
Subject: BIG ERRORS: The Bride.

Posted by [Marilyn Crow](#) on Mon, 16 Dec 2019 23:51:45 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Big Errors: The Bride.

I believe, that many people have been wrongly taught that the Body of Christ is also the `Bride` of Christ. I personally find this very strange that men especially would believe this - men becoming a bride/female, when we are saying that people of transgender are against God`s ways. `Men, come to Jesus and be His bride!` That is quite wrong!

There is NO scripture that tells us that the Body of Christ is also the Bride of Christ. No Scripture. People say, `It means purity.` We can say purity but NOT that men have to be female, a bride, especially in this season of LGTB.

There are 2 scriptures that people use to wrongly make this doctrine.

1.Eph. 5: 25 - 33. This scripture is after 4 chapters where the apostle Paul has laid out the doctrine of the Body of Christ, the New MAN. Then in chapter 5 Paul starts to exhort children, wives and husbands. He encourages the husbands to love their wives as Christ does His BODY. It is an exhortation.

2.In 2 Cor. 11: 1 - 3 the Apostle Paul is speaking specifically to his disciples in Corinth and saying that he wants to present them to the Lord, in purity, like a virgin. This is just a symbol, and just for his disciples. Paul does NOT present us to the Lord for it is the Lord Himself who will present us. (Jude 24)

So who is the `Bride?`

God`s word tells us that Israel is the Bride.

`For your husband is your Maker, whose name is the Lord of hosts...for the Lord has called you like a wife forsaken....` (Isa. 54: 5 & 6)

`I will betroth you to Me forever; yes, I will betroth you to Me in righteousness and justice, in loving kindness and mercy; I will betroth you to Me in faithfulness, and you shall know the Lord.` (Hosea 3: 19 & 20)

Why is it important? There are different inheritances for Israel, (the Bride) and the Body of Christ, (the New Man).

`Let no one cheat you or your reward.....and not holding fast to the Head, from whom the BODY, nourished and knit together by joints and ligaments, grows with the increase that is from God.`
(Col. 2: 18 & 19)

Marilyn.

Subject: Re: BIG ERRORS: The Bride.
Posted by [william](#) on Tue, 17 Dec 2019 02:54:33 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

So there are no men in Israel? (His wife?)

William

Subject: Re: BIG ERRORS: The Bride.
Posted by [Marilyn Crow](#) on Tue, 17 Dec 2019 05:13:18 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Hi William,

Good point which needs looking at. Speaking to Israel God says -

`For your Maker is your husband the LORD of hosts is His name...' (Isa. 54: 5)

Husband - Hebrew word `ba`al,` meaning a master, husband, (fig) owner .

We know that God is the owner, master of Israel. When they were unfaithful God `divorced` them,

signifying that they were unfaithful to Him and had gone after other gods. (Jer. 3:8) Finally we know that God will `marry` His unfaithful `wife` when the Lord connects again with them.

`Let us be glad and rejoice and give Him glory, for the marriage of the Lamb has come, and His wife has made herself ready.` (Rev. 19: 7)

Subject: Re: BIG ERRORS: The Bride.
Posted by [william](#) on Tue, 17 Dec 2019 10:49:50 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Yes, it is a good point, but I don't think you grasp it yet.

You say:Quote:I personally find this very strange that men especially would believe this - men becoming a bride/female, when we are saying that people of transgender are against God`s ways. `Men, come to Jesus and be His bride!` That is quite wrong!

You continue:Quote:There is NO scripture that tells us that the Body of Christ is also the Bride of Christ. No Scripture. People say, `It means purity.` We can say purity but NOT that men have to be female, a bride, especially in this season of LGTB.

Quote:2.In 2 Cor. 11: 1 - 3 the Apostle Paul is speaking specifically to his disciples in Corinth and saying that he wants to present them to the Lord, in purity, like a virgin. This is just a symbol, and just for his disciples.

I don't know why you don't just quote the verse before you tell us that it's "just a symbol" and "just for his [Paul's Corinthian] disciples"; here is what Paul said: [2Co 11:2 KJV] 2 For I am jealous over you with godly jealousy: for I have espoused you to one husband, that I may present [you as] a chaste virgin to Christ.

I suspect that you didn't quote it for a number of reasons:

- 1.) It sounds suspiciously like Paul is calling them a "bride" which is diametrically opposed to your premise--"Big Errors: The Bride."
- 2.) You contradict yourself by allowing that this verse/phrase is "just a symbol" while at the same time arguing for a strict literal sense for the term "bride" which you infer--cannot be a symbol--because otherwise men would have to be female!
- 3.) You then, when offering your 'proof,' take Isa 54:5 & 6, and substitute the word "bride" for "wife."

You say: Quote:God`s word tells us that Israel is the Bride.

'For your husband is your Maker, whose name is the Lord of hosts...for the Lord has called you like a wife forsaken....' (Isa. 54: 5 & 6)

Looks like Israel's 'husband' is the Lord (our creator!), or put another way, Israel is God's wife not His bride. Yes, I am aware of the middle-eastern custom of using the term "wife" during the engagement period, e.g. Mary and Joseph.

4.) In your zeal to prove your premise, are you actually willing to go so far as to remove Paul's teachings from a place of relevance to the Body of Christ?

Quote:the Apostle Paul is speaking specifically to his disciples in Corinth

Since, as far as I know, we have no surviving members of the Corinthian Church should we just ditch the book? Actually we can ditch about half the new testament since all of Paul's writings are to specific churches (Philemon excepted). Yes, I know that he was Their Apostle in a special way--he established the Corinthian Church--but whenever we don't like the ramifications of a verse can we just excise that portion by claiming that he was only referring to "his disciples"?

Secondly, and you know this, the Corinthians were predominately Greeks, not Jewish, so if Paul is giving God another soon-to-be-wife i.e. "bride", then he's presenting to Him a GENTILE bride which again, goes directly against your premise. Why oh why can't we just take the bible for what it says and not try to make it fit into our own pet doctrines? btw, I'm a disciple of Paul too, so I'm claiming that verse for myself!

5.) You also tell us what Paul means in Eph. 5:25-33:

Quote:There are 2 scriptures that people use to wrongly make this doctrine.

1.Eph. 5: 25 - 33. This scripture is after 4 chapters where the apostle Paul has laid out the doctrine of the Body of Christ, the New MAN. Then in chapter 5 Paul starts to exhort children, wives and husbands. He encourages the husbands to love their wives as Christ does His BODY. It is an exhortation.

What is your point? Of course, it's an attempt to prove your premise! Anyone who reads--and I mean ANYONE who's not trying to prove some unsubstantiated premise--Eph 5:25-33 cannot come away from the experience without a profound understanding that Paul here likens the relationship between husband and wife with the relationship between Jesus and His church/bride. And you know what? The Bible also likens the Church to His Body! You are willing to concede the last point in order to disprove the bride of Christ notion! Don't you see that both are true? By

contorting the scripture to make your premise seem valid, you seem to miss an obvious conclusion to your reasoning--if we are the Body of Christ THEN WE ARE THE FUTURE HUSBAND OF ISRAEL!

Forget that bride of Christ stuff... we are the Bridegroom of Israel! Unfortunately, this is what happens when we don't just take what is said in a normal grammatical sense--from our theology based upon His words--and instead try to make it say something we want it to say.

Yes, this passage is an "exhortation" but it is an exhortation that shows that the husband/wife relationship is a type of the Christ/church relationship, i.e. the bride and bridegroom relationship. [Eph 5:32 KJV] 32 This is a great mystery: but I speak concerning Christ and the church.

6.) As to who presents whom:

Quote:Paul does NOT present us to the Lord for it is the Lord Himself who will present us. (Jude 24)

I think both can be true.

7.) Lastly:

Quote:So who is the 'Bride?'

God's word tells us that Israel is the Bride.

'For your husband is your Maker, whose name is the Lord of hosts...for the Lord has called you like a wife forsaken....' (Isa. 54: 5 & 6)

Actually, Israel is always referred to as His wife, not His bride (unless we accept your premise which has yet to be proved.) What with all of the Israel/wife references (idolatry, etc.) in the OT, in what way would she be considered a virgin?

Blessings,
William

Subject: Re: BIG ERRORS: The Bride.
Posted by [william](#) on Tue, 17 Dec 2019 11:00:08 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Btw, on a personal and positive note, I really appreciate this style over and against your other way of posting. You let us know right up front what your premise was without ambiguity. Others might like your other style--and that's okay too--but I like the way you did it here!

Blessings,
William

Subject: Re: BIG ERRORS: The Bride.
Posted by [Marilyn Crow](#) on Tue, 17 Dec 2019 22:37:45 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

william wrote on Tue, 17 December 2019 11:00Btw, on a personal and positive note, I really appreciate this style over and against your other way of posting. You let us know right up front what your premise was without ambiguity. Others might like your other style--and that's okay too--but I like the way you did it here!

Blessings,
William

Thanks William,

The other topic I presented in more a `let`s share what we know about this.`For this topic I have to present what I believe against another teaching.

Good to discuss with you. Marilyn.

