

The Cambrian Peshier

A Voice of the Desposyni to the Dispersion

The Feast of St. Barnabas

June 11th, 2024

Dear Beloved Friends:

On The Christian Monarchy

It is monstrous to talk of Jesus Christ and to practice Judaism. For Christianity did not believe in Judaism, but Judaism in Christianity.

- Ignatius to the Magnesians §10

These all continued with one accord in prayer, with the women, and children, and Mary the mother of Jesus, and his brethren. – Acts 1:14 (from the Beza Manuscript of the New Testament, translated by William Whiston, 1745) (emphasis added)

Before we talk about St. Barnabas, we must first talk about St. Ignatius and his words quoted above. What could he possibly have meant that the Christian religion antedates Judaism?

The translation here is obscure, but the context of this passage clarifies that the Old Testament “saints” looked forward in faith for the Savior to come (Magnesians §9). Ignatius clearly affirms that Judaism was an innovation, even an apostasy, and that Jews converting to Christianity were really returning to the primordial religion of their forebears.

Judaism = Phariseeism

We must remember, as was pointed out in our last Peshet, that in the nomenclature of the Early Church, "Judaism" was "Phariseeism," and in particular, the alleged "oral tradition" which was given to Moses at the time of the giving of the Law. Jesus Christ and His followers rejected this "tradition of the elders" (Matthew 15:15; Mark 7:8, *et al*) as a spurious corruption of the revealed will of God in the Decalogue and the Scriptures composed by Moses through Divine inspiration.

It must also be remembered that when St. Paul rejected the Law in his "law vs. grace" antinomy, it was not the *revealed* will of God in the Scriptures to which he referred. It was to this secret, oral law which was sequestered by the Pharisees. Josephus, with obvious sympathies because he was one, can be cited for that veracity (*Antiquities* 13.10.6:297):

What I would now explain is this, that the Pharisees have delivered to the people a great many observances by succession from their fathers, which are not written in the Law of Moses . . .

The antinomians who think they find support in Paul have failed to understand his explicit references to this occult tradition condemned in Galatians (1:14), Colossians (2:8) and elsewhere.

Phariseeism = Cabalism

The Pharisees were the first "Cabalists":

The Word "Cabala," which is Hebrew, signifies "Admission" or "Initiation." The Jews appropriate this Word to the Knowledge or Comprehension of the Mysteries of the "Oral Law"; and accordingly the "Connoisseurs" in that Law are, in our Idiom, called "Cabalists."

- *The Traditions of the Jews* by Johann Andreas Eisenmenger (first published, 1700), abridged and reprinted by Independent History and Research, Michael A. Hoffman, 2006 (p. 144).

Isaac Newton, a contemporary of Eisenmenger, and as has been cited before, concurred that this was a part of a pseudo-wisdom tradition which was bowdlerized into Gnosticism:

[The apostacy] began to work in . . . such sorts of men as had imbibed the metaphysical philosophy of the Gentiles and Cabalistic Jews, and were thence called Gnosticks. John calls them Antichrists.

- *Observations Upon the Prophecies of Daniel & the Apocalypse of St. John*, (1733)
Anodos Edition (2019), p. 80

“Cabalism” is not necessarily evil on its face, but rather is initially sincere in its earnest piety and desire for a spiritual unity with the divine. However, the Pharisees exhibited religious fanaticism in an obsession with prayer vigils, fasting, and other austerities. They were superstitious and were paranoid over demonic contamination from dirt, blood and sex. They practiced astrology and observed omens.

Christ denounced them as “hypocrites” on numerous occasions, culminating in a litany of maledictions against them in Matthew 23, one of them for setting aside the Law of Moses to comply with their tradition:

Ye blind guides, which strain at a gnat, and swallow a camel. (v.24)

Phariseeism = “Anti-Messianism”

I will be his father, and he shall be my son.

- 2 Samuel 7:14

He is antichrist, that denieth the father and the son.

