

# *The Cambrian Peshier*

*A Voice of the Desposyni to the Dispersion*

The Peshier for Pentecost, 2025 *vulgaris*  
June 8th, 2028 *Anno Domini*

Beloved Friends:

## **The Desposyni As The Second Coming of Christ**

*Whilt thou at this time restore the kingdom to Israel?*

- Acts 1:6

*After this I will return and build again the tabernacle of David.*

- Acts 15:16

Perhaps the definitive lithmus test of Evangelical religion has become a confession of a literal return of Jesus Christ to the Earth. Yet as previous Peshiers have shown, such a return is no where taught in the Bible. Christ makes an "appearance" in the heavens, but at no time does He set foot upon *terra firma*. Not even St. Paul's Rapture doctrine has Jesus descending to Earth, but rather that the faithful are "caught up" into Heaven, and "so shall we ever be with the Lord."

Doctrinally, the literal return of Christ violates the Creeds of the Church and the scriptural doctrine of Atonement because Christ is only our high priest if He remains in the heavens (Hebrews 8:4 "For if he were on earth, he should not be priest") and as for the "kingdom," Earth remains Christ's "footstool" only so long as His throne remains in Heaven (Acts 7:49). Should He descend from His throne in Heaven to rule on Earth, it becomes genuinely an abdication.

We have also shown that the expression "caught up to heaven" is figurative language meaning - as says Newton - "to be given dominion" or "to be given the right to rule." It is not a physical thing, but rather one which refers to a change of status.

In the Ecumenical ruling of St. James the Just, the brother of Jesus and the first Lord Bishop of Jerusalem, the expression "I will return" clearly equates the "raising up of the tabernacle of David," not only as a resurrection, but also the meaning of the Second Coming of Christ: Christ returns in the dominion of a restored Davidic lineage. This is how James interpreted the expansion of the New Testament Church to the Gentiles: the installment of Desposynic bishops was the coming of Christ.

Now, lest the reader despair that we are teaching against the physical resurrection of the just and the life eternal in heaven, we are not. We do confess emphatically the Creeds of the Church which declare the same, and remind all skeptics that Jesus promised the resurrection at "the last day." This promise is truly "the blessed hope."

However, in terms of dominion and God's plan for the ages, dispensational doctrines which require parenthetical periods of spiritual defeat until some future discontinuous event occurs to enable believers to overcome sin and death, they are clearly heretical and surrender the world to the devil and wicked men.

Consequently, when the disciples asked Jesus at His Ascension about restoring the kingdom to Israel, it was a question about succession.

### **The Gospel Record as a Summary of Discourse and Events**

*And many other signs truly Jesus did in the presence of his disciples, which are not written in this book.*

- John 20:30

It should be obvious to anyone except extreme skeptics, that the Gospel accounts contain largely a summary of the teachings of Jesus at different times and at different places in their narratives. For example, the Sermon on the Mount in Matthew becomes the Sermon on the Plain in Luke. We cannot imagine that Jesus taught these things just once. We should expect that Jesus repeated His sayings many times in the many villages which He visited.

Likewise, variant accounts should not be viewed as "contradictions" as skeptics demand, but rather variations which repetition and adaptation to new circumstances would require. Variations are not contradictions because these are not accounts of the same incidents.

We find that Luke's account of the Ascension in Acts is more detailed than the Gospels. If Jesus walked with His disciples for 40 days after His Resurrection and "spoke to them concerning the kingdom of heaven," it should not surprise us that the "Magdalene Gospel" (Pepys Manuscript #2498: Magdalene Library, Oxford *op cit*) might provide greater elaboration of His response to their questions as here restated:

*And they asked him if he will restore the kingdom of Israel, and will do away with the foreign king, and with Pilate, Caesar's subordinate, and will rule himself, or perhaps appoint one of the family of David [to rule]?*

(Acts 1:6). Transl. Yuri Kuchinsky, p. 473 (cf. Peshier of the Annunciation, 2025)

In the Authorized Version, Christ here demurs, but from other sources (e.g. The Gospel of Thomas, Paul in Galatians 3:9, etc.), we learn that He did indeed appoint a successor in His brother, James.

[N.B. The reader of past Peshiers will appreciate that the Cambrian Church believes that it was a regency on behalf of St. Stephen, the true Messianic heir and successor, until he should come of age. We must also remember that Acts was written for an audience which included Roman authorities. It would not contain a clear description of church government which might compromise the safety of leaders who were still living at the time.]