Subject: Re: BIG ERRORS: The Bride.
Posted by [Marilyn Crow](#) on Tue, 17 Dec 2019 23:42:23 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Hi William,

Yes I should have quoted the scripture so people can read it without having to look it up. No underlying motive there. You said -

1.) It sounds suspiciously like Paul is calling them a "bride" which is diametrically opposed to your premise--"Big Errors: The Bride."

`For I am jealous over you with godly jealousy: for I have espoused you to one husband, that I may present [you as] a chaste virgin to Christ.` (2 Cor. 11: 2)

The Apostle Paul is talking specifically to his disciples and desiring to present them to the Lord, pure. We know that the apostle Paul does NOT present us to the Lord, but the Lord Himself does.

`Now to Him who is able to keep you from stumbling, and TO PRESENT YOU faultless before the presence of His glory with exceeding joy.` (Jude 24)

There are scriptures that specifically refer to people and NOT to us. Eg.

`Now I will come to you when I pass through Macedonia...` (1 Cor. 16: 5)

There are truths in God`s word for us however it is NOT all about us. We read of what God says to others and what people say to each other. We can learn truths but we do not say it is written about us.

Marilyn.

Subject: Re: BIG ERRORS: The Bride.
Posted by [Marilyn Crow](#) on Tue, 17 Dec 2019 23:43:56 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

You said -

2.) You contradict yourself by allowing that this verse/phrase is "just a symbol" while at the same time arguing for a strict literal sense for the term "bride" which you infer--cannot be a symbol--because otherwise men would have to be female!

I agree the term `bride` is a symbol.

Subject: Re: BIG ERRORS: The Bride.

Posted by [Marilyn Crow](#) on Tue, 17 Dec 2019 23:46:13 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

You said -

3.) You then, when offering your 'proof,' take Isa 54:5 & 6, and substitute the word "bride" for "wife."

Yes I did. Thank you William. I should have elaborated more on that. So....God calls Israel `like a youthful wife...` and He their `husband,` their owner, master. God tells them of their future.

`"Do not fear, for you will not be ashamed; neither disgraced, for you will not be put to shame; for you will forget the shame of your youth, and will not remember your widowhood anymore.

For your Maker is your husband, the Lord of hosts is His name; and your Redeemer is the Holy One of Israel; He is called the God of the whole earth. For the Lord has called you like a woman forsaken and grieved in spirit, like a youthful wife when you were refused," says your God.` (Isa. 54: 4 - 6)

Meanwhile Israel is unfaithful, so God says in pictorial language that He `divorces` her. ` Then I saw that for all the causes for backsliding Israel had committed adultery, I had put her away and given her a certificate of divorce;...` (Jer. 3:8)

Then we read of God saying that He will again connect, (symbolically marry) Israel, the `wife.` `the marriage of the Lamb has come, and His wife has made herself ready.` (Rev. 19: 7)

This is when the Lord returns in power and great glory, revealing Himself to Israel.

`Now I saw heaven opened and behold a white horse. And he who sat on him was called faithful

and true, and in righteousness He judges and makes war.....and on His robe and on His thigh a name written; King of kings and Lord of lords.` (Rev. 19: 11 & 16)

It shall be in that day that I will seek to destroy all the nations that come against Jerusalem. And I will pour on the house of David and on the inhabitants of Jerusalem the Spirit of grace and supplication; then they will look on Me whom they pierced....` (Zech. 12: 9 & 10)

Subject: Re: BIG ERRORS: The Bride.
Posted by [Marilyn Crow](#) on Tue, 17 Dec 2019 23:47:39 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

You said -

4.) In your zeal to prove your premise, are you actually willing to go so far as to remove Paul's teachings from a place of relevance to the Body of Christ?

Two scriptures, one, an exhortation and the other to specific people, do NOT a doctrine make.

Subject: Re: BIG ERRORS: The Bride.
Posted by [Marilyn Crow](#) on Tue, 17 Dec 2019 23:49:18 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

You said -

By contorting the scripture to make your premise seem valid, you seem to miss an obvious conclusion to your reasoning--if we are the Body of Christ THEN WE ARE THE FUTURE HUSBAND OF ISRAEL!

The Lord has many titles, some referring to Israel and some to the Body of Christ.

Israel - King of Israel, Lamb, Bridegroom. Made them a nation with one King and many priests.
Body of Christ - Head of the Body. Making us Kingpriests.

Subject: Re: BIG ERRORS: The Bride.
Posted by [Marilyn Crow](#) on Tue, 17 Dec 2019 23:51:09 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

You said -

Actually, Israel is always referred to as His wife, not His bride (unless we accept your premise which has yet to be proved.) What with all of the Israel/wife references (idolatry, etc.) in the OT, in what way would she be considered a virgin?

`This is the word which the Lord has spoken concerning him: "The virgin, daughter of Zion, has despised you..." (Isa. 37: 22)

`Therefore thus says the LORD: "Ask now among the Gentiles, who has heard such things? The virgin of Israel has done a very horrible thing...." (Jer. 18: 13)

Subject: Re: BIG ERRORS: The Bride.
Posted by [william](#) on Thu, 19 Dec 2019 09:54:29 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Quote:There are scriptures that specifically refer to people and NOT to us. Eg.

`Now I will come to you when I pass through Macedonia...` (1 Cor. 16: 5)

There are truths in God`s word for us however it is NOT all about us. We read of what God says to others and what people say to each other. We can learn truths but we do not say it is written about us.

Quote:Why is it important? There are different inheritances for Israel, (the Bride) and the Body of Christ, (the New Man).

In your first note, to establish your teaching ("BIG ERRORS: The Bride") you gave us three points:

- 1.) "Bride" Shouldn't be used to describe males.
- 2.) "Bride of Christ" doesn't mean "the Body of Christ", and Paul isn't talking to us, only his disciples in Corinth.
- 3.) Israel is the Bride.

Point one was eliminated with one question (So there are no men in Israel?). And even though you didn't concede the point you indicated that it needs further examination.

Point two was presented with a curious caveat--Paul was just referring to his disciples in Corinth. Divining your interpretative methodology is going to be tough since almost all of Scripture can be explained away if one simply uses the 'Now I will come to you when I pass through Macedonia' argument.

Just so you know, my interpretative methodology--taking literally the normal grammatical/historical sense of Scripture--knows instinctively that I'm not going to get a visit from Paul EVEN IF I MOVE TO MACEDONIA!

But I don't know your interpretative methodology especially since you constantly are coming up with things that don't fit the normal/grammatical sense of Scripture. Normal--means that you automatically recognize simile, metaphorical, symbols, allegory, etc.,--in the grammatical and historical context where they occur.

The Bible uses a bunch of terms for believers and while all are true you wouldn't normally use "children" (as in "children of God" or "children of Israel") when describing God's "bride" or "wife." It doesn't mean that both aren't true, it only means that at this time you might be wanting to describe certain aspects that relate to his progeny and other times you might want to highlight the matrimonial aspects.

Fathers
Husbands
Brothers
Sisters
Brides
Wives
Mothers
Sons
Daughters

Children
Church
Body
Kings & Priests

In a strict literal sense a man can't be a bride/sister/wife/mother/daughter/children, etc., but I can find Scripture that indicates that when certain specific grammatical devices are used (btw, all easily recognized by the normal/grammatical/historical reading method) a man can be included in the meaning of these terms. The same can be said for women (excepting of course the obvious--i.e. husband, etc.,). My point? Well, you start off your argument by using an interpretive method that is radically different than mine, yours actually doesn't allow for a man to be a bride--Quote:... 'Men, come to Jesus and be His bride!' That is quite wrong!

Then, when faced with an obvious problem to your premise you attempt to get ahead of it by saying that the "Body of Christ" cannot be the "Bride," or, as stated in the Eph 5:25ff passage--likened to the "wife"--presumably, for some yet-unstated-interpretive-method-known-only-to-yourself, principle.

Your last point: Israel is the Bride. Here you make an assumption that "wife" means "bride" and use a "wife" passage to prove that Israel is a "bride". Guess what? In some contexts this is perfectly okay to do (see my argument above) but you, trying to use my methodology, are now faced with a dilemma. What is it, you may ask?

Here it is in a nutshell. You say: Quote:There is NO scripture that tells us that the Body of Christ is also the Bride of Christ. No Scripture.

I say--There is NO scripture that tells us that ISRAEL is also the "Bride" of Christ. No Scripture.

You can't have it both ways. Israel is described as the "wife" not the "bride". Yet you intentionally swap the word "bride" for "wife". Again, I don't know how to deal with how you interpret scripture other than to say that at one time you dismiss Paul's reference (by saying it was only for the Greeks at Corinth--his disciples) and at other times you misquote the OT by saying that Isaiah refers to Israel as the "bride".

To use your quote lightly modified: --zero scriptures, do NOT a doctrine make.

You conclude with:

Quote:Why is it important? There are different inheritances for Israel, (the Bride) and the Body of Christ, (the New Man).

