.

It used to be fashionable to seek the roots of Christian prayers and liturgy only in the synagogue. Only forty years ago, Werner could write: ‘It is remarkable how few traces of the solemn liturgies of the High Holy Days have been left in Christian worship’¹¹¹, and Oesterley could conclude that ‘Christ was more associated with the synagogue type of worship than with that of the temple’¹¹². Although this has been an all too rapid sketch, and there is much more material, I hope it has been sufficient to indicate one or two other areas in which roots of the Eucharistic Liturgy might be found, and to

emphasise the importance of establishing a continuity between the Old Testament as the first Christians knew it, the New Testament, and the way the early Christians expressed their beliefs in their Liturgies.

¹ This is developed from a paper read in Dublin in November 2000 subsequently published in *Sourozh. A Journal of Orthodox Life and Thought* 83 March 2001

² E Werner *The Sacred Bridge* London and New York 1959 p.11.

³ E. Werner *The Sacred Bridge* London and New York 1959 p.11 and W. Oesterley *The Jewish Background to the Christian Liturgy* p 87

⁴ The canonical Gospels also present Jesus as the high priest, although not by name.

⁵ A. Chavasse 'A Rome, le Jeudi-saint au VIIe siècle, d'après un vieil ordo' *Revue d'histoire Écclésiastique* 50 (1955) 21-35 p.24

⁶ When the high priest entered the holy of holies and sprinkled blood on the *kapporet* ('mercy seat' over the ark) and in front of the *kapporet*, (Lev.16.15),

⁷ The quotations, and note 3 above, are from S de Blaauw 'The Solitary Celebration of the Supreme Pontiff. The Lateran basilica as the new temple in the medieval liturgy of Maundy Thursday' in *Omnes Circumstantes... presented to Herman Wegman* ed C Caspers and M Schneiders Kampen 1990, 120-143 pp. 121, 134, 143.

⁸ W.R. Smith *Lectures on the Religion of the Semites* 3rd edn London 1927 p.216.

⁹ F.W. Dillistone *The Christian Understanding of Atonement* Welwyn 1968 p.47.

¹⁰ *The Mystery of Salvation* 1995 pp.96ff.

¹¹ The bread of the Presence was for Aaron and his sons (Lev.24.9) but later tradition said it was eaten by all the priests (*m.Menahoth* 11.7).

¹² A Cowley *Aramaic Papyri of the Fifth Century BC* Oxford 1923 p.xxii

¹³ The 'shewbread' in the older English translations of the Bible.

¹⁴ Although 'Palm Sunday' is clearly a Tabernacles procession, as described in *m.Sukkah* 4.5. R.D. Richardson in his supplement to H. Lietzmann *Mass and the Lord's Supper* Leiden 1979 pp.625ff. argued that the Eucharist was not rooted in Passover, contra e.g. J. Jeremias *The Eucharistic Words of Jesus* London 1966. The theory that the Eucharist was a meal liturgy (e.g. G. Dix, *The Shape of the Liturgy* London 1945) is also criticised pp.656ff.

¹⁵ B Longenecker 'The Unbroken Messiah' *New Testament Studies* 41 (1995) pp.428-441 suggests why the unbroken Passover might have been significant for John.

¹⁶ The covenant element does not appear in many early liturgies see Richardson in Lietzmann, p.480.

¹⁷ Eusebius *History* 6.16 'a scroll in a jar near Jericho'.

¹⁸ See my 'The Secret Tradition' in *JHC* 2.1 1995 pp.31-67

¹⁹ The orientation of early church and synagogue buildings did not necessarily correspond with their declared directions for prayer. See J. Wilkinson 'Orientation Jewish and Christian' in *PEQ* January-June 1984 pp.16-30.

²⁰ See my *The Revelation of Jesus Christ* Edinburgh 2000

²¹ *DJD XXIII* 11Q Melch 4-5.

