

MELCHIZEDEK MAN OR MESSIAH?

by Avram Yehoshua

[THE SEED OF ABRAHAM](#)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS	iii
INTRODUCTION	1
MELCHIZEDEK IN GENESIS 14	3
The Covenant is Passed on to Abram	10
MELCHIZEDEK IN PSALM 110	12
MELCHIZEDEK IN HEBREWS SEVEN	15
Hebrews 6:20 and Having Become High Priest	16
Hebrews 7:1-3	17
Made Like or Resembling the Son of God	17
The Passive and Active Forms of the Greek Participle	20
Type and Anti-Type	21
Remains a Priest Forever	21
The Silence of Scripture	22
No Levitical Lineage, But Character	25
The True Meaning of Melchizedek’s Name	29
Melchizedek—An Angel?	31
Protestants and Catholics	33
Hebrews 7:4-11	34
Hebrews 7:12 and the Change in the Law	39
Hebrews 7:15-17 and In The Likeness Of	41
The Two Offices Become One in Messiah	42
The Mystery of Melchizedek	43
The Chronological Chart	43
Qumran	45
CONCLUSION	48
Genesis 14:18-20.....	48
Psalm 110:4	50
Hebrews Seven	50
BIBLIOGRAPHY	55
Articles Cited in the Introduction	55
Melchizedek in Genesis 14	55
Articles or Videos Cited for Melchizedek in Genesis 14	56

Melchizedek in Psalm 110	56
Articles Cited for Melchizedek in Psalm 110	57
Melchizedek in Hebrews Seven	57
Articles Cited for Melchizedek in Hebrews Seven	58
The Mystery of Melchizedek	60
Qumran	60
Articles Cited in Qumran	60

INTRODUCTION

The person of Melchizedek is controversial among Christians. Some think he was a normal human being while others believe him to be the preincarnate Jesus or even an angel. There are many appearances of Jesus in the Old Testament, what many English Bibles erroneously speak of as the “Angel of the LORD,”¹ and so why couldn’t Jesus have been Melchizedek? This article centers on the biblical answer to that question.

Melchizedek first comes upon the scene very early in the Bible. In just a few Scriptures in Genesis 14:18-20 he meets and blesses Father Abram (whose name won’t be changed to Abraham until Gen. 17:5) and then Abram gives Melchizedek a tithe.

The next time we read of Melchizedek is more than a thousand years later, in Psalm 110:4. No, he doesn’t personally appear, which certainly would have gone a long way in proving that Melchizedek was the preincarnate Messiah, but here God swears to make David’s Lord (i.e. the Messiah of Psalm 110:1; cf. Mt. 22:41-46), the (High) Priest (of Israel) forever “according to the Order of Melchizedek.” The name Melchizedek is only written twice in the entire Old Testament (Gen. 14:18; Psalm 110:4).

A little more than a thousand years after Psalm 110 was written (in perhaps 970 BC), the Author of Hebrews (67 AD) literally speaks of Melchizedek nine times in three chapters (Hebrews 5–7), with the concentration being in chapter seven:

1. Six of the nine times the name Melchizedek occurs in chapter seven of the Letter to the Hebrews.²
2. The Author also states six times that Yeshua (the Hebrew name of Jesus) is a (High) Priest “according to the Order of Melchizedek,” six times, again with the concentration coming in chapter seven (three of the six times).³

The chief New Testament Scripture passage that most Christians present as establishing the preincarnate Jesus being Melchizedek is Hebrews 7:1-4. It states,

“For this Melchizedek, King of Salem, Priest of the Most High God, who met Abraham returning from the slaughter of the kings and blessed him, to whom also Abraham gave a tenth part of all, first being translated “King of Righteousness,” and then also, King of Salem, meaning “King of Peace,” without father, without mother, without genealogy, having neither beginning of days nor end of life, but made like the Son of God, remains a priest continually. Now consider how great this man was, to whom even Father Abraham gave a tenth of the spoils.” (Hebrews 7:1-4)⁴

Melchizedek is spoken of as not having father or mother, or a genealogy, and having “neither beginning of days nor end of life” and that he remains a priest continually. The passage also speaks of his greatness in that even Father Abraham, the progenitor or head of Israel, the Chosen people of God, was blessed by him and he gave Melchizedek a tithe. These are very impressive credentials “for a mere man,” and taken literally and uncritically, would point to Melchizedek, the King and High Priest of Salem, being the preincarnate Son of God. The reasons are as follow:

1. Like Jesus, Melchizedek is both a king and a high priest and,
2. Like Jesus, “he remains a priest continually”⁵ and,

¹ See my article, [The Angel of the Lord](#) for why “Angel” is a horrendous English translation of the Hebrew word, which literally means Messenger.

² The name Melchizedek is seen nine times in the Letter to the Hebrews—5:6, 10; 6:20; 7:1, 10-11, 15, 17, 21.

³ “According to the Order of Melchizedek” is written six times in Hebrews—5:6, 10; 6:20; 7:11, 17, 21.

⁴ I’ve italicized the important points of the passage that are used by Christians to support Melchizedek having been Jesus.

⁵ [Is Melchizedek Jesus?](#) by Aaron Gray.

3. Melchizedek's name is translated as "King of Righteousness," which certainly speaks of Jesus, and
4. Melchizedek was King of Salem, which means "King of Peace," which Jesus is and,
5. Melchizedek had no beginning, nor genealogy, no father or mother, which can be said of Jesus and,
6. Melchizedek blessed Father Abraham, establishing his superiority over Abram and,
7. Melchizedek received a tithe from Father Abraham.

On the other hand, there are at least four reasons why Melchizedek wasn't the preincarnate Jesus:

1. When people in the Old Testament meet the preincarnate Jesus or "the Angel of the LORD," they, and every reader of the Scriptures, *always* realize the person or people have met God (the Son). This fact is glaringly absent when Abram meets Melchizedek in Genesis 14:18-20, and is never remedied anywhere else in Scripture.
2. Both Genesis and Hebrews state that Melchizedek *was the King and Priest* of Salem, which presents him as an actual man who ruled the city of Salem. There isn't even a hint in the Genesis account that Melchizedek was a divine being (i.e. Jesus).
3. Also, Melchizedek being the preincarnate Jesus doesn't seem possible because Jesus never ruled any city on Earth in the Old Testament, and is never spoken of in the New Testament as having ruled an earthly city or being its king and its high priest.
4. The Greek word for "made like" in Hebrews 7:3 ("*made like* the Son of God") is a word of comparison, not identity. It reveals that the Author of Hebrews is comparing Melchizedek to Yeshua in His eternal kingship and priesthood of Israel. The Author never says that Yeshua was Melchizedek.

The article, which deals with Melchizedek in Genesis 14, Psalm 110 and the Letter to the Hebrews reveals beyond any reasonable doubt that Melchizedek was in fact a human being; not the preincarnate Son of God. While some will choose to reject my conclusion, no one will be able to honestly refute it.

MELCHIZEDEK IN GENESIS 14

In the fourteenth chapter of Genesis, four kings from the East (Mesopotamia/Babylon) swoop down upon five kings and their cities in Canaan and plunder them. Part of the plunder is Lot, Abram's nephew. When Abram finds out about it he pursues the four kings, finds them in what is modern day Syria (on their way back home), and Abram and his two covenant friends and their people defeat them. He then takes Lot, the loot and all those Canaanites destined to be Babylonian slaves back to Canaan.

In Canaan, by what is present day northeast Jerusalem, Melchizedek greets Abram and provides food and wine for Abram and all the people with him ("bread" being another way in Hebrew of saying "food").⁶ Melchizedek also blesses Abram who then gives Melchizedek a tithe of his spoils. Genesis 14:18-20 reads,

¹⁸"Then Melchizedek, *King of Salem* brought out bread and wine. *He was the (High) Priest of the Most High God.* ¹⁹And Melchizedek blessed Abram and said: "Blessed is Abram of the Most High God, Creator of the Heavens and the Earth! ²⁰And blessed is the Most High God who has delivered your enemies into your hand!" And Abram gave Melchizedek a tithe of all."⁸ (Genesis 14:18-20; cf. Hebrews 7:1-4, 6)

The term, Most High God, in Hebrew is *El Elyon* אֱלֹהֵי עֶלְיוֹן and appears 28 times in the Hebrew Bible.⁹

⁶ אֶחָד Francis Brown, S. R. Driver and Charles A. Briggs, Based on the Lexicon of Wilhelm Gesenius; Edward Robinson, translator and E. Rodiger, Editor, *A Hebrew and English Lexicon*, Abridged, 1978 (Accordance Bible Software), paragraph 11,472. "bread, food...a bit of bread, as (a) modest term for a hospitable meal...food in general."

"A trio of eminent Old Testament scholars, Francis Brown, R. Driver and Charles Briggs spent over twenty years researching, writing and preparing this lexicon, which originally was the work of [Wilhelm Gesenius](#) (1786 to 1832), who was a Christian Hebraist, theologian and biblical scholar extraordinaire. Since [BDB](#) first appeared in the early part of the twentieth century it has been considered the finest and most comprehensive Hebrew lexicon available to the English-speaking student," although when *HALOT* came out, it superseded it.

אֶחָד Ludwig Koehler, Walter Baumgartner, and J. J. Stamm, Authors; M. Richardson, translator, *The Hebrew-Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament*, vol. 2 (Boston, MA USA: Brill Academic Publishers; 2002; Accordance Bible Software), pp. 526-527; "bread...food, nourishment...food" (grain and animals) "offered by fire to Yahweh...governor's food allowances, Neh. 5:14."

"One of the most trusted Old Testament resources is Koehler, Baumgartner and Stamm's *Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament* ([HALOT](#)). In its original form it was a 5 volume, 2,000+ page resource on biblical Hebrew and Aramaic produced over a period of 40 years."

אֶחָד *Hebrew to English Dictionary and Index to the NIV Old Testament* (derived from the Zondervan NIV Exhaustive Concordance; Accordance Bible Software), paragraph 4,415; "bread...any kind of food."

Also, compare "bread" (NKJV) in Gen. 18:5-8; 39:6; 43:31, 34; Ex. 2:20; 18:12; Dt. 23:3-4; 1st Sam. 22:22, 24-25; Psalm 102:4 and Luke 14:1, where versions like the HCSB, NASB, NET and the NRSV, etc., have "food" for "bread." Melchizedek provided more than just bread that day. It was a feast.

⁷ Melchizedek wasn't just "a priest." He was the *High Priest* of Salem. For example, many times in Scripture, Aaron is called just a "Priest" (cf. Ex. 28:3-4; 31:10; 35:19; 38:21, etc.), but we know that he was the High Priest of Israel (Lev. 21:10; Num. 35:25, 28), and this High Priesthood continued for his Sons after him (cf. Joshua 20:6; 2nd Kgs. 12:10; Neh. 3:1, 20; Hag. 1:1, 14; 2:4; Zech. 3:1, 8; 6:11; Mt. 26:3, 57, 62-63, 65; Heb. 3:1; 4:14; 6:20, etc.). Also, Melchizedek is the "model" or type of Yeshua as our High Priest (Heb. 2:17; 3:1; 4:14-15; 5:5, 10; 6:20; 7:26; 9:11), and so Melchizedek was the High Priest of Salem. Therefore, sometimes I'll be using *High Priest* for Melchizedek, as this is a faithful translation and understanding of who Melchizedek was.

⁸ Abram gave a tithe to Melchizedek, not the other way around, as some say (see Heb. 7:2). Thomas Whitelaw, author; *The Pulpit Commentary (Genesis-Job)*, ed. H.D.M. Spence and Joseph S. Exell; Accordance electronic ed. (Altamonte Springs: OakTree Software, 2017), paragraph 3,314, speaks of "Josephus, LXX. (Targum) Jonathan" (and) "Hebrews 7:6," teaching that Abram gave the tithe to Melchizedek. Hebrews 7:1-2 confirms it, which puts an end to the heresy that Melchizedek tithed to Abram.

[Thomas Whitelaw](#) (1840-1917) was a Scottish Presbyterian minister and biblical scholar...He...wrote many books, including commentaries on Genesis, John, and Acts and a study of the divinity of Christ."

This is its first use, found in our passage of Gen. 14:18, quickly followed by three more times in the next four verses (Gen. 14:19, 20, 22). “It expresses,”

“the extreme sovereignty and majesty of God and His highest preeminence. When the two words are combined...El Elyon...it can” also “be translated as “the most exalted God” (Psalm 57:2),”⁹ God Most High or the Most High God.

Genesis 14 states that Melchizedek was *the King of Salem*, an actual city in Canaan that will later be known as Jerusalem (“Jeru-Salem”).¹¹ Being “the King of Salem” symbolically means the “King of Peace,” as the Author of Hebrews brings out, for *Salem* means peace (Heb. 7:2). Was he *the King of Peace* (i.e. Yeshua)? Many people in Scripture are given names that reflect the God of Israel, but obviously that doesn’t make them the God of Israel. The simple and correct reading of the Scripture sees Melchizedek as an actual man—the king of a city called Salem. There is nothing in the passage that leads anyone to think that Melchizedek was divine.

The name *Melchizedek* can be rendered the King of Righteousness and some think he was *the King of Righteousness* (i.e. Jesus). Yet, there isn’t a single witness to this, in either the Old or the New, that clearly states that Jesus was Melchizedek. This is rather odd, especially as the Author of Hebrews devotes an entire chapter to Melchizedek (Hebrews 7), *comparing him to Jesus*.

There is an interesting correlation between Melchizedek not having any genealogy written about him, and a king of Jerusalem named Ebed Tob (which may very well have been Melchizedek by another name). He

⁹ [El Elyon Most High - One Of The Names Of God](#). “It occurs 19 times in Psalms.”

¹⁰ Ibid.

¹¹ C. F. Keil and F. Delitzsch, *Commentary on the Old Testament*, vol. 1, *The Pentateuch* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, 2001), p. 132. “As Abram returned with the booty...Melchizedek, king of Salem, came to meet him to congratulate him on his victory...They met in “*the valley of Shaveh, which is* (what was afterwards called) *the King’s dale.*” This valley...was, according to *Josephus*, two stadia” (about 1,200 feet or less than a quarter of a mile) “from Jerusalem, probably by the brook Kidron...which points to...Jerusalem. For the *Salem* of Melchizedek cannot have been the Salem near to which John baptized (John 3:23) or Aenon, which was eight Roman miles south of Scythopolis, as a march of about forty hours for the purpose of meeting Abraham, if not romantic, would at least, be at variance with the text of Scripture, where the (five) kings are said to have gone out to Abram after his return,” for the five kings lived far south of Jerusalem. “It must be Jerusalem therefore, which is called by the old name *Salem* in Ps. 76:2, out of which the name Jerusalem (founding of peace, or possession of peace) was formed by the addition of the prefix יְרֻ = יְרִי (Yeru = Yerui),” English Jeru, ““founding,” or יְרִי (Yerush) “possession,” or Foundation of Peace or Inheritance of Peace.

Psalm 76:2 in the NKJV states, “In *Salem* also is His Tabernacle, and His dwelling place in Zion.” Zion is equated with Jerusalem. “Tabernacle” and “dwelling” also parallel each other. It’s called Hebrew parallelism, which was the common way many Hebrew Scriptures were written; saying the same thing twice, with different words the second time (Salem/Zion).

The name of the city in Melchizedek’s day, Salem, in Hebrew is *Shalame* שָׁלַמֶּה which means, complete or whole, and is a sister word is shalom, God’s peace שָׁלוֹם. Therefore, *King of Salem* symbolically means King of Peace, and this is what the Author of Hebrews will use to speak of Melchizedek and Yeshua as Kings of Peace (Heb. 7:2).

[Carl Friedrich Keil](#) (1807-1888) was a German Lutheran Old Testament theologian who taught Bible, New Testament exegesis and Oriental languages...he was a conservative critic who reacted strongly against the” alleged “scientific biblical criticism of his day, and he supported Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch.” He, along with Franz Delitzsch, “edited his principal work, a *Commentary on the Bible*...The work remains a “most enduring contribution to biblical studies.””

Geoffrey W. Bromiley, General Editor; Everett F. Harrison, Roland K. Harrison and William Sanford LaSor, associate Editors, *The International Standard Bible Encyclopedia*, Volume Three (Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans Pub. Co., 1979), p. 313. “That “Salem” was the designation for Jerusalem is confirmed by its use in Ps. 76:2 (MT v. 3) in *synonymous parallelism* with “Zion”...The Amarna letters of Abdu-Heba, to the king of Egypt, reveal that as early as 1400 BC *Urusalim*” (city of Ebed tob; i.e. Salem/Jerusalem) “was an important Canaanite city-state.”

The [International Standard Bible Encyclopedia](#) has long been considered a standard among biblical reference works. “[This set](#) contains over 9,000 topics and 3,500 cross-references.”

ruled Uru-Salim (i.e. the city of Salem/Jerusalem), as is seen in the Tel el Amarna Tablets. Like Melchizedek he didn't obtain his kingship from his father or his mother, but from the "mighty King," who may very well have been Yahveh. Wayne Jackson writes,

"Among the Tel el Amarna tablets (discovered in Egypt in 1887), there are several letters written to a Pharaoh from Ebed-tob, who is called "king of Uru-Salim." The Canaanite king tells the Egyptian ruler that he did not receive his reign from his father and mother, but it had been conferred upon him by "the Mighty King."¹² (Cf. Heb. 5:4)

Here is a king whose name means that he is the Good Servant¹³ (of God). The similarity between Ebed-tob and Melchizedek is striking. If Ebed-tob wasn't another name for Melchizedek, we have another king of Jerusalem who came to power not because of his genealogy, but because he was a good servant of the Lord, whom he calls "the Mighty King."

A major point, of whether or not Yeshua was Melchizedek, is that *every time* Abraham meets Yeshua (as either spoken of in Scripture as Yahveh, for example as one of the three "men" who came to Abraham in Genesis 18:1-2f., or as the so-called "Angel" of the LORD [literally, the Messenger of Yahveh], for example in Gen. 22:11-18, when Abraham is about to sacrifice Isaac), *Scripture always reveals* to the person or people, *and to us the readers, that the Person is the Lord (Jesus)*. This understanding, that whenever Yeshua appears, to not only Abraham, but also to Hagar, Isaac and Jacob (Gen. 16:8f.; 21:14f.; 28:1f., respectively), to all Israel (Judges 2:1-4f.), to Samson's parents (Judges 13:1f.), and even to Balaam (Num. 22:23f.), that they, and we, know it's the Lord—occurs *every time*. This biblical fact is glaringly absent in Abram's encounter with Melchizedek. This is a major problem for those thinking that Jesus was Melchizedek. There is nothing mentioned in Genesis 14, nor anywhere else in the Old Testament (or even in the New for that matter), that Melchizedek was deity or that Abram had spoken with the Messenger of Yahveh (i.e. Yeshua).¹⁴

There isn't anything that Melchizedek says or does that reveals that he's Jesus. In other words, there is nothing in the passage to indicate a divine encounter. If Yeshua had appeared as Melchizedek, this would have been *the only passage in Scripture* where Scripture does not tell us of His appearance, and the only place where the character doesn't act or speak as God the Son. The obvious conclusion is that Melchizedek was a man, the King and High Priest of Salem, just as Genesis presents him.

Taking the opposite position for a moment; that Jesus was Melchizedek, some questions need to be asked:

¹² Wayne Jackson, [Was Melchizedek the Preincarnate Christ?](#), see A. H. Sayce, "Melchizedek," *Dictionary of the Bible*, James Hastings, ed. (Edinburgh: T.&T. Clark, 1908, III), p. 335.

¹³ *Ebed tov* means "Good Servant" or literally, Good Slave, to God. Moses is also called a "slave" of God (Joshua 1:1-2, although most English Bibles have "servant").

¹⁴ Yeshua appeared to the Three Fathers (Abraham, Isaac and Jacob) as God the Son or the Messenger of Yahveh. Scripture reveals it is Yeshua speaking as God (the Son). Only God the Father and God the Son (and the Holy Spirit of course) speak in the first person as God (cf. Gen. 22:12, 15-18; Prov. 8:14-36, where Wisdom is the personification of the Holy Spirit). Here are some references and how everyone knows when Yeshua or the Father reveal Themselves:

For Abraham: Gen. 12:1-4, 7-8; 13:14-18; 15:1-20; 17:1-22; 18:1-33; 22:1-18. This understanding, that whenever Yeshua appears, both the person He appears to, and we, the readers of the Scriptures, know that it's Him. This is seen even with Hagar (Gen. 16:7-13; 21:17-19).

For Isaac: Gen. 26:2-5; 26:24; cf. Rebekah, Gen. 25:22-23.

For Jacob: Gen. 28:10-17; 31:3, 11-13; 32:24-30; 35:1, 9-15 (cf. Laban: Gen. 31:24, 29, 42; and for Jacob seeing angels: Gen. 32:1-2; also Jacob speaking of the Lord appearing to him to Joseph; Gen. 48:3).

For Moses and Aaron: Exodus 3:1-4:23, 27; 6:1-8, 28-30-7:5, etc., culminating in all Israel "seeing" God descend upon Mt. Sinai and hearing Him speak forth the Ten Commandments to Israel. After that Moses continued to speak with God the Father and every time this happens Scripture reveals this to us (cf. Ex. 16:10; Lev.9:23; Num. 14:10; 16:19, 42; 20:6; Dt. 31:15). This understanding continues with Joshua and Yeshua (Joshua 5:13-15); all Israel (Judges 2:1-5); Gideon (Judges 6:12); the parents of Samson (Judges 13:3, 10, 21); Samuel (1st Sam. 3:21); and Kings David (1st Sam. 23:1-4, 9-12; Psalm 110:1f.), as well as Solomon (1st Kings 3:5; 9:2) and of course, all the Prophets of Yahveh (e.g. Nathan, 2nd Sam. 7:1-17; Isaiah 1:1ff.; Jeremiah 1:4-19; 31:3).

1. Was Jesus a High Priest on Earth at that time in Salem?
2. Was Jesus the King of the Canaanite city called Salem?
3. Is this, the earthly vocation of king and priest of Salem, something that Jesus would do for a day, so as to meet Abram? Ten days? A year? Ten years? Or was Jesus the King and Priest of Salem for just a few hours, the time that it took for this event to take place with Abram?

Of course, Jesus could not have been designated the King and High Priest of Salem if He was only there for an hour or two. That amount of time would hardly allow Scripture to say that He was its king and high priest. If Yeshua had stayed longer, perhaps a year or even ten years, He could well be called Salem's King and High Priest, but there is no Scripture that declares the length of time Jesus, as Melchizedek, was its king and high priest.

Also, with Hebrews telling us that "Melchizedek "remains a priest continually" (Heb. 7:3), we would expect that Jesus was still its king and high priest in the days of Joshua and King David, but of course, Melchizedek wasn't there in Jebus when Joshua came into the land. When did Jesus, as Melchizedek, stop being Salem's eternal king and high priest?

There are no biblical answers to those questions because Jesus was not Melchizedek. Also, there isn't any Scripture that says that Jesus reigned on Earth as a king and high priest. Interestingly enough, Yeshua will never be a king or high priest on this Earth, and so it's impossible, just from this standpoint that He was the King and High Priest of Salem (cf. Heb. 8:4).

The Genesis account speaks of Melchizedek as ruling in Salem as its King and High Priest. This is the assessment of Judaism, as the following three Jewish commentaries, that don't have the advantage of Hebrews 7:1-4, or at the very least, don't believe that Jesus is the Messiah of Israel, teach.

The Chumash is a respected Orthodox Jewish commentary on the first five books of the Bible (Genesis through Deuteronomy), commonly called Torah. It states that the Jewish Sages identify Melchizedek,

"as Shem, son of Noah...As the most honored of Noah's children, Shem was made the priest of God in Jerusalem (Ramban)."¹⁵

The Jewish Publication Society Torah Commentary also speaks of Shem being Melchizedek. Noted Jewish scholar Nahum Sarna describes Melchizedek as a *man*, a non-Hebrew, who worshiped the one true God. Sarna writes,

"Nothing is known of this priest-king who suddenly emerges from the shadows, and as suddenly, retreats into oblivion, as far as the biblical tradition is concerned. He is patently regarded as monotheist, one of the few select non-Israelite individuals who, in the scriptural view, preserved the original monotheism of the human race in the face of otherwise universal degeneration into paganism."¹⁶

Speaking of Canaan generally, and of Salem in particular, Sarna reveals that the Assyrian and the Hittite kings also functioned as high priests. He writes that it isn't known if,

¹⁵ Rabbi Nosson Scherman and Rabbi Meir Zlotowitz, General Editors, *The Chumash*, The Stone Edition, 2nd edition: 2nd impression (Brooklyn, New York: Mesorah Publications, Ltd., 1994), p. 65. *Ramban* is an acronym for Rabbi Moses ben Nachman, also known as Nachmanides (1194-1270). He was a leading Jewish scholar, Sephardic rabbi, philosopher, physician, Kabbalist and biblical commentator. He was born in Spain and died in Acre, Israel. He is also considered to be an important figure in the re-establishment of the Jewish community in Jerusalem following its destruction by the Crusaders in 1099.

Targum Jonathan, Targum Yerushalmi and the Babylonian Talmud speak of Melchizedek as a "nickname" for Shem. See Targum Jonathan and Targum Yerushalmi for Bereishith 14:18-20; Talmud Bavli; Nedarim 32b, etc.

¹⁶ Nahum M. Sarna, *Genesis*, The Jewish Publication Society Torah Commentary (Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society, 1989; Accordance Bible Software), p. 109.

[Nahum Sarna](#) (1923-2005) "was a modern biblical scholar who is best known for his study of Genesis and Exodus, represented in his *Understanding Genesis* (1966) and in his contributions to the first two volumes of the *JPS Torah Commentary* (1989/91)." (The "first two volumes..." means Genesis and Exodus.)

“the fusion of the royal and priestly offices was characteristic of the Canaanite city-states or was peculiar to Salem. In Assyria and among the Hittites, the king was also high priest, but such was not the case in Babylon,” yet “in the Phoenician sphere, at least in the Persian era, the king of Sidon styles himself “priest of Astarte.””¹⁷

The idea of a royal priesthood, the king being the high priest, was not foreign to paganism, and so Melchizedek, being the royal priest of Salem, is not unique. In other words, being king and high priest of a city doesn't mean that Melchizedek had to be Jesus, who is our King of Israel and its High Priest. For Sarna and the Jewish Sages, Melchizedek was a human being.

In *The Jewish Study Bible* Adele Berlin notes that Melchizedek was a Gentile, like Adam and Noah, etc., who worshiped the “God of Israel” and that this isn't “unusual in Genesis.”¹⁸ Here though, Melchizedek is an asterisk in Canaan, *a land steeped in pagan worship*. Berlin too sees Melchizedek as a man.

None of the three Jewish sources even suggest that Melchizedek was anything but a human being. That's because there is nothing in Gen. 14:18-20 that even hints at Melchizedek being anything other than a normal man. There are some Christians who think that the Essenes, a splinter group of Jewish men living in the desert around the time before and after Jesus, taught that Melchizedek was an angel, but they weren't speaking of Melchizedek. One of their titles for the angel Michael was the King of Righteous, which translates closely to the name, Melchizedek, but is spelled differently. I'll speak more on this in the section on Qumran (p. 45).

Turning to some Christian commentaries explaining Melchizedek of Gen. 14, that have the advantage of knowing the *Letter to the Hebrews*, they too see Melchizedek as a man. The brilliant 19th century German theologian, C. F. Keil, wrote about the nature of Melchizedek, stating,

“there was something very significant in the appearance in the midst of the degenerate tribes of Canaan of this *king of righteousness and priest of the true God* of heaven and earth, without any account of his descent, or of the beginning and end of his life, so that he stands forth in the Scriptures, “without father, without mother, without descent, having neither beginning of days nor end of life.” *Although it by no means follows from this however, that Melchizedek was a celestial being* (the Logos” [i.e. Jesus], “or an angel.”¹⁹

“In all these respects the noble form of this king of Salem and priest of the Most High God *was a type of the God-King and eternal High Priest Jesus Christ*; a thought which is expanded in Heb. 7 on the basis of this account.”²⁰

Keil, even knowing Hebrews 7, didn't see anything supernatural about Melchizedek, but saw him as a man and a type of Jesus as king and high priest of Israel.

