On the way towards identifying a Typologically-Melchizedekian exegetical tradition in the period of Late Judaism.

The project of my research proposal will be to identify and explore a typological-exegetical tradition in Late Judaism,¹ which links the figure of Melchizedek with Messianic and/or eschatological anticipations. My principle focus, for the purposes of this assignment, will be on the identification of various typological traditions surrounding the figure of Melchizedek in this period in order to cast light upon the characterization and employment of Melchizedek in 11Q13. In other words, I am interested in exploring the various Melchizedek-traditions which developed in tandem with exegetical traditions in the Intertestamental period, and which together likely formed the background against which the exegetical implications born out in the Epistle to the Hebrews make sense. In the literature review, I intend to survey the academic field concerning this question by paying particular attention to scholarly work centering around, or having something relevantly to do with, one particular writing recovered at Qumran, 11Q13.² By the end of this survey I will present a tentative argument, submitted in the form of a thesis statement, towards which any further research would be directed to establish. For the purposes of this assignment, my focus will be on the Qumran document’s use of Melchizedek, and alternative contemporary uses to which it may be related.

Melchizedek, as one author put it, is perhaps the most “enigmatic... figure in all of scripture”.³ This enigma is all the more potent precisely because of the mystery in which his character is shrouded, as Melchizedek only figures into the Bible on three occasions; one short narrative,⁴ one psalm,⁵ and is the subject of a few sparse passages of the epistle to the Hebrews.⁶

---

¹ I take the period of Late Judaism, or the ‘Intertestamental’ period, to be approximately the third century B.C.E. to the end of the first century C.E.
² Alternatively often called 11QMelchizedek
⁴ Genesis 14:17-20
The discovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls, however, has invited questions surrounding how the figure of Melchizedek was understood in Judaism prior to Christianity, in particular thanks to the **glorious** treatment of Melchizedek in the scroll called 11Q13 or 11QMelchizedek (which I will use interchangeably throughout). What is intriguing, however, is that 11Q13 seems to presume the audience’s tacit awareness of an exegetical tradition surrounding Melchizedek which links him to passages in Isaiah and Daniel. Not only does the scroll fail to refer or allude to Genesis 14, but it also avoids any explicit reference to Psalm 110, which is “the most frequently quoted or referenced psalm in the New Testament.”⁷ What is more, Psalm 110 is never once cited in any of the scrolls at Qumran,⁸ and despite the extensive treatment of Melchizedek in 11Q13, Melchizedek never again appears throughout the scrolls, except in 1QapGen where the narrative of Genesis 14 is recounted without any significant differences.⁹ Nevertheless, Melchizedek is envisioned in 11Q13 by the community to be the one who “will proclaim to them the jubilee, thereby releasing th[em from the debt of a]ll their sins”¹⁰ and is called “Anointed one.”¹¹ It is this combination of curious clues which have inspired the present quest, on which I embark, of situating 11Q13 in a lineage of exegetical tradition which eventually spills into the book of Hebrews in the New Testament.

### 1.1 Justification: What reasons inspired this project

I have long been interested in the Dead Sea Scrolls, and in pre-Christian messianic expectation in general. 11QMelchizedek is one example of texts which intrigue me, and I think that this text in