- 1 John 2:22

The Pharisees were the first “antichrists” because they opposed the notion of a Messiah. They wanted righteousness to be based upon correct religious instruction and spiritual experiences by which the soul could experience oneness with God.

For them, leadership was posited in the rabbi, not in a king. Rabbinic Judaism was committed in its rejection of an anointed leader.

Like many Evangelicals today with their “preacher religion,” Pharisees believed that righteousness consisted in attending religious events to hear the rabbi, to pay him tithes, to engage in prayer vigils and fasting, and to abstain from sex.

If, as Ignatius insists, there was an “Old Testament Christianity” that was fundamentally different from Judaism, what might it have looked like?

Before we can discuss that, we must talk more about St. Ignatius.

Jerusalem in Exile

St. Ignatius was a first century Christian (30-107 AD). In fact, according to an early history of the Syrian Church (i.e. Antioch and “The Book of the Bee”), Ignatius was the child whom Jesus sat on His lap when He gave his discourse about entering the Kingdom of God as little children (Luke 18:16).

Ignatius was later canonized as a “saint” because he was martyred. (His feast day is October 17th in the Western tradition). But before that time, he lived a long life as lord bishop of the Churches of Syria, which would have been the largest and most powerful contingent of churches outside of Jerusalem. Antioch became the Jerusalem Church in exile after its destruction in 70 AD.

[Perea/Petra had been a temporary hide-out until hostilities ended.]

As will be shown, to the First Christians, Judaism was irrelevant in the life of those who identified with the House of Israel. After these terrible Jewish-Roman Wars, the greater part of them lived in the Levant and in Asia Minor, and was the specific recipients of the Petrine Epistles as well as the Book of James. These were the refugee camps or Jewish “ghettos” which became identified as “the sojourners” during that stressful time of transition.

The Ignatian Epistles

Ignatius was said to be a disciple of St. John, a mentor of Polycarp, and as one of the “Apostolic Fathers,” composed several epistles which bear his name. They can be found in John Lightfoot’s collection, *The Apostolic Fathers*, and as a collection in the *Ante-Nicene Fathers* published by that eminent church historian from the 19th Century, Phillip Schaff.

Several of the Ignatian epistles were addressed to the churches identified in the Book of Revelation or at least in Asia Minor: Ephesus, Smyrna, Philadelphia, Magnesia, and Trallia.

Along with these epistles, Schaff has included several “spurious” epistles, but carefully delineates between the authentic and the non-authentic ones. What you are reading here is based upon Ignatius’ authentic epistles.

Of the authentic epistles, there exist longer and shorter recensions. Both are provided side-by-side in Schaff’s editions. There is also provided the limited Syriac editions which existed at the time.

While the vast majority of scholars have favored the shorter versions (based perhaps more arbitrarily upon a principle of Occam’s razor, than of any internal problems), it was William Whiston in his *Primitive Christianity Restored* (1711) who defended the longer recensions.

It is from the longer recension of the Epistle to the Magnesians that we learn that St. Stephen was the deacon to St. James the Just, the brother of Jesus, and that, because the diaconate was the normal path to the episcopate, Stephen would have been the heir apparent of the episcopal throne of Jerusalem. We find confirmation in the “Apostolic Constitutions” (as cited in the Melchizedek Peshier); so whether we accept the longer or shorter recensions, it does not matter. Our interest is to determine whether this was “common knowledge” among the First Christians. And indeed, it was.

The Messianic Dynasty

There shall not fail thee a man to be ruler in Israel.

- 2 Chronicles 7:19

David’s throne and royal seat is the priesthood in the holy church.

- Epiphanius, *Panarion* 3.1

I will make an everlasting covenant with you, even the sure mercies of David.

- Isaiah 53:3

Unlike our Protestant churches where leaders will use a pulpit, it was the custom for early Christian bishops to teach while seated as kings upon their thrones. In fact, their seat was called “the episcopal throne.”

The episcopal throne represented the Throne of the House of David. Whoever would have been seated upon that throne in Jerusalem would have in fact been the King of Israel, and a successor, not only to King David, but also to the Messianic “Son of David,” - Jesus Christ.