British theologian Gordon J. Wenham (born 1943) is said to be “one of the finest evangelical commentators” in Christianity. Writing for the *New Bible Commentary* he sees Melchizedek in Genesis as just a man—not the preincarnate Messiah, but again, a “type” of Messiah:

“Melchizedek, the priest-king of Salem...received Abram royally and laid out a banquet

¹⁷ Ibid., p. 110. Also, Marcus Dods states that in ancient times, the offices of king and high priest were combined, saying, “According to Aristotle (*Pol.* 3.14), the king in heroic times was general, judge *and priest*.” Marcus Dods, D.D., Author; W. Robertson Nicoll, Editor, C.H., D.D., LL.D., *The Expositor's Greek Testament*, Volume Four: *Hebrews* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, 2002), p. 306.

¹⁸ Adele Berlin, Marc Zvi Brettler, and Michael A. Fishbane, eds., *The Jewish Study Bible*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004; Accordance Bible Software), paragraph 436.

[Adele Berlin](#) (born 1943 in Philadelphia) “is an American biblical scholar and Hebraist....She has also written commentaries on Zephaniah, Esther and Lamentations...In 2004 the Jewish Book Council awarded Berlin, along with co-editor, Marc Zvi Brettler, the scholarship category award for the Jewish Publication Society and Oxford University Press book, *The Jewish Study Bible*,” which is where our quotes come from.

¹⁹ Keil, *The Pentateuch*, p. 133.

²⁰ Ibid., pp. 133-134.

for him.” Melchizedek is a “type” of Christ, a forerunner of the Messiah.”²¹

Melchizedek being “a type of Christ” means that Wenham sees Melchizedek’s name and the city he reigned over as picturing the character and Kingdom of Yeshua—righteous and peaceful, respectively. It also speaks of both of them as royal priests, something we don’t find in Israel, with the high priest coming from the Tribe of Levi and the House of Aaron, and the king coming from the Sons of David.

Wenham also realized that “bread” in Genesis 14:18 meant food and correctly speaks of Melchizedek making a feast for Abram and everyone with him. In other words, it wasn’t that Melchizedek just provided bread and wine.²²

Some like to equate the “bread and wine” that Melchizedek brought out for Avram (i.e. Abram) and his people, with communion. They see this as a precursor to the Lord’s Body and Blood. Even though I’m sure there was bread and wine in the feast that Melchizedek provided for Avram & Co., as these were staples for the ancient peoples, it most likely *wasn’t unleavened bread*, which biblically is the only bread sanctioned by God for the taking of the Lord’s body.²³ Most churches, stripped of their Hebraic biblical inheritance, don’t know this and serve leavened bread for communion, which is a theological train wreck.

The bread for the last Passover of Yeshua, commonly misnamed the Last *Supper* by Roman Catholicism, which seeks to strip Jesus of His Jewish lifestyle, as for all Passovers, was unleavened bread. This is how our Lord could hold it up and say that it represented His (sinless) Body. *It’s a blatant and flagrant sin to have leavened bread at Passover* (Ex. 12:8, 15, 20), or for communion because leavened bread, taken as the Lord’s Body, symbolizes that His Body is full of sin.²⁴ His last meal was a Passover, which begins the seven day Feast of Unleavened Bread. No leavened bread *is even to be seen* during the seven days, let alone eaten, and so it’s certain that the bread at the Passover Table of Yeshua was unleavened, If it wasn’t He would have sinned because God demands it (cf. Ex. 12:8). Christians, taking leavened bread for communion portray the Lord’s Body as full of sin (cf. 1st Cor. 5:6-8), and the Christian eating it is taking sin unto himself.

The bread that Melchizedek brought for the feast was leavened bread. In that Scripture doesn’t speak of it being unleavened, it wasn’t. In other words, this “bread and wine” cannot be a symbol for communion. There was also much food there. It was a feast in honor of what God had done through Avram—not just bread and wine. The Hebrew word for bread also means “food in general.” *Easton’s Bible Dictionary* speaks of the “bread” being part of the refreshments that Melchizedek brought:

“Returning by way of Salem, i.e., Jerusalem, the king of that place, Melchizedek, came forth to meet them with refreshments.”²⁵

Theologian John Hartley, writing in the *New International Biblical Commentary*, sees Melchizedek as “the *model* of a priestly messiah,”²⁶ but Melchizedek was not the Messiah.

Some Christians think that the name “Melchizedek” was not actually the name of the man, but a title, like “Pharaoh.” The fourth Christian commentary explains that Melchizedek was the man’s real name. Thomas Whitelaw states that “Melchizedek” is “not a titular designation, like Augustus (or) Pharaoh...but

²¹ G. J. Wenham, *Genesis, New Bible Commentary: 21st Century Edition*; ed. D.A. Carson et al.; Accordance electronic ed. (Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press, 1994), p. 70. For more on Wenham see [Gordon Wenham](#).

²² See p. 3, note 6 for what *bread* in Scripture means.

²³ Compare Ex. 12:8; Mt. 26:26f.; Luke 22:1; 1st Cor. 5:6-8, and note 24.

²⁴ See my articles, [Passover and Jesus](#), and [Passover](#).

²⁵ *Easton’s Bible Dictionary* (Accordance Bible Software), paragraph 189.

²⁶ John E. Hartley, *New International Biblical Commentary: Genesis* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, Inc., 2002), pp. 149-150.

[John E. Hartley](#), PhD, “was a Distinguished Professor Emeritus of Old Testament at Azusa Pacific Seminary...A founding member of the graduate school, he served...for 40 years. Hartley sought to teach students methods of interpretation to help them become confident interpreters of Scripture. In his research, Hartley pursued extensive work in word studies and biblical theology.” It seems he died in 2019.

the name of a person,”

“neither an angel (Origen), nor the Holy Ghost (Hieracas)...which interpretations are *baseless* conjectures; nor Christ (Ambrose),²⁷ which is contrary to Hebrews 6:20...which Hebrews 7:3²⁸ sufficiently negates.”²⁹

The fifth Christian commentator speaks of an ancient religious cult in Salem that actually worshipped the one true God,³⁰ which most likely was Melchizedek. Sherrill Stevens writes,

“There are ancient sources, outside the Bible, that provide evidence of a cult in the Jerusalem area who worshiped “the Highest God.””³¹

Stevens may be referring to the same evidence that Jackson brought up about a king called Ebed Tob (see p. 4), who was a king of Jerusalem or it could have been Melchizedek if he wasn't Ebed Tob, or someone else. Stevens though, doesn't speak of Melchizedek having been Jesus.

These eight biblical scholars, three Jewish and five Christian, see Melchizedek as a *man*, not an angel or the preincarnate Jesus who actually ruled the city of Salem as its king and high priest because there's nothing in the Genesis passage to suggest otherwise. From the Christian scholars Melchizedek is a *type or model* of Jesus as the eternal King and High Priest of Israel (the New Jerusalem; cf. Rev. 21:1f.).

Another question arises concerning the alleged preincarnate Jesus being Melchizedek: If Jesus was Melchizedek what did He do with the tithe that Abram gave him? With a preincarnate Jesus it would seem that as soon as His time with Abram was over He would return to Heaven, *as He always did with all His other preincarnate appearances* to people in the Old Testament. This question cannot be answered biblically or intelligently. A preincarnate Jesus would never have accepted the tithe because He could not take it to Heaven with Him.³² This too reveals that Melchizedek was a man and not Jesus.

In closing, Shara Drimalla notes that Melchizedek is the first “genuine priest of the God of Israel...before Israel...existed.”³³ In other words Melchizedek is the prototypical high priest of the one true God that

²⁷ See [The Order of Melchizedek](#)—See A Sermon by St. Ambrose, AD (340-397), for what Ambrose says about Melchizedek. Ambrose was a Roman Catholic Bishop from 374-397. In his sermon Ambrose equates communion with what Melchizedek gave Abram, and that this Gentile (Melchizedek) had the bread and the wine, which he gave to the “Jew” Abram, which means for Ambrose that communion is older than anything Jewish and therefore, is better than anything Jewish. Roman Catholic theologians always seem to be looking for ways to denigrate anything “Jewish” (e.g. Mosaic Law), and Ambrose was no exception. Ambrose though, writes that Melchizedek was a man who “resembled” Jesus, and so Ambrose didn't think that Jesus was Melchizedek, even though Thomas Whitelaw seemed to think so. Ambrose goes on to try and prove that the Catholic bread and wine, when consecrated by the priest, actually becomes the literal body and blood of Jesus, but this heresy is akin to magic. Some say that Ambrose thought Melchizedek was Christ, but it's hard to see from this sermon of his, which speaks of Melchizedek resembling the Lord.

²⁸ “without father, without mother, without genealogy, having neither beginning of days nor end of life, but *made like* the Son of God, remains a priest continually” (Hebrews 7:3 NKJV).

²⁹ Whitelaw, *Genesis-Job*, paragraph 3,312.

³⁰ This is the first time in Scripture that the Hebrew “*El Elyon*,” the Most High God or God Most High (or shortened to just “Most High”), is seen. Interestingly enough, the demons speak of this to Yeshua as the Son of “the Most High God” (Mk. 5:7; Lk. 8:28), and Gabriel says this of the Father to Mary about Jesus being “the Son of the Highest;” Lk. 1:30-32), and Yeshua as the Son of “the Most High” God (Lk. 6:35).

³¹ Sherrill G. Stevens, *Layman's Bible Book Commentary*, vol. 1, *Genesis* (Nashville, Tennessee: Broadman Press, 1979), p. 61, note 6 referring to Charles M. Laymon, ed., *The Interpreter's One-Volume Commentary on the Bible* (New York: Abingdon Press, 1971), p. 29.

[Sherrill Stevens](#) “served 48 years in churches in North Carolina, Kentucky, and Virginia. He” had a “Ph.D from Southern Baptist Theological Seminary.”

³² Compare Judges 13:3, 15-16, 19-21.

³³ [The Royal Priest—Abraham and Melchizedek](#) by Shara Drimalla and *The Bible Project*.

Gareth Cockerill writes that the Author of Hebrews is not, “particularly concerned with Melchizedek's being the first priest mentioned in Scripture. Rather, the Genesis passage provides a legitimate basis *for showing Melchizedek's superiority to Abraham and thus to the Levitical priestly order.*” Gareth Lee Cockerill, Author; Gor-

Scripture speaks of, even before Israel had Aaron, its first High Priest. This fact, of Melchizedek being before Aaron, and that he was a king and high priest, while Aaron was only Israel's High Priest, sets the stage for Yeshua's eternal kingship and high priesthood to eclipse and surpass Aaron's priesthood.

The chief points against the "Jesus was Melchizedek" teaching is that there is not a hint that Jesus was Melchizedek in the passage, let alone does Scripture say that Melchizedek was the Messenger of Yahveh, or God (the Son). Scripture presents Melchizedek as a man; a king and a high priest of a city in Canaan.

Also, nowhere in the Bible is Jesus ever seen as being a king or a high priest on Earth at anytime or anywhere. Not even today is Jesus a priest on Earth, as Hebrews clearly speaks of, and so it's certain He wasn't the king and high priest of Salem:

"For if He were on Earth, He would not be a priest, since there are priests who offer the gifts according to the Law of Moses." (Hebrews 8:4; cf. 4:14-15; 7:1, 15, 21; 8:1)

The Covenant is Passed on to Abram

Alfred Edersheim brings up an interesting perspective for the blessing that Melchizedek gave to Abram. He speaks of the Covenant that the Lord had made with Noah³⁴ about 370 years earlier³⁵ being symbolically passed on to Abram through Shem (or one of his descendants) as Melchizedek. Noah said to Shem: "Blessed is Yahveh, the God of Shem, and may Canaan be his servant" (Genesis 9:26). With the man Canaan and his descendants being in the land named after him, Shem would become his master in Canaan's own land (i.e. the land of Israel). Hence, Melchizedek, as the King and High Priest of Salem, symbolically ruled over Canaan, both the people and the land.

Edersheim thought that Melchizedek might have been a descendant of Shem, although it's more probable that Melchizedek was actually Shem, as Shem outlived Father Abraham.³⁶ Abram most likely knew Shem, or knew of him, before his encounter with him as Melchizedek in Genesis 14, and hence, no need for either man to introduce himself to the other man.

Be that as it may, the blessing of Melchizedek to Abram "inherently" included and confirmed *ownership of the land of Canaan to Abram*, something that God had spoken of to Abram in the previous chapter (Gen. 13:14-17). It's like Melchizedek/Shem was confirming and "passing the Torch" unto Abram. Edersheim writes,

don D. Fee, Editor, New International Commentary of the New Testament: *The Epistle to the Hebrews* (Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2012), p. 296.

[Gareth Lee Cockerill](#) (1944 to present). "Notable works: *The Epistle to the Hebrews* (NICNT). Other material by Cockerill include his *Melchizedek without Speculation: Hebrews 7:1-25 and Genesis 14:17-24*."

³⁴ "And as for Me, behold! I establish My Covenant with you and with your descendants after you." (Genesis 9:9).

³⁵ Noah was born in the year 1056 From Creation (FC). Adding 601 years to that for after the Flood, when God made the Covenant with him, gives us 1657 FC (cf. Gen. 5:32; 7:11; 9:8-9f.). Abraham was born in 1946 FC. Adding 80 years to that, an approximate time when Abraham met Melchizedek, gives us 2026 FC or 369 years since God made the Covenant with Noah.

³⁶ Shem was born 1,556 years From Creation (FC) and died 2,156 years FC. Shem lived to be 600 years old. Abram was born 1,946 years FC, and died 2,121 years FC. Abraham lived to be 175 years old. In other words, as incredible as it may seem, Shem, the 11th generation from Adam, actually outlived the 20th generation from Adam, Abraham, by 35 years. Shem was alive when Jacob was born, and Shem died only five years before Isaac died.

Shem was born in 2525 BC, while Abraham was born in 2135 BC (cf. Gen. 5:32; 11:11, 26; 25:7). Abram came to Canaan when he was 75 years old (Gen. 12:4). If Abram was 80 years old when he met Melchizedek, in Gen. 14:18-20, it would have been 2,026 years FC. When Abram was 80 years old, Shem would have "only" been 470 years old, and lived 130 years after that. So it's quite possible that Shem was Melchizedek, for Shem knew the one true God from his father Noah. It's also possible that any one of a number of Shem's progeny was Melchizedek, whom Abram would have known or known about, for Abram was a direct descendant of Shem. See my Chronological Chart on p. 43.

“we stand here at the threshold of two dispensations. The covenant with Noah...*was merging* into that with Abram...Melchizedek was probably...of the race of Shem in the land of Canaan, which was now in the hands of the Canaanites, who were the children of Ham” (and Canaan). “It was the old transferred to the new...Melchizedek transferred his title deed to the land to Abram, “while Abram” gave “tithes to Melchizedek, and humbled himself “to receive his blessing.””

Edersheim too rejects the notion that Jesus was Melchizedek, saying that even though Melchizedek was without any genealogy, and that Scripture doesn’t record his birth or death, it doesn’t make him the preincarnate Christ because Edersheim believes it was God’s intention to exclude those details. This way Melchizedek could be a type of Jesus in His being the Royal Priest of Israel. He states,

“amid the abundance of genealogical details of that period we know absolutely nothing of” Melchizedek’s lineage “in the roll of kings...his birth and death remain unmentioned...*that silence must have been intentional, and its intention typical...*designed to point forward to corresponding realities in Christ. What lay in germ” form “in Melchizedek was to be gradually unfolded—the priesthood of Aaron and the royalty in David—till both were most gloriously united in Christ. Melchizedek was, however, *only a shadow and a type; Christ is the reality and the antitype*. That Melchizedek was *not* Christ Himself *is evident from the statement that he was “made like unto the Son of God”* (Heb. 7:3). “It is for this reason that Scripture has shut to us the sources of historical investigation about his descent and duration of life, that by its silence it might point to the heavenly descent of”³⁷ Yeshua.

As we’ll see in the section on Hebrews 7:3,³⁸ the very phrase that some Christians think makes Melchizedek the preincarnate Jesus, is actually the phrase that torpedoes their idea. Being “*made like* the Son of God” obviously excludes Melchizedek from having *been* the Son of God. Edersheim becomes our sixth Christian theologian to speak against Melchizedek being the Christ.

None of the three Jewish scholars even suggested that Melchizedek might have been divine or heavenly, while the six Christian theologians made no attempt to establish Melchizedek as the preincarnate Jesus because there’s nothing in the text of Gen. 14:18-20, or anywhere else in the Old Testament, that clearly presents Melchizedek as deity. Melchizedek was a real person, the King and High Priest of Salem, just as Scripture presents him. Blessing Abram and receiving a tithe from him does not make Melchizedek the preincarnate Jesus, even if his name and city speak of righteousness and peace, but it does symbolically act as a divine bridge between the Covenant that God had with Noah and the Covenant that God made with Father Abraham.

Interestingly enough, in Jerusalem, archeology has found a site which they call the First Temple, preceding Solomon’s by more than a thousand years. It’s also called the “Temple of Melchizedek.” In other words, Solomon’s Temple wasn’t the first temple dedicated to the one true God in Jerusalem. It’s located south of where Solomon’s Temple Mount would be built, on the east side of “the City of David,” at ground level.³⁹ Archeologists believe this is the temple where Melchizedek performed his priestly duties.

³⁷ Alfred Edersheim, *Bible History: Old Testament* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Pub., 2003), pp. 60-61.

Alfred Edersheim (1825–1889) was a Jewish Viennese man who became a Christian. He was an ordained minister in both the Free Church of Scotland and the Anglican Church of England, and was a biblical scholar *par excellence*. In his time he was the foremost authority on Jesus, the Talmud and the Pharisees. His knowledge and understanding is insightfully brought out in his classic book, *The Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah* (1883).

³⁸ Page 17f.

³⁹ [Melchizedek’s Temple](#). See also [Where Abraham Met Melchizedek](#).

MELCHIZEDEK IN PSALM 110

Melchizedek is mentioned in Psalm 110:4. In verse one King David sees both the Father and the Son, and says of the latter, “my Lord.”⁴⁰ Of course, David’s Lord is Jesus. Verse one has David saying,

“Yahveh” (the Father) “said to my Lord (i.e. Yeshua), “Sit at My right hand until I make Your enemies Your footstool.”” (Psalm 110:1)

“Yahveh” (the Father) “*has sworn* and will not change His mind” (or revoke it), “You” (David’s Lord, v. 1, Messiah Yeshua) “are a Priest forever according to the Order of Melchizedek.” (Psalm 110:4)

King David must have been shocked by this vision from God about his Lord, the Messiah, being a High Priest “according to the Order of Melchizedek.” How could the Messiah be a king-priest when the two offices were separated by men from two different Tribes?

The kingship for Israel would eventually go to the Tribe of Judah, after Saul of the Tribe of Benjamin forfeited it. All future legitimate Kings of Israel would have to come from Judah, and specifically from King David (2nd Sam. 7:5-17f.). Yeshua was no exception (Heb. 7:14).⁴¹ Upon a simple understanding of Mosaic Law (cf. Gen. 49:10), the two offices of king and priest in Israel could never be combined, and they never will be.⁴² In Psalm 110:4 *another* priesthood of the Order of Melchizedek, because it’s for another Covenant and another Israel (cf. Gal. 6:16; Heb. 7:11, 15).

This radical concept is confirmed as God’s will, 600 years later, in a prophetic word by Zechariah. He says that the offices of king and high priest for (the new) Israel will come together or be combined in a man called “The Branch,” which is one of many Old Testament Messianic “names” for the Messiah of Israel.⁴³ Zechariah the Prophet declares,

“Thus says Yahveh of Hosts! Behold! The Man whose name is The Branch! From His place *He shall branch out* and He shall build the Temple of Yahveh! Yes! He shall build the Temple of Yahveh! He shall *bear the Glory* and He shall *sit and rule on His Throne* (i.e. as king). *So He shall be a (High) Priest on His Throne* and the counsel of Shalom” (*God’s Peace*) “shall be between them both.” (Zechariah 6:12-13)⁴⁴

“His Throne” is mentioned twice. It speaks of the Kingdom and the King named The Branch. He will sit on His Throne and also be its High Priest—just like Melchizedek. The Branch “shall build the Temple of Yahveh.” As we know from the God given wisdom of Joseph (Genesis 42:32), the mentioning of two things twice means that God has already established this and certainly intends to bring it to pass. This would be fulfilled in God’s Son a thousand years after David wrote Psalm 110.

The Illustrated Bible Dictionary brings out the explanation for the Davidic Messiah to be modeled after the Order of the King-Priest Melchizedek, superseding the temporal Priesthood of Aaron by saying,

“In Ps. 110:4 a Davidic king is acclaimed by divine oath as “a priest for ever after the order of Melchizedek”...If Jesus is the Davidic Messiah, he” therefore must also “be the “priest forever after the order of Melchizedek.” This inevitable conclusion is drawn by the writer to the Hebrews, who develops his theme of our Lord’s *heavenly* priesthood on

⁴⁰ “Yahveh said to *my* Lord, “Sit at My right hand until I make Your enemies Your footstool”” (Psalm 110:1).

⁴¹ For how Yeshua came from the line of David, see my article, [The Davidic Lineage of Messiah Yeshua](#).

⁴² “For if He were on Earth, *He would not be a Priest*, since there are Priests who offer the gifts” i.e. animal sacrifices “according to the Law” (Hebrews 8:4).

⁴³ See [The Names of the Messiah of Israel](#). For more on *The Branch*, and where the term comes from, see my article, [Yeshua The Branch?](#)

⁴⁴ See 2nd Samuel 7:11-13 for God’s promise to King David, that a son of David will not only rule forever, but also build Yahveh a House or Temple.

the basis of Ps. 110:4, expounded in the light of Gn. 14:18f., where Melchizedek appears and disappears suddenly, with nothing said about his birth or death, ancestry or descent, *in a manner which declares his superiority to Abram* and, by implication, to the Aaronic priesthood descended from Abram. *The superiority of Christ and his new order to the Levitical order of OT times is thus established (Heb. 5:6-11; 6:20-7:28).*⁴⁵

Also, Aaron wasn't made a priest by an oath, and Melchizedek, blessing Abram and receiving his tithe reveals that he was greater than Father Abraham, and subsequently, greater than the Aaronic Priesthood that came from the loins of Abram. Melchizedek blessed Abram.

The superiority of Melchizedek to Abram, and therefore the priesthood of Melchizedek to the priesthood of Aaron, and consequently that of Yeshua's royal priesthood, is seen in that,

1. Yeshua is the eternal King and High Priest of Israel, while the Kings of Israel and Aaron and his Sons died. Also,
2. Yeshua was sinless, but all the kings and priests, including David and Aaron, sinned and,
3. Yeshua, as God's Sacrificial Lamb for Israel's redemption, was an infinitely greater sacrifice than all the animal sacrifices that Aaron and his Sons performed combined.
4. Finally, Yeshua is God the Son, and so His sacrifice does things that animal sacrifice could never do: transform our nature and give us eternal Life

Thus the *Foundation* for the New Covenant is better or greater than the Old, with its promise of glorification and eternal Life better than all the blessings of the Promised Land although they symbolically parallel one another. "All the New" is "in the Old," in picture or symbolic form, including Yeshua's kingship and high priesthood "according to the Order of Melchizedek." The New Covenant does not invalidate the priesthood of Aaron, while this Earth remains (cf. Mt. 5:18). The New operates concurrently and outside the Covenant that God made with Israel at Mt. Sinai because it is a heavenly priesthood and Christians are in the Kingdom of Heaven on Earth (cf. John 18:36).

The eternal king-priest of Israel was actually embedded within "Mosaic Law" in Melchizedek, for Genesis is part of Mosaic Law, which in Hebrew is Torah and literally means the Teaching-Instructions of God. To King David God reveals that David's Lord would be a royal High Priest, like Melchizedek (Psalm 110:4). In other words, Messiah's royal Priesthood "was always there in Melchizedek." It just had to be brought out by God, which is what He does in Psalm 110:4 (and He later confirms it in Zech. 6:12-13 and then more fully in the Letter to the Hebrews).

Christian theologian and scholar Franz Delitzsch sees something that most Christian theologians haven't seen, and that is that Yeshua's priesthood *does not invalidate* the Aaronic Priesthood. He writes,

"it is not intelligible how the priesthood of Jesus Christ, after the manner of Melchizedek, is meant to be a proof in favour of the termination of the Levitical priesthood, and to absolutely preclude its continuance."⁴⁶ (cf. Mt. 5:18)

The Priesthood of Aaron is still valid, even in New Testament times, and this certainly validates Mosaic Law for Christian lifestyle, in spite of the Church teaching against it, saying that the sacrifice of Jesus nullified the Temple, the Aaronic Priesthood and animal sacrifice (and Mosaic Law). The Aaronic Priests continued to offer sacrifice at the Temple in the days of the Apostles, *with the Apostle Paul leading the way*, affirming the validity of the Temple, the Aaronic Priesthood and animal sacrifice.⁴⁷ Sacrifice, the

⁴⁵ J. D. Douglas, M.A., B.D., S.T.M., Ph.D., organizing Editor, *The Illustrated Bible Dictionary*, Part 2 (Leicester, England: Inter-Varsity Press, 1998), p. 977.

"[The Illustrated Bible Dictionary](#) vividly depicts the art, architecture, archaeology, geography, anthropology and topography of the Bible...this three-volume reference is invaluable for visualizing the historical and cultural artifacts mentioned in Scripture...Detailed maps chart out biblical regions and important structures like the temple and tabernacle."

⁴⁶ Delitzsch, *Psalms*, p. 692.

⁴⁷ Interesting to note, and running totally counter to Christian theology on Mosaic Law, is the Apostle Paul taking

physical Temple in Jerusalem and the Aaronic Priesthood, and the *written* Mosaic Law as God’s Christian lifestyle,⁴⁸ will fade away when the New Jerusalem comes into view,⁴⁹ because Christians will then be like Jesus—who is the Living Word of God; the Living Torah or the Living Mosaic Law, as Mosaic Law was once literally verbally spoken by God to Moses for Israel and then written down (cf. Jer. 31:33 where the word for the “law” that God wants to place in our hearts is Torah or Mosaic Law; God’s Instructions).

David Stern writes of Psalm 110:1 that the Jewish “sages identify this person as the Messiah.”⁵⁰ In the three Synoptic Gospels Yeshua speaks of David’s Lord as the Messiah.⁵¹

In regards to Melchizedek and also David’s Son being high priests, when only “priest” is written, Franz Delitzsch writes,

“for the king of Salem was, according to Canaanitish custom, which admitted of the union of the kingship and priesthood, really a high priest...united in his own person the offices of David and of Aaron.”⁵²

The Hebrew word for “Order,” as in “according to the *Order* of Melchizedek,” is *דִּבְרָה* *div’rah*, a feminine noun and Brown says it means, “cause, reason, manner,”⁵³ while *The Hebrew-Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament* specifically has “manner”⁵⁴ for Psalm 110:4. The word is a simple, straight-forward and a non-theological term: King David’s Lord, the Messiah, David’s Son, would be a High Priest after the manner of, or according to the Order of Melchizedek’s Priesthood, which was a royal priesthood—a king was also a high priest, unlike the Order or manner of Aaron (cf. Heb. 7:11). Aaron’s priesthood didn’t include kingship. As Hebrews brings out, Melchizedek *symbolizes* an eternal order of a royal priest (cf. Heb. 7:1-3). Also, there was no priest before or after Melchizedek, as he was its first and last royal priest, nor was there any royal High Priest before, or will there be any royal High Priest after, Yeshua.

Psalm 110:4 says nothing of Melchizedek having been David’s preincarnate Son or that Melchizedek was deity. In other words, there’s nothing in v. 4 to suggest that the Lord of v. 1 was Melchizedek, or conversely, that the priest (Yeshua) “after the Order of Melchizedek” had been Melchizedek. Not here in the Psalm nor anywhere else in the entire Old Testament.

A question arises—why would the Father swear by an oath that David’s Lord *would be* a Priest “after the Order of Melchizedek,” if Jesus *had already been the Priest* Melchizedek? He would have already been a royal High Priest. It is grammatically impossible that the One *who would be* “after the Order of Melchizedek” could have also been the head of the Order—Melchizedek.

Zechariah witnesses what David said in Psalm 110—Messiah the Branch would be the royal High Priest of Israel. He also revealed that The Branch would build the Temple—not like the physical Tabernacle of Moses nor the Temple of King Solomon, as glorious as they were; for God dwelt in both of them, but a Temple made up of redeemed people. Yeshua’s Temple is made up of precious, living stones, Jewish and Gentile Christians, with Yeshua as the CornerStone (e.g. 1st Peter 2:4-7; cf. Ps. 118:22; Rev. 21:1f.).

the Nazarite Vow upon him, which entailed three animals sacrificed at its end (Num. 6:14). Also, his willingness to pay for four other Jewish Christians under the same Vow (Acts 21:20-24), which would have meant a total of at least 15 animals sacrificed (as this was the minimum required), 25 years *after* the Resurrection, to prove that he still kept Mosaic Law (Acts 21:24; also see 1st Cor. 5:6-8, where he encourages the Corinthians to keep Passover and the Feast of Unleavened Bread; also, see Hebrews 8:4).

