

# **BIBLICAL MIDWIFERY**

**ESSAYS ON ITS ROLE IN THE  
KINGDOM OF GOD**

**JAMES WESLEY STIVERS**

***BIBLICAL MIDWIFERY:***  
***ESSAYS ON ITS ROLE IN THE KINGDOM OF GOD***  
***Teacher's Edition***

© James Wesley Stivers, 2003

First Edition, 1997  
Library of Congress Number: 4-715-398  
Copyright: James Wesley Stivers  
P.O Box 242, Andover, Kansas 67002

**Current Address: P.O. Box 8701,  
Moscow, ID 83843**

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

## *AUTHOR'S PREFACE*

INTRODUCTION	7
THE LEGAL STATUS OF MIDWIVES	11
THE ISSUE OF STATE CERTIFICATION	15
DEVILS, DRAGONS, & DIADEMS	19
MIDWIVES AND THE BIBLE	35
BIRTH AS A SACRED RITE	49
MIDWIVES & THE HOLY GRAIL	65
THE MIDWIFE & ECCLESIASTICAL HIERARCHY	93
LITURGY FOR THE MIDWIFE	105
CONCLUSION	115
APPENDICES	
<i>Operation Rescue or Operation Miscue</i>	117
<i>Salome: Matron Saint of Midwives</i>	125
<i>The Ruebke Decision of the Kansas State Supreme Court</i>	133
<i>The Cambrian Episcopal Church</i>	153
<i>Midwifery as a Diaconate in the Cambrian Episcopal Church</i>	155
Bibliography	
Answer Key	
Index	



## ***AUTHOR'S PREFACE***

My interest in home birthing and midwifery began before I was married. Very early, I was teething myself on the philosophy of self-sufficiency in *The Whole Earth Catalog* and *Mother Earth News*, when they were still "hippie" publications. My anti-statism found its intellectual underpinnings in Frederick Bastiat's classic, *The Law*, a primer for political libertarians. Factors like these combined with my Pentecostal faith - a theology which believes that health and wholeness are a part of God's covenantal blessings - to produce a bias in favor of hearth and home: homesteading, home schooling, home churching, home birthing and so on.

I am also a theologian. I was trained for the ministry, but my views soon cut against the grain of organized religion. So, I quit the ministry and concentrated on research and writing. I soon found myself on the frontiers in terms of doctrinal and social philosophy. I came to realize that we need a different kind of civilization than what we have now. Since civilizations are not made like a three-minute burger, I had to restrain my zeal and hunker down for the long-haul. The kinds of changes I am looking for may not happen in my lifetime.

My research continues, however. And I have been rewarded to find that the story of Christianity - the untold story - contains a parade of people who thought like I do. The old Celtic Church and society were very close to what I envision. I invite you to obtain my writings on the Celtic Church. If you enjoy the essays which follow here, you will enjoy them, as well.

Anyway, I was fortunate to marry a woman who thought like I did. Since home birthing was such a new thing, we decided to have our first baby in the hospital. The second one was born at home in an old apartment in Wichita, Kansas. Kay had prenatal care with a midwife, but because her team was 45 to 60 minutes away, I got to deliver the baby - or as midwives term it: "catch the baby". They arrived soon enough afterwards to provide the necessary post-partum care, but I must say, it was a stunning experience that I would recommend to all fathers.

Since then, we have had five home births and one miscarriage - all assisted by midwives (I learned my lesson, thank you!). But I must say it was that first homebirth that I think impacted my psychological perspective as a man. Unlike the previous, detached hospital experience, the homebirth emphasized the end result of sex. Sounds silly, doesn't it?

Yes, yes, of course, I knew that babies came from sex. But there I was experiencing this epiphany over the intense and ultimately joyful consequences of having had sex with this

woman. Suddenly, I became aware of my place in the great march of life through time. I became intensely aware of how this process builds the Kingdom of God on Earth. It's not the starchy sermon or the ventilating politician, but rather the submission to the disciplines of family life.

Our first home birth became a rite of passage for us, especially for me. It completed the circle of mutual discovery. We are partners, not just as lovers, but also as *begetters*. This was a spiritual experience which matured my view of women and sexuality, and I think the world would be better off if more men were forced into these kinds of experiences.

Some of the chapters which follow were originally essays circulated during the 1990s in a self-published theological journal called *Biblical Terranomics*. It is where I publish my latest seminal research on sundry topics to my friends and associates. My writing style is pleasing to some and not to others. A lot depends on whether you are interested in the subject matter. If you are not, then it will be tedious to read. Some of the subject matter in this book does not seem directly related to midwifery. You might be tempted to skim past it. Don't. You must appreciate how midwifery fits into the larger plan of God. That was why I wrote this book. Understanding that nexus requires an exploration of theology and Church history.

I hope you are prepared to study and think. My writing is concise, not verbose. I try to pack as much in one sentence as possible. Unlike most writers, I do not masticate my thoughts. I don't waste a whole page on one minor concept. Most adult reading material is written for the sixth grade level. My stuff requires you to think, to read it again, and then, think some more. Look up the references in the Bible. Read them. They are important.

- The Author

## INTRODUCTON

There is a general dearth of primary resources available on the history of childbirth and midwifery. For the most part, the profession has fallen into that category of folk practices which never came within the purview of the historian. Since time immemorial, the skills of the midwife were passed-down orally from mentor to apprentice, from mother to daughter. Not until very recently did this vocation become formally integrated into the world of scholarship and the constellation of professions available to the modern woman.

The same is true of the world of theology and Church vocation. Being a patriarchal institution - and sometimes a misogynist one as well - the Church has scarcely provided any role for childbirth and the ministry of the midwife in the work of God's Kingdom. It has been considered either unimportant or an outright nuisance to more "spiritual" matters. I hope to remedy that perspective with this book.

The **first chapter** was written immediately following an important legal battle for midwives before the Kansas Supreme Court. I studied that decision and wrote my evaluation. The midwife that was on trial was Mrs. Michelle Ruebke. She was our midwife for two births. She is one spunky gal. She was blocking abortion clinics before it was cool to block abortion clinics. She has seven children, I think (I've lost track), most of them girls. (I see a college of midwives in the making.) She is a mother in Israel.

My critique is not a reflection on her. I am against secularizing midwifery and state certification. She is, too. But she followed the protocol of her mentors which treats midwifery "as if," it were a secular profession and state certified. It got her out of a jam - this time. Yet, I believe the general trend is not good. Midwifery ought to be a fully ordainable office in the Church as a Christian ministry. That it is not is not the fault of midwives. It is the fault of the Church.

The **second chapter** continues on with a further discussion of state certification, but sets the issue within the larger context of socialized medicine. Sometimes, we need to see the bigger picture before making a proper evaluation.

The **third chapter** is entitled, "Devils, Dragons & Diadems." It's a strange title, but it aptly illustrates a Biblical view of the state. A proper understanding of the entire book rests upon understanding this essay.

With the **fourth chapter**, I finally launch into a study of "Midwifery and the Bible." Primarily, it is an inductive and historical study of midwifery in Biblical times and early Christianity. The study will provide three important implications:

- *First*, midwifery is meant to be more than an act of charity or a ministry of mercy. In the Early Church the midwife performed a sacerdotal function. What that means is that birthing was a sacrament. It was accompanied by a representative of a bishop, who was a symbol of the unity of the Church and of the Throne of Christ. The midwife was that representative. There will be more on this in the final chapters.
- *Second*, the Bible depicts the midwife as healer, priestess, prophetess, and a co-begetter. The midwife has an organic connection to the family she serves.
- *Finally*, state-certified and supervised birthing through current medical institutions is a satanic usurpation of the midwife. This has tremendous political implications. In a wider sense, the much criticized Oral Roberts was right. He saw the need to bring medicine back within the healing ministry of the Church. The state is hostile to this because it wants to become a rival religion. Midwives need to get their heads out of the sand on this issue.

The **fifth chapter**, "Birth as a Sacred Rite" discusses a theologically-based world view which makes home birthing and midwifery important. In this essay I attempt to provide the support for the sacramental view of childbirth. Don't skip this one.

The **next chapter** discusses the subject of the Holy Grail at length. I introduce you to the Esoteric Church of the Holy Family (the Desposyni) and its role in founding the Kingdom of God in time and on Earth. It will challenge you in ways you cannot imagine. But if you want to know more, write to us at the Cambrian Episcopal Church and receive past issues of our pastoral epistles entitled *The Cambrian Peshier*. They discuss this doctrine further.

It is important to realize that beyond her sacerdotal ministry the midwife has a role in building the Kingdom of God and serving the Grail family. Ultimately, her historic role of existence has been centered on that vocation. No midwife can be true to her liturgical mission and neglect that role.

"The Midwife and Ecclesiastical Hierarchy" is the **seventh chapter** and discusses the midwife's relationship to the church authorities. But it is a family-oriented church structure which is in view here. You need to use a little imagination, at this point. We have nothing in our culture that can help us relate to what I am talking about here. I do not mean to offend sensibilities of traditional churchists, but I believe the idea of the family clan with a family village, centered on the eldership of a family chieftain is a wholesome (and Biblically sound) vision for the future. Ponder what I say here. The Kingdom of God cannot be founded without a *Biblical* patriarchy. Notice, I said "Biblical." The kind of patriarchy which has developed in the Church and society is an institutional variety, one which displaces the family. In the institutional



paradigm, men find their authority in organizations and non-family institutions where the women, as women, are marginalized. In a Biblical patriarchy, the man's authority is founded and sustained by his women. It is a symbiotic relationship (a "co-dependency," if I may borrow a much abused term). A Biblical patriarchy cannot be restored without the midwife. In the Bible, the Patriarch was a man with a host. How did he get that host? I think you get the idea. Once again, the midwife stands as a key in the plan of God.

The **final chapter** is "A Liturgical Practice for Midwives." I provide a Biblically-based standard for the midwife and the "nuts and bolts" of her ministry which conforms to Apostolic tradition. It is short, but sufficient to equip any Christian midwife with the tools she needs to provide the spiritual dimension to her ministry. I strongly urge you, however, that you connect yourself to a spiritual Body that can authenticate and confirm your ministry. The Cambrian Episcopal Church of the Grail can do that for you, even from a long distance. See the Appendix on the "Diaconate".

I hope this introduction will make the following more readable for you. There is a companion volume for this book, however, which is available. It is entitled *The Mother Heart of God: A Study on the Pneumatic Role of the Woman*. I encourage you to get it. (See the Appendix for an address.)

**Notice to Instructors:**

Questions for Discussion and Testing follow each chapter.

A Key for Suggested Answers is found at the back of the book. Bible quotations, unless otherwise indicated, are from the Textus Receptus, as found in the King James Version or the Lamsa Version of the Peshitta.



## **CHAPTER ONE:**

### **THE LEGAL STATUS OF MIDWIVES**

In March of 1996, the Kansas State Supreme Court rendered a decision in favor of lay midwives and their participation in home births. The following is my evaluation of that ruling.<sup>1</sup>

Essentially, the Supreme Court decision involved a lawsuit by the Kansas Board of Healing Arts against a Kansas midwife, Michelle Ruebke (who happens to have been an attendant midwife at the births of two of my children. I can attest to her competency).

Basically, the Kansas Board of Healing Arts accused Mrs. Ruebke of practicing medicine without a license. Mrs. Ruebke's attorney argued that the statute under which she was accused was unconstitutionally vague. It was further argued that childbirth is a natural act and traditionally does not involve the practice of medicine.

The Court agreed that midwifery is a time-honored profession distinct from the medical profession. It ruled that these two professions are not to be confused, even though physicians now dominate a field which was once the province of midwives. The Court did disagree, however, with the defense claim that the statute was unconstitutionally vague. Rather, it went further and concluded that the State Legislature *never* intended for midwifery to be included within its provisions. (This required some research on the part of the Court. I was impressed.)<sup>2</sup> I might add that the Court did refer to some incidentals: meaning activities which Ruebke did

---

<sup>1</sup> Although we were substantial supporters of the Kansas Midwifery Association, somehow, I did not find out about the Supreme Court hearing until after it had occurred. Consequently, I am not familiar with the oral arguments. However, I have read the decision itself, including press reports, and have had a growing acquaintance with the legal issues for the last twenty-five years. Not much is new in the debate.

<sup>2</sup>The text of the decision can be found in Appendix C

which may be construed to be medical procedures. But the Court duly noted that in such cases a physician was serving a supervisory role which satisfied the statute. On this score, Mrs. Ruebke is to be commended, as is the midwifery profession in general. Midwives are scrupulous in clearly defining their procedures and recording them and avoiding procedures which fall outside the perimeters of their profession.

You need to understand that what I am describing here is "lay midwifery." A lay midwife is not a medical professional (doctor, nurse, nurse-midwife, therapist, etc.). She (or he) has received her training by apprenticing under a practicing midwife in home (or clinic) deliveries. Although there are professional guilds which seek to standardize procedures for lay midwives, the field is self-regulating (one of the few areas of freedom left). The key to safe births is good nutrition. Physicians are woefully behind on the latest research. Lay midwives have stepped in and filled the vacuum. Nutritional therapy diminishes the need for medical intervention. That is what makes home birthing so safe.<sup>3</sup>

Although the Court came down on the side of midwives with both feet, they did leave open the invitation for review if the Board was able to convince the Legislature to amend the statute. In this particular case, Ruebke is safe. But future activity could be jeopardized if the Legislature does amend the statute.

I expect that is where the next attack will occur - in the Legislature. It is important, now more than ever, to reinvigorate midwifery associations. We need to organize and prepare for perennial attempts to amend this statute.

While I am personally delighted that the Ruebke's and other midwives who were in jeopardy have been delivered from the beastly jaws of Leviathan, I must now speak about my concerns. As a theologian, I am troubled by the defense argument that childbirth is merely a natural act and ought not to be considered as a "disease, deformity, injury, or ailment." I know this has been the standard defense for many years, and it has been, generally, a successful defense. I cannot quarrel with success. But in the light of Biblical truth, I cannot see this position as anything other than a humanistic one. Let me explain.

It is clear from the Scriptures (Genesis 3:16) that God meant for childbirth to be accompanied by pain and sorrow. While in the New Covenant I see that as greatly reduced, there is no escaping the fact that childbirth is a wounding from God. It is a wounding that requires healing. (The word "medicine" comes from the Latin "medeor" - "to heal." If words mean anything, then we must conclude that midwives do practice medicine, at least in the Biblical sense.)

In its present form, childbirth is not a "natural" act because nature is not normative. It is fallen. Now, that does not mean nature is bad. God declared it all "very good". Yet because of man's sin, a disciplinary element had to be introduced into nature to remind man of God's

---

<sup>3</sup>I am assuming that the reader is familiar with the medical side of home birthing and the statistical data which supports the claim that it is very safe. See the Bibliography for resources.

judgment if he fails to repent. To a greater or lesser degree, that discipline is always with us, even as obedient children.

In my mind, since nature is not normative, to say that childbirth is not a wounding is a tacit denial of the Fall of Man. Do not misunderstand me. I do not mean to criticize anyone for using a legal argument that works. However, I want to interject a warning: using a humanistic principle of reasoning may come back to haunt us. It is possible, in some future Court, that this very "nature is normative" argument may be used against Christians, if not on this issue, perhaps on another one.

I do not know where such an attack could come from, but here is a possibility. Marquis de Sade, the father of sadism, said that it was impossible to commit "a crime against nature". He said that anything which is possible is natural. If it is natural, then it is moral. Can you see where this logic is heading? Today, homosexuals and pedophiles want their lifestyles legalized. They want to adopt children. They use Marquis de Sade's argument to defend themselves. Some Courts have already upheld physician-assisted suicide and "the right to die". This is where the "nature is normative" doctrine is leading us.

Theologians risk anachronism. We appear to be behind the times. But really, we seem irrelevant because we see too far into the future. Charles Hodge, Princeton divine of the 19th Century, saw clearly the problem with public schools. He warned that they would become mighty "engines of atheism". With McGuffey's Readers in hand, it was impossible to take him seriously at the time. But what he feared has come to pass.

As I have always maintained, midwives must find coverture in the Church. I believe that is the ultimate solution. Midwifery needs to be reintegrated into the healing ministry of the Church. (Some churches need to reintegrate the healing ministry!) By so doing, they will regain not only new constitutional protections, but spiritual protections, as well.

## QUESTIONS FOR REVIEW

1. Since the legal status in some states is in constant flux, discuss other more recent court cases involving midwives.
2. Do you find the Ruebke Decision to be representative of judicial attitude toward midwives?
3. Would you classify midwifery as a "healing" profession, and thus the practice of medicine?
4. What has the "pain" of childbirth been attributed to traditionally?
5. Would you agree with the notion that childbirth is a "wounding from God"? Why or why not?
6. What do we mean by the "nature is normative" doctrine?
7. How might the "nature is normative" doctrine lead to the legalization of practices unacceptable to Christians?
8. What new constitutional protections might a midwife gain if she integrated her practice as a ministry of a Church?

## **CHAPTER TWO:**

### **THE ISSUE OF STATE CERTIFICATION**

During the final decade of the 20th Century, there was a major push for socialized medicine in the United States. Much of Europe already has socialized medicine. Socialized medicine is what we call "doctor government." Doctors and hospitals become an agency of the government and work for the government, just like the military or the post office. With socialized medicine, you have no options for medical care other than what the government allows for you to have. But the price is the same for everybody.

Traditionally, the American people have been hostile to socialism. They invariably reject a socialist program on its first introduction. Consequently, people who promote a socialist agenda have relied upon the Hegelian dialectic for success.

The Hegelian dialectic (named after the famous philosopher) teaches that history moves according to the ebb and flow of conflicting opposites. If the state wants to control history, it must control both sides of a question in order to produce the desired result. For instance, if socialism is the goal, then you must create two opposite extremes: capitalism and communism. By setting forth the thesis and then its antithesis, the managed conflict can produce a synthesis, which becomes the new thesis, or paradigm for the culture.

In the case of socialized medicine, we begin with the thesis: the arcade of the private sector, its skyrocketing costs, and sleazy insurance companies. Then, there is a radical proposal which no one can accept: Mrs. Clinton's Health Care Bill. It fails to pass, but it succeeds in convincing everyone that health care reform is necessary and inevitable. Thus, while everyone relaxes from "the fight to stop socialism", its provisions are integrated, piecemeal, by the very people who originally opposed it (conservative Republicans).

Socialized medicine is inevitable as long as the Hegelian view of the state prevails. Hegel saw the modern state as "god walking on earth". Since the power to heal is the work of God, to be a god, the state must heal. To heal, it must control medicine. The state wants complete loyalty. To achieve that it must be the only healer. Our modern society still continues to break the First Commandment: "Thou shalt have no other gods before me." As long as it looks to government to provide the breast, then its power over our lives will continue to grow. It is only a matter of time before midwifery is integrated into the larger scheme of socialized medicine. That is what has happened in Europe.<sup>4</sup>

The Hegelian process is occurring to the health food industry before our very eyes. Until now, it has been a virtually unregulated industry. Health crazes regularly sweep the country, as new health products are introduced. It is a very profitable sector of the economy. The FDA, the guardian of pharmaceutical monopolies, wants a piece of the action; it wants to control the options in natural health care.

The antithesis of an unregulated health food industry was created: a proposal to require a physician's prescription to purchase vitamins - an insane proposal. It created a firestorm of protest. But in the polemics of the debate the "need" to regulate the industry was recognized. The synthesis occurred. The industry now allows FDA oversight. That was the goal from the start.

Midwifery and home birthing are contra-trend in this regard. The very premise underlying their motivation and practice is anti-statist. Midwives represent a private sector solution to an over-regulated medical profession which has caused the price of having children to skyrocket. Having babies at home keeps the woman in charge of the birth. The state must stand outdoors.

Because midwifery is contra-socialist, one would think that there would be a lot of government harassment. Bureaucracies tend to be hostile, but the courts have been friendly. In part it is because home birthing and midwifery are enjoying the residual effects from the triumph of feminism. Feminist dogma claims that the woman has "a right to her own body". This doctrine is sacrosanct in the courts.<sup>5</sup> They see birth as a feminist issue. Thus, midwives are feminist figures in the eyes of the courts.

Not all people who home birth are motivated by cost factors or ideology. Some do it out of religious convictions. For them, home birth denies the state's claim of sovereignty over the birth and the child. Healing is the work of God working through, in this case, the lay midwife, who is God's servant. This religious viewpoint is the Achilles heel of the state's divine claims.

---

<sup>4</sup>I have lived in the State of Idaho for several years now, a conservative Republican state. The Midwife Association wants government regulation and has been openly advocating it in the name of uniform standards of competency. That is the same argument that has been used to license and regulate every profession over the past century, from plumbers to school teachers. It is really a ruse by an existing market to shut-out competition and create job security.

<sup>5</sup>The *Roe v. Wade* decision stands as the pinnacle achievement of feminism. It is founded upon the 9th Amendment and "the rights retained by the people." To this day, Pro-Life advocates have been unable to refute the feminists without offering fascism as the alternative. See Appendix A for a review of this problem.



Midwives are of extreme value because they provide healing for those most vulnerable: the unborn. And they open the door to alternative medicine in general, such as naturopathic medicine. But for the Christian who is committed to the sovereignty of God, she is a necessary part of obedience to God.

The spiritual role of the midwife is the concern of this book. For those who look upon her role as merely that of a technician, parts of the following discussion will seem arcane, even weird. But that is where the Bible and Church History take us.

To settle the question of state certification of the midwife, we must first find the Biblical role of the state. Once we understand that, then we may proceed to evaluate whether the midwife must submit to certification, or whether she must seek another alternative.

We will do so in the next chapter.

## QUESTIONS FOR REVIEW

1. Give a definition of socialized medicine.
2. Describe the "Hegelian dialectic".
3. Is socialized medicine contrary to "free market" medicine?
4. Why would the state want to control medicine?
5. Why would parents be interested in a "free market" approach to childbirth?
6. Why have the courts been friendly to midwives?
7. How might the court decision which legalized abortion have helped the midwifery profession? (You might read Appendix A for help with this one.)
8. Why might some midwives want state licensing and regulation of their profession?
9. Do you support that perspective? Why or why not?

## CHAPTER THREE:

### DEVILS, DRAGONS, & DIADEMS

*Above it stood the seraphims. And one cried unto another, and said, Holy, holy, holy, is the LORD of hosts: the whole earth is full of his glory.*

- Isaiah 6:2-3

During the late 1970s and early 1980s, this author was very active with high school ministries in Rockford, Illinois, a mid-sized city not far from Chicago. The conservative publication, *Chronicles of Culture*, which claims Rockford as its home, was then a fledgling newsletter, and Ronald Reagan had not yet been elected President of the United States. Neo-conservative activists were still learning the ropes of American politics, and so was I.

My goal was to become a campus evangelist (I was 20 at the time). I was promoting the idea of student clubs for Christians which would provide daily devotions, Bible study, and even invite outside speakers to come on campus to make presentations on issues of academic interest. My approach made waves, and before long, I was spending more time fighting battles off campus, than I was ministering on campus.<sup>6</sup>

Appearances before the school board, interviews with the press, and appeals to the clergy gobbled up my time. Eventually, strange things began to happen. Our ministry house experienced vandalism. Then the city planning commission threatened to press *criminal* charges against me for conducting "religious activity" in violation of zoning ordinances. We even got visits from the health department. Apparently, our building did not meet the codes.

---

<sup>6</sup> My experience made the pages of the *Quarterly Review of the Christian Legal Society* in 1980.

In the midst of all of this, any outside help was welcome. A kindly Christian attorney offered his assistance, without charge. But in one of our conversations, he said something really weird. He gave me a ten minute lecture on how Satan was the author of the Mosaic Law. I did not like what he said, but I kept my mouth shut. I was just a kid in deep doo-doo and I needed adult allies.

Not long afterwards, I was sandbagged by both the clergy and the legal profession. The clergy association came out publicly against what I was doing. Then in a meeting with a "Christian" law firm and a couple of youth ministers representing two national, para-church youth organizations, I was told that I was going to suffocate in that doo-doo unless I quit. They could not help me, would not help me. And if I continued, they would oppose me. I quit. I was astonished at the corruption and decided to leave town.

My self-imposed banishment was calculated, not emotional. I realized that there was something radically wrong with organized religion. How could they possibly profess the necessity of the Evangelical message - that Christ is the only way to eternal life - yet let masses of young people grow up without a Christian witness, all in the name of their cozy "status quo"? Weren't the eternal destinies of these young people worth more than that? Such values seemed incomprehensible to me then and still do.

Lest you think that this is ancient history and irrelevant to our now more enlightened Christian community, think again. My former ally attorney is now a U.S. Congressman and is helping to lead the charge to return this land of ours back to God - a man who believes Satan authored the Ten Commandments! Does this give you a vague fear of doom for the nation? It does for me.

### **WHICH GOD? WHICH DEVIL?**

The notion of a satanic origin of Old Testament law is classical Gnosticism. Gnosticism was a heretical attack on the Early Church which basically believed in two gods: the good god and the bad god. The bad god created the world that is full of evil. That was Jehovah of the Old Testament. The good god was the one trying to save man from the world created by Jehovah. His name was Lucifer, the god of light. They believed that Jesus represented this "good" god.

The Gnostics inverted the values of the Bible. Anything Jehovah taught or commanded had to be disobeyed. It was evil. Homosexuality was important to Gnosticism. It was a statement of liberation from Jehovah. Because Jehovah forbade magic and sorcery, the Gnostics pursued psychic knowledge vigorously. They believed the occult was their means of access to Jesus and Lucifer, which Jehovah was trying to prevent.

By modern standards, the Gnostics were pleasant, spiritual people. A Gnostic would fit comfortably in our modern churches. That is because our modern churches are Gnostic, not Christian.

Greg Bahnsen's massive book, *Theonomy in Christian Ethics*, is the most complete answer to antinomianism available.<sup>7</sup> It is unanswerable and devastating. With the method of a surgeon, he proves the abiding validity of God's Old Testament law. He leaves us with no neutral ground, no DMZ in God's kingdom. You must either be a Theonomist or a Gnostic. You cannot reject the law without rejecting the lawgiver.

Bahnsen wrote his book in the 1970s. I read it in 1979. Next to Rushdoony's *Institutes of Biblical Law*,<sup>8</sup> I cannot think of a more important book for a Christian to read. A Christian civilization seems impossible without it.

Gnosticism was really the Christianized version of an ageless theme in pagan religion: the idea that the universe operates in terms of opposites or polarities. There are two indestructible principles or "gods" which emanate throughout the cosmos, according to their world view. These forces both repel, yet also attract each other. The pagans sometimes saw this dualism in sexual terms. Human sexuality was deified into a pantheon of gods and goddesses. With them, sexual intercourse became a religious rite, a means of bringing harmony to the cosmos.

There were many different labels for dualism in ancient times. Of course, the Greek philosophers spoke abstractedly of a Cosmos v. Chaos. But most pagans personified these principles. The Phoenicians and Canaanites called them Baal and Ashtoreth, a god and goddess. The Far Eastern religions had Yin and Yang. Nature religions worshipped the Sun as the male principle and the Moon as the female principle, or animal representations of the same. The Zoroastrians named them Ahura Mazda and Ahriman (respectively, the gods of light and darkness). Pre-Roman Druidism was the only ancient religion which did not teach an absolute dualism.

Zoroastrianism became the Mithras cult of Roman times. It was Mithraism, a copycat religion of Christianity, which combined with Gnosticism and produced the medieval doctrine of Satan as a rival deity to God and His people. It is that error which is still with us. This essay is an attempt to correct that error.

---

<sup>7</sup>Antinomianism is the belief that grace *excuses* the Christian from obedience to the moral law, in contrast to "theonomy" which teaches that grace *enables* the Christian to obey moral law. See Greg Bahnsen, *Theonomy in Christian Ethics*, The Craig Press, Nutley, NJ, 1979

<sup>8</sup> R. J. Rushdoony, *The Institutes of Biblical Law*, The Craig Press, 1973

## **WHY DO PEOPLE HATE OLD TESTAMENT LAW?**

It seems that the whole Christian world has been brainwashed by Gnostic doctrine. While in principle, it believes the Old Testament is in some sense divinely inspired; its law is viewed as an inferior expression of the holiness of God. Why? There are three Old Testament institutions which give basis for this view: slavery, polygamy, and the death penalty.

Because of the propaganda resulting from the Civil War, Americans are very sensitive about the topic of slavery in the Bible. They sugar-coat it, ignore it, or excuse it. They are always embarrassed by it. Humanists, of course, snicker at the Christian's discomfort. Christians defend themselves by saying that slavery was an Old Testament custom. That is not true, of course, because it was a Christian custom in the New Testament, as well. But the myth of a testamental conflict sounds good. It takes Christianity off the hook.

However, it is unfair to compare Biblical slavery with the pagan form of slavery which appeared in the American South. Slavery in pagan cultures is absolute. A caste system exists which chains the individual to his station in life.

Biblical slavery placed a time limit on servitude (seven years, Exodus 21:2), even for ethnic slavery (ten generations, Deuteronomy 23:1-3). It also permitted flight to the slave if his master was oppressive (Deuteronomy 23:15). The Old South, influenced by Roman civil law, did not recognize these Biblical restrictions. Its dereliction did not matter; God's law prevailed anyway. With the Civil War Amendments, all but voluntary servitude was abolished. And in the 1960s, the Civil Rights movement finished the process of liberation, exactly ten generations after the last slave was imported to American shores.<sup>9</sup>

Why does slavery exist in God's Kingdom? The reason is that mankind is a slave of sin. Slavery, as an institution, enforces God's economic discipline upon our lawlessness. It contains a redemptive quality. The African was a pagan. He needed discipleship. Slavery was useful for that purpose. But because white slave owners were themselves insubordinate to God's laws, it became a curse. The problems in the Afro-American community today do not reflect an incipient, racial defect. Rather, they magnify the lawlessness of the nation as a whole. Once upon a time, Afro-Americans were Christian, well-mannered, and moral. Not today.

Polygamy is the second custom which makes Old Testament law obnoxious to the modern mind. Again, Christians try to mute the criticism by declaring the New Testament superior to the Old in respect to polygamy. That is another misconception.

---

<sup>9</sup>A more vicious form of white slavery was practiced in the American Colonies under the guise of indentured servitude (see Michael Hoffman II, *They Were White and They Were Slaves*, Wiswell Ruffin House, NY 1992)

Martin Luther correctly recognized that the New Testament did not prohibit polygamy.<sup>10</sup> Jewish Christians certainly practiced it. Although admitted with reluctance, the Post-Nicene Fathers were aware of its acceptance by the New Testament Church.<sup>11</sup> How was this possible?

Our sex-saturated culture, typical of Canaanites, sees erotic romance as the only valid motive for marriage. It is impossible for our generation to understand how Biblical polygamy existed as a safety net for widows and orphans, and to insure coverture. If it is sex that polygamous men want, polygamy is the worst way to get it. Harlots or perversions are much easier avenues for gratification. Polygamy is still marriage and brings great burdens, which only great men are willing to bear. Polygamy was an integral part of Israelite culture that lingered in the Church until the destruction of the Temple in 70 AD.

The death penalty, however, is the Old Testament institution which has caused the greatest revulsion. The Early Church had the greatest difficulty with this one. This issue led Marcion to make his break with the Church and to start his Gnostic Church.

Of course, the death penalty for murder can be justified (Genesis 9:6). But how can Jehovah's order for the slaying of the innocent be reconciled with the notions of a loving God? Unwilling to see past the slit throats of Canaanite babies, Marcion concluded that Jehovah was an evil, capricious, and vengeful deity unworthy of the followers of the gentle Galilean.

Christianity's unwillingness to face and accept God's harshness has left it wandering, for many centuries, in a cratered DMZ between Gnostic heresy and Biblical faith. This fact is never more focused than on the Doctrine of Hell.

Biblically, Hell is the place of God's wrath. In Medieval theology, it became the home of Satan, the bastion of a rival deity. Christian divines eventually had to compromise God's power and sovereignty in order to absolve His authorship of the evil in the world. Demonology became the universal tonic to Gnostic accusations against God's pristine character. They blamed the Devil.

The problem with Gnosticism on this point and also with the Church's compromise with it is that it concedes evil as an absolute principle in the universe, and not as a relative one in relation to good. As in the attempt to resist gravity, the revolt against moral law is a temporary aberration. God's created order makes it possible, but not necessary nor ultimate. Consider these neglected Biblical texts:

- **See now that I, even I, am he, and there is no god with me: I kill, and I make alive; I wound, and I heal: neither is there any that can deliver out of my hand. - Deuteronomy 32:39**
- **I form the light, and create darkness: I make peace, and create evil: I the LORD do all these things. - Isaiah 45:7**

---

<sup>10</sup>See the prolific Church historian, Roland Bainton, in *The Reformation of the 16th Century*, p. 259 (Beacon Press, 1952)

<sup>11</sup>See the 80th Canon of Basil, *Nicene & Post-Nicene Fathers, Vol. 14*, p. 609. "Nicene" is used as a historical reference point for Church history. The Council of Nicea occurred during the time of the Roman Emperor, Constantine, who legalized Christianity throughout the Empire

- **Who is he that saith, and it cometh to pass, when the Lord commandeth it not? Out of the mouth of the most High proceedeth not evil and good? Wherefore doth a living man complain, a man for the punishment of his sins? -Lamentations 3:37-39**
- **The LORD hath made all things for himself: yea, even the wicked for the day of evil - Proverbs 16:4**
- **For of him, and through him, and to him, are all things: to whom be glory for ever. Amen. - Romans 11:36**
- **Hath not the potter power over the clay, of the same lump to make one vessel unto honour, and another unto dishonour? What if God, willing to shew his wrath, and to make his power known. endured with much longsuffering the vessels of wrath fitted to destruction: And that he might make known the riches of his glory on the vessels of mercy, which he had afore prepared unto glory, even us, whom he hath called, not of the Jews only, but also of the Gentiles? - Romans 9:21-24**
- **Behold therefore the goodness and severity of God. - Romans 11:22**

Perhaps no other book in the Bible illustrates better the dilemma the above references create than the Book of Job. In the early chapters of that book, we are told that the calamities which befell Job were caused by the work of Satan, the Devil. Later, while listening to the theodicies<sup>12</sup> of Job's friends, we become convinced of some moral defect, some secret crime, of which Job is guilty and which is the cause of his grief. But we are surprised at the end of the book when God confronts Job personally with this devastating truth: *God was the author of the evil which came upon Job.* The moral of the story is that God is the omnipotent creator of the universe, and He may do with it whatever He pleases. He is the potter, we are but clay.

When it comes to a divine adversary called "Satan," we are confronted with the fact that he is merely one of God's creatures, and as one of God's creatures, he is an instrument of His will. Satan has no independent, autonomous existence. Even in his rebellion, he fulfills God's eternal decree. Unlike Gnosticized theology, the Bible does not present Satan as the author of evil. As the first cause, God is.

Having said that, we are faced with another dilemma: the multitude of Scriptures which absolve God of any moral blame for the evil which He causes. There is, for instance, 1 John 1:5, which says "God is light and in Him there is no darkness at all." Or James 1:13, "Let no man say when he is tempted, I am tempted of God. . .," etc.

The problem of the ages lies here before us and the answer is found in the Biblical doctrine of moral agency. God may be the author of evil but He is not the author of sin. Evil, then, is the consequences for sinful choices, which spill over upon innocent bystanders. Why is not God more selective with the sanctions? Why do the innocent suffer along with the wicked? Because the suffering of the innocent is a part of the redemptive process for humanity. It is pedagogical. Men need to see the consequences of their choices. They must see their horror. Men

---

<sup>12</sup>*Theodicy* was a favorite subject of theological discourse during the 19th Century, as Calvinists tried to defend a supralapsarian God. Ultimately, it was abandoned in favor of Moral Government theology which provided a balanced perspective of God's power with that of man's moral agency. The best synopsis of this theology can be found in *The Moral Government of God* by Gordon C. Olson, 1966 (available from author).



are social creatures; their choices produce social influence; their consequences are social, too. When they see the great pain their choices have inflicted upon others, they face the guilt of their sin. Their consciences' confirm God's just sentence against them and convince them of their need of a Savior. Read Paul's Epistle to the Romans - Chapters 6 and 7 - in reference to sin and the law. Job's case may seem to have been special, but it really was not. Job admitted his pride and corruption and fell mute before his Creator.

If Satan is not an autonomous being with divine powers, then who is he and for what does he exist?

### **SATAN: GOD'S ROD OF JUDGMENT**

On rare occasions, I have been known to toy with self-complacent people. I do it to get them to think. One of such exercises is that I request people to prove to me that the Serpent in Genesis 3 is Satan. You cannot do it from the Biblical text. It tells us that the Serpent was one of "the beasts of the field", not an angelic adversary. Not until the last book of the Bible, millenniums later, are we told that the Devil was the Serpent (Revelation 12:9; 21:2). Even then, it is wrapped in strong metaphor.

Now, do not get me wrong. I believe that Satan was the author of that first temptation in Paradise. But I believe our understanding of it is rather simplistic. The Serpent was an animal, but it was also a sentient being and capable of choice. Ancient fables about dragons probably come very close to an accurate portrayal of the capacity of that primordial serpent. He had wings and legs. He could speak. He could communicate with the spirit world. Originally, serpents were probably terrestrial types of the heavenly host, just as Adam was an earthly type of the Godhead. Satan corrupted the first serpent in much the same way as he corrupted Judas Iscariot - by persuasion and then possession. The Serpent became Satan's mouthpiece. Let me cite some more passages to tie these assertions together.

Consider Isaiah chapter six which was introduced at the beginning of this essay:

*In the year that king Uzziah died I saw also the LORD sitting upon a throne, high and lifted up, and his train filled the temple. Above it stood the seraphim: each one had six wings; with twain he covered his face, and with twain he covered his feet, and with twain he did fly. And one cried unto another, and said. Holy, holy, holy, is the LORD of hosts: the whole earth is full of his glory. And the posts of the door moved at the voice of him that cried, and the house was filled with smoke.*

*Then said I, Woe is me! for I am undone; because I am a man of unclean lips, and I dwell in the midst of a people of unclean lips: for mine eyes have seen the King, the LORD of hosts.*

*Then flew one of the seraphims unto me having a live coal in his hand, which he had taken with the tongs off the altar: And he laid it upon my mouth, and said, Lo, this hath touched thy lips; and thine iniquity is taken away, and thy sin purged." (Emphasis added)*

"Seraphim" is the Hebrew word for "burning serpent." Elsewhere, it is translated as "fiery" serpent (e.g. Isaiah 14:29 and 30:6). It is "seraph" which is used in the serpent plague of Numbers 21:

*And the LORD sent fiery [seraph] serpents among the people, and they bit the people; and much people of Israel died... And the LORD said unto Moses. Make thee a fiery serpent, and set it upon a pole: and it shall come to pass, that every one that is bitten, when he looketh upon it, shall live. (v. 6 & 8)*

"Seraph" is used as a verb some 120 times in the Old Testament and means "to burn something up". But it is never used in the context of sacrifices. A different word is used for sacrificial burning (*cherem*). "Seraph" is always used in the context of burning up refuse, carrion, or other unclean things. It refers to judgment and the removal of offensive things, such as sin (e.g. Isaiah's unclean lips).

**As a noun, "Seraphim" is used only a handful of times, either as snakes sent in judgment upon sinful men, or as angels which minister the terror of Gods wrath.<sup>13</sup>**

Now, it is significant that Moses was commanded to make a "serpent of brass" and to mount it upon a cross-like pole so that the people would be saved from God's judgment upon their sin. It is significant because that is exactly what Jesus Christ did. By being mounted upon the Cross, taking into His body our sins and tasting death for every man, He diverted Divine wrath to Himself. Snakes are unclean animals and they are always associated with evil in Biblical metaphor. But "brazen serpents" are serpents purified by fire. Fire is a symbol of Hell and the wrath of God. Christ endured Hell; He became the brazen serpent. By so doing, He performed the task of the Seraphim in Isaiah's vision. But there is more.

It is obvious that Satan was once a seraph, being alluded to as a serpent in several places. He is also called "the angel of light" (2 Corinthians 11:14) and in classical theology is identified as "Lucifer" which means "bright or shining one."<sup>14</sup> "Satan" is itself a word which means "adversary", a serpentine characteristic. He is an angelic power, of course, who in the early chapters of Job appears before God with the "angels of God" (Septuagint). Like a cop on patrol, he declares to have come "From going to and fro in the earth, and from walking up and down in it" (1:7). Or as the Apostle puts it, "as a roaring lion, walketh about, seeking whom he may devour" (1 Peter 5:8). He is also the "devil," meaning in the legal sense of the word: an accuser.

Yet, the Angel of the Lord in Numbers 22:22 is a "Satan." In this sense he once guarded God's Throne. He was sent out to rid God's kingdom of anything offensive. To him was given the "power of death" (Hebrews 2:14). He served a holy purpose as God's enforcer. This legitimate purpose is brought out in 1 Corinthians 5:5, where an excommunicated member is commanded to be "delivered over to Satan for the destruction of the flesh, that the soul might be saved." There are other references which refer to "evil spirits" being sent by God (Judges 9:23; 1 Samuel

---

<sup>13</sup>See Vine's Expository Dictionary, p. 27 (Nelson) e.g. Isaiah 14:29; 30:6

<sup>14</sup> Jesus is described in Revelation 1 as a burning or luminous being, suggesting that he has become a seraph.