If James ruled, he ruled in regency to the true heir until he reached his majority. In this case, we believe it was Stephen.

But of course, per the record found in Acts Chapter 7, Stephen was martyred. James would have remained as a vicegerent in Christ’s stead – he, too, being a scion of the House of David - “pending Christ’s 2nd Coming.” Stephen’s death, as a son of Jesus Christ, would have created a crisis of succession in the First Church.

To this day, the obvious truth escapes the cognizance of Christian teachers that **Jesus Christ could not have been the true Messiah had He not left heirs to sit upon the Throne of David.** Historic Christianity argues that Christ reigns from Heaven in His Resurrected Body.

It is a nonsensical sophistry because an absent king is no king at all. The argument is nonsensical because the soul of King David is in Heaven, too. Why cannot he reign from heaven – the authentic progenitor of the dynasty?

It is sophistry because it takes Christ’s parable of the “lord’s long journey” to absurd extremes . . . 2000 years?

That is not what was meant by “the sure mercies of David” nor what James affirmed in his ruling in Acts 15 by the “raising up” of the “Tabernacle of David” to reign over the Gentiles. “The sure mercies of David” which was a Divine promise to the Messiah was also a guarantee that mankind would not fail to have Davidic shepherds to rule over them. After the Atonement, the primary mission of the Messiah was to propagate the royal lineage **through his own offspring** (Psalm 45). In fact, that was the point of the Atonement: to establish the gospel of the *kingdom*. This is what is meant by the “procession of the Holy Ghost.” More below.

The Esoteric Tradition

In numerous places in his epistles, Ignatius speaks of an esoteric tradition. He speaks of the “secrets of God” (Philadelphians 9) and the “mysteries of God” (Trallians 2):

Am I not able to write to you of heavenly things? But I fear to do so.

- Trallians 5

To the Ephesians, he said things like this:

And holden from the prince of this world were the virginity of Mary and her child-bearing and likewise also the death of the Lord – three mysteries to be cried aloud – the which were wrought in the silence of God .

- Lightfoot Edition, § 19, p. 68

No Apostolic Christianity

In numerous places, Ignatius treats the office of the bishop as a messianic office, not an apostolic one:

It is therefore evident that we ought to look upon the bishop, even as we would do upon the Lord himself.

- To the Ephesians 2:4

The Twelve Apostles were a *presbytery* to Christ their head; they were not an episcopacy. There was no apostolic succession. Just the opposite, the bishops appointed the successors of the Apostles:

In like manner, let all reverence the deacons as an appointment of Jesus Christ, and the bishop as Jesus Christ, who is the Son of the Father, and the presbyters as the Sanhedrin of God, and the assembly of the apostles. Apart from these, there is no Church.

- To the Trallians §3

Why would he say this?

David's Royal Line Runs through the True Church

Because the Christian churches in their contest with Judaism could claim to their Jewish brethren that they were ruled by *bona fide* descendants of the royal line of David through Jesus Christ, they represented the true Israel. The Jewish-Roman Wars had destroyed the Jewish state as a civil body politick. The Churches, on the other hand, could claim continuity of government for the House of Israel and of the royal line of David. After the fall of Jerusalem, the seat of that royal episcopacy became Antioch. That is why Ignatius announces Christ's Davidic lineage in numerous places in his epistles (e.g. Ephesians XX, Philadelphians IX, and Trallians II).

While for the presbytery, seniority was required; for the episcopacy, it was not. The bishop of the Magnesians §3 was a "youth," whom Ignatius defended by referencing the tender ages of kings Solomon and Josiah, and the prophet Daniel (who was also of royal lineage). Obedience was still required toward these young leaders, not because they manifested the wisdom of age but because they represented God's grace through their royal heritage.

But he does not stop there. He declares the office of the bishop to be that of a king:

He who honours the bishop shall be honoured by God, even as he that dishonours him shall be punished by God. For if he that rises up against kings is justly held worthy of punishment, inasmuch as he dissolves public order, of how much sorer punishment, suppose ye, shall he be thought worthy, who presumes to do anything without the bishop . . .