⁴⁸ Compare Rom. 3:20b, 31; 7:12, 14, 16, 1st Cor. 5:6-8; 7:19; 11:1; 1st John 2:6; Rev. 12:17, etc.

⁴⁹ Compare Mt. 5:17-18; Lk. 16:17, and see my article, [Hebrews and the Change of the Law](#).

⁵⁰ David Stern, *The Complete Jewish Study Bible* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers Marketing, LLC, 2016), p. 1,021.

⁵¹ *Ibid.*, Stern says that “No psalm is referred to more in the” New Covenant “than this one” (Mt. 22:41-45; Mk. 12:35-37; Lk. 20:41-44).

⁵² C. F. Keil and F. Delitzsch, *Commentary on the Old Testament: vol. 5, Psalms* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, 2001; originally published by T. & T. Clark, Edinburgh, Scotland, 1866-91), p. 697.

⁵³ Brown, *A Hebrew and English Lexicon*, paragraph 4,366.

⁵⁴ Koehler, *The Hebrew-Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament*, vol. 1, p. 212.

MELCHIZEDEK IN HEBREWS SEVEN

Was Jesus Melchizedek? Or did the Author of Scripture (the Holy Spirit), intentionally leave out Melchizedek's lineage, etc., in order for the Author of Hebrews (the human writer of the Letter to the Hebrews), to use Melchizedek as a type or "picture" of Yeshua as the eternal King and High Priest of Israel? I'll present overwhelming and irrefutable biblical evidence that rejects the former and establishes the latter.

The major themes of the Letter to the Hebrews is that the New Covenant is "better" or "greater" than the Old Covenant, and that Messiah Yeshua is better or greater than Father Abraham and Moses, the great savior, prophet, priest, king and revealer of God's will (i.e. Mosaic Law) to Israel.⁵⁵ Also, Yeshua is a greater High Priest than Aaron and a greater sacrifice than all the bulls and goats ever sacrificed:

1. Yeshua is greater than the angels because He is God the Son (Heb. 1:1–2:5), and He is also,
2. Greater than Father Abraham because like Abraham, the progenitor and head of natural Israel, Yeshua is the progenitor and head of eternal Israel.⁵⁶ Scripture speaks of Abraham being "as good as dead" (Heb. 11:11-12) for him to have a son, and so in the natural it was impossible for him (and Sarah) to propagate a son to carry on his name through the Covenant and become the Father of the people known as Israel. Yeshua was literally dead, impossible for Him to be the Head of an eternal Israel that creates human beings to become like Him; yet Yeshua rose from the dead, glorified, to be the Head and progenitor of eternal Israel (Col. 1:15-18).
3. Yeshua's salvation is greater than Moses' salvation or deliverance of the Hebrews from Egypt because Yeshua's blood transforms Jews and Gentiles, and delivers them from sin, sickness, death and Satan, and gives them eternal life (Hebrews 1:1–4:14).
4. Yeshua is a greater High Priest than Aaron because Yeshua never sinned, will never sin and now, will never sin or die. He is the God-Man glorified and the *perfect* mediator between God the Father and Israel because He is both Man and deity (God the Son).
 - A. He is also more compassionate and forgiving toward His people Israel than Aaron and his Sons could ever be (Acts 13:39; Heb. 3:1-6; 4:14–7:28).⁵⁷
5. Yeshua's sacrifice of Himself (Heb. 7:26-27; 9:12, 26) is greater than all the bulls and goats because His sacrifice is that of the unique and sinless Son of God—the God-Man. He not only cleanses and forgives Christians of sin, as the goats and bulls did,⁵⁸ but His blood and body *transform* Christians from their carnal, sinful Adamic nature into the sinless and glorified human and divine nature of God the Son. Christians are truly a new creature (2nd Cor. 5:17). The Author of Hebrews calls the end product of this, *perfect* or *perfection*,⁵⁹ also known as eternal glorification.
6. The Priesthood of Melchizedek is greater than the Aaronic Priesthood, Aaron descending from Father Abraham, in that Abram honored Melchizedek with a tithe and the *lesser*, the Author states, tithed to the *greater* priesthood (Heb. 7:1, 4, 9). For Levi, the "Father" of Aaron, the first High Priest of Israel,

⁵⁵ Even though Moses is not literally called a king, in leading Israel out of Egypt and in the Wilderness he functions as a king. He is also Israel's greatest prophet, speaking with God face to face on many occasions, and acts as a priest before Aaron is ever consecrated to the office as high priest. Moses also speaks with God and receives all of Torah. In this he is a perfect prototype of Messiah Yeshua who is Israel's eternal King and High Priest, as well as the revealer of God's words or instructions to Israel.

⁵⁶ 1st Cor. 15:45, 47; 2nd Cor. 5:17; Gal. 6:16; Col. 1:15-18; Heb. 11:11-12; Rev. 21:1-2, 10, 12, 14, 16, 19.

⁵⁷ Ligon Duncan, [Jesus and Melchizedek](#).

Jennings Ligon Duncan III is an American Presbyterian scholar and pastor.

⁵⁸ See Lev. 4:20, 26, 31, 35; 5:10, 13, 16, 18; 6:7; 19:22; Heb. 9:24-26.

⁵⁹ See Hebrews 2:10; 5:9; 7:28; 9:12; 10:14, 17; cf. Jer. 31:31-34; Heb. 8:10; 10:16; 11:140; 12:23, and also my article, [Hebrews and the Change of the Law](#).

was “in the loins of Abram” when Abram met Melchizedek that day. Yeshua’s Priesthood is *after the Order or Manner of Melchizedek’s*, which makes it an eternal royal priesthood, *with no need for lineage from Aaron*, and no priestly father to pass the priesthood down to Him and no priest to follow Him. Aaron’s though, will end when the Heavens and this Earth melt away on Judgment Day.⁶⁰ Then the Aaronic Priesthood and Temple sacrifice, and the written Mosaic Law will come to an end.

The Author of the Letter to the Hebrews speaks of Melchizedek in chapters five, six and seven. Hebrews Seven provides words and phrases that some Christians, not understanding The Hebraic Perspective that the Author speaks in, misinterpret to mean that the preincarnate Jesus was Melchizedek. Christians who believe that Jesus was Melchizedek interpret most of, but not all of, Hebrews 7:1-4 literally, as well as some other verses in Seven, as proof that Jesus was Melchizedek because,

1. Symbolically, “King of Salem” means “King of Peace,” and Jesus is certainly *the* King of Peace and,
2. The name Melchizedek can be translated as King of Righteousness and of course, Jesus is *the* King of Righteousness and,
3. Without lineage nor “beginning of days nor end of life,” can seem to apply to Jesus as God the Son before time while,
4. It’s written that Melchizedek lives in perpetuity (i.e. continually), which is also a proof for them that Melchizedek had to be Jesus and,
5. Melchizedek receiving a blessing and a title from Abram proves, for them, that Jesus was Melchizedek.⁶¹

Unfortunately they don’t interpret literally or even properly the phrase that Melchizedek was “*made like the Son of God*” (Hebrews 7:3c). As is obvious from just the English translation of the phrase, anyone “like” someone else *cannot be the person they are like*.

Their five points, as well as others, will be refuted and given the proper biblical understanding, with “made like” fully explained in order to realize that Jesus wasn’t Melchizedek, but that the Author is using Melchizedek to more fully reveal a glorious perspective on Messiah Yeshua that we don’t find anywhere else in the New Testament—that of Yeshua being the eternal King *and* High Priest of Israel.⁶²

Before commenting on Chapter Seven though, there’s a verse in Chapter Six that merits looking at in our search for God’s Truth about whether Jesus was Melchizedek or not.

Hebrews 6:20 and Having Become High Priest

Hebrews 6:20 reveals that Yeshua’s Priesthood did not historically begin in Melchizedek’s time, but rather after His Resurrection. If Yeshua had been Melchizedek, Yeshua *would have already been* a high priest in Abram’s time and also when He was born in Bethlehem. There would have been no need for Hebrews 6:20 to speak of Jesus “*having become* High Priest forever, *according to the Order of Melchizedek*. Most English translations speak of Yeshua *having become* High Priest forever, although some equally say “was made,” translating the Greek word γίνομαι (*geeno’my*). It means “to come into existence, be made...to come into being.”⁶³ Hebrews 6:20 says of Yeshua that,

⁶⁰ Mt. 5:18; Ps. 97:5; Is. 51:6; Micah 1:4; Nahum 1:5; Heb. 8:13; 2nd Peter 3:10, 12.

⁶¹ As an aside, the Author of Hebrews does not write of *Abram*, which is what Scripture calls him in Genesis 14 when he meets Melchizedek, but of Abraham. This isn’t unusual because God changed Abram’s name to Abraham three chapters later in Gen. 17:5. Since then, most every Jew, including our Author, refers to Abram as Abraham, even though Abraham was still Abram in Genesis 14. (Compare Gen. 12:1-4; Gen. 15:1-6; Acts 3:25; 7:2; 4:1-3, 9, 12-13, 16; Gal. 3:6, 8-9, etc.)

⁶² Hebrews 2:17; 3:1; 4:15; 5:6; 6:20; 7:1-2, 11, 17, 21, 26. See [The Davidic Lineage of Messiah Yeshua](#) for how Yeshua is of the lineage of David, but not of Aaron.

⁶³ γίνομαι Walter Bauer, augmented by William F. Arndt, F. W. Gingrich and Frederick Danker, *A Greek-English*

“the forerunner has entered for us, even Jesus, *having become* High Priest forever according to the Order of Melchizedek.” (Hebrews 6:20 NKJV)

Ahmayan voices the same concern and writes,

“Hebrews says that Jesus “was made” a High Priest (Heb. 6:20, or “*having become* High Priest forever”). How can Jesus Christ “be made” or become “High Priest *if he was already the High Priest Melchizedek?*” ...where did Jesus lose “his high priesthood as Melchizedek in the Old Testament.” Hebrews 7:3 states of Melchizedek—“neither having beginning of days nor end of life...*abideth a priest continually.*”⁶⁴ (Heb. 7:3d)

Ahmayan raises a valid point. If Yeshua had been Melchizedek, Yeshua would have already been a high priest—the High Priest and King of Salem. Scripture though, speaks of Yeshua only becoming high priest and entering into it after His Resurrection (cf. Acts 2:30, 36; Heb. 4:14; 5:5; 7:26; etc.).⁶⁵

Hebrews 7:1-3

¹“For this Melchizedek, *King of Salem and (High) Priest of the Most High God,*⁶⁶ who met Abraham returning from the slaughter of the kings and blessed Abraham,”

²“to whom also Abraham *gave a tenth* of all, first being translated “*King of Righteousness*” and then also, King of Salem, meaning “*King of Peace,*””

³“*without father, without mother, without genealogy, having neither beginning of days nor end of life, but made like the Son of God, remains a (High) Priest continually.*”

Some might question why I see Melchizedek as the High Priest of Salem, and not just as a priest, but not only does Scripture speak of Aaron the High Priest as just a “priest” some times, if Melchizedek is to parallel Yeshua, we know that Yeshua is Israel’s New Covenant High Priest (Heb. 2:17; 3:1; 4:14, etc.). Therefore, Melchizedek as King of Salem was also Salem’s High Priest (even if he is only called its priest, and he’s the only priest). The King of Salem is not going to be “just a priest” (cf. Heb. 5:5-6, 10; 6:20)⁶⁷ like Itamar, son of Aaron, but like Israel’s High Priest, as his older brother Elazar was.

Made Like or Resembling the Son of God

The most powerful point in Scripture, that Jesus was *not* Melchizedek, is found in Hebrews 7:3. It is the Greek word that’s translated into English as “made like” or “resembling” the Son of God. The Greek word reveals that Melchizedek was a *picture* of Yeshua (as Israel’s royal High Priest), but not Yeshua. The Greek word is ἀφομοιωμένος (*afomoiomaynos*) and is equally translated into English as “made like,” “like” or “resembling.” The following 10 English Bibles have the three synonymous words for *afomoiomaynos* in Hebrews 7:3c:

Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature (third edition, 2001; Accordance Bible Software), p. 197.

Bauer’s [Lexicon](#) is described as an “invaluable reference work” (Classical Philology) and “a tool indispensable for the study of early Christian literature” (Religious Studies Review).”

⁶⁴ [This Proves Melchizedek is Not Christ!!!](#) by Ahmayan.

⁶⁵ The Old Testament biblical concept of “Messiah” (or Christ) included both kingship and priesthood (see 2nd Samuel 7:12f.; Ps. 110:1, 4; Zech. 6:12-13).

⁶⁶ This phrase can be translated either way for Heb. 7:1, as the “Most High God” (ESV, HCSB, KJV, NASB, NET, NKJV), or “God Most High” (ASV, NIV).

The same is true of Gen. 14:18: “Most High God” (KJV, NET) and “God Most High” (ASV, ESV, HCSB, NASB, NET, NIV, NKJV, NRSV). One phrase is equal to the other, and either way it’s written it’s correct.

⁶⁷ See Sarna p. 6f. for why Melchizedek was Salem’s High Priest and also Franz Delitzsch, p. 14.

1. ASB, KJV, NASB, NKJV, WEB⁶⁸“but *made like* unto the Son of God...”
2. NET,⁶⁹ NIV“but is *like* the son of God...”
3. ESV,⁷⁰ HCSB,⁷¹ NRSV.....“but *resembling* the Son of God...”

The English words are similar and mean, “*to be made like, rendered similar*,”⁷² and to “resemble.”⁷³ The three different translations for the word and the phrase mean the same thing. The Author of Hebrews is clearly and unequivocally saying that Melchizedek *resembled* or *was like* Yeshua—not that he was Yeshua. If a Toyota Camry is *like* or *resembles* a Ford Fusion, it’s obvious that a Camry is not a Fusion.

Melchizedek was symbolically a picture of Yeshua as the eternal King and High Priest of Israel because of his name, the city he ruled over, no mention of his birth or his death, and his lack of lineage in Scripture. *This* is what allows the Author of Hebrews to speak of Melchizedek as still being alive. This is how God can say in Psalm 110:4 that David’s Son will be the King and High Priest of Israel *according to the Order of Melchizedek*, whose order is that of kingship and priesthood and symbolically eternal. Melchizedek becomes the historical foundation for Yeshua’s Royal Priesthood. Yeshua though, is the standard, existing long before Melchizedek. Ligon Duncan says that Melchizedek is *modeled after* Jesus, not the other way around. This is an important point:

“Hebrews 7:1-10 does not argue that *Jesus is like Melchizedek*. It argues that *Melchizedek is like Jesus*.” Melchizedek “is without father or mother or genealogy, having neither beginning of days nor end of life, but *resembling* the Son of God. *Now that’s a statement about Melchizedek...*The author of Hebrews is saying that Jesus is not like this figure who existed” in Abram’s time, “but *Melchizedek is like Jesus who existed eons before Melchizedek existed*. *It’s not simply...that Jesus is the fulfillment of an Old Testament foreshadowing; it’s that Melchizedek is the shadowing of someone who existed long before*” Melchizedek.⁷⁴

Here we have the *eternal* Son of God, his eternity being brought out by the silence of Scripture on Melchizedek’s lineage, his birth and death, and that his priesthood wasn’t passed on through a priest before him.

Wayne Jackson also brings up an obvious point about the Greek word that’s translated, *made like* or *resembling*. He says it’s a *comparison* between two different people:

“That Melchizedek was not the same person as Jesus is evident in that he is said to be

⁶⁸ WEB is the World English Bible.

⁶⁹ NET is the New English Translation.

⁷⁰ ESV is the English Standard Version.

⁷¹ HCSB is the Holman Christian Standard Bible.

⁷² ἀφομοιῶ Joseph H. Thayer, *Thayer’s Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament* (Edinburgh: T.&T. Clark, 1958; Accordance Bible Software, 2017), paragraph 1,995.

“For over a century, [Thayer’s](#) has been lauded as one of the best New Testament lexicons available for any student of New Testament Greek.”

⁷³ ἀφομοιῶ Bauer, *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*, p. 158.

⁷⁴ Duncan, [Jesus and Melchizedek](#).

Donald A. Hagner, Author; W. Ward Gasque, New Testament Editor, *New International Biblical Commentary: Hebrews* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, 1990), p. 102. “The parenthetical explanation of the meaning of Melchizedek and Salem” (in vv. 1-2) “is important because of the appropriateness of the titles in describing Christ, who is preeminently king of righteousness and peace. This supports the conclusion that *Melchizedek is like* the Son of God (v. 3).”

[Donald Alfred Hagner](#) (1936-present) “is an American theologian,” having taught at “Fuller Theological Seminary.” He has written a number of books, one of which is *Hebrews* (*New International Biblical Commentary*). His most recent work is *How New Is the New Testament? First-Century Judaism and the Emergence of Christianity*. He’s an ordained minister in the Presbyterian Church (USA).

“like unto” the Son of God (Heb. 7:3c). The participle *aphomoioo* denotes a *comparison* (e.g. a “copy” or “facsimile”)...*The term becomes irrelevant if the two persons were the same in identity.*”⁷⁵

The Greek word establishes that Jesus and Melchizedek could not have been the same person. Marcus Dods, quoting Davidson, says that Hebrews 7:1-2, that Melchizedek is seen as the king of righteousness and peace, is not to be taken literary. This is because of the Greek word in v. 3:

“*Such a comparison is decisive against attributing these characteristics to Melchizedek in a real sense. They belong to the portrait of him, which was so drawn that he was “made like” the Son of God—that by the features absent as well as by the positive traits a figure should appear corresponding to the Son of God and suited to suggest Him.*”⁷⁶

Jackson further offers a grammatical point that further solidifies the evidence that Jesus wasn’t Melchizedek. He speaks of the *differences* in the pronouns (the second and third person pronouns *you* and *his*) being used of Melchizedek in Psalm 110 compared to David’s Son (Yeshua the Messiah). He says that in Psalm 110 Yahveh,

“addresses David’s “Lord” (Jesus) “in the *second* person, while the reference to Melchizedek is in the *third* person (v. 4)...Accordingly, one should not make the mistake of identifying the ancient king-priest of Salem as Jesus Christ.”⁷⁷

Psalm 110:4 states,

“Yahveh has sworn and will not change His mind: **You**” (second person; David’s Lord, the Messiah, v. 1), “are a Priest forever according to the Order of Melchizedek!” (Ps. 110:4; third person, according to *his*, Melchizedek’s Order)

If Melchizedek and Yeshua were the same person the pronouns would have been similar (“You” and “Your;” not “You” and “his”).

The Greek word for “made like” raises three points against Jesus having been Melchizedek:

1. The Greek word in Hebrews 7:3 speaks of two different people.
2. The Greek word *always* distinguishes between two distinct people and,
3. Psalm 110 speaks of two separate people with its use of the second and third person pronouns.

According to Hebrews 7:3 and Psalm 110, Yeshua could not have been Melchizedek. That Melchizedek was “made like” the Son of God falls far short of Melchizedek *being* the Son of God.

Adding to this evidence is that the Greek word *aphomoioiomenos* can be seen as either an active participle or a passive participle. The former makes it plain to see that Jesus wasn’t Melchizedek, while the latter clearly reinforces the distinction of persons between Melchizedek and Yeshua.

⁷⁵ Jackson, [Was Melchizedek the Preincarnate Christ?](#)

Thayer, *Thayer’s Greek-English Lexicon*, pp. 89-90. A facsimile is an exact copy, especially of written or printed material...late 16th century (originally as *fac simile*, denoting the making of an exact copy, especially of writing); modern Latin from *fac!* (imperative of *facere* “make”) and *simile* (neuter of *similis* “like”). A simile is “a figure of speech involving the comparison of one thing with another thing of a different kind, used to make a description more emphatic or vivid.” For example, brave as a lion.

⁷⁶ Marcus Dods, D.D., Author; W. Robertson Nicoll, Editor, C.H., D.D., LL.D., *The Expositor’s Greek Testament*, Volume Four: *Hebrews* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, 2002), p. 308.

[Marcus Dods](#) (1834-1909) was a Scottish biblical scholar devoting “much time to the publication of theological books...In the *Expositor’s Bible* series he edited Genesis and First Corinthians.”

⁷⁷ Jackson, [Was Melchizedek the Preincarnate Christ?](#) See “Matthew 22:42-44 for Jesus’ application of this psalm to himself.” Ps. 110:1, all second person: (*You*; i.e. *Yeshua*), “*Sit here* until I make *Your* enemies *Your* footstool.” Psalm 110:4, “*You*” (*Yeshua*; second person) “are a priest forever according to the Order of Melchizedek” (third person; he/his; Psalm 110:4).

The Passive and Active Forms of the Greek Participle

Gareth Cockerill sees the Greek word as a perfect passive participle, meaning that the English translation should read, “having been made like the Son of God.”⁷⁸ He states,

“Melchizedek’s “eternity” is a reflection of the Son’s eternity in order that Melchizedek might be a pattern” picturing Yeshua. “There is no hint that the” Author “feared that Melchizedek’s “eternity” would make him the Son’s rival.”⁷⁹

With Melchizedek and Yeshua being two different people, Cockerill doesn’t see any encroachment upon Yeshua and His eternal being because Melchizedek’s eternity is only symbolic, having been *made like* the Lord.

Donald Guthrie states that the Greek word occurs only here in the New Testament, in Hebrews 7:3, and that Melchizedek is a copy or model of Yeshua, who is the Standard. Even though Yeshua came on the historical scene 2,000 years after Melchizedek, Yeshua is the pattern that Melchizedek is a copy of. Guthrie states that,

“The real key to the writer’s exegetical method is found in the phrase *resembling the Son of God*. The word translated *resembling* (*aphomoiomenos*) occurs only here in the New Testament. It is a suggestive word, used in the *active* of “a facsimile copy or model” and in the *passive* of “being made similar to.” It is because Jesus Christ is of the order of Melchizedek that the representative of the order is seen to be a model of the true. In other words, it is Christ’s priesthood that is the standard, not that of Melchizedek.”⁸⁰

Whether taken as a passive or active participle the Greek word clearly distinguishes that Melchizedek and Yeshua are two different men. Melchizedek though, is the only man in the Bible who symbolizes Yeshua as the eternal King and High Priest of Israel, the true King of Righteousness and Peace, as Hebrews brings out. Melchizedek was a man who was a picture of Yeshua due to Scripture being silent about his birth, death and lineage, etc. *The International Standard Bible Encyclopedia* confirms that the Greek participle *always* speaks of two different people:

“Some have thought that Melchizedek was a Christophany rather than a historical character and thus understood vv. 2b-3 *literally* rather than *typologically*. A major objection to such an interpretation is the statement that Melchizedek *resembled* (Gk. *aphōmoiōménos*) the Son of God (v. 3). The verb *aphomoiōō* *always* assumes two distinct and separate identities, one of which is a copy of the other.”⁸¹

An article for *Israel My Glory* also strikes down the idea that Yeshua was Melchizedek, saying that the Greek word for “made like” is the,

“language of *similarity, not identity*” and “is used to describe the relationship between the

⁷⁸ Gareth Lee Cockerill, Author; Gordon D. Fee, Editor, *New International Commentary of the New Testament: The Epistle to the Hebrews* (Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2012), p. 302, note 23; see also p. 177. See Bénétreau, 2:31-32; Ellingsworth, pp. 358-59; and O’Brien, p. 249.

[Gareth Lee Cockerill](#) (1944 to present). “Notable works: *The Epistle to the Hebrews* (NICNT). Other material by Cockerill include his *Melchizedek without Speculation: Hebrews 7:1-25 and Genesis 14:17-24*.”

⁷⁹ Ibid.

⁸⁰ Donald Guthrie B.D., M.Th., Ph.D., Author; Leon Morris, M.Sc., M.Th., Ph.D., General Editor, *Tyndale New Testament Commentaries: Hebrews* (Leicester, England: Inter-Varsity Press, 2000), p. 157. If “without father,” etc. is taken literally it, “Would suggest that Melchizedek must have been a heavenly being,” but “there is no suggestion in the Genesis narrative that Melchizedek was anything other than flesh and blood.” (All *italics* in this article are my way of emphasizing an important point, unless otherwise stated that it’s the author’s *italics*, aside of course, from *italicizing* book titles, and Greek or Hebrew transliterated words.)

[Donald Guthrie](#) (1916-1992) was a British New Testament scholar, best known for his *New Testament Introduction* (1962) and *New Testament Theology* (1981).”

⁸¹ Bromiley, *The International Standard Bible Encyclopedia*, Volume Three, p. 313.

two. Hebrews 7:3 states that Melchizedek was “*made like* unto the Son of God,” not that he actually was the Son of God.”⁸²

The Greek participle, whether seen as passive or active, clearly reveals that the Author of Hebrews is presenting Melchizedek and Yeshua as two distinct persons. Those who insist that Jesus was Melchizedek turn the English language upside down and “on its head,” taking it to hitherto unknown depths of folly, saying that the Greek word of for “made like” actually presents Jesus as Melchizedek. There is no honest debating with them at this juncture because they will not accept the plain meaning of the Greek word.

Type and Anti-Type

David Peterson sees Melchizedek as a *type* of Jesus in His eternal priesthood, and like Melchizedek, Yeshua’s priesthood is not based on physical descent from a prior priest. He says,

“Melchizedek is *like the Son of God* in the sense that he foreshadows his unique and never-ending priesthood. *In technical terms he is a “type” or pattern of Christ.* Psalm 110 envisaged the appearance of *another* king of Jerusalem (“city of Salem”) exercising a priesthood like Melchizedek’s, not apparently based on physical descent from any known priesthood, but nevertheless divinely appointed” (cf. Heb. 5:4).”⁸³

Ligon Duncan adds that Melchizedek is not only the type, with Yeshua being the anti-type, but that the anti-type *always exists before the type*.⁸⁴ He writes that this,

“is one reason why some of the older interpreters go back to Genesis 14 and they see it either as a Christophany or a theophany,⁸⁵ some sort of a preincarnate manifestation of Christ there in Melchizedek, *but the point is that Melchizedek is a type, and the type **always** has the reality existing **before** the type comes into the world. The type is there because the reality already exists*”⁸⁶ as the anti-type.

Melchizedek as king and priest, without any priestly lineage, is a type of Yeshua, just as Abraham was the progenitor of Israel and Moses the Savior, Law-giver, Prophet, Priest and King of Israel,⁸⁷ types of the Messiah or reflections of Yeshua before He came into the world as the Second Adam (1st Cor. 15:45, 47).

Remains a Priest Forever

The last phrase of Hebrews 7:3 is variously translated into English as “abideth,” “continues” or “remains” a priest “forever,” “continually,” “perpetually,” and “for all time.” Looking at the previous ten English Bibles, “forever” and “continually” dominate the translations (5x and 3x respectively), with “perpetually” and “for all time,” each being seen once:

⁸² *Jesus is Better Than Melchizedek*, [Israel My Glory](#), December/January 1993/1994.

⁸³ David Peterson, D. A. Carson, et. al., editors, *Hebrews*, New Bible Commentary: 21st Century Edition (Downers Grove, Illinois: InterVarsity Press, 1994; Accordance Bible Software), p. 1,336; cf. Hebrews 5:4-6; 7:13-17.

[David G. Peterson](#) (1944 to present) is a New Testament scholar, noted for his thesis titled, “The Concept of Perfection in the Letter to the Hebrews.”

⁸⁴ See Duncan, p. 18.

⁸⁵ A Christophany is “an appearance or non-physical manifestation of Christ. Traditionally the term refers to visions of Christ after His ascension, such as the bright light of the conversion of Paul the Apostle.”

A theophany is “a visible manifestation to humankind of God” (cf. Exodus 19:16, where God descends upon Mt. Sinai as Fire and Darkness, etc.). (Most of this was taken from [Christophany](#).)

⁸⁶ Duncan, [Jesus and Melchizedek](#).

⁸⁷ Even though the titles of priest and king are not spoken of for Moses in Mosaic Law, he functioned in those offices, actually anointing and consecrating Israel’s first official High Priest (Lev. 8–9), and shepherding Israel in the Wilderness, which is the main function of a king (to protect and to feed one’s people).