### **On Wresting Dominion from Satan**

*"Behold I and the children which God hath given me." Forasmuch then as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, he also himself likewise took part of the same; that through death he might destroy him who has the power of death, that is, the devil.*

- Hebrews 2:13,14

The power of death represents the power to extinguish dominion. Dead men cannot rule anything.

In destroying the "works of the devil" – he who had the "power of death" – Christ has restored the right of dominion to His own eternal person. He acquired sovereign title to the Earth both for Himself and for His viceroys.

Although we understand the Bible contains some 300 references to a personal devil, we do not always know if they refer to the same personal entity or whether it is a title or name ascribed to an "adversary" or "accuser." Jesus called Peter "satan" (Matt. 16:23) so we must allow for the possibility that many of these texts do not refer to a personal, supernatural being at war with God's kingdom. And certainly, we must accept that traditional Churchianity has embellished the accounts to create a mythology. The idea that "Lucifer" and anything "Luciferian" means "Satan" in this mythological sense, only serves to heighten superstitions about spirits, demons, and angels.

It might be that "Satan" is a categorical construct in God's moral government which as an office - much like the modern role of the prosecuting attorney, especially a corrupt version of it – was one which required "atonement" to rectify the relational distortion which resulted from the entrance of sin into the world. Not only was the original sin a

relational distortion in terms of man's calling and dominion of the Earth (for he lost that in the Garden of Eden) but also a relational distortion in the enforcement of God's moral government. As the Apostle says of Christ, He was declared both "just and the justifier" by offering His blood as "propitiation" for that sin (Romans 3:25,26 cf. 1 John 2:1,2).

### Who are the Desposyni?

*Every spirit that confesseth that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh, is of God.*

- 1 John 4:2

"Desposyni" and "Desposynoi" are variants of a Greek word not used of Christ in the Scriptures but used by the Early Church Fathers as a name exclusively referring to the Lord's kinsmen and their descendants. It means either "of the despot" or "with the despot." "Despotes" means *master* (or husband) and not properly, "lord." It is *kurios* which is used in the Greek Scriptures as in the *Lord* Jesus Christ. While "kurios" would refer to a lord, "despotes" would be a stronger term which we would expect for the head of a household. In the Greek world, freemen may stand equally as "lords" – with the modern equivalent being "mister" - a "despotes," on the other hand, is one who has no equal within the *economia* of a household. In relation to the world, Christ is a "kurios"; in relation to His family, He is a "despot."

As of any household in the ancient world, a "despot" would have those who are *with him*, who dwell in the house as guests, servants, or kinsmen. However, there would also be those in his household who would be *of him*, as in his descendants and heirs.

In the last Peshier (its unredacted edition), the Bezae Codex was analyzed to show that the children in the Upper Room in Acts 1:14 were in fact clearly identified as Christ's children.

Consequently, the true meaning of the Eucharist recognizes (as in the *Didache*), first, those who are of *the Blood* who are commemorated in the Cup, and second, those of *the Host*, who are commemorated in the Bread. Or as the fathers taught: those that are "of the Lord" (as in those of His lineage) and those who are "with the Lord" (as in those of His house, not of His blood but of His sanctuary). The Eucharist recognizes both, commemorates both, and in dipping the Host into the Cup, it represents the ongoing eschatological progression of the seed of Adam mingling and becoming the seed of the Second Adam.

As has been explained before,

*English has two voices, the active ("I testify") and the passive ("It is testified"). Greek has three voices, the active ("I testify"), the passive ("It is testified") and the middle ("I am attesting" or "It is I who am attesting"). In the*

*middle voice the subject is affected by the action. Its voice varies greatly and is seldom given a satisfactory English equivalent. In this case in 1 John 4:3, it can be translated as "is come in the flesh" or "is coming in the flesh." If the former, it favors the notion of a completed Incarnation in the past. If the latter, it supports the above interpretation of an on-going manifestation of the Incarnation. In Catholic tradition, the Incarnation continues in the Eucharist. In Protestant doctrine, it continues in the printed Bible. In the Bethany Community, it continues in the Messianic office.*

*The word "flesh" is sometimes used in the Bible as a euphemism for a man's penis and his emission which produces offspring. In saying that Jesus Christ is "come in the flesh" we could truthfully say this is a direct reference to His sexuality and success in producing offspring. Thus, as awkward as it sounds, a better rendering would be to say, "Jesus Christ is fleshing" . . . meaning He is propagating His seed on the Earth, now covenantally in His descendants and liturgically in the Eucharist. The apostolic church says this happens in the transubstantiation of the Eucharist alone. The Grail Church says Christ's flesh is propagated in a growing web of kinship.*

*- The Cambrian Peshier, Of the Presentation, 2022*

In a denial of the doctrine of Desposynic rule, Christianity has become a false religion embracing a usurpation against the rule of Christ through His viceroys. We think that the 2<sup>nd</sup> Coming of Christ refers to the enthronement of His people on Earth, just as He is in Heaven. This enthronement follows a prophetic process and a protocol as set forth in biblical law. More another time.