- To the Smyrneans, §9

In saying so, he would be inferring that he was himself a son of Jesus Christ because he claimed the royal power as "lord bishop." It would have been presumption, if not sedition, were that not the case.

Was Ignatius a Son of Jesus Christ?

That he would have been near Jesus in His travels such that He could be dangled on His knee meant that Ignatius, as a young child, would have been with his mother, who would have been sharing private space with Jesus and by action of law – his [*term redacted*].

Unlike John Mark, Ignatius would have been too young to have understood the teachings of Jesus - and certainly, too young to have traveled among the Seventy. Yet, as cited above from the Beza Manuscript of the New Testament of Acts 1:14, he would have been present with his mother on the Day of Pentecost and received of that heavenly power along with the other disciples while still yet a young child:

For this promise is unto you and to your children and unto them which are afar off, even as many as the Lord our God shall call.

- St. Peter, Acts 2:30

As explained in *Hierogamy & The Married Messiah* (Stivers, 2004), the physical offspring of Jesus Christ, especially after His Resurrection, would *not* have been subject, judicially, to the guilt of Original Sin. Even though they were still fully human and even though, as was their father – Jesus Christ – they would have been subject to the physical “infirmity” of the flesh – yet without sin – they would now have been free to exercise dominion in the Earth. His victory upon the Cross quieted their right to title. Satan’s legal claims had been repudiated.

This was Ignatius’ status.

Ignatius the God-Bearer

For the head of Christ is God.

- 1 Corinthians 11:1

Who is Theophorus?

- Emperor Trajan to Ignatius

Ignatius' name is Latin which means "of the nature of fire." That which is a natural attribute or innate in a thing is something which is imparted by lineage. Ignatius bore the attribute of He who "baptizes with fire."

In his Epistles, he always introduces himself as "Ignatius called Theophorus." "Theophorus" is Greek and means "borne of God," which we might mistakenly suppose is a mere theological expression to the condition of being "born again" or "born of the spirit" or "born of God," per Jesus' elucidations in John Chapter 3. Or, as a later understanding of the term as an onomastic expression, it might refer to the piety of the ancients to name their children or themselves after their favorite deities.

But in this case it means "God bearer" and in light of how Ignatius uses the language of "Christ bearer" in other places, he would be drawing attention to his special relationship with the Divine. It certainly drew the attention of Trajan, as noted above, when he interrogated Ignatius at his trial (see "The Martyrdom of Ignatius," *ANF, vol. 1*, Schaff edition, p.127 ff.).

Again, we might mistakenly interpret the expression as one which refers to his episcopal office; except, that *theophorus* in the ancient Greek religion was first used to name the *theotokos*: the sons of the gods, as in when Zeus is alleged to have mated with Earth-women and sired children from such copulations.

This is what agitated Trajan: only the Emperor could be a *theotokos* – the son of God. By calling himself *theophorus*, in the eyes of Trajan, Ignatius was also declaring himself to be a *theotokos*: the son of Jesus Christ, the King of the Jews.

Looking at these ancient documents through the lens of 2nd Century redactions, the author of the account leads us to believe that Ignatius merely called himself "Theophorus" as an act of piety and as a rejection of the Gentile superstitions concerning demonic powers. For Trajan, however, it was a matter of state security.

As the story is told, Trajan had just subjugated the Scythians and was on his way east to engage the Parthians. Syria was on the Roman frontier with the Parthians which was often contested. Trajan saw Ignatius as a potential vassal king of the Parthians, and his claim to be “Theophorus” as an act of sedition. “Theophorus” was code for Ignatius’ Desposynic lineage.

Ignatius was not so named because of some metaphorical or symbolic derivation. The name “Ignatius” contains no allusions to a deity. But by adding “theophorus,” he identifies himself as “Christkind” - a “son of the Messiah” – whose headship is in God, alone:

But the anointing which ye have received of him abideth in you, and ye need not that any man teach you: but as the same anointing teacheth you of all things, and is truth, and is no lie, and even as it hath taught you, ye shall abide in him.