---

⁵ Psalm 110:4  
⁶ Hebrews 5:6,10; 6:20; 7:1-25  
⁸ With the obvious exception of Biblical scrolls containing Psalm 110.  
⁹ Michael Wise, Dead Sea Scrolls: A New Translation p.83  
¹⁰ Michael Wise, Dead Sea Scrolls: A New Translation p.456  
¹¹ Michael Wise, Dead Sea Scrolls: A New Translation p.457
particular allows us to preview not only messianic expectations in general, but messianic exegesis in particular. In other words, it helps to situate the wild exegesis of sources like the Gospel of Matthew when it comes to Messianic expectation as commonplace and legitimate in the mind of the Jewish people in the first centuries BCE and CE respectively. For example, when Matthew\(^{12}\) uses Hosea 11:1 “out of Egypt I called my son”\(^{13}\) and applies it to Jesus of Nazareth, was Matthew\(^{14}\) exercising exegetical innovation or reflecting the anachronistic exegesis of later Christian communities, or else was Matthew interpreting the text in standard ‘messianic’ fashion, according to an already recognized form of typological-messianic exegesis? Although this question was part of my initial inspiration for the present topic, as I wanted to demonstrate that the Dead Sea Scrolls often practice exactly this kind of exegesis, what I found when paying closer attention to this particular scroll was something much more interesting still. Moreover, I have often been tempted to tease out the stunning similarities between the canonical book of Hebrews, and a handful of Dead Sea Scrolls which reflect messianic expectations. In the past I wanted to publish a short paper arguing that regardless of the exact authorship of the epistle, one could establish both that the author was part of a Pauline community, and also that the audience consisted of Jewish converts from Qumran, since nowhere but at Qumran do we find emphasis on a Melchizedek-Messiah. However, what this research allowed me to do was to loosen myself of so narrow a vision of the audience of that epistle by recognizing that perhaps some of the messianic texts at Qumran represent streams of messianic thought which were more widely recognized.

\(^{12}\) Matthew 2:15  
\(^{13}\) NRSV  
\(^{14}\) By the designation of the name I simply mean the author or authors – the dispute over authorship is immaterial for my present purposes.
1.2 Method

I may be excused if my methods of inquiry do not include some typical avenues employed in biblical studies, such as textual criticism, since those avenues are not open to me due to the peculiar focus of my project. At least as far as this proposal is concerned, the problematic element of identifying typological-exegetical traditions which transformed the figure of Melchizedek, and situating 11Q13 among one or more of those traditions, is a project which does not extend beyond an examination of 11Q13, and surrounding traditions and sources all with a view towards enlightening 11Q13. Since 11Q13 is unique in the sense that there are no textual antecedents nor multiple copies, textual criticism is impossible. The methods which I will endeavour to employ, instead, will be primarily the methods of source criticism and tradition criticism. It is my aim to identify and examine antecedent sources to 11Q13 which may have helped inspire its fanciful exegesis, such as Psalm 110, and to survey the landscape of religious tradition(s) surrounding Melchizedek, with which 11QMelchizedek was plausibly in conversation. It is thus by taking inventory of the textual and traditional precursors, which plausibly act as sources from which the author of 11Q13 draws, that I will attempt to both identify the exegetical tradition in which 11Q13 belongs, and help to illustrate the significance of 11Q13 according to a wider messianic-typological tradition to which I will argue Melchizedek-traditions belong.

2.1 Literature Review: Melchizedekian Typology

The first and perhaps most significant article to which I will turn my attention is oriented towards establishing precisely what I am in search of: a typological exegetical tradition in Late Judaism which spearheaded one or more Melchizedekian exegetical tradition(s). Chad L. Bird in
his *Typological Interpretation Within the Old Testament: Melchizedekian Typology* has brilliantly set the tone of the conversation in which my research project endeavours to participate. He suggests that typological interpretations of scripture were typical of the exegetical appropriation of the Old Testament by the authors of the New Testament, in other words suggesting that typological significance was the presumption of the authors of the Gospels and Epistles which figure into the classical canon of scripture. Although noting that this exegetical method took a back seat to allegorical interpretation in much of Church history, he situates the revival of strictly and adamantly typological interpretation in the time of the Reformation. He recognizes that this suggestion has not been well received by all modern schools of biblical criticism, and he aims to rectify this by demonstrating that the authors of the Old Testament intended their works to be read typologically. Thus, the New Testament authors, insofar as their exegetical approach was typological, “received its imprimatur from”\(^{15}\) the Old Testament itself.