1. ASB“abideth a priest *forever*.”
2. ESV“continues a priest *forever*.”
3. HCSB, NIV, NRSV“remains a priest *forever*.”
4. KJV“abideth a priest *continually*.”
5. NKJV, WEB“remains a priest *continually*.”
6. NASB“abides a priest *perpetually*.”
7. NET“remains a priest *for all time*.”

The Greek word for “forever” or “continually,” etc., is διηνεκής (*dia'neh'kase*). It means,

“continuous, *without interruption, always of time...for all time, without interruption...for an unbroken reign...remains a priest for all time* (i.e. Melchizedek’s priesthood goes on without lapse).”⁸⁸

“*continuous...continually*.”⁸⁹

The Jewish Author of Hebrews uses this concept of “forever” because in the passage in Gen. 14:18-20 Melchizedek’s death is not mentioned. *Symbolically* then, the passage can be said to present Melchizedek as not having died, or still being alive or continuing to exist. Lenski remarks that, “The text does not say that Melchizedek functions” today, “but that he “remains” in perpetuity,”⁹⁰

“because of all that v. 3 has said of him, this Melchizedek is one who “has been made like the Son of God,” the perfect tense indicating *that he remains so*,”⁹¹ but it doesn’t mean he’s alive today and functioning as a high priest.

Dods states that, “It is the *permanence* of the Melchizedek priesthood on which stress is laid.”⁹² The Author of Hebrews obviously uses Melchizedek’s priesthood (and kingship) symbolically, for the Author is not saying that Melchizedek is still operating as the King and High Priest of Salem (Jerusalem) in the Author’s day! There isn’t any Scripture, nor historical evidence, to support that Melchizedek was alive in Jerusalem acting as its king and high priest when Yeshua was there. No one can honestly suggest that Yeshua was Melchizedek, and so that is who the Author is speaking of, because the Author has just squashed that equation by saying that Melchizedek *resembled* Yeshua or *was made like* Yeshua in the phrase just before this. Therefore, Melchizedek must represent or picture the eternal kingship and priesthood of Messiah Yeshua, whom Scripture reveals is operating today in the Heavens.

The Silence of Scripture

The silence of Scripture concerning Melchizedek pertains to his birth, his death, his lineage and how he came to be the King and High Priest of Salem. In this way Melchizedek can be compared to Yeshua as the

⁸⁸ διηνεκής Bauer, *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*, p. 245.

⁸⁹ διηνεκής Thayer, *Thayer’s Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament*, paragraph 2,868.

⁹⁰ R.C.H. Lenski, *Lenski’s Commentary on the New Testament; The Interpretation of the Epistle to the Hebrews and the Epistle of James* (Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1961; Accordance Bible Software), p. 214.

[Richard Charles Henry Lenski](#) (1864-1936) “was a German-born American-naturalized Lutheran pastor, scholar, and author who published a series of Lutheran New Testament commentaries...He was educated at Capital Univ. in its Theological Dept., “which were institutions of the Evangelical Lutheran Joint Synod of Ohio. He was ordained as a pastor in that synod in 1887, and served” in congregations in Maryland and Ohio. “In 1911, he became a professor of theology at Capital University in its theological department...Lenski’s major work was a 12-volume series of commentaries on the New Testament...Each contains a literal translation of the Greek texts and commentary from a traditional Lutheran perspective.”

⁹¹ *Ibid.*, p. 213.

⁹² Dods, *Hebrews*, p. 308.

eternal King and High Priest of Israel. Ken Barker writes that Melchizedek was,

*“a real, historical figure...but the author of Hebrews (in accordance with Jewish interpretation) uses the silence of Scripture about Melchizedek’s genealogy to portray him as a prefiguration of Christ. Melchizedek’s priesthood anticipates Christ’s eternal existence and his unending priesthood. Some believe the appearance of Melchizedek to Abraham was a manifestation of Christ before his incarnation, but the comparison, “like the Son of God,” (Heb. 7:3) “argues against such an interpretation.”*⁹³

Barker realizes that the Writer of Hebrews was using “Jewish interpretation” to present Melchizedek as a picture of Yeshua. He also notes that Melchizedek, being *like* the Son of God, is a *comparison* between the two and so he realizes that it’s not possible that Jesus was Melchizedek.

Leon Morris also speaks of the silence of Scripture concerning Melchizedek’s absence of lineage, etc., and adds that Melchizedek was mimicking Jesus. Morris writes,

*“just as the record says nothing of Melchizedek’s genealogy, so it says nothing of his birth or death. This further silence in Scripture points the writer to another truth about Jesus...his priesthood is without end...it is the Son of God who is the standard, not the ancient priest-king...Melchizedek is “made like” (aphomoiomenos) the Son of God, not that the Son of God is like Melchizedek. Thus it is not that Melchizedek sets the pattern and Jesus follows it. Rather, the record about Melchizedek is so arranged that it brings out certain truths that apply far more fully to Jesus than they do to Melchizedek. With the latter, these truths are simply a matter of record, but with Jesus they are not only historically true, they also have significant spiritual dimensions. The writer is, of course, speaking of the Son’s eternal nature, not of his appearance in the Incarnation.”*⁹⁴

David Stern further explains this silence of Scripture or “lack of information” and that the Jewish Author of Hebrews is writing in “a Jewish way,” as Ken Barker spoke of above (p. 23). He states that there was no need for the Author to actually say that Melchizedek was (just) a man and not the Messiah:

*“Not that Malki-Tzedek” (the Hebrew pronunciation of Melchizedek) “had no father, mother, ancestry, birth or death, but that the” Genesis account “contains no record of them. This fact enables the author to develop the” teaching “that Malki-Tzedek continues as a” priest “for all time, like the Son of God, Yeshua...Such a teaching is altogether Jewish in character” and so “it is irrelevant” (for the Author of Hebrews) “to point out, as do...critics, that Malki-Tzedek surely was born of parents and died like other men.”*⁹⁵

⁹³ Kenneth Barker et al., eds., *The NIV Study Bible* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1985; Accordance Bible Software), paragraph 24,775.

[Kenneth Lee Barker](#) (1931 to present) is “an American biblical scholar and professor of Old Testament and Hebrew...he was also one of the original translators of the New American Standard Bible and the New International Version Bible.”

⁹⁴ Leon Morris, Author; Frank E. Gaebelin, General Editor; J. D. Douglas, associate ed., *The Expositor’s Bible Commentary*, vol. 12, *Hebrews* (Grand Rapids, MI, USA: Zondervan, 1990; Accordance Bible Software), paragraph 58,719.

[Leon Morris](#) (1914-2006) was an Australian New Testament scholar...his first major book (was), *The Apostolic Preaching of the Cross*.” Other notable books were *The Atonement: Its Meaning and Significance; New Testament Theology*, and *The Gospel According to John* (part of the *New International Commentary on the New Testament* series), *The Gospel According to Matthew* (IVP/Eerdmans, 1992), *The Epistle to the Romans* (IVP/Eerdmans, 1988), and *The Book of Revelation: An Introduction and Commentary*...1987).”

⁹⁵ David Stern, *Jewish New Testament Commentary* (Clarksville, MD: Jewish New Testament Publications, 1992), p. 679.

[David Harold Stern](#) (1935-2022). Stern’s major works were the *Complete Jewish Bible*, and *The Jewish New Testament Commentary*. Stern was well noted in Messianic Jewish circles for his teachings, many of which were fine, but he heretically translates the Greek word “law” (i.e. Mosaic Law) in the New Testament as being “Torah-legalism.” It’s not “Torah-legalism” that Paul was coming against in Romans and Galatians, but the perverse use of Mosaic Law as a vehicle for salvation, along with faith in Jesus (cf. Gal. 5:4). The difference is significant.

Stern believes it was obvious to the Author and consequently, to his Jewish believing audience, that Melchizedek was a human being who had parents and died, and that the Holy Spirit intentionally didn't place that information in Scripture. This way Melchizedek could be a type or model of Yeshua.

Donald Guthrie states that if one takes ““without father, without mother, without genealogy,” etc., literally, that it,

“Would suggest that Melchizedek must have been a heavenly being,” but “*there is no suggestion in the Genesis narrative that Melchizedek was anything other than flesh and blood.*”⁹⁶

This relates to the biblical fact that every time the preincarnate Jesus, or an angel, shows up in the Old Testament it is written as such and people know it. *If Jesus had been Melchizedek* it would have been the only time in the entire Old Testament where Jesus “showed up,” but Scripture didn't reveal it *or even give the slightest hint that it was Him*, meaning that there were no miracles that Melchizedek performed or words that he said that would lead us to believe that Melchizedek was Jesus.

Rightfully esteemed 20th century scholar F. F. Bruce points out that Melchizedek is a wonderful reflection of Jesus, but that Jesus wasn't Melchizedek. He writes of the silence in Genesis and how Melchizedek can be said to be a priest *continually*:

“nothing is said of his birth, nothing is said of his death. *He appears as a living man, king of Salem and priest of God Most high*; as such he disappears...Melchizedek remains a priest *continually for the duration of his appearance in the biblical narrative*, but in the antitype, Christ remains a priest *continually* without qualification...it is not the type,” Melchizedek, “which determines the antitype, but the antitype,” Yeshua, “which determines the type. Jesus is not portrayed after the pattern of Melchizedek, *but Melchizedek is “made conformable to the Son of God.”*”⁹⁷

Because Melchizedek doesn't die or have someone take over for him as high priest (or king) in Scripture, both the Author of Hebrews *and God* (Ps. 110:4) use Melchizedek as a reflection or type of Yeshua in His eternal kingship and priesthood. In this biblically “Jewish” way of seeing the Scripture, Melchizedek remains alive, as Bruce speaks of, for the duration of his appearance. Obviously Melchizedek is not still alive, but it can be symbolically said that he is. Bruce speaks of Melchizedek's humanity stating it's,

“not suggested that” Melchizedek “was a biological anomaly, or an angel in human guise”⁹⁸...If this point had been put to our author” (of Hebrews), “he would have agreed at

For instance, it's legalistic to say, as the Pharisees did, that Jesus should not heal the (chronically) ill on the Sabbath day (e.g. Mt. 12:10f.; John 9:1f.), for every Sabbath healing was chronic in nature. On the other hand, it's a perversion of Mosaic Law to teach that, if one kept Mosaic Law, *one would be saved*, as the Pharisees taught, and also as the Christian Pharisees believed (that adding Christ to the keeping of Mosaic Law was needed for salvation; cf. Acts 15:1-5f.). For more on the legalism the Pharisees attached to Sabbath healing, and why they attacked Jesus over this, see my article, [Messiah—The Sent One](#), p. 3f. For why Mosaic Law is God's lifestyle for every Christian, see my book, [The Lifting of the Veil—Acts 15:20-21](#), and also my short, two page articles, [A Snapshot of Church History and Mosaic Law](#), [The Feasts of Israel and the Church](#), [The Two Triangles of the NT](#), [Illicit SEX and the Church](#) and [Take the Quiz! Five Quick Questions about the New Testament](#).

⁹⁶ Guthrie, *Hebrews*, p. 157.

⁹⁷ F. F. Bruce, Author; Gordon D. Fee, General Editor, *The New International Commentary on the New Testament: The Epistle to the Hebrews* (Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans Pub. Co., 1990), pp. 159-160.

[Frederick Fyvie Bruce](#) (1910-1990), usually cited as F. F. Bruce, was a Scottish biblical scholar who supported the historical reliability of the New Testament. His first book, *New Testament Documents: Are They Reliable?* (1943) was voted by...*Christianity Today* in 2006 as one of the top 50 books which “shaped evangelicals.” He wrote over 40 books and was also a scholar on the life and ministry of the Apostle Paul.

⁹⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 159, note 20 states, “In the early centuries AD, some *gnostic* circles regarded Melchizedek as an angelic power superior to all others (Hippolytus, *Refutation* 7.36; Epiphanius, *Panarion* 55). In *Pistus Sophia*, Melchizedek rules the realm of light as the Receiver...of Light (33a-35a, 179b-180a,” etc.). “Orthodox Christians had little difficulty in identifying him with the Son of God before his incarnation; for the persistence of this view

once, no doubt, but this consideration *was foreign to his purpose*. The important consideration was *the account given of Melchizedek in holy writ; to him the silences of Scripture were as much due to divine inspiration as were its statements*. In the only record which Scripture provides of Melchizedek (Gen. 14:18-20) nothing is said of his parentage, nothing is said of his ancestry.”⁹⁹

Melchizedek is made to appear like God the Son by the intentional silence of Scripture. As such he presents a beautiful picture of Messiah Yeshua in His eternal Royal Priesthood.

No Levitical Lineage, But Character

Melchizedek didn't obtain his priesthood from any priestly lineage, and neither did Yeshua become High Priest of Israel because of any priestly or Levitical lineage, a requirement of the Law for the Aaronic High Priest of Israel. Aaron's priesthood was temporal, both in the fact that Aaron died and that his priesthood will one day vanish (Mt. 5:18; Heb. 8:13). Aaron sinned (cf. Ex. 32), but Scripture doesn't record Melchizedek sinning and so symbolically it can be said that he was sinless, which reflects Messiah's sinless character. Yeshua's priesthood is of another Covenant and "another order." It's eternal and unlike Aaron's, will never end. Melchizedek, "without father," etc., wasn't a priest due to lineage. Jackson writes that the,

*“meaning is this: his divine role was not genealogically derived, not handed down from his parents. So, neither was Jesus' priesthood determined by a physical lineage, as in the case of the Aaronic priests (Ex. 28:1; Num. 3:10).”*¹⁰⁰

Melchizedek didn't obtain his priesthood because of a priest-father before him and neither did Yeshua. There are some Christians though, who don't understand that Yeshua is of "another Order." Contrary to Scripture (cf. Heb. 7:14; 8:4; Rom. 1:3) they teach that Jesus had to have Levitical lineage to become Israel's High Priest. They see Mary as a descendant of Aaron, coming through Mary's relative, Elizabeth.¹⁰¹ This allegedly is how Jesus could become the High Priest of Israel, *having Levitical lineage*. This contradicts two Gospels because they only have Yeshua's lineage through Joseph (Mt. 1:1-20; Lk. 3:23-38), and the fact that the High Priest's father, not his mother, determined if he qualified to be High Priest.

"Jesus needing Levitical lineage" contradicts Scripture and the New Covenant, as well as what God de-

cf. J. B. McCaul: "Cunaeus...believes, as Ewald does...that Melchizedek was the second person in the...Trinity, the Divine angel of the Lord...if Melchizedek was "without beginning of days or end of life," but "abideth a priest continually," how can it be believed of him that he was a mere mortal?...Melchizedek, as the Divine *Logos*, existed from eternity;" *The Epistle to the Hebrews* (London, 1871), pp. 75, 80."

"A. T. Hanson argues that the writer to the Hebrews himself made this identification; *Jesus Christ in the Old Testament* (London, 1965), pp. 65-82— "but Melchizedek, **"resembling the Son of God"** (Heb. 7:3), is distinguished from him as certainly as Aaron is (cf. Heb. 7:11)" distinguished from Jesus.

"Guthrie, ad loc, p. 154 states, "A Samaritan tradition held that Melchizedek was the first priest of Mt. Gerizim. In the Qumran literature though, *Melchizedek has no priestly function*, but is both king and judge (cf. Theissen, p. 18; cf., also M. de Jonge & A. S. van der Woude, "11 Q Melchizedek and the New Testament," NTS 12 (1945-6), pp. 301-326; J. A. Fitzmyer, "Further Light on Melchizedek from Qumran Cave 11," JBL 86 (1967), pp. 25-41. The latter finds some evidence for a priestly function, which the former deny. Philo expounds on the Melchizedek theme, but his treatment shows few points of contact with" the Letter to the "Hebrews. "For a full treatment of this subject, cf. F. L. Horton, *The Melchizedek Tradition*, 1976." (For more information on the DSS and *Melchizedek*, see Cockerill, p. 46 of this article.)

⁹⁹ Bruce, *The Epistle to the Hebrews*, p. 160, note 21: "For the Aaronic priest, on the other hand, the establishment of proper parentage was an essential qualification; as late as the Hasmonaean dynasty, any uncertainty on this score could invalidate a man's claim to the office (Lev. 21:13f.; Ezra 2:62; Neh. 7:64; Josephus, Ant. 13.292; TB Quddushin 66a). It was therefore necessary that the identity of an Aaronic priest's father and mother should be publicly known."

¹⁰⁰ Jackson, [Was Melchizedek the Preincarnate Christ?](#)

¹⁰¹ Elizabeth was a "daughter" of Aaron (see Luke 1:5), but one possibility is that Mary's grandfather had a brother who married Elizabeth's grandmother. That would make Mary a relative, but not a "daughter of Aaron."

clares in Psalm 110:4. The Author of Hebrews writes that,

“if perfection were through the Levitical Priesthood (for under it the people received the Law), what further need was there that another Priest should rise according to the Order of Melchizedek, and not be called according to the Order of Aaron?!” (Hebrews 7:11)

Perfection (eternal glorification) was not part of the Levitical Priesthood. It wasn't the fault of Mosaic Law anymore than an apple isn't a bird. That's why the need for *another* Covenant with “another Priest;” one whom God specifically chose *not* to be descended from Levi and Aaron, as Psalm 110:4 presents (“after the Order of Melchizedek” meaning in this instance, without needing lineage to Aaron). The Author of Hebrews puts any Levitical descent for Yeshua “to rest,” when he states that if Jesus,

*“were on Earth, He would **not** be a Priest, since there are (Aaronic) Priests who offer the gifts according to the Law.”* (Hebrews 8:4)

The reason why Yeshua wouldn't be a Priest on Earth is because for this Creation, since Mt. Sinai, Mosaic Law is still in effect for Israel, and so Mosaic Law states that the High Priest must be a descendant of Aaron. These two Scriptures, along with the understanding that both Gospel accounts of Yeshua's lineage belong to Joseph and have no priestly line, negate the false teaching that “Jesus had to have Levitical (Aaronic) lineage and *that's* the only way He could become Israel's High Priest.¹⁰² Also, with the Author stating, “what further need was there that *another Priest* should rise according to the Order of Melchizedek,” the Author is presenting that Yeshua is that “other” or different Priest outside the Order of Aaron.

Richard Lenski speaks of Jesus having no Levitical genealogy and why Melchizedek didn't have any lineage. He writes that,

“nothing, absolutely nothing, depended on the human genealogy of Jesus as far as his priesthood was concerned. The genealogies of Jesus...extend back to royal David and nowhere are there any priestly ancestors; his tribe is that of Judah and not of Levi. The sudden way in which the Scriptures draw back and close the curtain on Melchizedek is the divine way of making him a type of Jesus, the King-Priest who, like Melchizedek, stands alone and unique in his priesthood and is absolutely distinct from the long Aaronitic (sic; Aaronic) succession of priests.”¹⁰³

With Psalm 110 recognized as Messianic by both Jewish and Christian commentators, and God speaking of the priesthood of David's Lord as being “forever,” the kingship of David's Lord and Son came from David's lineage (cf. Mt. 22:42; Rom. 1:3; Heb. 7:14), but there weren't any priests in David's lineage for Yeshua to receive His priesthood from. Also, with Melchizedek and Yeshua there is no beginning nor end of their priesthood. In other words, there were no high priests before or after Melchizedek and there were no high priest before Yeshua to give Him His Priesthood and there will be no high priest after Him. Melchizedek is symbolically an eternal high priest, while Yeshua is the eternal High Priest of Israel.

Melchizedek and were not made High Priests due to their lineage, but because they were righteous. This is another striking parallel between the two. Lenski writes that,

*“Melchizedek did not inherit...his priesthood, royal though it was. It depended on no connection backward or forward but *inherited in his person alone*...He appears, he vanishes...Yet Abraham bows to his priesthood, Abraham, in whom all the nations were to be blessed (6:14).”¹⁰⁴*

Melchizedek became High Priest of Salem because of his righteous character. This is seen through the symbolism of his name and the city he ruled over and the symbolic meaning of his name. Melchizedek

¹⁰² See my article, [The Davidic Lineage of Messiah Yeshua](#) to understand that both Gospel accounts of Yeshua's lineage (Mt. and Lk.) refer to Joseph, not Mary and also, how Yeshua could descend from King David with Scripture only speaking of His earthly father's lineage from the Tribe of Judah. Mary's lineage is never mentioned.

¹⁰³ Lenski, *The Interpretation of the Epistle to the Hebrews and the Epistle of James*, p. 213.

¹⁰⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 212-213.

helps us to better understand the righteousness and quality of peace of Yeshua, who didn't become High Priest of Israel because of a lineage back to Aaron, but because of His divine character. With Abram being blessed by Melchizedek, and then giving Melchizedek his tithe, Melchizedek's symbolic righteousness and peace actually has a basis in reality. Abram would never have tithed to an unrighteous man. That is conversely seen in his refusal to accept the wicked King of Sodom's offer of spoil (Gen. 14:21-23). Interestingly enough, if Shem were Melchizedek, he would be the son of the man *God* called righteous in his generation: Noah (Gen. 7:1).

Marcus Dods also sees of Melchizedek's personality as garnering him kingship and priesthood:

“dependence of Levitical priests on genealogies and their registers is illustrated by Neh. 7:64” and so “without father, without mother, without genealogy”...stands in Scripture alone, no mention is made of an illustrious father or mother from whom he could have inherited power and dignity, still less can his priestly office and service be ascribed to his belonging to a priestly family. *It is by virtue of his own personality* he is what he is; his office derives no sanction from priestly lineage or hereditary rights; and in this respect” Melchizedek “is made like to the Son of God.” Of course it is not meant that in point of fact he had neither father nor mother, *but that as he appears in Scripture* he is without father.”¹⁰⁵

We know that God saw Melchizedek as being righteous because He speaks of the Messiah being after the Order of Melchizedek in Psalm 110:4. God would not have spoken like that if Melchizedek had wicked (cf. Luke 1:5-6).

Symbolism and reality allow for Melchizedek to be like the Messiah in His divine righteousness and peace, and how he came into office. Because of Messiah's very character He has been given this honor of priesthood by His Father (cf. Heb. 5:4).

The fourth century Roman Catholic Church “Father” and theologian, John Chrysostom (354-407 AD), a truly vile and vicious anti-Semitic preacher, wrote of Melchizedek and Jesus not having any beginning:

“We know of no beginning or end in either case; in the one because none are recorded; in the other because they do not exist.”¹⁰⁶

Cockerill states that Melchizedek is not a priest like Aaron, whose mother and father, as well as his genealogy, is well known (cf. Ex. 4:14; 6:20), and that Heb. 7:2-3 pertains to Melchizedek. In other words, it's not Yeshua that's being spoken of because we know who His Father and earthly mother were:

¹⁰⁵ Dods, *Hebrews*, p. 308.

¹⁰⁶ J. Barnby, author; Henry D. M. Spence-Jones and Joseph S. Excell, Editors; *The Pulpit Commentary Series: Hebrews* (New York: Anson D. F. Randolph, 1890; Accordance Bible Software, 2017), paragraph 83,935.

[James Barnby](#) “wrote the Dictionary of Christian Biography and Literature to the end of the Sixth Century AD” and “Antipopes.”

[Chrysostom](#) was “one of the most virulently anti-Jewish preachers. Born in Antioch, the son of pagan parents ...His eight sermons (homilies) *against the Jews* were delivered during his first two years of preaching activity in Antioch (386-387). They were written down verbatim...subsequently circulated. Thus their great anti-Jewish influence was felt beyond the period in which they were written. Chrysostom attacks not only the teachings of Judaism, but more especially the way of life...accusing them of missionary activity, which dangerously competed with that of the Christians...He criticized those Christians in Antioch who cooperated with Jews in religious matters, *kept the Sabbath, the “great fast, and other Jewish festivals...*Chrysostom claimed that on the Sabbaths and festivals the Jewish synagogue was *full of Christians...*Chrysostom attempted to defame the synagogue, which he compared to a pagan temple and which he represented to his audience as the source of all vices and heresies...criticized the Jews for their avarice and viciousness...and it is not a mere coincidence that the destruction of the synagogue of Callinicon (also in Syria, cf. Ambrose of Milan) took place *immediately after a series of anti-Jewish sermons* on the occasion of a procession in honor of the Maccabees in 388.”

What Chrysostom confirms for us is that many Gentile Christians were keeping the Feasts of Israel and the 7th day Sabbath, as the biblical way to walk out their faith in Jesus. See my two page articles, [A Snapshot of Church History and Mosaic Law](#) and [The Feasts of Israel and the Church](#) to understand why walking out our faith in Yeshua through all the rules/laws of Moses that apply to us, is God's lifestyle for all Christians.

“It is important to remember that these two lines” (verses) “do not describe the Son of God himself, but...Melchizedek of Genesis 14...In fact, any attempt to apply the first line to Christ results in considerable awkwardness. How can the one” that “Hebrews regularly describes as “Son”¹⁰⁷ or “Son of God”¹⁰⁸ be called “without father?” How can one whose incarnation is...affirmed, be described as “without mother?”¹⁰⁹

In other words the descriptions in Hebrews 7:3, “without father, without mother,” and “without genealogy,” do not pertain to Yeshua as Melchizedek because we know who Yeshua’s Father is, and who His earthly mother was and also, the lineage and Tribe He came from (i.e. Judah).

Lenski writes of Melchizedek’s name and the city he ruled over, saying they speak of Jesus:

“The point in noting the meaning of the names is the fact that they reflect the very *attributes* of Jesus, our royal High Priest, who in the very highest sense is the King of righteousness” (and) “the King of peace. The names of the type point to the far greater anti-type.”¹¹⁰

J. Barmby also sees that Melchizedek was a righteous man who gained his position by his character, not any lineage.¹¹¹

Morris brings in another aspect of the peace that pertains to its Hebrew understanding in relation to Melchizedek’s title as the King of Salem. He says that Salem comes from,

“the same root as” *shalom*, “the Hebrew word for peace...The Greek word “peace” (*eirene*) has about it the negative idea of the absence of war; in the NT however, it picks up something of the fuller meaning of the Hebrew” *shalom*, “which it regularly translates in the LXX.”¹¹²

“Shalom” is actually the “Peace of God,” not just any peace, and as Morris brings out, not just a negation of hostilities or the quiet time between wars. This Peace of God is only found in the Person of Yeshua, for this Peace is actually part of His character.¹¹³ It’s reflected in Melchizedek being the King of Salem, which symbolizes the King of Peace.

Marcus Dods agrees, saying that Melchizedek’s name implies that he actually was righteous, and that he had obtained his position as king and high priest because of his character. Remember, Melchizedek is a priest of Yahveh, meaning that Yahveh chose him to be High Priest and King of Salem (cf. Heb. 5:4). Dods says that the Author of Hebrews presents this in Hebrews 7:2,

“being first, by interpretation, King of righteousness and then also King of Salem, which is King of peace. The form of the sentence is significant...“first” by his very name, “then” by his actual position...*the peace of his kingdom is considered as a consequence of*” his “*righteousness*. Righteousness and peace are characteristic properties of the Messianic Kingdom: “In his days shall the righteous flourish; and abundance of peace so long as the moon endureth, Ps. 122:7; similarly Is. 9:6-7; Zech. 9:9; cf. Rom. 5:1; Eph. 2:4, 15, 17. In Gen. 14:18 the name and title occur together מַלְכֵי־צֶדֶק מֶלֶךְ שָׁלֹם (*Malki’Zedek Mel’lech Sha’lame*, King of Righteousness, King of Shalame” Shalom, Salem, “Peace”). “The chief point of this is that the priest is also a king.”¹¹⁴

¹⁰⁷ “Son,” pertaining to Yeshua, is written 8x in the Letter to the Hebrews (1:2, 5 [twice], 8; 3:6; 5:5, 8; 7:28).

¹⁰⁸ “Son of God,” pertaining to Yeshua, is written 4x in the Letter to the Hebrews (4:14; 6:6; 7:3; 10:29).

¹⁰⁹ Cockerill, *The Epistle to the Hebrews*, p. 301.

¹¹⁰ Lenski, *The Interpretation of the Epistle to the Hebrews and the Epistle of James*, p. 211.

¹¹¹ Barmby, *Hebrews*, paragraph 83,935.

¹¹² Morris, *Hebrews*, paragraph 58,716.

¹¹³ Compare Isaiah 48:18; 66:12.

¹¹⁴ Dods, *Hebrews*, pp. 307-308.