- 1 John 2:27

We have argued this point in *The House of Bethany* (2007) that it would have been usurpation for someone to sit on the Throne of David who was not in fact a descendant of the royal line, and furthermore, as a continuation of the Messianic throne, it would have been usurpation and sedition also, for a Christian bishop not to have been a descendant of Jesus Christ, the rightful heir to the Throne of David.

This fact escapes most Christian theologians because their Cabalistic beliefs teach that Jesus has been enthroned in Heaven, with no extension of that rule on Earth, except in some token “spiritualized” meaning. It was not so understood by the First Christians: **the Procession of the Holy Ghost is achieved through the propagation of the Desposyni.**

Old Testament Christianity

I pray for a union both of the flesh and spirit of Jesus Christ.

- To the Magnesians §1

What this statement should mean has already been offered in the St. Mary the Virgin Peshier: *The Church of the New Earth* (2020). In the esoteric tradition, to quote Methodius again,

Can anyone now say otherwise than that the Bride is the undefiled flesh of the Lord, for the sake of which He left the Father and came down here, and was joined to it, and being incarnate, dwelt in it?

- "Banquet of the Ten Virgins", ANF, (Schaff Edition, vol. 6, p 334)

And again,

And as the Books and the Apostles plainly declare that the Church existeth not now for the first time, but hath been from the beginning: for she was spiritual, as our Jesus also was spiritual, but was manifested in the last days that He might save us. Now the Church, being spiritual, was manifested in the flesh of Christ . . . for this flesh is the counterpart and copy of the spirit . . .

"An Ancient Homily," Chapter 14,
Apostolic Fathers, Lightfoot, p. 50

And finally,

If our Lord's flesh is the Bride, the true Church, then it is not enough to become Christ's according to the spirit only. We do not become the Bride until we are perfected by becoming His flesh as well as His spirit . . .

- *Hierogamy & the Married Messiah*, Textbook Edition, Stivers (2004) p. 198

In *Hierogamy & the Married Messiah* and elsewhere, we have demonstrated that the Davidic kings were “anointed” ones, or messiahs, as were Aaronic priests as part of the sacerdotal order. But the race of messiahs reaches back to the Patriarchs where it is said of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob: “**Touch not mine anointed (messiahs) and do my prophets no harm.**” (Psalm 105:15)

David as a *Christ* (which means anointed one) - his followers would have been “Christians” because they were disciples of the anointed one.

Consequently, **adherence to the Patriarchal religion was to follow this aboriginal Christianity.** It represented a family covenant which descended from father to son: a line of succession which the author of the Johannine Epistles affirmed to be the true faith and which, to deny, constituted the doctrine of the “antichrist” (i.e. “anti-messianism”).

This all begins to make sense when we consider who the real author of John’s Gospel and the Epistles might be.

Lazarus as the Beloved Disciple

Other than the fact that the Fourth Gospel singles Lazarus out as the “beloved disciple” – or “he whom thou lovest” (11:3) – how is it that we can know that it was Lazarus who composed this Gospel?

This proposition has been considered by other Christian thinkers in the past. Vernon Eller’s *The Beloved Disciple* (Eerdmans, 1987) demonstrates from internal evidence that the Fourth Gospel could not possibly be the work of the Apostle John. To the contrary, with a methodical process of detective work (accompanied with charts, lest we lose our way) befitting of a Sherlock Holmes, he leads us to one final deduction: the beloved disciple was Lazarus.

In more recent years, a lay scholar by the name Edward L Bromfield from the Blue Mountains of Pennsylvania has offered impressive arguments that Barnabas and Lazarus are the same man and also this “Beloved Disciple” who authored this Gospel. Bromfield has done an excellent job sorting through the confusing list of “Maries” in the New Testament.