Of course, the aim of his paper is to establish that this is exegetically normative all with a view to exploring the way typological interpretations surrounding the figure of Melchizedek evolved in the period of Late Judaism. Chad Bird succinctly outlines the goals of his academic paper as follows:

Typological interpretation, far from being invented by the NT authors, was used extensively by... the OT; (2) one area of OT typology was that of typical individuals who served as prototypes both of other individuals within the OT and of Christ; (3) the Melchizedek of Genesis 14:18-20 served as an individual type of Messiah within the OT, as evinced in Psalm 110:4; and (4) the author of the Book of Hebrews utilized the

\(^{15}\) Chad L. Bird. ”Typological Interpretation within the Old Testament: Melchizedekian Typology.” In *Concordia Journal* 26, (2000) p.37
Melchizedekian typology already employed within the OT canon to further his arguments for the supremacy of the priesthood of Jesus to that of the Levites.\textsuperscript{16}

He begins by citing Horace Hummel who “has argued persuasively”\textsuperscript{17} for the conclusion that typological interpretation was legitimately founded on the soil of ancient Israelite religion, even suggesting that the formation of the Old Testament canon was a process tempered by a view to the typical nature of that which the writings reflected. The prophets, Bird suggests, “foretold what would be with the vocabulary and imagery of what had been; they painted the promise of the future with the colors of the past.”\textsuperscript{18} He goes further in suggesting that the Old Testament prophets employed a four-fold hermeneutic which was characterized on all sides by typology; this hermeneutic looks to find consistency in God, arguing that the way God has interacted with Israel in the past sets the tone for how he will continue to act in the future. It promotes and tacitly assumes the view that God is faithful to his promises, being ultimately ‘the same yesterday, today, and tomorrow.’ Thirdly, that the “future of Israel will be more magnificent than the past”\textsuperscript{19} and finally that this last hope was predicated on messianic expectation. Chad offers into evidence certain paradigmatic examples, the first of which is an examination of the typologically patterned Exodus account which parallels the Abrahamic journey described earlier in Genesis. Abraham descended into Egypt, ran into trouble with the Pharaoh, elicited plagues from the Lord against Pharaoh, and finally departed from Egypt bearing goods appropriated there. This Abahamic journey not only set the pattern for the Exodus story of Israel, but it is a typological image “embraced” by Isaiah who uses the Exodus narrative to elicit the hope of God’s favour in

\textsuperscript{16} Chad L. Bird. "Typological Interpretation within the Old Testament” p.37
\textsuperscript{17} Chad L. Bird. "Typological Interpretation within the Old Testament” p.37
\textsuperscript{18} Chad L. Bird. "Typological Interpretation within the Old Testament” p.38
\textsuperscript{19} Chad L. Bird. "Typological Interpretation within the Old Testament” p.38
a future exodus from captivity.\textsuperscript{20} Other similar examples of typological exegesis are provided, but the point is sufficiently established. Bird moves on to suggest that, insofar as Messianism is concerned, there are not only typological characters which intentionally foreshadow, in the minds of Biblical authors, the Messiah to come, but rather that these typical figures can be divided into three basic typological categories. The first of these categories of typical figures Bird designates as person-types;\textsuperscript{21} “a person-type individual may be defined as the following: an historic individual whose office and name are explicitly stated to be a prefiguration... of one in the future.”\textsuperscript{22} Second, there are office types, who effectively fulfill the same vocation, such as Adam and Noah with whom God covenanted similarly.\textsuperscript{23} Third, there are action-types, a good example of which would be the aforementioned Abrahamic-Exodus pattern, where “the Exodus [is the] action-type of Abraham.”\textsuperscript{24}

Bird, having established to his satisfaction the clear typological character of Old Testament literature, turns his attention to Melchizedek, suggesting that Melchizedek represents an office-type of the Messiah. Foundational to his argument is the construal of Psalm 110 as a Messianic psalm. Based on a narrative analysis of Melchizedek’s short encounter with Abraham as recounted in Genesis 14, Bird analyzes the use of the priest-king in the context of the Psalm which adopts him as a fitting typological image for the Messiah. He candidly suggests that “were we to stand in the sandals of the pre-Christian Israelitees, knowing what we do about the manner in which typology was used, we might conclude that the functions of Melchizedek’s offices will

\textsuperscript{20} See Isaiah 52:11-12
\textsuperscript{21} Chad L. Bird. “Typological Interpretation within the Old Testament” p.41
\textsuperscript{22} Chad L. Bird. “Typological Interpretation within the Old Testament” p.41
\textsuperscript{23} Compare Genesis 1:28-30 with Genesis 9:1-3
\textsuperscript{24} Chad L. Bird. “Typological Interpretation within the Old Testament” p.44
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correspond closely to or set the pattern for those which will be carried out by the Messiah.”