I can only assume that you started off in the other thread "What did the 12 Apostles teach" to eventually get to this conclusion (above--last quote) but, as I've already stated the 12 Apostles

taught precious little about the "different inheritances" for Israel. You haven't taught us anything about what the 12 Apostles taught beyond saying that since Matthew quoted Jesus this was to be equated with Matthew himself teaching a doctrine. You'd be better off using a title like: "What did Jesus teach", ...but not by much.

But we've exhausted that subject since the scripture seems to move in a different direction after Pentecost and focuses instead on the inheritance of grafted-in-gentiles and the natural-branch-Israel. This inheritance being pretty much the same with the exception of a few memorial factors thrown in, i.e. 12 pillars in the temple. Even there we see that certain overcomers from the Church will be made pillar's in the temple of God. Again, I presume that's a way of honoring those who have labored the most among us. (Unless you are going to say that this is an honor that was only given to the Philadelphian disciples? --Rev 3:12).

And then, lo and behold, you move at break-neck speed and end up again with the kingpriests.

I know that "all scripture" is for "doctrine" "teaching" "reproof" etc., but why is this one doctrine so important to you? I can understand preaching about things pertaining to life and even to death, but why pick out a doctrine that has scant evidence (two inheritances vs one inheritance) and spend so much time spinning your wheels (I'm spinning my wheels too) when, in the end, you and I both will be happy with whatever the Lord gives us, and if He decides that He's going to give Israel something different? what's the big deal? I know I'm not going to begrudge anyone over their inheritance. Why is this kingpriest thing so important to you? Is it the authority? Is it the clergy/laity thing that's so appealing?

Blessings,
William

Subject: Re: BIG ERRORS: The Bride.
Posted by [Marilyn Crow](#) on Fri, 20 Dec 2019 21:07:30 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Hi William,

Thank you for taking the time, (a lot) to address what you see, and give your thoughts. I did have a chuckle at you saying we are both `spinning our wheels.` That, I think shows that we both love the truth and are willing to spend time to lay out what we think is true and what we see as error.

Now some detail -

You said I was saying - 1.) "Bride" Shouldn't be used to describe males.

My first point was not as you stated for I said - `I personally find this very strange that men especially would believe this - men becoming a bride/female, when we are saying that people of transgender are against God`s ways.` I don`t think women should either. Be called `the bride.` You have misinterpreted my point.

Subject: Re: BIG ERRORS: The Bride.

Posted by [Marilyn Crow](#) on Fri, 20 Dec 2019 21:09:26 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

You said I was saying -2.) "Bride of Christ" doesn't mean "the Body of Christ", and Paul isn't talking to us, only his disciples in Corinth.

Just so you know, my interpretative methodology--taking literally the normal grammatical/historical sense of Scripture--knows instinctively that I'm not going to get a visit from Paul EVEN IF I MOVE TO MACEDONIA!

But I don't know your interpretative methodology especially since you constantly are coming up with things that don't fit the normal/grammatical sense of Scripture. Normal--means that you automatically recognize simile, metaphorical, symbols, allegory, etc.,--in the grammatical and historical context where they occur.

That is a generalisation William with no details. Also every Bible College student is taught - `Who is speaking to whom,` as a basic principle of Biblical interpretation as well as a basic in language.

All of God`s word as we well know is written to different people & groups, over the centuries. It is not written first to us. However it is FOR us to read and learn of God`s purpose through Christ.

Subject: Re: BIG ERRORS: The Bride.

Posted by [Marilyn Crow](#) on Fri, 20 Dec 2019 21:11:16 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Now to all your terms. Most of those are regarding life on earth. However I do notice that the word `Queen` is not there. If we are supposed to be the `Bride of Christ` and marry the King, then wouldn't we then be the Queen of heaven? But then we have been told we are KingPriests. Also God`s word says there is no marrying in heaven.

`Jesus answered and said to them, " Are you not therefore mistaken because you do not now the Scriptures nor the power of God? For when they rise from the dead, they neither marry nor are given in marriage, but are like the angels in heaven.` (Mark 12: 24 & 25)

Subject: Re: BIG ERRORS: The Bride.

Posted by [Marilyn Crow](#) on Fri, 20 Dec 2019 21:12:22 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

You said -

Then, when faced with an obvious problem to your premise you attempt to get ahead of it by saying that the "Body of Christ" cannot be the "Bride," or, as stated in the Eph 5:25ff passage--likened to the "wife"--presumably, for some yet-unstated-interpretive-method-known-only-to-yourself, principle.

One of the basic interpretive Principles is `Who is speaking to whom.` Also we know when something is doctrinal and when something is an `exhortation,` - to encourage, and to warn. All of Eph. 5 & 6 is an exhortation, encouragement and warning to the Body of Christ, to wives, to husbands, to children, & to bondservants & masters. Quite explanatory as you read.

Subject: Re: BIG ERRORS: The Bride.

Posted by [Marilyn Crow](#) on Fri, 20 Dec 2019 21:13:56 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

You said -

Your last point: Israel is the Bride. Here you make an assumption that "wife" means "bride" and use a "wife" passage to prove that Israel is a "bride". Guess what? In some contexts this is perfectly okay to do (see my argument above) but you, trying to use my methodology, are now faced with a dilemma. What is it, you may ask?

I say--There is NO scripture that tells us that ISRAEL is also the "Bride" of Christ. No Scripture.

I never said there was a scripture that said Israel is the Bride of Christ. I said Israel is the bride.

These scriptures may help you -

"As I live" says the Lord, "You (Israel) shall surely clothe yourselves with them all (sons) as an ornament on you as a bride." (Isa. 49: 18)

`Let us be glad and rejoice and give Him glory, for the marriage of the Lamb has come, and His wife has made herself ready.` (Rev. 19: 7)

Here we see that there is a marriage and a `wife` is marrying the Lamb. Thus to marry one is called a bride. Some interpretations actually say `bride.`

Subject: Re: BIG ERRORS: The Bride.

Posted by [Marilyn Crow](#) on Fri, 20 Dec 2019 21:16:04 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Hi William,

You said -

I know that "all scripture" is for "doctrine" "teaching" "reproof" etc., but why is this one doctrine so important to you?

Thank you for asking that question - `Why is it so important to me?`

I believe it is important to God for Him to share what His grand purpose is in Christ -

`God...having made known to us the mystery of His will, according to His good pleasure which He purposed in Himself, that in the dispensation of the fullness of the times he might gather together in one all things in Christ, both of which are in heaven and which are on earth - in Him.` (Eph. 1: 9 & 10)

We get so focused on `my ticket` to heaven, (so to speak) that we don't appreciate what God has revealed about His Son, and His (the Father's) purpose in Christ.

(In Summary)

God the Father desires that His Son rule visibly in the highest realm with His Body. (Ps. 2: 6) They have been promised to sit with the Lord on His throne. (Rev. 3: 21)

Other realms have other rulerships under Christ.

As we study God`s word concerning Christ overcoming all rule and authority and He being the only one Worthy to rule over all God`s kingdom, then our spirits are enlarged and we give Him all the honour, the glory, and appreciation now and forever.

Subject: Re: BIG ERRORS: The Bride.

Posted by [william](#) on Fri, 20 Dec 2019 21:41:08 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I agree with you. Everything that is written is important... I just don't understand the importance you are placing on separating the inheritances. Even the passage you quote in your last note contradicts the very idea that you seem to be intent on promoting.

You quote Eph 1:9-10, but fail to notice the very next verse/s where Paul (Israelite among Israelites) includes himself along with the gentiles at Ephesus, as a fellow heir of this wonderful inheritance!

Quote:[Eph 1:9-11 KJV] 9 Having made known unto us the mystery of his will, according to his good pleasure which he hath purposed in himself: 10 That in the dispensation of the fulness of times he might gather together in one all things in Christ, both which are in heaven, and which are on earth; [even] in him: 11 In whom also we have obtained an inheritance, being predestinated according to the purpose of him who worketh all things after the counsel of his own will:

Why is it so important to you to correct him (Paul) to make the point that as an Israelite his inheritance is different from our (the gentile) inheritance?

Maybe in your eyes Paul is only talking to a few Jews that may be in Ephesus and not the rest of the Greek gentiles that are in the assembly?

All Scripture is important (as I said) for doctrine, correction, reproof, etc., and to me this very passage of Scripture stands as a correction and reproof to what you are saying in your doctrine.

William

Subject: Re: BIG ERRORS: The Bride.
Posted by [Marilyn Crow](#) on Fri, 20 Dec 2019 22:21:08 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Hi William,

I'm not sure where you get the idea that I don't include the Jewish believers in the Body of Christ and its inheritance?

Also `my doctrine?` I just posted scripture on what God says His purpose through Christ was.

Marilyn.

Subject: Re: BIG ERRORS: The Bride.
Posted by [william](#) on Sat, 21 Dec 2019 01:26:19 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Marilyn Crow wrote on Fri, 20 December 2019 21:07Hi William,

Thank you for taking the time, (a lot) to address what you see, and give your thoughts. I did have a chuckle at you saying we are both `spinning our wheels.` That, I think shows that we both love the truth and are willing to spend time to lay out what we think is true and what we see as error.

Now some detail -

You said I was saying - 1.) "Bride" Shouldn't be used to describe males.