16:14ff; Psalms 68:49; Tobit 3:8). Satan's sin consisted not in doing what God made him for, but in his abuse of it: *he set out to tempt man to sin, so that he might have grounds to destroy him.* For that abuse of his power, he was eternally severed from God's Kingdom (Revelation 21).

Irenaeus offers interesting commentary on this point:

*So likewise also the devil, being one among those angels who are placed over the spirit of the air ... becoming envious of man, was rendered an apostate from the divine law: for envy is a thing foreign to God. And as his apostasy was exposed by man, and man became the means of searching out his thoughts, he has set himself to this with greater and greater determination, in opposition to man, envying his life, and wishing to involve him in his own apostate power. The Word of God, however, the Maker of all things, conquering him by means of human nature, and showing him to be apostate, has, on the contrary, put him under the power of man. For He says, 'Behold, I confer upon you the power of treading upon serpents and scorpions, and upon all the power of the enemy' (Luke 10:19), in order that as he obtained dominion over man by apostasy, so again his apostasy might be deprived of power by means of man turning back again to God.<sup>15</sup>*

Because Satan fell from his calling by depriving man of his Serpent-helper, Christ sends forth angels to do this work for him (Matthew 13:41; 18:10; Hebrews 1:7).

The Garden serpents (seraph/dragon) were Adamkind's ministers and mirrored the ministry of the heavenly host before God's Throne. They ministered God's providential care in the Garden. Theologian Meredith Kline attributes this providence to angels:

*The Bible does not require us, therefore, to think of the character and working of man's natural environment before the Fall as radically different than is presently the case... God gives his angels charge over the one who stands in his favor lest he should dash his foot against a stone (Ps. 91:12). Blessing consists not in the absence of the potentially harmful stone, but in the presence of God's providential care over the foot. Adam's world before the Fall was not a world without stones, thorns, dark watery depths, or death. But it was a world where the angels of God were given a charge over man to protect his every step and to prosper all the labor of his hand.<sup>16</sup>*

Remember, the promise of immortality was made only to Adam, and only if he partook of the Tree of Life. The rest of the cosmos experienced the cycles of nature.

So, man could stumble, but he could not fall. He could miss an ax stroke, but not wound himself. As the cherubim and seraphim guarded the Throne of God, so the dragon/serpent guarded man. Man lost that glorious pavilion in the Fall. He tries to replace it with civil government. And that is one reason why the Bible depicts government with monster and serpentine images. That is why Satan is described as a serpent and dragon, because he was one of God's covering seraphs - a burning one.

---

<sup>15</sup> *Ante-Nicene Fathers, Vol. 1, p. 553.* Irenaeus was a Church leader from the 2nd Century.

<sup>16</sup> as quoted by Gary North in *Is the World Running Down?*, p.124 (Institute for Christian Economics, 1988)

### **NAMES ASCRIBED TO SATAN IN REVELATION 12:9**

**SATAN (adversary)**

**DEVIL (accuser)**

**OLD SERPENT (view)**

**GREAT DRAGON (monster)**

### **GOVERNMENT: SATANIC OR MINISTERIAL?**

There have been a significant number of good, Christian men who have refused to believe in a spirit-being called "the devil." I have read some of their material and have considered their arguments carefully. I do agree with them that some Biblical passages do not refer to Satan, among them being the famous references to Lucifer in Isaiah 14 and Ezekiel 28 - unless it be by symbolic application. Demonologists are cranks. They find a devil behind every bush and a Satan in every catastrophe. The ancient world was very superstitious about demons. The Apostle Paul criticized them for it (Acts 17:22). It is understandable that neophyte Christians brought some of their superstitions into the Church. These things can be harmless unless they make the Word of God of no effect. Then, they become dangerous heresies.<sup>17</sup>

While respecting Bible scholars who are annoyed with these superstitious people, there are too many Scriptures which do indeed refer to a fallen angelic host - a host led by an archangel called "Satan." All the Scriptures cannot be explained away. There are some 300 references to a personal devil. I think his existence is as well established in the Bible as is the existence of Jesus Christ.

The real danger in developing a demonology lies not in whether we can prove their existence, but rather to miss or neglect the Bible's use of these various satanic symbols. The description of serpents, dragons, leviathans and other monsters is not meant to focus our attention on some super powerful being and his real (or imagined) activities. Rather, it is to focus our attention on the earthly model of angelic activity, which is government.

For example, Origen, another leader in the early Church, deplored the fact that the various government authorities on Earth found their source in a demon.<sup>18</sup> That was why the Early

---

<sup>17</sup> **The Salem Witch Trials and the various witch hunts of Europe should memorialize the dangers of such hysterias.**

<sup>18</sup> *Ante-Nicene Fathers, vol. 4, p.664*

Church refused to burn incense or offer other adulations to rulers. They believed such acts were paying homage to the ruler's demonic master.

*And we are not to believe in demons ... but if we are to obey God, we must die, or endure anything, sooner than to obey demons.<sup>19</sup>*

Clement, the Apostolic Father in Rome, also taught that the nations of the earth were partitioned according to the angelic host (1 Clement 29). There is support for that view in the prophet Daniel (chapter 10).

Sir Isaac Newton, who wrote more on theology than physics, believed the Beast of the Apocalypse - as other monster symbols, such as Leviathan - was a representation of a kind of government. He believed such types spanned the course of human history and were not unique to any particular period, such as a "Great Tribulation" at the end of history.

*For understanding the Prophecies, we are, in the first place, to acquaint ourselves with the figurative language of the Prophets. This language is taken from the analogy between the world natural, and an empire or kingdom considered as a world politic.*

*Accordingly, the whole world natural consisting of heaven and earth, signifies the whole world politic, consisting of thrones and people, or so much of it as is considered in the Prophecy: and the things in that world signify the analogous things in this.<sup>20</sup>*

I cannot help but agree with such conclusions. Our study above seems to support the perception that human government is inherently antichrist. It is not a one-time characteristic of government at the end-of-time, nor is government demonic only when it is tyrannical. Satan was given a monopoly over the death penalty. So is civil government (Romans 13). Satan had a policing power. So does civil government. Rulers are referred to as "gods" (*elohim*: Exodus 22:28; John 10:34). So is the angelic host, of which Satan is a part (Job 1). Origen referred to demons as "public executioners" and the "Angel of Death" in the Passover of Exodus as Satan himself. Civil government by its very nature is an expression of the satanic doctrine.

Among the ancients, it was a sort of generic symbolism to use animals of prey to represent rulers. We followed that custom in the United States when we chose a predator, the bald eagle, as our national symbol, even though we are told that Benjamin Franklin suggested the American turkey. The Cymry (Welsh) called their chieftains "pendragons" and their national symbol became the Red Dragon. They have a better grasp of Biblical symbolism than most religious groups. We might ask, justly, why a Christian people would choose a satanic symbol to represent its government?

---

<sup>19</sup>*Ibid.* p. 64

<sup>20</sup>*Observations upon the Prophecies of Daniel & the Apocalypse of John*, p. 16. Newton subscribed to the historical view of prophecy which is the belief that prophecy is history written in advance.

The Red Dragon of Revelation has seven heads and ten horns. This is an obvious reference to a particular government. Yes, like the Serpent in Eden, the Dragon is *used* by Satan. But Satan is not the Dragon. The Dragon is *the symbol of government, civil government*. It is important to think this fact through. Satan is not red, does not have a tail; he does not have seven heads, nor does he breathe fire. Jesus is not a woolly, cuddly lamb, either. Literalizing Biblical symbolism not only leads to silly conclusions, it also deprives us of the message that the symbolism is trying to teach us.

*The Book of the Revelation of Jesus Christ is a passionately anti-government document. Underline and circle that previous statement. It is the "state" as a concept of government which is thrown into the "Lake of Fire" - which is itself a symbol of God's eternal judgment.*

Satan's rule is limited to the power of delusion and error. At the pinnacle of his delusions foisted upon mankind is the notion of the state, the idea that mankind needs to provide its own judicial covering. Remember, man has a psychological need for this covering because he is meant to image God. God's Throne is "covered" by seraphim. The state is man's attempt to cover himself. Like Adam and his fig leaves, autonomous man cannot do it.<sup>21</sup>

R. J. Rushdoony's book, *The Politics of Guilt & Pity*, is a timeless commentary on the necessity of guilt to the exercise of power. The ritual of self-atonement, by which the state provides a saving act to expiate guilt, drives the psychological dependence upon a political order. After noting that citizenship in the ancient city-state rested upon submission to atonement by its priests, he adds this observation:

*In the modern state, in the name of democracy, there is an increasing pandering to guilt and to the hatred felt by the guilty for the innocent and for the successful. This then is the full triumph of the politics of guilt and its open enthronement. For the politics of guilt, the order of the day is mass destruction.*<sup>22</sup>

In *Atlas Shrugged*, Ayn Rand's famous political novel, she describes in concrete terms this guilt manipulation in the modern state. It is Dr. Ferris, a government official, who is speaking to Mr. Rearden, an industrialist:

*"Did you really think that we want those laws to be observed?" said Dr. Ferris. "We want them broken. There's no way to rule innocent men. The only power any government has is the power to crack down on criminals. When there aren't enough criminals, one makes them. One declares so many things to be a crime that it becomes impossible for men to live without breaking laws. Who wants a nation of law-abiding citizens? What's there in that for anyone? But just pass the kind of laws*

---

<sup>21</sup> An example of this need for judicial covering can be found in the story of Judges 18. The Tribe of Dan was looking to expand its territory and found prospects in the region of Laish where the people were "careless, after the manner of the Zidonians, quiet and secure." It was a place where "there was no magistrate in the land, that might put them to shame in any thing," v. 7. The lack of judicial coverture made these people prey for a people who had such a covering.

<sup>22</sup> *The Politics of Guilt and Pity*, R. J. Rushdoony, Thoburn Press, 1978, p. 10

*that can neither be observed nor enforced nor objectively interpreted - and you create a nation of law-breakers and then you cash in on guilt. "*

*"Now that's the system, Mr. Rearden, that's the game and once you understand it, you'll be much easier to deal with."*

This is satanic government in its perversion: the attempt to entrap the citizen in law-breaking as an excuse to destroy him. It is blood-lust and it is demonic to the core.

With the coming of Christ and His Atonement, mankind has been provided with a judicial covering. The world no longer needs "Satanic" government. It needs "ministerial" government. Instead of a top-down, pyramid structure to society, government has become a servant. The Beast (imperial government) and the false prophet (priestcraft government) have been replaced by the Kingdom of Saints: Christian Self-Government with Union in the Messianic Host (see Chapter 6). The Dragon (civil government) must come to the foot of the Cross to be purified by fire or else destroyed by fire.

## ADDENDUM

*For this purpose the Son of God appeared that he might destroy the works of the devil.*

- 1 John 3:8(b)

*And by his death he has destroyed him who had the power of death, that is, the devil.*

- Hebrews 2:14(b)

*And death and Sheol were cast into the lake of fire. This is the second death, which is the lake of fire.*

- Revelation 20:14

*And the devil who deceived them was cast into the lake of fire and brimstone.*

- Revelation 20:10(a)

In Genesis Chapter 9 we find God giving to man, for the first time, the right to execute murderers. Theologians credit the Noahide Covenant as the foundation for civil government; for the right and power to kill is the essence of government. All other governments - family, church, vocational, etc. - involve sanctions which fall short of physical death. This seems to be what distinguishes civil government from all others: the ability and duty to use deadly force.

I have pointed out in the above study that civil government and Satan's existence are somehow all entwined. The evilness of government demonstrates Satan's apostasy. Reviewing the Scriptures quoted above leads to certain conclusions:

- **First**, that Jesus came to destroy the "works of the devil".
- **Second**, the works of the devil involve "the power of death".
- **Third**, Jesus has destroyed the devil.
- **Fourth**, the devil is destroyed in the "second death".
- **Fifth**, Jesus has destroyed death in the "Lake of Fire".

While I do not want to suggest a chronology for when these things take place, I do believe there is a sequence: the Devil, who has the power of death, is destroyed before Death itself. 1 Corinthians 15 tells us that the last enemy Christ will destroy is Death.

Consequently, I believe the sequence found in Revelation 20 is that tyrannical government will be destroyed first (the Beast and the False Prophet). Then the institution of civil government itself (the devil/death penalty) will be destroyed. Then finally, natural death (death and Sheol) will be destroyed before the New Creation appears. Then comes the end when the kingdom is turned over by the Son back to the Father (1 Corinthians 15:24).

The reason this study on government is important to the role of the midwife will be demonstrated clearly in following chapters. The midwife is an office with judicial implications involving life and death.



## QUESTIONS FOR REVIEW

1. Why might the author claim that the entire book rests upon a proper understanding of this chapter? (See Introduction)
2. What might be a good description of the term "Gnosticism" as it is used by the author?
3. Does a Gnostic believe in Old Testament Law? Why or why not?
4. What are the three main reasons why people believe Old Testament Law is barbaric and unchristian?
5. Do you think there can be Christian versions of these institutions? Support your position.
6. How would you explain the statement that "God is the author of evil but not of sin"?
7. What might have been Satan's role before the Fall?
8. What are "Seraphim"?
9. Which Fathers of the Early Church are mentioned in the chapter who taught the view that human government was "satanic" or "demonic"?
10. How might that have been good prior to the Fall and how might that be bad now?
11. What is the difference between "adversarial government" and "ministerial government"?
12. If Jesus came to destroy death, how might that fact affect the role of civil government?



## **CHAPTER FOUR:**

### **MIDWIVES AND THE BIBLE**

This chapter is a theological discussion of midwifery - the practice of women assisting other women in childbirth. It is an ancient custom which spans the history of humankind. Although not much is found in the Scriptures pertaining to this subject, there is more than might be generally supposed. And what may be discovered there is of no small significance.

In the 3rd Century the Church was taken over by the Mahuzzims.<sup>23</sup> These were men who felt that the Creation Covenant was antiquated ("be fruitful and multiply"). They rejected marriage and family life as central pillars of the Kingdom of God on Earth. Instead, they valued the cloister over the bed chamber; the society of holy recluses over that of the home.

The Mahuzzim heresy made way for the Cataphrygians. These were spiritual elitists who saw the Church as an aristocratic government of spiritual supermen (or superwomen). They did not trust the family. They became institutionalists. They preferred basilicas over house churches; bishops over family elders. The result was the mangled churchianity which we see fitfully lingering today.

The ministry of the midwife suffered severely from this change. Throughout the history of ancient Israel and the early Church, midwives were essential ministers of the Kingdom, albeit quiet ones. But their importance only made sense within the context of a family-oriented social

---

<sup>23</sup>“Mahuzzim” is a term first coined by Sir Isaac Newton to describe an aspect of the Antichrist he found in Daniel 11. Translated as “fortress” or “forces,” it refers to the Antichrist’s worship of the “god of fortresses” and a “disregard for women.” The Mahuzzims teach the regimentation of society following a military model.

system. When that system was supplanted by the professionals, their work became vestigial. By the Middle Ages, midwives were being burned as witches.

Today, midwifery and home-birthing are making a comeback. Although eclipsed by the dazzling arsenal of modern medicine, the custom has survived in America's Celtic high country. Now that the medical profession is losing its messianic mantle, the respect for this Biblical vocation is rebounding. Unfortunately, theologians, still dominated by an institutional outlook and a misogynist bent are not interested in making it an area of research. A review of the Scriptures pertaining to that vocation would be appropriate at this point.



**MAHUZZIM RELIGION**  
**GOD OF FORTRESSES**  
**ANTICHRIST**  
**PYRAMID STRUCTURE**  
**INSTITUTIONS**  
**URBAN**  
**WAR**  
**MONASTERIES**  
**HOMOSEXUAL**

**FATHER RELIGION**  
**GOD OF PATRIARCHS**  
**JESUSCHRIST**  
**TRINITARIAN MODEL**  
**FAMILIES**  
**AGRARIAN**  
**WORK**  
**VILLAGES**  
**HETEROSEXUAL**



## SCRIPTURAL ANALYSIS

### Eve's Midwife

Before taking a look at the Biblical texts which refer to midwifery, it should be noted that the Hebrew word for midwife provides an interesting insight. It is a variant of the Hebrew word *yalad* (yaw-lad), which means "to bear," "to beget," or "to show lineage." In our Bibles the words for childbirth, such as "borne," "delivered," and "travailed," are all *yalad*. So, when the Bible tells us in Genesis 4:1 that Eve "bare Cain," it could be read that Eve "midwifed Cain," because it is the word "yalad." Likewise, when the Bible says that "so and so *begat* so and so," it could be said also that they *midwifed* them.<sup>24</sup>

What this really means is that the midwife participated in the birthing of children in a unique way. By "participate," I do not mean it just in the sense of "participating" with a team. Rather, she was an organic part of the begetting of children a co-begetter. This is how strongly the Biblical word should be understood.

Eve, the first woman in the world, understood it this way and recognized God as the first midwife:

*I have gotten a man from the LORD (Gen.4:1)*

Again, in Isaiah 66:7-9 the Prophet describes Yahweh as the perfect begetter and midwife:

*Shall I bring to the birth, and not cause to bring forth? saith the LORD: shall I cause to bring forth, and shut the womb? saith thy God. -v.8*

With God as the first midwife, we see, then, our first Biblical principle concerning midwifery: *it is integral to the birthing of children*. It is integral just as the sexual union, the conception, and the gestation - all essential elements in the manifestation of human life. The absence of the midwife is as unnatural as test-tube babies.

Does this imply that fathers may be midwives? No, it does not. It does not prohibit them from being so out of necessity. But as I will show, the Biblical texts always associate midwives with women. Remember that Yahweh (translated *LORD* in the English text) is a Trinity of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost. It is not a term which refers just to the Father. For example, "Let us make man in our image" refers to a plurality in the Deity. We may suppose that the Holy Spirit is the person who represents the feminine principle in the Godhead, and She is the one who is referred to in the birthing process ("Ye must be born of the Spirit"- John 3). Thus, we ought to

---

<sup>24</sup>#3205 in Strong's Concordance Hebrew Dictionary. *M'yalad*: the absolute participle of the infinitive case meaning "to cause to bring forth," hence someone who assists in delivery. See also *Brown-Driver-Briggs Hebrew and English Lexicon* (Hendrickson, 1997). Of course, I am not saying that the word "midwife" would be a better translation in these texts. I am merely illustrating the assertion that the midwife is a part of the "cause" of begetting and birthing.

see these texts as speaking of God in the person of the Holy Spirit who is the true midwife.<sup>25</sup> The Father speaks and the Spirit creates (Genesis 1). The Father "begets" and the Spirit "causes" (midwives) the birth.

### **Rachel's Midwife**

Our second encounter with midwives in the Bible is found in the sad episode of Rachel's death in Genesis 35:16-20. In this story we find the midwife making the difficult decision to lose the mother in order to save the child: "Fear not; thou shalt have this son also". The midwife must stare death in the face every time she assists a delivery.

From this experience, we can draw our next principle: that the midwife is a custodian of life. Midwifery is a calling dealing with life and death; it is not a sport or a hobby. It is a weighty calling.

As a custodian of life, the midwife must be a defender of life. If she crosses over the line to cause death, she ceases to be a midwife and becomes a witch. That was why witches were condemned in the Mosaic Law. It was not just because they indulged in superstitions or worshipped false gods. It was because they used their powers to kill and not to heal.<sup>26</sup>

---

<sup>25</sup>See the author's book *The Mother Heart of God and the Pneumatic Role of the Woman*, 1997. Skeptics argue that Mary's conception of Jesus by the Holy Ghost disproves a feminine role to the 3rd Person of the Trinity. But if you remember the Creeds, they tell us that the Son is begotten of the Father, not the Spirit. Thus, had the Holy Spirit caused Christ's conception in Mary's womb, we would have had to say that Christ was begotten by the Holy Spirit, or that the Holy Spirit is the Father. Read the text carefully. The angel said, "The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee, and the power of the Highest shall overshadow thee. . ." This expression "come upon thee" is used in the Scriptures to denote Divine empowerment for a holy task. In this sense, it was impossible for Mary to conceive a Divine being without her womb becoming supernaturally endowed to receive "the power of the Highest," a reference to the seed of the Father.

This interpretation is further supported by the "Magdalene Gospel" (also known as "the Culdee Gospel") which is an early Medieval Gospel harmony written in Middle English but apparently based upon earlier Latin records in the Celtic Church. It has the angel saying to Mary: "The Holy Spirit shall alight within you, and God, himself, shall overshadow you."

<sup>26</sup>The text in Exodus 22:18 is translated as "sorcerer" (the Greek, *pharmikea* from which we get pharmacy) in the Septuagint and "poisoner" in the Peshitta. Since midwives often use herbs in their profession, either term refers to the abandonment of a ministry of healing to become the minister of death.

## **Tamar's Midwife**

We encounter the midwife again in Genesis 38:28. In this instance Tamar is giving birth to twin sons of Judah, her father-in-law:

*And it came to pass, when she travailed, that the one put out his hand: and the midwife took and bound upon his hand a scarlet thread, saying. This came out first.*

Here, we see the midwife in another important role: the role of the witness. She authenticates the offspring. Her testimony carries legal authority. This is a judicial function. Considering that kings and the King of kings came from Judah's lineage, this act of *marking* the firstborn with a scarlet thread was of epochal importance. It affected the plan of redemption. Consequently, we see another important principle concerning midwifery: *the midwife is a prophetess*. Consider the following verse (v. 29):

*And it came to pass, as he drew back his hand, that, behold, his brother came out: and she said [the midwife], How hast thou broken forth? this breach be upon thee: therefore his name was called Pharez. And afterward came out his brother, that had the scarlet thread upon his hand: and his name was called Zarah.*

Interesting, is it not, that the midwife should name the child? Compare this with Isaiah 58:12 which tells us that the Messiah will be "A repairer of the breach." Thus, this midwife spoke prophetically by laying the burden of the breach upon the head of Pharez and his descendants until Jesus, who as the seed of "the breacher", healed the breach and restored the covenant line.

Naming a child is also a judicial act. It declares who the child is, who his parents are, and what his rights are. In so doing, the midwife validated these children as heirs of the Abrahamic Covenant who were entitled to his coverture.

## **The Hebrew Midwives**

Next is Exodus 1:15-21, which gives us the most extensive account about midwives found in the Bible. The context is the Egyptian paranoia over the population explosion among Israelites. Egyptians feared that the Israelite immigrants would soon outpace them demographically and militarily. They chose a course of genocide. Pharaoh ordered the Hebrew midwives to kill all male newborns:

*And the king of Egypt spoke to the Hebrew midwives, of which the name of the one was Shiphrah, and the name of the other Puah: And he said, When ye do the office of a midwife to the Hebrew women, and see them upon the stools; if it be a son, then ye shall kill him: but if it be a daughter, then she shall live.*

*But the midwives feared God, and did not as the king of Egypt commanded them, but saved the men children alive. And the king of Egypt called for the midwives, and said unto them, Why have ye done this thing, and have saved the*

*men children alive? And the midwives said unto Pharaoh, Because the Hebrew women are not as the Egyptian women; for they are lively, and are delivered ere the midwives come in unto them. Therefore God dealt well with the midwives: and the people multiplied, and waxed very mighty. And it came to pass because the midwives feared Cod, that he made them houses.*

There are three main principles to be found in this text. **First**, *midwives here appear to have been organized into a guild, with a governing hierarchy.* To modern eyes, it seems that the KJV is telling us that there were only two midwives - not realistic for millions of people. A closer reading reveals that these two were midwife representatives to the governing authorities. They came up with an excuse to protect their colleagues. Notice that their lie was believable. Pharaoh never questioned it. Hebrew women *were* lively. But for our purposes of study, it is important to notice that *even though Hebrew women did not need midwives, they chose them anyway.* That was because midwives served a spiritual and legal purpose which outweighed their medical value. In a culture where one's spiritual and material inheritance depended on the legitimacy of one's birth, the midwife served a vital function.

That leads us to the **second** principle: *there is an office of the midwife.* "When ye do the office of a midwife" - Pharaoh recognized that midwifery was a vocation among the Israelites. The Hebrew word for "office" here is *ken* (kane). Used as a noun as it is in this passage, it means "station." It is the same word used throughout the Old Testament in reference to the "office of priests." If we can say the priesthood had a fixed official status, so did midwives.

Now, the word "priest" in Hebrew is *kohen* (ko-hane). Its primary root means "to mediate", "to stand between, or before". Priests stand before and guard the altar, and mediate between God and men. Similarly, midwives also mediate; they "stand before" the mother, protecting her and the child, until it is safely delivered to her breast (Jasher 66:30; Revelation 12:1-5). Birth is an important time, spiritually, which will receive our attention later. But notice the expression that the midwives "came in unto them." That is the same Biblical expression to describe a husband approaching his wife for sexual intercourse (e.g. Genesis 16:4). Just as the husband approaches a woman to give her his seed, so also the midwife approaches her to receive it. In this respect, midwifery serves as a sexual ministry.<sup>27</sup>

**Finally**, the *midwives refused to become agents of the state*, but maintained the independence of their vocation under God's authority. By doing so, they recognized their calling as a ministry and not as a profession or department of state. Verse 21 tells us that God "made them houses." The Aramaic text says "he blessed them with families." The Septuagint says "they established for themselves families." Apparently, the typical Hebrew midwife was unmarried. She lacked the protection of a husband. Here, God rewarded their courage in the face of tyranny

---

<sup>27</sup>While the morality of sex in the Bible is concerned with the giving and receiving of seed (who gives it to who, and how, etc.) and not whether it feels good or not, it might be worth mentioning the physical pleasure of childbirth. Prior to the Fall of Man, childbirth was meant to provide sensual pleasure to the woman. It is beyond the scope of this book to explore this aspect of birthing, but some women do report experiencing multiple orgasms during the time of delivery. It is probable that the role of the midwife was meant to enhance this kind of experience.



with coverture. In a future chapter we will see how the bishops of the Church provided such coverture to midwives.<sup>28</sup>

The crisis of Exodus Chapter 1 represents the Adversary's attempt to destroy the Messianic line. In this respect midwives became the guardians of God's plan of redemption, clearly a priestly function.

The cultural milieu described in this text must also be considered as having bearing on the role of the midwife. At this point in Israelite history, the promise of fertility and demographic expansion made to the Biblical patriarchs was being fulfilled. Israelites were destined to become a prolific people. Indeed, the Apostle Paul described Abraham as "heir of the world" (Romans 4:13), implying that the demographic expansion of Israel was meant to continue until the earth was filled with them. While this destiny has not been fulfilled - at least, not yet - it does demonstrate how important demographics is to building the Kingdom of God on Earth, and how central the role of the midwife is to that process.

### **The Midwife in Prophecy**

The last Scripture with direct reference to the midwife is found in Revelation 12, where we find the Dragon as midwife:

*And there appeared a great wonder in heaven; a woman clothed with the sun, and the moon under her feet, and upon her head a crown of twelve stars: And she being with child cried travailing in birth, and pained to be delivered.*

*And there appeared another wonder in heaven; and behold a great red dragon, having seven heads and ten horns, and seven crowns upon his heads. And his tail drew the third part of the stars of heaven, and did cast them to the earth: and the dragon stood before the woman which was ready to be delivered, for to devour her child as soon as it was born.*

*And she brought forth a man child, who was to rule all nations with a rod of iron: and her child was caught up unto God, and to his throne. And the woman fled into the wilderness. And the dragon was wroth with the woman, and went to make war with the remnant of her seed, which keep the commandments of God, and have the testimony of Jesus Christ.*

In the above text we find a repetition of Pharaoh's murderous attempt. When the Hebrew midwives failed to kill the Hebrew boys, Pharaoh ordered his own people to throw them into the

---

<sup>28</sup> *Interpreter's Dictionary* suggests that midwives were often barren women who had no homes. Next to harlotry, it was one of the few professions available to unattached women. This text might also be interpreted to mean that these midwives each founded a *Beyth M'yalad*: House of Midwives, in distinction from *Beyth Ashtarowth*: House of Ashtaroths (temple harlots). In either case this text establishes a precedent for an "order of midwives" comparable to the "order of widows" found later in the Church.

river on sight. In Revelation we find the Dragon usurping the midwife's office, so that he might destroy the Seed of God.

You will also find here that the legitimate midwife is symbolized by "the moon under her feet."<sup>29</sup> Revelation 12 is a critical passage in understanding the role of the midwife. That symbolism will be developed more in a later chapter.

Recall that in the previous chapter, the Dragon was offered as a Biblical type for satanic government, even civil government generally. It follows, then, from this text in Revelation, that state involvement in obstetrics, especially when it reflects the despotism of our current neo-pagan culture, only betrays a satanic attempt to identify and then destroy the "Seed of the Woman", God's Bride. It harkens back to the time when Satan tempted King David to number the children of Israel (1 Chronicles 21:5). Mustering the armies of God required atonement. The attempt by the modern state to mark, number, control, and destroy the Lord's hosts is a defiant act of blasphemy. Apparently, only midwives were allowed this intimate knowledge. This symbolism contains a deep mystery, which cannot be developed until after a discussion of the Holy Grail.

### **THE ROLE OF THE MIDWIFE IN THE EARLY CHURCH**

The ministry of the midwife, so important to the life of Israel, was still firmly entrenched with the arrival of Christ and His Church. According to the non-canonical Scriptures, Salome was a midwife at the birth of our Lord. The story, as it is told in one source (the Gospel of Pseudo-Matthew), relates a miraculous account confirming Mary's virginity:

*And Joseph said to the blessed Mary: I have brought thee two midwives - Zelomi and Salome; and they are standing outside before the entrance to the cave, not daring to come in hither because of the exceeding brightness. And when the blessed Mary heard this, she smiled; and Joseph said to her: Do not smile; but prudently allow them to visit thee, in case thou shouldst require them for thy cure. Then she ordered them enter. And when Zelomi had come in, Salome having stayed without, Zelomi said to Mary, Allow me to touch thee. And when she had permitted her to make an examination, the midwife cried out with a loud voice, and said: Lord, Lord Almighty, mercy on us! It has never been heard or thought of that any one should have her breasts full of milk and that the birth of a son should show his mother to be a virgin. But there has been no spilling of blood in his birth, no pain in bringing him forth. A virgin has conceived, a virgin has brought forth, and a virgin she remains.*

*And hearing these words, Salome said: Allow me to handle thee, and prove whether Zelomi have spoken the truth. And the blessed Mary allowed her to handle her. And when she had withdrawn her hand from handling her, it dried up, and through excess of pain she*

---

<sup>29</sup>As will be explained later, reference to "the feet" is sometimes a Hebrew euphemism for genitals.

*began to weep bitterly, and to be in great distress, crying out, and saying: O Lord God, Thou knowest that I have always feared Thee, and that without recompense I have cared for all the poor; I have taken nothing from the widow and the orphan, and the needy have I not sent empty away. And, behold, I am made wretched because of mine unbelief since without a cause I wished to try Thy virgin.*

*And while she was thus speaking, there stood by her a young male in shinning garments, saying: Go to the child, and adore Him, and touch Him with thy hand, and He will heal thee, because He is the Savior of the world, and of all that hope in Him. And she went to the child with haste, and adored Him, and touched the fringe of the cloths in which He was wrapped, and instantly her hand was cured. And going forth, she began to cry aloud, and to tell the wonderful things which she had seen, and which she had suffered, and how she had been cured; so that many through her statements believed.<sup>30</sup>*

Another account tells us that Salome was the only midwife, and thereafter, became Mary's attendant and accompanied the holy family into Egypt.<sup>31</sup> Her unexplained appearances in the Gospels tend to confirm a prior connection.<sup>32</sup>

Later Church tradition would make her a controversial figure. Heretical sects of the 2nd Century began invoking her name for support. Representatives of orthodoxy, such as Origen, took a dim view of her. But Origen himself was heavily infected by the Mahuzzim heresy. Orthodoxy's definition of heresy was itself skewed. These heretical sects, so-called, were likely neophyte apologists of an earlier, but fading, orthodoxy, one which accepted the spiritual contributions of midwife presbyters of which Salome stood with preeminence.

Regardless, Church accounts solidly support the tradition that Salome was the first competent witness of the Virgin Birth. Thus, we find a midwife, once again, serving a pivotal role at a critical juncture in God's redemptive plan.

It is unlikely that the disciples of our Lord had any understanding about His divine origins. They saw Him as Israel's Messiah, a glorified man, not as the Second Person of the Trinity. The expression, "Son of God", as in Peter's confession (Matthew 16), they understood metaphorically. Not until the Resurrection and then the Ascension did they realize the possibility of a true Incarnation. It was through the testimonies of eyewitnesses, like Salome, that the full meaning of Christ as the Divine Logos became discernible to the Early Church (Luke 1:1-4). As acknowledged by some of the Church Fathers, women like Salome and Mary Magdalene were "Apostles to the Apostles" and served key roles in the unfolding of God's saving revelation.

---

<sup>30</sup>These apocryphal accounts can be found in Volume 8 of *The Ante-Nicene Fathers* (Roberts' edition). In saying they are apocryphal I am not saying they are not true, but that obvious glosses with later Catholic dogma have prevented them from entering the Canon.

<sup>31</sup>*The History of Joseph the Carpenter, ANF v. 8*

<sup>32</sup>See Appendix on the life of "Salome: Matron Saint of Midwives"

## MIDWIVES AS PRESBYTERS

The life of the Church, the Ekklesia of Jesus Christ, involves far more than the short liturgies of worship on a given Lord's Day. In the Early Church, the sacramental life of God's people was experienced every day. Within the narrow definition of the Church as the public assembly, it seems preposterous to talk of women presbyters. But if we understand how Christianity involved itself in the private sphere, it begins to make sense.

Herein lays the tragedy of the current vitriolic debate over women priests in many traditional denominations: both sides are equally right and equally wrong. This paradox is possible only because we do not have a right view of the life of the Church. Liberals will point to the clear practice of woman presbyters in the Early Church to justify their feminist agenda. Conservatives will correctly argue against that agenda from Biblical texts. It is because we define the life of the Church within the context of the public assembly that we misread the Early Church and the Scriptures.

It was the house church, with an itinerating ministry, which was central to the Church of the first two centuries. Theologians betray condescension when they speak of it as the "primitive Church". Modern man cannot understand ancient culture because all areas of his life have become public, and thus, politicized. In ancient times, even when rulers claimed divinity and despotic powers, the household existed as a miniature kingdom. At no time has the home, as an institution, been violated as it has in Western Civilization.

The sponsors, or patrons (more correctly, matrons), of house churches were often women, typically widows, who were heads of households and had the financial resources and the social status to nurture the new faith. Frequently, they assumed priestly prerogatives within their households and with apostolic sanction. While the prophetic ministry was off-limits to the woman in the public gathering, it was encouraged in the house church, provided she wore her sign of authority - the veil (1 Corinthians 14). Prophecy was a preaching ministry.<sup>33</sup>

Very often, such women were midwives. I say this because Titus 2 provides us with a description of the ministry of the woman elder. In it we find the role of older women directed toward teaching younger women the facts of life, and assisting them in their tasks as wives and mothers:

*The aged women likewise, that they be in behaviour as becometh holiness, not false accusers, not given to much wine, teachers of good things; that they may teach the young women to be sober, to love their husbands, to love their children, to be discreet, chaste, keepers at home, good, obedient to their own husbands, that the word of God be not blasphemed. - v. 3-5*

*The Recognitions of Clement*, among other documents of the Early Church, identifies this leadership role with the "order of widows"<sup>34</sup> which is listed with that of the midwife in *The*

---

<sup>33</sup>See Karen Jo Torjesen's, *When Women Were Priests*, HarperCollins, 1995.

<sup>34</sup>*Ante-Nicene Fathers*, v.8, p.156 and *Nicene & Post-Nicene Fathers*, v.14, p.130. The latter cites a 4th Century Synod which banned the ordination of women presbyters, "Widows called presidents shall not be appointed in churches." Commentators concede this as an innovation to nullify the practice of the pre-Nicene Church.

*Canons of Hippolytus*.<sup>35</sup> The *Apostolic Constitutions* can be cited in favor of their ordination as deaconesses who ministered to women.<sup>36</sup> Like any other order of ministry, they were under the authority and protection of their bishop.<sup>37</sup>

With Clement of Alexandria, an anti-Gnostic leader of the 3rd Century, we have an explanation for how this tradition grew out of the practice of the Apostles:

*Furthermore, the Lord says of himself, "John came abstaining from food and drink, and they say, 'He is possessed'. The Son of Man came eating and drinking, and they say, 'Look at him, a greedy drunkard, a friend of tax officers, a sinner'" Are they not criticizing the apostles? [Clement is here referring to his Gnostic opponents who denigrated sex and marriage.] Peter and Philip produced children, and Philip gave his daughters away in marriage.*

*In one of his letters Paul has no hesitation in addressing his "yokefellow" (Philippians 4:3). He did not take her around with him for the convenience of his ministry. He says in one of his letters, "Do we not have the authority to take around a wife from the Church, like the other apostles?" (1 Corinthians 9:5) But the apostles in conformity with their ministry concentrated on undistracted preaching, and took their wives around as Christian sisters rather than spouses, to be their fellow-ministers in relation to housewives, through whom the Lord's teaching penetrated into the women's quarters without scandal. We know the dispositions made over women deacons by the admirable Paul in his second letter to Timothy (1 Timothy 5:9-15).*

- *Stromateis, Bk. III, 52-53*<sup>38</sup>

Although Greek whiz-boys try to discount Clement's use of the word *syzygos* - yokefellow - (Greek was his mother tongue, by the way), the early tradition is strong that Paul was a widower who remarried. His spouse was probably Lydia of Acts 16. She is the only one *not* mentioned by name in the salutations of the Philippian Epistle. The bearing that Paul's remarriage has on his Corinthian counsel to celibates and virgins has not been adequately appreciated.

Separated by time and culture, it is difficult to understand the crisis it created for a woman to become a Christian in that early period. Very often, she was a wife (or the slave) of a pagan who at best was uncooperative and at worst, hostile to her new faith. She was his property. She was denied attendance at the public assembly. The Eucharist had to be brought to her by a

---

<sup>35</sup>Hippolytus was a 3rd Century Christian leader in Rome. See Canons No. 17, 18, & 32 (*ANF* v. 5, p. 256-257). Page 257 lists the Canons of the Church of Alexandria. Canons 17 & 18 cite midwives in their role of preserving the decorum and modesty between the sexes. Midwives appear to be a special classification of widow and deaconess. They are listed with "free-born women."

<sup>36</sup>"Ordain also a deaconess who is faithful and holy, for the ministrations towards women"-*ANF*, v.7, p. 431

<sup>37</sup>E.g. Hippolytus' *The Apostolic Tradition*, ed. Gregory Dix & Henry Chadwick, Alban Press, 1937

<sup>38</sup>*The Fathers of the Church, Clement of Alexandria, Stromateis Bks. 1-3*, trans. John Ferguson, Catholic University of America Press, 1991

deaconess, often clandestinely. Any prayers, teaching, or fellowship she received came through the ministry of the presbytriss.<sup>39</sup>

The birth of a child was especially a moment of crisis, because a pagan father would dedicate the child to his deity or kill it. Thus, the midwife played a key role in sanctifying and saving the offspring of such women. By being first to attend the mother and child upon delivery, she would baptize the child and anoint it before it was presented to the father. In this respect, midwives forged a quiet, yet mighty, weapon against Satan's kingdom. They voided demonic claims upon such babies by making them Christian babies.

## REVIEW

Now let me summarize what has been said about the midwife.

- **First**, she was an organic part of begetting children, a co-begetter.
- **Second**, as a custodian of life, she was a healer.
- **Third**, her role as a witness/prophetess made her a unique member of the Divine Council, those chosen few in the Bible who were co-workers with God in His redemptive plan.
- **Fourth**, as guardians of God's Elect, midwifery takes on the features of a priesthood. This view can be supported in three ways:
  - 1) It contained a hierarchy,
  - 2) It had official status, and
  - 3) It had direct accountability to God.
- **Finally**, rivals to midwives were depicted as satanic. We may conclude that midwifery is a holy calling which is instituted by God the Spirit, Himself, as the first midwife. Midwives are meant to be honored and protected by the leaders of Christ's Church as God's representatives in their special mission.

---

<sup>39</sup>In using the terms deaconess and presbytriss interchangeably to refer to the same person, the records seem to cause some confusion. In relation to her bishop, the midwife would be a deaconess. In relation to the woman she assists, she would be a woman with spiritual authority, a presbytriss.