Moving on from this section, Bird then analyzes the way in which the Melchizedekian typology was used in the New Testament epistle to the Hebrews. Restricting himself to a discussion of Hebrews 7:1-10, Bird briefly demonstrates that Melchizedek is understood by the author of Hebrews to be a “type of Christ.” He goes on to criticise others, such as Lampe, who have, in his estimation, failed to recognize that “the author of Hebrews was building upon an already established typological tradition.” He argues that the author of Hebrews did not construct the ‘type’ “ex nihilo.” Thus, Bird’s contribution has been to argue persuasively for a typological hermeneutic characteristic of Old Testament literature, in which the person of Melchizedek was appropriated as a Messianic type in Psalm 110, and the implications of this typological approach to Melchizedek invited and elicited a typological tradition on which the author of Hebrews eventually draws. There are a few noteworthy weaknesses of this article, among which are included the presumptions and presuppositions of the author which are not shared by all contemporary scholars. Among these there are the ideas that there was a unique messianic typology and anticipation, rather than a variety of such typologies and expectations. The work also lacks any discussion of various Intertestamental ‘Melchizedek traditions’ for comparison with the exegesis suggested in Hebrews. Moreover, the significance for the purposes of my examination of 11QMelchizedek is indirect, as it only serves to illuminate the chronological ‘bookmarks’ between which the sectarian exegesis was elaborated.

2.2 Literature Review: The Melchizedek argument of Hebrews

25 Chad L. Bird. “Typological Interpretation within the Old Testament” p.47-48
26 Chad L. Bird. “Typological Interpretation within the Old Testament” p.48
27 Chad L. Bird. “Typological Interpretation within the Old Testament” p.49
28 Chad L. Bird. “Typological Interpretation within the Old Testament” p.49
Richard Longenecker writes, in his article *The Melchizedek Argument of Hebrews: A Study in the Development and Circumstantial Expression of New Testament Thought*, that Melchizedek appears outside the Biblical literature “in a number of writings that can be assigned to the period of Late Judaism.”\(^\text{29}\) He identifies the discovery of the “Melchizedek Scroll from Qumran”\(^\text{30}\) as the event which acted as an academic catalyst, increasing interest in the exploration of Melchizedek in the “materials of Late Judaism and of later Rabbinic Judaism.”\(^\text{31}\) The aim of his article is to survey “varied attitudes taken toward Melchizedek in Late Judaism,”\(^\text{32}\) to explicate, in relation to these, “the argument of the Letter to the Hebrews,”\(^\text{33}\) and finally to cast light upon the “significance of Hebrews’ Melchizedek argument for an appreciation of theological development.”\(^\text{34}\) To begin, he examines the “Hasmonean-Sadducean”\(^\text{35}\) views of Melchizedek, which seem to have identified the “messianic kingdom”\(^\text{36}\) with the Hasmonean dynasty. This exegetical stream is represented by the book of Jubilees, which adopts “Melchizedek [as the] title for Jacob and his two sons, Levi and Judah.”\(^\text{37}\) The author of Jubilees “wrote sometime during the reigns of Jonathan, Simeon, and John Hyrcanus”\(^\text{38}\) and that this Hasmonean exegetical tendency to use Melchizedek as an image for their reign was in use outside of Jubilees is evidenced even in the Bible in 1 Maccabees.\(^\text{39}\) This appropriation of Melchizedek by the supporters of the Hasmonean rulers is also evidenced in the Qumran copy of Jubilees which omits, for apparent ideological reasons, the reference to Melchizedek in Jubilees.