Lacking fresh biographical information, however, his logic and inferences have proved too much and led to another conflation: that these identities were also Joseph of Arimathea. In spite of this bizarre conclusion, his material is still worth the read:

<https://thingspaulandluke.wordpress.com/2012/11/05/barnabas-whom-jesus-loved/>

Notice that Bromfield wrote his study in 2012, five years after my *House of Bethany* book. Since my book had a very limited circulation, it is unlikely that it was Bromfield's source. His research is probably his own.

Important New Evidence

However, a pivotal piece of information which is lacking in other scholarly works is found in the 2nd Epistle of "John." It was written to "Martha," and says so twice, in verses 1 and 5. *Young's Concise Critical Commentary of the Holy Bible* (Baker, 1977, p. 175) renders "Lady" as "Martha," without explanation:

"Lady". Gr. *Kyrios*. Heb. *Martha*

To my knowledge, no other scholar has made this connection.

Martha was Lazarus' sister, not the Apostle John's, and we know that it had to be the "Martha" from the Gospel being addressed here, because she has a sister who has children (2 John 13) and is living with the author. It would have to be Mary, because the three of them were privy to "commandments received" "from the beginning" (v. 5 *et al*), as in the beginning of Christianity (John 13:34; 15:12; 1 John 3:23; 2:7-8). These three were present at the beginning of Christ's ministry, and it has been argued that they were also the initial sponsors of that ministry (See Christmas Peshier, 2020: *Obedience to the House of Bethany, et al*).

Is Lazarus also Barnabas?

The correlations to make these two men the same man have been cited in previous Peshiers. But to summarize, the meaning of the names of these two men are the same: one in Aramaic and the other in Hebrew. Church history also places them at the same

place (Cyprus) at the same time (50s AD) with the same job (as bishops). They both were rich men. They both were Levites.

Barnabas is called “Josés” or a “Joseph” by Luke in the Acts of the Apostles (4:36). We have no biblical references to cite which would make Lazarus into a “Josés” also. But both names are used as surnames, so we do not know Lazarus’ first name.

“Barnabas” means “paraclete” (“the helper” or “comforter” or “advocate”), per the interpretation offered in Acts 4:36; while “Lazarus” is a unique cognate of Eleazer. “Eleazer” appears in the New Testament in other places, which makes “Lazarus” a variant intentionally drawing attention to its meaning and the construction of the name’s components.

The “L” or “lamed” added to “azar” in Hebrew forms the preposition “to,” “for,” or “at” and makes it into a title rather than a personal name meaning: “to help,” “for help,” or “at help.”

Furthermore, because it has been Hellenized, the “os” added to the Hebrew verb root - (*azar* =“help”) makes it into a hybrid word with the Greek relative pronoun, “who?”

Now, *L + Azar + os* together become “He who is for help.” So, Lazarus could have been named “Joseph” with “Lazarus” as a surname. “He who is for Help” adds formality to make it equivalent to “Paraclete.”

The other scholars mentioned above follow another path listing all the “Mary’s” in the New Testament and by a process of elimination try to attach the right Mary to these men. But again, inferences upon inferences require fresh biographical information to corroborate them. In *The House of Bethany: A Study on Footwashing, the Johannine Community & the Family of Jesus* (full title) (2007), I used **Talmudic sources** to make the connection. In the Talmudic narratives, Nicodemus is the father of Mary and Martha. And in the Clementine narratives, Nicodemus’ amanuensis is Aeneas, who also is a traveling companion of Lazarus. In ancient times, an amanuensis was a personal assistant along the lines of an in-house servant or deacon. Very often such servants served in a family for generations. That this man would have been with Nicodemus and then with Lazarus only makes sense if this was a father/son succession.

Robert Eisenman's *The New Testament Code*, (Watkins, 2006) also uses Talmudic sources to make these connections. Since *The House of Bethany* is not for public distribution, Eisenman should be consulted by scholars for verification.

Caution must be used in relying upon Talmudic sources, however, because they are derogatory, even hostile. They are often filled with calumny toward our Gospel personages and deviously weave falsehoods into their narratives.