²² Amos 3.12 (LXX) refers to 'those priests in Damascus' as a remnant, along with Samaria, of something destroyed. See J. Sawyer 'Those Priests in Damascus' *ASTI* viii.1970.7 pp 123-130.

²³ Perhaps 'firstfruits' thus Vermes, but *DJD I* Oxford 1955 'la première bouchée'.

²⁴ CD Ms B also mentions the saving power of the mark described by Ezekiel.

²⁵ My book of that name, published London 1987

²⁶ An anachronism here, but it makes for clarity.

²⁷ Cf The Acts of Thomas 27, an *epiklesis* over the anointing oil 'Come Thou Holy Name of the Christ, with 'come' repeated eight times, after which the anointed see a human form and then at dawn share the bread of the Eucharist.

²⁸ Compare the reconstructions in G. Dix *The Shape* pp.178ff and A Gelston *The Eucharistic Prayer of Addai and Mari* Oxford 1992 pp 49ff.

²⁹ e.g. Justin on Luke 1.31 the Spirit and the Power of God are the Word, *Apol* 1.33: also my *The Great Angel*, London 1992 p130.

³⁰ Solomon prayed for Wisdom to come to him. The later text probably preserves the original significance of this (*Wisd.* 8.13). She gave immortality. The older text is sanitised; Solomon went to the great high place at Gibeon and there asked for Wisdom (*I Kgs* 3.6-9).

³¹ M. Idel *Kabbalah. New Perspectives*. New Haven and London 1988 p.168

³² See L. Ginzberg *Legends of the Jews* vol.1, Philadelphia 1909, pp.50ff.

³³ This seems to have been an ancient pattern, but the Hebrew and Greek texts of Exodus are notoriously divergent, and any discussion of the affairs of the holy of holies was forbidden.

³⁴ See my 'Beyond the Veil of the Temple. The High Priestly Origins of the Apocalypses' *SJT* 51.1 (1998) pp.1-21

³⁵ There is no second verb, despite the English versions The Hebrew is simply 'worshipped the Lord and the king.

³⁶ A similar sequence appears in *3 En.* 13-15

³⁷ This is a possible reading of *hqbrwhy* cf *Ezra* 6.10,17 and B130 of Theodotion where *prosechthe* or *prosenechthe* in sacrificial sense,

³⁸ The whole sequence is that of *Dan.7*; there is even the textual confusion in *47.4*, where one text tradition has *qareba* = offered, and the other has *baseha* = come. See R.H. Charles *The Book of Enoch* 1912 p. 92

³⁹ E.g. J.Milgrom *Leviticus* New York 1991

⁴⁰ The high priest's duties are listed in Ben Sira 45.16: to offer sacrifice, to offer incense as the *`azkarah* and make atonement.

⁴¹ This is seen clearly in the myth of atonement, when the four archangels bind Azazel and then cleanse and heal the earth, to renew its fertility 1 En.10.

⁴² *Against Celsus* 6.43 in both Greek and Latin texts.

⁴³ Targum Ps.Jon Exod.24.8 was perhaps aware of this and made the blood of the Sinai covenant an expiation.

⁴⁴ Mishnah Menahoth 11.7 and note in Danby *The Mishnah* Oxford 1989 p.509.

⁴⁵ I believe it is

⁴⁶ Little has been published on this subject, but see R.Gane 'Bread of the Presence and Creator in Residence' VT XLII.2 (1992) pp. 179-203. It may be significant that Jesus's first Sabbath controversy mentioned the eating of the bread of the Presence and who was permitted to do this Mark. 2.23-28.

⁴⁷ The bread was *lehem panim*, literally bread of presence or faces, and was *ma^areket* spread out, *tamiyd*, perpetually, with pure incense before the face/presence of the Lord. LXX says salt was set with it, Lev.24.7-9. Similar language occurs in Ps.23.5: You spread out a table before me/my face.