\(^{29}\) Richard Longenecker, “The Melchizedek Argument of Hebrews” p.161  
\(^{30}\) Richard Longenecker, “The Melchizedek Argument of Hebrews” p.161  
\(^{31}\) Richard Longenecker, “The Melchizedek Argument of Hebrews” p.161  
\(^{32}\) Richard Longenecker, “The Melchizedek Argument of Hebrews” p.162  
\(^{33}\) Richard Longenecker, “The Melchizedek Argument of Hebrews” p.162  
\(^{34}\) Richard Longenecker, “The Melchizedek Argument of Hebrews” p.162  
\(^{35}\) Richard Longenecker, “The Melchizedek Argument of Hebrews” p.161  
\(^{36}\) Richard Longenecker, “The Melchizedek Argument of Hebrews” p.161  
\(^{38}\) Richard Longenecker, “The Melchizedek Argument of Hebrews” p.161  
\(^{39}\) Richard Longenecker, “The Melchizedek Argument of Hebrews” p.162  

See 1 Maccabees 14:41 where the phrase “ἐἰς τὸν αἰῶνα” appears.
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The Pharisaic “materials treat Melchizedek in three ways;”\(^{40}\) first as Shem, second as an eschatological ‘workman’ counted alongside Elijah and the Messiah, and finally as “an irreverent priest who relinquished the rights of his office to Abraham.”\(^{41}\) There is some controversy about whether this Pharisaic disparagement of Melchizedek was in response to the Sadducean view, or else in response to the Christian use of Melchizedek\(^{42}\) which had been popularly used by Christians from very early on, such as in Justin Martyr’s *Dialogue with Trypho*.\(^{43}\)

Philo of Alexandria, who represents a very uniquely interesting exegetical tradition, refers to Melchizedek three times in those writings of his which have survived to our day, wherein Philo makes Melchizedek out to be “the eternal Logos.”\(^{44}\) This view, it has been argued, may have been “fairly widespread.”\(^{45}\) Josephus also makes brief reference to Melchizedek as a Canaanite who became a priest of “Israel’s God”\(^{46}\) and who built the first temple in Jerusalem.\(^{47}\)

Finally, Longenecker comes to a treatment of 11Q13, especially in light of Hebrews, which he suggests together represent same exegetical stream. Here, Longenecker suggests that 11Q13 provides a peek into the logic around which the author of Hebrews “built his argument”\(^{48}\) as their use of Melchizedek seems rife with thematic parallel, for example by focusing on the atoning ministry of Melchizedek’s priesthood, or, more subtly, contrasting Jesus with merely ‘angelic beings’. Moreover, any suggested parallel between Philo and Hebrews is overplayed, and there are, it seems, no other candidates. The seminal conclusion in which I am interested is that “no

\(^{40}\) Richard Longenecker, “The Melchizedek Argument of Hebrews” p.165
\(^{41}\) Richard Longenecker, “The Melchizedek Argument of Hebrews” p.165
\(^{42}\) Richard Longenecker, “The Melchizedek Argument of Hebrews” p.166
\(^{43}\) See chapters 19 and 33.
\(^{44}\) Richard Longenecker, “The Melchizedek Argument of Hebrews” p.169
\(^{45}\) Richard Longenecker, “The Melchizedek Argument of Hebrews” p.169
\(^{46}\) Richard Longenecker, “The Melchizedek Argument of Hebrews” p.170
\(^{47}\) Richard Longenecker, “The Melchizedek Argument of Hebrews” p.170
\(^{48}\) Richard Longenecker, “The Melchizedek Argument of Hebrews” p.173
longer can it be assumed that... Melchizedek was a quite insignificant figure during the first century, as is sometimes stated"⁴⁹ but rather he captured the religious imagination of Jewish exegetes, and provided a prototype of the Messiah for whom the Jewish people were waiting.