My first point was not as you stated for I said - `I personally find this very strange that men especially would believe this - men becoming a bride/female, when we are saying that people of transgender are against God`s ways.` I don't think women should either. Be called `the bride.`
You have misinterpreted my point.

Quote:My first point was not as you stated for I said - `I personally find this very strange that men especially would believe this - men becoming a bride/female, when we are saying that people of transgender are against God`s ways.` I don`t think women should either. Be called `the bride.` You have misinterpreted my point.

True, you did, but I didn't misinterpret your meaning and gave my answer (er, question) accordingly.

Quote:You said I was saying -2.) "Bride of Christ" doesn't mean "the Body of Christ", and Paul isn't talking to us, only his disciples in Corinth.

Quote:Just so you know, my interpretative methodology--taking literally the normal grammatical/historical sense of Scripture--knows instinctively that I'm not going to get a visit from Paul EVEN IF I MOVE TO MACEDONIA!

But I don't know your interpretative methodology especially since you constantly are coming up with things that don't fit the normal/grammatical sense of Scripture. Normal--means that you automatically recognize simile, metaphorical, symbols, allegory, etc.,--in the grammatical and historical context where they occur.

That is a generalisation William with no details. Also every Bible College student is taught - `Who is speaking to whom,` as a basic principle of Biblical interpretation as well as a basic in language.

All of God`s word as we well know is written to different people & groups, over the centuries. It is not written first to us. However it is FOR us to read and learn of God`s purpose through Christ.

Generalisation? Sorry, I didn't go to Bible College but I do know how to be more specific in my answers than you did when you gave the vague generalization concerning Paul's trip to Macedonia. I knew what you meant even though it was vague.

Specifically here is what I meant. Paul wrote to specific Churches. God preserved (Paul's writings) and we now call it God's Word to us.

Now if any of us read any of the words that Paul has written and don't take the default position that his words are ultimately meant for us (whether in principle or as an example etc.) then we are at liberty to say "oh, that was just written specifically to his own disciples at that specific location in Ephesus" and ignore the greater implications to our own present day situations. I said that you could do that whenever you ran across something that didn't fit your own narrative. You did exactly and specifically that very thing with the verse. The question is, does what Paul said apply in any way to our own present day situation? It does, if you believe in the concept that "...they are written for our admonition, upon whom the ends of the world are come." [1Cor10:11]

Using your method, when I quote 1Cor10:11 (as I just did), you could just reply (and keep replying endlessly to all of my arguments) "oh, well, Paul was just speaking to his disciples at Corinth and it doesn't mean that these things were meant to be applied to us in our present situation." That is not a generalization, that is exactly where your method leads (except when YOU want to use it in the plain-and-simple-meaning).

Plainly and simply, I took every one of your arguments in your first post and negated them, not with any slight of hand (like saying, "oh, that was just for them, not for us") but by using almost exclusively the very verses you brought to the table using the plain grammatical/historical sense we all use when reading the Bible. You know this or you wouldn't have used the Macedonia example. When Paul talks about a trip to Macedonia the whole English speaking world knows that he's not talking about some spiritual journey that Christians may or may not take to some spiritual Macedonia. Yet you imply that I don't know this and that if I did I could not conclude that Paul was implying anything about a husband/bride/wife sort of thing.

[2Co 11:2 KJV] 2 For I am jealous over you with godly jealousy: for I have espoused you to one husband, that I may present [you as] a chaste virgin to Christ.

Specifically, this verse implies that 1). the husband is God. 2). he desires to present them (and as I suspect--all of us who might read his words) to God. 3). as a chaste virgin (who by implication is THE BRIDE). 4). to Christ (no comment necessary here!).

Here are your arguments:

This doesn't apply to us because Paul isn't speaking to us.

He's not talking about presenting a bride to Christ here because in Jude 24 somebody else does the presenting and it isn't Paul.

You didn't go further but I suspect you could have continued the argument that since Jude 24 is speaking of presenting someone "faultless" to God, and doesn't mention anything about presenting a "bride," then by logical implication Paul cannot be referring to a "bride" so he must be talking about "purity". Case closed.

My answer doesn't require gymnastics. Paul, just like every Christian minister, desires that all who hears his words, would be yoked to One Husband and eventually presented as a bride to Jesus.

In case you haven't figured it out our argument isn't about brides, inheritances or anything like that, SPECIFICALLY it is about HERMENEUTICS and yours is notably different than mine.

William

Subject: Re: BIG ERRORS: The Bride.
Posted by [william](#) on Sat, 21 Dec 2019 01:45:07 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Marilyn Crow wrote on Fri, 20 December 2019 21:11 Now to all your terms. Most of those are regarding life on earth. However I do notice that the word `Queen` is not there. If we are supposed to be the `Bride of Christ` and marry the King, then wouldn't we then be the Queen of heaven? But then we have been told we are KingPriests. Also God's word says there is no marrying in heaven.

`Jesus answered and said to them, " Are you not therefore mistaken because you do not now the Scriptures nor the power of God? For when they rise from the dead, they neither marry nor are given in marriage, but are like the angels in heaven.` (Mark 12: 24 & 25)

This is your typical response, instead of answering the specific issues, you mock me because I didn't include certain words in my list. I didn't think of queen. I'm sure that I could come up with a lot more to add but not just any word would fit (like queen). The list was simply a list that someone could take and find examples that wouldn't be typical or literal in usage. The bible doesn't use "queen" in the sense I was speaking about so I obviously wouldn't use it.

If there's no marriage in heaven what's all of the fuss about concerning the marriage supper of the lamb?

Subject: Re: BIG ERRORS: The Bride.
Posted by [william](#) on Sat, 21 Dec 2019 02:24:40 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Marilyn Crow wrote on Fri, 20 December 2019 21:13 You said -
Your last point: Israel is the Bride. Here you make an assumption that "wife" means "bride" and use a "wife" passage to prove that Israel is a "bride". Guess what? In some contexts this is perfectly okay to do (see my argument above) but you, trying to use my methodology, are now faced with a dilemma. What is it, you may ask?

I say--There is NO scripture that tells us that ISRAEL is also the "Bride" of Christ. No Scripture.

I never said there was a scripture that said Israel is the Bride of Christ. I said Israel is the bride.

These scriptures may help you -

"As I live" says the Lord, "You (Israel) shall surely clothe yourselves with them all (sons) as an ornament on you as a bride." (Isa. 49: 18)

"Let us be glad and rejoice and give Him glory, for the marriage of the Lamb has come, and His wife has made herself ready." (Rev. 19: 7)

Here we see that there is a marriage and a "wife" is marrying the Lamb. Thus to marry one is called a bride. Some interpretations actually say "bride."

Please, I used the quote and tried to make it as much like yours as possible. Correct my quote to say:

"I say--There is NO scripture that tells us that ISRAEL is the "Bride""

You apparently knew what I meant though because you supply 2 verses:

Is 49:18- (actual verse KJV) [Isa 49:18 KJV] 18 Lift up thine eyes round about, and behold: all these gather themselves together, [and] come to thee. [As] I live, saith the LORD, thou shalt surely clothe thee with them all, as with an ornament, and bind them [on thee], as a bride [doeth].

Clearly He isn't calling them a bride here, is He? Can anyone who reads this passage (go ahead and look at the context) state that it means Israel is a bride? No, not anyone who knows English.

Second verse you supplied:

[Rev 19:7 KJV] 7 Let us be glad and rejoice, and give honour to him: for the marriage of the Lamb is come, and his wife hath made herself ready.

You might need to hold up here a moment and not treat this verse as if you had already proved that Israel is a bride. I consider it just as likely that this verse is referring to the Church as His bride.

Two verses? Is that all you've got? Really only one verse since Is 49:18 does not confer "bride" status only that she (Israel) is clothed and adorned like you'd expect a bride to be clothed and adorned.

One verse, that's written to the Churches (gentile churches, I might add--sticking to that bible college rule you mentioned--who is writing to whom?) so this verse can't be used unless it mentions Israel specifically, otherwise we are back to making generalizations.

Besides, you'd have a better case (though not a good one) just to leave the word in the Rev 19:7 passage--wife--and not substitute "bride" (even though that's what it means!) because, at the very least, you can show that Israel is called God's wife in the OT. Course you know that as soon as you do I'd point out your inconsistency.

William

Subject: Re: BIG ERRORS: The Bride.
Posted by [william](#) on Sat, 21 Dec 2019 02:45:56 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Marilyn Crow wrote on Fri, 20 December 2019 22:21Hi William,

I'm not sure where you get the idea that I don't include the Jewish believers in the Body of Christ and its inheritance?

Also `my doctrine?` I just posted scripture on what God says His purpose through Christ was.

Marilyn.

Well, is there any significance to be found in you switching the term Jewish for Israelite here? (Pardon me, I'm just a little gun-shy at the moment.)

I thought we were talking about the separate inheritances of the two groups (the Church and Israel). I've been contending for the one-sheepfold that Jesus mentions and you, as far as I can tell, give a two-sheepfold solution.