⁴⁸ Or, the table was silver *b.Menahoth* 99a, but this does not affect the argument.

⁴⁹ The most holy items were deemed to impart holiness e.g. the altar Exod.29.37; its vessels Exod.30.29; the cereal offering eaten in the holy place Lev.6.17-18 English numbering;

⁴⁹ Hence the original significance of the commandment not to bear the Name of the Lord lightly, 'for the Lord will not hold him guiltless...' (Exod.20.7)

⁵¹ Alfred Marx *Les Offrandes Végétales dans l'Ancient Testament* Leiden 1994

⁵² *`azkarah* is a noun formed from the hiph'il form of the verb *zkr*, see Gesenius Hebrew Grammar Oxford 1910 #85b, and so is equivalent to *hazkiyr*.

⁵³ Onkelos and Neofiti *l'dkrh*.

⁵⁴ Cf possible translations of Exod 3.15: 'This is my Name and thus I am to be invoked/remembered, *zikri*; Ps 6.5 'In death there is no invoking thee, *zikreka*, and in Sheol who can praise you?'; and Isa. 26. 13 'Other gods besides you have ruled over us, but you alone we have invoked by name, *nazkiyr*.' ..

⁵⁵ Schaefer #396,398

⁵⁶ See my book *The Revelation of Jesus Christ* Edinburgh 2000, pp.180-182, 264

⁵⁷ A similar emphasis is found in later Jewish texts. See J.Goldin 'Not by means of an angel and not by means of a messenger' in *Religions in Antiquity. Essays in Memory of E R Goodenough* ed. J.Neusner (Supplements to Numen XIV) Leiden 1970

⁵⁸ Targum Onkelos Lev 24. Describes the bread of the Presence as the most sacred of the oblations.

⁵⁹ It is interesting that the 1971 ARCIC statement on the Eucharist, section 5, says that the *anamnesis* makes Christ present i.e. it is in effect an invocation: 'The elements are not mere signs. Christ's body and blood become really present'. It is important to distinguish between memorial 'We are there' and invocation 'He is here'. Although reasoning from the Passover memorial, 'making effective in the present an event in the past', it was not the original Passover sacrifice that was made present in the Passover memorial, as another animal was offered each year.

⁶⁰ V.A.Hurowitz 'Solomon's Golden Vessels (I Kings 7.48-50) and the Cult of the First Temple' in *Pomegranates and Golden Bells*, edd. D.P.Wright, D.N.Freedman, A Hurvitz Winona Lake 1995, pp.151-164, suggests that the P source shows the reformed cult, and that the incorporated older lists of vessels are signs that the original cult was more anthropomorphic.

⁶¹ 'I shall not drink of the fruit of the vine until the Kingdom of God comes' Luke 22.18.

⁶² Reading with R.H.Charles

⁶³ See also H.L.Jansen 'The Consecration in the Eighth Chapter of the T Levi' in *The Sacral Kingship. Proceedings of the Eighth International Conference for the History of Religions* Rome 1955, Leiden 1959, pp.356-365.

⁶⁴ Compare Jer.44.18, the cult of the Queen abandoned (in the time of Josiah) and 1 En.93.8 Wisdom abandoned just before the first temple was destroyed.

⁶⁵ See W.E.Rast 'Cakes for the Queen of Heaven' in *Scripture in History and Theology. Essays in Honour of J.Coert Rylaarsdam* Ed. A.L.Merrill and T.W.Overholt Pittsburgh 1977 pp.167-180.

⁶⁶ See M. Delcor 'Le Culte de la Reine du Ciel selon Jer.7.18, 44.17-19, 25 et ses Survivances' in *Von Kanaan bis Kerala FS für J.P.M. van der Ploeg* ed. W.C.Delsman and others Neukirchen-Vluyn 1982 pp 101-121.