## *Parens patriae* and Men Without Feet

*Have your feet shod with the . . . Gospel of Peace.*

- Ephesians 6:15

*In the Scriptures kings are called gods, and so their power after a certain relation compared to the divine power. Kings are also compared to fathers of families: for a king is truly Parens patriae, the politique father of his people.*

- King James I from *The Divine Right of Kings*,

*Correctly defined, "patriarchy" does not refer to the rule of men in society, but rather the rule of fathers: a very important distinction in biblical nomenclature. "Patriarchs" are father rulers who rule as kings and magistrates of their families and estates. Procreation is not the deciding factor in fatherhood; rather, it is the power to bequeth an estate. Slaves can procreate but only freemen can have heirs.*

- *The Institutes of Biblical Terranomics*, James Stivers, publication pending

### **First, On "Men Without Chests"**

C.S. Lewis of Cambridge University (and Oxford) was a famous 20th Century Christian thinker and apologist. He is popularly known as a friend of J.R.R. Tolkien and as the author of the "Chronicles of Narnia" (1956). Among theologians and Christian leaders, he is perhaps remembered most for his *Screwtape Letters* (1942), *Mere Christianity* (1952), and *The Abolition of Man* (1943).

In *The Abolition of Man*, he wrote a chapter called, "Men Without Chests" in which he tried to explain that the notion of civilization cannot exist in a purely cerebral society (one run by abstract philosophy or ideology) nor, on the other hand, that of raw instinct (hedonism). Values and the distinctions within society must be created by "men with chests" - men who have developed "sentiment" as a balance between reason and desire.

Were he alive today, he might have added a chapter to *The Abolition of Man*: "**Men Without Feet.**"

Jesus said, "Blessed are the peacemakers" (Matthew 5:9) and the Apostle admonished the followers of Christ to "Shod your feet with the gospel of peace." But men without "feet" cannot be "shod" and thus, cannot administer peace nor become "peacemakers." A "Peacemaker" must have "standing" - pun intended - and a legitimate stake in the outcome. He must have status and proximity to overcome spatial limitations to dominion: "boots on the ground."

Contrary to the gush of modern pietists, feet represent sovereignty in Scripture - "The heavens are my throne and the earth is my footstool" - consequently, peace can only be made among sovereigns. A peacemaker is not one who "turns the other cheek," but rather one who enforces the Law of God. **Peace can only be made by a mediator who has the power to enforce the peace.** When Jesus called His followers "peacemakers," He meant for them to have the power - *causa sine qua non* - to enforce "the king's peace." The Gospel of His "Kingdom" is the good news that Christ has become the universal sovereign who empowers all who represent *Him* as the administrators of *His* justice and of *His* peace. Only men with feet can do this.

### On Relational Theology

Relational Theology is a form of theological investigation which analyzes how scriptural doctrine affects human relationships. Because Scripture is an expression of covenant obligations, it follows that *relational theology* will focus upon how human relations are governed. An example of relational theology would be Abraham Kuyper's doctrine of sphere sovereignty in which he analyzes the various roles of institutions and their relation to one another through what he called "sphere law." A famous Dutch theologian and statesman who reached his pinnacle of influence in the era just prior to World War I, his legacy survives today in the social theories of Reformed Calvinists. (More below).

Another would be the moral government theology propounded by Hugo Grotius (the father of international law) and his intellectual heirs among the "covenant" theologians of the American Puritans: such as Jonathan Edwards (Yale), N.W. Taylor (Yale) and Charles Finney (Oberlin).

During the late 20th Century, R. J. Rushdoony and his *Institutes of Biblical Law* (1978) became another example of relational theology, a tome which begins with this famous quote ascribed to John Wycliffe who provided England with its first translation of the Bible:

*This Bible is for the government of the people, by the people, and for the people.*

### Self-Government With Union

Rushdoony argued that biblical law extends to all human relations. In relational theology there is no zone in which God's sovereignty cannot be manifested. There are no human zones of autonomy, as for example with marital sexual relations, in which the notions of romantic love or intimacy have primacy over God's law and His creation mandate.

