

BIBLICAL TERRANOMICS

October, 1996

No.19

©James W. Stivers

THE PATRIARCHY & PLURAL MARRIAGE

And the children of Issachar, which were men that had understanding of the times, to know what Israel ought to do . . . (made 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 be, or may have been, a warrior. 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, 1828 edition).

I do not intend to repeat studies I have done elsewhere on the patriarch (*The Law of Coverture* series in *The Family Spokesman; Restoring the Foundations; The Biblical Case for Polygamy*, etc.).

In previous studies I have shown that the *Geber* is the foundation or the anchor of society. He is almost always a polygamist, or his sons are polygamists. His is a family with a host (Psalms 127:4). The Geber is not a leader of society, but rather is the father of the leaders of society. From the Gebers - the patriarchs - 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.

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.

There is a lot of talk about patriarchs these days. There is even a Christian magazine with that name. I applaud the call for masculine leadership. But the model which is 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.

This little essay serves as an addendum to the last one (No. 18) in which I introduced the role of the House of David in the leadership of the Church. You will recall that that role has prophetic significance. The Church cannot reach

maturity without it. Here, I introduce another thesis: *it is the Gebers who will restore the House of David*. Just as the Gebers of Issachar and Manasseh made David king, so it will 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 was a church, 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 death (for the simple among us, I refer, of course, to the Branch Davidians in Waco, Texas). This incident should make it obvious how deep the Babylonian captivity of the Church really is.

I will remind you that the New Testament Church was ruled by Gebers and the House of David. When the Jewish nation was destroyed in 70 A.D., that 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 David. The Gentile Church eventually became the persecutors of Davidic Christians. The book of Revelation calls this Mystery Babylon and it is still with us.

PLURAL MARRIAGE IN THE EARLY CHURCH

Eusebius tells us that the Church of the Constantine era destroyed all writings deemed heretical. This would include the Davidic Christians; for by this time, they were lumped together with the Ebionites and persecuted.

Yet, truth survives. With St. Basil of the late fourth 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

- 80th Canon, Nicene & Post-Nicene Fathers, v. 14, p. 609

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. 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 are admitting to being the innovators. Apostolic Christianity was not spiritual enough for them.

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

While I do not want to belabor points I have dealt with elsewhere (see *The Biblical Case for Polygamy*), 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 ordaining 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. (I think we see here an explanation for the presbyterian and episcopal models for church polity.) Comparing various prophecies concerning the House of David, as provided in our last issue, 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 (Hosea 3:4-5).

After losing 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. Celtic chieftains became the successors and guardians of the Davidic cause. That was why the Church of Rome had to engage in a millennium-long attempt to smash them.

In reference to plural marriage, 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 was necessary to provide an adequate pool of candidates which could assume leadership of the expanding church.

CONCLUSION

I write material that some people choke on. It is strong meat; I realize that. But it is necessary. A diet of milk alone will lead to malnourishment and spiritual midgets. We have a lot of midgets in the churches, people who take offense at the things I write, yet fail to realize how essential it is to God's plan. Their rebellion only delays, it never defeats, God's purposes.

Christian civilization is trying to perpetuate a society which refuses to breed its best men. It is doomed. Europe is being overrun by Muslims. Muslims understand what a patriarchy is; they know what the enabling principle is. The West snickers and calls it barbarism. When the West has its back to the wall, it will resort to the kind of barbarism for which it is infamous: genocide through the weapons of its superior technology. We will instigate a war, as in the case of Iraq, and use that as an excuse to bomb them into oblivion. So, we think that we are morally superior? Ha!

Others are looking to the traditions of the Celtic South for renewal. And there is much of value in the old Bellum ways. Yet, I must remind you that the South is a matriarchal society and has been so for a hundred years. All societies which lose a major war, are invaded and occupied become matriarchal societies. The South still needs more than it can give.

If the South could ever learn a protocol for reviving this custom for its best men, I could see them becoming a tower of world influence within a single generation. Unfortunately, there are too many prudish Southern Belles to stand for that.

Look at the heretical Mormons. Establishment author, Harold Bloom, predicts that the two major religions of the United States will be Southern Fundamentalism and Western Mormonism. Each of them received their cultural foundations and social impetus in two powerful, Biblical institutions. In Dixie it was slavery; in Utah it was polygamy. In each case you find these

institutions providing a social order of the extended family. The inertia of these two institutions still benefits those two societies. I might add that Mr. Bloom correctly identifies them both as Gnostic and completely severed from any meaningful connection with historic Christianity.

If covenant Christians would somehow grasp these implications, perhaps we could create a third force which would prevent America from slipping into apostasy and ruin, and then provide a means of fulfilling the Church's mission in the world.

* * * * *