Fortunately, biblical sources are sufficient to identify a common link between these two men in that they share the same Mary as a *sister*. She must have sufficient wealth to provide a place of gathering for hundreds of people. In an age when most families slept together in one room, such accommodations rival that of the opulent Herodians. It is difficult to believe that there were two such wealthy benefactors with the same name.

The process of deductive reasoning may suggest an alternative that Lazarus and Barnabas were brothers: two boys with the same name! But because the biblical record does not offer us anyone else as members of that illustrious family, it is easier to conflate the identities: one Mary with one sister (Martha) with one brother - Lazarus/Barnabas.

Whether we can definitively conflate these identities with absolute certainty or not would not be fatal to our argument that the Bethany family represents a different branch of Christianity and would be the true author of the Johannine Community. Occam's razor simplifies the narrative.

Barnabas and Ignatius

If the Johannine Epistles are any guide, Mary and Barnabas/Lazarus were in Rome prior to the persecutions under Nero. Martha would have been in the East, probably Cyprus. Stephen would have been her son, long dead; Ignatius would be her son also, but much younger and safely hidden on Cyprus.

With the persecutions ended, he would have been appointed bishop of Antioch after the fall of Jerusalem, after James was dead and after it was clear that there was no hope for the Church there. He would have been over 40 years of age. John Mark would have been his mentor, later mistaken for John the Apostle.

At the time of the persecutions, the Bethany family in Rome escaped to the Pyrenees and to Celtic Briton. While the trail is lost to us in the East after Ignatius, in the West, it lived on in St. Ambrose of Milan (the home of Trinitarianism) and the sacred lineage of the Arthurian legends (cf. *Merlin: High Priest of the Holy Grail*, Stivers, 2011).

Implications

We have explained that the Beloved Disciple performed the role of the kinsman/redeemer. One of the tasks of that role in Old Testament law was that of the executor of the estate: in this case, if the sons of the Messiah were entitled to rule over the Gentiles per the decree of James in his ruling of Acts 15 – then the bishoprics of the Gentile churches would have been assigned to them. Barnabas' presence on the Pauline Missionary Journeys would have been the occasion for this to occur. And the turning away of John Mark would have been symptomatic of Paul's deviations from the original mission. Paul was never entirely purged of his Pharisee/Cabalist orientation toward mysticism. He loved austerity and hyper-charismatic experiences. As a former Herodian, he would have been too proud to bend the knee to any bishop, Davidic or not. His king was conveniently in heaven, awaiting a mythical 2nd Coming, never understanding that the doctrine of the *Parousia* was a ruse of the Desposynic bishops to throw Roman authorities off the trail (cf. Hegesippus).

Consequently, we can say that prior to Apostolic Christianity and certainly Pauline Christianity, there was *Messianic Christianity* represented by the Bethany family as guardians and custodians of whatever was left of the House of David.

In contrast, historic Christianity and Judaism are both Cabalistic and anti-messianic in their doctrines of succession, religious authority, and the dominion covenant. Lacking and even refusing to acknowledge the existence of the Desposyni, they have no means to effectuate the "2nd Coming" as truly taught by the Prophet Daniel and St. John of the Apocalypse, and hence are forever blinded to their "Day of Visitation."

A servant of Jesus,

James

Collect for the Day:

Grant, O God, that we may follow the example of your faithful servant Barnabas, who, seeking not his own renown but the well-being of your Church, gave generously of his life and substance for the relief of the poor and the spread of the Gospel; through Jesus Christ our Lord, who lives and reigns with you and the Holy Spirit, one God, for ever and ever. Amen.

The Cambrian Peshier is the pastoral epistle of the Cambrian Episcopal Church of the Grail, a fellowship and abbey adhering to a spiritual tradition from ancient Wales. We use the Authorized Version of the Bible (King James Version) as our default translation and the Book of Common Prayer of the Episcopalian Church for liturgical guidance. We are not an affiliate of any denomination.

© Copyright is reserved to the Cambrian Episcopal Church of the Grail and its Overseer, 2020-2024, Idaho, USA