For example, "consensual sex" is not a free zone. Just because a man's wife may consent to anal sex, or even desire it, it does not make it "moral" in terms of God's creative intent for sex: which is procreation. The modern notion that sex is "intended for pleasure" does not reflect God's revealed will in the Scriptures. The avoidance of pregnancy, whether through contraception or deviancy, is the thing which God condemns in the New Testament as "lasciviousness," "incontinence," and "uncleanness."

[N.B. See *Hierogamy & the Married Messiah* (Stivers, 2004) for a detailed analysis of this topic. [2046AD.org](http://2046AD.org)]

Aberrant sex may not necessarily be a mortal sin which threatens eternal punishment, but it is a "crime" against one's own body, which is the vessel of the unborn seed which the Creator has given to us for custodial care.

However, each institution in society is self-governing and has no supremacy over the others. The notion that the state can be used to reform all other institutions, including marital relations - as appears to be the case with the Christian Nationalists -

*In neo-Calvinism, sphere sovereignty (Dutch: soevereiniteit in eigen kring), also known as differentiated responsibility, is the concept that each sphere (or sector) of life has its own distinct responsibilities and authority or competence, and stands equal to other spheres of life. Sphere sovereignty involves the idea of an all-encompassing created order, designed and governed by God. This created order includes societal communities (such as those for purposes of education, worship, civil justice, agriculture, economy and labor, marriage and family, artistic expression, etc.), their historical development, and their abiding norms. The principle of sphere sovereignty seeks to affirm and respect creational boundaries, and historical differentiation.*

*Sphere sovereignty was first formulated at the turn of the 20th century by the neo-Calvinist theologian and Dutch prime minister Abraham Kuyper.*

*Sphere sovereignty implies that no one area of life or societal community is sovereign over another. Each sphere has its own created integrity. Neo-Calvinists hold that since God created everything "after its own kind", diversity must be acknowledged and appreciated. For instance, the different God-given norms for family life and economic life should be recognized, such that a family does not properly function like a business. Similarly, neither faith-institutions (e.g. churches) nor an institution of civil justice (i.e. the state) should seek totalitarian control, or any regulation of human activity outside their limited competence, respectively.*

- Wikipedia Source

requires a surrender of the "sphere sovereignty" which was so important to Kuyper.

## The Landed Gentry

*Land is the thing that is given in covenant.*

- *The Institutes of Biblical Terranomics* (Stivers)

But what if society has no men with feet? No "boots" on the ground?

If patriarchs, or the landed gentry, represent the "feet" of society, then without them, there are no longer any custodians of the Gospel or a ministry of mediation among men. The role of the magistrate is to enforce the law of God and to regulate social relations. When a society no longer has a landed gentry, the magistrate becomes too far removed from the people and cannot rule with wisdom or beneficence. He must practice selective enforcement as a deterrent with increasingly severe sanctions. Selective enforcement alienates the people which he governs and results in the "good ole' boys" club that finally ends in rebellion or complete tyranny.

In Bouvier's *Institutes of American Law* (circa. 1850), the "taking" of a property is the physical possession required to perfect title of ownership. This "taking" required the stepping-off of the property by its new owner.

The three indicia of title were these: 1) the right of property in one's person (proof of personal sovereignty), 2) the right of possession (the quieting of title), and 3) possession.

**Property in one's person** means that a man is not encumbered with a conventional disability: an impairment of his right to contract. "Contract law" presupposes free moral agency. This is a condition of status. If a man has made a contract, he is legally and morally bound to the performance of that contract before he can make another which might impair the rights of the antecedents. This is why Jesus commanded His disciples not to enter vows and oaths. The oath binds a man and in some sense restricts his freedom.

That is also why in biblical land law - the Mosaic Law - it was impossible for the land to be encumbered by contract for a period of more than 50 years. There was the Year of Jubilee: the year of release. This fact guaranteed that children could not be bound to a status encumbered by their fathers. It nullified the "corruption of blood."

After title is quieted in one's person, the **right to possess** a thing requires the surrender of adversarial claims by other competing parties. A "warranty deed" to land simply means that the power of the civil government is pledged to defend the property rights of the one who holds title. Usually, a "title search" is required to determine that there are no potential adversaries to the claim of title. Finding none, then title is certified

to the holder with a deed.

Finally, **possession** is the physically taking of a thing. Rich men who fail to "possess" their land, fall prey to squatters and other parties which might lay claim to it by "adverse possession."