Interesting that Dods speaks of the “chief point” being “that the priest is also king,” but it seems that Scripture is saying that the king is also the high priest. Why? Because kingship speaks of rulership, while priesthood, as honorable as that is, is not the office which rules when there are two different people in those offices. The king always rules over the high priest, just as David and Pharaoh did. Also, Genesis literally says first that Melchizedek is Salem’s king and then its high priest. Both the Old and New Testaments center on the King of Israel, with only the Letter to the Hebrews speaking of Yeshua as Israel’s King and High Priest “according to the Order of Melchizedek.” The “chief point” is that Melchizedek was the King and High Priest of Salem, and that his name and city he ruled over speak of his character, which are reflections of Messiah’s character and how God could honor Yeshua by making Him King and High Priest of Israel.

Leon Morris states, as Nahum Sarna did before him,¹¹⁵ that it wasn’t unusual for a king to also be the high priest of his city-kingdom:

“Melchizedek was not only a king, but a “priest of God Most High.” It was not uncommon for one person to combine the roles of priest and king in antiquity.”¹¹⁶

So although it wasn’t uncommon for a king to be a high priest, Melchizedek is the only one that Scripture symbolically speaks of as being righteous and full of peace.

The True Meaning of Melchizedek’s Name

Leon Morris sees that the translation of Melchizedek’s name in Hebrews 7:2 is not quite accurate, and this will help us to better understand why the Author of Hebrews translates it the way he does. In other words, if the Author had presented the more accurate translation for the name Melchizedek it wouldn’t have suited his purpose in presenting Melchizedek as the type or divine picture of Yeshua as the King of Righteousness. This will prove to be another point against those who think that Yeshua was Melchizedek. Morris states that the Author of Hebrews speaks of,

“the significance of Melchizedek’s name and title. The name, he says, means “king of righteousness”...it might be more accurate to render it “*my king is righteous.*”¹¹⁷

Morris is right. The name doesn’t mean “King of Righteousness,” but “*my King is Righteous.*”¹¹⁸ If Yeshua had been Melchizedek it would have been foolish for Yeshua to have a name that meant “*my King is Righteous.*” The name for a “Jesus-Melchizedek” should have meant “the Righteous King.”

The International Standard Bible Encyclopedia (ISBE) confirms the accuracy of this translation with ancient texts from the region dating from about 2000-1600 BC. The year 2055 BC is the approximate time period that the meeting of Melchizedek and Abram took place and is certainly acceptable.¹¹⁹ *ISBE* states,

“The Amarna and Ras Shamrah parallels suggest...the original meaning was, “*my..king is righteous.*”¹²⁰

¹¹⁵ See p. 6.

¹¹⁶ Morris, *Hebrews*, para. 58,716.

¹¹⁷ *Ibid.*, paragraph 58,717. (*Italics* in the quote are Morris’s.)

¹¹⁸ *Melchi*, or rather *Malki*, in Melchizedek (Hebrew: *Malki’zedek*) literally means “my king,” not just “king.” For “King of Righteousness” it should be *Melech’zedek*. (See p. 30, note 120 for further understanding.)

¹¹⁹ Abram was born in 2135 BC (or 1,946 years “From Creation,” when Adam was created). He left Haran when he was 75 (Gen. 12:4; 2060 BC or 2,021 From Creation). Adding five years for his meeting with Melchizedek as an approximate time of their meeting (Gen. 14:18f.), we get 2055 BC or 2,026 FC). This is reasonably “within” the range of what *ISBE* presents for Melchizedek’s name. (Of course, it could have been a few years less or more than five years but it’s an approximate time and gives us an understanding of “when.” For how I came to Abram being born in 2135 BC or 1,946 FC, see my chart on page 43.)

¹²⁰ Bromiley, *The International Standard Bible Encyclopedia*, Volume Three, p. 313. They insert a parenthesis with “the” in it after “my” and before “king” to emphasize who the king is (“my, the king, is righteous”), but with it or

In other words the name Melchizedek actually means “*my King is Righteous.*” With this the name Melchizedek is symbolically seen as speaking of Melchizedek’s king, Yeshua, being righteous,¹²¹ but the Author of Hebrews, wanting to make the point that Melchizedek appears as a divine picture of Yeshua the Righteous King, translates Melchizedek’s name as “King of Righteousness.” His translation is acceptable, but it’s not 100% accurate.

The literal translation of Melchizedek’s name actually points to Melchizedek being a human being, whose king is Yeshua. On the other hand, if Yeshua had been Melchizedek, Yeshua would never have had a name that literally meant, “*My King is Righteous.*” Instead, His name would have been *Tzadik’Melech*—(the) Righteous King or *Melech’Tzadik*, (the) King of Righteousness.¹²²

Willard Swartley explains that the “i” in the Hebrew name of Melchizedek means “my,” a “possessive suffix” that’s added unto “Melech” (“king”) and also, the vowel of the second “e” drops off “king” (“Melch”) as a point of grammar. With the added “i” the name Melchizedek means, “*my king,*” not just “king.” Swartley writes,

“The text of the Epistle to the Hebrews follows this interpretation in stating explicitly that the name in Greek translation...means...“king of righteousness,” *omitting translation of the possessive suffix*”¹²³ which would make it, “my king is righteous.”

The Author of Hebrews slightly alters the meaning of the name Melchizedek to fit his theological presentation that Melchizedek is a person who perfectly pictures Messiah Yeshua as the King of Righteousness. The name Melchizedek though, does not mean, King of Righteousness, but *my King is Righteous*. This points away from Yeshua having been Melchizedek as the Lord would not have had a name that pointed away from Him as *the King of Righteousness*.

The name Yeshua means Savior, and it’s an extremely appropriate name for the King and High Priest of Israel who saves His people from their sins. It’s not an accident that God gave that name for His Son to Joseph and Mary through the angel Gabriel on two different occasions. To Joseph the angel said,

“And she will bring forth a Son and you shall call His name Yeshua, *for He will save His people from their sins.*” (Matthew 1:21)

To Mary the angel Gabriel said,

“Behold! You will conceive in your womb and bring forth a Son, and shall call His name Yeshua...And when eight days were completed for the circumcision of the child, His name was called Yeshua, the name given by the angel before He was conceived in the womb.” (Luke 1:31; 2:21)¹²⁴

without it the the meaning is the same (“my king is righteous”).

Douglas, *The Illustrated Bible Dictionary*, Part 2, pp. 976-977. “Melchizedek (Heb. *malkî-sedeq*...(my) king.” “Melchizedek’s name may be compared with that of a later king of Jerusalem, *Adoni-zedek* (Josh. 10:11ff.)” which means, “my Lord/lord is righteous.”

¹²¹ If Melchizedek was a high priest unto the Most High God, he most likely knew Yeshua as his King, and so the meaning of his name, “My King is Righteous,” is very appropriate. His name meant that he was a representative of The King, Yeshua, which he was. Abram understood that.

¹²² For the many names of the Messiah from the Old Testament, see my article, [The Names of the Messiah of Israel](#).

¹²³ Hebrews 7:3. Willard M. Swartley, *Covenant of Peace* (Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing, 2006), p. 255. Gary Staats, *A Christological Commentary on Hebrews* (2012), p. 71: “(The writer of Hebrews) is identifying Melchizedek as a king of righteousness and a king of peace. He thus becomes a beautiful type of Jesus Christ who is also the final King of righteousness and the final King of peace.” See [Melchizedek](#).

¹²⁴ All Jewish baby boys are given their names at their circumcision on the eighth day of their lives, following God’s command to Abraham (Gen. 17:10-14; cf. Gen. 21:4; Luke 2:21).

Melchizedek—An Angel?

The Bible Knowledge Commentary offers a cursory Melchizedek who was an angel. It uses the phrase in Heb. 7:3, that Melchizedek *remains a priest forever*,¹²⁵ to support their position:

“It *seems* more natural that the author meant that *Melchizedek belonged to an order in which there was no end to the priesthood* of those engaged in it. (He later said in 7:8 that Melchizedek “is declared to be *living*.”) *If this is correct, Melchizedek may have been an angelic being* who reigned for a time at Salem (i.e., Jerusalem). If so, the statement that he was “without beginning of days” *would not mean* that he was eternal, *but simply that he had a pretemporal origin*. Nor would this concept of Melchizedek as an angel elevate him to the same level as God’s Son, since the author painstakingly asserted the Son’s superiority to the angels (1:5-14). There is indeed *evidence* that, at Qumran, Melchizedek was regarded as an angelic personage. If this is the case in Hebrews, then the Son of God is the priest in an order in which Melchizedek is simply a priest.”¹²⁶

The Bible Knowledge Commentary believes that it “seems more natural” to make Melchizedek an angel, but anyone can say that it “seems more natural” about anything. It’s supporting that “natural-ness” with reason and Scripture and/or interpretation that helps to persuade of its truthfulness.

Melchizedek as an angel could *never* be used as a type of Jesus because Jesus is both *God the Son and a human being*. Angels don’t fall into either of those categories, and so the Author of Hebrews could not have made any comparison between an angel Melchizedek and Jesus.

If *The Commentary’s* Melchizedek king-priest *angel* belonged to an angelic order where there was “no end to his priesthood,” there are some serious theological problems that *The BK Commentary* studiously avoids. Where is this angelic king-priest today, and in eternity? What city is he ruling over now? Also, a priest ministers and performs animal sacrifices, among other things, for those who have sinned so they can be reconciled to God. Yet here is an alleged king-priest *angel on Earth* in Salem mediating between whom? It could not be between man and God, for the priest is always of the same “order” or nature as those he ministers to; hence Aaron as a man was able to minister for and to the men of Israel.

This is one reason why Yeshua had to become a man; to be able to be Israel’s High Priest and minister to Israel (both Jews and Gentiles who come into the Israel of God through Yeshua; cf. Rom. 11:11f.; Gal. 6:16). Yeshua knows the temptations that we face—not as God the Son, but as Yeshua the Jewish man. Angels do not know this and so cannot be priests of men. Yeshua had to be God the Son in order to know how Father God thinks and feels. Yeshua, as the God-Man, is the perfect mediator for God and Israel.

An angelic Melchizedek would have to minister or be a priest to other angels, and so why would he be the King and High Priest of Salem? Angels are in the Heavens. There isn’t a single Scripture in all the Bible where we see an *angel-priest* ministering as a priest to a man or men.¹²⁷ The angels that are with God, like Michael and Gabriel, certainly do not need a mediator-angel-priest, for they have direct access to God *and* they have *never* rebelled or sinned against God. There’s no need for mediation for them.

What of the evil angels (i.e. demons and Satan)? The angelic high priest Melchizedek *couldn’t* minister to them, to reconcile them to God because their fate was sealed at Creation¹²⁸—all the demon angels will live eternally in the Lake of Fire (i.e. Hell) because they rebelled with Satan against God (Mt. 25:41) and no amount of mediation will change that. *They have no opportunity for repentance and forgiveness* be-

¹²⁵ See [Was Melchizedek a theophany or a real man?](#) (No author is given for the article.)

¹²⁶ Ibid.

¹²⁷ Some might suggest the Angel of the LORD, but this being wasn’t an angel. He was God the Son. For why this is so, see my article [The Angel of the Lord](#).

¹²⁸ We know that Satan the Snake (Rev. 12:9; 20:2) was in the Garden deceiving Eve, and so he must have rebelled, and taken the angel-demons with him during Creation or immediately thereafter. Nothing was made or created before Day One (cf. Gen. 1:1-5).

cause they knew the Glory that is God their Creator and they intentionally chose to rebel against Him (cf. Num. 15:30-31). So, an angelic-Melchizedek is not needed here either.

Was it “man” that this king-priest angel Melchizedek mediated for in Salem? That would not be possible because men need a *human* priest who is “like them” (Heb. 2:9-18; 4:14-16). This is seen in,

1. the Aaronic Priesthood ministering to and for Israel and,
2. in Yeshua becoming a Jewish man so He could mediate for, and between sinful Israel and the holy God of Israel (His Father) and,
3. We also see this concept *among every priesthood in the ancient world*. The human-priest is a mediator for human beings in their community.

There isn't a single Scripture where an angel is a king or priest on Earth. Angels have never ruled over cities as earthly kings or high priests for any period of time. There isn't anything in Scripture to support *The BK Commentary's* foolish opinion, and certainly nothing in Genesis 14:18-20, to suggest that Melchizedek was an angel.

The BK Commentary (BK) says that their “Melchizedek-angel,” which Hebrews speaks of as “without beginning of days,” wasn't eternal, but “pretemporal.” If one is “*without beginning of days*” though, he would have to be from eternity past because the phrase means that symbolically, Melchizedek wasn't created. Angels are created beings and so their concept of pretemporal can't point to an angel-Melchizedek.

It also cannot mean just from a time before Creation because pretemporal means that their Melchizedek-angel was created and existed “*before the existence of time.*”¹²⁹ The problem with this is that nothing existed before time, which began at Creation, except God. No angels were created before God created *the Heavens and the Earth* (Gen. 1:1f.) and *all* that is in them (Ex. 20:11; Neh. 9:6; Acts 4:24). The Bible is silent as to the Day when the angels were created, but their creation could not have been before Day One of Creation because Gen. 1:1 speaks of God creating both the Heavens, where angels are, and the Earth. A “pretemporal” Melchizedek-angel is impossible. The phrase for Melchizedek in Hebrews 7:2, without or no “*beginning of days,*” implies an eternal being, not an imaginary pretemporal angel. The Messiah of Israel is said to have been both premundane and eternal, for He existed before Creation and from eternity past,¹³⁰ and this is certainly implied in Melchizedek having no beginning of days. *BK's* angel-Melchizedek fails for many reasons, one of which is that they don't understand the symbolism or the meaning of Melchizedek not having any beginning of days that the Author of Hebrews uses.

Also, if their Melchizedek angel-king and high priest is eternal “going forward,” where is he ruling now? Is he a rival to Jesus as King and High Priest of Israel in the Heavens, and if so, where does Scripture present this?

BK speaks of *evidence* for their belief that Melchizedek was an angel, but the evidence is not from Scripture nor any Jewish Christians like the Author of Hebrews. It's from a writing about 2,000 years after Melchizedek reigned in Salem and it seems that *BK* doesn't understand that the Jewish writing speaks of Michael the angel, not Melchizedek the King of Salem (see p. 46). Michael was seen as a righteous angel. Remember that “righteous” is part of Melchizedek's name, and so attaching righteousness to the angel

¹²⁹ [Pretemporal](#)—Occurring or happening before the existence of time. Premundane means basically the same thing—existing before the creation of the world. Both Creation and time happened at the same event.

¹³⁰ Alfred Edersheim, *The Life and Times of Jesus The Messiah* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Pub., 2000; Accordance Bible Software), paragraph 737: “as the Rabbinic ideas were at least based on the Old Testament, we need not wonder that they also embodied the chief features of the Messianic history. Accordingly, a careful perusal of their Scripture quotations show that the main postulates of the New Testament concerning the Messiah are fully supported by Rabbinic statements. Thus, such doctrines as the *pre-mundane existence* of the Messiah.”

Paragraph 748: The Rabbis convey the idea that “the existence of this Messiah was regarded as premundane—before the moon (Ps. 72), before the morning-star (Ps. 110)—and eternal (Ps. 72), and His Person and dignity as superior to that of men and Angels.”

Para. 751: “even in strictly Rabbinic documents, the *premundane*, if not the *eternal existence of the Messiah* appears as matter of common belief. Such is the view expressed in the Targum on Isa. 9:6, and in...Micah 5:2.”

Michael, who was seen as the King of the Angels, would present Michael as the King of Righteousness or “Malchizedek.” No one at Qumran believed that Melchizedek of Genesis 14:18-20 was an angel. There is no “evidence” at Qumran for *BK’s* angelic Melchizedek (of Gen. 14). As an “aside,” I would not recommend *The Bible Knowledge Commentary* to anyone because their scholarship is less than stellar.

As we know, some Christians think that Jesus was Melchizedek, but every Christian denomination that I know of, even the cult known as the Roman Catholic Church, teaches that Melchizedek was a man.

Protestants and Catholics

All denominations of Protestantism, etc., and the Roman Catholic Church teach that Melchizedek was an ordinary human being. Hilton Oswald says that since the beginning of Protestantism (i.e. Martin Luther, the founder of Lutheranism and therefore, an inspiration for all the Protestant denominations which followed), Protestant Christianity has taught that Melchizedek was not Jesus, but a man. Oswald writes,

“Traditional Protestant Christian denominations, following Luther, teach that Melchizedek was a historical figure and an archetype of Christ.”¹³¹

Roman Catholicism teaches the same thing. The *Catholic Standard* states that the Letter to the Hebrews makes a *comparison* between the two. The,

“text says that he was *made to resemble* Christ. So, Melchizedek is...a type or prefiguration of Christ.”¹³²

Of course, just because every Protestant, Pentecostal, Charismatic and Catholic church teach that Melchizedek was a human being doesn’t necessarily make it so, but it is a significant point to consider. Tremper Longman III notes that many Christians believe that Jesus was Melchizedek, and states that the,

“popular understanding of the relationship between Melchizedek and Jesus is that Melchizedek is an *Old Testament Christophany*.”¹³³

Donald Hagner thinks that the reason why these Christians say that Jesus was Melchizedek is because they falsely interpret Hebrews 7:3. Hagner says,

“It is the *literal* reading of verse 3 that has led some to the conclusion that Melchizedek was actually an appearance of the preincarnate Christ. What...is being pointed out by the author however, is the surprising *silence* of Scripture about the lineage...birth and the death of Melchizedek. *In a rabbinic way, the silence* is seen to be significant rather than simply fortuitous,¹³⁴ especially for a person of such great status, who was both a king and a priest.”¹³⁵

Cockerill notes that there are other kings in the Genesis passage and that Melchizedek isn’t seen any differently than they are in terms of their human nature. He writes that,

“Melchizedek “is identified as a human being like the King of Sodom” in the same passage of Gen. 14 and Melchizedek “reconfirms God’s blessing on Abraham, receives Abraham’s homage and then...disappears from the text.”¹³⁶

¹³¹ Hilton C. Oswald, *Luther’s Works: First lectures on the Psalms II, Psalms 76-126* (1976), Psalm 110:4. See [Melchizedek](#).

¹³² [Catholic Standard](#).

¹³³ Tremper Longman III, [How To Read Genesis](#) (Downer’s Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 2005), p. 172.

Longman’s use of “Christophany” isn’t quite accurate. A Christophany is “an appearance or non-physical manifestation of Christ. Traditionally the term refers to visions of Christ after His ascension, such as the bright light of the conversion of Paul the Apostle.” It should be a manifestation of the preincarnate Christ.

¹³⁴ Fortuitous means, “happening by accident or chance rather than design.”

¹³⁵ Hagner, *Hebrews*, p. 102.

There's no biblical reason to think that either Gen. 14:18 or Heb. 7:1-3 (or v. 8) confer divine status on Melchizedek. To believe otherwise, one must interpret Heb. 7:3 falsely, which leads the person to the untenable position that Jesus actually lived and ruled in Salem for a period of time as its king and high priest. This is theologically impossible, for there is nothing in those two texts, nor anywhere else in Scripture, that plainly speak of Jesus having been Melchizedek or having ruled anywhere on Earth and that, as a king and a high priest, before (or even after) His incarnation, death and resurrection. *Melchizedek* was "made like" and "resembled" the Son of Man—Jesus wasn't Melchizedek.

Duncan insightfully reveals that the first three verses of Hebrews Seven help Christians to better understand who Yeshua is. Duncan says that,

"The fundamental point here is not that we would come away knowing more about Melchizedek," but that we would be "more in awe of Jesus"¹³⁷ as the eternal King and High Priest of Israel—the King of Righteousness and the King of Peace; our King and Savior.

The Author of Hebrews uses Melchizedek to help us to further realize who our Messiah is in His eternal office as the King and High Priest of Israel. Those who don't see that seem to take Heb. 7:1-3 literally, but that's not fully true, as we've already seen with Melchizedek not having father or mother, etc. Also, if they actually took the Greek word in v. 3 literally, that Melchizedek *resembled* or was *made like* Yeshua, they couldn't continue in their fallacy.

Hebrews 7:4-11

⁴"Now consider how great this man was, to whom even Father Abraham gave a tenth of the spoils. ⁵And indeed those who are of the Sons of Levi, who receive the Priesthood, have a commandment to receive tithes from the people according to Mosaic Law, that is, from their brethren, though they have" (also) "come from the loins of Abraham, ⁶but he whose genealogy is not derived from them received tithes from Abraham and blessed him who had the promises. ⁷Now beyond all contradiction the lesser is blessed by the greater. ⁸Here mortal men receive tithes, but there he receives them, *of whom it is witnessed that he lives.* ⁹Even Levi, who receives tithes, paid tithes through Abraham, so to speak, ¹⁰for he was still in the loins of his Father when Melchizedek met him. ¹¹Therefore, if *perfection* were through the Levitical Priesthood (for under it the people received the Law), what further need was there that *another* Priest should rise *according to the Order of Melchizedek*, and not be called *according to the Order of Aaron?*" (Hebrews 7:4-11)

Another important phrase to consider is found in v. 8: "of whom it is witnessed that he" (Melchizedek) "lives." Is the Author saying that he actually saw Melchizedek alive? Hardly. He's speaking symbolically of the only passage of Melchizedek in Scripture that doesn't speak of his death (Gen. 14:18f.).

Unfortunately, this phrase is taken literally by the people who think that Jesus was Melchizedek. Was Melchizedek still alive in the Author's time? They would say that Melchizedek was still alive because he was Jesus, but this is refuted by the Author, without his even being aware of their position, in his use of the comparison of Melchizedek and Yeshua in v. 3 (*made like* the Son of God) and v. 11. Yeshua is "*another* Priest" who arose according to the Order of Melchizedek. The Author doesn't say that Jesus had been Melchizedek. The Author continually speaks of Yeshua being "according to the Order of Melchizedek," but he never says that Yeshua was Melchizedek.

Some Scripture is meant to be taken literally, like don't murder or commit adultery, but not the Author's phrase about Melchizedek still being around. There isn't anything in Scripture to support a literal understanding of verse eight's, "of whom it is witnessed that he lives."

¹³⁶ Cockerill, *The Epistle to the Hebrews*, pp. 305-306.

¹³⁷ Duncan, [Jesus and Melchizedek](#).

Jackson writes that the sense of “order” reveals that Yeshua couldn’t have been Melchizedek. He states that,

“Christ was said to be a priest “after (*kata*) the *order (taxis)* of” Melchizedek (Heb. 5:6, 10; 6:20; 7:11). “The Greek term *taxis* (order) suggests a *similar* “arrangement.” For example, just as Melchizedek was both a king and priest simultaneously, so Christ is as well (cf. Zech. 6:12-13; Heb. 1:3). The preposition *kata* used with the accusative case suggests the sense of “in accordance with, corresponding to.”¹³⁸ Hence a *comparison* is being drawn.”¹³⁹

A *comparison* of Melchizedek and Jesus negates Jesus from having been Melchizedek. The Author of Hebrews speaks of Yeshua’s Priesthood being “*according to the Order of Melchizedek*” six times in three chapters.¹⁴⁰ The Writer, of course, was quoting from Psalm 110:4. This Psalm is universally recognized as messianic,¹⁴¹ meaning that it speaks of Israel’s Messiah. Verse one has (Father) Yahveh saying to David’s Lord (Yahveh the Son, i.e. Messiah Yeshua) to sit at His right Hand until He (the Father) makes a footstool of the enemies of David’s Lord.¹⁴²

In the Gospels (Mt. 22:41-46; cf. Mk. 12:35f.; Lk. 20:41f.) Yeshua speaks of “David’s Lord,” the phrase “my Lord” literally being on David’s lips in Psalm 110:1, pertaining to the Messiah. David also writes of his Lord as being “*according to the Order of Melchizedek.*” David doesn’t say that His Lord was Melchizedek, but that He would be a priest *according to the Order of Melchizedek*. The priesthood of Yeshua is *not* according to the *Order of Aaron* (“that *another* Priest should arise *according to the Order of Melchizedek*, and not be called according to the *Order of Aaron*,” Heb. 7:11), but *like* that of Melchizedek’s priesthood, whose lineage isn’t seen in Scripture, nor his death, which makes it possible for the Author to symbolically speak of Melchizedek still being alive.

The English phrase, “according to the *order* of” (NKJV) is the Hebrew עַל־דְּבַרְתִּי (*ahl div’rati*). It means, “in the *manner* of,” or “with regard to,”¹⁴³ in the “*cause*” or “*reason*”¹⁴⁴ of, which again reveals that Yeshua *was not* Melchizedek. If Yeshua had been Melchizedek, David would have said something like:

Yahveh has sworn and will not relent, “You (David’s Lord; v. 1) are Melchizedek, the king-priest forever, and according to Your Order, the Order of Melchizedek, You will rule and minister as Israel’s king and high priest. (cf. Psalm 110:4)

That is not what David said, and as we saw before, King David would not have used two different pronouns for his Lord and Melchizedek if they were the same person. The idea of being “in the order” of someone obviously *compares* two people. Also, whenever the Messenger of Yahveh (erroneously called the Angel of the LORD, i.e. Jesus) appears in the Old Testament, *He is never given a human name*, and also

¹³⁸ Jackson, [Was Melchizedek the Preincarnate Christ?](#) “Daniel Wallace, *Greek Grammar Beyond the Basics*, Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1996, p. 377.”

¹³⁹ Ibid.

¹⁴⁰ Hebrews 5:6, 10, 6:20; 7:11, 17, 21.

¹⁴¹ Edersheim, *The Life and Times of Jesus The Messiah*, para. 5,025. Edersheim, speaking of Matthew 22:42f., writes, “Without addressing any one in particular, He set before them all, what perhaps was the most familiar subject in their theology, that of the descent of Messiah. Whose Son was He? And when they replied: ‘The Son of David,’ He referred them to the opening words of Psalm 110, in which David called the Messiah ‘Lord.’ The argument proceeded, of course, on the two-fold supposition that the Psalm was Davidic and that it was Messianic. Neither of these statements would have been questioned by the ancient Synagogue.”

¹⁴² The Three are all Yahveh: Father, Holy Spirit and Son. “Yahveh” is more like Their last name than a particular name for any one of Them. There’s Father Yahveh, Holy Spirit Yahveh and Son or Yeshua Yahveh. Just as a family of Smith’s has father Smith, mother Smith and son Smith, and they all share the same last name and have the exact human nature, so the Three in the God Family share the same “last name,” have the exact divine nature and are “one.” For more on this see my articles, [Yeshua—God the Son](#) and [Three Persons—One God?](#)

¹⁴³ Koehler, *The Hebrew-Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament*, vol. 1, p. 212.

¹⁴⁴ דָּבַר Brown, *Hebrew and English Lexicon*, n. p.

we know it's Yeshua. How is it that we have a name for the King of Salem (i.e. Melchizedek)? Melchizedek didn't have any lineage that gave him his priesthood, and so Yeshua doesn't need any either, from Aaron, to be Israel's eternal High Priest because Yeshua is a priest "according to the Order of Melchizedek" (cf. Heb. 7:11).

Looking at the "silence of Scripture" from another point of view, the Author of Hebrews could have said at any time in his Letter, "Oh yes! Jesus was Melchizedek!" It's extremely telling that he doesn't, especially as chapter seven is devoted to the comparison between Melchizedek and Yeshua. It's obvious that being "in the order or manner" of someone doesn't make those two people the same person. For example, Aaron's son Eliezer was made High Priest when his father Aaron died, and so Eliezer was "in the Order of Aaron," but that didn't make Eliezer his father Aaron.

Hebrews 7:4f., speaks of Melchizedek being greater than Father Abraham and also the Priesthood of Aaron that descended from Levi, great grandson of Abram. While Israel tithed to God through the Levitical Priests (Num. 18:21-28), Abram gave a tithe to Melchizedek, which Hebrews uses to declare that Melchizedek was greater than Father Abraham *and* the Levitical Priesthood that came through him. With Yeshua being of a similar order as Melchizedek, Yeshua's Priesthood is also greater than that of Aaron and also, Yeshua, like Melchizedek, is greater than Abraham. This is no small matter. Who is Melchizedek?

Abraham is seen as the head or Father of Israel, both in the natural Jewish realm and in the Christian realm (cf. Rom. 4:11, 16; Gal. 3:7-9). Melchizedek was greater than Abram because Melchizedek blesses Abram, and Hebrews states that the lesser is blessed by the greater (vv. 6-7; cf. Gen. 14:19), and Abram gave Melchizedek a tithe (vv. 2, 4, 6, 9; cf. Gen. 14:20). Does this mean that Melchizedek was Jesus? Hardly.