Your doctrine, to my mind, means your topic, which was/is "Re: BIG ERRORS: The Bride." Which, by the way, you haven't given any substantiation to your contention. (I don't care whether you call it doctrine or sharing or whatever).

William

Subject: Re: BIG ERRORS: The Bride.
Posted by [william](#) on Sat, 21 Dec 2019 03:43:16 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Marilyn Crow wrote on Fri, 20 December 2019 21:11 Now to all your terms. Most of those are regarding life on earth. However I do notice that the word `Queen` is not there. If we are supposed to be the `Bride of Christ` and marry the King, then wouldn't we then be the Queen of heaven? But then we have been told we are KingPriests. Also God`s word says there is no marrying in heaven.

`Jesus answered and said to them, " Are you not therefore mistaken because you do not now the Scriptures nor the power of God? For when they rise from the dead, they neither marry nor are given in marriage, but are like the angels in heaven.` (Mark 12: 24 & 25)

I did miss one thing here, you wondered about why I didn't use the term "queen" and I've already answered that but I can just as easily ask you the same question using your contention--"Israel is the bride"--wouldn't that make Israel the queen of heaven? Isn't that your contention?

The whole kingpriest argument has already been beaten to death but since you seem so desperate to revive it, I should point out to others who might be interested, that it can be found here under the section Eternal Purposes--New order of beings:

<http://overcomersonline.com/FUDforum2/index.php?t=msg&th=930&start=0&S=3d25916c02565c3b426b4ffb4908d458>

Have fun!

William

Subject: Re: BIG ERRORS: The Bride.
Posted by [Marilyn Crow](#) on Sat, 21 Dec 2019 04:35:46 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Hi William,

I am sorry if how I came over seemed like mocking to you. That was not my intention. Also no reason for changing Israelite to Jewish. It`s not my intention to change your mind, but to point out what I have been taught. Many people may not have heard that side. I realise you believe differently and we know that the Holy Spirit will teach us and eventually we will all know the truth.

I do agree with 1 Cor. 10:11 concerning that we are warned not to do certain behaviours that were recorded of old. And I also agree that we don't just cherry pick scriptures or discount ones, for all scripture is for us to learn from but it is NOT all ABOUT us.

In 2 Cor. 11: 1 - 3, Paul is saying he desires to present those disciples to the Lord. I know that Paul will not present me to the Lord because the Holy Spirit through the Apostle James tells me that the Lord Himself will present me. To me that is straight forward.

So summarising - I only see this teaching that the Body of Christ is also referred to as a bride, based on 2 scriptures. One is an exhortation and the other a symbol referring to Paul's disciples. That to me does not constitute sound doctrine.

Marilyn.

Subject: Re: BIG ERRORS: The Bride.

Posted by [william](#) on Sat, 21 Dec 2019 04:46:17 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Marilyn Crow wrote on Sat, 21 December 2019 04:35Hi William,

I am sorry if how I came over seemed like mocking to you. That was not my intention. Also no reason for changing Israelite to Jewish. It's not my intention to change your mind, but to point out what I have been taught. Many people may not have heard that side. I realise you believe differently and we know that the Holy Spirit will teach us and eventually we will all know the truth.

I do agree with 1 Cor. 10:11 concerning that we are warned not to do certain behaviours that were recorded of old. And I also agree that we don't just cherry pick scriptures or discount ones, for all scripture is for us to learn from but it is NOT all ABOUT us.

In 2 Cor. 11: 1 - 3, Paul is saying he desires to present those disciples to the Lord. I know that Paul will not present me to the Lord because the Holy Spirit through the Apostle James tells me that the Lord Himself will present me. To me that is straight forward.

So summarising - I only see this teaching that the Body of Christ is also referred to as a bride, based on 2 scriptures. One is an exhortation and the other a symbol referring to Paul's disciples. That to me does not constitute sound doctrine.

Marilyn.

If that is indeed the case wouldn't you just as easily say that your teaching/doctrine/sharing is based solely on zero scripture, since Israel has always been referred to as His wife? not His bride? Using your own standard would your presentation be "sound doctrine"?

William

Subject: Re: BIG ERRORS: The Bride.
Posted by [Marilyn Crow](#) on Sat, 21 Dec 2019 05:19:12 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Hi William,

Actually we know that the New Jerusalem is referred to AS THE BRIDE.

`And I saw a new heaven and a new earth, for the first heaven and the first earth has passed away. Also there was no sea. Then I, John, saw the holy city, new Jerusalem coming down out of heaven from God, prepared as a bride adorned for her husband.` (Rev. 21: 1 & 2)

And God`s word tells us who will be in that city.

`But now they, (Old Testament saints) desired a better, that is, a heavenly country. Therefore God is not ashamed to be called their God, for he has prepared a city for them.` (Heb. 11: 16)

Marilyn.

Subject: Re: BIG ERRORS: The Bride.
Posted by [william](#) on Sat, 21 Dec 2019 05:33:23 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I was wondering when you'd get to that. Of course I don't believe that it's limited to the OT saints, but you know that already!

Subject: Re: BIG ERRORS: The Bride.
Posted by [Marilyn Crow](#) on Sat, 21 Dec 2019 05:40:54 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Well here we are again?

So where do you see in scripture, others promised the inheritance of the city?

Subject: Re: BIG ERRORS: The Bride.

Posted by [william](#) on Sat, 21 Dec 2019 17:04:55 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Marilyn Crow wrote on Sat, 21 December 2019 05:40 Well here we are again?

So where do you see in scripture, others promised the inheritance of the city?

Well, you probably said it the best--we are Christ's Body. He's not going anywhere without us!

[Luk 17:37 KJV] 37 And they answered and said unto him, Where, Lord? And he said unto them, Wheresoever the body [is], thither will the eagles be gathered together.

Seriously though, are you really unaware of the scripture passages that teach this?

Okay, I'll throw out just one to get you started:

[1Co 3:22-23 KJV] 22 Whether Paul, or Apollos, or Cephas, or the world, or life, or death, or things present, or things to come; all are yours; 23 And ye are Christ's; and Christ [is] God's. [emphasis mine]

William

Subject: Re: BIG ERRORS: The Bride.

Posted by [Marilyn Crow](#) on Sat, 21 Dec 2019 22:22:24 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Hi William,

Yes seriously. I was taught differently, so am looking to you to present what you have been taught.

And what a great scripture to show our inheritance in Christ - 1 Cor. 3: 22 - 23.

So where do you see we will be with the Lord on His throne?

`To Him who overcomes I will grant to sit with Me on My throne, as I also overcame and sat down with My Father on His throne.` (Rev. 3: 21)

Marilyn.

Subject: Re: BIG ERRORS: The Bride.
Posted by [william](#) on Sun, 22 Dec 2019 00:08:32 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Marilyn Crow wrote on Sat, 21 December 2019 22:22Hi William,

Yes seriously. I was taught differently, so am looking to you to present what you have been taught.

And what a great scripture to show our inheritance in Christ - 1 Cor. 3: 22 - 23.

So where do you see we will be with the Lord on His throne?

`To Him who overcomes I will grant to sit with Me on My throne, as I also overcame and sat down with My Father on His throne.` (Rev. 3: 21)

Marilyn.

Well, I can't remember ever being taught about the inheritance. I'm sure I picked up what I know over time from different people but I don't ever remember someone saying "okay, today we are going to learn about our future inheritance in Christ". I did hear messages geared toward what we have in Christ right now, i.e. our present inheritance.

I guess it was touched on in Biblical Theology but it was probably more in the context of a timeline of the end-times. (Pre-trib, pre-millennial, millennial-reign, eternal state.)

I'm sure you remember when the Sons of Zebedee came to Jesus and asked Him about sitting one on the right and the other on His left hand in glory and Jesus responded to them saying: "Ye

know not what ye ask..." and then went on to say that the request wasn't His to give anyway... later the other disciples ribbed James and John and Jesus interrupted them with a lesson on Gentile lordship vs true greatness. I kinda took that as a area that wasn't to dominate my thinking. Important? yes, because the Bible has things to say about it, but not so important that I should spend a lot of time with it. Later I realized that the NT writers didn't spend too much time on it either, not that it was avoided, because over and over our inheritance, in and with Christ, is mentioned, but there wasn't a lot of exact detail concerning what it would entail. Now that's just me, and I wouldn't begrudge anyone who chose to spend a lot of time with the subject.

In fact, since you've brought up the subject, I've found a book, actually a three volume set (that a lot of people seem to believe is the best book on the subject of the Kingdom--idunno, but I'll find out!) that spends a whopping 2189 pages on the subject of the kingdom!

Suspicious person that I am, I can't recommend it until I've read it (I'm only on page 120) but so far, if his interpretive methodology stays within the realm he's already set forth, it should be a good read.

You may already have it, or have heard of it.

It's called The Theocratic Kingdom of Our Lord Jesus by George Nathaniel Henry Peters

It was written back in the 1880's, I think. You can find it free online in various places.

Again, I'm not in a position to critique it yet so don't think that it represents my views. I will say that the first 120 pages has an excellent representation of the grammatical/historical hermeneutical approach that mirrors my own views concerning how we understand God's word to us.