## QUESTIONS FOR REVIEW

1. What is the "Mahuzzim heresy"?
2. Why did midwifery suffer when this heresy prevailed in the Church?
3. What is the Hebrew word for "midwife" and what does it mean?
4. Who does the author claim was the first midwife?
5. Do you agree with his position? Why or why not?
6. What are two important principles we learn from the record of Rachel's midwife?
7. In the record of Tamar's midwife, we see the midwife marking the firstborn son. How might this illustrate the judicial role of the midwife?
8. What does it mean to say that Christ is the "healer of the breach"?
9. Do you think there were only two midwives serving the Hebrews in Exodus 1? Why or why not?
10. The expressions "office of midwife" and "office of priest" share a common Hebrew word. What is it?
11. Do you think it is accurate to describe midwifery as a "sexual ministry"? Why or why not?
12. From your study in the previous chapter, what might the Dragon represent in Revelation 12?
13. In this text why does the Dragon usurp the role of the midwife?
14. According to Church Tradition, who was the Virgin Mary's midwife?
15. From the record provided in the chapter, was a midwife needed to provide Mary with medical attention?
16. What service did these midwives provide?
17. What impact judicially and theologically did their witness have?
18. In the Early Church, there was an "Order of Widows", as well as presbytresses (women elders) and deaconesses. How do you think midwives would have been classified? Be thorough.





## **CHAPTER FIVE:**

### **BIRTH AS A SACRED RITE**

Around 380 A.D., an idealistic young Celt from what is now northern Wales arrived in Rome to study law. He was the son of a Christian Druid who had personally and carefully taught him the traditions of his people. The lad's name was Morien and he had come to Rome with zeal to change the world for the glory of God. Law and politics at the Empire's center of power seemed to be the appropriate vehicle for such a noble venture. He set to his studies earnestly and soon earned a reputation for intellectual acumen.

Morien became disillusioned with Roman law, however, and became convinced that changing people was the only means of changing the world. So, he left the study of law and took-up preaching the Gospel. For the next twenty years, Morien became a renowned preacher of righteousness. Built like a linebacker, he was never intimidated by dark alleys or the bustling markets. Morien became a great soul-winner. With a powerful voice, he preached wherever a crowd would listen. Rich or poor, small or great; women, children, slaves - it did not matter to him. Like an ancient David Wilkerson, he preached in the Harlems of Rome. And like a Billy Sunday, he preached to the powerful just the same. The Church rolls swelled; the presbytery loved him.

Morien created a sensation during those years. While he never became more than a lay preacher and teacher, the impact of his ministry shook the Empire. He preached against sin, never as an abstract principle, but, like the Savior, in a personal way. Always kind, he probed the hearer's conscience, demolishing every excuse until repentance became the only option.

Unfortunately, Morien experienced the fate of all successful prophets. He began to rebuke the wrong people. He began holding the aristocracy to the same standards as the common man. He rebuked the Christians for their decadence and sin. He demanded the rich abandon their ill-gotten wealth and follow the communalism of the Early Church, the social system in which he was reared as a Celt. People began to take his ideas seriously.

Predictably, there were some among the ruling classes which became alarmed by these developments. Not only were their pet vices endangered by this spiritual revival, but the entire social system was threatened, as well. "The very idea of setting slaves free, of teaching women how to read the Scriptures, of abandoning usury and the police state - why that would bring chaos!"

These people appealed to the Church of Rome to silence this trouble-maker. But it was too late. Morien had friends in high places. He was impeccably orthodox, a master of patristic literature as well as the Scriptures. He was modest in deportment, pristine in reputation, and not given to shocking rhetoric. The leadership refused to silence him.

Morien's detractors looked elsewhere for someone with sufficient stature and ambition who could organize a Church Council to bring this man's movement to an end. They did not have to look far. For across the Mediterranean to the south lay Carthage, the home of the most powerful bishop of the Empire. There was a man who understood the exercise of power for the sake of good order, a man who held no illusions about the virtues of the common man, but saw all men as hopelessly depraved and in need of strict societal control. That man was Augustine.

And now you know who Morien is. For he is known to us today, infamously, by his Latin name: Pelagius.

Rome's failure to follow through with its visitation from Heaven led to swift judgment. It was sacked in 410 A.D. The Pelagians were scarcely out of the city when the barbarian armies appeared. Some of them fled to Carthage to confront Augustine. Pelagius went on to Palestine. Synods were convened. Except for Carthage, Pelagius and his teachings were exonerated every time.

Sweating from the prospects that the tables might soon be turned against them, the Augustinians appealed to the Emperor, charging that Pelagianism threatened the political order. You will recall that the Empire had two capitals at this time: one in Rome and one in Constantinople. With trouble from the barbarians, the Emperor could not tolerate any internal strife. To him, Pelagius represented Druidism, the dreaded religion of the rebellious Celt. Recognizing its history of revolutionary opposition, the Emperor *compelled* the Churches of the Empire to condemn Pelagianism as a heresy and to completely stamp it out. The Augustinians, with inquisitional fervor, happily obliged.

Banished, the followers of Pelagius left the Empire, most of them to the Church of the East. Pelagius himself returned to Britain, where he was warmly received and appointed the Abbot of the monastery of Bangor in north Wales. It was the largest Bible College in the world at that time. From there, he laid the theological foundation for the Celtic Church, one which would flourish under Patrick, and then re-invade the continent through Columbanus.<sup>40</sup>

### PELAGIUS' GREAT HERESY

What was Pelagius' great heresy? Well, curiously, the Church and State documents which condemned him have failed to survive. So, all that we are left with are the works of his enemies, like Augustine, who forbade even the mention of his name. Although condemned to oblivion, Pelagius' works did survive in the crypts of Irish monasteries. Many of them were circulated during the Middle Ages, but under different names. Some of them (and only Irishmen would do this) were circulated under the names of Jerome and Augustine! Alcuin taught Charlemagne Pelagianism, all the while thinking he was expounding the works of Jerome.

It is obviously beyond the scope of this essay to offer a point-by-point analysis of the debate between Pelagianism and Augustinianism. We are talking about midwifery, right? So, what is the point? Well, to put it bluntly, Pelagius was condemned because he denied that infants were damned unless they were baptized. He denied that God's grace suspends His law. He denied that man's sexuality was sinful. What he did teach was that infants should be baptized because they were already saved. He taught that all men, by the grace of God, can and must obey the written Law of God. Pelagianism taught that sexual desire was holy, a necessary part to the growing of God's Kingdom.

Most theologians will tell you that the argument was over free will v. predestination, with Pelagius the champion of free will and Augustine the champion of predestination. The issues were more complex than that. Both men were much more sophisticated. Pelagius taught extensively on Divine Providence. And Augustine never denied the will of man.

While Calvinist theologians think they have worked-out the wrinkles in the Augustinian system, yet they must borrow from Pelagian theology to do so. R. J. Rushdoony's works are a basic denial of the central pillar of Augustine's system: the sexual interpretation of the Fall of Man.<sup>41</sup> It was Augustine who taught that lust was Original Sin, **and** since we are all conceived

---

<sup>40</sup> *An Introduction to Celtic Christianity*, ed. James P. Mackey (T&T Clark, Edinburgh, 1989) see M. Fort-homme Nicholson's chapter: "Celtic Theology: Pelagius". Thomas Cahill's, *How the Irish Saved Civilization* (Doubleday, 1995), and Thomas Hudson's, *The High Age of the Celtic Church* (Attic Press, 1992)

<sup>41</sup> Rushdoony was a Van Tillian, supralapsarian Calvinist. He also founded the Christian Reconstructionist movement during the late 20th Century, which might be described as a purist revival of theocratic Calvinism. His *Flight from Humanity* (Thoburn Press, 1978) is a direct assault on Neo-Platonism (i.e. Manicheism, a world view which permeates Augustinianism). Other CR writings, like those of Gary North, bear striking resemblance to Charles Finney's *Systematic Theology* (cf. North's *Unconditional Surrender*). Calvinists take great delight in lampooning Finney as the arch-Pelagian of the 19<sup>th</sup> Century, yet borrow his concepts.

through lust, then sin is passed-down to all mankind through the seminal fluids of our conception. Infants are damned because of that Original Sin, unless saved by the priest's baptism.

Like watching a circus freak, Pelagius marveled and then condemned this awful parody of God's government. He taught that, although the world was fallen, it was still good. "Fallen" does not necessarily mean "evil." It just means "losing ground". In the quest of perfection, or the completion of moral character, man lacks an essential ingredient. Original sin or the "sinful nature", as it is called, means an inherited tendency to "miss or fall short of the mark," by Biblical definition. The thing which is lacking is the grace of God's presence in man's psychic experience (his mind). Pelagius said that presence was supplied by the Holy Scriptures and the understanding provided by the Holy Spirit. Augustine charged that Pelagius was relying upon external means of grace. Augustine said regeneration was a miracle of metaphysical transformation (a healing by the removal of lust). It was impossible for Augustine to see Pelagius' point. Pelagius had a clear understanding of moral agency. He could differentiate between man's moral nature and his physical nature. He could see how the truth of God operates on the will and changes it. Pelagius' Druidic roots taught the magical power of words. The Word of God had real power in the minds of Christian Druids. Augustine could not see that, because for him, man's problem was not moral, rather something in his physical being - specifically man's sexuality.

In reference to sexual desire, Augustine believed that the erection of the male member was proof of sin. He believed that holy sex was the kind devoid of pleasure (he would have loved test-tube babies). This view became the cornerstone of Christian doctrine and social theory until this very day. In this system, people who want to marry are suspect (they need counseling). People who enjoy sex are lecherous (they should do it only to procreate). People who want sex more than the Church allows are children of the devil (never mind that the command "be fruitful and multiply" means "have lots of sex and babies").

Like good Pelagians, the Celts, especially the Irish, never gave-up their love of sex and family. To them, it was not dirty. That was one way the Celtic Church acquired its "pagan" reputation from the Roman propaganda mills. Ireland had its monks. But most of them were so temporarily, until their training was completed and they re-entered society.

You will notice that the fruit of Augustinianism bears striking resemblance to the Mahuzzim and Cataphrygian heresies described in an earlier chapter. It would be helpful to provide a further explanation of these obscure terms, at this point. The term "Mahuzzim" is a Biblical word found in Daniel's prophecy concerning Antichrist apostates, who, among other things, forsake "the desire of women" (11:36-38). In the Early Church, this was known as the Encratite heresy. It began with Tatian, Justin Martyr's disciple. Although it was resisted by the Provincial Councils for many years, it finally prevailed by forcing celibacy on the clergy (except for the Celtic clergy, as I just mentioned).

The Cataphrygians were the Montanists. On the surface, they appeared to have taught the opposite of what I alleged in my earlier chapter. For instance, they taught the priesthood of the believer, charismatic endowments, and a layman's church. However, what the Montanists ended up with was a super-church run by super-spiritual people. It ended with the very elitism they professed to despise. Anti-Montanists grafted these elements into the catholic body and made the bishops the recipients of this spiritual authority. The church leadership became Cataphrygian.

And this kind of osmosis should not surprise us. Americans profess to be anti-communist; yet, all ten planks of the Communist Manifesto are integral parts of American society.

### **WHERE DO BABIES COME FROM?**

It is the claim of the Christian faith that personal salvation is a complete and total salvation. Every Lord's Day preachers from all denominations ascend their pulpits and marshal a host of Biblical texts to prove mankind that Christ saves to the uttermost the total man: body, soul, and spirit. Whatever it was that was lost in Eden, never mind Augustine or Pelagius, it has all been regained in Christ: first, by regeneration (the new birth) and the indwelling of the Holy Spirit; second, by the life of sanctification; and finally, by the consummation of the final resurrection.

There are variations on how this theme is taught, of course, but the fact remains that the Church teaches, and it has always taught, that the Christian's salvation is real and is effective throughout his entire being. A Christian cannot be partially saved and partially damned. He cannot be potentially saved. He cannot be saved in his spirit, yet damned in his flesh, as the Gnostics say. Man is completely saved judicially and practically.

Convinced of the truth of this doctrine, the world of Christianity then commits a most amazing contradiction. It tells us that the offspring of Christian parents are not saved. We are told that these two completely saved individuals, holy people, produce from their bodies seminal fluids which are unclean and which produce offspring that are in sin and subject to damnation (either at birth for the Calvinists, or at an Age of Accountability for Arminians).

Now to our chagrin, we find that salvation is not complete according to these guardians of the faith. Apparently, Christ does not save a man's entire body, soul, and spirit. He saves everything except for what lies between the thighs. That is off-limits to the Spirit of God.

How may we account for this strange inconsistency?

Well, we must begin by understanding the two main views of psychogenesis (soul creation). We know that sin is a spiritual thing, so it does not have to do with the body, directly. It springs from the motives of the heart, the spiritual essence of man, and then is manifested through the deeds of the body. Where does that spiritual essence come from? There are basically two views in the Church.

**The first view is called *traducianism*.** It says that both man's soul and body were created by the coming together of sperm and ovum at conception. There is nothing added or created other than what is already there in the seed. Augustinians favor traducianism. I hold to a form of traducianism which I will explain later.

**The second view is the one which the Church officially adopted and that is *Creationism*.**<sup>42</sup> Creationism taught that God specially creates the soul at conception and puts it

---

<sup>42</sup>Not to be confused with the "Creationism" as a scientific view of origins opposing Evolution. This view of psychogenesis was a compromise position between Augustine's view and that of Origen, who taught the pre-existence of the soul.

into the embryo. Pelagius believed in Creationism; although, I should add that Druid metaphysics was much closer to Augustine's view. I will explain this anomaly in a moment.

First, however, it should be noted that Creationists have a big problem with Original Sin, because if God creates a new fallen spirit every time there is a conception, then He is deliberately creating something which is sinful and subject to His wrath. If, on the other hand, the Creationist says that sin is in the flesh and not in the spirit (but is pride a sin of the body?), then God is guilty of putting a pure, sinless spirit into a sinful body subject to His wrath. So, in either case, the Creationist has a hard time believing in Original Sin, even if he wants to do so.

But Creationism lacks Biblical support, as I will explain shortly. There is such a thing as Original Sin, but not as Augustine understood it. We might say that Pelagius and Augustine over-reacted to each other's rhetoric and pushed their positions to extremes. It not, certainly their followers did. Pelagius came from the Druid tradition which believed in the immortal soul. The Druids also taught a pre-existence and reincarnation which began in the primordial human. Unlike the Hindu Karma, however, Druid reincarnation was a procession of intergenerational, cellular memory. Scientists may call this phenomenon "instinct", but to the Druids, it was spiritual, encompassing the astral, as well as the terrestrial planes. Thus, although it *appears* to be the Creationist view, it really is a form of "spiritual traducianism" (see chart on p. 51).<sup>43</sup>

Now, Christian theology does not reject the idea of immortality, or at least, potential immortality. But it is a pagan view to maintain that immortality was retained by Adam after the Fall. Mankind became mortal - body, soul, and spirit - after the loss of Paradise. Immortality was regained through Christ and the indwelling of the Holy Spirit. So, the Druids were wrong, although they were not alone. Some Jewish sects held to the same views. Christianity corrected their metaphysical speculations with Divine Revelation.

Nevertheless, Pelagius did not base his theology on this view of psychogenesis or on any other metaphysical system, for that matter, as did Augustine. Pelagius was a prophet concerned with moral issues, not metaphysics. He was a Scripturalist and had a keen sense of God's moral government. He also had the doctrinal support of the Church Fathers, like Irenaeus, Hilary, Origen, Clement, and many others. Augustine was the extremist and the Latin Church was his offspring.

---

<sup>43</sup> **Druidism, as did Enochian Judaism, taught that each covenant line had a guardian angel. It is very possible that people with visions of past lives are really tapping into the intergenerational memories of these angelic beings.**

**ORIGIN OF THE SOUL**

<b><u>TRADUCIANIST:</u></b>	<b><u>CREATIONIST:</u></b>	<b><u>INCARNATIONIST:</u></b>
<b>Soul is created by the union of the seed. Augustine</b>	<b>Soul is created separately at conception. Church Councils Pelagius</b>	<b>Pre-existence of the Soul in Heaven. Origen</b>

Each of the above views share a common error: they teach a post-conception individuation of the personal soul. What that means is that each individual is a non-individual until the soul becomes a person at conception. This is personalism from impersonalism.

Celtic Christianity, drawing from its Druidic roots, taught the pre-existence of the personal soul in Adam. This is a personal traducianism: personalism from personalism

So, do babies come from the fluids of our bodies? Or do they come from a baby factory in Heaven? And what does it matter? Let's see what the Scriptures and the Early Church had to say about it.

## SCRIPTURAL ANALYSIS

We begin by examining the Biblical use of the word "seed".

- "Being born again, not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, by the word of God, which liveth and abideth for ever. -1 Peter 1:23
- "But God giveth it a body as it hath pleased him, and to every seed his own body. All flesh is not the same flesh: but there is one kind of flesh of men, another flesh of beasts, another of fishes, and another of birds... There is a natural body, and there is a spiritual body. And so it is written, The first man Adam was made a living soul; the last Adam was made a quickening spirit." - 1 Corinthians 15:38-45

Presumably, we can say that a natural body clothes a natural seed. Regenerate man has a spiritual seed; so someday, he will have a spiritual body.

- "And God said, Let the earth bring forth grass, the herb yielding seed, and the fruit tree yielding fruit after his kind, whose seed is in itself, upon the earth: and it was so". - Genesis 1:11
- "And the LORD God formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life; and man became a living soul." - Genesis 2:7
- "And God said, Behold, I have given you ... every beast of the earth, and to every fowl of the air, and to every thing that creepeth upon the earth, wherein there is life [a living soul]" - Genesis 1:29-30

From the etymology of the word *nephesh* (soul), we see that animals have souls, too. If we say that unregenerate man has an eternal soul, then we must say also that the animals do. Man is not a spirit trapped in a prison of flesh. He is seed.

- "And the LORD God said, Behold, the man is become as one of us, to know good and evil: and now, lest he put forth his hand, and take also of the tree of life, and eat, and live for ever: Therefore the LORD God sent him forth from the garden of Eden. - Genesis 3:22-23
- "For all things cannot be in men, because the son of man is not immortal. - Ecclesiasticus 17:30<sup>44</sup>

Unlike the animals, man was promised immortality for obedience. He was promised death for disobedience. How can we say that man has sinned, yet his soul has not died? Now consider how God speaks of human seed:

- "Unto thy seed will I give it." - Exodus 33:1

God covenants, blesses, and punishes seed (1 Kings 2:33; 11:39; Psalms 37:26-28; Jeremiah 22:30; 36:31). Seed can glorify God (Psalms 22:23), fear God (Psalms 22:23), serve God (22:30), inherit the earth (25:13), etc. Seed have a heart (Deuteronomy 30:6).

The term "seed" is distinguished from "children" or "infants" (*zera*: seed; *taph*: children; *olal*: babe). There is a "seed of evildoers" (Isaiah 1:4; Psalms 37:28) and the "seed of the righteous" (Psalms 37:25; Proverbs 11:21). God discriminates between seed (Hebrews 11:18). He seeks a "godly seed in the earth" (Malachi 2:15).

Whether man exists in seminal form or has been born, he still has a real existence (John 8:37; Hebrews 7:9-10). The human spirit is not a divine spark added at conception.

---

<sup>44</sup>**This is not the Ecclesiastes of the Canon of our modern Bibles but the apocryphal book found in the Septuagint. However, it was used as Scripture by the Early Church.**



- "And their seed shall be known among the Gentiles, and their offspring among the people: all that see them shall acknowledge them, that they are the seed which the LORD hath blessed. - Isaiah 61:9
- "To fear the Lord is the beginning of wisdom: and it was created with the faithful in the womb. She hath built an everlasting foundation with men, and she shall continue with their seed. - Ecclesiasticus 1:4-5
- "They shall not labour in vain, nor bring forth for trouble; for they are the seed of the blessed of the LORD, and their offspring with them. And it shall come to pass, that before they call, I will answer; and while they are yet speaking. I will hear." - Isaiah 65:23-24
- "As for me, this is my covenant with them, saith the LORD; My spirit that is upon thee, and my words which I have put in thy mouth, shall not depart out of thy mouth, nor out of the mouth of thy seed, nor out of the mouth of thy seeds seed, saith the LORD, from henceforth and for ever." - Isaiah 59:21
- "For as the new heavens and the new earth, which I will make, shall remain before me, saith the LORD, so shall your seed and your name remain." - Isaiah 66:22
- "For I will pour water upon him that is thirsty, and floods upon the dry ground: I will pour my spirit upon thy seed, and my blessing upon thine offspring." - Isaiah 44:3
- "But the Lord will never leave off his mercy, neither shall any of his works perish, neither will he abolish the posterity of his elect, and the seed of him that loveth him he will not take away: wherefore he gave a remnant unto Jacob, and out of him a root unto David." - Ecclesiasticus 47:22
- "But this shall be the covenant that I will make with the house of Israel; After those days, saith the LORD, I will put my law in their inward parts, and write it in their hearts; and will be their God, and they shall be my people. . . If those ordinances depart from before me, saith the LORD, then the seed of Israel also shall cease from being a nation before me for ever." - Jeremiah 31:33,36
- See also Ezekiel 36:25-28.

The remnant, after judgment, is the "holy seed" (Isaiah 6:13). God appoints "another seed" (Genesis 4:25). There is a "seed of the serpent" and the "seed of the woman" (Genesis 3:15). Some seed are wicked from the womb (Isaiah 48:8); some seed God covenants with before birth (Isaiah 46:3).

- "thy people also shall be all righteous: they shall inherit the land for ever, the branch of my planting, the work of my hands, that I may be glorified. A little one shall become a thousand, and a small one a strong nation: I the LORD will hasten it in his time." - Isaiah 60:21-22
- "But God has chosen the foolish ones of the world to put the wise to shame; and God has chosen the weak ones of the world to embarrass the mighty; And he has chosen those of humble families in the world, and the lowly and those who are insignificant, in order to belittle those who consider themselves important, So that no man should boast in his presence. - 1 Corinthians 1:26-29 (Peshitta)
- "And the LORD thy God will circumcise thy heart, and the heart of thy seed, to love the LORD thy God with all thine heart, and with all thy soul, that thou mayest live." - Deuteronomy 30:6

All the above refer to the seed of the "natural man". The seed of the "spiritual" man is the Logos of God: the WORD made flesh (1 Peter 1:23; 1 John 3:9).

Now, we examine a representative view of the pre-Nicene Church Fathers, Clement of Alexandria from *Stromateis, Books I, II, III*. -

- "In the past a man coming from marital intercourse was required to wash. It cannot be too strongly said that the Providence of God revealed through the Lord no longer makes this demand. The Lord eliminates washing after intercourse as unnecessary since he has cleansed believers by one single baptism ... (Bk.III,82)
- "Just as that which is born of the flesh is flesh, so that which is born of the Spirit is Spirit', not just in the process of birth but in its education. So 'the children are holy', objects of delight, when the Lord's words have brought the soul to God as a bride." (Bk. III, 84).
- "When Salome asked. 'How long will death maintain its power'? the Lord said, 'As long as you women bear children' (from the lost Gospel according to the Egyptians). He is not speaking of life as evil and the creation as rotten. He is giving instruction about the normal course of nature. Death is always following on the heels of birth."  
"The design of the Law is to divert us from extravagance and all forms of disorderly behavior; this is its object, to draw us from unrighteousness to righteousness, making us responsible in marriage, engendering children, and living well. The Lord 'comes to fulfill, not to destroy the Law'. Fulfillment does not mean that it was defective." (Bk. III, 45-46).
- "These people [his Gnostic opponents] say that sexual intercourse is polluted. Yet they owe their existence to sexual intercourse! Must they not be polluted? Personally, I think that the seed coming from consecrated people is sacred too. - (Bk. III, 46)
- "These people do anything rather than walk by the canon of the gospel in conformity with truth. Why do they omit what follows in the words spoken to Salome? She said, 'Then would I have done better if I never had a child?' suggesting that childbearing was not a necessary obligation. The Lord replied in the words, 'Eat every plant but do not eat a plant whose content is bitter.' By these words he is indicating that the choice of celibacy or wedlock is in our power and not a matter of the absolute constraint of a commandment. He is also clarifying the point that marriage is cooperation with the work of creation. So no one should ever think that marriage under the rule of the Logos is a sin, if he does not find it bitter to bring up children . . . since there is no harm in disciplined pleasure, and each of us is in a position to make a decision over the engendering of children." (Bk. III, 66-67).
- "To the married he adds these words: 'My elect shall not labor in vain or produce children to be under a curse, since their seed is blessed by the Lord.' If a man produces children in obedience to the Logos, nurtures them, and educates them in the Lord, as with the man who fathers children following instruction in the truth, there is a reward in store for him, as for the elect seed too." (Bk. III,98)<sup>45</sup>

The miscellaneous scriptures cited above provide an understanding which both confirm traducianism and yet repudiate Augustine's use of it. They confirm our pre-existence in Adam. The passing of the generations is like the unrolling and rolling of a scroll. Each person awaits the opportunity for manifestation according to the Sovereign will of God in bringing the sperm and ovum together. But there is nothing new added. The personality existed in a covenantal and a real sense before the union.

---

<sup>45</sup>I should add that Clement is justly considered representative of the early Christian view: born in Athens, of sympathy with the Ebionites, and having directed the catechetical school in Alexandria which was the leading center of Christianity at that time.

Augustinianism is repudiated because the sexual act which releases the seed into the womb is not sinful in any way. Original Sin consists in the absence of the Divine Logos in the spiritual consciousness. The Druids called this a condition of *brutishness*.<sup>46</sup>

Pelagianism is confirmed in the respect that the offspring of regenerate people are holy. Like John the Baptist, they are filled with the Holy Spirit while yet in their mother's womb (Luke 1). So, we can say that Christians alone have immortal souls because they have the same Spirit which raised Christ from the dead (Romans 8:11).

On this point, Irenaeus says:

*For the breath of life, which also rendered man an animated being, is one thing, and the vivifying Spirit another, which also caused him to become spiritual. The breath then is temporal, but the Spirit eternal. As, then, he who was made a living soul, forfeited life when he turned aside to what was evil, so, on the other hand, the same individual, when he reverts to what is good, and receives the quickening Spirit, shall find life.*<sup>47</sup>

### **Three Key Scriptures**

There are three key Scriptures which provide final confirmation to all that has been said thus far. The first is in 1 Corinthians 6:15-20:

*Know ye not that your bodies are the members of Christ? shall I then take the members of Christ, and make them the members of an harlot? God forbid.*

*What? know ye not that he which is joined to an harlot is one body? for two, saith he, shall be one flesh.*

Notice the plural "members," and the making of these members "the members of an harlot". Obviously, Paul is referring to the act of sexual intercourse, but he is not saying that the union consists of the insertion of the penis into the harlot. For the penis is one member and is removed after the sexual encounter. The "members" Paul refers to here is the seed. They become a permanent part of the harlot. Paul rebukes Christian fornicators for taking their seed, the "members of Christ", and making them the members of the body of a harlot. This is what the Scriptures mean to "profane" one's seed. "Profane" is a word which means "outside the temple."

Paul then in the following verse declares that fornication is a sin "against one's own body", i.e. one's seed. "Body", as it is used here, is a collective noun. Our bodies are temples and

---

<sup>46</sup>The reader will note that the Druids are held in high esteem by this author. One must make an important distinction between the Druidism at the time of Christ and the Early Church from the neopagan variety promoted today. The Druids were the spiritual leaders of the Celts very much like the Magi were for the Persians which worshipped Jesus in Bethlehem. See the author's book, *The Holy Conspiracy: Christian Druidism and Cultural Alchemy* (1995) for a more complete explanation of this distinction.

<sup>47</sup>ANF, v. 1 p. 537-538

future generations live in that temple. By casting out our seed in a sin of uncleanness or into an unbeliever is to condemn our seed to literal or covenantal death. Within this context, we can see why early marriage was mandated by the ancient Rabbis.

The Body of Christ consists of Christians past, present, and future. The saints of the past are with the Lord. The saints of the present are seen at the assembly for worship. The saints of the future are still in our bodies. We may not see them, but God sees them. They do not have potential existence; they have a real existence.

The second Scripture is found in the Second Commandment. It tells us that,

*... for I the LORD thy God am a jealous God, visiting the iniquity of the fathers upon the children unto the third and fourth generation of them that hate me; And shewing mercy unto thousands of them that love me and keep my commandments.*

Now, Ezekiel 18:14 tells us that God will overcome the effects of sin and limit it to one generation. Thus, while the extent of the Curse is limited, the promise of blessing has never been diminished. "Thousands of generations" clearly means unto the end of time. The blessing of one individual's righteousness will benefit his or her offspring until the end of time.

This is confirmed by Peter in our final reference. In his sermon at Pentecost in Acts 2, he tells his hearers, "For the promise [of the Holy Spirit] is unto you, and to your children, and to all that are afar off, even as many as the Lord our God shall call" v. 39.

Here, we find God's intention to make all the first fruits of the Gospel the heads of covenant lines. Peter declared that Pentecost was a fulfillment of the prophecies concerning the Lord's heritage (Psalms 127), some of which were cited above.

*Lo, children are an heritage of the LORD: and the fruit of the womb is his reward.*

- Psalms 127:3

## COVENANT LINES

God covenants with every person who comes to Christ. He promises them salvation and confirms that promise with the "seal of our inheritance," the indwelling of the Holy Spirit (Ephesians 1:13).

God's covenant extends to the seedline of each Christian. That is why sex, for a Christian, is holy. Sex can be said to be the means of manifesting that holy life. For the Christian, it is like the growing of tree branches. The branches are holy because the root is holy:

*For if the first fruit be holy, the lump is also holy:  
and if the root be holy, so are the branches.*

- Romans 11:16

We need only to abide in Him. But even if we are disobedient, God chastises us, that we perish not with the world (1 Corinthians 11:32).

Sexual passion for the Christian is a glorious manifestation of our sonship if it is consummated according to the ordinance of God. It represents the power of God's blessing upon our offspring, waiting and yearning for their manifestation into creation (Romans 8:19).

Thus, the begetting of children is a sacred act. It is also the central pillar of building the Kingdom of God. Jesus said that the Kingdom of God consists of children (Matthew 19:14). Why, then, are we not bringing them into the world?

Most of our churches, especially evangelical churches, focus on evangelism. I think they have missed the point. It is better to bring children into the world who do not need to be evangelized. Like the Pharisees, they search the world over to find one proselyte and then make him a hundredfold more a child of hell (Matthew 23:15).

Why? Because they are antinomian. They despise God's law in the Creation Ordinance to be "fruitful and multiply". They despise the discipline of the marriage bed. They foolishly think the Kingdom of God consists in how many people we convince to repeat the sinner's prayer. Why should there be sinners in the first place, when we can have godly procreation? The notion makes as much sense as to start fires so that firefighters will have something to do.

**The forgotten doctrine is that the Kingdom of God consists in begetting children, baptizing them, and providing Christian nurture.** It is in exerting Christian dominion through the family. This was the practice of the earliest Christians. If Evangelicals spent half the energy in discipleship that they spend on evangelistic programs, we probably would not need the other half for evangelism. People would be beating down the doors to our homes, begging us to tell them about Jesus.

## THE MIDWIFE IN KINGDOM BUILDING

What this chapter has tried to do is revive a conceptual understanding of the culture which makes midwifery important. A Christian culture which centers its energies on procreation and family life is one which heightens the importance of midwives, not merely as medical professionals, but as a spiritual ministry, as well.

It was the practice of the Early Church, and confirmed by the earliest councils, to baptize Christian infants as soon as they were born. They discouraged the practice of waiting until the eighth day, as it was for circumcision. For Christian families, the midwife served a dual function. First, she attested to the birth of the child. Second, she witnessed the covenant sign of the child's rebirth, when the father baptized the child. She was in a position to testify of the child's induction into the community of faith. Here is the faith of the fathers, of the patriarchs who were priests to their own households. The midwife served as a vital link to the larger body of Christians and no doubt served as an emissary between house churches and the community overseer.<sup>48</sup>

*Judge none blessed before his death: for a man shall be known in his children.*  
-Ecclesiasticus 11:28

---

<sup>48</sup> **This book assumes that the reader is familiar with the Biblical doctrine of the covenant. It assumes that the reader understands why infant baptism is Biblical and important. People who are unclear about these two doctrines should contact this author for other material which will explain and establish them.**

## QUESTIONS FOR REVIEW

1. What was the Latin name for Morien?
2. Where did he preach"?
3. Name three of his ideas that got him into trouble with the rich and powerful.
4. Who was recruited to become his opponent?
5. Was this opponent successful in ending Morien's career? Why or why not?
6. Did Morien accept the idea that infants need to be baptized to be saved from God's wrath?
7. By "sinful nature", do we mean that everything God has made has become evil? Why or why not?
8. Augustine believed that when a man got an erect penis, it was proof of his sinfulness. Do you agree with that idea? Why or why not?
9. Forsaking "the desire of women" is a primary characteristic of what heresy described in Daniel 11?
10. What are the two main views of psycho-genesis?
11. What does it mean to say that each individual soul was created in Adam?
12. How is the meaning of the Hebrew word for seed different from the words for children and infants?
13. When God covenants with His people, does He also covenant with their seed?
14. Clement of Alexandria quotes the "Gospel of the Egyptians" to tell about a discussion between Jesus and Salome. What was it about?
15. Do you agree with Clement that "the seed coming from consecrated people is sacred"? Why or why not?
16. What do you think this statement means: "Eat every plant but do not eat a plant whose content is bitter"?
17. Based on what Irenaeus said on page 55, do unbelievers have immortal souls?
18. According to the 2nd Commandment, God visits the descendants of covenant keepers with mercy \_\_\_\_\_ unto a generations.
19. What is a covenant line?
20. In the Early Church, how did the midwife participate in building covenant lines?





## **CHAPTER SIX:**

### **MIDWIVES & THE HOLY GRAIL**

*I will overturn, overturn, overturn, it: and it shall be no more, until he come whose right it is; and I will give it him.*

- Ezekiel 21:27

The 5th Century was coming to a close. The last Roman emperor had abdicated his throne not many years before. Law and order had broken down. Armies marched effortlessly across the map of Europe. Butchery, plunder, and plague filled the land. The known world was in a period of massive devolution. Roman civilization was crumbling like a sand-castle at high-tide.

The Britons, softened by three centuries of Christian culture, had surrendered their best men to the Continent to save the Empire. Now, they were hopelessly outmatched by pagan invaders. It seemed to be the end of the world.

When all seemed lost and the enemy invincible, a champion arose concerning whom legends would be told until the end of time. Ancient historians, partisans for the invaders and envious of his celestial fame, banished his name from their chronicles. He was simply called "the great one," "the mighty warrior." This mysterious Celtic chieftain, this pendragon, led his army of boys and farmers to victory after victory. Crushing the invaders, Britain experienced a precious period of tranquility and glory which was immortalized into the legend of Camelot. We know the champion as Arthur.

The story of King Arthur is one that has frustrated historians for centuries. That is because it is a Celtic story, and non-Celts do not know how Celtic allegories are used. They are used like Biblical types and applied to contemporary figures. Because Arthur's story has been appropriated by bardic story tellers to different people at different times and places, historians

have given up and consigned it to myth, instead. However, in recent decades, working with new data, sympathetic historians have reconstructed the core of the Arthurian legends. *The Legacy of Arthur's Chester* by Robert B. Stoker (Covenant Publishing) is an example of the more balanced works.<sup>49</sup>

Arthur really existed. He was the nephew of Ambrosius, who succeeded King Vortigern. These men are known to history. Arthur was his first captain in battle. Some of his alleged exploits were those of other family members, but Arthur stands out as the most illustrious of his clan. Deeply Christian, his armies delayed the Saxon conquest by two centuries. This allowed time for the Celtic Church to mature and bear fruit. Converting Ireland and launching the Age of Saints, the Church of the Cymry (Wales) became the Mother Church of an essential element of Western Civilization: the principle of individual freedom.<sup>50</sup>

Arthur's dizzying success was not to last, of course. We all know the story. His defeat began with his failure to protect his bride, Guinevere. She was taken by his adversary. A crisis of succession developed. Arthur's only heir was his betrayer, and the battle in which he was mortally wounded was one against his own.

Rarely has the Celt been defeated on the battlefield. The inevitable traitor has been his undoing. "Celt against Celt," of course, was the formula of Roman success. So it was for the Saxon.

During the eclipse of his fortunes, we are told an amazing story about Arthur's quest to find the Holy Grail, the chalice (cup) which was used by our Lord at the Last Supper. Reputed to have been brought to Glastonbury by Joseph of Arimathea and to contain the Lord's blood, it was held to have supernatural powers. Arthur's knights sought for it, hoping that its recovery would restore the purity and royal virtue of the kingdom. They failed.

### **HOLY BLOOD, HOLY GRAIL**

In 1983 a group of three British authors published a book which astonished the world, *Holy Blood, Holy Grail* (Michael Baigent, Richard Leigh & Henry Lincoln). It went unnoticed in Fundamentalist circles, except by prophecy buffs and the people who read tabloid magazines. It became a bestseller. Three years later they published a sequel, *The Messianic Legacy*.<sup>51</sup>

Baigent and his colleagues can be described as investigative historians. They are also iconoclasts. Essentially, their books set out to revise accepted history of Christian origins. Central to their thesis is the allegation that Jesus Christ was part of an international conspiracy of Davidic Jews, attempting to restore the Throne of David in Jerusalem. He was the heir-apparent. When their plot failed, he was killed (or simply disappeared) and a new religion was concocted

---

<sup>49</sup> **available from this author**

<sup>50</sup> **The discussion in the previous chapters concerning Pelagius and free moral agency has direct bearing on the issue of individual freedom. The freedom of the individual is not metaphysically possible unless the individual has a free will.**

<sup>51</sup> **Dell Publishing, 1982 and 1986 respectively**

around his legend, which eventually became Christianity. He was married to Mary Magdalene who bore him children and fled the Roman siege of Jerusalem. She and the children disappeared in the Jewish communities of southern France. A few centuries later, the authors allege, a descendant married into Frankish royalty, which became the Merovingian dynasty. The authors claim that the history of Europe is the story of the families of nobility descended from these Merovingians (e.g. the Hapsburgs), their rule over the Holy Roman Empire, their meddling in world affairs, and their quest for political supremacy.

Today, they are said to be working through a secret society known as the Priory of Sion, which was founded by one of their own, a knight who made himself King of Jerusalem during the Crusades. The Knights Templar, Rosicrucians, and other secret societies are supposed to be a part of this historic effort toward world government. I might add that the "Protocols of the Learned Elders of Zion", lampooned by anti-Semites, is alleged by these authors to be really a non-Jewish document and a bungled attempt to smear the reputation of the Priory.

Conspiracy watchers like Texe Marrs and J. R. Church justifiably smell a satanic plot. Baigent and his crew snicker at Fundamentalists like Marrs, but they do nothing to calm fears that this Priory of Sion and their future messiah may indeed be the work of an Antichrist.

That does not diminish the value of their research, however. Whether by accident or not, they discovered that the Celtic legends of the Holy Grail were cryptic allegories:

*In many of the earlier manuscripts the Grail is called the Sangraal; and even in the later version by Malory it is called the Sangreal. It is likely that some such fibrin - Sangraal or Sangreal - was in fact the original one. It is also likely that that one word was subsequently broken in the wrong place. In other words, 'San graal' or 'San greal' may not have been intended to divide into 'San Graal' or 'San Graal' but into 'Sang Raal' or 'Sang Real.' Or to employ the modern spelling, Sang Royal: Royal blood.*

- *Holy Blood, Holy Grail*, p. 306<sup>52</sup>

Of course, the books make for fascinating reading. That is how they became bestsellers. The authors have a gifted ability to weave plausible fact with apparent fiction. They operate from premise that where there is smoke, there is fire. That kind of premise can take you only so far. To the Christian, they make a critical error of judgment, which skews their reading of the facts: that error is the assumption that Christianity is not true, that Jesus is not the Son of God, and that he did not rise again from the dead.

---

<sup>52</sup>Most Grail scholars dismiss this assertion. But the storyline of the Grail legends themselves talk of a sacred lineage. So whether "San Greal" ought to be "Sang Real" need not be proved, considering the larger message of the Grail romances.

The result is a return to the same theme as in most liberal scholarship: Few question that Jesus Christ ever existed. If He was not the Son of God, then who was He? Liberals always end up with the following options:

- a) Jesus the Rabbi,
- b) Jesus the Zealot,
- c) Jesus the Magician, or
- d) All the above.

The idea that Jesus Christ practiced magic is receiving a lot of attention, lately. The New Age movement loves to make Him a psychic. The people associated with these esoteric teachings, historically, have practiced sorcery. This Priory of Sion, Merovingian dynasty, and group of secret societies could not possibly be the descendants of the Jesus of the Bible. For in everything, He was obedient to the Law of Moses. The Law of Moses forbade the magic arts. They are Gnostic in their dedicated antinomianism.