2.3 Literature Review: Michael or Yhwh?

Rick Van De Water in an article published in 2006 called Michael or Yhwh? Toward Identifying Melchizedek in 11Q13 has argued impressively that Melchizedek, popular to the common opinion that he represents an angelic figure, actually represents YHWH himself. Van De Water turns first to other scholars, such as F. Manzi, who have come to the same conclusion in order to furnish plausibility for his thesis. However, Water sets out with the purpose of arguing “that the identification of Melchizedek as an intermediary can be reconciled with Manzi’s thesis that ‘Melchizedek’ is a divine title.”⁵⁰ Interestingly Water goes as far as to propose that the figure Melchizedek can be identified in other enigmatic figures in the Dead Sea Scrolls, such as the ‘son of God’ of 4Q246.⁵¹ The figure of Melchizedek, he proposes, can be recognized as at once a mediator of God, and also as God himself, by appealing to the early rabbinic idea that “God has a divine mediator who shares his throne.”⁵² Water identifies this theological conviction as predating the “second century CE”⁵³ and points to the example of the Magharians as a Jewish sect believing “in a celestial being who created the world... and was God’s intermediary.”⁵⁴ 11Q13, Water suggests, “reflects [this] belief”⁵⁵ and he identifies similar

---

⁴⁹ Richard Longenecker, “The Melchizedek Argument of Hebrews” p.171
⁵¹ Rick Van De Water, “Michael or Yhwh?” p.84
⁵² Rick Van De Water, “Michael or Yhwh?” p.76
⁵³ Rick Van De Water, “Michael or Yhwh?” p.77
⁵⁴ Rick Van De Water, “Michael or Yhwh?” p.77
⁵⁵ Rick Van De Water, “Michael or Yhwh?” p.77
language in other scrolls, such as 1QS 3.24. Moreover, turning to the etymology of Melchizedek’s name, he proposes that the “rendering” of it as “‘King of Righteousness’... is not the only possibility.” He suggests instead that the name might be translated as “My king is righteousness” and is actually “God’s designation of him.” Thus, Water argues that there is a clear distinction between Melchizedek and God, but argues that this distinction “need not overrule Manzi’s case.” Pointing to the evidence presented in 11QMelchizedek’s treatment of the character, Water proposes that Melchizedek often plays roles traditionally ascribed to Ywhw, such as when 11Q13, when using Isaiah 61:2, exchanges Melchizedek’s name for Ywhw. Unfortunately most of his treatment deals extensively with Hebrew vocabulary and etymology, and as such I am not able to provide a comprehensive overview of all his points. However, granting him the benefit of the doubt, it seems as though there is a legitimate case which can be made for reading an implicit deuteron-theism out of 11Q13, and this in turn helps to characterize the typology in use.

2.4 John J. Collins

Next I will turn to John J. Collins, in his article *Messianic expectation at Qumran* but I will also freely draw on other writings of his including first and foremost his impressive monograph *the Scepter and the Star*. In his article, as well as in his other works, he clearly argues that messianic expectation at Qumran was characterized by the anticipation for more than a single Messianic figure. He explains: “that we may speak of a common Jewish hope for a royal messiah from the Davidic line and of a distinctive sectarian hope in the Dead Sea Scrolls for a

---

56 Rick Van De Water, “Michael or Yhwh?” p.78
57 Rick Van De Water, “Michael or Yhwh?” p.78
58 Rick Van De Water, “Michael or Yhwh?” p.78
59 Rick Van De Water, “Michael or Yhwh?” p.78
60 Rick Van De Water, “Michael or Yhwh?” p.78
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priestly messiah”⁶¹ who differed from the anticipated king. What Collins identifies diverse titles which are evocative of a typological messiah, such as the titles of ‘branch’ or ‘prince’ which “often function as variant ways of referring to the eschatological Davidic king.”⁶² In adducing various such-like passages together and presenting a case for their typological continuity, he goes on to argue for a seminal and typological distinction between a Davidic Messiah and a Priestly Messiah. Turning to the shocking passage in 1QS9:11, which says that the community awaits “until there come the Prophet and the Messiahs of Aaron and Israel.”⁶³ This plural form of Messiah is one which Collins strongly argues evidences an underlying tradition at Qumran of deutero-Messianism.⁶⁴ In his treatments, however, Collins makes a point of excluding “figures like Melchizedek in 11Q13... who are never called מֶשֶׁהָ⁶⁵ as a priestly or kingly messiah-figure, and instead identifies Melchizedek here as “the prophet”⁶⁶ who is another kind of Messiah. Unfortunately, although Collins is a prolific writer and something of an authority in the matter of Qumran Messianism, his rash exclusion of any discussion of Melchizedek in terms of Messianism in the scrolls leaves much to be desired for my purposes. However, it also more clearly spotlights the platform from which my contribution might be made.