Blessings,
William

Subject: Re: BIG ERRORS: The Bride.
Posted by [Marilyn Crow](#) on Sun, 22 Dec 2019 04:48:46 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Hi William,

Thank you for drawing my attention to George Peters` book. I looked up on line and got a download of a PDF from a site that gave some good information. (library.dts.edu) I see that Peters premillennial views were in conflict with the majority of his denomination, (Lutheran). This prevented him from receiving much recognition from his colleagues and lived in relative obscurity.

Wittenberg College, however awarded him an honorary Doctor of Divinity degree in 1907.

Again we see that those who hold to the truth often have to suffer somewhat for their beliefs. We are blessed to receive the truths passed on to us all by such godly men and women.

I would also like to thank you William for the opportunity to post what I believe on your forum. I do like a healthy robust discussion, for truth needs to be vigorously discussed and presented. I know we both, as with others seek to -

`Be diligent to present yourself approved to God, a worker who does not need to be ashamed, rightly dividing the word of truth.` (2 Tim. 2: 15)

As you can see I do not mind opposing views for we are all winners when the truth prevails, and I`m sure over time we all learn from each other, especially what godly men and women have taught us many years ago.

Subject: Re: BIG ERRORS: The Bride.

Posted by [Marilyn Crow](#) on Sun, 22 Dec 2019 04:50:10 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Now as to George Peters` book, from what I can see in the descriptions it is what we have come to know as the truth concerning the Lord`s reign in the millennium. It seems that Peters has gone meticulously throughout God`s word and to bring out scriptures relating to this great truth. No wonder the book is over 2,000 pages. A good read I imagine and very uplifting concerning the Lord, His promise to Israel & the fulfilment of that. The Lord Himself revealed this -

` Then He said to them, "O foolish ones, and slow of heart to believe in all that the prophets have spoken! Ought not the Christ to have suffered these things and to enter into His glory?" And beginning at Moses and all the Prophets, He expounded to them in all the Scriptures the things concerning Himself.` (Luke 24: 25 - 27)

Subject: Re: BIG ERRORS: The Bride.

Posted by [Marilyn Crow](#) on Sun, 22 Dec 2019 04:52:08 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

So onto our discussion. So where do you see we will be with the Lord on His throne?

`To Him who overcomes I will grant to sit with Me on My throne, as I also overcame and sat down with My Father on His throne.` (Rev. 3: 21)

Obvious I`m not interested (as you are not too) in who is on one side or the other, as if the Lord is sitting on a `seat.` And as you say you have not heard any teaching specifically on this topic, then may we approach it from another angle where we all can contribute, as I know many of those here are well versed in God`s word.

I think the topic could be - The Pre-eminence of Christ. (Col. 1: 18)

And I think I need to start another thread for that. I will go and prepare some notes and hope that some others will contribute. What better than to share and discuss of Christ, His character, His offices and His purposes.

regards, Marilyn.

Subject: Re: BIG ERRORS: The Bride.

Posted by [william](#) on Sun, 22 Dec 2019 06:25:11 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Marilyn Crow wrote on Sun, 22 December 2019 04:48Hi William,

Thank you for drawing my attention to George Peters` book. I looked up on line and got a download of a PDF from a site that gave some good information. (library.dts.edu) I see that Peters premillennial views were in conflict with the majority of his denomination, (Lutheran). This prevented him from receiving much recognition from his colleagues and lived in relative obscurity. Wittenberg College, however awarded him an honorary Doctor of Divinity degree in 1907.

Again we see that those who hold to the truth often have to suffer somewhat for their beliefs. We are blessed to receive the truths passed on to us all by such godly men and women.

I would also like to thank you William for the opportunity to post what I believe on your forum. I do like a healthy robust discussion, for truth needs to be vigorously discussed and presented. I know we both, as with others seek to -

`Be diligent to present yourself approved to God, a worker who does not need to be ashamed, rightly dividing the word of truth.` (2 Tim. 2: 15)

As you can see I do not mind opposing views for we are all winners when the truth prevails, and I'm sure over time we all learn from each other, especially what godly men and women have taught us many years ago.

Ay, there's the rub... I don't hold to any doctrine that was taught no matter how respected the individual, no matter how revered the author, unless God's Word is at it's foundation and any edifice/creed/doctrine or teaching built on that foundation is an actual affirmation of His Word.

That same book (so far so good) has this quote: "...for God holds us only responsible for the plain, naked, grammatical sense of the Word, and not for recondite, hidden senses that the ingenuity or imagination of man may concoct."

Here is another: "Allowing a development of doctrine in the Bible itself (i.e. given in respective dispensations, and by different writers), made under the auspices of the Spirit, the same, by the principle of interpretation adopted (prop.4) shows, by its completeness and manner of presentation, that the Bible is designed to be a book for the people, for all men, both learned and unlearned. It is addressd to the masses, to the ignorant, to all classes, and, therefore, is not merely designed for the educated. It assumes upon the very face of it, that its important doctrines can be easily comprehended, and that to realize their force and value it is unnecessary to make additions or alternations. It takes it for granted that it contains all that is requisite for us to know concerning the kingdom, and that every person can obtain this knowledge by its perusal and study. It assumes, that it is correct in its claim of being an infallible guide (Ps 119:105, 2Pet.1:19, Gal. 1:8, Isa 8:20, 2Tim3:17, etc.), as endorsed by the early Christians, Reformers, etc., in the things pertaining to God and the everlasting happiness of man. It distinctly teaches that without a due acceptance of its doctrines, we are regarded by the Almighty as those, however learned in other respects, who lack understanding. It urges upon us, in view of its Divine origin, purity, veracity, power, duration, etc., the obligation that we are under to know God's Word. It professes to enlighten every one who receives it respecting God and our personal relationship to Him, the Messiah and our need of Him, the kingdom and the manner in which to gain it, the duties pertaining to God and man, the future destiny of ourselves and the world, etc., and that to obtain this enlightenment we do not absolutely require, valuable as they may be in many respects, those cumbersome systems of interpretation, those diversified and ponderous exegetical commentaries, etc., which are given as helps to the student."

You have stated again and again that "I was taught this" or "this is what I was taught" (my paraphrase), frankly I don't care about what you were taught. I'm willing to lay down everything I

was taught if the scripture doesn't teach it. Paul can say to Timothy: [2Ti 1:13 KJV] 13 Hold fast the form of sound words, which thou hast heard of me, in faith and love which is in Christ Jesus. We can't say that... our teachers, however much we respect them, don't have the benefit of having their word recorded in the scripture of truth.

[Isa 8:20 KJV] 20 To the law and to the testimony: if they speak not according to this word, [it is] because [there is] no light in them.

These are the principles that I was taught (good sound teaching from an excellent teacher!) but note that the things that were taught weren't man's carefully crafted words but truths derived from the sound doctrine of the Bible.

Do we really think that God (the Masterful architect of the world, the One who desires us to know Him and fellowship with Him) cannot express Himself in a manner that even the children among us can understand?

If we don't start with that premise we'll be easily swayed by men who, however sincere, have been swayed themselves.

Paul says: (and includes himself) [Gal 1:8 KJV] 8 But though we, or an angel from heaven, preach any other gospel unto you than that which we have preached unto you, let him be accursed.

God has preserved those words and many more (the Bible) so that we will not be led astray.

William

Subject: Re: BIG ERRORS: The Bride.
Posted by [william](#) on Wed, 25 Dec 2019 09:50:56 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Marilyn Crow wrote on Sat, 21 December 2019 05:19Hi William,

Actually we know that the New Jerusalem is referred to AS THE BRIDE.

`And I saw a new heaven and a new earth, for the first heaven and the first earth has passed away. Also there was no sea. Then I, John, saw the holy city, new Jerusalem coming down out of heaven from God, prepared as a bride adorned for her husband.` (Rev. 21: 1 & 2)

And God`s word tells us who will be in that city.

`But now they, (Old Testament saints) desired a better, that is, a heavenly country. Therefore God is not ashamed to be called their God, for he has prepared a city for them.` (Heb. 11: 16)

Marilyn.

You are right about the Lord showing us who will be in that city:

Hebrews 11:8: By faith Abraham, when he was called to go out into a place which he should after receive for an inheritance, obeyed; and he went out, not knowing whither he went.

Hebrews 11:9: By faith he sojourned in the land of promise, as in a strange country, dwelling in tabernacles with Isaac and Jacob, the heirs with him of the same promise:

****Little detour here:****

Jesus makes this interesting statement to the Jews: Matthew 3:9: And think not to say within yourselves, We have Abraham to our father: for I say unto you, that God is able of these stones to raise up children unto Abraham.

Later, Jesus says, after the Centurion (Gentile, btw) exhibits an extraordinary faith: Matthew 8:10: When Jesus heard it, he marvelled, and said to them that followed, Verily I say unto you, I have not found so great faith, no, not in Israel.

And He continues with: Matthew 8:11: And I say unto you, That many shall come from the east and west, and shall sit down with Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob, in the kingdom of heaven.