### **The United States or the *united* States**

The American experience has been one of mixed law traditions. It began with the distinctions found in English law: 1) People's law of self-government in the form of "**Common Law**" which descended from custom and biblical teachings, 2) the **King's law** superimposed upon Common Law based upon the right of conquest (principally, a relic of the Norman Invasion, 3) **Canon law**: the rulings - often arbitrary - based upon the ecclesiastical canons of clerics, such as archbishops and popes, and 4) **Mercantile law**: the rules of commerce between nations at ports of entry.

In general, the King's law was an expression of state sovereignty and in America was replaced by the various legislative bodies when the Colonies declared independence. The general belief at the time was that these legislatures exercised a sovereignty derived from the People. The respective federal and state governments were "bound" by their constitutions. Sometimes referred to as "chains," these new embodiments of regal authority were limited by designated powers. "The consent of the governed" became the foundation for political legitimacy.

While municipal law represented the community covenant and limited, yet also protected, a property owner's use of his land, in the county – the unincorporated territory in the countryside - land law remained under the Common Law with the landholder as magistrate on his own estate. For greater questions of controversy, the principal officer of the County was the Sheriff who could call "Courts of Assize" to settle controversies between landholders. These courts were juries of one's neighbors which could be held anywhere at the Sheriff's choosing, and when a verdict was rendered, would be the enforced by him.

Later, state legislatures would institute judgeships for purposes of convenience and stability. But just as it was in England, so it became in America: a continual rivalry emerged between the "People's Law" and "Ruler's Law."

The pretended abolition of slavery in the 13th Amendment really was a transference of sovereignty over persons from landholders to the state. "No slavery *except* as punishment for crime" became the exact mechanism to destroy property rights in the United States. Statutory criminal codes replaced the moral law of God as expressed in the Bible, which until that time, could be argued in a Court of Law. Today, to argue your case from the Scriptures will find you in contempt of court.

The deviousness of this amendment is proved by the fact that it failed to prohibit slavery based upon race or skin color, which would extend the protections of the Common Law upon all the races. Instead, it abolished the Common Law by superceding the "obligations of contracts" clause of the Constitution. The Amendment empowered Congress with the right to enforce its provisions: meaning, that it was now Congress which could enforce, control, or void the obligations of contracts.

"The eminent domain" clause of the Constitution was meant, originally, to extend to government ownership over uninhabited lands, not lands in possession by the people according to the indicia outlined by Bouvier as cited above. The "without just compensation" clause cannot supplant the 5th Amendment for persons to be secure in their property. "Just compensation" is an impossible standard unless the subject is willing. It impairs the obligation of contract for land tenure and turns the meaning of "fee simple" on its head. Depriving someone of their rights - without their consent - is a tort at Common Law and makes all government entities which practice it a criminal enterprise.

### **The Free Soil Party**

Before Abraham Lincoln became a Republican, and before there was a Republican Party, there was the "Free Soil Party."

In the early 19<sup>th</sup> Century, there was a vast and mostly empty continent to the West of the Appalachians. Of course, there were several colonial outposts of the French and Spanish explorers. There were the Indian Tribes. But as far as anyone could tell, these groups could claim the land; they could not possess the land.

The American people wanted to move West and possess the land. And even though the land had been ceded to the "united States" by the powers of Europe, Congress represented the *People* and it was only the *People* who could take possession.

They wanted rules for the fair distribution of the land but they did not want to pay for something they already owned. They already paid for it in blood, sweat, and tears. Congress was not a sovereign to cede land title; it was an agent for the sovereign People and could only issue "patents."

While the Free Soil Party began as an abolitionist movement, yet it also included party aspirations for agrarianism, with numerous attempts to promote a society of free men standing on their own ground.

### **Pentecost, 2025**

The season of Pentecost gives occasion for the reading of the law of Moses and for the reading of biblical land laws which require that "the land shall not be sold forever."

The First Christians were empowered to be the witnesses of that Law on the Day of

Pentecost and Jesus gave as His first homily in Nazareth (Luke 4) the reading of Isaiah which described His Messianic mission: to declare the “Acceptable year of the Lord” – the Jubilee. We have forgotten.

A Servant of Jesus,

James

**Collect for the Day:**

*Almighty God, who on this day didst open the way of eternal life to every race and nation by the promised gift of the Holy Spirit: Shed abroad this gift throughout the world by the preaching of the Gospel, that it may reach to the ends of the earth; through Jesus Christ our Lord, who liveth and reigneth with thee, in the unity of the same Spirit, one God, forever 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, 2020-2025, Idaho, USA