Baigent's work on the Celtic Church is well-done, although by no means complete.<sup>53</sup> A number of the facts he presents have been accessible knowledge in the Cambrian Church for centuries, including the likely answer to the question below:

### **WAS JESUS MARRIED?**

That question challenged me back in the 1980s when the Christian world was outraged by the movie version of Kazantzakis' book, *The Last Temptation of Christ*. My objection was based upon the reports that Christ was depicted in the movie as a fornicator.<sup>54</sup> That he could have been married to Mary Magdalene, had sexual intercourse with her, and had children by her is not a problem doctrinally or morally. If you are a Mahuzzim (Augustinian) like most of the Christian world, then the idea is blasphemous. But that is because you see sexuality as sin. You have a perverse view of Christianity. A sexual Jesus is not the same as an immoral Jesus.<sup>55</sup>

There is another reason why traditional Christians will object to the notion that Jesus was married: they do not have a clear understanding of their own creeds. They fear admitting that Christ was fully human. They suffer from Docetism. Docetism was part of the Mahuzzim heresy. It taught that Jesus was more like a phantom than a human being. According to the Docetists, he did not eat, drink, defecate or sleep. He faked the whole thing. A lot of people have a hard time believing that Christ had to use the latrine. It just doesn't seem very spiritual, does it? Nor does seminal emissions.

However, Biblical doctrine tells us that all of these things were part of His humiliation in the flesh:

---

<sup>53</sup> He acknowledges some dependence on the Taylors. Mrs. Taylor's book-set - *Our Neglected Heritage* - is available from this author. In those books she discusses the Desposyni.

<sup>54</sup> Having viewed the film, I no longer have any objections. In fact, I highly recommend it.

<sup>55</sup> Perhaps the best study on the subject was done by William E. Phipps, a Presbyterian scholar. His book, *Was Jesus Married?*, was published by Harper & Row in 1970, long before Baigent's books.

*Forasmuch then as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, he also himself likewise took part of the same; For verily he took not on him the nature of angels but he took on him the seed of Abraham. Wherefore in all things it behooved him to be made like unto his brethren, that he might be a merciful and faithful high priest in things pertaining to God, to make reconciliation of the people.*

- Hebrews 2:14-17<sup>56</sup>

When you compare the above Scriptures with Hebrews 13:4, you begin to see that sexuality was not incompatible with being the Son of God, no more so than having to take a nap:

*Marriage is honorable in all, and the bed undefiled:  
but whoremongers and adulterers God will judge.*

- Hebrews 13:4

The Greek word for "bed" here is "coitus" - intercourse. So, if Jesus was properly married, sexual relations would have been as holy for Him as it might be for any other person.

Irenaeus' Recapitulation doctrine is important on this point. Irenaeus, you will recall, was the 2nd Century bishop of Lyons in Gaul. He knew Polycarp, who sat at the feet of the Apostle John. Irenaeus taught that Jesus entered every stage of human life in order to sanctify it.<sup>57</sup> If Jesus were not married and had children, that stage of life would not have been sanctified. It would have been left outside of God's redemptive plan.

Although this sounds logically consistent with Irenaeus' teaching, he fudged on this point. He found God's redemption of human sexuality in the conception of Mary by the Holy Spirit. Irenaeus was painfully illogical here. It is as though he were trying to avoid a touchy subject. More on this in a moment.

There is a solid, 2nd Century tradition that Mary Magdalene was an intimate companion of the Savior. In the non-canonical Gospel of Philip, one of the passages reads:

*There were three who always walked with the Lord: Mary his mother and her sister and Magdalene, the one who was called his companion. His sister and his mother and his companion were each a Mary.<sup>58</sup>*

Later on, the text relates a complaint by the disciples that Jesus was showing Mary too much attention and "kissing her on the lips" in front of them. We may pass this off as the work of a Gnostic heretic, but you must remember that the Gnostics were either anti-sexual or homosexual in orientation. The notion that Jesus could have been sexual was anathema to the larger Gnostic movement.

---

<sup>56</sup>See also Hebrews 4:15; 5:2; 7:25; John 1:14; Romans 8:3; Philippians 2:7; Colossians 2:15 for related passages.

<sup>57</sup>See *The Holy Conspiracy* by this author for an extended discussion of this doctrine.

<sup>58</sup>*The Nag Hammadi Library*, ed. James M. Robinson, Harper & Row, 1988

But there was an early sect with Gnostic leanings which might have perpetrated this tradition. That was Valentinus of the 2nd Century, the almost Bishop of Rome. It appears that his view produced a movement in favor of turning Jesus and Mary into a god and goddess. This unbalanced and extremist teaching horrified the bishops of the churches. It was at this point that a reaction set in. They destroyed all records of the personal lives of Jesus and His disciples (such as the books of Papias). Then, they restricted that knowledge to oral tradition. Then, it was lost altogether. The Encratite heresy may have begun as simply an attempt to save the Church from becoming a fertility cult. It was an overreaction.

Hippolytus lets the cat out of the bag, however. In his commentary on the Song of Solomon, his exegesis makes the story a parable about Jesus and Mary Magdalene. In it she is a figurehead for the Church. That such an erotic tale about Jesus and Mary could have been related by a Church Father with such stature as Hippolytus (the disciple of Irenaeus) seems to me to be conclusive proof of our Lord's marital status, and proof of a cover-up. Could this explain why the Roman Catholic Church has always disdained him?<sup>59</sup>

What about Scriptural support? Aside from the fact that the Bible was not written to tell the personal lives of its characters, there are four main accounts which point to our Lord's marital status. First, before His messianic ministry, He was known as a rabbi. Aside from being addressed as such, the Scriptures relate that it was his custom to read and teach the Torah on the Sabbath in the synagogues (Luke 4:16). Considering His experience in the Temple when twelve years old, it is difficult to believe He was silent until His thirtieth birthday. Irenaeus claimed that Jesus had a public ministry which spanned ten years.<sup>60</sup> Modern commentators think Irenaeus was off his rocker. But he was only one generation removed from the Apostles. The tradition was still fresh. It is much more reasonable to accept that Jesus taught as a rabbi several years before He began His messianic ministry.

The bearing this has on His marital status is that the Mishnah required all rabbis to be married with children. One could not be a good Jew without being a family man. Consider the following:

*In ancient Judaism the more liberal rabbis allowed that the age of twenty four was the upper limit for marriage, but the more rigid said, "When a bachelor attains the age of twenty and is unmarried, the Holy One says, 'Let him rot'".<sup>61</sup>*

The usual age for "the bridal chamber" for the Jewish male was sixteen. Consider also the duties of the father to his son:

---

<sup>59</sup> For an English translation of the pertinent passages, see Susan Haskins, *Mary Magdalen, Myth and Metaphor*, (Berkeley, 1993) For a discussion of the Roman Catholic opinion of Hippolytus, see *The Apostolic Tradition*, edited by Gregory Dix & Henry Chadwick (Alban Press, London, 1992)

<sup>60</sup> *Ante-Nicene Fathers, v.1*, p. 392

<sup>61</sup> *Was Jesus Married?*, William E. Phipps, Harper & Row, 1970 (republished 1989) p. 47. In the apocryphal book, "The Gospel of the Nativity of Mary," a Scripture is quoted not found in our Bibles which says, "Cursed is every one who has not begotten a male or a female in Israel." (*ANF, vol. 8, p.384*)

*A Jewish father completed his responsibilities to his son by arranging for his marriage. Abrahams quotes a first-century saying in discussing the ancient Jewish family: "He who loves his wife as himself, and honors her more than himself who leads his sons and daughters in the straight path, and marries them near their time of maturity; to his house the words of Job apply: 'Thou shalt know that thy tent is in peace'.<sup>62</sup>*

The above was typical of Jewish custom during the time of the Savior. Since His foster father, Joseph, is described as a "just man" (Matthew 1:19), and since Jesus is described as being "subject" unto him and His mother (Luke 2:51), it seems logical to assume that Joseph would have betrothed Him in fulfillment of the Law, and likewise, Jesus would have fulfilled His marital duty. There are eighteen years of His life unaccounted for in the Gospels.

Now, our discussion turns to the Greek word for wife and woman. It is *gune*, the same word. An unmarried woman is referred to as a virgin or a widow. Consequently, texts like Luke 8:2 acquire a completely different light, if we translate "woman" as "wife":

*And his twelve were with him, and the wives [gune] who were healed of diseases and unclean spirits, Mary who is called Magdala, from whom seven demons went out, and Joanna, the wife of Chuza the steward of Herod and Susanna, and many others, who ministered to them of their wealth.*

- v. 1-3 (Peshitta)

We know the apostles were married, as were our Lord's brethren (1 Corinthians 9:5). Why not Jesus?<sup>63</sup>

Furthermore, Baigent *et al* use the case of the death of Lazarus to support the case for a married Jesus. Mary does not rise to meet the Lord until He calls her. According to Judaic law, this is the deference which all married women showed toward their husbands when sitting *shiva* (mourning). It is yet another clue pointing to the same conclusion: Jesus had a special relationship with this woman (John 11).

Finally, in one of the most touching accounts in the Bible, Mary Magdalene has just discovered the empty tomb and is devastated emotionally. The account reads in John 20:11-17:

*But Mary stood without at the sepulcher weeping: and as she wept, she stooped down, and looked into the sepulcher, And seeth two angels in white sitting, the one at the head, and the other at the feet, where the body of Jesus had lain.*

---

<sup>62</sup> Phipps, p. 47

<sup>63</sup> Does it not seem rather strange that the Apostle Paul used himself as an example of celibacy? Would not Jesus have been a better and more convincing example for the Apostle to appeal to for the support of his position? The fact that he avoided mentioning our Lord's marital status strongly suggests that He was not a celibate.

*And they say unto her, Woman, why weepest thou? She saith unto them, Because they have taken away my Lord, and I know not where they have laid him.*

*And when she had thus said, she turned herself back, and saw Jesus standing, and knew not that it was Jesus.*

*Jesus saith unto her, Woman, why, weepest thou? whom seekest thou? She supposing him to be the gardener, saith unto him, Sir, if thou have borne him hence, tell me where thou hast laid him, and I will take him away.*

*Jesus saith unto her, Mary. She turned herself and saith unto him, Rabboni: which is to say, Master.*

*Jesus saith unto her, Touch me not: for I am not ascended to my Father: but go to my brethren, and say unto them, I ascend unto my Father, and your Father; and to my God, and your God.*

Notice Mary's assumption of the rights of kin. She claimed to have the right to dispose of the body of Jesus (v. 15). Then, she calls Him *Rabboni*, which in the Aramaic text is the stronger "my Master." (The Hebrew for husband is ba'al, master). And then, the Lord commands her not to touch Him, an unusual request, especially when you consider that He allowed His disciples to do that very thing shortly later.

The word "touch" here should be understood in the same sense as Paul uses it in reference to sexual relations in 1 Corinthians 7:1. Mary, filled with yearning desire, wanted to embrace her husband. But He was quick to tell her that their relationship had changed. In the resurrection, there is no marriage. He was in His resurrected body now and could not resume the intimacy they had before. No doubt, this would have been a great burden for Mary to bear.

There is one more problem related to this issue. That is the offspring. Would have our Lord's physical offspring been any different because He was the Son of God? The answer is "No." The creeds tell us that Christ's divine nature did not mingle with His human nature. They were together, yet without confusion. Consequently, His children would have been fully human, not supermen as some fantasize. The claim by the royal families of Europe to some kind of divinity is silly as well as heretical. The marital and parental experience of the Christian is no different than what Jesus and Mary would have experienced. The indwelling of the Holy Spirit gives the Christian and his children the same connection with God that our Lord's children would have had.

After having followed me along on this exercise, let me say that I am not attempting to prove whether Jesus was married or not. To me, it is not a problem one way or the other. I think the heretics, like Mormon Gnostics and like Augustinians, are not able to think straight on this issue. That is why I brought it up. Christians must always be thinkers, and approach the interpretation of the Bible without prejudices fostered by a party spirit. Hippolytus as much as said that Jesus was married. Yet, Clement of Alexandria, a contemporary, said He was not. Perhaps we will never know for sure until we get to Heaven.



What is important for the midwife to understand at this point is the theological and moral issue involved in the proposition that Jesus was married. If you can accept in principle a married Jesus, then that is an indication that you have been purged of the Mahuzzim doctrine. A midwife who has not overcome the Mahuzzim heresy, will, in the course of time, adopt a pattern of thinking which works against the validity of her own profession. We are seeing that right now in midwifery's surrender to state regulators.

### WHAT IS THE HOLY GRAIL?

Baigent and company discovered that the Grail referred to a woman's womb, a cup which contained a royal blood, a royal seed. If it was not Mary Magdalene's womb, then whose was it?

It is the story of the Bible - "the seed of the woman"(Genesis 3:15). It is the story of the Church (Revelation 12). Every Christian woman who bears the children of a Christian man is a "holy grail". Her womb is a sacred chalice carrying the holy seed of God. As I described it in our last chapter, every Christian is the head of a new covenant line which will reach to the end of time (Second Commandment) and which will multiply into a host (Isaiah 60:21-22). All that is necessary is that we abide in Him: Jesus Christ (John 15):

*Remain with me and I with you. Just as a branch cannot give fruit by itself unless it remains in the vine, even so you cannot unless you remain with me. I am the vine, you are the branches.*

-v. 4-5

"If the root be holy, so are the branches" (Romans 11:16). The Elect of God is the holy blood, the holy seed. If they follow through with the sacramental process, all who hear the call of the Gospel and respond with repentance and faith become the Elect, with their offspring. Their seed is promised the same saving grace as a part of God's Covenant. It was effectual even before their conception. Their offspring need only to abide in the Vine to maintain their faith. Else, like the Jews, they will be cut off for their unbelief (Romans 11:20-22).

In reference to King Arthur and the quest for the Holy Grail, the Celtic bards were teaching in allegory. Men teach in allegory when it is too dangerous to tell the truth plainly. Arthur was a Warrior-King who fought in the defense of Christian civilization and the holy people. The Grail legends of seeking, finding, and guarding the Cup of the Covenant were really allusions to the primary task of ancient champions to find and protect the Elect. In Arthur's case it was a personal quest: for his bride, the prize of the kingdom was violated. His malaise reflected the loss of something worth fighting and dying for.

Yet, there is more to this story than meets the eye. What was it? Or who was it that Joseph of Arimathea brought to Glastonbury in Celtic Britain?<sup>64</sup> We find clues in the Scriptures,

---

<sup>64</sup>Readers familiar with the Grail story know that this legend concerning Joseph of Arimathea and his band of refugees is the point of origination for the history of the Holy Grail.

which tell us of a family, a lineage, which was central to God's ongoing plan for humanity. Jesus belonged to this family and became the representative head of it. It cannot be spiritualized or symbolized away.

### **THE HIDDEN HISTORY OF CHRISTIANITY**

In Acts chapter 15 we find a very interesting story about the Early Church. It is the first general Church Council and the controversy is over the matter of circumcising Gentile Christians. There is testimony given; there is deliberation. Then, there is a decision rendered. And who do you suppose gives that judgment? Is it Paul, the Apostle who wrote most of the books of the New Testament? No. Is it Peter, the one on whom the Catholics say the Church was to be built? No. Who is it, but James the Lord's brother! He is not even an apostle, and yet, it is he, rather than one of the twelve, who is the "pope" of the Church. James rules the Church in His brother's stead.

There is more significance to this than most commentators are willing to see. Generally, it is supposed that the Apostles "let" James become the bishop of the Jerusalem Church for sentimental reasons. "Oh, he's the Lord's brother. Let's make him a figurehead." This is silly reasoning. When God's plan for the ages is at stake and men's eternal destinies, you do not give yourself to sentimentalism.

Others credit James as a man of exceptional holiness. A Nazarite from birth, he was known as "James the Just" - the Righteous - even among the enemies of Christianity. The Early Church historians explain that the party of Jews who supported James was so great that they compelled the Temple authorities to give him the right to enter the Holy of Holies and intercede for the people. Only the High Priest could enter the Holiest Place. He was allowed to wear the priestly robes. This fact demonstrates that James served as an opposition High Priest for Israel in defiance of the Herodians. He offered no sacrifices, of course, except to plead the blood of Jesus. Tradition tells us that his knees were as camel's knees from so much prayer. The historian, Josephus, who was contemporary to these events, credits the Holocaust of 70 A.D. as direct judgment from God for the murder of James by his Temple adversaries.<sup>65</sup>

That was not the end of it, however. The Lord had four brothers: James, Simon, Jude, and Joses, and at least two sisters (Matthew 13:55; Mark 6:3). Simon, also the Lord's cousin by levirate marriage, succeeded James as bishop of Jerusalem by a ruling of a council of Apostles and kinsmen. When he died, Judah (the author of "the Epistle of Jude") led the surviving Jerusalem saints eastward to Syria and Mesopotamia. It appears Joses took refuge in Britain, possibly with the sisters.<sup>66</sup>

On at least two separate occasions, inquisitions were instigated by Jews against the descendants of the Lord's kinsmen - once during the reign of Domitian and once during the reign of Trajan. In each instance, the charge was for belonging to the House of David. Apparently, the House of David became identified with the Lord and His kinsmen. These were not the first

---

<sup>65</sup> See Eusebius' *Ecclesiastical History*

<sup>66</sup> See *St. James: First Bishop of Jerusalem*, Isabel Hill Elder, available from this author

attempts, nor the last, made to exterminate the descendants of King David. One of the stories is worth repeating here:

**"Of the family of the Lord there were still living the grandchildren of Jude, who is said to have been the Lords brother according to the flesh. Information was given that they belonged to the family of David, and they were brought to the Emperor Domitian by the Avocatus. For Domitian feared the coming of Christ as Herod also had feared it. And he asked them if they were descendants of David, and they confessed that they were. Then he asked them how much property they had, or how much money they owned. And both of them answered that they had only nine thousand denarii, half of which belonged to each of them; and this property did not consist of silver, but of a piece of land which contained only thirty-nine acres, and from which they raised their taxes and supported themselves by their own labor.**

**"Then they showed their hands by continuous toil as evidence of their own labor. And when they were asked concerning Christ and his kingdom, of what sort it was and where and when it was to appear, they answered that it was not temporal nor an earthly kingdom, but a heavenly and angelic one, which would appear at the end of the world, when he should come in glory to judge the quick and the dead, and to give unto every one according to his works.**

**"Upon hearing this, Domitian did not pass judgment against them, but, despising them as of no account, he let them go, and by a decree put a stop to the persecution of the Church.**

**"But when they were released they ruled the churches, because they were witnesses and were also relatives of the Lord."**

**- Eusebius as he quotes Hegesippus, Book III, chap. XX**

After relating Simeon's martyrdom at 120 years of age, he quotes Hegesippus again,

**"Up to that period the Church remained like a virgin pure and uncorrupted: for if there were any persons who were disposed to tamper with the wholesome rule of the preaching of salvation, they still lurked in some dark place of concealment or other. But, when the sacred band of apostles had in various ways closed their lives, and that generation of men to whom it had been vouchsafed to listen to the Godlike Wisdom with their own ears had passed away, then did the confederacy of godless error take its rise through the treachery of false teachers, who, seeing that none of the apostles any longer survived, at length attempted with bare and uplifted head to oppose the preaching of the truth by preaching knowledge falsely so-called."<sup>67</sup>**

When the Scriptural witness is considered with the apostolic practice of the Early Church, it becomes plain that the Lord's kinsmen - the *Desposyni*, as they were called - formed a college out of which the bishops of the churches were chosen by the successors of the Apostles in a sort of dynastic succession. This Christian caliphate was in compliance with the Davidic Covenant which I shall speak to in a moment.

That custom was not to last, however. As it was related above, with the passing of the Apostles, self-serving wolves crept into the churches and led them in a revolt against the House of David. The last we hear of the *Desposyni* is early in the 4th Century, during the time of Constantine. Pope Sylvester is said to have met with eight *Desposyni* leaders - each of whom ruled a branch of the Church. We are told that they requested three things: 1) that the confirmation of Christian bishops of Jerusalem, Antioch, Ephesus and Alexandria be revoked; 2)

---

<sup>67</sup> *Ante-Nicene Fathers*, v. 8, p. 764

that these bishoprics be conferred instead on members of the Desposyni; and 3) that Christian churches 'resume' sending money to the Desposynic Church in Jerusalem, which was to be regarded as the definitive Mother Church. **"Not surprisingly, the Bishop of Rome rejected these requests, stating that the Mother Church was now Rome and that Rome had authority to appoint her own bishops."**<sup>68</sup>

The Desposyni left the Empire for good, some to the Churches of the East, others to the Celtic Church in northwestern Spain, Ireland, Brittany and Wales. The presence of the Desposyni explains the Hebraic orientation of Celtic Christianity: family-centered, sabbatarian, Mosaic, dynastic, and Pelagian.

### **THE COVENANT OF DAVID**

There are two kinds of covenants in the Bible: **the covenant of works** and **the covenant of grace**. The covenant of works is found mainly in the Adamic covenant (sometimes called the dominion covenant, cultural mandate, creation ordinance, etc.) and the Mosaic covenant (the Decalogue, the statutes and ordinances). The covenant of grace is found in the Noahic Covenant, the Abrahamic Covenant, and the New Covenant. These are distinctions which theologians use for purposes of study, although some men, like dispensationalists, use those distinctions to array the Scriptures against themselves.

There is really one plan that God has for His creation, and each covenant is a tool which He uses to bring that plan into fruition. All the covenants point to Jesus and His plan for the Church. The Davidic covenant is a part of that plan.

1 Samuel 13:14 tells us that God was deposing King Saul for his disobedience: "the LORD hath sought him a man after his own heart, and the LORD hath commanded him to be captain over his people." Yahweh had found that man in a shepherd boy of the House of Jesse.

David was Israel's messiah. You must remember that "messiah" meant "the anointed one," referring to the pouring of sacred oil upon the head in an act of ordination for priestly or kingly service. David became the proto-type of the messianic office: deliverer, judge, holy man. David not only saved Israel militarily, but spiritually, as well (2 Samuel 24). He was a student of the law (Psalms 119) and the composer of liturgy (Psalter). He was zealous to do the will of God and had a personal relationship with Him (Psalms 23).

Because David set it in his heart to build God a temple, God rewarded his earnest desire with a covenant: that his bloodline would be the source of Israel's rulers unto the end of time:

---

<sup>68</sup>The *Messianic Legacy*, Baigent et al, p.101 quoting Martin's, *Decline and Fall of the Roman Church*, p. 42

*Thus says the LORD of hosts: I took you from the sheepfold from following the sheep, to be the ruler over my people Israel; And I have been with you wherever you went, and I have destroyed all your enemies from before you, and I will make for you a great name, like the name of the great men that are on the earth.*

*Moreover I will appoint a place for my people Israel, and will plant them and make them to dwell in their own place in peace and he disturbed no more; neither shall wicked men enslave them any more, as formerly.*

*From the day that I commanded you to be a judge over my people Israel, I have given you rest from all your enemies. Also the LORD declares to you that he will make you a house.*

*And when your days are fulfilled and you shall sleep with your fathers. I will raise up your offspring after you, who shall come out of your loins, and I will establish his kingdom.*

*He shall build a house for my name, and I will establish the throne of his kingdom for ever.*

*I will be like a father to him and he shall be like a son to me. If he commit folly, I will chasten him with the rod of men and with the stripes of the children of men;*

*But my mercy I will not take from him, as I took it, from Saul who was king before you, and whom I put away from before me.*

*And your house and your kingdom shall be established for ever before me; your throne shall be established for ever.*

*According to all these words and according to all this vision, so did Nathan the prophet speak to David.*

<p>This is the essence of the Davidic Covenant: an appointed dynasty to rule over the House of God's People until the end of history.</p>
---

This implication of the Davidic covenant was understood by the prophets and the Apostles, themselves. The following is a collection of the more pertinent texts:

- **“My covenant will I not break, nor alter the thing that is gone out of my lips. Once have I sworn by my holiness that I will not lie unto David. His seed shall endure for ever, and his throne as the sun before me. It shall be established for ever as the moon, and as a faithful witness in heaven. Selah. - Psalms 89:34-37**
- **"Jerusalem is builded as a City that is compact together: Whither the tribes go up, the tribes of the LORD, unto the testimony of Israel, to give thanks unto the name of the LORD. For there are set thrones of judgment, the thrones of the house of David." - Psalms 122:4-5**
- **"For thy servant David's sake turn not away the face of thine anointed. The LORD hath sworn in truth unto David; he will not turn from it: Of the fruit of thy body will I set upon thy throne. If thy children will keep my covenant and my testimony that I shall teach them, their children shall also sit upon thy throne for evermore. For the LORD hath chosen Zion; he hath desired it for his habitation. There will I make the horn of David to bud: I have ordained a lamp for mine anointed. - Psalms 132:10-18**

- **"Thus saith the LORD; If ye can break my covenant of the day, and my covenant of the night, and that there should not be day and night in their season; Then may also my covenant be broken with David my servant, that he should not have a son to reign upon his throne; and with the Levites the priests, my ministers.**
- **"As the host of heaven cannot be numbered, neither the sand of the sea measured: so will I multiply the seed of David my servant, and the Levites that minister unto me... Considerest thou not what this people have spoken, saying. The two families which the LORD hath chosen, he hath even cast them off? thus they have despised my people, that they should be no more a nation before them.**
- **"Thus saith the LORD; If my covenant be not with day and night, and if I have not appointed the ordinances of heaven and earth; Then will I cast away the seed of Jacob, and David my servant, so that I will not take any of his seed to be rulers over the seed of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob: for I will cause their captivity to return, and have mercy on them. - Jeremiah 20-26**
- **"And it shall come to pass in that day that I will call my servant Eliakim the son of Hilkiah: And I will clothe him with thy robe, and strengthen him with thy girdle, and I will commit thy government into his hand and he shall be a father to the inhabitants of Jerusalem, and to the house of Judah. And the key of the house of David will I lay upon his shoulder; so he shall open, and none shall shut; and he shall shut, and none shall open. - Isaiah 22:20-22 Compare with,**
- **"And to the angel of the church in Philadelphia write; These things saith he that is holy, he that is true, he that hath the key of David. he that openeth, and no man shutteth; and shutteth, and no man openeth; " - Revelation 3:7**
- **"Behold, the days come, saith the LORD, that I will raise unto David a righteous Branch, and a King shall reign and prosper, and shall execute judgment and justice in the earth. In his days Judah shall be saved, and Israel shall dwell safely: and this is his name whereby he shall be called. THE LORD OUR RIGHTEOUSNESS. - Jeremiah 23:5-6**
- **God rejects one of the Davidic lines in 22:30, the line through whom Jesus would have been descended had he been the son of Joseph (Matthew 1). God pledges to take from the house of David shepherds to feed his flock (23:4).**
- **"He shall be great, and shall be called the Son of the Highest: and the Lord God shall give unto him the throne of his father David". - Luke 1:32**
- **Jesus was a descendant of David through his mother, Mary:**  
**"The LORD also shall save the tents of Judah first, that the glory of the house of David and the glory of the inhabitants of Jerusalem do not magnify themselves against Judah. In that day shall the LORD defend the inhabitants of Jerusalem; and he that is feeble among them at that day shall be as David; and the house of David shall be as God, as the angel of the LORD before them." - Zechariah 12:7-8**
- **"O house of David, thus saith the LORD; Execute judgment in the morning, and deliver him that is spoiled out of the hand of the oppressor, lest my fury go out like fire, and burn that none can quench it, because of the evil of your doings." - Jeremiah 21:12**
- **Then take silver and gold, and make crowns, and set them upon the head of Joshua the son of Josedech, the high priest; And speak unto him, saying, Thus speaketh the LORD of hosts, saying. Behold the man whose name is The BRANCH; and he shall grow up out of his place, and he shall build the temple of the LORD: Even he shall build the temple of the LORD; and he shall bear the glory, and shall sit and rule upon his throne; and he shall be a priest upon his throne: and the**

counsel of peace shall be between them both. . . And this shall come to pass, if ye will diligently obey the voice of the LORD your God. - Zechariah 6:11-15

- "For the children of Israel shall abide many days without a king, and without a prince, and without a sacrifice, and without an image, and without an ephod, and without teraphim: Afterward shall the children of Israel return, and seek the LORD their God, and David their king; and shall fear the LORD and his goodness in the latter days. - Hosea 3:4-5
- "James answered, saying, Men and brethren, hearken unto me: Simeon hath declared how God at the first did visit the Gentiles, to take out of them a people for his name. And to this agree the words of the prophets; as it is written, After this I will return, and will build again the tabernacle of David, which is fallen down; and I will build again the ruins thereof, and I will set it up: That the residue of men might seek after the Lord, and all the Gentiles, upon whom my name is called, saith the Lord, who doeth all these things." - Acts 15:13-17
- "In that day will I raise up the tabernacle of David that is fallen, and close up the breaches thereof; and I will raise up his ruins, and I will build it as in the days of old: That they may possess the remnant of Edom, and of all the heathen which are called by my name, saith the LORD that doeth this." - Amos 9:11-12

### THE GRAIL OR THE PALLIUM

The great coup in the Early Church was the successful denial that there were any heirs of the Davidic Covenant, except for Jesus Christ. By spiritualizing such prophecies as cited above, the Gentile churches were able to throw-off their Davidic Bishops, eventually consigning the Davidic Church to oblivion.

A symbolic understanding does not work, however, certainly not if we use the Apostolic methods of interpretation. It is arguable that there were not enough of the Desposyni available to supply all of the churches with bishops. That fact reflects the concerns of end-time prophecies, which I shall speak to in a moment. It still does not justify the open revolt against the Desposyni which occurred when there were men of the House of David available for the leadership of the churches.

Even Paul, who is relied upon most by the spiritualizers, recognized the importance of the physical descendants of the Covenant People in God's redemptive plan:

*Who are Israelites; to whom pertaineth the adoption, and the glory, and the covenants, and the giving of the law, and the service of God and the promises; Whose are the fathers, and of whom as concerning the flesh Christ came, who is over all, God blessed for ever. Amen.*

- Romans 9:4-5

In Romans chapter 9, 10, and 11, Paul makes the case for the doctrine of election, whereby God weeds out the bad seed of the House of Israel over the generations, until there is left a holy remnant:

*Boast not against the branches. But if thou boast,  
thou bearest not the root, but the root thee. - 11:18*

What is the root? **The Remnant.** Upon the Remnant were the branches from the wild olive tree grafted. The natural branches (the Jews) were cut off from the root. Who was the Remnant? Those who abided faithfully in God and His Covenant in Jesus Christ - in particular, the Desposyni:

*As concerning the gospel, they are enemies for your sakes:  
but as touching the election, they are beloved, for the fathers' sakes.  
For the gifts and calling of God are without repentance.*

- Romans 11:28-29

Of course, the Bible speaks of Jesus as the root and the vine. We are the branches. But as Paul uses it in Romans 11, "the fathers" become the root of the elect people. Righteous men who die in their righteousness become the source of God's love upon their offspring. This is especially true of the descendants of the Old Testament patriarchs - the Davidian Desposyni. This is the doctrine of election.

As James declared at the Jerusalem Council, the Gentile Churches were meant to be a possession of the House of David. Jesus Christ sits upon the Throne of His father David and the Desposyni serve as viceroys because they are also heirs of the Covenant of David (9:4; Psalms 122:5 cf Rev. 3:21). Christ is the firstborn among many brethren (8:29) and holds "the keys of David". Might these be the same keys which Jesus gave to Peter in Matthew 16:19, the keys of the kingdom of heaven? Adam Clarke, a 19th Century evangelical commentator, provides this explanation:

*"Key" is the emblem of authority and knowledge; "the key of David" is the regal right or authority of David. David could shut or open the kingdom of Israel to whom he pleased. The kingdom of the Gospel, and the kingdom of heaven, are at the disposal of Christ. [So far, on Rev. 3:7]*

*[Now, on Mt. 16:19] By the "kingdom of heaven", we may consider the true Church, the house of God, to be meant; and by the keys, the power of admitting into that house, or of preventing any improper person from coming in.*

Clarke goes on to say and later to quote Lightfoot that these keys of the kingdom are one and the same. Typical of the spiritualizing school, he says that Peter and the Apostles were deputized by Christ and given these keys: "the keys of David". And astonishingly, he uses the Council of Acts 15 as an example of this "binding and loosing":

*When the time was come wherein the Mosaic law, as to some part of it, was to be abolished, and left off, and, as to another part of it, was to be continued and to last forever, he granted Peter here, and to the rest of the apostles, chap. 18:18, a power to abolish or confirm what they thought good, and as they thought good; being taught this, by the Holy Spirit.*



As you will recall, the judgment of the Jerusalem Council was that of James the Just, not of Peter or the other Apostles. So, how is it possible that the Apostles had the "keys of the kingdom", if it was one of the Desposyni who exercised that regal right?

The answer can only be found, once again, in the creeds of the Church. Because we confuse the two natures of Christ - His divine nature with his human nature - we confuse the offices of Christ, mixing the human with the divine. For example, it was never possible for Jesus, in his human nature, to be a sacrifice for sin and Savior of the world. That is a divine office which can be fulfilled only by God the Son.

The office of Messiah, however, is a human office. David was a Messiah, as was his anointed offspring. The office and power of Messiah (*Kristos* in the Greek - "Christ") is accomplished by a special gift from the Holy Spirit. Jesus is the eternal Messiah by virtue of His resurrected body. But He is an absent Messiah because He is absent in the flesh, although as God. He is always with us. Thus, He became the first and chiefest of a dynasty of Messiahs. These Messiahs do not succeed by virtue of rank in birth or status, but by election and ordination by the Body of Christ, the Church. What we discovered is that James the Just, by Apostolic appointment, succeeded Jesus in the Messianic office, pending His return: just as a Vice-President will serve as Commander-in-Chief if the President is not present to perform his duties.

The Apostles could never have represented Christ in His Messianic office. They could be his ambassadors as the Savior of the world. They could birth the new Christians into the Church, the Israel of God, but they could not rule the Churches because they were not of the House of David. Only the Desposyni could do that. There was in the Early Church an apostolic office and a *messianic* office. Peter was an apostle; James was a messiah.<sup>69</sup>

Now, notice that I did not say James was *the* Messiah. Only Jesus can be *the* Messiah. Jesus is "the king of kings, and lord of lords."<sup>70</sup> In James' Epistle, he refers to himself as merely "a servant of Jesus". You may recall the humility of the Desposyni. They were tradesmen and farmers. They had calluses on their hands. They were not lords over God's heritage. Rather, they were undershepherds for their brother Jesus the Messiah. Yet, I do not want to diminish the importance of their messianic office. They were entrusted by Jesus with the "Key of David" and the power over the gate of the Kingdom of Israel.

The above remarks may seem heretical. Living in a Protestant and democratic age, we are not familiar with this kind of thinking. Because Christians, generally, do not understand the Ecumenical Creeds of the Early Church, *they are themselves heretical*. What I am teaching here is Biblically and doctrinally sound.

I now refer you to Ignatius, the second bishop of Antioch (30-107 AD). Legend says that Ignatius was the child Jesus sat upon His lap during His discourse about entering the

---

<sup>69</sup>This statement seems to contradict passages like Matthew 19:28, which promise dominion to the Apostles. That is resolved when it is decided whether the Apostles were to rule the House of Israel as *vicegerents* or *viceroys*. As vicegerents, they rule as representative of the Messiah. Their authority ends with their death. There is no succession with vicegerency as there is with the viceroy. A viceroy is a royal heir.

<sup>70</sup>Jesus Christ was known to the Early Church as "Messiah of messiahs, and patriarch of patriarchs" (Isaiah 9:6-8). See Irenaeus (*ANF*, v. 1, p. 577)

kingdom of heaven as little children. Ignatius was contemporary with the Apostles and with the life of the Early Church. The Canon was not yet closed when he wrote his Epistles, several of which have come down to us. Protestants have problems with Ignatius. In fact Ignatius is probably the single reason Protestants reject the authority of Church Tradition. Ignatius was big on the authority of bishops, not just as a side issue, but as a central message in all his writings. In one place he said, "Do nothing without the bishop." You can see why Protestants bristle. But to establish my thesis of the messianic character of the bishopric, let me quote him at length:

- "For we ought to receive every one whom the Master of the house sends to be over His household, as we would do Him that sent him. It is manifest, therefore, that we should look upon the bishop even as we would upon the Lord Himself." - Epistle of Ignatius to the Ephesians
- "Since therefore I have, in the persons before mentioned, beheld the whole multitude of you in faith and love, I exhort you to study to do all things with a divine harmony, while your bishop presides in the place of God, and your presbyters in the place of the assembly of the apostles, along with your deacons, who are most dear to me, and are entrusted with the ministry of Jesus Christ, who was with the Father before the beginning of time, and in the end was revealed." - Epistle of Ignatius to the Magnesians
- "And do ye also reverence your bishop as Christ Himself, according as the blessed apostles have enjoined you. He that is within the altar is pure, wherefore also he is obedient to the bishop and presbyters: but he that is without is one that does anything apart from the bishop, the presbyters, and the deacons. Such a person is defiled in his conscience, and is worse than an infidel. For what is the bishop but one who beyond all others possesses all power and authority, so far as it is possible for a man to possess it. who according to his ability has been made an imitator of the Christ of God? And what is the presbytery but a sacred assembly, the counselors and assessors of the bishop? And what are the deacons but imitators of the angelic powers, fulfilling a pure and blameless ministry unto him, as the holy Stephen did to the blessed James ... He, therefore, that will not yield obedience to such, must needs be utterly without God, an impious man who despises Christ, and depreciates His appointments. - Epistle to the Trallians<sup>71</sup>
- "To all them that repent, the Lord grants forgiveness, if they turn in penitence to the unity of God, and to communion with the bishop." - Epistle to the Philadelphians
- "See that ye all follow the bishop, even as Jesus Christ does the Father, and the presbytery as ye would the apostles; and reverence the deacons, as being the institution of God. Let no man do anything connected with the Church without the bishop. Let that be deemed a proper Eucharist, which is (administered) either by the bishop, or by one to whom he has entrusted it. Wherever the bishop shall appear, there let the multitude also be; even as, wherever Jesus Christ is, there is the Catholic Church." - Epistle to the Smyrnaeans

It is obvious from the above references (and there are more) that my thesis is established that the office of the bishop is a messianic office, not an apostolic one. For Ignatius, speaking with the highest authority, tells us that the presbytery are the successors of the Apostles. The Bishops are the successors of Christ, Himself.

However, Ignatius was speaking of the first bishops, those of the Desposyni. Men who were not of the House of David were not called to be bishops, except in a provisional sense.

---

<sup>71</sup>The Epistle to the Trallians is generally not considered as an authentic Ignatian epistle. I include it here because of the interesting tradition it conveys about James and Stephen. For a discussion on the relevance of the spurious Ignatian epistles see either Lightfoot's *Apostolic Fathers* or the Translator's Introduction to them in *Ante-Nicene Fathers*, v. 1)

According to Ignatius, the Church may temporarily exist without the bishop (Epistle to the Romans, ch. 9). The Apostles used the casting of lots as a substitute for a bishop (Acts 1).

Thus, we might say that the bishops of the Roman Catholics and other similar sects are lacking a Desposynic certification. At most, they are presbyters and not bishops; for they lack the covering of the House of David. Unless they recognize their provisional character and are ready to submit to the Desposyni, they are in rebellion and stand outside the altar of God. The same is true of Protestants.

The pallium was the heavy cloth worn by a bishop around his shoulders. He gave it to his successor. That was how you knew a man was a bishop. He wore the pall.

Many of the ministers of the faith in the Early Church were Levites and priests who converted (Acts 6:7) in fulfillment of prophecy (cited above). John the Baptist was a Levite of a priestly order (Luke 1). So was Paul's benefactor and missionary companion, Barnabas (Acts 4:36). It should not surprise us that God would literally fulfill His promises to David's offspring, as well - the Holy Grail. They are the rightful heirs of the pallium.

### **BIBLE PROPHECY**

Some years ago, I wrote an unpublished study on Bible prophecy, entitled *Hope for Tomorrow: A Rebuttal of Apocalyptic Determinism*.<sup>72</sup> Essentially, what I argued against was the notion that God had an arbitrary timetable for the end of human history. I called that interpretation of Bible prophecy the "apocalyptic model" because it taught that God would prevail over evil by just wiping-out all of the bad guys. Apocalypticism teaches that the Church wins by a discontinuous, cataclysmic event called Armageddon and the Second Coming of Christ.

I felt that this view represented the wrong spirit. The Scriptures teach us that God does not "take pleasure in the death of the wicked," nor is He "willing that any should perish but that all should come to repentance." I put forward a view I called the "soteriological model" (*soter* meaning "to save"). I teach that God's redemptive plan takes precedence over all other considerations. There are certain redemptive accomplishments which must take place before the end of the world. Here is a quick summary:

**The first is worldwide evangelism** (Matthew 24:14). Most people do not have problems with this one. Evangelism is a big thing for most Churches. It has to be done in each generation, though. The Apostles did it in theirs (Colossians 1:6, 23). But Jesus did not come back. Why?

**Second, there is the task of world discipleship** (Matthew 28:18-20). In the Great Commission Jesus promised His disciples that He would be with them until the "end of the age".

---

<sup>72</sup>While this study is still unpublished, a summary was provided in *The Separatist Papers #4* (1983), available from this author

The age of what? The age of "discipling the nations." May we say that all nations profess the Christian faith as their national religion? No.