Then Paul gives us that wonderful news that we gentiles are heirs of the same promise! Romans 4:16: Therefore it is of faith, that it might be by grace; to the end the promise might be sure to all the seed; not to that only which is of the law, but to that also which is of the faith of Abraham; who is the father of us all,... Romans 4:24: But for us also, to whom it shall be imputed, if we believe on him that raised up Jesus our Lord from the dead; (For context I might add that Paul is speaking to the Roman/Gentile Church.)

Next, just so there could be no mistaking his meaning, he writes this to the Galatians (Gentiles): Galatians 3:7-9: Know ye therefore that they which are of faith, the same are the children of Abraham. 3:8: And the scripture, foreseeing that God would justify the heathen through faith,

preached before the gospel unto Abraham, saying, In thee shall all nations be blessed. 3:9: So then they which be of faith are blessed with faithful Abraham.

I'll finish up the detour with the end of Gal. 3 where Paul says: Galatians 3:28: There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither bond nor free, there is neither male nor female: for ye are all one in Christ Jesus. Galatians 3:29: And if ye be Christ's, then are ye Abraham's seed, and heirs according to the promise.

****End of detour****

Now that we know a little something about the who and whom, we can continue with the rest of the Hebrew passage you brought up:

Hebrews 11:10: For he looked for a city which hath foundations, whose builder and maker is God.

Hebrews 11:11: Through faith also Sara herself received strength to conceive seed, and was delivered of a child when she was past age, because she judged him faithful who had promised.

Hebrews 11:12: Therefore sprang there even of one, and him as good as dead, so many as the stars of the sky in multitude, and as the sand which is by the sea shore innumerable.

Hebrews 11:13: These all died in faith, not having received the promises, but having seen them afar off, and were persuaded of them, and embraced them, and confessed that they were strangers and pilgrims on the earth.

Hebrews 11:14: For they that say such things declare plainly that they seek a country.

Hebrews 11:15: And truly, if they had been mindful of that country from whence they came out, they might have had opportunity to have returned.

Now, with some biblical knowledge under our belts we return to your presentation... btw, here is the way you quoted the passage complete with your parenthetical gloss:Quote:And God's word tells us who will be in that city. '[i]But now they, (Old Testament saints) desired a better, that is, a heavenly country. Therefore God is not ashamed to be called their God, for he has prepared a city for them.' (Heb. 11: 16)

But, as I've been saying over and over, you don't need to gloss the word of God, the actual words are enough. (Or if you must, leave off your commentary/implication that Israel only is included... say "the OT saints and all of us who name the name of Christ are looking for this city".)

Hebrews 11:16: But now they desire a better country, that is, an heavenly: wherefore God is not ashamed to be called their God: for he hath prepared for them a city.

Now tell me, is this city only for the OT saints, or are we to be included as well?

You decide:

Hebrews 11:39: And these all, having obtained a good report through faith, received not the promise:

Hebrews 11:40: God having provided some better thing for us, that they without us should not be made perfect.

Hebrews 12--the whole chapter could be quoted here (the cloud of witness, etc)

And finally:

Hebrews 13:14: For here have we no continuing city, but we seek one to come.

The OT saints, the Hebrews, those children of Abraham, and the children of Abraham by faith, we all are looking for that city!

Blessings,
William

Subject: Re: BIG ERRORS: The Bride.
Posted by [Marilyn Crow](#) on Sun, 29 Dec 2019 23:30:56 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Hi William,

Let`s look a bit closer.

`And all of these, having obtained a good testimony through faith, did not receive the promise, God having provided SOMETHING BETTER for US, that THEY should not be made perfect apart from US.` (Heb. 11: 39 & 40)

Notice the `THEY and US.` The THEY are the Old Testament saints and the US are the Body of Christ.

`SOMETHING BETTER` relates to a greater dominion. (Greek - kreitton & kratos)

`MADE PERFECT,' relates to being complete, to consummate.

Thus we see that the OT saints will be made complete in the city after the Body of Christ will be with Christ on His throne, the greater dominion.

Marilyn.

Subject: Re: BIG ERRORS: The Bride.
Posted by [james](#) on Mon, 30 Dec 2019 21:34:20 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

So what's the thing that bothers you to the point that you keep hammering the deal about who has what in God's kingdom? Do you have a desire to have dominion over others and set on thrones? We know Jesus' answer when the mother of James and John asked for them to be seated at the right and left of Jesus (Matt. 20) Maybe we're different but I don't concern myself with thoughts about what powers or places of authority I may or may not have in eternity. I frankly , am so unworthy of anything from God, that just to be in His presence forever is overwhelmingly wonderful to meditate upon.

When you said you were correcting Errors, couldn't you have just said you thought there was a difference between the bride and the body of Christ? Maybe there is, I think everyone on this forum knows we're not Israel and that we are the Body of Christ. So is it your opinion that our theology is flawed with errors? I'm sure I don't have full revelation of everything God's Word lays out (though after 40 years I should be further along than I am, but that's on me) but I do believe The Holy Spirit gives discernment keeping me from errors, heresy, false doctrines, and false shepherds. I'm not claiming never to have been deceived or believed something someone misinterpreted in scripture, but God, in His grace and mercy has shown me eventually. So I am just wondering what's the point you're seeking to get over? I respectfully disagree that there are apostles today (not even your dear uncle) so with that position, I can't and won't receive teachings that are based from that belief.

So if someday you're in a place in God's kingdom of dominion over me, then hallelujah, I really don't mind... just remember that what ever I said to you in this life I did so in love and kindness with humility. I love you as a sister in Christ. ðŸ™•

Subject: Re: BIG ERRORS: The Bride.
Posted by [Marilyn Crow](#) on Mon, 30 Dec 2019 23:03:14 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Hi James,

`Hammering!` Isn't this forum open to discussion? And I am just discussing as others do here. Just because I have been taught differently, & you believe you have the truth, then doesn't it behove those who have the truth to speak the truth graciously and patiently? When people have to try and put others down it means they are threatened.

Now why I have brought this topic up is that it is not doctrinally correct, only based on an exhortation, and something said by Paul specifically to his disciples. Also it leads to an error in where we believe we will go to be with the Lord. Then, and most importantly it leads to not making the Lord pre-eminent over all.

Think about it, God's word tells us that the Lord is pre-eminent, and that we His Body will rule and reign with Him on His throne. So if you believe we have been promised the city, then that COMES DOWN OUT OF HEAVEN FROM GOD. And thus the Lord's throne, in that scenario is placed below the angelic realm, below where even Lucifer ruled, below God.

God has written in His word concerning His Son and that He will rule from the highest realm. We know that no one was found worthy for such an esteemed high rulership, none but the Lord Jesus Christ. And that is truly worth speaking about.

I'm am not concerned about my rulership etc but that the Lord be pre-eminent in all things, as the Father has purposed before time.

Hope that is a more helpful explanation.

regards, Marilyn.

Subject: Re: BIG ERRORS: The Bride.
Posted by [james](#) on Mon, 30 Dec 2019 23:27:51 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Marilyn Crow wrote on Mon, 30 December 2019 23:03

Now why I have brought this topic up is that it is not doctrinally correct, only based on an exhortation, and something said by Paul specifically to his disciples. Also it leads to an error in where we believe we will go to be with the Lord. Then, and most importantly it leads to not making the Lord pre-eminent over all.

I`m am not concerned about my rulership etc but that the Lord be pre-eminent in all things, as the Father has purposed before time.

Hope that is a more helpful explanation.

regards, Marilyn.

Help me connect the dots Marilyn, I'm assuming you're concerned about The Lord Jesus not being "pre-eminent over all" in the life of a Christian, right? Because we know from scripture that He IS...preeminent over all Col. 1:15-18

Maybe you think believers zeal for Christ will wane if we don't have the same interpretation of future events?

Subject: Re: BIG ERRORS: The Bride.

Posted by [Marilyn Crow](#) on Mon, 30 Dec 2019 23:37:06 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

james wrote on Mon, 30 December 2019 21:34I respectfully disagree that there are apostles today (not even your dear uncle) so with that position, I can't and won't receive teachings that are based from that belief.

Hi James,

Any of us can just say, `I don`t believe such and such,` but it takes effort and study as God`s word says to discuss with each other.

`Be diligent to present yourself approved to God, a worker who does not need to be ashamed, rightly dividing the word of truth. (2 Tim. 2: 15)

And I have not seen you do that. I presented what God`s word says and you never commented. Always easy to hide behind emotive words. Here are the texts again -

`When He ascended on high.....He gave apostles....` (Eph. 4: 8 & 11) Note the `s` plural.

`Paul, Silvanus, and Timothy,..... Nor did WE seek glory from men, either from you or from others, when WE might have made demands as APOSTLES of Christ.`(1 Thess. 1 & 2 Thess. 2: 6)

Quite plain from God word.

Marilyn.

BTW I do not believe that all who call themselves `apostles` are truly so. Only the Lord knows who are His, I believe.

Subject: Re: BIG ERRORS: The Bride.
Posted by [Marilyn Crow](#) on Mon, 30 Dec 2019 23:44:20 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

james wrote on Mon, 30 December 2019 23:27Marilyn Crow wrote on Mon, 30 December 2019 23:03

Now why I have brought this topic up is that it is not doctrinally correct, only based on an exhortation, and something said by Paul specifically to his disciples. Also it leads to an error in where we believe we will go to be with the Lord. Then, and most importantly it leads to not making the Lord pre-eminent over all.

