

Life-Spans of Early Patriarchs

Part 2

Jasher 16:8-12

(Compare to Genesis 14:12-21)

And Abram recovered all the property of Sodom, and he also recovered Lot and his property, his wives and little ones and all belonging to him, so that Lot lacked nothing. And when he returned from smiting these kings, he and his men passed the valley of Siddim where the kings had made war together. And Bera king of Sodom, and the rest of his men that were with him, went out from the lime-pits into which they had fallen, to meet Abram and his men. And **Adonizedek king of Jerusalem, the same was Shem**, went out with his men to meet Abram and his people, with bread and wine, and they remained together in the valley of Melech. **And Adonizedek blessed Abram, and Abram gave him a tenth from all that he had brought from the spoil of his enemies, for Adonizedek was a priest before God.**

The notion of Shem being Melchizedek throws a devastating monkey wrench into the doctrinal workings of Hebrews chapter 7. Hebrews establishes its doctrine largely on the premise that Melchizedek was “without father, without mother, without genealogy, having neither beginning of days nor end of life”. Christianity has typically held to a very mystical view of Melchizedek on the basis of this passage alone. Hebrews 7 goes on to argue in verses 4-10 that since Yeshua is the new priest who is to come “after the order of Melchizedek” (Psalm 110:1-4), and there is *no genealogical connection between Melchizedek and Abraham* (in whose loins was the Levitical priesthood) there is likewise *no genealogical connection* between the Levitical priesthood and the new priest Yeshua.

From this line of logic Hebrews goes on to argue in verses 11 and 12 that this new priesthood must “of necessity” mean that there is a new law! At this point Hebrews’ argument becomes absurd. The question is: Who establishes the Law in the first place? Is it the priests? Or is it God? Even if a new priesthood *were* to arise, would not the new priests be obligated to observe the Laws established by God? Where is it written that *new* priests require a *new* law?! Hebrews’ argument smacks of the assumption that there really is no God ...or at least one who could truly communicate His will to man. It was well established in the pagan world that it was the priests who had to concoct the laws to be observed by their followers because their gods could not speak.

Now if Hebrews’ original notion of *a new priesthood* were false, how much *less* is there an argument for a *new law*?

God promised that the priesthood would remain **forever** with Aaron of the tribe of Levi, and further chose a line through his descendants Eleazar and Phinehas (see Exodus 40:13-15, and Numbers 25:10-13). God also promised that the new priest/Messiah would bring together the priesthood and the kingdom (see Jeremiah 33:14-18, and Zechariah 6:12-13). It comes as a shock to most Christians to find out that Yeshua in fact has all the genealogical credentials of *both* the kingly tribe of Judah, and the priestly tribe of Levi! (See my article at http://www.judaismvschristianity.com/problem_with_hebrews.htm) It is in this fact alone that Yeshua fulfills the prophecy of being a priest “after the order of Melchizedek!” He is **both** king and priest in one. It is not as Hebrews would have us believe in suggesting that Yeshua is like Melchizedek in that there is no genealogical connection between him and Levi. The priesthood never left the descendants of Levi as God had promised! Furthermore, if indeed Shem was Melchizedek, there is a direct genealogical thread that flows from Melchizedek all the way through Abraham, Levi, and Aaron, to Yeshua. This completely destroys the doctrinal foundations of the book of Hebrews.

A summary of Yeshua’s genealogical credentials is as follows.

Yeshua’s mother Mary was *close genetic kin* to Elisabeth who was “of the daughters of Aaron” (Luke 1:5,36). According to the Law this could mean only *one* thing. Mary’s mother also had to have been a full-blooded daughter of Aaron. Mary’s father Heli was of the tribe of Judah, making Mary a perfect blend of the two tribes. And since Yeshua had no earthly father, it logically flows that his physical bloodlines were identical to his mother’s. (See article for a complete picture)

Most Christians will be inclined to reject the record of Jasher for the sake of Hebrews in spite of the fact that Joshua 10:13 and 2Samuel 1:18 cite Jasher as an accurate record. I would again encourage the reader to study my article in depth to see that Hebrews’ premise of Yeshua *not* being a descendant of Levi is absolutely false. This fact gives Jasher’s record of Shem being Melchizedek real plausibility.

The burden is on Christianity to first prove that Yeshua does **not** have any Levitical blood in him. If it were not for the book of Hebrews, Christians would be absolutely thrilled about the fact that Yeshua clearly fulfills God’s prophecy to bring both Judah and Levi together into one man. It is simply amazing the lengths to which many will go to try to disprove these beautiful prophecies for the sake of the book of Hebrews and its anti-Law doctrines they have come to love.