**Third, all of our Lord's enemies must be subjugated** (Acts 2:34-35; 4:25-26). His reign will continue from Heaven until that happens (1 Corinthians 15:24-25). The *last* enemy is death (v. 26). There is no rapture, no resurrection of the saints until ALL His enemies have surrendered. Has that happened yet? Certainly not.

**Fourth, every single prophecy must be specifically fulfilled** (Acts 3:21, 26). Are there any prophecies yet to be fulfilled? I can think of a bunch of them. Try this one: Genesis 12:1-4. Look at Romans 4:13, first. Has the seed of Abraham inherited the earth yet? No.

**Fifth, the Body of Christ has not been matured and perfected.** The fivefold ministry of apostles, prophets, teachers, pastors, and evangelists must continue "until we reach a perfect man" (Ephesians 4:10-16; 5:26-27; Revelation 19:7-8). Is Jesus coming back for an imperfect bride? No. Read these scriptures carefully. They are not talking about positional sanctification. The Body of Christ will not have the power to accomplish world evangelism and discipleship UNTIL it has been perfected. It is yet to come.

**Sixth, a Jewish Jerusalem must become Christian,** (Matthew 23:39). That can only happen if number seven happens.

**Seventh is the conversion of the Covenant People.** The context of that is found in Romans chapters nine, ten, and eleven. But the key verses are these:

*What then? Israel hath not obtained that which he seeketh for; but the election bath obtained it, and the rest were blinded. I say then, Have they stumbled that they should fall? God forbid: but rather through their fall salvation is come unto the Gentiles, for to provoke them to jealousy.*

*Now if the fall of them be the riches of the world, and the diminishing of them the riches of the Gentiles; how much more their fullness?*

- 11:7-12

You must remember that when the Apostles speak of the "Gentiles", they are referring to all uncircumcised peoples. The former Israelites who became "lost" would be considered "Gentiles" because they were no longer a part of the customs and political division known as Israel, and no longer were ruled by the House of David. Paul continues,

*For I speak to you Gentiles, inasmuch as I am an apostle of the Gentiles. I magnify mine office: If by any means I may provoke to emulation (jealousy) them which are my flesh, and might save sonic of them. For if the casting away of them be the reconciling of the world, what shall the receiving of them he but life from the dead? - v. 13-15*

This marvelous claim by Paul was taken quite seriously by the Puritans, both in England and America. They felt that the conversion of the Jews was essential before the Church could be

perfected and empowered to complete its mission. They believed it was also necessary to usher in the Millennial kingdom.<sup>73</sup>

*For I would not, brethren, that ye should be ignorant of this mystery, lest ye should be wise in your own conceits; that blindness in part is happened to Israel, until the fullness of the Gentiles be come in.*

*And so all Israel shall be saved: as it is written, There shall come out of Sion the Deliverer, and shall turn away ungodliness from Jacob: For this is nay covenant unto them when I shall take away their sins.*

- v. 25-27

Theologians have grappled with the above Scriptures for centuries. Indeed, they do seem to teach a great secret. Whatever it is, it is essential to the consummation of history.

The English Puritans responded with evangelistic fervor toward the Jews. They also became theonomists, hoping that the covenantal blessings upon Christians would convince the Jews that Christians were the chosen people and that the Gospel is true. Their success was limited, but real. Since the time of the Puritans until now, there has never been such goodwill between Christians and Jews. Of course, there is a noisy group of fanatics who call themselves Jews, but are not, but are "of the synagogue of Satan" (Revelation 3:9). There are tares among the Jewish people just as there are tares among Christians. That should not dissuade us from our task.

Ultimately however, the plan of the Puritans was defective. It has not succeeded. Why? The key is found in verse 25; the blindness (hardness) will continue "until the fulness of the Gentiles be come in." Come in to what? Presumably, it is the kingdom of God, the Ekklesia of Jesus Christ, the true Israel. "And so all Israel shall be saved." The Remnant, the Gentile Israelites, and the rebellious Jews - they all will be saved. How will this happen? Return to the words of James in Acts 15:14-17:

*Simeon hath declared how God at the first did visit the Gentiles, to take out of them a people for his name. And to this agree the words of the prophets; as it is written, After this I will return, and will build again the tabernacle of David, which is fallen down; and I will build again the ruins thereof, and I will set it up: That the residue [remnant] of men might seek after the Lord, and all the Gentiles, upon whom my name is called.*

---

<sup>73</sup>See Iain Murray's *The Puritan Hope, Banner of Truth, 1971*

Notice that the prophecy refers to the "tabernacle" of David, meaning the "household of David" will enlarge and grow numerous "as the stars of heaven"(Jeremiah 33:20-26). The "ruins" refer to the lost glory, power, and influence - in other words, the "rule" or kingdom of David. When this restoration occurs, "the residue of men" will "seek after the Lord". James distinguishes the "residue of men" from "all the Gentiles". Is he speaking here of the remnant of Jews who live through the various holocausts and judgments of God? I think so.

That returns us to my thesis which is that the Churches must appoint the seed of the Desposyni as bishops or rulers. When the Gentile Churches (which include the Gentile Israelites) are officially under the covering of the House of David and the messianic office, and when the Jewish community sees that this is so and that the "Law shall go forth from Zion" (Isaiah 2:3), then the blindness will be taken away and the consummation of the ages shall come.

The Priory of Sion and all those associated with it appear to represent a satanic deception. These people are the power brokers of the world. They do not bear the fruits of the Gospel. Satan's imitations, his false Christs, are designed to discredit God's true plan. What I have shared with you here is God's true plan. It is rooted in the Scriptures, confirmed by apostolic tradition, and loyal to the testimony of Jesus.

If all of this sounds like the Desposyni are an elite, you are right. But it is unlike the elites I condemned in an earlier chapter. You must destroy the old structure before you can build the new one. Our theme text from Ezekiel 21:27 tells us that God will overturn and destroy the elites of this world until "he come whose right it is, and I will give it him". If you read the context, the issue of controversy is who will rule. Various elites have ruled through the centuries. They are overturned by new elites, which are in turn, overturned by others.

This process will continue until the designated aristocracy arises and is ready. As Thomas Jefferson was once quoted as saying, "We need an aristocracy of virtue - the virtue of Jesus." Jesus has come as the true Messiah. He has left behind a Messianic government in the House of David - His kinsmen according to the flesh (Daniel 7:25-27). It was recognized by the Apostles and the Early Church. We neglect it to our own spiritual peril. The House of David is the spiritual covering God has appointed for the churches. It is not civil in nature; it is spiritual. It is an extension of the government of Heaven.

## THE MUSTARD SEED CONSPIRACY

*Another parable put he, forth unto them, saying, The kingdom of heaven is like to a grain of mustard seed, which a man took, and sowed in his field: Which indeed is the least of all seeds: but when it is grown, it is the greatest among herbs, and becometh a tree, so that the birds of the air come and lodge in the branches thereof.*

- Matthew 13:31-32

It is impossible to conclude that the Kingdom Parables were meant to directly refer to the Church. Certainly, the Parable of the Mustard Seed fails to fit the historical experience of the Church. The Mustard Seed, as does the Leaven, begins its work insignificantly and without notice. It grows quietly and imperceptively.

The story of Christ and His Church differs considerably. When Jesus was born, it caused an uproar. Talkative shepherds and royal caravans stirred the city of Jerusalem and resulted in the deaths of many infants. His entrance was humble, but splashy.

The Church was born at the crowded Temple during the Feast of Pentecost, accompanied with all the fanfare of signs and wonders. The Christian movement drew the attention of all, as Paul declared to Festus, "that these things were not done in a corner". The Church launched ambitious missionary campaigns, created marvels, confronted opposition, and suffered persecution. They turned the world upside-down.

The centuries which have followed have continued to see an impressive array of dramatic events, filling books with tales that would take a lifetime to read. No, the Church does not fit the description of the Mustard Seed.

Does the Millennial reign after the Second Advent fulfill this parable? I don't think so, unless you believe that Jesus plans to sneak into town. He didn't the first time; I don't think He will the second time, either.<sup>74</sup>

Could this parable represent the subjective experience of the Christian? We are getting warm. But we are not quite there. Why do I say that? People know when they are born again. It is noticeable. Even for infants, they may not be conscious of what is happening to them, but it is obvious to those around them.

**I think this parable is referring to the demographic growth of the Desposyni.** It is not talking about the Church but rather the kingdom of Heaven. The birds of the air, both clean and unclean, which rest in its branches, are people. They live in its branches. A kingdom is a

---

<sup>74</sup>Secret rapturists will take issue here. But remember that they believe in a two-fold return: the first, secretly, to gather the elect, and then second, with a heavenly host to rout the Antichrist. The second phase is definitely cataclysmic.

government, a monarchy. Jesus is the king and the House of David produces His Kingdom's princes. A government provides a covering, it provides shelter and protection. That is what a mustard tree does.

Just like Noah in his generation, it is very possible that Jesus and His kinsmen were the only uncorrupted branch of the Davidian bloodline left in the world - truly a mustard seed. Persecution compelled them to go underground. The Romans hated them; the Jews hated them; the Church hierarchy hated them. They eventually fled the Empire and found refuge in the churches outside of the Empire, especially in the Celtic Church.

History ought to be interpreted with this truth in mind: Satan's perennial attempt to find, and then corrupt (Ezra 9:2) or destroy the House of David. Consider John's vision of the "Woman clothed with the Sun" in Revelation 12, which we have referred to before. The Woman is the Holy Grail, the Womb carrying the Seed of God. The Dragon seeks to destroy the Man-child at his birth, but fails. The Man-child is obviously Jesus; for He is caught up to Heaven to rule with God. That would make Mary the anti-type of this Biblical symbol.<sup>75</sup>

The Woman flees into the Wilderness, outside the realm of the Roman power. The Dragon spews out a flood (floods of army invasions), seeking to carry her away. The Earth helps the Woman. The imperial armies run out of resources and the military expansion stops. Furious, the Dragon leaves her to attack "the remnant of her seed" - the Christian martyrs.

But the Woman lives. She can bear more of the holy Seed, the heirs, the Desposyni. Mary, the mother of Jesus, was proto-typical. She had daughters. Her sisters had daughters and sons. The line continues. Satan continues his attempt to destroy the holy Seed. If he can do so, he can stop God's redemptive plan. But he will fail because Jesus has overcome him, and the saints are promised the same.

---

<sup>75</sup>See David Chilton's commentary on Revelation, *The Days of Vengeance* and also Isaac Newton's *Commentaries on Daniel and the Apocalypse*. Contact author for sources.



## GUARDIANS OF THE GRAIL

King Arthur was a descendant of Joseph of Arimathea, who some scholars identify as the uncle of Mary, mother of Jesus.<sup>76</sup> Arthur knew. Now you know why he was so crushed to lose his wife. She was his bride, she was his holy grail.

The Celtic Church provided refuge to the Desposyni during the Middle Ages. The Dragon's flood was great. It almost overwhelmed the Celts. There were many fierce battles, many martyrs.

**The midwives kept these secrets. They knew. They protected the Grail family. They were burned as witches. Yet, the Woman clothed with the Sun still lives.**

---

<sup>76</sup>The Talmud is cited as a source for this tradition. This writer has not been able to verify that source but it is cited by otherwise reliable authors (Gladys Taylor, E. Raymond Capt, and Isabel Hill Elder). The Grail legends themselves claim a Davidic origin of the Grail Guardians through Joseph of Arimathea. Being a member of the Sanhedrin, it is not improbable that he was a secret Davidian. Consider, also, that Joseph begged Pilate for the body of Jesus. In so doing, he assumed the rights of next-of-kin.



## QUESTIONS FOR REVIEW

1. The opening text from Ezekiel 21:27 describes the process of history. How would you compare it to the words of Jesus in Matthew 24 about "wars and rumors of wars" and when will this process end?
2. How might the idea of "free will" - the ability of man to originate choice - lead to the idea of "individual freedom" as opposed to slavery, socialism, and other kinds of tyranny?
3. What church does the author claim was the "Mother Church" of this kind of doctrine?
4. From your reading, identify the central thesis of the book *Holy Blood, Holy Grail*.
5. Do you think Jesus was married? Why or why not?
6. Irenaeus taught the Recapitulation Doctrine. What does it mean?
7. Do you agree with the author's contention, that the womb of a Christian woman can be considered a "holy grail"? Why or why not?
8. Who are the Desposyni?
9. Who was the leader at the First Church Council in Acts 15?
10. Give two reasons why he was the leader of the New Testament Church?
11. What was the essence of the Davidic Covenant?
12. What does the author identify as the "messianic office" of the Church?
13. From the writings of what Church Father does the author quote to support this assertion?
14. What does the word "soteriological" mean?
15. Is the Church a continuation of the "kingdom of David"?
16. What is the "Mustard Seed Conspiracy"?
17. Why do you think the Dragon attacks the offspring of the Woman?
18. Why does the author describe midwives as "guardians of the Grail"?



## CHAPTER SEVEN

### THE MIDWIFE & ECCLESIASTICAL HIERARCHY

*And the children of Issachar, which were men that had understanding of the times, to know what Israel ought to do. . . [to make David king]*

- 1 Chronicles 12:32

*Now the sons of Issachar ... were valiant men of might in their generations ... for they had many wives and sons.*

- 1 Chronicles 7:1-4

Approximately 250 times in the Bible, the Hebrew word *geber* (pronounced gheh-ber) and its variants (*gibbor*) appear, translated as "mighty man," "man of valour," or simply "man" (60 times). There are three other words for man: *adam*, *ish*, *enosh*. With the guttural Hebrew, *geber* is pronounced "ghever", the "v" sound being similar to the "b" sound.

The Geber is not just an ordinary man, although the word is sometimes used interchangeably with "ish" (Jeremiah 22:30). It is a word which highlights the masculinity of man (Deuteronomy 22:5).

It does not mean soldier or warrior, directly, although a Geber may have been a warrior at one time. Since Levites and old men are referred to as "gebers," we must find the meaning of the word in the moral qualities which make the warrior. The Septuagint translates it as "powerful or strong one." Thus, we find it is just as much a title of honor as it is of status. The closest modern word for "geber" is patriarch - a man who is viewed as a great man, a man of self-dependent

authority. Among the Celts, he was known as the "Co-Arb." The word "Baron" comes from the word **Geber** (Webster's Dictionary, 1828 edition). **These men were the elders who sat at the city gate.**<sup>77</sup> In previous studies I have shown that the Geber was the foundation or the anchor of Biblical society.<sup>78</sup> He was almost always a polygamist, or his sons were polygamists.<sup>79</sup> His was a family with a host (Psalms 127:4). The Geber was not necessarily a leader of society, but he certainly was the *father* of the leaders of society. From the Gebers - the patriarchs - were to come the missionaries, the soldiers, the lawyers, the teachers, the scribes, the entrepreneurs - in general - the professional classes which create the fabric of society. A society which lacks the Geber creates a peer society, one in which professionals are accountable to committees of their equals. It is a rootless society which ends in bureaucracy, irresponsibility, incompetence, vice, crime, and finally, tyranny. If we had a Geber-based society today, such men would have to answer to angry fathers for their wrongdoing.

In the example cited above, we find the tribe of Issachar as a society with Gebers, with foundations. Many commentators love to quote 1 Chronicles 12:32, the part about "understanding the times." But they are afraid to tell the Christian world that these wise and brave men were polygamists. That was the enabling principle. The burdens of caring for many wives and children trained them, disciplined them, to become great men.

The topic of polygamy is a troubling one to the modern Christian. The Church and society condition him to believe such a person is one of extraordinary wickedness. It is a profound irony, then, to witness in the Scriptures polygamy among the men most blessed by God. Indeed, polygamy is seen, at times, to be God's blessing upon the men he favors. Yet, our culture reverses the values and sees men without sexual ardor as the holy men. Women are conditioned to believe that sex is rape by its very definition and to turn away from it in disgust.

Yet, there are a few brave souls among us who want to talk about patriarchs. There is even a Christian magazine with that name. The call for a godly and masculine leadership must be applauded. But the model which they put forward for emulation is the Puritan model, the one which created the mess we are in. It failed, because it created a unity of the mind and not that of the heart.

*Kinship* creates a unity of the heart; it creates loyalty. These neo-Puritans, with their Augustinian heresy, are snake oil salesmen. Men need more than the same creed; they need the same blood.

---

<sup>77</sup> E.g. Ruth 4:2. Note how Boaz is referred to as a "geber" (i.e. "mighty man") in 2:1. He was one of the landed gentry.

<sup>78</sup> *The Law of Coverture* (1999), *The Kinsman-Redeemer* (2002), *Eros Made Sacred* (1991)

<sup>79</sup> It is impossible for the modern Christian to comprehend how universal polygamy was in ancient Israel. The census reports in Numbers prove its pervasiveness. In 3:40-43 we are told that there were 22,273 firstborn sons: meaning 22,273 families (since a family cannot have more than one firstborn son). In 1:46 we are told that there were over 600,000 fighting men. If you divide 22,000 into 600,000, you get 28. The average Israelite family had 28 sons, not including daughters. Only polygamy can account for families of this size (see *Eros Made Sacred*)

## THE GEBERS AS ELDERS IN THE CHURCH

In the last chapter the role of the House of David in leadership was introduced for consideration. You will recall that its restoration was an important concern of Old Testament prophecy. We discovered that it was an important step in legitimizing the Church's earthly authority in the Millennial Kingdom. Here, I introduce yet another proposition: *might we first need to restore the Gebers who, in turn, will restore the House of David?* Just as the Gebers of Issachar and Manasseh made David king, so it might be the Gebers who will restore the rule of David to the churches. Where is the Geber today?

He does not exist because plural marriage does not exist. There are no fathers who have the authority to command men because **there are no men who are fathers with a host**. There was a church a few years ago, with "mighty men," which attempted to restore a Davidic man to the bishopric of their church. The government of the United States, amidst the cheers of apostates, burned them and their church to the ground.<sup>80</sup>

One must remember that the New Testament Church was a continuation of the House of Israel and it was ruled by the old-style elders (Gebers) of the Old Testament (cf. Exodus 3:16 *et al* and Acts 15:2) and the House of David.<sup>81</sup> When the Jewish nation was destroyed in 70 A.D., it greatly diminished their influence on the Gentile churches. Tempted by accommodation with Rome and an alliance with Imperial power, the leaders of the churches eventually threw off the yoke of the Davidic leaders. The Gentile Church, in the end, became the persecutor of Davidic Christianity. The book of Revelation calls this Mystery Babylon and it is still with us.

## PLURAL MARRIAGE IN THE EARLY CHURCH

The Imperial Church of the Constantine era attempted to destroy all writings deemed heretical. This would include the Davidic Christians; for by this time, they were lumped together with the Ebionites and persecuted.<sup>82</sup>

---

<sup>80</sup>I am referring to the Branch Davidian massacre of Waco, Texas. That incident was a startling affirmation of Martin Luther's treatise - "The Babylonian Captivity of the Church" - in which he defended plural marriage against what he alleged was the Satanism of celibacy and enforced monogamy. See *Eros Made Sacred*.

<sup>81</sup>Overseers (or bishops) sometimes were called *Mebakkers* in the Dead Sea Scrolls. See "The Kinsman-Redeemer" by this author (2001), available on-line at <http://www.grailchurch.org/kinsman.htm>

<sup>82</sup>For instance, we have no complete manuscripts of the New Testament prior to the 4th Century, nor do we have numerous writings mentioned by the ancient Fathers, such as the Gospel of the Hebrews or the writings of Papias, a disciple of John who provided much biographical information.

Yet, truth survives. With the Canons of St. Basil (late 4th Century) and an opponent of polygamy, we have proof of the highest authority:

*The Fathers say nothing of polygamy as being beastly, and a thing unagreeable to human nature. To us it appears a greater sin than fornication.*<sup>83</sup>

Who were these "fathers" of whom Basil speaks? Read the 1st Canon and you will find "the fathers" were the first bishops of the Church, the bishops of the apostolic era. Then, compare it with the 13th Canon:

*Our fathers did not think that killing in war was murder; yet I think it advisable for such as have been guilty of it to forbear communion three years.*

Thus, we find that Basil and his colleagues were admitting here that they were the innovators. Apostolic Christianity was not spiritual enough for them.

If plural marriage in the Early Church was true, what of Paul's conditions for church leadership found in the Pastoral Epistles. There, monogamy is set forth as a requirement.<sup>84</sup>

While I do not want to belabor points I have dealt with elsewhere,<sup>85</sup> it is enough to say that Paul had a practical consideration in that ruling: that was the prevention of *nepotism*. Nepotism tends to produce an aristocracy in any institution which practices it. Paul did not want his churches to be absorbed into a single dominating family, or group of families, which plural marriage would have created. Why?

While Paul does not say why, I think we can figure it out. Paul's churches were Gentile churches. At this point, the new branch of the House of David (the Desposyni) was too small to keep up with the expansion of the Church. Paul avoided establishing bishoprics with full Davidic authority and privilege, lest they be filled with men who were not of the House of David and thus make for an unholy competition for rulership in the churches.<sup>86</sup> Comparing various prophecies concerning the House of David, as provided in our last chapter, along with warnings from the Lord and His Apostles concerning ravenous wolves, it seems a period of apostasy was anticipated. Gentile Israel would be without Davidic rulers for a long time:

---

<sup>83</sup>80th Canon, *Nicene & Post-Nicene Fathers*, v. 14, p. 609. This was cited in an earlier chapter. In formal logic, an admission from one's opponent is considered the highest form of evidence. The same Church Councils which condemned polygamy also took a hostile attitude towards a married clergy in general, which throws doubt on the whole argument, since you cannot condemn one and not the other.

<sup>84</sup>1 Timothy 3:2; Titus 1:6. Some believe these texts are establishing a minimum requirement of marriage to at least one woman and do not prohibit polygamy at all.

<sup>85</sup>See *Eros Made Sacred or the Biblical Case for Polygamy*, (1991 Stivers Publications) for an inductive investigation of Biblical texts pertaining to polygamy.

<sup>86</sup>I think we see here an explanation for what scholars generally perceive as confusion and an evolutionary process for church polity in the Early Church. The Presbyterian model grew from the provisional government of the Gentile churches; the Episcopalian model grew from the monarchy of the Davidic churches.



*For the children of Israel shall abide many days without a king, and without a sacrifice, and without an image, and without an ephod, and without a teraphim: Afterward shall the children of Israel return, and seek the LORD their God, and David their king; and shall fear the LORD and his goodness in the latter days.*

- Hosea 3:4-5 (emphasis added)

Having lost the churches of the Roman Empire, the Davidic Christians fled to the churches of the East (Parthia and beyond) and to the Celtic churches. If you study Celtic crosses, you will find proof of the Davidic influence.<sup>87</sup> Celtic chieftains became the successors and guardians of the Davidic cause. They were aided by Druid midwives. That was why the Church of Rome had to engage in a millennium-long attempt to smash them.<sup>88</sup>

In reference to plural marriage, it was entrenched among the tribal Celts, whose leaders practiced it even with St. Patrick's approval.<sup>89</sup> As was argued above, it was lawful for the Davidic bishops to practice it; for David was promised the same blessing of Abraham: that his descendants would become "as the hosts of heaven." Plural marriage would have been useful in providing an adequate pool of candidates which could assume leadership of the expanding church.

### **Why This is Important to Midwives?**

For most midwives operating within the context of our modern culture, the medical aspects of their profession is all-consuming. Most midwives are oblivious or perhaps even uninterested in the radically contra-trend impact homebirthing is having on the general culture. As in all revolutions, there is an intellectual vanguard which is its guardian and guide. The revolution of modern midwifery is no exception. While she might not consider the cultural ramifications of her activity beyond achieving a safe delivery for her client, it does not diminish the rippling effect the midwife's counsel and expertise will have in changing her client's views towards the institutions which control other areas of our lives.

Many midwives are already comfortable with the kind of person homebirthing attracts: sometimes the radical, other times the libertarian, and other times the poor person who simply cannot afford the "bells and whistles" our technology offers. Often unconsciously, the midwife in many ways contradicts the extravagant and dubious claims of modern medicine. It leads her clients to wonder if other institutions are making dubious claims, as well.

---

<sup>87</sup>*An Introduction to Celtic Christianity*, ed. James P. Mackey, op cit

<sup>88</sup>St. Brigid is an example. See *Celtic Women* by Peter Ellis, (Eerdman's, 1995), an important work. See also *The Templar Revelation* by Lynn Picknett & Clive Prince (Simon & Schuster, 1998) who say of midwives (p. 158): "One of the major motives behind the atrocities of the witch-hunts was the hatred and fear of midwives, whose knowledge of alleviating the pain of birthing was deemed a threat to decent civilization: Kramer and Sprenger, authors of the infamous *Malleus Maleficarum* – the handbook of European witchfinders – particularly singled out midwives as deserving of the worst possible treatment at their hands."

<sup>89</sup>*Ibid*, p. 160

As for sexuality, the midwife, simply because she is better informed, irresistibly is a sexologist. She is comfortable with sexual subjects, and perhaps a little earthy. Midwives are familiar with the salutary effects of semen on the female and are very supportive of a generous amount of sexual activity. We now know that female orgasm results in the release of oxytocin into the woman's bloodstream - a critical component in emotional well-being as well as a successful pregnancy. Modern midwifery drew its first breath in the counter-culture of the 60s Hippie Movement, a movement of liberated sex, especially for women. Usually, midwives are more tolerant of the sometimes strange sexual morés of their clients. *The Farm*, a commune in the hills of Tennessee which has become a cultural Mecca for many midwives, began as one of many counter-culture groups emerging from the sexual revolution of the 1960s and 70s.<sup>90</sup>

In this respect, only the most religiously intolerant midwife will be troubled by the proposition of a polygamy supported by religious principle. Perhaps, it will grow out of a fear of Mormonism or other cultic associations. But even for them, the Hippocratic Oath imposes a professional burden if they refuse clients simply because they disapprove of their morals. For most midwives, their clients' sexual fulfillment will be welcomed as long as it is between consenting adults.

Following the triumph of feminism in modern times, a return to the old "patriarchal polygamy" of the past would be undesirable. The polygamy of the early Celtic Church represented a healthy exclusion of the dominating patriarchalism of the Imperial Church. It is that kind of familial/tribal structure that is being introduced here. Women and midwives flourished in that early culture when it was still Christian but not yet ecclesiastical.

From what has been presented thus far, it is apparent that the midwife serves a vital role in the Desposynic Church. In her hands lies the safety of each new generation of the Desposyni. She is their shield from the inquisitional attacks of the state. But on a larger scale, she demonstrates the superiority of homebirth over hospital birth. The most difficult and dangerous time of operating "outside the system" occurs in childbirth. If homebirthing is a success, why not home schooling, cottage industries, and a low-tech civilization? It challenges the "religion of institution" and suggests that humanity does not have to bureaucratize every new technology that appears in the market place.

---

<sup>90</sup>See Wikipedia source: [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/The\\_Farm\\_\(Tennessee\)](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/The_Farm_(Tennessee))

## MIDWIVES AS PRIESTESSES OF THE ALTAR

*Teach the widows ... that they are the altars of God.*

- Epistle of Polycarp 4:3

*(T)he golden altar within the Holy of holies has  
reference to those in a state of virginity.*

- Methodius, "The Banquet of the Ten Virgins"<sup>91</sup>

In Aime Martimort's study, *Deaconesses*, a work of cautious and thorough scholarship, we find that the "Order of Deaconess" is an ill-defined role in the history of the Church.<sup>92</sup> It is sometimes confused with the "Order of Widows and Virgins" (female orphans) and sometimes confused with the presbytriss. During the 2nd Century, the situation was still fluid. The Church was in a transition from the family-based, household church to the imperial bureaucratic order of later centuries. The masculine roles of elders (grandfathers) and deacons (household servants) were themselves in transition from the family setting to the public assembly. Following the lead of Latin culture which promoted a rigidly masculine presence in the public realm, the Gentile Church developed the masculine ecclesiastical offices earlier. The feminine roles, at home in a tribal culture, were discarded as vestigial in the new social setting. It should not surprise us that tribal cultures - such as those of the Celt and the Goth - preserved the feminine presence in Christian worship longer than did the Classical world.

Studies like Martimort's are excellent and useful as far as they go. However, they lack consideration of two key elements: **first**, they do not take into account the inversion of values within the Church brought about by the Mahuzzim (Encratite) heresy. And **second**, they do not consider the Celtic experience which preserved a different, yet authentic, apostolic tradition.

Originally, as I said in an earlier chapter, the deaconess was not a separate ecclesiastical order. Deaconesses were, as Clement said, generally the wives of deacons who assisted their husbands in their work. This practice is Biblically sound because the Creation Mandate (Genesis 1) teaches us that the woman is called to be her husband's helper in his vocational task.<sup>93</sup> During the Apostolic period, deacons were preachers and baptizers. It followed that their wives would be the same, especially in women's quarters in that gender-segregated society.

Also, since it was the practice of the Early Church to baptize in the nude, and to anoint with oil (chrism) the baptized from head-to-toe, it is understandable that the deaconess would be given the task of performing this ceremony upon the female converts.

---

<sup>91</sup> *ANF*, v. 6, p. 328

<sup>92</sup> *Deaconesses, A Historical Study* (English edition: Ignatius Press, 1986)

<sup>93</sup> See my book *The Mother Heart of God, A Study on the Pneumatic Role of the Woman*, 1997

The case of the spouses of presbyters was the same. As with the wives of the Apostles and the Desposyni, they shared in the office of their husband. In the early days, the clergy at all levels were required to be married. When marriage was restricted and finally banned, the absence of such women created a spiritual vacuum within the ministry of the Church.

In Old Testament times, the widow had the power to vow without coverture (Numbers 30). This gave to her the right to contract which made her equal with men. She may not have been qualified to be the ruler of men, but within her estate and household, she was. Upheld by the 5th Commandment, she was entitled to equal honor as her deceased husband.

For this reason, it should not surprise us that such widows exercised sacerdotal and even Episcopal powers in the Early Church. When churches still met in homes and represented the extended family group, it was natural that such a role would fall to the widowed matron of the household, especially if her husband lacked a male heir. This was certainly the case among the Celtic churches.

If her husband was polygamous, obviously, there was more than one widow. Which one became the matron?

This question leads us to an interesting doctrine in Biblical times: the midwife as a priestess. As indicated in an earlier chapter, the Canons of Hippolytus is an example of an historical source which identifies the midwife as a distinct office within the Order of Widows.<sup>94</sup> But it was not clearly defined why that was the case. That was because it had to do with the Mysteries of the Church, which I can only sketch here.

When the New Testament Church formalized the Order of Widows and Virgins, they were identified as representing the Church as the "spouses of Christ." That was why Paul condemned the younger widows who waxed "wanton against Christ" by wanting to marry. Since the bishops were heirs of the Messianic office, these women were betrothed in a symbolic marriage to their bishops. To renounce their vows was to divorce Christ, a very serious matter.

Under the above heading, I quoted just two of the Early Fathers who described the widows and virgins as "the altars of God." The reason the Fathers forbade women to officiate at the Altar, was because they were the Altar: and the Altar cannot serve the Altar.

This is not unusual symbolism. The inner chambers of the Temple were veiled. Women were also veiled. Certainly in the pagan world, the woman's body was likened to a temple, and her womb was the inner sanctum. The 3rd Century bishop, Methodius, followed this same imagery throughout his discourse on the Ten Virgins, claiming it as apostolic tradition, and calling virginity "the unbloody altar of God": an oblique reference to the virginal blood of the wedding night.

---

<sup>94</sup>The Order of Widows was the next step for the unmarried deaconess (1 Timothy 5:3, 9-10). The qualifications required included the rite of footwashing and "relieving the afflicted." Might not midwifery be included within this category?

The symbolism of Revelation 12 ties this in with the midwife. There, you will recall, the Woman "clothed with the Sun" is in the throes of childbirth. In Biblical code, the Sun is the Father and the Moon is the Mother (Genesis 37:9-10). The Woman is crowned with twelve stars, identifying her as the zodiacal sign: Virgo. The Woman is "the Virgin." In this case, the Mother is serving as midwife to the Virgin; for the Moon is under her feet (her genitals).

In this vision, the Sun is God the Father and the Moon is the Holy Spirit (again see my book, *The Mother Heart of God*). The Virgin is Mary and her son, of course, is Jesus. Keeping this in mind, we can understand, then, this remark in the *Didascalica*, a 3rd Century clergy manual:

*The deaconess should be honored by you as the Holy Spirit is honored... and widows and orphans [virgins] should be esteemed by you as you would esteem the altar of God.*<sup>95</sup>

Among the Celts, if a virgin claimed to be raped, it was the midwife who tested her virginity and reported her findings to the authorities. Recall that in an earlier chapter, this custom was cited of Salome, who examined the blessed Mary at the birth of Jesus to verify her virginity.

According to Church Tradition, Mary was a young girl at this time, no more than 14 years old. Salome, although not married to Joseph, nevertheless, lived with the Holy Family, served as Mary's mentor, and stood as a sort of godmother to Jesus. (Mary named one of her daughters Salome.) She followed His ministry, and according to Demetrius, she saw everything.<sup>96</sup>

Thus, if we adopt the view of the Early Fathers that the womb is the symbol of the Altar of God, then we can say that the midwife, like the Holy Spirit, is the priestess officiating at that Altar.
--

Finally, returning to our question of who became the matron widow in a polygamous household, the answer is the midwife. It was she who attended the Altars.

---

<sup>95</sup> *Deaconesses, op cit*

<sup>96</sup> See Appendix, "Salome: Matron Saint of Midwives"

## **CHAPTER CONCLUSION**

What we may conclude from all of this is the simple truth that birth is an intense time spiritually, as well as physically. There is a manifestation of the Divine Presence at birth, especially so for those parents and midwives who are open to it.

**"For where two or three are gathered in my name,  
there am I in the midst of them."**

The midwife serves in Yahweh's stead. Most midwives are trained to ignore their spiritual impulses at birth. They are taught to focus on the medical aspects of the delivery. But there is a moment, however brief, when the opportunity for spiritual ecstasy is present, when all parties may share in a transcendent moment with the Divine.

**Midwives can become the evangelists of a new spirituality and a new philosophy of social order. Our world cries out for it.**

## QUESTIONS FOR REVIEW

1. What does the word "ecclesiastical" mean?
2. What is a "geber"?
3. What is the usual name in the New Testament for an ecclesiastical leader?
4. What was the usual name for a leader in ancient Israel?
5. Did these leaders in ancient Israel have spiritual responsibilities?
6. Why were Gebers polygamists?
7. What is the reason the author claims Gentile Gebers were forbidden by Paul to be polygamists?
8. Do you think spiritual leaders should be polygamous? Why or why not?
9. According to Hosea, when would the Throne of David be restored to Israel"?
10. Explain in what sense midwives are "priestesses" and of what altar do they serve?
11. To qualify for the Order of Widows, a woman had to first serve as a \_\_\_\_\_.
12. How might midwifery fit in the description found in 1 Timothy 5:9-10?
13. Who is called the "matron saint" of midwives?
14. To which member of the Trinity does the Didascalia liken a deaconess?





## **CHAPTER EIGHT:**

### **LITURGY FOR THE MIDWIFE**

During the early Christian period, the ministry of the Midwife was a specialized task within the offices of the presbytriss and the deaconess. However, for women who were midwives, what began as a simple service of mercy, expanded into larger spiritual and practical duties of critical importance to women, children, household servants, and even the public ministry of the Church. As long as the Church maintained its familial orientation and its commitment to the mystery of the Grail, midwives remained key players in building the Kingdom of God. They were the extended arms of their bishop. As an ordainable office, the midwife did not exist apart from her bishop.

It is painfully obvious that such an ordainable office does not currently exist among mainline churches, even though the need is great. With the rise of unwed pregnancies, single-parent homes, and concubinage, the midwife can provide a spiritual covering for women and children where it is currently lacking, even at hospital births. This ministry, obviously, can and must extend beyond the birth. Midwives have a rapport with women and children that is impossible for the clergy and the current ministries of the church to have. The on-going needs of baptism, participation in the Eucharistic meal, nurture and spiritual instruction are all elements within the midwife's purview.

Liberal churches are making changes in the area of women priests, but they only duplicate the current masculine role in the public assembly and do not meet the needs I have just described, nor do they provide an adequate spiritual covering for those Christian midwives who still believe the traditional doctrines of Christianity. An apostate church however meritorious in its isolated changes can provide covering for no one.

It is essential that the midwife stand within the Altar of God. What that means is that she must function under duly ordained authority and that she be not irregular in the performance of her duties. Consequently, the liturgies which follow are for midwives who have been duly ordained by their spiritual leaders.<sup>97</sup>

Obviously, this is a frontier in Christian ministry. Although the midwife's sacerdotal role is an ancient one, many of those ancient ways are lost to us. The Cambrian Episcopal Church stands ready to offer assistance in recapturing those traditions.<sup>98</sup>

Most men are derelict in their priestly role in the home. Consequently, they are neither competent nor willing to perform even the most basic of spiritual tasks. It is not a violation of family government if the mother solicits the spiritual and liturgical assistance of the midwife who is properly set forth for her sacerdotal ministry. If it is known that the husband/father will not or cannot perform these spiritual tasks according to Apostolic standards, it is proper and in order for the midwife, representing her bishop or church, to do them, until such time as the man is ready to assume his priestly office in the home. The following are the basic tools intended to equip the midwife for that priestly task.

## **1. PRAYERS FOR THE BIRTH:**

Anoint the mother with oil in the form of the crucifix upon the forehead and again on the abdomen. The oil must be consecrated by the midwife's bishop. This makes the prayer the petition of the Church and not just that of the midwife.

When anointing say:

*(Name). I anoint you with oil in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit. Amen.*

and you may add,

*As you are outwardly anointed with this holy oil, so may our heavenly Father grant you the inward anointing of the Holy Spirit. Of his great mercy, may he forgive you your sins, release you from suffering, and restore you to wholeness and strength. May he deliver you from all evil, preserve you in all goodness, and bring you to everlasting life; through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.*

---

<sup>97</sup>The standards of the Desposynic Church require either a bishop of Apostolic succession, or a *Mebakker* (Davidic bishop), or a Body of the Covenant People whose leaders have been appointed according to the Apostolic pattern of Acts 1 (chosen by lots). Appointments by other means are considered irregular. See Church Policy of the Cambrian Episcopal Church.

<sup>98</sup>The following is drawn from the Cambrian Prayer Book, which is a resource available only to Catechumens in the Cambrian Episcopal Church. It is an archaeological recovery of the Tradition from the Anglican Book of Common Prayer, Celtic spiritual folklore, the Dead Sea Scrolls, and numerous other ancient, Christian documents. As all liturgies, they are optional to the Officiate.

Laying hands upon the anointed places say:

*(Name), I lay my hands upon you in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit, beseeching our Lord Jesus Christ to sustain you with his presence, and to confirm the Covenant which assures the faithful of salvation and safety in childbirth, to drive away all affliction of body and spirit, and to give you that victory of life and peace which will enable you to serve him both now and evermore. Amen.*

or this,

*(Name), I lay my hands upon you in the Name of our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ, beseeching him to uphold you and fill you with his grace, that you may know the healing power of his love. Amen.*

Communion may follow (see below), if not, the Lord's Prayer is said together and closed with this blessing:

*May God the Father bless you, God the Son heal you. God the Holy Spirit give you strength. May God the holy and undivided Trinity guard your body, save your soul, and bring you safely to his heavenly country; where he lives and reigns for ever and ever. Amen.*

If there is distress in labor,

*Lord Jesus Christ, Good Shepherd of the sheep, you gather the lambs in your arms and carry them in your bosom: We commend to your loving care this woman and this unborn child. Relieve their pain, guard them from all danger, restore to them your gifts of gladness and strength, and raise them up to a life of service to you. Hear us, we pray, for your dear Name's sake. Amen.*

or have the mother repeat this prayer:

*Lord Jesus Christ, by your patience in suffering you hallowed earthly pain and gave us the example of obedience to your Father's will: Be near me in my time of weakness and pain; sustain me by your grace, that my strength and courage may not fail; heal me according to your will; and help me always to believe that what happens to me or my baby is of little account if you hold us in eternal life, my Lord and my God. Amen.*

A litany to be repeated during the final phase of labor:

*My God is my love,  
My God is my guard,  
My God is my healing one;*

*My bright love is my merciful Lord,  
My sweet love is Christ,  
His heart is my delight;*

*All my loves are you,  
O King of glory.*

If the woman must cry out, let her say,

*Jesus! Only-begotten Son,  
Lamb of God the Father,  
You gave the wine-blood  
of thy body to buy me from the grave;  
My Christ! My Christ!  
My shield, my encircler,  
Each day, each night,  
Each light, each dark.  
Be near me, uphold me,  
My treasure, my triumph,  
In my living, in my standing,  
In my watching, in my sleeping.*

*Jesus, Son of Mary!  
My helper, my encircler,  
Jesus, Son of David!  
My strength everlasting.*

With some practice, the repetition of this litany can be coordinated with breathing rhythms. At the discretion of the midwife, it may be recited responsively or simply repeated.