The Aaronic Priests bless Israel and Israel tithes to them, but that doesn't make them divine. Giving Melchizedek his tithe meant that Abram recognized that Melchizedek was not only a priest of the Most High God, but that Melchizedek was greater than he, for Melchizedek blesses Abram, and from this Order of Melchizedek comes Yeshua's Priesthood, which is also greater than the Priesthood of Abram's great, great, great, great grandson Aaron. Just in terms of respect for someone older than us (cf. Lev. 19:32; Prov. 16:31-33), if Abram was 80 years old the day he met Melchizedek, if Shem had been Melchizedek, he was 470 years old,¹⁴⁵ and the King and High Priest of God Most High in Salem, and technically, the king and high priest of all of Canaan, according to Edersheim.

Perhaps someone might say that the Writer of Hebrews didn't know that Melchizedek was Jesus, but this negates their position because if he didn't know, how could he be presenting Melchizedek as Jesus, in their opinion, from v. 3 and v. 8? Also, the Holy Spirit knew if Jesus had been Melchizedek, yet we *never* see anywhere in Scripture that Jesus is said to have been Melchizedek.¹⁴⁶ It's unreasonable that the Author of Hebrews speaks of Yeshua being a (High) Priest "according to the Order of Melchizedek" six times in three chapters,¹⁴⁷ *but never once clearly and succinctly states that Yeshua had been Melchizedek.*

The Author, saying in v. 8, that "it is witnessed that he *lives*," would have been a perfect place to reveal that Yeshua had been Melchizedek. This of course, is a serious problem for those who think that Jesus was Melchizedek. It's one thing if Peter, Paul, Luke and John never mention Melchizedek or Jesus having been Melchizedek. It's quite another for the Author of Hebrews to overlook this simple statement because he literally speaks the name of Melchizedek nine times in three consecutive chapters,¹⁴⁸ and sees the Priesthood of Melchizedek as a picture of the eternal Priesthood of Yeshua. There is no place in all of Scripture that we see the simple equation that "Jesus was Melchizedek." The obvious reason is because *neither the Author, nor anyone else, thought that Jesus had been Melchizedek.*

¹⁴⁵ More on this in the section, *The Chronological Chart*, p. 43f.

¹⁴⁶ *Jesus is Better Than Melchizedek*, [Israel My Glory](#).

¹⁴⁷ "According to the Order of Melchizedek" is seen six times in Hebrews 5:6, 10, 6:20; 7:11, 17, 21.

¹⁴⁸ The name Melchizedek is written nine times in Hebrews: 5:6, 10; 6:20; 7:1, 10-11, 15, 17, 21.

Donald Guthrie adds that, “after the *order* of Melchizedek,” means that the Priesthood of Yeshua “has no succession as Aaron’s order had.”¹⁴⁹ When Hebrews speaks of this “Order” of Melchizedek he uses the Greek word τᾶξις (*taxis*), which Thayer says simply means,

“an arrangement...an order...for which in Heb. 7:15 we have...after the manner of the priesthood...of Melchizedek.”¹⁵⁰

Walter Bauer states that *taxis* means the same thing,

“an arrangement” and that the Author of “Hebrews understood” Psalm 110:4 “which the author interprets to mean that Jesus was a high priest...to the entirely different nature of Melchizedek’s priesthood as compared with that of Aaron; 7:11b.”¹⁵¹

Marcus Dods offers a keen insight, saying that Melchizedek is “the whole order” of his priesthood. There are no other high priests before Melchizedek nor after him. “This one man constitutes the order.”¹⁵² Melchizedek “succeeds no one in office and no one succeeds him. *In this sense* he abides a priest for ever”¹⁵³ or rather, *continually*, and also “it is witnessed that he lives” (Heb. 7:8). Witnessed by Scripture symbolically, in not speaking of his death.

Ezra 2:58-63 states that some Levites were disqualified from the Levitical Priesthood because they couldn’t prove their lineage. Levites needed Levitical genealogy from Levi. Dods writes that “dependence of Levitical priests on genealogies and their registers is illustrated by Neh. 7:64,”¹⁵⁴ where some priests were excluded from the priesthood because they couldn’t prove their Levitical lineage.

Yeshua though, wasn’t from the Tribe of Levi, but from Judah, the Tribe of the Kings of Israel,¹⁵⁵ even though some try and say that Mary was from the Tribe of Levi so as to make Yeshua being Israel’s High Priest “right” according to their understanding of Mosaic Law. This overrides the meaning of Psalm

¹⁴⁹ Guthrie, *Hebrews*, p. 128.

¹⁵⁰ τᾶξις Thayer, *Thayer’s Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament*, paragraph 9,130.

¹⁵¹ τᾶξις Bauer, *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*, p. 989.

¹⁵² Dods, *Hebrews*, p. 306.

¹⁵³ Ibid.

[Bible Hub](#) Hebrews 7:15. [Jamieson, Fausset and Brown Bible Commentary](#) (Robert Jamieson, A. R. Fausset and David Brown) is an excellent commentary and was originally published in 1871. “After the similitude of Melchisedec—answering to “after the order of Melchisedec’ (Heb 5:10). The “order” cannot mean a series of priests, for Melchisedec neither received his priesthood from, nor transmitted it to, any other mere man; it must mean “answering to the office of Melchisedec.” Christ’s priesthood is similar to Melchisedec’s in that it is “for ever” (Heb 7:16-17)

Charles Spurgeon said of the *Commentary*: “It is to some extent a compilation and condensation of other men’s thoughts, but it is sufficiently original to claim a place in every minister’s library. Indeed, it contains so great a variety of information that if a man had no other exposition he would find himself at no great loss if he possessed this.”

[Bible Hub](#) for Hebrews 7:15. [Gill’s Exposition of the Entire Bible](#): “And it is yet far more evident...From a fact which cannot be denied; for that after the similitude of Melchisedec there ariseth another priest; or another has risen, even Jesus the son of David, of the tribe of Judah...one like to Melchizedek: hence we learn that Melchizedek and Christ are not the same person; and that the order and similitude of Melchizedek are the same; and that Christ’s being of his order only imports that there is a resemblance and likeness between him and Melchizedek in many things, which are observed in the beginning of this chapter: and this “arising” does not intend Christ’s setting up himself, only his appearance in this form; and being expressed in the present tense, denotes the continual being, and virtue of his priesthood.”

[John Gill](#) (1697-1771) was an English Baptist, a biblical scholar, and a staunch Calvinist.

¹⁵⁴ Ibid., p. 308. Nehemiah 7:64, “These sought their listing *among* those who were registered by genealogy, but it was not found. Therefore they were excluded from the Priesthood as defiled.”

¹⁵⁵ See my article, [The Davidic Lineage of Messiah Yeshua](#), for why we don’t know Mary’s lineage or that she was from the Tribe of Levi, and how Yeshua was from the Tribe of Judah, even though only Joseph’s lineage from Judah is known, not Mary’s.

110:4, and specifically Heb. 7:14—

“For *it is* evident that our Lord arose from Judah, of which Tribe Moses spoke nothing concerning priesthood.” (Hebrews 7:14)

Yeshua’s Priesthood is not of Aaron, but according to the Order of Melchizedek, and so He doesn’t have lineage from Aaron. Also, Yeshua comes with the New Covenant and a kingship and priesthood after the Order of Melchizedek, not according to the Order of Aaron.

Lenski writes that the fact that Jesus wasn’t of the Levitical line, but according to the Order of Melchizedek, *proves* that Yeshua’s Priesthood is eternal, whereas that of Aaron’s obviously is not, and that Melchizedek was a picture of Yeshua:

“consider what God said through David regarding this royal priest and regarding the Messiah...*who is typified by Melchizedek*. The very objection which...against Jesus, the fact that he was *not* a son of Levi, but descended from the tribe of Judah, was not in the Aaronic succession and thus not a legitimate...high priest” (according to the general reading of the Law of Moses), “*is made the most overwhelming proof for...the eternal High Priesthood of Jesus, which is indeed, not according to the order of Aaron, but as God himself had declared by David, “according to the order of Melchizedek.”*”¹⁵⁶

The Author of Hebrews then speaks of perfection or glorification not being able to come through Mosaic Law or the Levitical Priesthood. Perfection is having the same nature as Yeshua: divine, human and sinless. This is what awaits Christians on Judgment Day. This then, was the need for *another Priest not of the Order of Aaron*, because the blood of bulls and goats could never affect fallen human nature:

“Therefore, if *perfection* were through the Levitical Priesthood (for under it the people received the Law), what further need was there that *another Priest* should arise *according to the Order of Melchizedek*, and not be called according to the Order of Aaron?” (Hebrews 7:11)

The Author of Hebrews puts to rest the “need” for Jesus to have lineage from Aaron. He is of the Order of Melchizedek; not that of Aaron. God already certified this in Psalm 110:4. If Yeshua were of the Order of Aaron He could only offer animals as sacrifice, not Himself, for nowhere in God’s Instructions to Aaron does He mention human sacrifice.¹⁵⁷

Yeshua is Israel’s eternal Royal High Priest, the first “perfected” or glorified human being in the Universe. The first of the New Creation. God the Son became Man so that Man could become like God the Son in His perfected or glorified state. In other words, what the Serpent offered Adam and Eve, God always had in mind. Yeshua is now the God-Man glorified, the first of many Jews and Gentiles to follow (cf. 1st Cor. 15:20, 23; Col. 1:15-18).¹⁵⁸ This is what the Author means when he speaks of perfection or being made perfect, and how Mosaic Law could not do that for Israel.

David Petersen notes that Hebrews 7:11 is the first time in the Letter that the Author shifts from Yeshua as perfect to Christians as perfect, saying,

“For the first time, the language of perfection (applied to Christ in 2:10; 5:9; 7:28) is applied to...believers. The law of Moses *made nothing*” (or rather, no one) “*perfect*, but in Jesus Christ a better *hope* is introduced, by which we draw near to God.” (Heb. 7:19)¹⁵⁹

The blessings of the Mosaic Covenant were physical and temporal for the Hebrew people—a good land abounding in food and water; and protection from, and destruction of, Israel’s enemies, etc. The blessings of belief in the Jewish Messiah are eternal glorification and oneness with the Father and the Holy Spirit, through Son, for eternity.

¹⁵⁶ Lenski, *The Interpretation of the Epistle to the Hebrews and the Epistle of James*, p. 208.

¹⁵⁷ See my article, [Human Sacrifice and Yeshua](#) for how Yeshua could do that, according to Torah.

¹⁵⁸ See my article [Salvation—The Promise!](#) for what this Gift of Salvation entails—becoming like Yeshua.

¹⁵⁹ Peterson, *Hebrews*, p. 1,336.

Hebrews 7:12 and the Change in the Law

“For the priesthood being changed, of necessity there is also a change of the Law.” (Hebrews 7:12)

This verse doesn't speak of Melchizedek, or course, but of Jesus being the High Priest of Israel when Mosaic Law demands a Son of Aaron take that position. Something that all Christian commentators miss is the understanding that with there being a “change in the Law” (Heb. 7:12), it doesn't mean *all* Mosaic Law is changed or nullified, and in this case Mosaic Law isn't changed until Judgment Day, when Mosaic Law will be our nature (cf. Jer. 31:31-34, esp. v. 33 where God speaks of putting Mosaic Law [“law”] upon our hearts and in our minds). The understanding that the High Priest needs to be of Aaronic lineage remains for the Old Covenant. It's the New Covenant that has this change in Mosaic Law. This change that Hebrews speaks of presents a new kind of priest for Israel; one who lives forever, is not from the lineage of Aaron and whose sacrifice is greater than any Son of Aaron ever made, and who is not from the Tribe of Levi.¹⁶⁰ This “change in the Law” does not effect the entire corpus of Mosaic Law, but with the Church teaching that the Law was “done away with by Jesus at the Cross,” most theologians and pastors believe that the Law is “no more,” and that this verse supports their poorly reasoned belief.

For instance, Heinrich Meyer, in his commentary on Hebrews 7:15, echoes what most Christians think about the Law of Moses, saying,

“and the more still is it evident, namely, that with the Levitical priesthood *the whole Mosaic law, too, is changed (and deprived of validity)*.”¹⁶¹

When is the Law “deprived of validity”? Many Christians see the answer to that in various New Testament cites, and also in The Letter to the Hebrews. One of them is this:

“In that He says, “*A new covenant,*” *He has made the first obsolete. Now what is becoming obsolete and growing old is ready to vanish away.*” (Hebrews 8:13)

The Letter to the Hebrews is generally understood to have been written about 67 AD, three years or so before the destruction of the Temple in Jerusalem in 70 AD, because of its references to sacrifices still being offered there by the Aaronic Priests.¹⁶² Note that the Author states that the First Covenant is “obsolete,” goes on to *qualify and define* that by saying, “what is *becoming obsolete and growing old is ready to vanish away.*” In other words, the First Covenant and its Mosaic Law *had not yet vanished away in 67 AD*, but it was “*growing old*” and “*becoming obsolete.*” Most of the Christians living in that day fully expected the Lord Yeshua to return in their lifetime.¹⁶³ This statement in Hebrews reflects that, in the Author knowing that Mosaic Law would “vanish away” on Judgment Day.

Some would say that the Old vanished when the Temple was destroyed in 70 AD, but there is no linkage or Scripture to the destruction of the Temple and Mosaic Law being invalidated in any New Testament

¹⁶⁰ See my articles, [Yeshua—From the Tribe of Levi?](#) and [The Davidic Lineage of Messiah Yeshua](#), and [Hebrews and the Change of the Law](#).

¹⁶¹ [Bible Hub](#) for Hebrews 7:15. [Heinrich Meyer](#) (1800-1873), was a German Protestant minister. He wrote commentaries on the New Testament.

Before Meyer, Matthew Poole thought Mosaic Law was abolished with the New Covenant. Writing about Heb. 7:15 he states, ““There ariseth another priest,” not only of another tribe than Aaron, but of a different order from his; is constituted, manifested, and beginneth the exercise of his office *with the abolition of Aaron's.*” Aaron's office wasn't abolished in 67 AD, nor is it abolished today. On Judgment Day it will be abolished.

[Bible Hub](#) for Hebrews 7:15. [Matthew Poole](#) (1624-1679) was an English Non-conformist theologian and biblical commentator.

¹⁶² Hebrews 5:1, 3; 7:27; 8:3-4; 9:25; 10:1.

¹⁶³ See Acts 1:20; 2:17; 1st Thess. 4:15-17; 5:4; 1st Cor. 1:7-8; 7:29-31; 8:29; 10:11; 15:51-52; Rom. 16:20; Phil. 3:20; 4:5; 2nd Tim. 4:6-8; Heb. 10:25; James 5:3, 7-8; 1st Peter 4:7, 17-19; 1st John 2:18; Rev. 1:1, 3; 2:25; 3:11; 22: 7, 10-12, 20.

writing before or after its destruction. In other words, the linkage is made by Man. Also, Yeshua specifically speaks of Mosaic Law remaining until there are no more Heavens and Earth (Mt. 5:18), and Christians (His followers) needing to keep it (Mt. 5:19).

The First Covenant's Mosaic Law is still valid today and still in effect as God's New Testament *lifestyle* for all Christians, as amplified by Yeshua.¹⁶⁴ The Old said, you must not murder, but Yeshua amplified it by saying that hate broke the commandment not to murder. The New doesn't do away with the Law; it amplifies it. Murder is still a sin, and so is Sabbath breaking.

Mosaic Law will "vanish away" and truly be obsolete when all Christians are transformed into the very Image of Christ on Judgement Day. Its laws and rules still apply to Israel today—to the Israel of God who believe in Messiah Yeshua (Gal. 6:16; cf. Rom. 11:11f.), as interpreted and amplified by Yeshua. "Hate equals murder" is a much harder New Testament law than the Old Testament commandment not to murder. On the Day of Judgment the nature of Christ, which Mosaic Law is a verbal reflection of, will be the nature of every Christian and the need for the written Mosaic Law will be *obsolete* because it will be the nature of every Christian, being written on every Christian's heart. God says of the New Covenant,

““But *this is* the Covenant that I will make with the House of Israel after those days,” says Yahveh! “I will put *My Mosaic Law in their minds, and write it on their hearts*, and I will be their God, and they shall be My people.” (Jeremiah 31:33; cf. Jer. 31:31-34; Heb. 8:10; 10:16).

The Author of Hebrews confirms that Mosaic Law is still in effect, when the Church teaches that it was done away by Jesus on the Cross, saying of Yeshua more than 35 years after the Cross and Resurrection:

“For if Jesus were on Earth *He would not be a Priest, since there are Priests who offer the gifts*” (of sacrificial animals) “according to the Law.” (Hebrews 8:4, 10; 10:16)

According to Yeshua, Mosaic Law will be in effect as long as this Earth exists.¹⁶⁵ We also see the proof of this “change” not taking effect while this Earth exists, in that Yeshua will *not* be the High Priest of Israel in His thousand year reign from this earthly Jerusalem (cf. Ezk. 43:19; Rev. 20:1-6f.), nor its king (cf. Ezk. 44:15)44:3; 45:7, 16, 22, etc.).

The written Law of Moses will vanish away only as we enter into the eternal New Jerusalem because then the Law will be written on our hearts and minds. In other words, Mosaic Law will be our nature because we will be like Yeshua, whose nature is the basis for Mosaic Law.¹⁶⁶ Another way of saying this is that Mosaic Law is a reflection of Yeshua's personality. Want to be like Jesus? Walk in Torah (Mosaic Law), as the Apostles Paul and John did all their lives (1st Cor. 4:16-17; 11:1; 1st John 2:6; Rev. 12:17; 14:12).

¹⁶⁴ Five *Pillars* of Mosaic Law are:

1. The Feasts of Israel (Lev. 23:1-44),
2. The Law of Love (Dt. 6:4-5; Lev. 19:18c; Mt. 5:43; 22:35-40),
3. The Mosaic Dietary Laws (Lev. 3:17; 11:1f.; Dt. 14),
4. The Seventh Day Sabbath (Gen. 1:31–2:3; Ex. 20:8-11; Dt. 5:12-15; Ex. 35:1-3; Mark 2:27-28) and,
5. The Tithe (Gen. 14:18-20; 28:10f.; Dt. 14:22-29).

¹⁶⁵ Matthew 5:18: “For assuredly, I say to you, until Heaven and Earth pass away, not one jot or one tittle will pass from the Law until all is fulfilled.” It's easy to understand what Yeshua means by “fulfilled.” After the Resurrection He says to His Apostles in Luke 24:44:

“These are the words which I spoke to you while I was still with you, that all things must be *fulfilled* which were *written in the Law of Moses* and the Prophets and the Psalms *concerning Me*.” He fulfilled the Law's prophecies about a coming Messiah, as well as those in the Prophets and the Psalms. He didn't do away with the Law.

¹⁶⁶ See Psalm 40:8; Jeremiah 31:31-34; Romans 7:22; Hebrews 8:10; 10:16.

Hebrews 7:15-17 and In The Likeness Of

“And it is yet far more evident if, in the *likeness* of Melchizedek, there arises *another* priest who has come, not according to the law of a fleshly commandment, but according to the power of an endless life. For He testifies: “You are a Priest forever *according* to the *Order* of Melchizedek.”” (Hebrews 7:15-17)

This would have been another perfect place for the Author of Hebrews to say that Jesus had been Melchizedek, but on the contrary, he says just the opposite. The Author states of Yeshua that He is “in the *likeness* of Melchizedek,” and that Yeshua is “another priest,” or a different priest than Melchizedek, which obviously cannot mean that Yeshua was Melchizedek. An article in *Israel My Glory* states of *likeness of Melchizedek*, that,

“This reveals that Melchizedek was an individual who was a type of Christ—not that he actually was the preincarnate Christ.”¹⁶⁷

The Greek word for *likeness* is ὁμοιότητα (*homoi'otaeta*)¹⁶⁸ and supports this. Bauer says it means a “state of being *similar* to something, *likeness*, *similarity*.”¹⁶⁹ Johannes Louw writes that it’s “the state of being similar to something—“similarity, likeness, being similar.””¹⁷⁰ A third lexicon also has “similarity, likeness.”¹⁷¹ All three lexicons speak of the Greek word meaning that Jesus was like or similar to Melchizedek: neither of them had their offices conferred upon them by lineage and both have royal priesthoods.

Six times the Writer of Hebrews cites Psalm 110:4 when stating that Jesus is a priest “after the Order of Melchizedek.”¹⁷² If Yeshua had been Melchizedek, the Author of Hebrews, who certainly knew that Yeshua was the Son of God, literally speaking of Him 12 times as such,¹⁷³ *would certainly have declared that Yeshua had been Melchizedek*. He would not have said that he Son of God (7:15) was *like* Melchizedek or that Melchizedek *resembled* the Son of God (Heb. 7:3). It’s unreasonable to think that the Author of Hebrews speaks of Melchizedek nine times in three chapters,¹⁷⁴ and this in direct relation to Yeshua, *but never once says that Yeshua had been Melchizedek*.

¹⁶⁷ *Jesus is Better Than Melchizedek, Israel My Glory*. The author, who isn’t named in the article, sums it up nicely, saying a “popular interpretation is that Melchizedek was Christ...in some preincarnate form. Thus, he would have been like the Old Testament “angel of the Lord” (e.g. Gen. 16:7-11; Ex. 3:2; Jud. 13:3-21). Proponents of this view point to the language of Hebrews 7:3: “Without father, without mother, without descent, having neither beginning of day nor end of life.” There are some serious problems, however, with this idea. Six times the writer of Hebrews cited Psalm 110:4 when stating that Jesus is a priest “after the order of Melchizedek” (5:6, 10; 6:20; 7:11, 17, 21). If Jesus actually *was* Melchizedek, He would not be said to be “after the order of Melchizedek.” Furthermore, language of similarity, not identity, is used to describe the relationship between the two. Hebrews 7:3 states that Melchizedek was “made *like* unto the Son of God,” not that he actually was the Son of God. Finally, Hebrews 7:15 states that Jesus is a priest “after the similitude [likeness] of Melchizedek,” not that he actually was Melchizedek. These verses indicate that Melchizedek was an individual who was a type of Christ, not that he actually was the preincarnate Christ.”

¹⁶⁸ The same Greek word is found in both the GNT-TR and the GNT-WH.

¹⁶⁹ Bauer, *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*, para. 707.

¹⁷⁰ Johannes Louw and Eugene A. Nida, Editors, *Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament based on Semantic Domains*, vol. 1 (New York: United Bible Societies, 1989), p. 617.

¹⁷¹ *Hebrew to English Dictionary and Index to the NIV Old Testament* (derived from the Zondervan NIV Exhaustive Concordance; Accordance Bible Software), para. 3,999.

¹⁷² Hebrews 5:6, 10; 6:20; 7:11, 17, 21.

¹⁷³ Yeshua as God the Son is seen 12 times in the Letter to the Hebrews: eight times as “Son” (p. 28 note 107) and four times as “Son of God” (see p. 28 note 108).

¹⁷⁴ Melchizedek is named nine times in the Letter to the Hebrews (Heb. 5:6, 10; 6:20; 7:1, 10-11, 15, 17, 21), but not once does Hebrews state that Yeshua was Melchizedek or that Melchizedek was Jesus. He is not only named nine times, but he and his Priesthood are the historical basis or prototype for Messiah’s eternal Priesthood and Kingship.

False interpretations of Scripture abound within Christianity (e.g. Christianity’s anti-Mosaic Law theology and Christianity’s practice of *illicit SEX*),¹⁷⁵ and false interpretations abound outside of Christianity (e.g. Joseph Smith’s Mormons and their teaching on their “heavenly Father;” that he used to be a man on another planet who was regenerated and became “a god,” but is still a man-god),¹⁷⁶ and the Catholic Church’s “Mother Mary” (sinless and the one whom God’s Grace comes through to Catholics),¹⁷⁷ and so it’s no surprise that there are people who think that Jesus had been Melchizedek.

The Two Offices Become One in Messiah

The Aaronic Priesthood began in the Wilderness (cf. Lev. 8–9; Num. 3:1f., 8:5f.). About 400 years later, with Saul from the Tribe of Benjamin, who would forfeit his kingship, David from the Tribe of Judah would be king, and after him, his sons would continue for more than 400 years. The article, *Jesus is Better Than Melchizedek*, states that both offices,

“were governed by clear regulations set forth in Deut. 17:14-20 and 18:1-8. *They were however, separate offices for separate individuals. The kings were from the tribe of Judah, the priests were from the tribe of Levi, and the two roles were not held by the same individual.* When kings strayed into priestly functions, they were reminded sternly of the wrongness of their actions. Consider the cases of King Saul (1st Sam. 13:5-14), and King Uzziah (2nd Chron. 26:16-21).”¹⁷⁸

It’s more than interesting that God set up Israel to have two separate offices for the king and high priest, while Israel’s Messiah would not follow that concept. Those two offices were combined in one person, *which Melchizedek epitomizes*. Psalm 110:4 speaks of this and Zechariah 6:12-13 confirms it.

All wasn’t fulfilled at the Cross, as many Christians like to say (cf. Luke 24:44). *All* will be fulfilled when this Universe melts away at the manifestation of Yahveh and then Christians will be glorified.¹⁷⁹ The point here is that Melchizedek came on the scene before Israel existed, and Messiah Yeshua’s royal priesthood, even though it appears to defy Mosaic Law, actually harkens back to a greater priesthood than Aaron and a greater kingship than David. It’s not being injected into the Mosaic Covenant; it’s being realized in the New Covenant.

¹⁷⁵ Illicit SEX is an acronym for Sunday, Easter and Xmas, which also includes the eating of unclean animals and a contempt for Mosaic Law, which is God’s New Testament lifestyle for every Christian. See my short, two page articles on why Christianity is wrong, and also why the Mormons are a damnable cult: [A Snapshot of Church History and Mosaic Law](#),

[Apostolic Christianity’s Lifestyle](#)

[Christians! Stop Following The Pope!](#)

[Illicit SEX and the Church](#)

[Mormons—Are They Christians?](#)

[Paul and Mosaic Law at Caesarea](#)

[Seven Reasons Why The Church is Wrong](#)

[The Feasts of Israel and the Church](#), and [The Two Triangles of the NT](#),

[Why Sunday?](#) and [Xmas and its Origin](#).

¹⁷⁶ “According to [Mormon theology](#), God the Father is a physical being of “flesh and bones” (Doctrines and Covenants 130:22)...Latter-day Saint leaders have also taught that God the Father was once a mortal man who has completed the process of becoming an exalted being; God the Eternal Father, [Teachings of Presidents of the Church: Joseph Smith](#) (LDS Church: 2011), pp. 36-44. According to Joseph Smith, God “once was a man like one of us and...once dwelled on an earth the same as Jesus Christ himself did in the flesh and like us” (ibid.).

¹⁷⁷ See [What’s Wrong with the Catholic Church?](#) and also [The Two Triangles of the NT](#).

¹⁷⁸ *Jesus is Better Than Melchizedek*, [Israel My Glory](#).

¹⁷⁹ See my article, [Salvation—The Promise!](#), for what God has planned for us in eternity.

The Mystery of Melchizedek

The ancient Jewish Sages and Rabbis saw Melchizedek as an historical figure; an actual person. They didn't find anything in the Genesis 14 or Psalm 110 to suggest otherwise. Many thought that he was Shem, the son of Noah.¹⁸⁰ Theologian F. F. Bruce writes that, "Some of them identified him with Shem, whose life...overlapped Abraham's;" Shem "survived the Flood by some 500 years."¹⁸¹

Abram was called by God to Canaan when he was 75 (Gen. 12:4). He meets Melchizedek perhaps five years later, when he is about 80 years old. Taking 80 as an approximate age when they met in Genesis 14, the year *From Creation* (FC) would have been 2026. Abram was born in the year 1946 FC (2135 BC), and adding 80 to that makes the date for their meeting in the year 2026 FC or 2055 BC. It may very well have been Shem as it seems that Abram knew him or knew of him. Be that as it may, an asterisk (*) after a name in the chart below reveals who of the descendants from Shem, including Shem, were alive in 2026 FC (2055 BC), and could have been Melchizedek when Abram met him that day.