⁶⁷ Cakes for the female deity had been baked in a special oven shaped like a beehive, according to the explanation of a terracotta model found off the coast of Tyre. Said to be a ceremonial baking scene, it is a priest blessing the bread which has been baked in a beehive shaped oven in the centre of the group, see W.Culican 'A Votive Model from the Sea' PEQ (July -December 1976). A beehive oven was also used for the bread of the presence, although the texts are obscure (b.Menahoth 95a, j Menahoth 11)

⁶⁸ This is one of the themes in the Maundy Thursday service in the Orthodox Church, linking the Last Supper to Wisdom's table.

⁶⁹ Moses was identified as the manna, the bread from heaven, see G.Vermes 'He is the Bread. Targum Neofiti on Exodus 16.15' *Post Biblical Jewish Studies* Leiden 1975 pp. 139-146.

⁷⁰ F.C.Senn *Christian Liturgy Catholic and Evangelical* Fortress Minneapolis 1997 p.60.

⁷¹ Most recently M Scott *Sophia and the Johannine* Jesus JSNT Sup.71 Sheffield 1992

⁷² Eusebius's oration to the Bishop of Tyre (*History* 10.4) shows that the new churches were built in conscious imitation of the temple and its priesthood, but this does not mean it was an innovation.

- ⁷³ Many priests in Jerusalem joined the church Acts 6.7.
- ⁷⁴ Bread *lehem*, is very similar to the rare word *l'hw*, which LXX Zeph.1.17 renders *sarx*, flesh. For Jesus as the female Wisdom figure, see my *The Revelation of Jesus Christ*, Edinburgh 2000, pp.109-113.
- ⁷⁵ Ikons of Christ enthroned and Wisdom enthroned both have in the halo *ho on*, the Greek equivalent of the Tetragrammaton.
- ⁷⁶ At the end of the second temple period it was eaten by the priests on duty (m Menahoth 11.7).
- ⁷⁷ Illustration of 16th century example now in the Moscow Kremlin Museum in *The Art of Holy Russia. Icons from Moscow 1400-1660*. Royal Academy of Arts, London 1998, item 35 p.187. The commentary says that the ikon depicts, among other things, the appearance of the Virgin three days after her death. She has her right hand raised in blessing, whilst the left holds a scroll. Thus she is presented as Wisdom, the high priestly figure giving her blessing.
- ⁷⁸ Didache 14 describes the Sunday Eucharist and quotes Malachi 1.11, the oracle of the pure offering.
- ⁷⁹ Mary Douglas 'The Eucharist; Its Continuity with the Bread Sacrifice of Leviticus' MT 15.2 (1999) pp.209-224, draws similar conclusions, using the methods of an anthropologist and on the basis of a different set of materials. Building on A.Marx op.cit.n.48 that the cereal and animal sacrifices are parallel systems, she demonstrates first why the inner parts of the animal that were offered as the holiest portion, and 'what goes for the animal, goes for the loaf of bread', p.223.
- ⁸⁰ The verse has a significantly shorter form in the MT than in 4Q Deut^d or the LXX, perhaps because it was a key proof text in Heb.1.6 and was altered in the post Christian era.
- ⁸¹ C.f the prayer of the Cherubic Hymn in the Liturgy of St John Chrysostom: 'For thou art he that offers and is offered, both he that receives and he that is given.' (I am grateful to Bishop Basil of Sergievo for this reference).
- ⁸² E.g the Copts, the Armenians.
- ⁸³ See K.E.McVey 'The Domed Church as Microcosm; the Literary Roots of an Architectural Symbol' *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 37 (1983)