## **2. PRAYER OF THANKSGIVING:**

*O LORD, your compassions never fail and your mercies are new every morning: We give thanks for giving our sister, [Name] both relief from travail and the joy of a child. Continue with them, I pray, the good work you have begun; that they both will daily increase in bodily strength, and rejoicing in your goodness, may so order their lives and conduct that they may always think and do those things that please you; through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.*

To which the mother should say,

*Lord Jesus, I thank you for this gift of your love.*

## **3. IF THE MOTHER OR CHILD DIES:**

Making the sign of the Cross, say

*Depart, O Christian soul, out of this world;  
In the Name of God the Father Almighty who created you;  
In the Name of Jesus Christ who redeemed you;  
In the Name of the Holy Spirit who sanctifies you.  
May your rest be this day in peace,  
and your dwelling place in the Paradise of God.*

#### 4. FOR BAPTISM:

The newborn infant cannot be baptized unless the parent is already baptized. The mother should be baptized before the birth, if possible, as this sanctifies the child before delivery. At all baptisms, the Apostles' Creed should be recited. Then in giving the Charge, in this case say,

*Do you [Name] now pledge to bring up this child in the Christian faith?*

When the mother responds, "I do", then inquire of the child's full name. With consecrated water from the bishop, sprinkle the child three times with the following words:

*[Name of child], I baptize you in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit.*

This is followed by the Lord's Prayer and then the blessing:

*The LORD bless thee, and keep thee:  
The LORD make his face shine upon thee,  
and be gracious unto thee:  
The LORD lift up his countenance upon thee,  
and give thee peace.  
The Name of Jesus be upon thee. , Amen.*

Kiss the child and return him to his mother.

An alternative and more Celtic baptismal liturgy follows: with three drops of water, the midwife says,

*In name of God,  
In name of Jesus,  
In name of Spirit,  
The perfect Three in power.*

*The little drop of the Father  
On thy little forehead, beloved one*

*The little drop of the Son  
On thy little forehead, beloved one*

*The little drop of the Spirit  
On thy little forehead, beloved one*

*To aid thee, to guard thee,  
To shield thee, to surround thee.*

*To keep thee from the fays,  
To shield thee from the host.*

*To save thee from the gnome,*

*To deliver thee from the spectre.*

*The little drop of the Three  
To fill thee with Their gladness.*

*The little drop of the Three  
To fill thee with Their virtue*

*O the little drop of the Three  
To fill thee with Their virtue.*

The baptism should be duly recorded on a Certificate in triplicate: one for the mother, one for the midwife, and one for the bishop. The Certificate should contain the name of the baptized, the time and place, the names of the parents, the name of the midwife, and the name of her bishop.

Chrism ought to be done by the bishop alone at Confirmation, unless special orders are received by the midwife.

## **5. THE EUCHARIST:**

In her expanded role as presbytriss, the midwife may administer the Holy Communion to the mother and those with her. Using elements blessed by her bishop, she should proceed with the following liturgy:

**First**, she should pray the Proper for the Day, or other prayers designated by the bishop.

**Second**, she should read a passage from the Gospel or a passage of Scripture appropriate to the Day, according to the Lectionary, or else one of the following:

John 3:16; John 6:35; John 6: 51, 55-56; John 15:4-5a, 8-9

**Third**, she should read or summarize her bishop's most recent homiletical epistle, lesson, or sermon.

**Fourth**, she should offer suitable prayers and conclude with the following or an appropriate Collect:

*Almighty Father, whose dear Son, on the night before he suffered,  
instituted the Sacrament of his Body and Blood:*

*Mercifully grant that we may receive it thankfully in remembrance of Jesus Christ our Lord, who in these holy mysteries gives us a pledge of eternal life; and who lives and reigns for ever and ever. Amen.*

**Fifth**, a Confession of Sin may follow. The following or some other form is used:

*Most merciful God, I(we) confess that I have sinned against you in thought, word, and deed, by what I have done, and by what I have left undone. I have not loved you with my(our) whole heart; I have not loved my neighbor as myself(ourselves). I am truly sorry and I humbly repent. For the sake of your Son Jesus Christ, have mercy on me(us) and forgive me, that I may delight in your will, and walk in your ways, to the glory of your Name. Amen.*

Then the midwife alone says,

*Almighty God have mercy on you, forgive you of all your sins through our Lord Jesus Christ, strengthen you in all goodness, and by the power of the Holy Spirit keep you in eternal life. Amen.*

A deaconess using the preceding form substitutes "us" for "you" and "our" for "your."

The kiss of peace may be exchanged or reserved for the footwashing.<sup>99</sup>

**Sixth**, the Apostles' Creed should be recited.<sup>100</sup>

**Seventh**, the midwife may say the following Invitation:

*The Gifts of God for the People of God.*

*Take them in remembrance that Christ died for you, and feed on him in your hearts by faith, with thanksgiving.*

The recipient(s) respond:

*I thank you Lord Jesus for these gifts of your love.*

The Sacrament is administered with the following or other words:

*The Body (Blood) of our Lord Jesus Christ keep you in everlasting life. Amen.*

---

<sup>99</sup>See *The Ordinance of Footwashing: The Kingdom Come* by this author (2003). Footwashing was important in the Early Church for the forgiveness of post-baptismal sin.

<sup>100</sup>"I believe in God the Father Almighty, maker of heaven and earth; and in Jesus Christ His only Son our Lord; who was conceived by the Holy Ghost, born of the Virgin Mary, suffered under Pontius Pilate, was crucified, dead, and buried. He descended into hell; the third day, He rose again from the dead. He ascended into heaven and sitteth on the right hand of God the Father Almighty. From thence, He shall come to judge the quick (living) and the dead. I believe in the Holy Ghost, the holy catholic church, the communion of saints, the forgiveness of sins, the resurrection of the body, and the life everlasting, Amen."

One of the usual postcommunion prayers is then said, or the following:

*Gracious Father, we give you praise and thanks for this Holy Communion of the Body and Blood of your beloved Son Jesus Christ the pledge of our redemption; and we pray that it may bring its the discipline and forgiveness of our sins, strength in our weakness, and everlasting salvation; through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.*

(The Eucharistic liturgy of the *Didache* may be used but the presbytriss -midwife - must first receive instruction in its proper use).

The Communion is completed by the Sacred Footwashing as it was by the Savior in John 13. The exchange of footwashing, with earnest prayers, and the kiss of peace are enjoined to keep the Eucharist pure.

The service is closed with the singing of a Psalm or hymn and the benediction.

Since our scope is the ministry of the midwife, the above instructions are not complete for all the things a presbytriss or deaconess may have to do. If the midwife desires to expand her role, further training and ordination from her bishop is necessary.



## **QUESTIONS FOR REVIEW**

- 1. The author identifies the Midwife as a specialized function of the deaconess. Do you think midwives should be willing and able to provide a more comprehensive spiritual ministry? Why or why not?**
- 2. What do you think the author means when he refers to the midwife/deaconess as an extension of the arms of her bishop?**
- 3. In the larger context of the Church, what does the author mean that the midwife must stand "within the Altar of God"?**
- 4. Reflecting on an earlier chapter, if a midwife is ministering God's healing as a deaconess, should she not learn to do so as a priestess rather than as merely a medical professional?**
- 5. Would you be willing to administer the sacraments to your clients, if so requested by them and commissioned by your Church? Why or why not?**



## CONCLUSION

The scope of what has been covered in this book is somewhat sweeping and may require much rumination by the reader. In many ways I have challenged certain fundamentals of what we have been taught is Christianity. In challenging those assumptions you are now required to pursue truth and verify what I have said. The Cambrian Episcopal Church has resources available to help you to do that which are outlined in the bibliography.

Celtic Christianity is a new and elusive term to many people. It has many aspects, but perhaps the central core is its pious reverence for creation, for all experiences of life as manifestations of the providence of God and opportunities in the pursuit of virtue. Everything belongs to God; everything must be sanctified by the Christian.

As one author has explained the Celtic way,

*Each action, thought or intention is **sained**, made holy by blessing. Blessing is a consecration, an inclusion of the mundane within the sacred that confers grace and protection. Blessing allows whatever is blessed to fully realize its innate potential.*

- *Celtic Blessings*, by  
Caitlin Matthews

The corrosive effect of modern secularism has been to take the world - nature, our bodies, our experiences - from the realm of sacredness and degrade it to a disposable commodity. The Celts respected the creation. They did not kill it or destroy it. Instead, they hallowed it and healed it.

Birthing has been degraded to a technological procedure. Gone is its wonder and power as a part of the web of Divine life. We have lost our sense of its mystery in God's unfolding plan for the ages. Our age is spiritually dead.

Or is it? As the Druids taught, perhaps our departure, our apostasy, will teach us a different lesson: that life is not worth living if we cannot connect with God's great web of sacred life and hold it with gentleness.

The birth of a child is a sacramental act. It is worship. Childbirth, with Christian nurture, builds the Kingdom of God. It should be revered; it should be sained. The Midwife is a priestess, the representative of Christ and His Church. She must resist with all her might the temptation to degrade that calling into the secular role of the technician. Once again, she must become, as the Celts called her: *the knee-woman*, the woman on her knees, in prayer, bringing the Seed of God into the world.

\* \* \* \* \*

## APPENDIX A

### OPERATION RESCUE OR OPERATION MISCUE

This issue of *Biblical Terranomics*<sup>101</sup> grows out of the controversy in Wichita, Kansas this summer over the actions of Pro-Lifers to rescue the unborn. If you followed the national news media in August, you will recall that Randall Terry's Operation Rescue group was invited to Wichita by local Pro-Life leaders. Tactics chosen to fight abortion included the blocking of entrances to buildings where abortions were performed. Although this tactic was used frequently by local Pro-Lifers during the preceding two years, including this writer, the assistance of Operation Rescue created massive arrests, and raised the demonstrations to national significance. Unquestionably, this tactic took a heavy psychological and economic toll on the abortion industry in this city.

The response of the judiciary was to stiffen its stance. Repeated arrests led to longer jail time for many rescuers. Since local attorneys were unavailable, I was asked by the local leadership to provide some Para-legal assistance. Specifically, I was requested to explore a legal remedy which could be used by a layman without the aid of an attorney. To my knowledge the *habeas corpus petition* is the only layman's remedy which can expedite release from imprisonment. Said petition was prepared and submitted. Unfortunately, about the same time, Rev. Don Wildmon, leader of a national anti-pornography organization, offered the assistance of two of his staff attorneys. Although fine individuals, they clearly lacked enthusiasm for using the petition I prepared, in spite of the fact that word came from the U.S. Attorney's office that a habeas corpus petition could result in release of petitioners within four hours. Realizing that the OR and local Pro-life leadership were not prepared mentally to deal with the issues contained in my legal brief and in the petition, I abandoned the project. Consequently, nothing was done. Prisoners served out their time (some are still serving) and stiffer fines were imposed.<sup>102</sup>

To clarify, it should be mentioned that my petition was to be used in dealing with local charges of trespassing, not the contempt charges imposed by federal judge, Patrick Kelly. While the federal charges affected a mere handful of individuals, the trespassing charges affected hundreds. Curiously, local attorneys had no interest except in the federal charges.

Although the protests are lawful only in terms of the Bible and Common Law, the Rescue movement still wants to fight the judiciary with technical legalese. It wants to use the "rule of

---

<sup>101</sup>Originally published as *Biblical Terranomics* #4. **Biblical Terranomics** is a publication issued on an occasional basis, reflecting on-going research into the subject of land law and the Bible. Its focus is centered upon local government and customary law, as opposed to national government and statutory law. Our vision is to see Christian reconstruction begin in the dominion of Christian men over their family estates.

<sup>102</sup>The protests came to a screeching halt when Federal Judge Patrick Kelly threatened to nullify the corporate charters of the respective churches involved. The pastors immediately capitulated.

necessity" defense, but rejects the Common Law which alone gives it validity. It wants to overturn *Roe*, but refuses to face the fact that it was the 14th Amendment and its alien law system which made *Roe* possible. I believe the Pro-Life movement is doomed to failure.<sup>103</sup>

To illustrate what I am saying, let me relate some aspects of a conversation I had with Wildmon's attorneys. One somberly told me that "the Common Law is dead." I asked him if he had read John Whitehead's book, *The Second American Revolution*, especially his appendix on Common Law. He had not. (I found that incredible.) When we were discussing getting these arguments before a jury, another attorney told me she did not trust juries to judge the law and the facts! These attorneys were nice people and seemingly sincere Christians, but their education made them dangerous to Christian liberty.

Of course the Common Law is dead. That is because Common Law is People's law and the People are "dead in their trespasses and sins" (Ephesians 2:1). Common Law cannot be enforced by attorneys. It must be enforced by Christians obeying God's law in their daily lives.

Herein is the legal brief which was prepared.<sup>104</sup>

---

<sup>103</sup>Written in 1991, time has proven me right. The Pro-Life movement has been reduced to a special interest lobby.

<sup>104</sup>The *Habeas Corpus Packet* with do-it-yourself instructions is no longer available. However, should a midwife find such a petition necessary, one can be provided to her if she is registered as a deaconess in the Cambrian Episcopal Church.

## **A LEGAL BRIEF FOR AN ACTION AGAINST ABORTIONISTS**

(a summary)

1. "Abortion On demand" is based upon the 14th Amendment.
2. The 14th Amendment was thought to have enlarged the sphere of Common Law rights secured by the 9th Amendment and elsewhere.
3. The Common Law does not give the woman, or anyone else, the right to kill an unborn child. Rather, it is a criminal offense.
4. The 14th Amendment has had the effect of diminishing Common Law rights.
5. The 14th Amendment applies to government and public officials, not the private citizen.
6. Common Law provides for others to come to the aid of the unborn.
7. Therefore, rescues do not violate the 14th Amendment; for they are sanctioned by the Common Law.
8. The Constitution cannot be interpreted in a manner so as to contradict or defeat itself. Unborn children are members of the "Posterity" for whom the Constitution was created by "We the People" to protect. Abortion violates the Preamble to the Constitution and is thus unconstitutional.
9. The Common Law is based upon the Bible.

## **A LEGAL BRIEF FOR AN ACTION AGAINST ABORTIONISTS**

The legal foundation for the practice of abortion in the United States is the Supreme Court decision, *Roe v. Wade*. It began as an action brought in the United States District Court, (Northern District of Texas), by an unmarried pregnant woman who wished to terminate her pregnancy by abortion. She wanted, and in the end obtained, a declaratory judgment against the validity of the Texas statute making abortion illegal. This case (decided in 1973) overturned the statutes of virtually all 50 states.

The summary of this case in the Lawyers Edition 2d reveals:

*the right to choose whether to have children was protected by the Ninth Amendment, through the Fourteenth Amendment. . . (Roe v. Wade, 35 L Ed 2d supra, 147)*

This fact immediately brings us to the heart of the matter: there is something unique about the 14th Amendment which makes abortion possible in the United States. Heretofore, Pro-Life advocates have focused their energies on the moral and political battles - proving that life begins at conception and appointing pro-life Judges to the courts. The time has come to deal directly with the legal issues which made *Roe* possible. Operation Rescue, with its massive arrests, has made it possible to force evasive judges to answer the obvious constitutional questions.

Legal historians will note that the 14th Amendment has served the purpose of enforcing the Bill of Rights in state jurisdictions. Prior to that Amendment, the state citizen had to rely upon the Bill of Rights found in his respective State Constitution. The Bill of Rights applied only to the federal government.

Few people understand, however, that the 14th Amendment did not provide a *carte blanche* of the federal Bill of Rights onto state jurisprudence. The power of enforcement was found in Congress, not the judiciary. Thus, the courts depended upon federal legislation before they could act. That is why some rights we normally expect are absolute, such as the freedom of religion, are not necessarily so. The 14th Amendment allows discretion to Congress in the enforcement of those rights. For those who appeal to the 14th Amendment for protection, it has served as a watered-down version of the Bill of Rights.



This fact had little impact on the standing of those who were citizens prior to that Amendment, especially free, white males. They still relied upon the protections they had hitherto enjoyed in the Common Law of their respective states.

The 14th Amendment served the purpose of making citizens those who had limited rights before, principally the newly freed Negro. That is why we have various Civil Rights Acts. Congress had to empower the judiciary to enforce those federally-created rights. However, over the years, the 14th Amendment has been expanded in its application and has been used to satisfy the complaints of all minority groups. That is why feminists and homosexuals have worked diligently in the area of federal legislation to have deviates declared minority groups. It brings them under the purview of the 14th Amendment, the "equal protection" clause, and the Civil Rights Acts. The 14th Amendment has had the effect of producing a nation of special-interest groups.

On the issue of abortion, the federal courts took the lead, instead of waiting for Congress. That tendency by the courts in recent years is what is referred to by the expression "judicial activism". For the courts, it was enough that women were fully enfranchised by the 19th Amendment. The Courts decided that women had protection and unborn children did not. For the 14th Amendment reads:

*All persons born or naturalized in the United States, and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens of the United States and of the State wherein they reside. No State shall make any law which shall abridge the privileges and immunities of citizens of the United States.*

The fetus had no rights because it was not a "person born or naturalized" and thus, was not entitled to "the equal protection of the laws".

Contrast this view with that of the ancient common law and early American law as stated by John Bouvier, in his *Institutes of American Law*:

*203.-I. Life is a gift which man has received from God, and which society incessantly endeavors to secure to him, even before he is born, from the very instant he exists in ventre sa mere. The law does not alone punish the homicide of a man who is born, but it punishes as a misdemeanor, whoever has procured the criminal abortion of a woman quick with child, even with her consent. And though the mother appears to have some rights over the foetus, which is yet apart of herself, she is punishable for attempting its life. An infant in ventre sa mere or in its mother's womb, is considered as having rights of a man born, whenever it is for the interest of his life or his preservation that he should so be. (a) It is for this reason that if a woman quick with child should be capitally convicted, her execution will be delayed until after her confinement<sup>105</sup>.*

The legal issue of abortion really turns on the question of whether the 14th Amendment has set aside the Common Law. In recent years the Courts have assumed that it has. And for that reason, whatever influences the Bible may have had on our jurisprudence, it has been lost with

---

<sup>105</sup> John Bouvier's, *Institutes of American Law*, Book I, part 2, tit 1, chap.2, § 1, pp. 86-87 (1851). It should be noted that Bouvier's Law Dictionary (Third Revision, 8th Edition, 1914) is the only official legal dictionary used by Congress.

the Common Law and has been replaced by statist law founded upon secular humanism. If we are ever going to regain a Pro-Life jurisprudence, we must plead the Common Law, which finds its source in the Holy Writ of God's law-word.

A constitutional argument in favor of the unborn child which has not yet been argued in the courts is that the unborn child comes under the protection of the Constitution through the Preamble which reads:

*WE THE PEOPLE of the UNITED STATES, in order to form a more perfect Union, establish Justice, insure domestic Tranquility, provide for the Common Defense, promote the General Welfare, and secure the Blessings of Liberty to Ourselves and our Posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America.*

According to Common Law, the "Posterity" exists at conception. Consider again Bouvier's *Institutes* (vol. 1, § 10, para. 176, pp.73):

*The rights of a child in ventre sa mere are numerous: 1. For all beneficial purposes to himself such a child is considered as born... 8. Others may act on his behalf*

Numeral Eight of Bouvier's paragraph above is of critical significance to Operation Rescue. Rescuers are acting on behalf of one - indeed many - of the "Posterity" protected by the Constitution, the Bill of Rights, and the Common Law. The *Roe* decision is a spurious one, void of precedent and arbitrary in its rejection of Common Law to the end of promoting a radical, social agenda. It grants "privileges and immunities" to abortionists at the expense of the loss of genuine legal and natural rights of unborn children - rights which have been recognized by Western Civilization for over a thousand years.

Through the years, the courts have repeatedly told us that the Constitution cannot be interpreted in a manner which would cause it to contradict or defeat itself. The Supreme Court's decision in *Roe v. Wade* uses the 14th Amendment to do that very thing: to cause "We the People" to destroy "the Posterity". It defeats the Preamble which defines for us the very purpose of the Constitution and the Bill of Rights. A more radical departure from the Constitution cannot be imagined. (It is the interpretive equivalent of using the 14th Amendment to justify the extermination of whites by blacks, or men by women.)

Those engaged in Operation Rescue are acting within the Common Law, the Organic Constitution, and the Law of God. It is the abortionists, and those who defend them, who are the lawless ones.

When the Pro-life movement, Operation Rescue, and American Christians become learned concerning the proper standing "at law", then their deficient endeavors in the courtroom as advocates for the unborn will be overcome, and victory for the cause of Christ and America's posterity will be within reach in the true judicial power of the state.

\* \* \* \* \*

### ADDENDUM

It should be added that the Supreme Court ruled in *Grovey v. Townsend*, 295 U.S. 45 (1935), that it was impossible for private citizens, exercising their lawful rights, to violate the 14th Amendment. Therefore, it seems an abortionist, while protected against harassment from government officials and organizations considered public, cannot expect the private citizen to be barred from attempting to stop an abortionist *in the act of abortion*. This may sound like an invitation to anarchy. But that is the fault of the Court which has sanctioned a holocaust against the unborn. It forces us back to Common Law procedures and the decisions of local juries which vote according to their consciences.

*Common Law may refer to judge-made (as opposed to legislature-made) law, to law that has its origins in England and grows from ever-changing custom and tradition, or to written Christian law.*

- *Law Dictionary for Non-Lawyers*,  
Dan Oran J.D. West Publishing Co., 1985

Recommended reading:

Works by John Whitehead available from the Rutherford Institute, P.O. Box 7482, Charlottesville, VA 22906. Phone: (804)978-3888.



## APPENDIX B

### SALOME:

#### MATRON SAINT OF MIDWIVES

*And there appeared a great wonder in heaven; a woman clothed with the sun, and the moon under her feet, and upon her head a crown of twelve stars:*

- Revelation 12:1

At times, it is difficult to identify various people in the Bible. Sometimes, the information is too scanty, at other times, contradictory. This is especially true of the people mentioned in the Gospels. Frequently, we are forced to rely upon the testimony of the ancient historians of the Church to connect the dots for us.

That the records seem contradictory does not mean they are uninspired, as some liberal scholars wish to imply. There are other very good reasons for why the record has been left as it is.

For one thing, cousin marriages were legal under the Mosaic Law, as was polygamy. That was why men could be brothers and cousins at the same time. Their father and mother may have been cousins, or their father may have married sisters.

The ancient church historians, such as Julius Africanus and Hegesippus, remind us of the Hebrew custom of the *levirate marriage* to explain these anomalies, also. The levirate marriage (nothing to do with the Levites) was the custom of a brother marrying his deceased brother's widow. This custom was commanded in the Mosaic Law to give women greater security. In Israel, true marriage was a form of adoption. That was why she took her husband's name. A wife was the man's "sister-bridge". She became a member of the family and a joint-heir in the family estate. If her husband died, she could expect to be cared for by his brothers.

This custom was not limited to brothers, however. In the book of Ruth, we find that this levirate obligation extended to the next of kin. Boaz was not Ruth's brother-in-law, but he was obliged to marry her because she came with the parcel of land which he wished to redeem. He was delighted, of course, because he loved her. But it demonstrates one reason why land could not be bought or sold like a commodity in ancient Israel: buyers had to marry the women that came with it.

The levirate custom explains why the genealogies in Matthew and Luke are not identical. A man could be identified with two fathers: one, by the adoption of the levirate marriage, the other, by true issue. Simeon, the Lord's brother, was both His brother and His cousin. That was because he was the son of Clopas, Joseph's younger brother. Clopas became the head of Joseph's household after his death.

There is another good reason why associations were sometimes obscured in the Gospels: *persecution*. It was a dangerous time. Men died young. There were many widows.

Like a witness protection program, the identities of some individuals were blurred or misidentified in the Gospels. For instance, some of the Apostles were the Lord's kinsmen. Even James and John may have been His cousins. It was important in that era that the new Christian movement not be identified as a reemergence of the House of David. Messianic claims in association with the royal stature of Davidides posed a serious political threat to Rome. It was a subversive wedge repeatedly used by the powerful Parthian Empire against Rome (e.g. the Magi at Christ's birth). Since the Gospels were meant for general circulation, identifying the two together was unnecessarily dangerous.

Recall King Herod's massacre of the Bethlehem infants. That was not out of character for Herod, both for personal and political reasons. He had married the Maccabean princess, Mariamme, to solidify his own claims to the Throne, only to murder both her and her thirteen-year-old brother, when the latter was ordained to the High Priesthood. Herod sometimes murdered his own sons.

Joseph, the presumed father of Jesus, was the titular head of the House of David in his day. He and his kinsmen found it prudent to live unostentatiously on the fringes of Galilee, outside of Herod's jurisdiction.

Eventually, early Christianity was viewed by Rome as a political movement. In a sense, it was. Although it was spiritual in nature, it did have political implications. During the first one hundred years of its existence, Christianity was led, without dispute, by the Lord's kinsmen - the Desposyni, as they were called. The Apostles and disciples received their marching orders from them, especially from James, the Lord's brother (see Acts 15).

These Davidic leaders were in constant danger. The Jewish Revolt of 70 AD was wrongfully blamed on these Davidians. There were three separate attempts by Rome to wipe them out. Trajan, Hadrian, and Domitian - all sustained state operations to seek them out and destroy them, either by assassination, or if that was not possible, by mass murder.

With these volatile circumstances in mind, it is no wonder that the Gospels avoid discussing them as having any meaningful influence on Christianity. The book of Acts presents us with James as the first leader of Christianity. But it does not tell us that he is the brother of Jesus. We learn that fact from the more visible Epistles of Paul (e.g. Galatians).

In *Biblical Midwifery*, there is a lengthy account given about Salome and the birth of Jesus. There are several Early Church accounts which cite the presence of Salome as the attending midwife. Two accounts cite her as doubting Mary's virginity and examining her to confirm it. In all accounts, she becomes a believer and a competent witness of the Virgin Birth.

In the Gospels, Salome appears in only two instances: the Crucifixion and the Resurrection, both very important scenes, and both indicative of a very long and close relationship with the Savior's family (Mark 15:40 and 16:1).

Early Church accounts explain the details of the relationship further. Convinced of their sacred calling, Salome joined the Holy Family after Christ's birth, fled with them to Egypt, and then followed them to Nazareth.

Of her piety and faithfulness, Demetrius of Antioch says,

*This woman Salome was the first who recognized the Christ, and who worshipped Him, and believed on Him when He came upon the earth; and she did not return to her own house until the day of her death. Whithersoever Christ went to preach, with His mother the Virgin, there she followed Him with His disciples until the day when they crucified Him and [the day of] His holy resurrection. She saw them all, with His mother the Virgin.*

Salome, herself, had a handmaid: a *doulos* named Sarah. Together, they joined Joseph's household as Mary's handmaidens and mentors. Being a young girl, Mary was not equipped to face the responsibilities of managing the household of Joseph, which was large. The aging Joseph was, as I said, the titular head of the House of David in his day. He was a man of means and great responsibilities. Some writers claim the word for "carpenter," in the original languages, means more than a furniture carpenter, but a master craftsman. (Joseph appears to have been a very successful artisan, producing exquisite architectural effects for homes, and may have been a builder. This makes sense, because the House of David was privy to the secrets of building, ever since the days of Solomon's Temple.)

He was also widower, and some say a bigamist. Anastasius of Antioch cites the lost writings of Epiphanius to claim that Salome was Joseph's wife. In which case, he would have been married to both Mary and Salome at the same time, although the argument can be made - especially by Catholics and Orthodox - that his marriage to Mary was symbolic only.

Distilling from the early records, we find five sons identified with Joseph: James, Simon, Jude, Joseph, and Jesus. There were also five daughters: Lysia, Lydia, Salome, Mary, and Anna. Jerome tells us that Escha was Joseph's first wife (the daughter of Haggi, brother of Zachariah, father of John the Baptist) and bore the four brothers and two daughters, most of who would have been grown by the time of our Lord's birth.

Simeon, however, was the son of Clopas, the younger brother of Joseph who assumed the levirate position, as I said, after Joseph's death. In which case, Simeon would not have been Escha's son and also would have been younger than Jesus. He would have had to have been the son of either Mary or Salome. Or, perhaps, he was the son of Mary, Jesus' sister. Anastasius tells us that Mary, the sister of Jesus, married Clopas, her uncle (an accepted custom in ancient Israel) which clarifies the confusion of John 19:25, which identifies her as Mary's sister (sister-in-law). It is almost certain this Mary was the daughter of Salome and named after the beloved Holy Virgin.

This leaves the daughters, Anna and Salome, to be identified. These two were most likely Mary's daughters: Salome after her namesake, and Anna, named after Mary's mother. This a reasonable deduction from the records, but not explicitly stated (Salome could have been the mother of these girls).

Some commentators make Salome the mother of James and John and the wife of Zebedee (Matthew 27:56). That would not be possible, unless we want to believe that she was divorced or widowed. Jesus called James and John, "the sons of thunder." Perhaps, Zebedee was a man with a temper, in which case, Salome simply may have left him. Being a midwife, she may have been away from home too much anyway, a fact which strains marriages for many midwives, even today.

In any case, Salome was intimately associated with the beginnings of Christianity, was present at the founding of the Church in Acts 2, appears to have been a mother of some of the Desposyni, and was a figurehead, as I will show, in the Esoteric Church.

### **SALOME & THE ESOTERIC TRADITION**

Some esoteric sayings of Jesus, cited by the Fathers of the Early Church, support the view of Salome's profound influence behind the scenes, and are cited here:

- Clement, Bishop of Rome and companion of both Peter and Paul, relates this account in the closing of his second epistle:

*For the Lord himself asked by a certain person, When his kingdom should come? answered, "When two shall be one, and that which is without as that which is within; and the male with the female, neither male nor female. "*

- 2 Clement 5:1

- Clement of Alexandria, a 2nd Century leader and teacher of the esoteric doctrines, expands on this same story, credits Salome with having asked the question and then cites other references:



*When Salome asked when she would know the answer to her question the Lord replied, "When you trample underfoot the integument of shame, and when the two become one and the male is one with the female, and there is no more male and female."*

*- Stromateis Book III, 92(2)*

*When Salome asked, "How long will death maintain its power?" the Lord said, "As long as you women bear children." He is not speaking of life as evil and the creation as rotten. He is giving instruction about the normal course of nature. Death is always following on the heels of birth.*

*- Stromateis Book III, 45(3)*

*The Savior himself said, "I am come to undo the works of the female", by female meaning lust, and by the works meaning birth and decay.*

*- Miscellanies 3:63<sup>106</sup>*

- Gospel of Thomas:

*Jesus said, "Two will recline on a couch; one will die, one will live".*

*Salome said, "Who are you, mister? You have climbed onto my couch and eaten from my table as if you are from someone".*

*Jesus said to her, "I am the one who comes from what is whole. I was granted from the things of my Father. "*

*[She said] "I am your disciple."*

*[Jesus said] "For this reason I say, if one is [whole], one will be filled with light, but if one is divided, one will be filled with darkness."*

*Jesus said, "I disclose my mysteries to those who are worthy of [my] mysteries. Do not let your left hand know what your right hand is doing. "*

- *The Book of the Resurrection of Christ:* Lists among the women who went to Jesus' tomb "Mary Magdalene, Mary the mother of James whom Jesus delivered out of the hand of Satan, Salome who tempted him, Mary who ministered to him and Martha her sister."
- *The Pistis Sophia,* a proto-Gnostic document exalts Mary Magdalene and Salome as the primary interlocutors.

---

<sup>106</sup>For the authenticating of these sayings and an explanation of their meaning, see *The Mother Heart of God*, by this author

- The Carpocratians, a scandalous yet influential Gnostic sect, appealed to Salome's authority to justify their naturalistic account of Jesus' birth and their view of sexuality, namely, that wives should be held in common.

Consider that Salome's questions were concerned with issues which are of natural importance to midwives: relational issues between the sexes, sexuality, women's health, pregnancy, childbirth, and the importance of these things in the plan of God. However garbled our meager accounts may be, from both orthodox and heretical sources, she fits clearly the profile of the Christian midwife.

Whether she had a great influence in the Early Church is a little more complicated question. That she had stature in the Early Church can be supported by the fact that she was cited as an authoritative source by heretical groups early in the 2nd Century. Meaning this: if Salome was not of sufficient importance in the Early Church, why would any group bother to use her to support their cause? Orthodox leaders were compelled to respond, meaning Salome was an important figure; otherwise these groups could have been safely ignored.

The first stage of the Orthodox polemic against the heretics was a public denial of any esoteric tradition or Esoteric Church. The Gnostic sects which claimed such a tradition as their own were perverting the truth and bringing disrepute to the Christian faith. It was necessary to deny its existence, because if the Orthodox apologists tried to correct the errors of the heretics by appealing to the esoteric tradition themselves, it would have exposed it to public scrutiny. Basically, the Esoteric Church consisted of the families related to Jesus who were of royal and priestly descent, which included Salome's children. These people had a different calling and mission in the world than did the usual ministers of the Church. They were God's shadow government. To have admitted their existence, when so many deadly adversaries lurked in the shadows, it would have shamefully risked the lives of its members. Midwives were important to this Esoteric Church; they served as witnesses and guardians of that sacred lineage.

The Orthodox polemic continued with a defense of Salome's orthodoxy and virtue. The Carpocratians invented the story that Salome disputed the Virgin Birth. The Orthodox responded by citing the strong Coptic tradition that she *did* believe in the Virgin Birth. Why would she have followed the Lord, if she knew that He was just an ordinary man?

The association of Salome's name with a lurid sensuality was another Carpocratian invention. Confusing her with Herod's Salome and the Dance of the Seven Veils, she was used as a figurehead to promote Gnostic paganism. The Church Fathers did not successfully respond to this movement. They overreacted in the opposite direction, in the direction of de-sanctifying the status of sexuality.

That led to the final stage which reflected the apostasy within the Church itself. It began to believe its own cover-up. The role of women in the Church became a central issue of controversy toward the end of the 2nd Century, as was sexuality. The emphasis was shifting away from the *family* of Christ to the *institution* of the Church, patterned after the structural model of the Roman Empire. Women and childbearing did not have a place in this structure. They were considered base and unclean. So, to conceal the fact that Christianity itself was

changing, the role of these Holy Women in Christ's ministry and their witness had to be marginalized.

### **SALOME & THE CELTIC CHURCH**

The legends surrounding Salome continued in the Celtic Church of Gaul, Spain and the British Isles. She is believed to have been with the band of refugees which set sail with Joseph of Arimathea for the southern coast of France. Jewish and Christian colonies were found in that region which provided sanctuary. It appears that the Holy Women - such as Martha, Salome, and Mary Magdalene - settled in these areas. The traditions surrounding their ministries are strong and survive to this day.<sup>107</sup> Others sailed up the Rhine to Lyons (a future bastion of Celtic Christianity) and on to Britain. The story of these legends, with their supporting documents, can be found in books made available by the Cambrian Episcopal Church.

Celtic Christianity flourished during the first millennium of the Christian era. It was family oriented, anti-imperial, and non-institutional. The role of women in spiritual ministry was recognized in the Celtic Church, and was constantly an annoyance to the Latin clerics. The Celtic Church also nurtured the Esoteric Church and raised up champions for its cause when the Roman juggernaut turned westward.

Salome may be lost to the annals of history, but her influence lives on. The traditional Church has not honored her with a Feast Day, but one has been designated for her by the Cambrian Episcopal Church. It is July 15th and shares the month with Mary Magdalene.

### **CONCLUSION**

In the book of Revelation we find the Esoteric Doctrine taught in figures. In chapter 12, as we related above, the Woman clothed with the Sun is giving birth. There is powerful symbolism here. Most commentators recognize this scene as one pertaining to Jesus Christ, who is "caught up to the Throne of God." The Woman wears a crown of Twelve Stars: Virgo, the Virgin. This is a clear reference to Mary, the mother of Jesus. In this instance, the Sun would be Joseph, who represents the heavenly Father, because he was the Davidic heir and representative of the royal line which Jesus would sanctify. The Moon was at the Virgin's "feet", the Hebrew euphemism for genitals. The Moon is clearly Salome, the personification of the Holy Spirit and the midwife guarding the Christ-child from the Dragon. The Dragon is the symbol of satanically inspired government. The Messianic government competes with this government. The Dragon seeks to destroy the Woman and her Seed and makes war with those that remain on Earth. The Earth helps the Woman and swallows the Dragon's flood.

**The Dragon is threatened by the reproductive powers of the Messianic line.** Within this context, these holy women - the Messianic Bride and her Midwife - are Satan's greatest adversaries. They are the origin and guardians of the competing reservoir of Rulers which will grow, slowly, but relentlessly, until his evil Empire is no more.

---

<sup>107</sup> *The Coming of the Saints*, John W. Taylor, 1906 (Covenant Publishing, 1969)



## APPENDIX C

### **Entire Ruling of the Kansas Supreme Court re: midwifery**

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF KANSAS

No. 73,851

THE STATE BOARD OF NURSING and STATE OF KANSAS ex rel. STATE BOARD OF HEALING ARTS,

Appellants,

v.

E. MICHELLE RUEBKE,

Appellee.

#### SYLLABUS BY THE COURT

1. Where the trial court denies a temporary injunction based on a finding that a statutory act authorizing the injunction is unconstitutional, the proper scope of review is first to determine, as a matter of law, with unlimited review, whether the trial court erred in holding the act unconstitutional.
2. The constitutionality of a statute, the violation of which is a criminal offense, should ordinarily be determined by the standards applied to criminal statutes generally, even though considered in the context of a civil suit.
3. A statutory act which provides for both criminal penalties and license revocation should be interpreted by reference to sound public policy.
4. A common-sense determination of fairness is the standard for vagueness to be used in the context of an injunction action in which provisions of the Kansas Healing Arts Act and Kansas Nursing Act are challenged. That is, can an ordinary person exercising common sense understand and comply with the Act? If so, it is constitutional.
5. A statute will not be declared unconstitutionally void for vagueness and uncertainty where it employs words commonly used, previously judicially defined, or having a settled meaning in law.
6. In their ordinary usage, the terms in K.S.A. 65-2802(a) used to define the healing arts clearly

and unequivocally focus exclusively on pathologies and abnormal human conditions. Pregnancy and childbirth are neither pathologies nor abnormalities.

7. The specific terms in the statutory definition of the healing arts do not include the normal delivery of children and are not unconstitutionally vague.

8. The term "the practice of medicine and Surgery," which is included in the statutory definition of the healing arts, is not unconstitutionally vague because it has an established legal meaning in this state--a meaning which does not include a midwife's aiding in childbirth.

9. There is no indication contemporaneous with the enactment of the healing arts regulatory scheme that unlicensed midwifery was being illegalized.

10. Even if traditional and time-honored techniques employed by midwives fit within a technical definition of the practice of medicine or surgery, if the legislature did not intend to regulate the historically separate practice of midwifery, then it should not be considered the practice of medicine or surgery for the purposes of the Kansas Healing Arts Act.

11. This court recognizes a strong preference, where consistent with legislative intent, for interpreting certain subjects as outside a statute's scope, rather than declaring the statute unconstitutional.

12. A statute must be interpreted in the context in which it was enacted and in light of the legislature's intent at that time.

13. An activity is not incident to the practice of medicine merely because it is engaged in by some members of the medical profession. One thing is incident to another only if it naturally and inseparably depends upon, appertains to, or follows another that is more worthy.

14. The practice of midwifery is Separate and distinct from the practice of medicine. The practice of midwifery is not incident to the practice of medicine or surgery so that it becomes part of the healing arts by the application of K.S.A. 65-2869.

15. Midwifery itself is not the practice of the healing arts. Under the facts of this case, we hold that those activities beyond midwifery in which defendant midwife might have engaged were excepted from the Kansas Healing Arts Act by virtue of the supervision provided by a licensed physician.

16. Nursing deals with "persons who are experiencing changes in the normal health process." K.S.A. 65-1113(d)(1). As these words are commonly understood, pregnancy and childbirth do not constitute changes in the normal health process, but the continuation of it.

17. Assistance in childbirth rendered by one whose practical experience with birthing provides comfort to the mother is not nursing under the Kansas Nursing Act, such that licensure is required.

Appeal from Butler district court; CHARLES M. HART, judge. Opinion filed March 15, 1996. Affirmed in part and reversed in part.

Mark S. Braun, assistant attorney general, argued the cause and was on the brief for appellant State Board of Nursing.

Mark W. Stafford, special assistant attorney general, argued the cause and was on the briefs for

appellant State Board of Healing Arts.

Kathryn Gardner, of Martin, Pringle, Oliver, Wallace & Swartz, L.L.P., of Wichita, argued the cause and was on the brief for appellee.

The opinion of the court was delivered by

LARSON, J.: The State Board of Healing Arts (Healing Arts) and the State Board of Nursing (Nursing) appeal the trial court's denial of a temporary injunction by which the Boards had sought to stop E. Michelle Ruebke, a practicing lay midwife, from continuing her alleged practice of medicine and nursing.

The trial court found that (1) certain provisions of both the Kansas Healing Arts Act, K.S.A. 65-2801 et seq., and the Kansas Nursing Act, K.S.A. 65-1113 et seq., were unconstitutionally vague; (2) Ruebke's practices incident to her lay midwifery were not within the scope of either act; and (3) even if the acts were held to be constitutional and Ruebke fell within their practice definitions, she was exempted from coverage under both acts because of certain exceptions.