The Chronological Chart

Name	Year of Birth From Creation (FC)	Year of Death From Creation (FC)	Years Lived	Scripture Reference	Year of Birth in BC
01. Adam	0	930 FC	930	Genesis 5:5	4071 BC
02. Seth	130 FC	1042 FC	912	Gen. 5:3, 8	3951 BC
03. Enosh	235 FC	1140 FC	905	Gen. 5:6, 11	3846 BC
04. Kenan	325 FC	1235 FC	910	Gen. 5:9, 14	3756 BC
05 Mahalalel	395 FC	1290 FC	895	Gen. 5:12, 17	3686 BC
06. Jared	460 FC	1422 FC	962	Gen. 5:15, 20	3621 BC
07. Enoch	622 FC	987 FC	365	Gen. 5:18, 23	3459 BC
08. Methuselah	687 FC	1656 FC	969	Gen. 5:21, 27	3394 BC
09. Lamech	874 FC	1651 FC	777	Gen. 5:25, 31	3207 BC
10. Noah	1056 FC	2006 FC	950	Gen. 5:28-29; 9:29	3025 BC
11/01. Shem*	1556 FC	2156 FC	600	Gen. 5:32; 11:11	2525 BC
The Flood	1656 FC	--	371 Days	Gen. 7:6-8:19	2425 BC
12/02. Arphaxad*	1656 FC	2094 FC	438	Gen. 11:10, 13	2424 BC
13/03. Shelah*	1691 FC	2124 FC	433	Gen. 11:12, 15	2399 BC
14/04. Eber*	1721 FC	2185 FC	464	Gen. 11:14, 17	2360 BC
15/05. Peleg	1755 FC	1994 FC	239	Gen. 11:16, 19	2306 BC
16/06. Reu	1785 FC	2024 FC	239	Gen. 11:18, 21	2296 BC
17/07. Serug*	1817 FC	2047 FC	230	Gen. 11:20, 23	2264 BC
18/08. Nahor	1847 FC	1995 FC	148	Gen. 11:22, 24-25	2234 BC
19/09. Terah*	1876 FC	2081 FC	205	Gen. 11:24, 32	2205 BC
20/10. Abraham	1946 FC	2121 FC	175	Gen. 11:26; 25:7	2135 BC
21/01. Isaac	2046 FC	2226 FC	180	Gen. 21:5; 35:28	2035 BC
22/02. Jacob	2106 FC	2253 FC	147	Gen. 25:26; 47:28	1975 BC
23/03. Joseph	2196 FC	2306 FC	110	Gen. 50:22	1885 BC

¹⁸⁰ See p. 6, *The Chumash*, and also, *The Jewish Publication's Society Torah Commentary*.

¹⁸¹ Bruce, *The Epistle to the Hebrews*, pp. 161-162, note 26.

Even though Terah has an asterisk, as he was alive in 2026 FC (2055 BC), he wasn't Melchizedek because we know that Abram left Terah in Haran, along with the rest of his family. In the chart there are five of Abram's "Fathers" (not counting Terah), *any one of which* could have been Melchizedek because they all were alive in 2026 FC or 2055 BC:¹⁸²

1. Shem was Abraham's great, great, great, great, great, great, great grandfather (seven "greats").
 - a. Shem died in **2156 FC**, which means *he actually outlived Father Abraham* by 35 years, which is truly astounding. Abraham died in 2121 FC at the age of 175, when Shem was 565 years old and still had 35 years left to live to be 600.
 - b. Shem was still alive in Isaac and Jacob's time. Shem died when Isaac was 110 years old, and when Jacob was 50 years old.
 - c. If Shem was Melchizedek he would have been 470 years old on the day he met Abram, who was 80 years old. Abram was 80 years old in 2055 BC. Shem was born in 2525 BC, and so in 2055 BC Shem would have been 470 years old.
2. Arphaxad was Abraham's great, great, great, great, great, great grandfather (six greats). Arphaxad died in **2094 FC**. Abraham outlives him by 27 years, but Arphaxad was very much alive when Melchizedek met Abram in 2026 FC.
3. Shelah was Abraham's great, great, great, great, great grandfather (five greats). Shelah died in **2124 FC**. He outlived Father Abraham by three years.
4. Eber was Abraham's great, great, great, great grandfather (four greats). Eber died in **2185 FC**. He outlived Father Abraham by 64 years.
5. Serug was Abraham's great grandfather. Serug died in the year **2047 FC**, which means that he too, could have been Melchizedek because the meeting of Gen. 14 took place about 21 years earlier. Serug would have been 209 years old.
6. Avram's father Terah was still alive, but it's doubtful that he had left Haran and become King of Salem as well as its High Priest. Besides, there is no "fatherly greeting" from Abram. Be that as it may, Terah died in the year **2081 FC** or 56 years after Avram met Melchizedek in **2026 FC**.

Father Abram was 100 years old when Isaac was born, seven chapters after Gen. 14, in Gen. 21:3 (cf. Gen. 17:17). Even Ishmael hadn't been born yet (cf. Gen. 16:11) when Abram met Melchizedek. Abram was 86 years old when Ishmael was born (Gen. 16:16). This is why having Abram be about 80 years old when he met Melchizedek is reasonable because Abram came into Canaan when he was 75. In other words, the meeting had to be between when Abram enters Canaan (age 75) and when Ishmael is born two chapters after Genesis 14 (when Abram is 86 years old).

Any one of the first five men above could have been Melchizedek; all from the *righteous* line of Noah, with Abram descended from all of them, which means they were his great grandfather, etc., and that he would know them or know of them. Shem, the first one, is the strongest possibility. This may account for the reason why Melchizedek blesses him in line with what God had promised his father Noah (Gen. 8:17; 9:1) and Abram (Gen. 12:1-3; 15:1f.; 17:1f.). This is also why Abram gave him a tithe of all his spoils of war after he blessed Abram—Melchizedek was the High Priest of the Most High God and a direct link from the Covenant that God had made with Noah and his sons through Shem.

Of all the Fathers (Shem, Arphaxad, Shelah, Eber and Serug), Shem was the oldest living Father in Abram's day, and as such he would have the most honor from all his descendants, especially having Noah as his father, and so it's not unreasonable to present Shem as Melchizedek, the King and High Priest of Salem, which would mean that "Melchizedek" was a second name for him. Of course, Shem may not have been Melchizedek, but it's interesting how the figures (dates of death) present themselves in the

¹⁸² The "BC" dates in The Chronological Chart (by Avram Yehoshua) spin off of the Exodus having taken place in 1440 BC, a date that many scholars agree upon, while other scholars see it closer to 1200 BC. I side with the former scholars as recent archeology backs the earlier date of 1400 BC.

“line of the righteous Fathers,” and that Abram is of the righteous line of Noah. Noah was the 10th generation from Adam, and Abraham was the 20th generation from Adam and the 10th generation from Noah. As Noah began a new human race, so Abram would begin the race of Israel; God’s Chosen People.

Also, if Shem or any of the other eligible Fathers listed above was Melchizedek, we now have the date of Melchizedek’s birth, death, his father and his genealogy, all the way back to Adam and Eve. There are those who say it cannot be Shem, etc., because Melchizedek doesn’t have any lineage in Genesis or Hebrews. It could be that Scripture doesn’t connect Shem to Melchizedek for its own purpose, and this is where the silence of Scripture comes in. It doesn’t mean that Shem couldn’t have been Melchizedek. Besides, who else could Melchizedek have been for Father Abram to seemingly know him, receive his blessing and give Melchizedek his tithe?

In commenting on Hebrews 7:1-2, Lenski writes of “Luther and others” believing that Melchizedek was Shem, no doubt having seen what the Rabbis before them had said. Lenski says that,

“Rabbi Ismael...thought him to be Shem, Noah’s son; *this opinion has been accepted by Luther and by others*...Origen thought him to be an angel...others specified this angel as Michael. Hierakas, at the end of the third century, made him *a temporary incarnation of the Holy Spirit*; others a similar incarnation of the Logos”¹⁸³ (i.e. the preincarnate Jesus).

It’s interesting that a “spiritual” Melchizedek didn’t mean he was automatically the preincarnate Jesus for many Christians. Opinions varied in early Christendom, from angels and Michael, to the Holy Spirit, and also of course, Jesus. It’s unfortunate that we don’t know why, or what was the scriptural basis of them for thinking that Melchizedek was an angel or the Holy Spirit or Jesus. We have to also remember that Gnosticism played a large part in the lives of the early heretical *and* orthodox Christians, and so ideas about Melchizedek could be very fanciful without any substance needed.

Qumran

Qumran means “river bed,” and in this case an old dried up river bed in Israel. “Qumran” is the designation for a series of caves in the Judean desert where archeological discoveries about Jews living in the desert 2,000 years ago began to be found, *coinciding* with the establishment of the State of Israel in 1948—nothing less than a divine miracle.¹⁸⁴ The discoveries are collectively known as The Dead Sea Scrolls. It was in Qumran Cave 11 that the primary fragments of a scroll speaking about “Melchizedek” were found, and hence the designation, 11QMelchizedek (or 11QMelch), which stands for the fragments of parchment about *this* Melchizedek found in the 11th Qumran Cave. This Melchizedek wasn’t the biblical Melchizedek, but the angel Michael, who had the designation, King of Righteousness.

About a century before the birth of Yeshua in Bethlehem, the Essenes, a splinter group of Jewish men living in the Judean desert, taught about Michael the angel. This “Melchizedek” is an angel, or even possibly an extension of God. In an article titled *Melchizedek*, we see how some, like *The Bible Knowledge Commentary*, came to think that Abram met the angel-priest Melchizedek:

“The Qumran Scrolls...indicate that *Melchizedek* was used as a name of the Archangel Michael, interpreted *as a heavenly priest*; Michael as *Melchi-zedek*, contrast with Belial, who is given the name of *Melchi-resha* “king of wickedness.” What we have here is the confusion of the biblical character Melchizedek with the description that the Essenes, who wrote the Qumran Scrolls, gave to the angel Michael. In describing Michael as the “King of Righteousness” they...used the two Hebrew words to do it: *Malki* (King) and *Tzedek* (Righteousness). *It wasn’t that they saw the biblical Melchizedek as the King of*

¹⁸³ Lenski, *The Interpretation of the Epistle to the Hebrews and the Epistle of James*, p. 207.

¹⁸⁴ [Qumran Caves](#). These discoveries of Jews living before and after the time of Messiah Yeshua reveal the Palestinian lie that the Jews only came to the land in the late 1800s. The Hebrew parchments of Qumran were an incredible discovery that the God of Israel timed with the establishing of the Third Commonwealth of Israel in 1948.

Righteousness, but Michael as the King of Righteousness."¹⁸⁵

The Essene angel Michael was actually created by their imagination. There isn't anything in Scripture that speaks of Michael the angel as the King of Righteousness. In that same article it states that they also gave to Michael titles usually reserved for God:

"11Q13 (11QMelch) is a fragment of a text, dated to the end of the second or start of the first century BC, about Melchizedek, found in Cave 11 at Qumran...and part of the Dead Sea Scrolls. Melchizedek is seen as a divine being in the text and is referred to as "El" or "Elohim," titles usually reserved for God. According to the text, Melchizedek will proclaim the "Day of Atonement" and he will atone for the people who are predestined to him. He also will judge the peoples."¹⁸⁶

Without knowledge of the true Messiah the fanciful thoughts of those Essenes ran wild, and yet we do know that the true King of Righteousness, Yeshua, did atone for Israel. There's nothing, though, in Scripture that speaks of the angel Michael atoning for anyone.

The Essenes hid their scrolls in the caves to preserve them from the advancing Roman Army in 67 AD that decimated the land of Israel, Jerusalem and destroyed the Temple, extinguishing the last Jewish state known as Judah. Be that as it may, the Essenes began as a group of Jewish men about 100 years before Messiah was born in Bethlehem, which means that their existence began more than 1,700 years after Abram met Melchizedek. What they have to say about their angel Michael as the King of Righteousness has nothing to do with the biblical Melchizedek. Of course, there are Christians who don't realize this and give their opinion about "Melchizedek" being an angel.

In the Christian realm there is Gnostic Christian evidence that Melchizedek was Jesus Christ,¹⁸⁷ which doesn't concern us because they "believed in their Jesus" in the framework of Gnosticism, which deals with angels needing to be accessed in order "to get to God" (cf. Col. 1:9-2:10). Their Jesus is Gnostic, one of many entities (e.g. angels) that lead to God the Father. Their Jesus is not the Jesus of Scripture.

Gareth Cockerill also presents evidence that the Qumran writings of Melchizedek aren't speaking of the biblical Melchizedek, but of the angel Michael, the "Angel of Truth" and the "Prince of Light," as the Essenes called him, and also the King of Righteousness. He writes,

"11QMelchizedek (11Q13) has been the primary Qumran document cited in support of" Melchizedek being "the angel called Michael, (the) "Angel of Truth," and "Prince of Light(s)"" which is seen in other Qumran writings... "the fact that "Melchizedek" is written as two words in 11QMelchizedek (מֶלְכִּי, "king;" צְדָקָה, 'righteousness') suggest that the people of Qumran coined the name "King of Righteousness" for Michael by analogy with the other names they gave him, "Angel of Truth" and "Prince of Light(s)." "King of Righteousness" was particularly appropriate for Michael's function in 11QMelchizedek as the one who brings about the "righteousness" of God by establishing God's eschatological kingship... That the people of Qumran would understand "Melchizedek" as "King of Righteousness" is substantiated by the fact that...Philo (*Alleg. Interp.* 3.79-82), Josephus (*Ant.* 1.180; *J.W.* 6.438), who knew Hebrews, and the admittedly later Targums...all "understand "Melchizedek" in this way. I know of no witness to any other understanding of this name in the Second Temple period. Furthermore, *there is not reason to believe that*

¹⁸⁵ [Melchizedek](#).

¹⁸⁶ Ibid. The terms "El" and "Elohim" mean God/god and Gods/gods, respectively.

¹⁸⁷ James M. Robinson (translator), *The Nag Hammadi Library in English*, 1978 at [Melchizedek](#) states that, "A collection of early Gnostic scripts dating on or before the 4th century, discovered in 1945 and known as the Nag Hammadi library, contains a tractate pertaining to Melchizedek. Here, in this Gnostic script dating back to the 4th century, it's proposed that Melchizedek is Jesus Christ. Søren Giversen and Birger A. Pearson, translators, in the text of the [tractate](#) says that, "Melchizedek, as Jesus Christ, lives, preaches, dies and is resurrected, in a gnostic perspective. The Coming of the Son of God, Melchizedek speaks of his return to bring peace, supported by God, and he is a priest-king who dispenses justice."

*11QMelchizedek is describing the biblical person named “Melchizedek.” This document makes no reference to Psalm 110 or to Gen. 14:14-27. When the people of Qumran refer to the Melchizedek in Genesis, in the Genesis Apocalypse, they wrote his name as one word.”*¹⁸⁸

“Melchizedek” as the name of the biblical character is always written as one word in Hebrew, but the Jews of Qumran, when speaking of Michael the angel, wrote it in two words because they were describing what they believed to be a characteristic of the angel Michael as the King of Righteousness. *They weren’t saying that Michael was Melchizedek.*

The International Standard Bible Encyclopedia writes that the fragments about “Melchizedek” were found a few years after the initial finding of the first Dead Sea Scroll parchments:

“In 1956 thirteen fragments of a first-century manuscript were found in Qumrân Cave 11 (11QMelch). The text is an eschatological midrash built on the concept of the Jubilee Year (Lev. 25) and weaving in a number of eschatological passages (Dt. 15:2; Isa. 61:1; Ps. 82:1f.; 7:8f. [MT 9f.]; Isa. 52:7). A. S. van der Woude, the original publisher of 11QMelch, saw Melchizedek as playing a significant role, standing in the assembly of God *among the angelic beings*. There he is depicted as executing divine judgment, which is somehow related to the Jubilee Year. He also seems to be involved either as one who atones for the sins of the people or as the priest who mediates atonement to them. A few students of Qumrân literature identify the Melchizedek of 11QMelch *as an earthly person who met Abraham* (Gen. 14) and whose likeness will be reproduced in the coming Messiah. Most Qumrân scholars however, view the Qumrân Melchizedek as a *high angelic being* who was thought to have appeared to Abraham.”¹⁸⁹

It seems that the scholars who saw Melchizedek as an angelic being who met Avram didn’t realize that it wasn’t the Melchizedek of Scripture that Qumran was speaking about, but the angel Michael as the “King of Righteousness.” In other words, they didn’t realize that the Melchizedek of Qumran wasn’t the Melchizedek of Genesis 14.

The use of the two nouns, King (*Malki*) and Righteousness (*Tzedek*) were used not as Michael’s alter ego, but as a description of Michael in a non-scriptural position as an angel-priest. Therefore, it’s the angel Michael, the Prince of the people of Israel (cf. Daniel 10:21; 12:21) that the Essenes in The Dead Sea Scrolls spoke of.

Paul Sumner also didn’t realize that “Melchizedek” in the Qumran fragments wasn’t the biblical Melchizedek either. He states that Melchizedek was a divine being “referred to as “*El*” or “*Elohim*,” titles usually reserved for God”¹⁹⁰ or the pagan gods.

The anonymous author of the article, *Jesus is Better Than Melchizedek* says that the “authors of the Dead Sea Scrolls” saw their “Melchizedek” as a “super-angel.”¹⁹¹ Of course this is Michael he is speaking about, as the angel and King of Righteousness.

In their book, *Biblical Figures Outside the Bible*, Michael Stone and Theodore Bergren state that the,

“Qumran Scrolls also indicate that Melchizedek *was used as a name* of the Archangel Michael, interpreted as a heavenly priest; Michael as *Melchi-zedek* contrast with Belial, who is given the name of *Melchi-resha* “king of wickedness.”¹⁹²

¹⁸⁸ Cockerill, *The Epistle to the Hebrews*, p. 298, note 14.

¹⁸⁹ Bromiley, *The International Standard Bible Encyclopedia*, Volume Three, p. 313.

¹⁹⁰ Paul Sumner, *Hebrew Streams*; [Melchizedek: Angel, Man or Messiah?](#) Feb. 25, 2010.

¹⁹¹ *Jesus is Better Than Melchizedek*, [Israel My Glory](#).

¹⁹² Michael Stone and Theodore Bergren (eds.), [Biblical Figures Outside the Bible](#), p. 181.

Michael E. [Stone](#) is...Professor of Religion and Professor of Armenian Studies at the Hebrew University of Jerusalem...Theodore Bergren is Associate Professor of Religion at the University of Richmond, Virginia.

Stone is saying that the *name* Melchizedek was used as another name for Michael, but this isn't accurate. Michael was seen as *melchi-tzedek* and was contrasted with Belial, who was given the name *melchi-resha*, "King of Wickedness." Stone writes that the Essenes saw Michael as an angelic priest who would *some-how* make atonement for Israel or lead Israel into atonement.¹⁹³

Gareth Cockerill's significant insight revealed that "Melchizedek" wasn't the *name* the Essenes gave to the angel Michael, but a description of the angel Michael as what the name Melchizedek symbolizes: the King of Righteousness. This was realized because the "Melchizedek" in relation to Michael was spelled with two nouns (king and righteousness) as two words, whereas the biblical Melchizedek is always spelled with two nouns as one word. Therefore, what some Christians say about "Melchizedek" from the Melchizedek fragments of The Dead Sea Scrolls, that he was the preincarnate Christ, or a heavenly angel, relates to the Essene view of the angel Michael, not the Melchizedek of Genesis 14.

CONCLUSION

Genesis 14:18-20

Genesis 14:18-20 presents Melchizedek as a man—the King and High Priest of Salem. There isn't a single hint in the passage, let alone a divine declaration, that Melchizedek was the preincarnate Christ. No one in the passage, nor anywhere else in the Old Testament (or the New), says that Melchizedek was the Messenger of Yahveh or Jesus. This is significant because Old Testament Scripture *always* reveals Yeshua's preincarnate appearances, in Hebrew, as the Messenger of Yahveh (the so-called "Angel of the LORD"), etc. In other words, *the biblical characters knew* that they encountered this divine being, and so do we. The meeting between Melchizedek and Abram glaringly lacks this. This is a serious problem for those who say that Jesus was Melchizedek.

Was Jesus actually the King and High Priest of Salem? If so, how long did He reign and conduct His priestly (and kingly) duties for the people of Salem? Did Jesus just become its king and high priest to bless Abram and then return to Heaven? That would hardly constitute Him being its king and high priest. Did He hold those offices for a year, a decade, 500 years? He certainly wasn't there when David conquered Jebus. David would turn Jebus, ancient Salem, into his royal city—Jerusalem. The Jebusites were pagans. Obviously Jesus wasn't their king nor high priest as Melchizedek. Melchizedek also wasn't ruling when Joshua came into the Land either, in 1400 BC or 655 years after Abram met Melchizedek that day in 2055 BC. When did Jesus return to the Heavens? Anyone who answers that is just giving their fanciful opinion.

Another problem for the "Jesus was Melchizedek" people is Melchizedek took the tithe from Abram. The preincarnate Jesus could never have done that. Instead He would have told Abram to offer some animals to God in sacrifice, as He did with Samson's parents. What could Jesus have done with the tithe? He couldn't take it to Heaven with Him.

Ancient kings, specifically of the Assyrians and Hittites, were also high priests. This revealed that Melchizedek, as King and High Priest of Salem, was not unusual in his office. Ebed-tov, a king who could also have been Melchizedek, wrote to Pharaoh saying that he didn't get his kingship from his father nor his mother, meaning that it wasn't handed down to him because of his lineage, but rather because he earned it, no doubt due to his righteousness as a person. This points to Ebed Tob also being Melchizedek. This concept, of attaining his kingship from "the mighty God," due to his righteousness, is a powerful reason why Yeshua was made King and High Priest of Israel by His Father. The Author of Hebrews says that no high priest (of God) takes this honor upon himself, but is given it by God.

¹⁹³ Ibid.

The nine scholars who commented on *Melchizedek*, the first three of them being Jewish, all saw Melchizedek as a man:

1. *The Chumash* spoke of Melchizedek as Shem.
2. Nahum Sarna said that Melchizedek was a Gentile monotheist who worshiped the one true God in a land filled with paganism, and that king-priests were not an uncommon phenomena.
3. Adele Berlin said that it was not unusual in Genesis for a foreigner, a non-Hebrew like Melchizedek, to “recognize and revere the God of Israel.”
4. C. F. Keil stated that although Scripture didn’t present Melchizedek’s genealogy, birth or death, he was not Jesus, but a type of Jesus being the “God-King and eternal High Priest” of Israel.
5. Wenham said that Melchizedek was “a *type* of Christ, a forerunner of the Messiah.”
6. John Hartley spoke of Melchizedek being the *model* of the priestly Messiah in His two offices combined into one person, something we don’t see with Aaron, Israel’s first High Priest.
7. Thomas Whitelaw explained that the name *Melchizedek* wasn’t a title, like Pharaoh, but the name of an actual man, and so even though Melchizedek can mean “king of righteousness,” it doesn’t mean that Jesus was Melchizedek. There are many Hebrew names that, if taken literally, imply that the person is God or the Son of God. For instance, Avi’El (“Abiel,” my Father is God; Avner (“Abner,” my Father is Light), etc.
8. Sherrill Stevens spoke of ancient sources “outside the Bible,” revealing that there was a group of people in Jerusalem who worshiped the Most High God, no doubt Melchizedek and his people in Salem.
9. Alfred Edersheim saw Melchizedek as a man, a type of Messiah. Melchizedek acted as a bridge between the covenant that God had made with Noah and the blessing of Noah for his son Shem for the land of Canaan (Gen. 9:24-27), and the covenant that God had made with Abram for the land of Canaan, and Melchizedek (Shem or one of his descendants) blessing Abram. Edersheim believed that Melchizedek was a type and shadow of Messiah Yeshua as the eternal, royal priest because of the lack of information or the silence of Scripture on Melchizedek’s genealogy, etc.

It seems that Abram must have known who Melchizedek was as the King of Salem and the High Priest of the Most High God (i.e. Yahveh), because there isn’t so much as a word of introduction for the two of them in the three verses of Genesis 14:18-20. Nor did anyone tell Abram that Melchizedek was its king and high priest. Abram knew.

Shara Drimalla said that before Israel even existed, Melchizedek was a priest of the Most High God in a land filled with pagans and pagan practices (e.g. Sodom and Gomorrah). Melchizedek was God’s “foothold” in the land of Canaan for Israel and Joshua.

These scholars all agree that Melchizedek was an actual man because there’s nothing in the passage to suggest otherwise. Genesis 14:18-20 would be the *only instance of its kind in all the Old Testament* that Jesus actually had taken up residence on Earth, specifically in Salem, for an undetermined period of time, with no hint of His being divine.

It’s one thing for Yeshua to appear in His preincarnate state to Abraham and many others, for a few minutes or even a few hours, and then return to Heaven. It’s quite another for Yeshua to remain on Earth, rule in a city *and* offer animal sacrifices as the High Priest of Salem. This didn’t happen—Yeshua wasn’t Melchizedek and He didn’t rule in Salem nor was He its high priest. Melchizedek was. No Scripture speaks of Melchizedek being the “Angel of the LORD,” or that Jesus appeared to Abram as Melchizedek. None.

Psalm 110:4

Psalm 110:4 presents the Son of David, the Messianic King and High Priest of Israel after the Order or Pattern of Melchizedek (NET). Just as Melchizedek was the King and High Priest of Salem, and that it wasn't lineage that got him those offices, and that Scripture doesn't speak of his death, and so, the Author of Hebrews can use that for the Messiah of Israel. He would be the King and High Priest of Israel, with the heavenly Jerusalem as its capital, paralleling the Salem and Jerusalem that Melchizedek and David ruled, respectively, and Yeshua didn't get His priesthood from lineage, and of course, He is eternal.

Zechariah 6:12-13 confirms this royal priesthood for Israel's Messiah, the Branch, which began with the Resurrection of Yeshua and the New Covenant.

“Therefore let all the House of Israel know for certain that God has made this Yeshua, whom you crucified, both Lord and *Messiah*.” (Acts 2:36 NKJV)

The biblical concept of the Messiah contains both kingship and high priesthood, as Psalm 110:1, 4 and Zech. 6:12-13 reveal. In Ps. 110:4 Melchizedek is spoken of, but there is no mention of him being divine, God the Son, or Melchizedek coming or being the King and High Priest of Israel. A simple thought is expressed in that David's Lord would be a royal priest after the Order of Melchizedek.

A question arises that if Jesus *had been* Melchizedek, why would God need to swear an oath that David's Lord *would become* a (High) Priest after the Pattern of Melchizedek? Heb. 6:20 states, “where the forerunner has entered for us, even Jesus, *having become* High Priest forever according to the Order of Melchizedek.” If Jesus had been Melchizedek, Jesus was *already* king and high priest (of Salem) when He was born in Bethlehem. There would have been no need to speak of Jesus as “*having become* High Priest forever (*according to the Order of Melchizedek*).

Also, Melchizedek is spoken of in the third person in the Psalm, while David's Lord is written of in the second person. If Melchizedek was Jesus he would have been written of in the second person.

Hebrews Seven

One powerful point that refutes Jesus as having been Melchizedek is found in Hebrews 7:3. The Greek participle, ἀφομοιωμένος (*afomoiomaynos*), whether active or passive, closes down all thoughtful discussion on whether the preincarnate Christ was Melchizedek because it *always compares two distinct and different people*. Melchizedek *resembled* Yeshua; he wasn't Yeshua. He was a *picture* of Yeshua (as Israel's eternal royal High Priest). Melchizedek reveals Yeshua's eternal state as King and High Priest of Israel, and neither one received their priesthood from an established lineage.

The passive participle of the Greek word is translated as “having been made like the Son of God,” while the active participle for the Greek word means that Melchizedek was made like Yeshua; he was a copy or model of Yeshua. It's the language of similarity, not identity. The Author of Hebrews presents Melchizedek and Yeshua as two different people. Those who believe they were the same person take some of the things the Author says literally, that the name Melchizedek means king of righteousness, and the city he reigned over meant that he was king of Salem, but they fail to include the word that means Melchizedek resembled Jesus. The Greek word *always* speaks of a comparison between two people. The word could not be used because it would be irrelevant if Melchizedek and Jesus were the same person.

Nine times the Author speaks of Melchizedek and parallels him with Yeshua as the Messiah, being the Royal High Priest of Israel,¹⁹⁴ but the Author *never* states that Yeshua was Melchizedek. This isn't an oversight, as the Holy Spirit is truly the Author of Hebrews, but something that the Spirit did not lead the human Author of Hebrews to present because obviously, Melchizedek wasn't Yeshua. How simple that would have been to speak of it if it were so. In the three chapters of Hebrews Five through Seven, not

¹⁹⁴ Hebrews 5:6, 10; 6:20; 7:1, 10-11, 15, 17, 21.

once does the Author declare that Jesus was Melchizedek, but as we've just seen, he presents the direct opposite—Melchizedek and Yeshua are two different people.