3.1 Methods in the Literature

---

⁶² John J. Collins. "Messianic Expectation at Qumran” p.73
⁶⁵ John J. Collins. "Messianic Expectation at Qumran" p.75
⁶⁶ John J. Collins. "Messianic Expectation at Qumran" p.89
The methods which the aforementioned articles used are discussed in this section. In the first article, Chad L. Bird employs the methods of Tradition-Historical criticism, as he attempts to identify the exegetical pattern of typology within the Jewish literature formative of Israelite and later Christian faith. Of course, to the extent that Bird predetermines the Melchizedek ‘type’ on the pattern of the hundred and tenth psalm, he is also involving himself in source criticism. However, his typological thesis requires a species of genre criticism, since he is looking to the ‘genre’ of typology and identifying it in Hebrews. Finally he also appeals to canonical criticism when he, very briefly, deals with Horace Hummel.

Richard Longenecker, for his part, seems to use source criticism to establish his argument that Hebrews was not operating out of an exegetical vacuum. He also appeals to rhetorical criticism to the extent that he attempts to tease out, on the basis of the exegetical background of the first century C.E., the epistle to the Hebrews’ procedure of persuasive presentation.

In Rick Van De Water’s article he employs tradition criticism to the extent that he identifies, with the Magharians, a form of deuteron-theism, to which he will ultimately appeal as normative or at least not esoteric. He also uses source criticism as he attempts to draw out the dynamic relations between 11Q13’s exegesis and that of Psalm 110.

John J. Collins, of course, employs a great many methods of criticism. In what little of his work I have attempted to succinctly present here, his arguments involved the use of redaction criticism, which helped him establish the deuto-messianism he identifies in 1QS9:11. He also uses, perhaps more obviously and more frequently, Tradition criticism.

4.1 My proposal to advance research in this direction
Thus we have seen that the work of previous scholars has focused on a wide range of related areas, but none have provided a comprehensive outline of any clear stream of typological exegetical tradition of Melchizedek related to the wider typological category of Messianic anticipation. I propose not only to situate 11Q13 and Hebrews in the same exegetical tradition, but to argue that the typology at play in 11Q13 is distinctively messianic, and this can allow one to use 11Q13 as a lens through which to understand Messianism generally at Qumran. Against John Collins, I would argue both that the category of Messianism was alive and well during the period of Late Judaism, and also that the Qumran exegesis operated not on the presumption of deutero-messianism, but on the presumption of a messianic deutero-typology. I would argue ultimately that the plural form of ‘Messiahs’ in 1QS9:11 evidences that the tradition of messianic typology evolved to a stage at Qumran where previously disparate types of Messiah, priestly and kingly, were being anticipated in a single Messianic figure, for whom the paradigmatic representative figure became Melchizedek, the priest-king. Thus, my proposal will be simply to establish that the Melchizedek typology of 11Q13 was dynamically developed to bring together exegetical implication of messianic types with which the Jews of Qumran were confronted in their writings. Though this thesis will eventually involve appeals to Enochian streams of exegetical tradition, along with a thoroughgoing outline of historical development which will help explain why the Melchizedekian typology at Qumran took the form it did, and how it relates to the other scrolls at Qumran, the research for these has seemed to me to be beyond the scope of the present proposal.