We have jurisdiction pursuant to K.S.A. 60-2101(b).

#### Factual Background

The Boards' petition alleged Ruebke held herself out as a certified midwife; had been offering prenatal, labor, and delivery services to pregnant women in Kansas; and had been functioning as a registered professional nurse and/or a practitioner of the healing arts.

The petition set out details relating to three pregnancies: the Butterfields, where the petition alleged that twins had died and Ruebke had refused to permit the mother to be taken to the hospital (evidence showed it was Ruebke who had called the ambulance and that one of the twins had died); the Strubels, where it was alleged (although the evidence failed to establish) that Ruebke, who was assisting Kathy Brace, identified herself as a state and nationally certified midwife; and the Ingrams where Ruebke assisted in a delivery directed by a nurse and complications developed, requiring the delivery to be performed in a local hospital.

Based on the allegations of the petition, the trial court issued a temporary restraining order pending a hearing on a temporary injunction.

The hearing on the temporary injunction revealed that Ruebke acts as a lay midwife comprehensively assisting pregnant women with prenatal care, delivery, and post-partum care. She is president of the Kansas Midwives Association and follows its promulgated standards, which include a risk screening assessment based upon family medical history; establishing prenatal care plans, including monthly visitations; examinations and assistance in birth; and post-partum care. She works with supervising physicians who are made aware of her mode of practice and who are available for consultation and perform many of the medical tests incident to pregnancy.

Ruebke does not advertise her services but is available to members of her church, friends, and Christians who hear about her by word of mouth. She delivers babies throughout the state and has supervising physicians in many different regions.

Ruebke does not charge for her services and considers them to be a ministry. Some families have given her money, others goods, and many have given her nothing.

Ruebke testified she had received a copy of and follows the consent decree dated November 15, 1984, from the District Court of Finney County, Kansas, in State ex rel. Board of Healing Arts v. Hitchcock, No. 84 C 238, which contained the following orders;

"1. Defendant shall be permitted to engage in the practice of midwifery in the State of Kansas, and such practice shall not be considered the practice 'of healing arts or the practice of medicine and surgery, so long as she utilizes a licensed physician in the vicinity who has agreed to be available in case of complications and to be available for consultation and examination, and so long as' she will provide such physician with her 'prenatal records of the patient in the event the physician so requests prior to delivery.

"2. The plaintiff Board of Healing Arts shall, prior to December 1, 1984, notify the Kansas Medical Society and Kansas Association of Osteopathic Medicine of the contents of this order, and further shall notify all doctors of medicine and all doctors of osteopathy licensed by it of the contents of this order no later than July 15, 1985, all such notices to be in writing."

Ruebke testified she fully complies with all the requirements of the vital statistics laws of the State of Kansas and registers all births as the state requires.

Dr. Debra L. Messamore, an obstetrician/gynecologist, testified she had reviewed the Kansas Midwives Association standards of care and opined those standards were similar to the assessments incident to her practice as an OB/GYN. Dr. Messamore concluded that in her judgment the prenatal assessments made by Ruebke were obstetrical diagnoses.

Dr. Messamore testified that the prescriptions Ruebke has women obtain from their physicians are used in obstetrics to produce uterine contractions. She further testified the Kansas Midwives Association standard of care relating to post-delivery conditions of the mother and baby involved obstetrical judgments. She reviewed the birth records of the Butterfield birth and testified that obstetrical or medical judgments were reflected. Although admitting that many procedures at issue could be performed by a nurse rather than a physician, she opined,

"Obstetrics includes taking care of the normal process and making sure that it's as normal as possible for the mother and the baby, but also checking to make sure if there's any complications that develop and then treating those complications as they arise, or trying to prevent them if the mother has certain risk factors."

She also stated her opinion that, so defined, obstetrics is a branch of medicine or surgery.

Ginger Breedlove, a Kansas certified advanced registered nurse practitioner and nurse-midwife, testified on behalf of Nursing. She reviewed the Butterfield and Struble records and testified nursing functions were involved. She admitted she could not tell from the records who had engaged in certain practices and that taking notes, giving enemas, and administering oxygen is often done by people who are not nurses, although education, experience, and minimum competency are required.

After the hearing, the trial court adopted, with two minor exceptions, the proposed findings of fact and conclusions of law submitted by Ruebke's counsel. The court held that provisions of both acts were unconstitutionally vague, Ruebke's midwifery practices did not and were not intended to come within the healing arts act or the nursing act, and her activities fell within exceptions to the two acts even if the acts did apply and were constitutional.

The factual findings, highly summarized, were that Ruebke had not been shown to hold herself out as anything other than a lay midwife; has routinely used and consulted with supervising



physicians; was not shown to administer any prescription drugs; was not shown to do any suturing or episiotomies, make cervical or vaginal lacerations, or diagnose blood type; and had engaged only in activities routinely and properly done by people who are not physicians.

#### Regulatory history of midwifery

One of the specific statutory provisions we deal with, K.S.A. 65-2802(a), defines the healing arts as follows:

"The healing arts include any system, treatment, operation, diagnosis, prescription, or practice for the ascertainment, cure, relief, palliation, adjustment, or correction of any human disease, ailment, deformity, or injury, and includes specifically but not by way of limitation the practice of medicine and surgery; the practice of osteopathic medicine and surgery; and the practice of chiropractic."

K.S.A. 65-2869 specifically provides that for the purpose of the healing arts act, the following persons shall be deemed to be engaged in the practice of medicine and surgery:

"(a) Persons who publicly profess to be physicians or surgeons, or publicly profess to assume the duties incident to the practice of medicine or surgery or any of their branches. "(b) Persons who prescribe, recommend or furnish medicine or drugs, or perform any surgical operation of whatever nature by the use of any surgical instrument, procedure, equipment or mechanical device for the diagnosis, cure or relief of any wounds, fractures, bodily injury, infirmity, disease, physical or mental illness or psychological disorder, of human beings."

With the two applicable healing arts statutes above set forth in mind, it will be helpful in establishing the basis for our decision to relate a brief history of the regulation of midwifery and the healing arts, first generally, then more specifically the particular history in Kansas.

In describing the history of lay midwifery, a law review comment, *Choice in Childbirth: Parents, Lay Midwives, and Statutory Regulation*, 30 St. Louis U.L.J. 985, 989-90 (1986), recounts that midwifery belonged to women from Biblical times through the Middle Ages. However, subsequent to the Middle Ages, women healers were often barred from universities and precluded from obtaining medical training or degrees. With the rise of barber-surgeon guilds, women were banned from using surgical instruments.

When midwives emigrated to America, they occupied positions of great prestige. Some communities licensed midwives and others did not. This continued until the end of the 19th century. In the 19th and 20th centuries, medical practice became more standardized. Economically and socially well-placed doctors pressed for more restrictive licensing laws and for penalties against those who violated them. The law review comment suggests that

licensure was a market control device; midwives were depriving new obstetricians of the opportunity for training, and elimination of midwifery would allow the science of obstetrics to grow into a mature medical specialty.

There is a notable absence of anything in the history of Kansas healing arts regulation illustrating any attempt to specifically target midwives. In 1870, the Kansas Legislature adopted its first restriction on the practice of medicine, captioned:

"CONCERNING EMPYRICISM.

"A BILL to protect the people of Kansas from empyricism, and to elevate the standing of the

medical profession."

It provided;

"Section 1. That it shall be unlawful for any person within the limit of the state of Kansas, who has not attended two full courses of instruction and graduated in some respectable school of medicine, either of the United States or of some foreign country, or who cannot produce a certificate of qualification from some state or county medical society, and is not a person of good moral character, to practice medicine in any of its departments for reward or compensation, for any sick person in the state of Kansas." L. 1870, ch. 68, =A7 1.

This legislation sought to protect the public by seeking to restrict the practice of medicine to those with formal credentials. It should not be viewed as having been intended to apply to midwives, for two reasons. First, by its express language the statute applies only to those who practiced on "sick" people. We later defined "sick" within a statutory regulation of the practice of medicine to mean ailments or infirmities of the body and mind, affected with disease, ill, indisposed, not in health, and disordered. *State v Douglas*, 124 Kan. 482, 484, 260 Pac. 655 (1927). Second, there can be little doubt that in 1870 Kansas, particularly in rural areas, there were not enough educated physicians available to deliver all of the children born in the state. In fact, until 1910 approximately 50 percent of births in this country were midwife assisted. 30 St. Louis U.L.J. at 988.

In 1901, the 1870 law was repealed and replaced by the immediate precursor to our current healing arts act. G.S. 1901, =A7 6674 defined the practice of medicine and surgery regulated by the act as follows:

"Any person shall be regarded as practicing medicine and surgery within the meaning of this act who 'shall prescribe, or who shall recommend for a fee, for like use, any drug or medicine, or perform any surgical operation of whatever nature for the cure or relief of any wounds, fracture, or bodily injury, infirmity or disease of another person' or who shall use the words or letters 'Dr.,' 'doctor,' 'M.D.,' or any other title in connection with his name which in any way represents him as engaged in the practice of medicine and surgery. . . [N]othing in this act shall . . . apply to the administration of domestic medicines, nor to prohibit gratuitous services."

This statute's focus on "wounds, fracture, or bodily injury, infirmity or disease" is inconsistent with an intent to include the natural delivery of children. In addition, midwifery continued its prevalence at this time, and childbirth had not yet become the dominant province of physicians.

Although obstetricians held themselves out as a medical specialty in United States as early as 1868, midwives were not seen as engaged in the practice of obstetrics, nor was obstetrics universally viewed as being a branch of medicine. In 1901, North Carolina recognized obstetricians as engaged in the practice of medicine but women midwives, as a separate discipline, were exempted from the licensure act. *State v. Welch*, 129 N.C. 579, 40 S.E. 120 (1901). In a 1911 Kansas case addressing whether chiropractic was the practice of medicine, we noted in passing that in a strict sense obstetrics is not the practice of medicine;

"Medicine is defined as 'the science and art of dealing with the prevention, cure, or alleviation of disease; in a narrower sense, that part of the science and art' of restoring and preserving 'health which is the province of the physician as distinguished from the surgeon and obstetrician.' (Webster's New Inter. Dict.)." *State v. Johnson*, 84 Kan. 411, 417, 114 Pac. 390 (1911).

Although many states in the early 1900's passed laws relating to midwifery, Kansas has never expressly addressed the legality of the practice. In 1915, in *Yard v Gibbons*, 95 Kan. 802, 808-09, 149 Pac. 422 (1915), this court implied that a woman with considerable midwife experience was qualified to testify as an expert witness in a malpractice case against an osteopath for allegedly negligently delivering the plaintiff's child.

In the early 1900's, Kansas passed legislation requiring registrations of births, which required the attending physician or midwife to file a certificate of birth with the local registrar. G.S 1915, =A7 10162. As part of that act, physicians and midwives were to register their names. G.S. 1915, =A7 10163. Ruebke argues the purpose of this act was to regulate physicians and midwives and that its repeal in 1951 shows the legislature's intent to no longer regulate lay midwives. This is a misreading of the history of this enactment. Physicians were already regulated when this act was passed, and its purpose was not to regulate any profession, but to implement a system to keep track of vital statistics. When repealed in 1951, it was replaced by a another scheme to collect birth information, where midwives and physicians were still required to file a birth certificates, but were not required to register. L. 1951, ch. 355, =A7 9.

The popularity of midwifery declined significantly during the first third of the 20th Century. By 1930, births attended by nonphysicians had declined to 15 percent of all births. 30 St. Louis U.L.J. at 993. This trend continued, and by 1975 the percentage of births attended by midwives had dropped to less than 1 percent. Note, *Regulation of Midwives as Home Birth Attendants*, 30 B.C.L.Rev. 477, 484 (1989).

In 1957, the independent regulation of doctors of medicine and surgeons, osteopaths, and chiropractors was replaced with the current healing arts act, L. 1957, ch. 343. This act adopted the current definition of the practice of medicine that was previously set forth. L. 1957, ch. 343, =A7 2. Provisions similar to the current ones deemed certain persons to be engaging in the practice of the healing arts or the practice of medicine and surgery. L. 1957, ch. 343, =A7=A7 67, 68, 69.

The 1978 Kansas Legislature created a new classification of nurses, Advanced Registered Nurse Practitioner (ARNP). L. 1978, ch. 240, =A7 1. One classification of ARNP is certified nurse midwives. Although the regulations permitting the practice of certified nurse midwives might be argued to show additional legislative intent to prohibit the practice of lay midwives, this argument has been rejected elsewhere. See *Leigh v. Board of Registration in Nursing*, 395 Mass. 670, 679-81, 481 N.E.2d 1347 (1985).

In 1978, Kansas Attorney General opinion No. 78-164 suggested that the practice of midwifery is a violation of the healing arts act, although it relied on a questionable interpretation of the Massachusetts law which was specifically disavowed in the Leigh case referred to above. Although potentially persuasive, such a opinion is not binding on us. *State v. Scherzr* 254 Kan. 926, 932, 869 P.2d 729 (1994).

Most probably in response to the 1978 Attorney General opinion, a 1978 legislative interim committee undertook a study of a proposal to recognize and regulate the practice of lay midwifery. However, the committee reached no conclusion, noting that at the time 32 states or territories recognized the practice of midwifery through either legislation or regulations.

In 1984, the Board of Healing Arts brought an action against Lynda J. Hitchcock, a practicing lay midwife in Finney County, which resulted in a consent decree. Ruebke testified she has carefully followed the provisions of the consent decree.

A 1986 review of the laws of every state found that lay midwifery was specifically statutorily permitted, subject to licensing or regulation, in 25 jurisdictions. Twelve states, including Kansas, had no legislation governing or prohibiting lay midwifery directly or by direct implication. Several states recognized both lay and nurse midwives. Some issued new licensing only for nurse midwives, while others regulated and recognized both, often as separate professions, subject to separate standards and restrictions. Note, *Midwifery in America: The Need for Uniform and Modernized State Law*, 20 *Suffolk U.L. Rev.* 1117, 1125, 1127-29 (1986).

In the 1991 debate on H.B. 2127, which increased the penalties for those practicing medicine or surgery without a license, testimony regarding home births with lay midwives appeared to assume that lay midwives were engaged in the unlicensed practice of the healing arts. However, Richard Gannon, representing the Board of Healing Arts, "noted that midwifery services can be performed within the current law if done so under the supervision of a physician." Minutes of House Committee on Public Health and Welfare, March 18, 1991. Larry Buening, general counsel for the Board of Healing Arts, contended that midwifery is the practice of the healing arts but not a branch thereof.

In voting against H.B. 2127, Representative Stevi Stephens expressed her understanding that it would apply to midwives "who INVADE the practice of the healing arts." House J. 1992, p. 546. In the Senate Committee on Public Health and Welfare, Senator Doug Walker placed on the record his view that the bill "would not adversely impact the practice of midwifery, and any consequence it would have on that effect would be contrary to the intent and understanding of that legislation." Minutes of the Senate Committee on Public Health and Welfare, March 17, 1992. While this legislative history is of interest, it is questionable whether it evidences legislative intent or merely expresses different legislators' personal viewpoints. See *In re Heller*, 160 *Bankr.* 655, 659 (D. Kan. 1993).

In April 1993, the Board of Healing Arts released Policy Statement No. 93-02, in which the Board stated it reaffirmed its previous position of August 18, 1984, that

"(m)idwifery is the practice of medicine and surgery and any practice thereof by individuals not regulated by the Kansas State Board of Nursing or under the supervision of or by order of or referral from a licensed medical or osteopathic doctor constitutes the unlicensed practice of medicine and surgery."

In the recent case of *State v. Mountjoy*, 257 *Kan.* 163, 891 *P.2d* 376 (1995), we reviewed a criminal prosecution of midwives for practicing the healing arts without a license. The jury had returned verdicts of not guilty, and the State appealed on a question reserved: whether the trial court erred in instructing the jury criminal intent was a required element of the crime of practicing the healing arts without a license. The defendants in *Mountjoy* argued that the healing arts act provided insufficient notice that midwifery is illegal and that it was therefore unconstitutionally vague. We held the practice of the healing arts without a license is a strict liability crime not requiring criminal intent and refused to consider the defendants' constitutionality issue for lack of statutory authority to do so. 257 *Kan.* at 167.

This historical background brings us to the question of whether the healing arts act is unconstitutionally vague and if Ruebke's midwifery practices, as a matter of law, come within the act's scope. In making this determination, we first consider the parties' diametrically opposed views as to our scope of review on appeal.

## Scope of Review

The parties' contentions regarding our scope of review present a quandary. First, because portions of the healing arts act and the nursing act were declared unconstitutionally vague, the Boards suggest that as a legal determination, the question of the constitutionality of the acts is entitled to unlimited review with no deference due the trial court. See *Gillespie v Seymour*, 250 Kan. 123, 129, 823 P.2d 782 (1991). Ruebke argues that our consideration of this question can rise no higher than our scope of review of the trial court's ultimate decision not to permit a temporary injunction, which is subject to review only for an abuse of discretion. See *U.S.D. No. 503 v. McKinney*, 236 Kan. 224, 226-27, 689 P.2d 860 (1984); *Wichita Wire, Inc. v. Lennox*, 11 Kan. App. 2d 459, 462, 726 P.2d 287 (1986).

We decline to adopt Ruebke's proposed scope of review. In cases in which a trial court's decision regarding an injunction is based on disputed facts, although we look to whether the trial court abused its discretion, in doing so we will look at whether the factual basis for its decision is supported by sufficient evidence. See *State, ex rel., v. Reed*, 190 Kan. 376, 381, 375 P.2d 588 (1962). Similarly, where we review a mixed law-fact question, we apply the substantial competent evidence test to the factual findings, and determine by unlimited review whether those findings support the legal conclusions. See *Tucker v. Hugoton Energy Corp.*, 253 Kan. 373, 377-78, 855 P.2d 929 (1993). By analogy, the proper scope of review here is to determine, as a matter of law, with unlimited review, whether the trial court erred in holding the act unconstitutionally vague and, if it did not, whether it abused its discretion in denying the temporary injunction.

The parties have an additional dispute regarding the stringency of our review. Ruebke contends that because the healing arts act makes the unlicensed practice of medicine a strict liability crime, our review should be exacting and the act must be strictly scrutinized. Healing Arts does not dispute that rule, but argues that the rule applies only if it were pursuing a criminal charge. Because Healing Arts is asking for an injunction, it argues we should give the act a liberal construction to achieve the public safety purposes of regulating the unlicensed practice of medicine.

We have held that the constitutionality of a statute, the violation of which is a criminal offense, should be determined by the standards applied to criminal statutes generally, even though considered in the context of a civil suit. *State, ex rel., v. Fairmont Foods Co.*, 196 Kan. 73, 77, 410 P.2d 308 (1966); see *State, ex rel v. Fleming Co.*, 184 Kan. 674, 339 P.2d 12 (1959). In *Boatright v. Kansas Racing Comm'n*, 251 Kan. 240, Syl. =B6 4, 834 P.2d 368 (1992), we held: "If a statute could subject a person to both criminal and administrative actions, the criminal standard for determining vagueness applies."

Under the standard applied in criminal cases, a statute "is vague and violates due process if it prohibits conduct in terms so vague that a person of common intelligence cannot understand what conduct is prohibited, and it fails to adequately guard against arbitrary and discriminatory enforcement." *State v. Adams*, 254 Kan. 436, Syl. =B6 1, 866 P.2d 1017 (1994). A statute which requires specific intent is more likely to withstand a vagueness challenge than one, like that here, which imposes strict liability. See *City of Wichita v. Lucero*, 255 Kan. 437, 451, 874 P.2d 1144 (1994).

Even where the rule of strict construction applies, it means only that ordinary words are given their ordinary meaning and that the statute should not be read to include more or less than that readily found within it. See *State v. Finley*, 199 Kan. 615, 617, 433 P.2d 414 (1967). Under strict

construction of a criminal statute, any reasonable doubt as to its meaning is to be decided in favor of the accused. *State v. Donlay*, 253 Kan. 132, Syl. =B6 3, 853 P.2d 680 (1993).

We recognized in *Chambers v. Herrick*, 172 Kan. 510, 516-17, 241 P.2d 748 (1952), that an act which provides for both criminal penalties and license revocation should be interpreted by reference to "sound public policy" when the case did not involve criminal prosecution. Our case arises as an injunction action, and a common-sense determination of fairness is the standard to be utilized. That is, "can an ordinary person exercising common sense understand and comply with the statute? If so, the statute is constitutional." *Boatright v. Kansas Racing Conim'n*, 251 Kan. 240, Syl. =B6 3. In the Indiana case of *Smith v. State ex rel. Medical Licensing Bd.*, 459 N.E.2d 401, 406 n.4 (Ind. App. 1984), a similar approach was adopted where it was held the primary purpose of the Indiana Medical Practice Act was for the protection of the public.

In construing the acts in question, we must consider both their vagueness and the intertwined question of whether they apply to Ruebke's actions as a midwife. This is not a case where the acts are so clear and unambiguous in expressing legislative intent that there is no room for statutory construction. See *State ex rel. Stephan v. Board of Seward County Comm'rs*, 254 Kan. 446, 448, 866 P.2d 1024 (1994). However, in construing statutes, "[s]tatutory words are presumed to have been and should be treated as consciously chosen and, with understanding of the ordinary and common meaning, intentionally used with the legislature having meant what it said." *State Dept. of SRS v. Public Employee Relations Board*, 249 Kan. 163, 168, 815 P.2d 66 (1991). But, if the wording has a commonly understood technical meaning in the context it is employed, it should be construed according to such meaning rather than conflicting nontechnical ordinary meanings. See *Flour Mills of America v. Burrus Mills*, 174 Kan. 709, 716-17, 258 P.2d 341(1953).

We have held that the interpretation of a statute given by an administrative agency within its area of expertise is entitled to deference, although final construction of a statute always rests with courts. See *In re Tax Appeal of Harbour Brothers Constr. Co.*, 256 Kan. 216, 221, 883 P.2d 1194 (1994). However, under the facts of this case, we owe no deference to the construction expressed by Healing Arts as to the legal question of the scope of its own

jurisdiction. See *Kansas Power & Light Co. v. Kansas Corporation Comm'n*, 237 Kan. 394, Syl. =B6 1, 699 P.2d 53 (1985).

We do, of course, attempt wherever possible to construe a statute as constitutional, as *U.S.D. No. 503 v. McKinney*, 236 Kan. 224, 230, 689 P.2d 860 (1984), teaches us:

"Long-standing and well-established rules are that the constitutionality of a statute is presumed, that all doubts must be resolved in favor of its validity, and before the statute may be stricken down, it must clearly appear the statute violates the Constitution. Moreover, it is the duty of the court to uphold the statute under attack, whenever possible, rather than defeat it, and if there is any reasonable way to construe the statute as constitutionally sound, that should be done."

If legislative intent can be determined, we should construe the statute consistent with that intent. See *State ex rel. Stephan v. Board of Seward County Comm'rs*, 254 Kan. 446, 448, 866 P.2d 1024 (1994). To ascertain and give effect to legislative intent where police power is to be exercised, we must fairly read the entire context of the legislation on the subject, rather than only an isolated section, and consider the object of that legislation and the evils or mischief sought to be prevented or remedied. *Kansas State Board of Healing Arts v. Foote*, 200 Kan. 447, 452, 436 P.2d 828 (1968). We are mindful that Commissioner Harman, in *Foote*, stated that the "whole

purpose and tenor of the healing arts act is the protection of the public against unprofessional, improper, unauthorized, and unqualified practice of the healing arts" and "to secure to the people the services of competent, trustworthy practitioners." 220 Kan. at 453.

Throughout its history, the healing arts regulatory scheme has been unsuccessfully challenged on a variety of constitutional grounds. See *Vakas v. Kansas Board of Healing Arts*, 248 Kan. 589, 808 P.2d 1355 (1991); *Kansas State Board of Healing Arts v. Acker*, 228 Kan. 145, 612 P.2d 610 (1980); *Sutherland v. Ferguson*, 194 Kan. 35, 397 P.2d 335 (1964); *State, ex rel., v. Cooper*, 147 Kan. 710, 78 P.2d 884 (1938); *State v. Johnson*, 84 Kan. 411, 114 Pac. 390 (1911); *State v. Wilcox*, 64 Kan. 789, 68 Pac. 634 (1902). However, we have never before considered the precise question of whether the statutory definition of the healing arts is unconstitutionally vague.

Is the healing arts act unconstitutionally vague and does it apply to midwifery?

K.S.A. 65-2802(a)

We have previously set forth the two provisions of the healing arts act under which Ruebke's activities are claimed to be prohibited. The first is K.S.A. 65-2802(a), which limits the healing arts to "ascertainment, cure, relief, palliation, adjustment or correction of any human disease, ailment, deformity or injury."

In holding this provision is not unconstitutionally vague, we rely on the principle that "Kansas has long held a statute will not be declared void for vagueness and uncertainty where it employs words commonly used, previously judicially defined or having a settled meaning in law. In re *Brooks*, 228 Kan. at 544." *State v. Rose*, 234 Kan. 1044, 1046, 677 P.2d 1011(1984).

The definition of healing arts uses terms that have an ordinary, definite, and ascertainable meaning. The trial court's conclusion that "disease, ailment, deformity or injury" are not commonly used words with settled meanings cannot be justified.

In *Crees v. California State Board of Medical Examiners*, 213 Cal. App. 2d 195, 208 n.4, 28 Cal. Rptr. 621(1963), a statute proscribed the unlicensed practice of "any system or mode of treating the sick and afflicted in this State, or who diagnoses, treats, operates for, or prescribes for any ailment, blemish, deformity, disease, disfigurement, disorder, injury, or other mental or physical condition of any person." The court held there was no merit to the contention that the statute was vague: "A reading of the section suggests that people of common intelligence would have no trouble in understanding what was proscribed." 213 Cal. App. 2d at 215.

The fact that the terms "injury" and "disease" are explicitly defined for the narrow purposes of other statutory enactments does not deprive these terms of common meaning. See K.S.A. 1995 Supp. 44-508(e) (defining injury for workers compensation purposes); K.S.A. 1995 Supp. 40-3103 (defining injury for purpose of the Automobile Injury Reparations Act); K.A.R. 28-1-1 (defining disease).

Our holding that the act is not unconstitutionally vague because the words it uses have ordinary and readily understood meanings does not resolve the dispute before us, which deals with both vagueness and whether Ruebke's activities come within the act's provisions. Although we hold the act not to be unconstitutionally vague, we also hold the definitional provisions do not cover midwifery. In their ordinary usage the terms in K.S.A. 65-2802(a) used to define healing arts clearly and unequivocally focus exclusively on pathologies (i.e., diseases) and abnormal human conditions (i.e., ailments, deformities, or injuries). Pregnancy and childbirth are neither pathologies nor abnormalities.

Our conclusions find support in the decisions of other courts addressing similar questions. For example, under a definition of the practice of medicine similar to our definition of the healing arts, the Court of Criminal Appeals of Texas held:

"It would appear, however, that the Legislature of Texas has not defined the practice of medicine so as to include the act of assisting women in parturition or childbirth insofar as the practice of medicine without registering a certificate evidencing the right to so practice is made punishable as an offense.

"No reason appears why the Legislature could not establish a line of statutory demarcation separating the work of the midwife from that of practicing medicine.

"We agree that childbirth is a normal function of womanhood, and that proof that the appellant for a consideration agreed to and did attend Julia Valdez at childbirth does not support the allegation of the complaint and information that she treated or offered to treat Julia Valdez for a disease, disorder, deformity or injury or effect a cure thereof." *Banti v. State*, 289 S.W.2d 244, 247 (Tex. Crim. 1956).

The regulatory acts of other states which have been held to include midwifery define healing arts more broadly to deal not only with injuries and abnormalities, but also "conditions" as well. See *Bowland v. Municipal Court*, 18 Cal. 3d 479, 491, 134 Cal. Rptr. 630, 556 P.2d 1081(1976) ("[A]lthough normal childbirth is not a 'sickness or affliction' within the meaning of section 2141, we conclude, in light of the total statutory scheme governing the practice of the 'healing arts,' that section 2141's prohibition against unlicensed persons treating a 'physical condition' was intended to encompass the practice of midwifery."); *Crees*, 213 Cal. App. 2d at 208 n.4; *Smith v. State ex rel. Medical Licensing Bd.*, 459 N.E.2d 401 (practice of medicine defined to include diagnosis and treatment of any "condition" in Indiana; includes midwifery as dealing with "condition" of pregnancy).

Other jurisdictions have explicitly included birth or midwifery within the healing arts. See Mo. Rev. Stat. =A7 334.010 (1994) (prohibits unlicensed practice of medicine or surgery in any of its departments or "the practice of midwifery").

The specific terms in the statutory definition of the healing arts are not unconstitutionally vague, but they do not include the normal delivery of children.

Having addressed the issue of whether the specific words of the statutory definition of the healing arts are vague and include midwifery, we must also consider whether the definition as a whole is rendered vague, or broad enough to include midwifery, by the inclusion of the general words "the practice of medicine and surgery" in the definition of the healing arts.

The term "the practice of medicine and surgery," which is included in the statutory definition of the healing arts is not unconstitutionally vague because it has an established legal meaning in this state--a meaning which does not include a midwife's aiding in childbirth.

"Medicine is defined as 'the science and art of dealing with the prevention, cure, or alleviation of disease; in a narrower sense, that part of the science and art of restoring and preserving health which is the province of the physician as distinguished from the surgeon and obstetrician.' (Webster's New Inter. Dict.) The same authority defines surgery as the 'art or practice of healing by manual operations; that branch of medical science which treats of mechanical or operative measures for healing diseases, deformities or injuries.'" *State v. Johnson*, 84 Kan. at 417.

Similarly, *State ex rel. Mo. State Rd. v. Southworth*, 704 S.W.2d 219, 223 (Mo. 1986), held that



the term "practice of medicine" is not unconstitutionally vague.

At least as early as 1915, it is clear that medicine was understood by its nature to be concerned with disease and infirmities. See American Medical Association, Regulation of the Practice of Medicine, p. 78 (1915) ("[A]ny regulation of the practice of medicine should be taken to be directed against any unauthorized person who attempts to treat any physical ailment by whatsoever system he may choose."). Similarly, there is no indication contemporaneous with the enactment of a healing arts regulatory scheme that unlicensed midwifery was being illegalized; nor, from a practical standpoint, could it have been. As we earlier explained, midwifery remained prominent in the earlier part of this century. The services of midwives were needed, and it is abundantly clear that early regulation of Kansas medical practice made no mention of, nor could in any manner be considered to have altered or changed, midwifery.

From its inception in Kansas, the regulation of physicians was directed toward "empyrists," who were quack "healers." No subsequent language in the statutory scheme has clearly shown an intent to expand these enactments to midwives. If the legislature had intended to illegalize such ongoing practices, it could have done so directly. It did not.

Our definition of the practice of medicine was, from its inception more limited than that of other states. See Regulation of the Practice of Medicine, p. 72 (New York included the diagnosis and treatment of "any human . . . physical condition"; Iowa explicitly included those professing to be obstetricians, as well as physicians, and Surgeons, in its act).

Peckmann v. Thompson, 745 P. Supp. 1388 (C.D. Ill. 1990), is particularly informative on the question of whether the "practice of medicine" in its ordinary sense could be applied to midwifery. The Illinois court found that it could not, stating:

"As noted, paragraph 4400-50 prohibits the 'practice of medicine in all of its branches.' Because the Act fails to define this term, and because its common understanding generally does not encompass assisting the normal delivery of a healthy child, the plaintiffs reasonably may have concluded that their conduct was not proscribed by that portion of the Act. Similarly, paragraph 4400-49 prohibits, among other things, the unlicensed treatment of any 'ailments, or supposed ailments.' Again, because that term is nowhere defined, and because its common understanding generally does not describe the condition of a pregnant woman without complications, the plaintiffs reasonably may have concluded that their conduct was not proscribed by that portion of the Act." 745 F. Supp. at 1393.

Healing Arts argues that the "practice of medicine" includes the practice of obstetrics. It reasons, in turn, that obstetrics includes the practices traditionally performed by midwives. From this, it concludes midwifery is the practice of medicine.

However, equating midwifery with obstetrics, and thus with the practice of medicine, ignores the historical reality, discussed above, that midwives and obstetricians coexisted for many years quite separately. From the time of our statehood, the relationship between obstetricians and midwives changed from that of harmonious coexistence, cooperation, and collaboration, to open market competition and hostility. See 20 Suffolk U.L. Rev. at 1119-20.

We will not engage in speculation or osmotic reasoning that while obstetrics and midwifery were not in the technical or narrow sense the "practice of medicine" 80 years ago, they have now subliminally so become. Such questionable logic should not be the underpinning of the

prohibition of midwifery when, if the Kansas Legislature had wanted to specifically equate midwifery to the practice of medicine, it could have done so as the Missouri Legislature did. See Mo. Rev. Stat. =A7 334.010 (1994).

To even the most casual observer of the history of assistance to childbirth, it is clear that over the course of this century the medical profession has extended its reach so deeply into area of birthing as to almost completely occupy the field. The introduction of medical advances to the childbirth process drew women to physicians to assist during the birth of their children. Yet, this widespread preference for physicians as birth attendants hardly mandates the conclusion that only physicians may assist with births.

Neither logic nor experience suggests this conclusion. At the time the legislature chose to commence to regulate practitioners of medicine and surgery, the delivery of children, although sometimes assisted by physicians, was not the practice of medicine or Surgery. We noted in *State v. Johnson*, 84 Kan. 411, 114 Fac. 390 (1911), that as a technical matter obstetrics itself was not part of the art and science of medicine, even though medicine might from time to time be applied in the course of obstetrical practice. Where the ordinary meaning of words may have changed since the enactment of a statute, they must be understood in the sense they were intended at the time the statute was enacted. *United Parcel Service, Inc. v. Arnold*, 218 Kan. 102, 107, 542 P.2d 694 (1975). The fact that a person with medical training provides services in competition with someone with no medical degree does not transform the latter's practices into the practice of medicine.

This analysis is similar to the approach taken by Massachusetts. In *Commonwealth v. Porn*, 196 Mass. 326, 82 N.E. 31(1907), the court considered whether a midwife who also used prescriptions and, in cases of emergency when no physician was available, obstetrical instruments was engaged in the practice of medicine. The Massachusetts court had held in an earlier case that whether a midwife practiced medicine in a given case depended on the facts of that case: "Whether upon such evidence it would appear that the ministrations of a midwife are those of a physician, or rather of an attendant nurse and helper, would ordinarily be a question of fact or, if the facts were not in dispute, a question of law." *Commonwealth v. Porn*, 195 Mass. 443, 445-46, 81 N.E. 305 (1907). Massachusetts found, as a matter of law, that in the second case the defendant had practiced medicine. Thus, Massachusetts does not consider the practice of midwifery itself to be the practice of medicine under definitions similar to our own, but it does find that a midwife practices medicine when she "practices midwifery and uses obstetrical instruments when a physician is unavailable and who prescribes drugs." *Leigh v. Board of Registration in Nursing*, 395 Mass. 670, 680 n.12, 481 N.E.2d 1347 (1985). In *Leigh* the use of a fetal heart monitor, a blood-pressure cuff, and oxygen was insufficient to cause a midwife to be engaged in medicine. 395 Mass. at 685.

In addition, the rule of construction *eiusdem generis* suggests that the inclusion of specific words dealing solely with pathological conditions shows the intent of the legislature to deal only with such "healing" practices in the general terms "medicine" and "Surgery";

"The rule *eiusdem generis* is a well known maxim of construction to aid in ascertaining the meaning of a statute or other written instrument which is ambiguous. Under the maxim, where enumeration of specific things is followed by a more general word or phrase, such general word or phrase is held to refer to things of the same kind, or things that fall within the classification of

the specific terms.'" Bank of Kansas v. Hutchinson Health Services, Inc., 246 Kan. 83, 89, 785 P.2d 1349 (1990) (quoting John Deere Co. v. Butler County Implement, Inc., 232 Kan. 273, 277, 655 P.2d 124 (1982)).

Healing Arts argues that discussing Ruebke's activities as "midwifery" is irrelevant and useless because the term is so indefinite that it lacks any meaning. Healing Arts asks us to review each action Ruebke takes--every decision she makes and everything she does--and determine if any of them standing alone are the practice of the healing arts, e.g., severing the umbilical cord.

The term "practice of midwifery" is not meaninglessly indefinite. Without explicit definition, it has been held sufficiently definite to withstand a challenge for vagueness. See State ex rel. - Mo. State Bd. v. Southworth, 704 S.W.2d at 223-24, where it was stated:

"Likewise the words 'practice of midwifery' are words of common usage, understandable by persons of normal intelligence. Appellant herself testified that the term 'midwife' means a woman assisting a woman at childbirth.' Her definition is almost identical to that of Black's Law Dictionary 895 (5th ed. 1979), wherein midwifery is defined as [a] woman who assists at childbirth; an accoucheuse.' Similarly, the relevant definition of 'midwifery,' found in Webster's Third New International Dictionary 1432 (1981), is 'the art or act of assisting at childbirth; also; OBSTETRICS.' . . . Suffice it to say that 'practice of midwifery' is commonly understood to include the exercise of, as a profession or occupation, the art or act of assisting at childbirth. ". . . Persons of ordinary intelligence need not guess at the statute's meaning and the statute affords sufficient guidance to those who must apply it."

Ruebke argues, and the trial court so ruled, that even if particular acts constitute the practice of the healing arts as defined by the act, those practices are not prohibited if the legislature never intended the act to apply to midwives. Ruebke seeks support for this argument in Acupuncture Society of Kansas v. Kansas State Bd. of Healing Arts, 226 Kan. 639, 645, 602 P.2d 1311 (1979), in which this court considered whether acupuncture was surgery, such that a chiropractor would be prohibited from practicing it. We noted that while the practices used in acupuncture fit within a broad definition of surgery, acupuncture had its own separate and unique history. Because acupuncture was historically and commonly not considered surgery, even though it technically may have been under some definitions, we found the legislature had no intent to include it as such. Whatever the dictionary definition of "surgery," acupuncture was outside of the contemporaneous understanding of surgery by the ordinary layman.

Similar reasoning applies to midwifery: Even if the traditional and time-honored techniques employed by midwives fit within a technical definition of the practice of medicine or surgery, if the legislature did not intend to regulate the historically separate practice of midwifery, then it should not be considered the practice of medicine or surgery for the purposes of the healing arts act.

K.S.A. 65-2869

Healing Arts contends that even if Ruebke's activities are not prohibited under the definitional provisions of K.S.A. 65-2802(a), she nevertheless should be deemed to be engaged in the practice of medicine and surgery because she is one of the people who "publicly profess to assume the duties incident to the practice of medicine or surgery or any of their branches" pursuant to K.S.A. 65-2869.

Before we consider this expansionist view of the legislative language, we must first address the trial court's implicit ruling that K.S.A. 65-2869 need not be considered because it is

unconstitutionally vague. Although the Illinois federal district court in *Peckmann*, 745 F. Supp. 1388, has suggested that the wording "practice of medicine in all of its branches" is unconstitutionally vague when applied to midwifery, we specifically reject such an approach to our healing arts act and the conclusions it would require.

As articulated in *Flax v. Kansas Turnpike Authority*, 226 Kan. 1, 9, 596 P.2d 446 (1979), this court recognizes a strong preference, where consistent with legislative intent, for interpreting certain subjects as outside a statute's scope rather than declaring the statute unconstitutional:

"In *State v. Smiley*, 65 Kan. 240, 69 Pac. 199 (1902), *affid* 196 U.S. 447, 49 L. Ed. 546, 25 5. Ct. 289 (1905), this court recognized the proposition that general language, valid upon its face, may be construed to exclude certain subjects or classes of things in order that the entire statute will not be held unconstitutional . . .

Following this reasoning, we hold that K.S.A. 65-2869 as we construe it herein is not unconstitutionally vague.

Healing Arts argues that the prohibition on chiropractors practicing obstetrics in K.S.A. 65-2802(a) shows clear legislative intent to include obstetrics as a branch of medicine or surgery. According to this argument, Ruebke publicly professes to assume duties incident to obstetrics, and therefore her midwife services are prohibited. We find no support in the language of the statute for this tortured argument that the prohibition of chiropractors from obstetrics practice is intended by the legislature to bring lay midwifery within the healing arts act. The provision cited by Healing Arts means no more than it says--that chiropractors may not engage in obstetrics.

Nevertheless, we must still consider the question of whether Ruebke is deemed to be engaged in the healing arts because her services are "incident to" the practice of medicine or surgery. A statute must be interpreted in the context in which it was enacted and in light of the legislature's intent at that time. Constructions placed on statutes by the court must be reasonable and should not lead to absurd results.

As we have previously stated, the legislature has at no time made it plain that midwifery was to be considered part of the healing arts. If we were to ignore the historical reality that the legislature never manifested any intent to prohibit midwifery and adopt Healing Art's argument, we would be giving K.S.A. 65-2869 a construction unintended by the legislature and absurd in application.