Even though Melchizedek is on the historical scene before Yeshua was born in Bethlehem, Yeshua, as the anti-type, was alive from eternity past. His coming to Israel, dying and rising from the dead is the historical event that made Him the King and High Priest of eternal Israel.

Hebrews 7:3 also states that Melchizedek “remains a priest continually,” which is taken up by many to prove that Melchizedek is still alive as Jesus. The Author is speaking symbolically of Melchizedek because with Scripture not revealing his mother or father, birth or death, it allows for the Author to present Melchizedek as “remaining alive.” He's speaking of a snapshot in time, of Melchizedek in Genesis 14:18-20, “frozen in time.” *In that picture* Melchizedek never dies and so, he remains a priest *continually*. The Author is not suggesting that Melchizedek was alive in his day as the King and High Priest of Jerusalem (Salem) because Yeshua wasn't the king or high priest of Jerusalem; one of the Sons of Aaron was its high priest and there was no Jewish king in the Author's day. It's the very silence of Scripture that allows the Author of Hebrews to paint this picture of Melchizedek *being like or resembling* Yeshua. As Bruce wrote, Melchizedek “continues for the duration of his appearance” *in Scripture*. Where this is symbolic of Melchizedek, it is reality for Yeshua.

Yeshua though, unlike Melchizedek, has a genealogy; actually two.¹⁹⁵ We know who Yeshua's divine Father and Mother are, as well as His earthly (step) father and mother; *when* Yeshua was born¹⁹⁶ and when He died.¹⁹⁷ Therefore, what the Author of Hebrews says about Melchizedek, as being without father and mother, and not having his birth or his death, cannot be speaking of Yeshua. In other words, Melchizedek has to have been a real man and not the preincarnate Jesus because if Jesus had been Melchizedek the Author of Hebrews could not have said that Melchizedek didn't have a father or mother, etc., unless the Author of Hebrews didn't realize that Jesus had been Melchizedek. This though, would negate any possibility that the Author was declaring Jesus to have been Melchizedek; the very thing the people who think that Jesus was Melchizedek teach about what the Author says.

Part of being of the Order of Melchizedek means that Yeshua didn't need any Levitical lineage to be Israel's High Priest and He is the beginning and the end of this Order; there were no priests before Yeshua and there won't be any after, for He lives forever. This parallels Melchizedek in that he has no lineage spoken of and no priests were before or after him.

Both are given their high priesthood not because of any lineage, but because of their righteous character. Melchizedek's name and the city he ruled over indicates this and also Abram, giving his tithe to Melchizedek, confirms it. Yeshua's character as the King of Righteousness and Peace is well known, but He needed lineage from King David of the Tribe of Judah to be the Messiah, the King of Israel. This lineage from David is established through Joseph in both Matthew and Luke—two witnesses.

The exact symbolism or meaning of the name *Melchizedek* is altered by the Author of Hebrews to fit his theological presentation so that Melchizedek can mean King of Righteousness. It would have been less effective to present him as a type of Jesus if the Author spoke of the literal meaning of Melchizedek's name as, My King is Righteous. The Author didn't want this because it would present Melchizedek in a way that wouldn't align with Jesus. In other words, this isn't something that Yeshua would ever say or name of Himself or be called. This too points away from Yeshua having been Melchizedek.

The Bible Knowledge Commentary presented Melchizedek as having been neither a man nor the Messiah,

¹⁹⁵ See Matthew 1:1-17f.; and Luke 3:21-38. Mary is the human mother or rather carrier of Yeshua, but the Holy Spirit is the divine Mother (cf. Luke 1:30-35). As for the Holy Spirit being the Mother in the God Family of Father, Mother and Son, see my articles, [Yeshua—God the Son](#) and [Three Persons—One God?](#)

¹⁹⁶ See my article, [The Feast of Tabernacles](#).

¹⁹⁷ The Gospel's speak of Yeshua dying on Aviv 15, the first day of the Feast of Unleavened Bread. The evening before Yeshua ate the Passover Meal with His 12 Apostles. To understand how John 13 is the Passover Meal that the Synoptic Gospels present, and not a “Memorial Meal” or a Passover Meal a day earlier than is biblically mandated, see my article, [Passover and the Apostle John](#).

but an angel, less-than-scholarly basing it not upon Scripture, but a very poor understanding of Melchizedek being “without beginning of days,” and on a false reading of the Qumran literature on Michael the angel as the King of Righteousness. Also, Scripture never speaks of any angels ruling a city on Earth as either a king or a high priest, and certainly not both. Then there is the point that an angel-high priest could not minister to human being, but only other angels. That’s one reason Yeshua had to become a man in order to be Israel’s High Priest. He is the perfect mediator between God and Israel (cf. 1st Tim. 2:5).

In Hebrews 7:4-11 the Author teaches that Melchizedek was greater than Father Abraham and consequently, the Aaronic Priesthood that descended from Abraham because Abram was blessed by one greater than him (i.e. Melchizedek), and gave Melchizedek a tithe. Abram would certainly have seen Shem as Melchizedek, greater than himself because he was the son of Noah who had received the blessing from his father, and he was almost five times the age of Abram.¹⁹⁸

Yeshua didn’t have to have lineage from Aaron because Yeshua is “another Priest,” outside the Order of Aaron, but well within the bounds of Torah and God’s will, as seen Psalm 110:4. Aaron’s priesthood could not make anyone perfect or glorified, while Yeshua’s Sacrifice and Priesthood perfects all His followers. Aaron didn’t live forever, but died, and through Abram, he symbolically tithed to Melchizedek, symbolically making Melchizedek’s Priesthood greater than Aaron’s, and Yeshua’s priesthood greater than Aaron’s.

Hebrews 7:12 speaks of a change of the Law. It doesn’t have to do with whether Jesus had been Melchizedek or not, but with Christianity’s heretical interpretation that a “change” in the Law means that the entire Law of Moses is changed or negated, except for what the Church sees as the moral laws of the Old Testament. Christianity’s illicit SEX is “set in stone” and is a greater deception to Christians than the Pharisaic traditions that nullified God’s Word ever were. Illicit SEX reveals how blind, proud and ignorant most Christians are to understanding God’s Word in relation to New Testament Christian lifestyle. Thinking that Jesus was Melchizedek pales in comparison to the heretical blunder that “Jesus did away with Mosaic Law.”

This “change in the Law” doesn’t effect the Aaronic Priesthood or do away with it, even though the Temple is not standing and the Aaronic Priests are not offering animal sacrifice today. As Jesus Himself said, Mosaic Law will be valid until this Earth and the Heavens are no more (Mt. 5:18). This change also doesn’t make Yeshua the High Priest of Israel on this Earth because He is the King and High Priest of the New Jerusalem. This non-priestly ministry of Yeshua on Earth is clearly seen in the millennial reign of Yeshua as the Prince of the Millennial Kingdom, and also what the Author of Hebrews states about Yeshua not being a priest on Earth (Heb. 8:4).

Mosaic Law is still in effect and will continue to Judgment Day. In the Millennial Kingdom there will be animal sacrifice,¹⁹⁹ and an Aaronic High Priest and his sons will perform it. The 7th day Sabbath is seen as God’s holy day to keep and to assemble on,²⁰⁰ as well as the Feasts of Israel²⁰¹ and the New Moons.²⁰² All that will continue under Messiah Yeshua who will reign from this earthly Jerusalem (Rev. 20:1-6f.) as the Prince (Ezk. 44:3; 45:7, 16, etc.), the Son of David ruling on His Throne through Mosaic Law (cf. Mt. 5:17-18; Lk. 1:31-32).

The Author of Hebrews is not “doing away with” the Aaronic Priesthood, Temple and animal sacrifice, as the Church wrongly teaches, but *contrasting* Aaron with Yeshua as High Priest, and Aaron’s animal sacrifices against Yeshua’s Sacrifice, and Aaron’s life as a sinner, with Yeshua’s sinless life, and Aaron’s life and death as a mortal man, with Yeshua eternal life. This is what makes the priesthood of Yeshua better or greater than Aaron’s. As long as this Earth and these Heavens exist, Mosaic Law will be God’s lifestyle

¹⁹⁸ “You must rise before the gray headed and honor the presence of an old man, and fear your God! I *am* Yahveh!” (Leviticus 19:32)

¹⁹⁹ Ezekiel 40:38-43, 46-47; 42:13; 43:15-27; 44:10-11, 15, 25-27, 29-30; 45:15-25; 46:2, 4, 6-7, 11-15, 20, 24.

²⁰⁰ Ezekiel 44:24; 46:1, 3-4, 12.

²⁰¹ Ezekiel 44:24; 45:21-25; 46:9, 11; 1st Cor. 5:6-8.

²⁰² Ezekiel 46:1, 3, 6.

for every Christian.²⁰³

Confirming the proper interpretation of Melchizedek *resembling* Yeshua is Yeshua being made in the *likeness* of Melchizedek (Heb. 7:15). The Greek word for *likeness* means something that is *similar* to something else. Yeshua was like or similar to Melchizedek: neither of them had their offices conferred upon them by lineage and both have royal priesthoods, and both have characters of righteousness and peace.

The Aaronic Priesthood and kingship in Israel are two separate offices, but they combine into one royal priesthood under the Messiah, prefigured in Melchizedek. Both Psalm 110:4 and Zechariah 6:12-13 confirm the Messiah being made a king-priest after the Order of Melchizedek, not Aaron or David, whose kingship did not include priesthood.

Cockerill brought out that Melchizedek is seen in the Genesis account as a human being, just as the king of Sodom is, and Duncan revealed that the comparison between Melchizedek and Yeshua by the Author of Hebrews is so that we come away not with a better understanding of Melchizedek, but that we would be “more in awe” of Yeshua as Israel’s eternal King and High Priest, as well as Yeshua being the King of Righteousness and Peace. This is brought out against the backdrop of Melchizedek.

Both Catholics and Protestants, and every other denomination or Christian faith that I know of, teach that Melchizedek was a man, not the preincarnate Jesus. Sometimes there is safety and reason in numbers.

The ancient Jewish Sages saw Melchizedek as a man, an actual historic figure. They didn’t find anything in the Genesis or the Psalm passages to suggest otherwise. Many of them, as well as many Christians, thought that he was Shem, the son of Noah, which Melchizedek most likely was. The chronological chart, reveals that Shem was alive when Melchizedek met Abram, and Shem actually outlived Father Abraham. The fact that Abram tithed to Melchizedek also suggests that Shem was Melchizedek. Abram knew, or knew of Melchizedek, before they met that day.

In early Gentile Christianity opinions as to who Melchizedek was varied from angels and Michael to the Holy Spirit, and Jesus. Most Gentile Christians came out of Gnosticism, or were influenced by it, and so they had a lot of heretical baggage they had to deal with, if they dealt with it at all. Many Christians thought they had to access angels to get to God. That’s why Paul speaks of the fullness of the Godhead residing with Yeshua, and that there’s no need for those Gnostic angel mediators (cf. Col. 19f.).

The discoveries of ancient Hebrew texts in Qumran, known as The Dead Sea Scrolls, specifically fragments of a scroll known as “Melchizedek,” reveal what some ancient Jews, known as the Essenes, around the time before and during Yeshua’s life in Israel, thought about Michael the angel, not Melchizedek the King of Salem. Many Christians today don’t realize that the Essene “Melchizedek” wasn’t the biblical Melchizedek, but an appellation or description of the angel Michael as the King of Righteous. This mistake means that some Christians think that the Essenes saw the biblical Melchizedek as an angel. What the Essenes have to say about their Michael though, has nothing to do with the biblical Melchizedek.

Cockerill presented evidence that the Essene Melchizedek wasn’t the biblical Melchizedek, but Michael the angel, the Essene “Angel of Truth” and the “Prince of Light” and also the King of Righteousness, which in Hebrew is “*Melchi Zedek*,” *written as two words* by the Essenes. The biblical character of Genesis 14, “Melchizedek” is always written as one word in Hebrew.

Someone might say that Yeshua, as having been Melchizedek, was still alive, because the Author knew

²⁰³ See Matthew 5:17-19 and my articles,
[Mosaic Sacrifice and the Blood of Jesus](#)
[Mosaic Sacrifice in the New Testament](#)
[Hebrews and the Change of the Law](#)
[The Feasts of Israel and the Church](#)
[Law 102](#)

[Take the Quiz! Five Quick Questions about the New Testament.](#)

Also, Ezekiel 40:42, 46-47; 43:18-22, 27; 44:11, 15, 30; Rev. 20:1-6f.

that Yeshua was alive, but to make that connection is just what we've seen isn't possible. It's unreasonable that the Author of Hebrews speaks of Yeshua being a (High) Priest "according to the Order of Melchizedek" six times over three chapters, *but never once states that Yeshua was Melchizedek*. Any of those places would have been a perfect place to state that Yeshua had been Melchizedek because the Author speaks of Melchizedek still being alive or that "he lives." There isn't a single cite in Hebrews that speaks of Jesus having been Melchizedek. The obvious reason is because *the Author never meant for anyone to think that Melchizedek was Yeshua*. He used Melchizedek as a pattern for Messiah Yeshua.

Those who think that the preincarnate Jesus was Melchizedek don't take into account that Genesis 14 has absolutely nothing about him that speaks of divinity, nor do they realize that the two different pronouns for David's Son and Melchizedek in Psalm 110 strike down that the two are the same person. This, along with the fact that the Psalm speaks of the Son being according to the Order of Melchizedek, means that Yeshua wasn't Melchizedek.

The Son of God was not Melchizedek.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Articles Cited in the Introduction

1. [Is Melchizedek Jesus?](#) by Aaron Gray.
2. [The Angel of the Lord](#) by Avram Yehoshua.

Melchizedek in Genesis 14

1. Berlin, Adele; Marc Zvi Brettler and Michael A. Fishbane, eds. **The Jewish Study Bible** (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004). Accordance Bible Software; Altamonte Springs, FL: OakTree software, 2012).
2. Bromiley, Geoffrey W., General Editor. Everett F. Harrison, Roland K. Harrison and William Sanford LaSor, Associate Editors. **The International Standard Bible Encyclopedia** (Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1979).
3. Brown, Dr. Francis, Dr. S. R. Driver and Dr. Charles A. Briggs, based on the lexicon of Professor Wilhelm Gesenius. Edward Robinson, Translator. E. Rodiger, Editor. **Hebrew and English Lexicon** (Abridged). (Accordance Bible Software; Altamonte Springs, FL: OakTree software, 2012.)
4. Cockerill, Gareth Lee, Author. Gordon D. Fee, Editor. **New International Commentary of the New Testament: The Epistle to the Hebrews** (Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2012), pp.
5. Dods, Marcus, D.D., Author. W. Robertson Nicoll, Editor, C.H., D.D., LL.D.' **The Expositor's Greek Testament, Volume Four: Hebrews** (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, 2002.)
6. **Easton's Bible Dictionary**. Accordance Bible Software (Altamonte Springs, FL: OakTree software, 2012).
7. Edersheim, Alfred. **Bible History: Old Testament** (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, 2003; originally written in 1890).
8. Hartley, John E. **New International Biblical Commentary: Genesis** (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, Inc., 2002).
9. **Hebrew to English Dictionary and Index to the NIV Old Testament** (derived from the Zondervan NIV Exhaustive Concordance). Accordance Bible Software (Altamonte Springs, FL: OakTree software, 2012).
10. Keil, C. F. and F. Delitzsch. **Commentary on the Old Testament: vol. 1, The Pentateuch** (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, 2001; originally published by T. & T. Clark, Edinburgh, Scotland, 1866-91).
11. Koehler, Ludwig, Walter Baumgartner, and J. J. Stamm, Authors; M. Richardson, Editor, translator. **The Hebrew-Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament** (Boston, MA USA: Brill Academic Publishers, 2002). Accordance Bible Software (Altamonte Springs, FL: OakTree software, 2012).
12. Sarna, Nahum M. Levine, Baruch A., Nahum M. Sarna, general Editor. **The Jewish Publication Society Torah Commentary: Genesis** (Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society, 1989; Accordance Bible Software; Altamonte Springs, FL: OakTree software, 2012).
13. Scherman, Rabbi Nossou and Rabbi Meir Zlotowitz, General Editors. **The Chumash** (Brooklyn: Mesorah Publications, Ltd., 1994).
14. Stevens, Sherill G. **Layman's Bible Book Commentary: Genesis** (Nashville, Tennessee: Broadman

Press, 1978).

15. Wenham, G. J. **Genesis, New Bible Commentary: 21st Century Edition** (Downers Grove, Illinois: InterVarsity Press, 1994; Accordance Bible Software).
16. Whitelaw, Thomas, author. **The Pulpit Commentary (Genesis-Job)**, ed. H.D.M. Spence and Joseph S. Exell; Accordance electronic ed. (Altamonte Springs: OakTree Software, 2017).

Articles or Videos Cited for Melchizedek in Genesis 14

1. [Adele Berlin](#)
2. [Ambrose](#)
3. [BDB](#)
4. [Carl Friedrich Keil](#)
5. [El Elyon Most High - One Of The Names Of God](#)
6. [Gordon Wenham](#)
7. [HALOT](#)
8. [International Standard Bible Encyclopedia](#) and also [This set](#)
9. [John E. Hartley](#)
10. [Melchizedek](#)
11. [Melchizedek's Temple](#) (video)
12. [Nahum Sarna](#)
13. [Passover](#) by Avram Yehoshua
14. [Passover and Jesus](#) by Avram Yehoshua
15. [Sherrill Stevens](#)
16. [The Royal Priest—Abraham and Melchizedek](#)
17. [Thomas Whitelaw](#)
18. [Was Melchizedek the Preincarnate Christ?](#) by Wayne Jackson
19. [Where Abraham Met Melchizedek](#) (video)
20. [Wilhelm Gesenius](#)

Melchizedek in Psalm 110

1. Brown, Robert and Philip W. Comfort, translators. J. D. Douglas, Editor. **The New Greek-English Interlinear New Testament** (Wheaton, IL: Tyndale House Publishers, 1990; Accordance Bible Software).
2. Douglas, J. D., M.A., B.D., S.T.M., Ph.D., Organizing Editor. **The Illustrated Bible Dictionary** (Leicester, England: Inter-Varsity Press, 1998).
3. Keil, C. F. and F. Delitzsch. **Commentary on the Old Testament: vol. 5, Psalms** (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, 2001; originally published by T. & T. Clark, Edinburgh, Scotland, 1866-91).
4. Koehler, Ludwig. Walter Baumgartner, and J. J. Stamm, Authors; M. Richardson, Editor, translator. **The Hebrew-Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament** (Boston, MA USA: Brill Academic Publishers, 2002). Accordance Bible Software (Altamonte Springs, FL: OakTree software, 2012).

5. Stern, David. **The Complete Jewish Study Bible** (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers Marketing, LLC, 2016).

Articles Cited for Melchizedek in Psalm 110

1. [Hebrews and the Change of the Law](#) by Avram Yehoshua
2. [The Branch](#) by Avram Yehoshua
3. [The Davidic Lineage of Messiah Yeshua](#) by Avram Yehoshua
4. [The Illustrated Bible Dictionary](#)
5. [The Names of the Messiah of Israel](#) by Avram Yehoshua
6. [Was Melchizedek the Preincarnate Christ?](#) by Wayne Jackson
7. [Yeshua The Branch?](#) by Avram Yehoshua

Melchizedek in Hebrews Seven

1. Barker, Kenneth. Et al., eds. **The NIV Study Bible** (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1985; Accordance Bible Software).
2. Barmby, J., Author. Henry D. M. Spence-Jones and Joseph S. Excell, Editors; **The Pulpit Commentary Series: Hebrews** (New York: Anson D. F. Randolph, 1890; Accordance Bible Software, 2017).
3. Bauer, Walter; augmented by William F. Arndt, F. W. Gingrich and Frederick Danker. **A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature**, third edition 2001 (Accordance Bible Software; Altamonte Springs, FL: OakTree software).
4. Bromiley, Geoffrey W., General Editor. Everett F. Harrison, Roland K. Harrison and William Sanford LaSor, Associate Editors. **The International Standard Bible Encyclopedia** (Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1979).
5. Brown, Dr. Francis, Dr. S. R. Driver and Dr. Charles A. Briggs, based on the lexicon of Professor Wilhelm Gesenius. Edward Robinson, Translator. E. Rodiger, Editor. **Hebrew and English Lexicon** (Abridged). (Accordance Bible Software; Altamonte Springs, FL: OakTree software, 2012.)
6. Bruce, F. F., Author. Gordon D. Fee, general Editor. **The New International Commentary on the New Testament: The Epistle to the Hebrews** (Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1990).
7. Cockerill, Gareth Lee, Author. Gordon D. Fee, Editor. **New International Commentary of the New Testament: The Epistle to the Hebrews** (Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2012).
8. Dods, Marcus, D.D., Author. W. Robertson Nicoll, Editor, C.H., D.D., LL.D. **The Expositor's Greek Testament** (Volume Four) **Hebrews** (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, 2002).
9. Douglas, J. D., M.A., B.D., S.T.M., Ph.D., Organizing Editor. **The Illustrated Bible Dictionary** (Leicester, England: Inter-Varsity Press, 1998).
10. Edersheim, Alfred. **The Life and Times of Jesus The Messiah** (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, 2000).
11. Guthrie, Donald, B.D., M.Th., Ph.D., Author. Leon Morris, M.Sc., M.Th., Ph.D., general Editor. **Tyndale New Testament Commentaries: Hebrews** (Leicester, England: Inter-Varsity Press, 2000).
12. Hagner, A. Donald. Author; W. Ward Gasque, New Testament Editor. **New International Biblical**

Commentary: Hebrews (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, 1990).

13. **Hebrew to English Dictionary and Index to the NIV Old Testament** (derived from the Zondervan NIV Exhaustive Concordance). Accordance Bible Software (Altamonte Springs, FL: OakTree software, 2012).
14. Oswald, Hilton C. **Luther's Works: First lectures on the Psalms II, Psalms 76-126** (St. Louis, MO: Concordia Publishing House, 1976).
15. Lenski, R.C.H. **The Interpretation of the Epistle to the Hebrews and the Epistle of James**, Lenski's Commentary on the New Testament (Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1961; Accordance Bible Software).
16. Longman, Tremper. **How To Read Genesis** (Downer's Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 2005).
17. Louw, Johannes and Eugene A. Nida, Editors. **Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament based on Semantic Domains** (New York: United Bible Societies, 1989).
18. Morris, Leon, Author. Frank E. Gaebelein, general Editor; J. D. Douglas, associate ed. **The Expositor's Bible Commentary**, vol. 12, **Hebrews** (Grand Rapids, MI, USA: Zondervan, 1992. Accordance Bible Software).
19. Peterson, David, Author. Ed. D.A. Carson, et al.; **Hebrews, New Bible Commentary: 21st Century Edition** (Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press, 1994; Accordance electronic ed.).
20. Stern, David. **Jewish New Testament Commentary** (Clarksville, MD: Jewish New Testament Publications, 1992).
21. Swartley, Willard M. **Covenant of Peace** (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing, 2006)
22. Thayer, Joseph. **Thayer's Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament** (Accordance Bible Software; Altamonte Springs, FL: OakTree software, 2012).
23. Yehoshua, Avram. [The Lifting of the Veil: Acts 15:20-21](#) (Latest revision 2023).

Articles Cited for Melchizedek in Hebrews Seven

1. [A Snapshot of Church History and Mosaic Law](#) by Avram Yehoshua
2. Adam to Yeshua, PDF chart by Avram Yehoshua
3. [Bible Hub](#) for Hebrews 7:15: [Gill's Exposition of the Entire Bible](#).
4. [Bible Hub](#) for Hebrews 7:15: [Heinrich Meyer](#).
5. [Bible Hub](#) for Hebrews 7:15: [Jamieson, Fausset and Brown Bible Commentary](#).
6. [Bible Hub](#) for Hebrews 7:15: [Matthew Poole](#).
7. [Catholic Standard](#)
8. [Christians! Stop Following The Pope!](#) by Avram Yehoshua
9. [Christophany](#)
10. [David G. Peterson](#)
11. [David Harold Stern](#)
12. [Described](#)
13. [Donald Alfred Hagner](#)
14. [Donald Guthrie](#)
15. [Frederick Fyvie Bruce](#)

16. [Gareth Lee Cockerill](#)
17. [Have You Ever Wondered?](#) by Avram Yehoshua
18. [Hebrews and the Change of the Law](#) by Avram Yehoshua
19. [Human Sacrifice and Yeshua](#) by Avram Yehoshua
20. [Illicit SEX and the Church](#) by Avram Yehoshua
21. [Is Melchizedek Jesus?](#) by Aaron Gray
22. [Israel My Glory](#)
23. [James Barmby](#)
24. [Jesus and Melchizedek](#) by Ligon Duncan
25. [Kenneth Lee Barker](#)
26. [Leon Morris](#)
27. [Marcus Dods](#)
28. [Melchizedek](#)
29. [Melchizedek: Angel, Man or Messiah?](#)
30. [Mormon theology](#)
31. [Mormons—Are They Christians?](#)
32. [Passover and the Apostle John](#) by Avram Yehoshua
33. [Pretemporal](#)
34. [Richard Charles Henry Lenski](#)
35. [Seven Reasons Why The Church is Wrong](#) by Avram Yehoshua
36. [Take the Quiz! Five Quick Questions about the New Testament](#) by Avram Yehoshua
37. [Teachings of Presidents of the Church: Joseph Smith](#)
38. [Thayer's](#)
39. [The Angel of the Lord](#) by Avram Yehoshua
40. [The Davidic Lineage of Messiah Yeshua](#) by Avram Yehoshua
41. [The Feast of Tabernacles](#) by Avram Yehoshua
42. [The Feasts of Israel and the Church](#) by Avram Yehoshua
43. [The Names of the Messiah of Israel](#) by Avram Yehoshua
44. [The Royal Priest—Abraham and Melchizedek](#) by Shara Drimalla and The Bible Project
45. [The Two Triangles of the NT](#) by Avram Yehoshua
46. [This Proves Melchizedek is Not Christ!!!](#) by Ahmayan
47. [Three Persons—One God?](#) by Avram Yehoshua
48. [Was Melchizedek the Preincarnate Christ?](#) by Wayne Jackson
49. [What's Wrong with the Catholic Church?](#) by Avram Yehoshua
50. [Why Sunday?](#) by Avram Yehoshua
51. [Xmas and its Origin](#) by Richard Davis
52. [Yeshua—From the Tribe of Levi?](#) by Avram Yehoshua

53. [Yeshua—God the Son](#) by Avram Yehoshua

The Mystery of Melchizedek

1. Bruce, F. F., Author. Gordon D. Fee, general Editor. **The New International Commentary on the New Testament: The Epistle to the Hebrews** (Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1990).
2. Lenski, R.C.H. **The Interpretation of the Epistle to the Hebrews and the Epistle of James**, Lenski's Commentary on the New Testament (Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1961; Accordance Bible Software).
3. Sarna, Nahum M. Levine, Baruch A., Nahum M. Sarna, general Editor. **The Jewish Publication Society Torah Commentary: Genesis** (Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society, 1989; Accordance Bible Software; Altamonte Springs, FL: OakTree software, 2012).
4. Scherman, Rabbi Nosson and Rabbi Meir Zlotowitz, General Editors. **The Chumash** (Brooklyn: Mesorah Publications, Ltd., 1994).

Qumran

1. Cockerill, Gareth Lee, Author. Gordon D. Fee, Editor. **New International Commentary of the New Testament: The Epistle to the Hebrews** (Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2012).
2. Hagner, A. Donald. Author; W. Ward Gasque, New Testament Editor. **New International Biblical Commentary: Hebrews** (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, 1990).
3. Stone, Michael and Theodore Bergren (eds.), [Biblical Figures Outside the Bible](#) (Harrisburg, Pennsylvania: Trinity Press International, 2002).

Articles Cited in Qumran

1. [Israel My Glory](#), *Jesus is Better Than Melchizedek*. December/January 1993/1994.
2. [Melchizedek: Angel, Man or Messiah?](#) Paul Sumner, *Hebrew Streams*; Feb. 25, 2010.
3. [Melchizedek](#).
4. [Melchizedek](#). James M. Robinson (translator), *The Nag Hammadi Library in English*. 1978.
5. [Qumran Caves](#).²⁰⁴

[Who is Melchizedek?](#) Is a nine minute video by Bible Animations that highlights important Scripture facts about if Melchizedek was the preincarnate Christ or a man who was a type of Messiah.

²⁰⁴ This article was finished on Tuesday, March 26, 2024 and last revised on Sunday, April 14, 2024.