- ⁸⁴ Eusebius *History* 10.4. J Wilkinson *Egeria's Travels* 3rd edn Warminster 1999, p.62 assumes, as do others, that this was Platonism. But if Eusebius knew about Bezalel Exod.31.2, he may well have known that the original tabernacle was built according to what Moses had seen on Sinai, Exod.25.9,40, and so 'copy of a heavenly model' may not have been Platonism on Eusebius' part.
- ⁸⁵ See my *The Revelation of Jesus Christ* Edinburgh 2000 pp.279-301.
- ⁸⁶ Whatever scholars mean by that phrase.
- ⁸⁷ I argued this case in detail in my book *The Older Testament* London 1987.
- ⁸⁸ Wilkinson *Egeria* pp.62-3.
- ⁸⁹ Thus B.Kühnel *From the Earthly to the Heavenly Jerusalem. Representations of the Holy City in Christian Art of the First Millennium*. Freiburg 1987 p.82. Eusebius, *Life of Constantine* 33.1 wrote of the New Jerusalem, built at the very the place of the resurrection, 'this being perhaps that fresh new Jerusalem proclaimed in prophetic oracles...'
- ⁹⁰ Eusebius *Life of Constantine* 3.28
- ⁹¹ See A Grabar *Ampoules de Terre Sainte* Paris 1958
- ⁹² Wilkinson *Egeria* p.62, c.f.1 Kgs 6.16-17
- ⁹³ Eusebius *In Praise of Constantine* 9.16, delivered July 25th 336.
- ⁹⁴ See n.82.B Kühnel *Earthly to Heavenly Jerusalem* pp.93-111.
- ⁹⁵ Pictures in M Biddle *The Tomb of Christ* Stroud 1999 pp.21-28.
- ⁹⁶ 'valde com summo honore' *Itinerarium Egeriae* xxvi
- ⁹⁷ *It.Egeriae* 48.1. The temple was consecrated by Solomon at the autumn festival (1 Kgs 8.2)
- ⁹⁸ Letter of Paula and Eustochia in Jerome *Letters* 46.
- ⁹⁹ *It.Egeriae* 24.2,3. Wilkinson, *Egeria* p. 173n says 'These railings symbolised the firmament which divided heaven from earth', but gives no references.
- ¹⁰⁰ *It.Egeriae* 37.3
- ¹⁰¹ Babylonian Talmud Horayoth 12a
- ¹⁰² The story is told in 'The Testament of Solomon' in J.H.Charlesworth,ed. *Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* vol 1 London 1983.
- ¹⁰³ Eusebius *Life of Constantine* 26.1: 'wicked men or rather a whole tribe of demons through them, had striven to consign to darkness and oblivion that divine monument to immortality...'
- ¹⁰⁴ Originally the incident recorded in 2 Chron.24.20-22, but 'Zechariah' was identified with the father of John the Baptist, and so the Infancy Gospel of James 23 locates the death of John's father in the temple.
- ¹⁰⁵ Brevarius de Hierosolyma 2 in Corpus Christianorum Series Latina CLXXV *Itineraria et Alia Geographica*
- ¹⁰⁶ And elsewhere, but the Palestinian association is significant here.
- ¹⁰⁷ P Meyendorff *St Germanus of Constantinople On the Divine Liturgy* St Vladimir's Seminary Press New York 1999 p.10.
- ¹⁰⁸ R Taft 'The Liturgy of the Great Church. An Initial Synthesis of Structure and Interpretation on the Eve of iconoclasm' p.66
- ¹⁰⁹ There is a picture of the old stamps of The Virgin and St Catherine used in St Catherine's Monastery, Sinai, in National Geographic Magazine 125.1 1964 p.89. Also G.Galvaris *Bread and the Liturgy. The Symbolism of Early Christian and Byzantine Bread Stamps* Wisconsin 1970.
- ¹¹⁰ Something similar is said of the 'Babylonians' who ate the goat of the sin offering raw if the Day of Atonement fell on a Sabbath and they could not cook it (*m.Menahoth* 11.7).
- ¹¹¹ E Werner *The Sacred Bridge* London and New York 1959 p.11.
- ¹¹² W. Oesterley *The Jewish Background to the Christian Liturgy* p 87.