An activity is not "incident to" the practice of medicine merely because it is engaged in by some members of the medical profession. Drafting medical research papers may be an activity to which certain licensed physicians devote considerable time, but it is not an activity which only licensed practitioners can claim to do without fear of criminal prosecution because it is "incident to" the practice of medicine. Physicians may testify in court as experts in biological processes or pharmacology. Nevertheless, an unlicensed expert is not committing a crime by publicly professing availability to present such testimony because it might be "incident to" the practice of medicine in some general sense.

Applying the rules of construction outlined earlier in this opinion, one thing "incident to" another only if it "naturally and inseparably, depends upon, appertains to, or follows another that is more worthy." *Black's Law Dictionary* 762 (6th ed. 1990). The practice of midwifery is separate and distinct from the practice of medicine. The practice of midwifery is not incident to the practice of medicine or surgery so that it becomes a part of the healing arts by the application of K.S.A. 65-2869.

Although we hold the practice of midwifery is not itself the practice of the healing arts under our statutory scheme, our conclusions should not be interpreted to mean that a midwife may engage in any activity whatsoever with regard to a pregnant woman merely by virtue of her pregnancy. In *Banti v. State*, 289 S.W.2d 244, 247-48 (Tex. Crim. 1956), the Texas court explained the limited scope of its similar holding:

"We should not be understood as holding that the statute could not be violated so long as the patient was a pregnant woman. Of course pregnancy would not prevent a woman from having a disease, disorder, deformity or injury for which she would require the services of a practitioner of medicine."

Therefore, the question of whether Ruebke was engaged in the practice of the healing arts, under the facts of this case developed during the evidentiary hearing, is not resolved only by our conclusion that the practice of midwifery is not included in K.S.A. 65-2802(a) and K.S.A. 65-2869. However, we need not decide the precise boundaries of what a midwife may do without engaging in the practice of the healing arts because, in the case before us, Ruebke was found to have worked under the supervision of physicians who were familiar with her practices and authorized her actions. Any of Ruebke's actions that were established at trial, which might otherwise have been the practice of the healing arts, were exempt from the healing arts act because she had worked under the supervision of such physicians.

K.S.A. 65-2872 exempts certain activities from the licensure requirements of the healing arts act. In relevant part it provides:

"The practice of the healing arts shall not be construed to include the following persons:

.....

"(g) Persons whose professional services are performed under the supervision or by order of or referral from a practitioner who is licensed under this act."

The trial court found as a factual matter:

"Throughout her years of practice as a midwife, Michelle Ruebke has routinely utilized a licensed physician in the vicinity of the family who has agreed to be available in the case of complications and to be available for consultation and examination, and has routinely provided such physician with her prenatal records of the patient when the physician has so requested prior to delivery.

"Michelle Ruebke has continuing contact with the supervising physician throughout the prenatal care and delivery of the child.

"Michelle Ruebke has worked with most of her supervising physicians for some period of time now, but she initially established her relationship with them by talking with the physician in person, answering questions about her practice, reviewing the forms that she requests them to complete, and asking about their preferences, including such details as whether the physician wants to be notified of the time a woman goes into labor, when a baby is delivered, at what point he would like to be called, and whether he is available for consultation at any point during the pregnancy. Michelle Ruebke's goal is to ask the physicians for input so that she can work with them in the manner the physician desires.

"Throughout her practice, the supervising physicians with whom Michelle Ruebke has worked have seen the mother before delivery, have agreed to work with Michelle Ruebke, have agreed to be available for consultation, have agreed to be available for referral in the event emergency care

or transfer to a hospital is necessary, have been familiar with Michelle Ruebke's practice and have provided certain services to her regarding the mother under their cooperative care."

The question of whether Ruebke's activities are exempted from the healing arts act is a legal question over which our review is unlimited. See *Garrison v. State Farm Mut. Auto Co. Inc.*, 258 Kan. 547, 550, 907 P.2d 891(1995). This court discussed K.S.A. 65-2872(g) briefly in *State, ex rel., v. Doolin & Shaw*, 209 Kan. 244, 262, 497 P.2d 138 (1972):

"The use of technicians to assist medical doctors is a long-standing practice. Nurses, nurses' aides, physical therapists, X-ray technicians, laboratory technicians, prosthesis technicians, and fitters of artificial eyes are examples of the use of ancillary technicians. The right to referral by physicians is recognized by K.S.A. 65-2872 (g)."

It should be clear that the level of supervision required of these ancillary technicians is minimal and substantially less than direct oversight and control. In light of the uncontested factual findings of the trial court, which were supported by competent evidence in the record, we agree with the trial court that the exception to the healing arts act recognized by K.S.A. 65-2872(g) applies to any of Ruebke's midwifery activities which might otherwise be considered the practice of the healing arts under K.S.A. 65-2802(a) and K.S.A. 65-2869.

We hold only that midwifery itself is not the practice of the healing arts and that, under the facts of this case, those activities beyond midwifery in which Ruebke might have engaged were excepted from the healing arts act by virtue of the supervision provided by a licensed physician.

Is the Nursing Act Unconstitutionally Vague?

The trial court also found that the definition of the practice of nursing in K.S.A. 65-1113(d) is unconstitutionally vague. Again, if the nursing act does not plainly apply to midwifery, our preference is to hold it does not cover such activities rather than declare it unconstitutionally vague, if such can be done within the intent of the legislature. Consistent with our analysis of the healing arts act, we reject the trial court's conclusion that the nursing act is unconstitutionally vague and uphold the validity of the act.

As we have held, the legislature has never specifically acted with the intent to restrict or regulate the traditional practice of lay midwifery. Nevertheless, Nursing argues such birth assistants must be licensed nurses before they may render aid to pregnant women. In oral argument, Nursing conceded much of its argument would be muted were we to hold, as we do above, that the practice of midwifery is not the practice of the healing arts and thus not part of a medical regimen.

The practice of nursing is defined in K.S.A. 65-1113 as follows:

"(d) Practice of nursing. (1) The practice of professional nursing as performed by a registered professional nurse for compensation or gratuitously, except as permitted by K.S.A. 65-1124 and amendments thereto, means the process in which substantial specialized knowledge derived from the biological, physical, and behavioral sciences is applied to: the care, diagnosis, treatment, counsel and health teaching of persons who are experiencing changes in the normal health processes or who require assistance in the maintenance of health or the prevention or management of illness, injury or infirmity; administration, supervision or teaching of the process as defined in this section; and the execution of the medical regimen as prescribed by a person licensed to practice medicine and surgery or a person licensed to practice dentistry. (2) The practice of nursing as a licensed practical nurse means the performance for compensation or

gratuitously, except as permitted by K.S.A. 65-1124 and any amendments thereto, of tasks and responsibilities defined in part (1) of this subsection (d) which tasks and responsibilities are based on acceptable educational preparation within the framework of supportive and restorative care under the direction of a registered professional nurse, a person licensed to practice medicine and surgery or a person licensed to practice dentistry."

The practice of nursing is defined by reference to the practitioner's substantial specialized knowledge in areas of the biological, physical, and behavioral sciences and educational preparation within the field of the healing arts. Ruebke claims no specialized scientific knowledge, but rather readily admits she has no formal education beyond high school. Her assistance is valued not because it is the application of a firm and rarefied grasp of scientific theory, but because, like generations of midwives before, she has practical experience assisting in childbirth.

Moreover, "nursing" deals with "persons who are experiencing changes in the normal health processes." As these words are commonly understood, pregnancy and childbirth do not constitute changes in the normal health process, but the continuation of it.

A nurse is commonly understood, as reflected in our statutory definition of nursing, to be a person who works in the same area as and under the supervision of a physician or other practitioner of the healing arts. As we have held, the practice of lay midwifery has, throughout the history of the regulation of nursing, been separate and distinct from the practice of the healing arts, to which nursing is so closely joined. While we have no doubt of the legislature's power to place lay midwifery under the authority of the State Board of Nursing, the legislature has not done so.

We find no legislative intent manifested in the language of the nursing act clearly illustrating the purpose of including the historically separate practice of midwifery within the practice of nursing. See generally *Acupuncture Society of Kansas v. Kansas State Bd. of Healing Arts*, 226 Kan. 639, 645-46, 602 P.2d 1311 (1979) (even if acupuncture might fit some technical definitions of surgery, because it is historically separate with a unique history, it is not surgery within the healing arts act). Assistance in childbirth rendered by one whose practical experience with birthing provides comfort to the mother is not nursing under the nursing act, such that licensure is required.

Although the parties raise questions about the applicability of various other exceptions to both the nursing act and the healing arts act, the law governing temporary injunctions, and other issues, in light of our holdings above we need not address these questions in the present action. We affirm the trial court's order denying the Boards a temporary injunction, although we reverse its finding that the acts at issue violate the constitution.

Affirmed in part and reversed in part.





## APPENDIX D

### THE CAMBRIAN EPISCOPAL CHURCH

The Cambrian Episcopal Church is an evangelical and catholic church which teaches the esoteric tradition of the first Christians. By "evangelical", we mean that we teach that mankind can only be saved by the Atonement of Jesus Christ. The offer of salvation is extended to all who will receive Christ in faith as their Savior.

By "catholic", we mean that we teach the cardinal doctrines of the faith as expressed in the Church's three Ecumenical Creeds: the Apostles' Creed, the Nicene Creed, and the Athanasian Creed. While we do accept other churches as Christian which have a deficient understanding of these Creeds, yet we hold them with guarded communion.

The "esoteric tradition" of the Early Church refers to those teachings and practices which existed prior to its first apostasy in the middle of the Second Century. Because the Roman Empire sought to exterminate the Esoteric Doctrines, they were veiled with symbolic language to protect those who believed and practiced them. There are still hostile elements in the world today, even within Christianity, which expose teachers of the Tradition to persecution and danger. However, America's free society has greatly diminished those risks and has provided you with the opportunity to hear these truths.

Although we use the Episcopal Book of Common Prayer as our primary resource, the Cambrian Episcopal Church is not structurally connected to the Episcopalian Church or to the Anglican Church. But we are Episcopal in our form of church government.

The Cambrian Episcopal Church represents a branch of the Celtic tradition that comes through ancient Wales (hence, the name "Cambrian"). It traces its doctrinal and spiritual lineage through the representatives of Celtic Christianity to the Lord's kinsmen (called the Desposyni) and Apostles of the Jerusalem Church in the First Century. The Jerusalem Church was the true Mother Church of Christianity. Further inquiries may be directed to our outreach ministry:

Cambrian Episcopal Church  
P.O Box 8701 Moscow, ID  
83843 (208) 882-5135  
[www.grailchurch.org](http://www.grailchurch.org)



## APPENDIX E

### MIDWIFERY AS A DIACONATE IN THE CAMBRIAN EPISCOPAL CHURCH

If you operate your midwifery practice as a Christian ministry, you may register it with the Cambrian Episcopal Church. You will receive a Certificate of Recognition and be listed on its roster as a deaconess in the Church. This status does not interfere with a membership in your current church, since the Cambrian Episcopal Church is a Desposynic Church.

A Desposynic Church is a catholic church in the truest sense of the word, one which transcends denominational barriers. It is an inclusive Church which is co-extensive with the venue of the Kingdom of God and is not limited by a church with faulty rituals, doctrine, or even an ecclesiastical leadership which does not recognize its existence.

In this "Grail" Church, midwifery is an ordainable office of ministry. This means that the midwife is an extension of the Throne of Christ and of His healing virtue into the birthing experience. The midwife serves as a deaconess for Jesus Christ who is, in turn, represented by the bishop - or more accurately - "the Overseer" (episkopos - from which we get the word "bishop", is better rendered as "overseer" or "superintendent"). He is the symbol of the unity of the Church. A Pastor or elder in a local church is not usually an "episkopos," but rather is a minister - a deacon or presbyter.

The benefits of registering are manifold. There is a unique bond of fellowship among those who serve the Grail in this way. There is also a rest and peace of mind, knowing that you are serving God in a manner which pleases Him and which honors the visible manifestation of His Kingdom.

Under the laws of the United States, registering will provide you with *judicial coverture*. Midwives who operate outside of a church covering cannot invoke the benefits of the First Amendment, which prohibits the government from interfering with the free exercise of religion.

We know of one case, for example, of two midwives in the same city. One practiced as a minister within her church, the other did not. When the County Prosecutor decided to prosecute midwives, he pursued both women. However, as soon as he discovered that the first midwife practiced as a service in her church, he dropped the charges against her, yet continued to pursue the other, even though the first midwife's trouble was occasioned by death at birth - a serious matter. In this instance, the First Amendment served as a formidable barrier to government persecution.

This does not mean that the Church can protect all midwives against a tyrannical government all of the time. Sometimes, we are called to suffer persecution. But it does mean, at least within the American context, these institutional barriers are usually too great for most government officials to breach.

More important than judicial coverture is spiritual coverture. Operating as a midwife, without God's visible validation, is presumption. Performing a holy task which God has reserved to His own ministers, even with the noblest of motives, exposes you to spiritual attack from the Adversary. It can take many forms: a strained or broken marriage, health problems, litigation, and so on. We do not suggest that problems are always satanic in origin, but presumption is sin, and sin restricts the flow of God's protective care in our lives. The wise will kick the stumbling stones out of their path. Practicing midwifery without God's ordination leaves the stumbling stones in the way. If you refuse to be licensed by God, you will eventually be required to be licensed by the state: an unholy taskmaster.

It is usually not enough that your pastor, elder, or church board approves of your work. Their authority is impaired by their corporate status, which is in itself a form of state licensure of the church. Only the Desposynic Church holds the "keys of the kingdom" whose members are the visible representatives of Christ's Throne upon the earth. They are immune to the limitations of state incorporation. If you want to maintain unity with Christ's Throne, you must seek-out such a representative.

There are several steps involved in registering:

- 1) If the midwife is married, she will need her husband's permission;
- 2) The midwife must obtain a copy of the book, *Biblical Midwifery*, because it contains theological and liturgical resources that will she need;
- 3) In her own worship, she must show unity with the Desposynic Church by partaking of Holy Communion in the manner set forth by the Church's rite (contact us for details);
- 4) She must complete and submit the Application for Diaconal Recognition;
- 5) She must agree to submit an Annual Report;
- 6) She must agree to inform her clients of her status as a Deaconess in the Church; and
- 7) She must be bonded and insured by the Cambrian Episcopal Church.

## **THE DIACONATE: TERMS OF BONDING & INSURANCE**

The kind of bonding and insurance which the Church provides is that which is required by God in His Word. It may or may not fulfill the needs of general liability coverage which many in the medical profession are required by law to have. The midwife is urged to consult a legal professional or the pertinent state agency if she believes that she needs this kind of insurance to protect her personal assets.

In the Greek New Testament, the words for "deacon" and "deaconess" mean simply "servant." The word for "minister" means servant, also, or "assistant." In the beginning, such words referred to household servants who ministered to their masters and to those whom they were commissioned by their masters to help. Later, as the Church became more public and institutional, they became formal orders of assistants to their bishops.

The ministry of deacons and deaconesses in the Scriptures was one to God and not to man. When people came to them for help, they were coming to God. In exchange for God's help, as mediated by His ministers, they submitted to His rule and discipline. This was just reciprocity. This was equity.

When a minister performed his or her duties in an unworthy manner, recourse was made to the Episcopal office, his superior, for remedy. Thus, when a deacon or deaconess ministers to others, it must be upon the basis of informed consent; namely, that the client knows the minister is serving God in his act of mercy and not the client who is the recipient of that mercy. A person coming to the minister for help does so upon the basis of dependency and grace, not as an entitlement or as a person with "consumer's rights."

In times past, if services rendered by God's ministers failed or resulted in injury or damage of some kind, it was accepted as the will of God and was not challenged. The minister (deacon) was merely a channel of God's grace, whether the results were good or bad. The deacon was immune to legal sanctions.

The modern trend of suing ministers and other officers of the church has happened only because the church, as an institution, has been secularized. Its services, whether physical, spiritual, or psychological, are considered rendered to and for the person seeking help, and not to God. This is a humanistic perspective and alien to the Scriptures. Thus, incompetence and ill-will which result in supposed injury are blamed upon the minister, who then becomes subject to penal sanctions, whether criminal or civil.

The policy of the Cambrian Episcopal Church asserts that works of mercy ought to be performed when requested, not offered like the wares of a peddler. Advertisements should be avoided. Services should not be rendered in a "for profit" venture, that is, for the seeking of gain. Charges may be requested to weed-out the insincere from the seekers, but also because mankind is not permitted to approach God's throne empty handed. Tithes must be paid by the petitioner to the minister, who in turn tithes to the Episcopal office to sanctify the gift the minister receives.

If you are a deaconess, for instance, serving as a midwife, your client should sign an "Informed Consent Form" provided by the Church. This makes the client understand that by coming to you, they are submitting to the Providence of God. By coming to you, they will receive God's grace, and the outcome, even if it ends badly, will be accepted as such. Your competence is measured only by God's mercy. He guides your hands, and should they err, He has caused them to err.

With that understanding, the Cambrian Episcopal Church requires that clients seek remedy for alleged damages within the venue of the Church and not the courts. The morally derelict actions of a minister are all that can be reviewed and can only be reviewed by the one holding the Episcopal office: the Overseer. Penalties take the form of penance and/or the forfeiture of assets limited to the amount equal to the bond. We have established an indenture and insurance according to Biblical standards to remedy these situations.

They are as follows:

- 1) The minister/deacon (or deaconess), must provide an annual surety bond of the amount specified in Leviticus 27: fifty shekels for males and thirty shekels for females. It shall be held in trust by the Overseer to secure the good faith of the minister.
- 2) The minister shall tithe whatever gifts are received. The purpose of the tithe is to invest (clothe) the judicial officer of the Church - the Overseer - with resources to fulfill his Biblical roles of *ga'al* (i.e. kinsman-redeemer, arbitrator, priest, etc.) \* If the midwife is a member of a church already, she should give at least 1% to her Overseer, and the rest to her church. It is to her local church that she will turn to for help first. If she is not the member of a local church, she should send a complete tithe to her Overseer.
- 3) The minister must submit to annual review for the first six years. At that time, he or she may be ordained. Ordination is similar to tenure. The minister is no longer subject to review, the requirement to submit annual reports, and annual bonding payments.

Further inquiries should be directed to the Cambrian Episcopal Church.

\*see *The Kinsman-Redeemer* by this author

## **BIBLIOGRAPHY**

*The Apocrypha*. Destiny Publishers, Merrimac, Massachusetts, 1982

Bahnsen, Greg L., *Theonomy in Christian Ethics*, Phillipsburg, NJ: The Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Co., (1977) 1984.

Baigent, Michael; Leigh, R.; Lincoln, H.; *Holy Blood, Holy Grail*, Dell Publ., 1 Dag Hammarskjold Plaza, N.Y., 10017 (1983)

\_\_\_\_\_ *The Messianic Legacy*, Bantum Doubleday Dell (1986)

Bauckham, Richard, *Jude and the Relatives of Jesus in the Early Church*, T&T Clark, 59 George Street, Edinburgh, EH2 2LQ Scotland (1990)

Cahill, Thomas, *How the Irish Saved Civilization*, Doubleday (1995)

Church, J.R. *Guardians of the Grail*, Prophecy Publications, P.O. Box 7000, Oklahoma City, OK 73153 (1991)

Clarke, Adam, *Clarke's Commentaries*, Abingdon, Nashville

Clement of Alexandria, *Stromateis Books 1-3*, trans. John Ferguson, *The Fathers of the Church* vol. 85. Catholic University Press, Washington, D.C., (1991).

Ellis, Peter, *The Druids*, Eerdmans Publ., Grand Rapids, Michigan, (1994) *Celtic Women*, Eerdmans Pub], (1996)

Epiphanius, Bishop of Salamis, *The Panarion*, trans. Philip Amidon, Oxford University Press, Oxford, England, (1990)

*Episcopal Book of Common Prayer*, Seabury Press, (1979)

Gardner, Laurence, *Bloodline of the Holy Grail*, Element, P.O. Box 830, Rockport, Mass. 01966 (1996)

Haskins, Susan, *Mary Magdalen: Myth and Metaphor*, Harcourt Brace & Company, N.Y.

Hippolytus of Rome, *The Apostolic Tradition*, edited etc., Gregory Dix and Henry Chadwick, Morehouse Publ., 871 Ethan Allen Highway, Ridgefield, CT 06877 (US edition) (1937) 1992.

Kansas State Supreme Court, *State Board of Healing Arts v. Michelle Ruebke*, 1996, Topeka, Kansas

*The Book of Jasher*, referred to in Joshua & 2 Samuel, Artisan Sales, P.O. Box 1497, Thousand Oaks, Calif. 91360 (1990)

*Lamsa Bible*, English Version of the Peshitta, trans. George Lamsa, Harper & Row Publ., N.Y. (1933) 1968

Mackey, James P., ed., *An Introduction to Celtic Christianity*, T&T Clark, Edinburgh (1995)

- Matthews, Caitlin *The Little Book of Celtic Blessings*, Element. Inc., 42 Broadway, Rockport, Ma 01966 (1994)
- Martimort, Aime Georges, *Deaconesses: An Historical Study*, Ignatius Press. San Francisco (1986)
- Murray, Iain H., *The Puritan Hope*. The Banner of Truth Trust, P.O. Box 652, Carlisle, Penn. 17013 (1971)
- Newton, Sir Isaac, *Observations upon the Prophecies of Daniel and the Apocalypse of John*, facsimile reprint, contact author
- North, Gary, *Is the World Running Down?* Institute for Christian Economics, Tyler, Texas (1990)
- Phipps, William E. *Was Jesus Married?* Harper & Row (1970)
- Picknett, Lynn & Prince, Clive, *The Templar Revelation*, Simon & Schuster (1997)
- Rand, Ayn, *Atlas Shrugged*, Prometheus (contact Laissez Faire Books or this author)
- Roberts, Alexander & Donaldson, James *The Ante-Nicene Fathers vol. 1-10*, and *The Nicene & Post-Nicene Fathers vol. 1-14* Hendrickson Publishers, P.O. Box 3473 Peabody, Mass. 01961 (1994)
- Robinson, James M. ed. *Nag Hammadi Library* (Gnostic Scriptures) Harper & Row, San Francisco (1988)
- Rushdoony, Rousas John, *Institutes of Biblical Law*. Craig Press, Nutley, NJ (1973)
- Septuagint with Apocrypha* Zondervan, (1978)
- Smith, Morton, *Clement of Alexandria and a Secret Gospel of Mark*, Harvard University Press. Cambridge Mass. (1973)
- Stivers, James W. *Biblical Terranomics* (1996), *The Biblical Case for Polygamy* (1991), *The Mother Heart of God* (1997), *The Seed of Cain & the Revival of Mystic Humanism* (1987) Stivers Publications, P.O. Box 8701 Moscow, Idaho, 83843.
- Stoker, Robert B. *The Legacy of Arthur's Chester*, Covenant Publishing Co. 6 Buckingham Gate, London, S.W.1 (1965)
- Tabor, James D. & Gallagher, Eugene V. *Why Waco? Cults and the Battle for Religious Freedom in America*, University of California Press, Berkeley (1995)



Torjesen, Karen Jo, *When Women Were Priests* Harper, San Francisco (1995)

Wise, Michael; Abegg, Martin; Cook, Edward *Dead Sea Scrolls*, translated texts, Harper, San Francisco, (1996)

The **Friends of the Cambrian Church** has numerous titles available to aid in a thorough research of the issues introduced in this book. Write to: P.O. Box 8701, Moscow, ID 83843.



## NOTES



# **ANSWER KEY**

## **CHAPTER ONE:**

### **QUESTIONS FOR REVIEW**

**1. Since the legal status in some states is in constant flux, discuss other more recent court cases involving midwives.**

Answer: This question provides the instructor an opportunity to discuss current legal situations involving midwives. The student should be asked to describe their similarities with the Ruebke case and to contrast their differences.

**2. Do you find the Ruebke Decision to be representative of judicial attitude toward midwives?**

Answer: This is a subjective question, but the answer should suggest an affirmative response.

**3. Would you classify midwifery as a "healing" profession, and thus the practice of medicine?**

Answer: Again, this is a subjective question designed to help the student verbalize her perception of the profession. The instructor should help the student understand that midwifery is a healing ministry and the practice of medicine within the context of Biblical definitions.

**4. What has the "pain" of childbirth been attributed to traditionally?**

Answer: The Curse of God upon Creation following the Fall of Adam and Eve in Genesis 2.

**5. Would you agree with the notion that childbirth is a "wounding from God"? Why or why not?**

Answer: The student should be able to see that it is. However, some students might have a misconception about the role of physical pain. While men must suffer the burden of working the soil which is uncooperative and sometimes hostile, the woman must overcome the burden of the realities of sex and childbearing. Each of these are gender-related aspects of the Dominion Covenant, which are legitimate and intended as a source of joy, but yet are aspects which reflect our levels of wisdom and obedience.

**6. What do we mean by the "nature is normative" doctrine?**

Answer: It is the idea that the way nature is now is the way it has always been and is the way it ought to be.

**7. How might the "nature is normative" doctrine lead to the legalization of practices unacceptable to Christians?**

Answer: Mankind's desires, however depraved by ethical standards, are merely instinctual and should be followed without blame.

**8. What new constitutional protections might a midwife gain if she integrated her practice as a ministry of a Church?**

Answer: No answers are clearly provided in this chapter. This question is used to draw the student into consideration of the 1st Amendment and its clause guaranteeing the "free exercise of religion".

**CHAPTER TWO:**  
**QUESTIONS FOR REVIEW**

**1. Give a definition of socialized medicine.**

Answer: It is the providing of medicine to the general public by a state agency.

**2. Describe the "Hegelian dialectic".**

Answer: History is the result of conflicting opposites.

**3. Is socialized medicine contrary to "free market" medicine?**

Answer: Yes. By its very definition, it is a state monopoly of medicine which excludes competition from non-state alternatives.

**4. Why would the state want to control medicine?**

Answer: The state's messianic role of protector must include the roles of provider and healer.

**5. Why would parents be interested in a "free market" approach to childbirth?**

Answer: It is usually cheaper and safer because the midwife is directly responsible to her client.

**6. Why have the courts been friendly to midwives?**

Answer: They see the midwife as a feminist figure.

**7. How might the court decision which legalized abortion have helped the midwifery profession? (You might read Appendix A for help with this one.)**

Answer: If the woman has the right to control her reproductive life, even to the right of terminating a pregnancy, she certainly has the right to decide how her unborn child will be born.

**8. Why might some midwives want state licensing and regulation of their profession?**

Answer: Some might be willing to surrender to state control in order to stop abortion. Others might find that state regulation would make it more profitable by eliminating unwanted competition from lay midwives.

**9. Do you support that perspective? Why or why not?**

Answer: This question is designed to encourage classroom discussion.



## **CHAPTER THREE:**

### **QUESTIONS FOR REVIEW**

**1. Why might the author claim that the entire book rests upon a proper understanding of this chapter? (See Introduction)**

Answer: A proper understanding of the role of government is essential to understanding the role of the midwife.

**2. What might be a good description of the term "Gnosticism" as it is used by the author?**

Answer: Gnosticism was a rival heresy in the Early Church which inverted the values of the Bible and pursued salvation through knowledge, especially psychic knowledge.

**3. Does a Gnostic believe in Old Testament Law? Why or why not?**

Answer: No, the Gnostic believes that the Old Testament God was Satan, an evil god.

**4. What are the three main reasons why people believe Old Testament Law is barbaric and unchristian?**

Answer: slavery, polygamy, and capital punishment

**5. Do you think there can be Christian versions of these institutions? Support your position.**

Answer: Yes, slavery practiced in the New Testament and was regulated by the Apostles. The restriction of polygamy in the Pastoral Epistles implies that it was practiced among the laity. Capital punishment is enjoined as a legitimate function of government in Romans 13 and elsewhere.

**6. How would you explain the statement that "God is the author of evil but not of sin"?**

Answer: Evil is the consequence or the sanctions against sin. All of the evil in the world is the compounded consequences of sin.

**7. What might have been Satan's role before the Fall?**

Answer: He guarded the Throne of God in the sense that he punished sin as God's law enforcer.

**8. What are "Seraphim"?**

Answer: Fiery angelic beings which guard the Throne of God.

**9. Which Fathers of the Early Church are mentioned in the chapter who taught the view that human government was "satanic" or "demonic"?**

Answer: Irenaeus and Origen

**10. How might that have been good prior to the Fall and how might that be bad now?**

Answer: Satan served God and justly enforced God's law prior to the Fall, but in the Fall, his motives changed to entrap man as a justification to destroy him.

**11. What is the difference between "adversarial government" and "ministerial government"?**

Answer: Adversarial government looks upon all citizens as criminals who can be controlled through guild manipulation. Ministerial government attempts to serve the people by searching-out the matters of controversy and rendering justice.

**12. If Jesus came to destroy death, how might that fact affect the role of civil government?**

Answer: Since civil government has a monopoly on death as a sanction for law-breaking, it follows that it is abolished along with death.

**CHAPTER FOUR:**  
**QUESTIONS FOR REVIEW**

**1. What is the "Mahuzzim heresy"?**

Answer: It was a movement in the Early Church which diminished the role of the woman and the family in building the Kingdom of God. The Kingdom of God became identified with the institutional church which was run by spiritual professionals.

**2. Why did midwifery suffer when this heresy prevailed in the Church?**

Answer: The birthing of children was no longer viewed as a sacred task. Midwives were marginalized and finally excluded from the spiritual life of the church.

**3. What is the Hebrew word for "midwife" and what does it mean?**

Answer: *M'yalad* - "to cause to bring forth".

**4. Who does the author claim was the first midwife?**

Answer: God, the Holy Spirit.

**5. Do you agree with his position? Why or why not?**

Answer: This is a subjective answer to provide the instructor an opportunity to challenge the student's logic and evidential support.

**6. What is one important principle we learn from the record of Rachel's midwife?**

Answer: The midwife is a custodian of life.

**7. In the record of Tamar's midwife, we see the midwife marking the firstborn son. How might this illustrate the judicial role of the midwife?**

Answer: Identifying the firstborn established the order of succession and the civil responsibilities of each child, including their descendants.

**8. What does it mean to say that Christ is the "repairer of the breach"?**

Answer: He restored the covenant line.

**9. Do you think there were only two midwives serving the Hebrews in Exodus 1? Why or why not?**

Answer: No, it is not physically possible for two women to serve as midwives to so many people.

**10. The expressions "office of midwife" and "office of priest" share a common Hebrew word. What is it?**

Answer: kane

**11. Do you think it is accurate to describe midwifery as a "sexual ministry"? Why or why not?**

Answer: Yes, if we define sex as the giving and receiving of seed. The husband "goes in unto" the woman to give her his seed and the midwife "goes in unto" the woman to receive it.

**12. From your study in the previous chapter, what might the Dragon represent in Revelation 12?**

Answer: While the image of the Dragon would represent civil government, the Red Dragon of Revelation 12 would represent a particular Antichrist government of Satanic origin.

**13. In this text why does the Dragon usurp the role of the midwife?**

Answer: The Dragon knows that the Kingdom of God is advanced through the "Seed of the Woman". Thus, to attack and defeat the Seed, the Dragon must destroy it as soon as it is born.

**14. According to Church Tradition, who was the Virgin Mary's midwife?**

Answer: Salome (also Zelome)

**15. From the record provided in the chapter, was a midwife needed to provide Mary with medical attention?**

Answer: No, the birth occurred without hardship.

**16. What service did these midwives provide?**

Answer: They provided a vaginal examination to confirm Mary's virginity.

**17. What impact judicially and theologically did their witness have?**

Answer: In verifying our Lord's virginal birth, they confirmed His miraculous origins and established the doctrinal foundation upon which all Evangelical theology is based.

**18. In the Early Church, there was an "Order of Widows", as well as presbytresses (women elders) and deaconesses. How do you think midwives would have been classified? Be thorough.**

Answer: To become admitted as a Widow, the midwife first had to have served in the Church as a deaconess, a maidservant. The physical and medical assistance provided by the midwife falls into the kind of care deaconesses provided to women. As senior midwives provided more spiritual care, especially as representatives of their bishops, they assumed the role of presbytresses. It is probable that junior midwives were classified with deaconesses and senior midwives were classified with presbytresses.

## **CHAPTER FIVE:**

### **QUESTIONS FOR REVIEW**

**1. What was the Latin name for Morien?**

Answer: Pelagius

**2. Where did he preach?"**

Answer: the City of Rome

**3. Name three of his ideas that got him into trouble with the rich and powerful.**

Answer: He believed that women ought to be taught to read the Scriptures, slaves should be freed, and wealth should not be gained through usury.

**4. Who was recruited to become his opponent?**

Answer: Augustine

**5. Was this opponent successful in ending Morien's career? Why or why not?**

Answer: He was successful in forcing him out of the Roman Empire through the edict of the Emperor.

**6. Did Morien accept the idea that infants need to be baptized to be saved from God's wrath?**

Answer: No, he believed they should be baptized because they were already saved.

**7. By "sinful nature", do we mean that everything God has made has become evil? Why or why not?**

Answer: No, the "sinful nature" is the result of "Original Sin" and is not inherently blameworthy.

**8. Augustine believed that when a man got an erect penis, it was proof of his sinfulness. Do you agree with that idea? Why or why not?**

Answer: This is a subjective question but an important one for the instructor to explain to the student. If the student agrees with Augustine, then the idea of midwifery as a base calling - a little better than the prostitute - is validated. If Pelagius was right, then midwifery is a sacred calling.

**9. Forsaking "the desire of women" is a primary characteristic of what heresy described in Daniel 11?**

Answer: the Mahuzzim heresy

**10. What are the two main views of psycho-genesis?**

Answer: Creationism and Traducianism

**11. What does it mean to say that each individual soul was created in Adam?**

Answer: The identity, personality, and spiritual essence of each person who would ever be conceived was created in Adam and is carried by his descendants, according to their divisions, from generation to generation.

**12. How is the meaning of the Hebrew word for seed different from the words for children and infants?**

Answer: The word "seed" refers to people who have not yet been born or even yet conceived.

**13. When God covenants with His people, does He also covenant with their seed?**

Answer: Yes.

**14. Clement of Alexandria quotes the "Gospel of the Egyptians" to tell about a discussion between Jesus and Salome. What was it about?**

Answer: It was about whether child bearing was a part of God's plan or not.

**15. Do you agree with Clement that "the seed coming from consecrated people is sacred"? Why or why not?**

Answer: This is a subjective question designed to help the student fully appreciate the redemptive power of Christ over our reproductive life.

**16. What do you think this statement means: "Eat every plant but do not eat a plant whose content is bitter"?**

Answer: Suggested answer: Use sex for its intended purpose.

**17. Based on what Irenaeus said on page 55, do unbelievers have immortal souls?**

Answer: No, they do not.

**18. According to the 2nd Commandment, God visits the descendants of covenant keepers with mercy unto thousand a generations.**

**19. What is a covenant line?**

Answer: The genetic descendants of a Christian.

**20. In the Early Church, how did the midwife participate in building covenant lines?**

Answer: By helping Christian women have successful pregnancies and baptizing their children, if needed.

## **CHAPTER SIX:**

### **QUESTIONS FOR REVIEW**

**1. The opening text from Ezekiel 21:27 describes the process of history. How would you compare it to the words of Jesus in Matthew 24 about "wars and rumors of wars" and when will this process end?**

Answer: Suggested Answer: Each generation is judged for its trust in false messiahs until the true Messiah comes.

**2. How might the idea of "free will" - the ability of man to originate choice - lead to the idea of "individual freedom" as opposed to slavery, socialism, and other kinds of tyranny?**

Answer: If man's created design consists in his ability to choose, then he must have the liberty to fulfill that design with the choice of alternatives. Freedom is his natural state. Tyranny takes away the objects of choice.

**3. What church does the author claim was the "Mother Church" of this kind of doctrine?**

Answer: The ancient Church of Britain which prevailed in Celtic Wales.

**4. From your reading, identify the central thesis of the book *Holy Blood, Holy Grail*.**

Answer: Jesus Christ was the titular head of the House of David and founded Christianity as a continuation of the Messianic office of the Davidic dynasty. He was married to Mary Magdalene and perpetuated that dynasty by fathering children who became the progenitors of the royal houses of Europe.

**5. Do you think Jesus was married? Why or why not?**

Answer: Suggested Answer: Yes, it is not denied by Scripture, it is supported by a significant leader of the Early Church, and all good Jews were married.

**6. Irenaeus taught the Recapitulation Doctrine. What does it mean?**

Answer: Jesus entered every stage of human life and sanctified it.

**7. Do you agree with the author's contention, that the womb of a Christian woman can be considered a "holy grail"? Why or why not?**

Answer: Yes, if the Seed is holy, then the vessel which carried it is holy also.

**8. Who are the Desposyni?**

Answer: The Desposyni are the kinsmen of Jesus.

**9. Who was the leader at the First Church Council in Acts 15?**

Answer: James, the brother of Jesus.

**10. Give two reasons why he was the leader of the New Testament Church?**

Answer: He was a holy man and a descendant of King David.

**11. What was the essence of the Davidic Covenant?**

Answer: The descendants of David were promised the leadership of God's people.

**12. What does the author identify as the "messianic office" of the Church?**

Answer: The bishop

**13. From the writings of what Church Father does the author quote to support this assertion?**

Answer: Ignatius, bishop of Antioch

**14. What does the word "soteriological" mean?**

Answer: Having to do with the doctrine of salvation.

**15. Is the Church a continuation of the "kingdom of David"?**

Answer: Yes, there is an eternal continuity to the Covenants of God.

**16. What is the "Mustard Seed Conspiracy"?**

Answer: It is the secret growth of the Desposyni within the Church.

**17. Why do you think the Dragon attacks the offspring of the Woman?**

Answer: Because they have been given the Dominion Covenant.

**18. Why does the author describe midwives as "guardians of the Grail"?**

Answer: They are the custodians of the successful pregnancies of Christian women especially the Desposyni.



**CHAPTER SEVEN:**  
**QUESTIONS FOR REVIEW**

**1. What does the word "ecclesiastical" mean?**

Answer: Having to do with the church as an institution

**2. What is a "geber"?**

Answer: It was the title ascribed to men of status in Israelite society. It meant "mighty man", a man of means and station.

**3. What is the usual name in the New Testament for an ecclesiastical leader?**

Answer: bishop or elder

**4. What was the usual name for a leader in ancient Israel?**

Answer: elder or master

**5. Did these leaders in ancient Israel have spiritual responsibilities?**

Answer: Yes, they led their families and communities in worship and in obedience to God's law.

**6. Why were Gebers polygamists?**

Answer: Polygamy enabled them to have large families and in turn a host with which to govern.

**7. What is the reason the author claims Gentile Gebers were forbidden by Paul to be polygamists?**

Answer: Gentile elders were a temporary leadership pending the arrival of the Desposyni.

**8. Do you think spiritual leaders should be polygamous? Why or why not?**

Answer: This is a subjective question to help the student formulate an opinion which is Biblically informed. It is hoped that the student will recognize the value of helping the families of godly men become numerous and powerful.

**9. According to Hosea, when would the Throne of David be restored to Israel'?**

Answer: When the people of God "seek" for it.

**10. Explain in what sense midwives are "priestesses" and of what altar do they serve?**

Answer: They are the priestesses of new life and they serve at the altar of the womb.

**11. To qualify for the Order of Widows, a woman had to first serve as a \_\_\_\_\_(deaconess).**

**12. How might midwifery fit in the description found in 1 Timothy 5:9-10?**

Answer: In “relieving the afflicted” the midwife attends both mother and child.

**13. Who is called the "matron saint" of midwives?**

Answer: Salome

**14. To which member of the Trinity does the Didascalia liken a deaconess?**

Answer: the Holy Spirit

## **CHAPTER EIGHT:**

### **QUESTIONS FOR REVIEW**

**1. The author identifies the Midwife as a specialized function of the deaconess. Do you think midwives should be willing and able to provide a more comprehensive spiritual ministry? Why or why not?**

Answer: Midwives often work together as a team with apprenticing midwives. Perhaps the junior partners can focus on the medical aspects of the process while senior midwives can provide guidance spiritually, as well.

**2. What do you think the author means when he refers to the midwife/deaconess as an extension of the arms of her bishop?**

Answer: She was accountable to her spiritual leader and represented his ministry in quarters he normally could not go.

**3. In the larger context of the Church, what does the author mean that the midwife must stand "within the Altar of God"?**

Answer: She must have spiritual coverture.

**4. Reflecting on an earlier chapter, if a midwife is ministering God's healing as a deaconess, should she not learn to do so as a priestess rather than as merely a medical professional?**

Answer: Yes, for healing comes from God, not medical procedures which will fail without His blessing.

**5. Would you be willing to administer the sacraments to your clients, if so requested by them and commissioned by your Church? Why or why not?**

Answer: It is not unusual for deacons to take the elements of the Eucharist from the altar after they have been blessed to the sick and infirm. This is precisely what midwives can do. It is encouraged.