I`m am not concerned about my rulership etc but that the Lord be pre-eminent in all things, as the Father has purposed before time.

Hope that is a more helpful explanation.

regards, Marilyn.

Help me connect the dots Marilyn, I'm assuming you're concerned about The Lord Jesus not

being "pre-eminent over all" in the life of a Christian, right? Because we know from scripture that He IS...preeminent over all Col. 1:15-18
Maybe you think believers zeal for Christ will wane if we don't have the same interpretation of future events?

Hi James,

The Lord is pre-eminent over all as we know, and I`m sure Christians believe that. However because there has been false teaching regarding our inheritance then that actually presents the Lord in a lower rulership position.

The Holy Spirit has been sent to lead us into all truth concerning the Lord. Thus if I believe I see an error especially in relation to the Lordship of Christ, then it is my responsibility to bring up that discussion.

Marilyn.

Subject: Re: BIG ERRORS: The Bride.
Posted by [james](#) on Tue, 31 Dec 2019 01:09:58 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I'm sure there are people that presents Jesus in all kind of unbiblical ways and rulership positions, but that is not the case on this forum.

We know people also wrest scriptures to back up their beliefs as well as just plain misinterpreted what is being presented by God for our instruction. We can say we are ALL sent forth with a message, or are delegates for Christ...and that's true. But the Biblical pattern and example of an apostle (an we've been over this before on this forum) is the commissioned person had a direct encounter with Jesus, witnessed Him in person and was anointed by Jesus for specific purposes. Yes, we could say there were others in scripture called apostles but is that the proper translation of the original writings? I'm not digging out my Greek NT cause it wouldn't help me, I've forgotten everything I learned in Greek class 40 years ago.

Besides, if there are Apostles today my believing or not won't change the fact. Truth is truth whether anyone believes it or not.

Anyway, I'll bow out because this could go on forever, and I'm not interested enough to spent the time on it.

Hope I didn't offend you; I'm not offended, just not interested in something I know I will never convince you differently nor you me.

Subject: Re: BIG ERRORS: The Bride.
Posted by [Marilyn Crow](#) on Tue, 31 Dec 2019 03:23:36 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

James,

You have accused me of `hammering,` without any proof, no examples and then bow out. Is that Christian? You need to give examples so that I and others can learn what you are saying.

Otherwise there needs to be an apology for the accusation.

I have noticed in this topic that if someone does not agree then they will try and put down, accuse the other person, or flood the topic with lots of their own comments and not address the topic. It tells me that some people are threatened by certain scriptures.

Marilyn.

Subject: Re: BIG ERRORS: The Bride.
Posted by [james](#) on Tue, 31 Dec 2019 03:50:47 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Maybe the word hammering means something different in Australia than here...

I apologize for using the word " hammering " and that I offended you with it.

Sorry

Subject: Re: BIG ERRORS: The Bride.
Posted by [Marilyn Crow](#) on Tue, 31 Dec 2019 04:11:03 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Hi James,

`Hammering` gives the picture of someone continually hitting people over the head with their ideas.

Thank you for your apology. Much appreciated.

regards, Marilyn.

Subject: Re: BIG ERRORS: The Bride.
Posted by [william](#) on Tue, 31 Dec 2019 11:34:31 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Marilyn Crow wrote on Tue, 31 December 2019 03:23

I have noticed in this topic that if someone does not agree then they will try and put down, accuse the other person, or flood the topic with lots of their own comments and not address the topic. It tells me that some people are threatened by certain scriptures.

Marilyn.

Now that is funny!

Since I don't know anyone else you could be referring to but to me in this topic:

- 1) I have completely answered all of your propositions.
- 2) My 'put downs' are limited to actually showing that you've not proven ANY of your propositions.
- 3) My 'accusations' are that you have not provided ANY basis for your propositions.
- 4) My 'flood of comments' are almost exclusively directed to the topic and fortified with ample scripture references.
- 5) As to not addressing the 'topic'? How can you make such a statement when all I've done is address the topic???
- 6) You seem to be in a projecting-mode when you say that "some people are threatened by certain scriptures". Scripture is not something that should ever be feared, in fact, faith comes by hearing and hearing by the Word of God! It's my food, my nourishment!

The only thing that I haven't answered is your last appeal (the "they" "we" "better" argument) which, to anyone who reads the book of Hebrews knows full well that the central point of the whole book is that we have better promises, better covenant, better High Priest, better Sacrifice, etc..

The "weak and beggarly elements"(Gal4:9) of the old covenant dim in comparison to the new covenant!

Those OT saints are in for a blessing for sure!

My real surprise was that you didn't say that the verse you quoted was to the "Hebrews", (you know, those "Israelites") and not to the "body of Christ". That would have been more typical of your style of interpretation, but I understand, you couldn't get away with it here because it would

have threatened the very point you were making!!!

Lest I be accused of not being specific, let me quote you:

Quote:Hi William,

Let`s look a bit closer.

`And all of these, having obtained a good testimony through faith, did not receive the promise, God having provided SOMETHING BETTER for US, that THEY should not be made perfect apart from US.` (Heb. 11: 39 & 40)

Notice the `THEY and US.` The THEY are the Old Testament saints and the US are the Body of Christ.

`SOMETHING BETTER` relates to a greater dominion. (Greek - kreitton & kratos)

`MADE PERFECT`,` relates to being complete, to consummate.

Thus we see that the OT saints will be made complete in the city after the Body of Christ will be with Christ on His throne, the greater dominion.

Okay, 'let's look a bit closer'.

The verse is not a problem if it is simply read in the context of the book so I won't try to give an opinion, it really needs no interpretation.

You, however, feel the need to make 3 points.

1) "Better" relates to greater dominion. (Greek - kreitton & kratos).

It does not have anything to do with "dominion" except in your own mind. You are acting like you've already made a case for your proposition when you have yet to present any evidence for it--beyond repeating it over and over.)

Here are the places the word for "better" (grk. ἵππεύω) is used in the book of Hebrews:

(Hebrews 1:4; 6:9; 7:7; 7:19; 7:22; 8:6; 9:23; 10:34; 11:16; 11:35; 11:40; 12:24)

Hebrews 1:4: Being made so much better than the angels, as he hath by inheritance obtained a more excellent name than they.

Hebrews 6:9: But, beloved, we are persuaded better things of you, and things that accompany salvation, though we thus speak.

Hebrews 7:7: And without all contradiction the less is blessed of the better.

Hebrews 7:19: For the law made nothing perfect, but the bringing in of a better hope did; by the which we draw nigh unto God.

Hebrews 7:22: By so much was Jesus made a surety of a better testament.

Hebrews 8:6: But now hath he obtained a more excellent ministry, by how much also he is the mediator of a better covenant, which was established upon better promises.

Hebrews 9:23: It was therefore necessary that the patterns of things in the heavens should be purified with these; but the heavenly things themselves with better sacrifices than these.

Hebrews 10:34: For ye had compassion of me in my bonds, and took joyfully the spoiling of your goods, knowing in yourselves that ye have in heaven a better and an enduring substance.

Hebrews 11:16: But now they desire a better country, that is, an heavenly: wherefore God is not ashamed to be called their God: for he hath prepared for them a city.

Hebrews 11:35: Women received their dead raised to life again: and others were tortured, not accepting deliverance; that they might obtain a better resurrection:

Hebrews 11:40: God having provided some better thing for us, that they without us should not be made perfect.

Hebrews 12:24: And to Jesus the mediator of the new covenant, and to the blood of sprinkling, that speaketh better things than that of Abel.

How do you get the idea of "Dominion" from these verses? Does the writer simply change the way he/she is using the word, without warning, in verse 40?

Remember, you can't use a proposition that you haven't made a case for, and then use it to "prove" that this usage "relates to greater dominion".

2) Your second point is the words translated "MADE PERFECT", you say this "relates to being complete, to consummate."

I see no real problem here because the greek words "ἡ τελειότης" or "teleiōtēs" (tel-i-o'-o;

from G5046;) means: to complete, i.e. (literally) accomplish, or (figuratively) consummate (in character):--consecrate, finish, fulfil, make) perfect. But again, no idea of dominion here, yet you continue...

3) Your third point: "Thus we see that the OT saints will be made complete in the city after the Body of Christ will be with Christ on His throne, the greater dominion."

No, we don't "see" something that you see (again, you are using an unproved proposition, that you have set out to make but so far have come up short). Where is the separation between us (body of Christ), the OT saints, and the "we" of Heb11:40? Where is this "greater dominion"? The text does not support what you are contending. Why are you continually adding your gloss to the scripture? That is a dangerous thing.

Is it possible for you to quote us a passage without your editorial guidance? We know how to read scripture. You seem incapable of setting forth your doctrine without your own glosses added. That is a shame.

Anyone who teaches SOUND Biblical doctrine ought to be able to do it using scripture itself. Teaching unsound doctrine... now that's impossible without gloss.

William
